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**Introduction**

Material culture comes in many forms, but one form of material culture that is deeply culturally self-reflective is dolls. Dolls reflect what it means to be a human being and a member of society for a particular culture during a particular historical period. For the purposes of this study, I will concentrate on discussing Native American dolls, but I will also bring in other forms of Native American material culture that surround the dolls and help with their explanation. The iconography of dolls displays various features of a culture. The iconography of a doll from a Native American culture can show the materials a culture has access to, what is valued or important to a culture, and/or represent the basic characteristics of a culture. Through cross-cultural impact, the iconographies changed; it is this change that will be the main discussion of this paper.

There is some conjecture on the identification of dolls; not only their originating cultures, but also their materials. There has

---

*Figure 1: A cradle doll from the Hualapai tribe of the Southwest*
been culture diffusion between tribes and cultures that lived within close proximity of each other. This diffusion led to a blending of styles among and between tribes. There are also issues with the identification of materials used in the case of animal hides. Without running tests on pieces of the material, it is impossible to positively identify the actual animal the hide came from.

There are also issues with fake Native American crafts circulating the markets. Fakes are reproductions of crafts that individuals claim to be authentic. There is also some illegal trafficking of ethnographic materials. This has also stemmed from looting of archaeological sites, but there is also some trafficking that stemmed from wars that took place between tribes and also between the European colonizers and the Native Americans.

There are wild misconceptions about Native American cultures. During the early period of tourism within Native American regions, many Euro-Americans developed an idea of American Indians and romanticized their cultures. Many Euro-Americans and Europeans began to associate all Native American cultures with the cultures and traditions of the Plains Indians (Johnson 2011: 89). Many Native American craftsmen began to make dolls that reflected this Eurocentric association and made their dolls in the style of the Plains Indians, even if it was not their traditional custom. This further instilled the idea within Europeans’ minds that there was a general culture among Native Americans. This view is false as I will explain through a later
discussion of the various cultures of Native Americans in the Cultural Regions section.

This thesis takes as its focus one particular doll collection: during the late 1940s through the 1950s, Ruth Doyle, an anthropologist and sociologist, collected a variety of Native American dolls from around the country with the help of her sister, Agnes Baptist. Agnes worked on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota as a nurse. It was through the network of nurses on the reservations throughout the continent that Agnes was able to help her sister obtain so many dolls. Ruth Doyle received her undergraduate degree in Anthropology and Sociology from Boston University. It was here that she developed her love and interest for Native American cultures, but her love of dolls also stemmed from her family. The family that Agnes and Ruth were from had a history of craft makers. Ruth herself made quilts and dolls and they had another family member who was a doll collector. Together, Agnes Baptist and Ruth Doyle compiled a wide collection of dolls and other ethnographic materials from all over the country and from numerous cultural regions and tribes. (Personal communication, Tom Doyle: April 4, 2014)

In 1993, Ruth Doyle and Tom Doyle, her son, donated the doll collection to the Robbins Museum of Archaeology in Middleboro, Massachusetts. It was donated in memory of Howard Doyle, the husband of Ruth Doyle, who accompanied Ruth on many other trips around the New England Area to obtain more dolls. Originally the Smithsonian National Museum of the American
Indian wanted the collection to add to their repertory of ethnographic materials, but Ruth Doyle wanted the collection to stay within New England. (Doyle Doll Collection Catalog; Personal Communication, Tom Doyle: April 4, 2014)

Studying these dolls is a very important anthropological project for a variety of reasons. Firstly, studying these dolls gives insight into not only the dolls as items of material culture, but this study has the potential to generate a wider understanding of Native American cultures during a particular time period. Essentially, I believe these dolls can provide a window into the history of Native American cultures through the study of material culture. The dolls are embodiments of history, just as they are embodiments of culture. Secondly, these dolls can provide insight into theories of change and continuity, especially in the case of diffusion. For further ethnographic purposes, these studies can be used in comparative ethnographic studies on cultural similarities and differences.
Thirdly, this study provides a framework in which material culture can be studied in respect to the impacts of colonization on indigenous peoples. There are further insights that can be made using dolls and other forms of material culture that will be covered in the conclusion of this paper; these include religious and political insights.

The impacts of colonization and European contact can still be viewed in Native American material culture today. In the case of dolls, contact and colonization changed the types and forms of materials that were used in creation of arts and crafts. Further, the new materials changed the techniques that were used in developing the arts and crafts. The purposes of the dolls and other crafts changed. What once had the purpose of teaching within the culture, changed into a form of economic surplus and eventually economic dependence. That is not to say that Native Americans no longer make dolls for themselves within their cultures for their own uses, but, at least as a majority, dolls have been transformed into a commodity for Euro-Americans to purchase. The colonization and introduction of Western innovations changed Native American culture, but more specifically material culture. The changes and variations in material culture over time can give insights into the histories, ethnohistories, and the fundamental core values of a culture of past and contemporary cultures.

This thesis includes the following sections: a literature review, a discussion of the value, meaning and changing nature of material culture; an overview of
Native American culture regions, a discussion of the dolls themselves in relationship to the culture regions; the historical and sociocultural impact of colonization; an overview of the contested notions of art vs. craft; the impact of colonization on the dolls themselves, and a case study of three dolls. I conclude with an overview of the value of the project and work that remains to be done for future researchers.
Literature Review

In writing a paper of this volume, there are many factors that must be included and accounted for: for instance, where the information is coming from, what the information is about, and whether or not it is correct. I was fortunate in that I was able to find many sources to use within the body of my paper and to help my research along, but there were cases in which different sources had conflicting information. It was at that point that I had to base my decision of which piece of information to use upon my own personal knowledge and intuition. There was also some information that I could not find or was unavailable, and thus was not included in this paper.

There is also some uncertainty about many aspects of pre-contact material culture for many regions, but none of the regions had such limited information as the Southeast. Overwhelmingly, there is ambiguity about the origins of many objects. As noted, there was cultural diffusion even before contact, and tribes would adopt different customs based on the customs of other tribes. One of my sources, American Indian Art, addresses this:

Uncertainty about the real origin of Indian objects can also be due to actual tribal custom. Most Indian groups engaged in exchanges of gifts with other groups during informal visits or peacemaking. When such exchanges continued over a long period, they contributed to a blending of tribal styles. A basic similarity of style then emerged for the participating tribes. (Feder: 28)

After contact, there is also the factor of Pan-Indianism. This is also discussed in American Indian Art:
In the Oklahoma area and elsewhere, a special phenomenon known as Pan-Indianism has developed. Here many different tribes were placed on reservations in proximity to one another, and a blending and borrowing of tribal styles evolved to the point where most groups completely lost their individuality. (Feder: 45).

These factors make identification an imperfect science and it cannot always be done reliably.

I have also stated elsewhere in this paper that material identification cannot always be done. When a doll is made from hide or has hide clothing, it is obvious. What is not always obvious is the type of animal the hide came from. Without taking a sample—essentially destroying the integrity of an object—and performing tests on the sample, an identification cannot be made without having been told by the maker (who may also misinform on purpose or by accident) at the time of purchase or having written records that state this information. Therefore, I cannot state or include the difference in hide in relation to the Doyle Doll Collection.

In conducting my research, I was able to use many different books, journals, and scholarly/magazine articles. In all of my searching, I was only able to find very limited information on dolls specifically; only one of the books I used, *Small Spirits: Native American Dolls from the National Museum of the American Indian* by Mary Jane Lenz (2004), was specifically on dolls. Thus, much of the information I gathered had to be drawn from information on Native American crafts of a region or tribe as a whole. This made some of my research more difficult and challenging.
Through the whole of my research I conducted one interview. It was with Tom Doyle, the son of one of the collectors. I was hoping to learn other information about his family and the collection, but instead he took the interview time to ask me questions about my research. This was very eye-opening to the difficulties of conducting interviews, especially when someone is so close to the research you have conducted. He became very defensive during the interview and, thus, was less helpful in answering my questions. He did not really provide any information that I did not already have. Included with the collection are personal letters, receipts from purchase, articles about the family from newspapers, a scrapbook made by Agnes Baptist, and an original catalog made by Ruth Doyle. This is where some of the personal information about the dolls and about the family came from. Along with all of these items, there was a transcript of an interview of Ruth Doyle. This transcript gave me the rest of the information on the dolls and the family.

Along with the research I conducted, I also incorporated theoretical frameworks from several past anthropologists. To discuss briefly, I explored the implications of the theories of Malinowski, Steward, Leacock, Turner, and Wolf. For Malinowski, I drew from both his Theory of Needs and his three orders of sociocultural reality. Steward’s theory of Cultural Ecology was introduced in the Cultural Regions section. I was able to incorporate the theories of Leacock on feminism and colonialism. For Turner, I used his theories on symbols and symbolism and from Wolf, I used his theories on power, history, and culture. Unfortunately, I did not come across any Native
American theories in my research and, therefore, I was not able to implement their theoretical views. (Moore 2012)

All of these various aspects of my paper were incorporated in different ways and made my paper what it is. By including the theoretical frameworks, I was able to go beyond the surface of information provided by other texts and provide deeper meaning and value to the information I introduced. Although I did have access to primary sources on the collection, they were not as helpful as the other secondary sources I used. This is because the primary sources did not have as deep of an iconography or as complete of an ethnohistory. Instead, I combined various pieces of information from various secondary sources that has not necessarily been used in the ways it will be for the purposes of the paper.
Material Culture

Material culture can be defined in a variety of different ways, but, for the purposes of this paper, I have taken material culture to mean a physical and concrete form that has contextual and symbolic significance within its respective society beyond its fundamental purpose. As previously stated, the scope of this paper will focus on material culture in the form of Native American dolls, but that is not to imply that material culture does not come in other various mediums and forms. In early Native American culture, arts and other crafts were considered to be inseparable from other aspects of culture; unlike Western society, art was not created for art’s sake (Johnson 2011: 6).

As to be expected, the materials of the Native American artist were the materials that were most readily available, but these were not the only materials used. The use of rare materials gave prestige to its owner and, thus, were eagerly sought out (Feder: 33). Intertribal trade was conducted not only in these raw materials, but also in finished products which had incorporated rare materials (ibid: 33). It can be derived from this information that materials and material objects within Native American society acquire cultural status both during and after they have been consciously or unconsciously assigned meaning and value by the members of the society (Axtell 1981: 256).

When considering material culture, one must be aware of the arguments of art versus craft and their differences. As far as American Indian societies are concerned, there is no distinct difference; art begins as a craft and craft
begins as an art (Dockstader 1962: 21). There are copious arguments on the subject of art versus craft; each taking a different perspective and applying various definitions to each side. For instance: one position states that any craft has the potential to become a work of art, but it is not until after an exceptional amount of creativity and technical skill is applied that a craft is brought to this new level (Dockstader 1962: 21). Another argument states that the works “art” and “craft” are folk terms and are ambiguous for stylistic traits (Becker 1978: 863). Another defines craft as being the knowledge and skill used to produce useful objects that are the pre-ideological aesthetic standard dominating creativity whereas “art” is defined by standards and aesthetics established by the global art world (Becker 1978: 864, Dockstader 1962: 21).

Generally speaking, art is seen as being above craftwork. From this value judgment, it can only be assumed that an artist would be held to a higher standard than a craftsperson. The artistic elite consider craftspersons to have the skill set that supports the artist’s unique expression he gives a work (Becker 1978: 863). Thus, the craft has a purpose beyond its surface whereas art is meant only to be admired, appreciated, and experienced (Becker 1978: 869). Some argue that crafts can be aesthetically pleasing even though art emphasizes beauty; others would argue that the crossover into the aesthetic realm is greater than the skills of the craft.

This argument of the aesthetics of craftsmanship has divided the craftsperson into two forms: the ordinary craftsperson and the artist-
craftsperson. These forms go beyond the crafts themselves and also take into consideration the purpose of the craftsperson. According to Becker, the ordinary craftsperson is “trying to do decent work and make a living”, while the artist-craftsperson has “more ambitious goals and ideologies” (1978: 866). This distinction creates a hierarchy that puts the artist at the top, the artist-craftsperson in the middle, and the craftsperson on the bottom. With only the craftwork being considered, it can then be assumed that the artist-craftsperson’s work would be above that of the ordinary craftsperson; from this we can derive that the ordinary craftsperson would see the artist-craftsperson’s work as a source of ideas and innovation (Becker 1978: 866).

One dimension of craft creation is the craftsperson/employer relationship. This person defines what the outcome of the craftsperson’s work should be, thus creating a worker-employer relationship. In this relationship, the employer has the final say over a product, but also understands the worker—in this case the craftsperson—possesses the special skills and knowledge necessary to create the product while the worker recognizes the employer’s authority over the final product (Becker 1978: 866). This relationship is an example of a symbiotic understanding of the roles each person plays.

This relationship can be considered a parallel to the American Indian craftsperson and tourist relationship in which the tourist would be considered the employer. When a Native American craftsperson creates a product to sell
to tourists he must take into consideration what the tourist will find aesthetically pleasing and what the tourist will be willing to buy. Although the craftsperson may possess skills beyond what is displayed in the crafts he sells, he must consider whether or not using his more advanced skill set is financially worth the time or effort. If the materials the craftsperson uses are too expensive, the tourist may not be willing to purchase his crafts; conversely, if the craftsperson spends too much time working on a single craft, he may not have enough crafts to sell to the tourists and, thus, will not earn enough money to remain financially stable.

Studying material culture has numerous implications and can be used in various fields of study. As just expressed, the study of material culture can easily be applied to the worker-employer relationship. One can also choose to study material culture from a different angle or perspective. The broadness of the topic allows studies on material culture to be applied to various aspects of daily life, culture, and ethnographic objects. It can then be assumed that large amounts of qualitative and quantitative information can be derived from studies on material culture and these studies can have numerous foci.

In relation to the Doyle Doll Collection, the study of material culture is purposeful. Within this collection, the method of acquisition of the dolls varies; some of the dolls were gifted to either Ruth or Agnes, others were purchased passing through an area, and others were purchased by sending letters to doll makers across the country. Therefore, there very well could be dolls within the
collection that were made to appease the taste of the Euro-American tourist.

With further research, one could provide information on the differences between these different dolls and whether or not the variations in gifting or purchasing were variables of change.
Cultural Regions

Before delving further into the topic of material culture with respect to Native Americans, the diverse cultural regions of Native Americans must be discussed. While there are human cultural universals including such practices as marriage, an incest taboo, among others, and it can be suggested that variation within these universals is too broad to be useful, it is important to acknowledge, as would be expected, that societies within close proximity would share cultural characteristics. Still, these shared characteristics also incorporate very distinct differences.

Naturally, the most common materials societies use that are culturally sanctioned are readily available within their area. The materials that are not found in the area must be traded for other goods with peoples who have access. One can discern that one of the easiest ways to geographically locate the origins of an object of material culture is to geographically locate the origins of the natural materials of the object. The bits of information one can derive from materials are the clues to what the society regarded as important or significant, as aesthetically pleasing, or just as easily accessible and usable.

In relation to dolls, each cultural region would have had its own cultural traditions when crafting the dolls during the pre-contact era. The materials that were used for crafting would depend on accessibility; obviously a Plains woman crafting a doll for her daughter would not be carving it from whalebone unless she had obtained it through trade. With the proper understanding, the
dolls have the ability to convey the cultural diversity of the American Indians, but also their diverse natural environments (Lenz 2008). Without even a brief background in the various cultural regions, some of the information conveyed could be missed.

The cultural regions of American Indians have been divided many ways since the first anthropological inquiries—language, geographic location, topographical region. The standard used today was developed by Alfred Kroeber and lists the regions as Woodlands, Southeast, Plains, Southwest, California, Northwest, Sub-arctic, and Arctic (personal communication, Curtis Hoffman May 19, 2014). It is important to note that these regions are often divided further into sub-regions; these sub-regions are also defined by the topography and have their own variations within the region. One of the most important aspects of each cultural region is the topography. The topography of a region has more impact on a society than most people give credit. (Johnson 2011)

Depending on the kind of topography of a region, the societies that inhabit it will be shaped by it. For example, the peoples of the southwestern deserts are not going to be largely concerned with whaling; instead, they will build their livelihood around the resources they have access to. Julian Steward referred to this process of adapting to an environment as Cultural Ecology (Moore 2012: 178-180). In a very general relation to Steward’s theory, the problems of securing livelihood, or the ability to easily do so, are correlated
to the quantity and nature of artistic productions (Feder: 35). According to
Steward, these adaptations shape the underlying patterns of society including
different aspects of material culture, and even its meanings and values as part
of a culture core (Moore 2012: 179). The ensuing sections will discuss the
culture regions identified above.

**The Woodlands:** The Woodland tribes of the northeast were of the
earliest people to have contact with the Europeans. They are among the most
well studied regions. These peoples spoke many languages and were located in
various sub-regions. Generally speaking, these people were hunters, fishers,
and gatherers, but agriculture was still found further away from the sub-arctic
(Johnson 2011: 19). Like all other Native Americans pre-contact, they made
their clothes out of animal hide and used the natural materials they had access
to in order to create the decoration of their clothing. These decorations
included embroidery of quills and the hair of various animals—commonly
moose hair in the north—and dyes of plants and roots (ibid: 21). The animals
were hunted by the men and then the process of dehairing and tanning the
hide was left to the women; an obvious example of division of labor (ibid: 37).

After contact with the European traders, the Woodland peoples began to
adopt many of the materials the Europeans have brought in trade, such as
cloth, ribbon, beads, thread, and artificial dyes (ibid: 23). The introduction of
these materials changed much of the material culture of the region; a pattern
that was soon to follow with other tribes as the Europeans moved west. With
the westward expansion of the Europeans, many of the Woodland tribes were forced west (ibid: 18).

**The Southeast:** The tribes of the Southeast are among the least studied. Some of my sources claim that very little from the pre-contact period is known about them. The common theory about their origins claims they are descended from the Mound Builders of the Mississippian region (Johnson 2011: 138). Other sources suggest the peoples of this region were sedentary hunter-gatherers who had also adopted some agriculture; they only moved when food within their area became scarce (“Southeastern American Indian Facts”). After the decimation of a majority of these tribes by European diseases, the tribes of this region—the Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Seminole, and Cherokee—most likely adopted members of other tribes that had been all but wiped out, becoming the tribes we are familiar with today (Johnson 2011: 138). After this point, these tribes became farmers and had strong similarities to the characteristics of the white southerners, including owning land and slaves (ibid: 139). To the European settlers, they were known as the “Five Civilized Tribes” (ibid: 139).

**The Plains:** The peoples and tribes of the Plains are among the most well known; their cultures were adopted as the romanticized ideals of Native Americans in Western culture. This region is very topographically diverse and, thus, culturally diverse—if we are to follow the Cultural Ecology theory of Steward. Generally speaking, the Plains people relied heavily on the bison—not
only for food, but also for their hides, bones, and horns. Their reliance on the bison herds made them a nomadic people who moved with the herds, but it was not until after the introduction of the horse by the Spanish that they were more efficiently nomadic (Johnson 2011: 89).

Although these peoples relied highly on the bison, they also hunted other game similar to their neighbors the Woodlands people: elk, moose, and caribou. When a woman’s husband killed one of these animals, it would be her duty to tan the hide; this division of labor was a commonality among Native American tribes. After the tanning process was over, they would make various goods from the hide, including shirts, dresses, and tipis (ibid: 90). Conversely, the men would be in charge of decorating ceremonial clothing with painting (ibid: 91).

The Southwest: The tribes of the Southwest are also among the most well studied Native American cultures and were among the first to have European contact with the Spanish (“Southwest” 2000: 187). The land here is semi-desert and desert and the people who live here are largely divided between two major groups: the Athabascan and the Pueblos. These two groups were often at war with one another, but the Navajo of the Athabascan absorbed many of the traditions of the Pueblo, especially the Hopi. These traditions included weaving, masked dances, and agriculture (Johnson 2011: 152). The Pueblo peoples were often being culturally invaded by not only the raiding Athabascans, but also the Spanish who attempted to influence their religious
beliefs. Despite this, the Pueblos were able to maintain their religious systems based around the kachinas, or supernatural spirits (“Southwest” 2000: 219). The southwest also included the tribes of the Great Basin who were nomadic peoples (“Great Basin” 2000: 277).

**California and the Northwest:** I found very limited information on the peoples of California and the Northwest. They were largely sedentary people. The tribes of California and the Northwest Coast were fishers and gatherers; the tribes of the Northwest Coast were also known for whaling. They built coastal houses and large fishing boats (Johnson 2011: 182).

**The Arctic and the Sub-Arctic:** The regions of the Arctic and the Sub-arctic are commonly thought of as the land of the Eskimo and the igloo by those with limited background in the field; the Arctic and Sub-Arctic regions are actually much more diverse than this. The people of this region were mainly fishers and hunters who lived in seasonal houses. During the winter, some of the Canadian Inuit would live in igloos or in sod, wood, and whalebone semi-subterranean huts at winter village sites; during the summer, seal or caribou skin lodges were used (Johnson 2011: 224). Much like other regions, the men would hunt and the women would tan the hides afterwards in order to make clothing or other items (ibid: 225).

After first contact with the Europeans, the diverse cultures of North American Indians began to undergo vast and various forms of change. One of the initial and possibly the most remarkable form of change was caused by
trade. When the Europeans arrived with new and innovative materials, many Native Americans were quick to adapt. Many of the materials that were introduced were not necessarily any more functional than the materials they already had, but they were more aesthetically pleasing and were considered to be signs of prestige (“Woodlands” 2000: 27). Among these items of prestige, there were also functional items that were adopted, such as iron and brass metalwork. Many of these Western materials—but not all—gradually replaced the traditional native materials. This eventually forced the Native Americans into an economic dependence of the fur trade in order to continue to obtain Western materials (ibid: 27).

This replacement of natural materials and the dependence on the fur trade caused major changes in the cultures of the Native Americans. This is explained by several theoretical frameworks; and here I will focus on the theories of both Malinowski and Leacock as separate, but working together as a single unit for the purposes of my paper. Using Leacock’s argument on capitalism and production, it can be argued that the socioeconomic changes brought about by Western society created a capitalist society and brought about the inevitable subordination of women (Moore 2012: 200-201). Men were employed by the European settlers and traders in the fur trade because of the European patriarchal ethnocentrism which displaced women and rendered men more powerful through their immediate integration into the capitalist economy.
The second theory comes from Malinowski and his Theory of Needs. Malinowski argued that cultural responses created new conditions which caused new cultural responses and this process continued. He then theorized that there are cultural responses to basic needs which create new conditions from which new needs surface and are established in human behavior (ibid: 128-129). When Western innovations were introduced into native societies, the cultural response of acceptance of the innovations created the new condition of a desire for Western innovations. This in turn led to a greater dependence on western goods, linking American Indian societies with European goods and trade. This engendered economic dependence on the Europeans. As will be discussed later, this historical process impacted the dolls in the collection from the various regions through materials used in their creation.
The Dolls

With the further understanding of the cultural regions the Native Americans belonged to, the dolls they made will have deeper meaning and purpose. Dolls can be found all over the world and in many different time periods. For the Native Americans, the dolls had a variety of purposes and were believed to have their own inner spirits because of their cultural significance; it is generally believed that this idea stems from the anthropomorphic forms of the dolls (Lenz 2004: 7). Thus, the original value of the dolls was spiritual and social, not monetary (Lenz 2004: 8).

The dolls had many purposes within Native American society, but, most interestingly, the dolls reflected the actual people of the tribe. The only place this was not the case was in the Southwest in the case of the kachinas; this will be discussed later on in the paper. The reason this is so interesting is because the dolls were so specific that they represented each tribe’s idea of what it meant to be human (Lenz 2008).

The main purpose one finds when studying Native American dolls is the objective of teaching children. When girls are young, and sometimes also boys, they are given dolls; from these dolls they learn details of their tribe’s traditional life and culture and they also learn gender roles, including specific skills they will need as they move into the adult world. Young Plains boys, for example, learn about war parties and young girls learn the role and skills of a mother (ibid: 49). Dolls are also found in ceremonies, teaching children about
spiritual life. The *kachina* dolls represent the different spirits that come down from the mountains. The men will dress up as the spirits and perform different dances in ceremonies held in the *Kivas*, and they are associated with fertility, rain, reproduction, the harvest and the general well-being of the cosmos as well as ability of Hopi society to reproduce itself. Having these dolls is a way for the children to comprehend and make a connection to who these different spirits are (ibid: 18). The *kachinas* were made for children, but were also a major part of the ceremonies held in the *Kivas*; it was here that children were given their *kachinas*. For the purposes of this paper, these teaching dolls are the ones I will be focused on. Each region has different traditions in the materials used and the crafting of each doll. Therefore I organized this section by these regional variations:

**The Woodlands:** The peoples of this region were known for a variety of dolls, but none are better known than the cornhusk dolls. The cornhusk doll was actually made in many parts of the country, although the cornhusk dolls of the Iroquois were the most well known (Lenz 2004: 65). The Seneca and Oneida tribes—segments of the Iroquois tribe—also used cornhusk when making their dolls, but they would sometimes include an apple-head to their dolls. This type of doll was made by shaping an apple into a face as it dried and attaching it to a body made of cornhusk (ibid: 66-67).

**The Southeast:** There is very little information on the traditional dolls of this region because of the early and deep impact the Westerners had on these
peoples (Lenz 2004: 69). In post-contact dolls, mainly trade cloth was used. The most well known dolls of the Southeastern tribes were the patchwork dolls of the Seminole tribe.

**The Plains**: The dolls of this region were traditionally made from wood, hide, and other natural materials that were used for decoration. At a young age, children were given dolls that were extremely simple, but as they aged their dolls became more complex and realistic; they even began to make the dolls themselves (Lenz 2004: 60). I find the most fascinating feature of these dolls to be their reflections as true representations of people. As an example, the female dolls of the Blackfoot tribe would often have white beading on their dark bodices. This beading was meant to represent the elk teeth that were sewn onto a woman’s dress that represented the status of her family (ibid: 17). The dolls followed the trends of their life-sized counterparts; because of this, the dolls can be used to trace the development and changes in the tribes (Kant 1989: 65).

The dolls of the Plains people are well represented as used by both girls and boys. The girls would treat their dolls as they would their future children and carry them in cradleboards. The boys would use their dolls to represent hunting or war. The boys would play together, just as they would have to work together in the real situation. The boys would often create lances and shields from parts of a willow tree (Lenz 2004: 64).
**The Southwest:** As previously noted, this region is known for its diversity in the different tribes located here. The Apache, who were part of the Athabascan people, would make dolls from forked sticks and would attach horsehair. These dolls were often decorated with what would be jewelry and the traditional dress of their makers. The other Athabascan people, the Navajo, are among the very few American Indians who did not traditionally make dolls. They had a traditional belief that representations of the human form were only to be used in religious contexts; this belief was later relaxed by the 1940s.

The Pueblo people did not commonly make dolls that represented the actual people of their tribes. Instead, as I mentioned above, they made dolls that represented the spirits they worshiped known as *kachinas.* These dolls were traditionally known as *tihu (tihu in the singular).* They were carved from wood and colorfully

![Figure 3: Kachina from the Hopi tribe of the Southwest](image-url)
painted (Lenz 2004: 72). Although these dolls are meant to represent the spirits the Pueblo peoples worshipped, these dolls also reflect the men who would dress as these spirits during ceremonial dances, helping to teach children to recognize these numerous spirits (ibid: 14). During these dances, children would be given the *kachina* dolls by the men who were dressed as the *kachinas*. Although the dolls did not represent people, the children would still play with these dolls and carry them around as children from other regions did with their dolls.

**California and the Northwest:** Like the Southeast, there is little information on the dolls of California and Northwest peoples. This was caused by the invasion and the settlement of this region by the Russians in the north and the Spanish further south. From what little is known, the dolls of this region were very simple. They were made from shells, cedar bark, or stone (Lenz 2004: 57).

**The Arctic and the Sub-arctic:** The vastness of this region accounts for many variations between styles and materials; that is not to assume that there is a lack of similarity between the tribes of this region. Unlike other regions, an Arctic or Sub-arctic child’s first doll would be carved by his or her father from bone or ivory from a walrus. Along the coasts, many dolls would be carved from driftwood (Lenz 2004: 51). Many of these dolls did not have arms, presumably because this would make them easier to dress. These dolls often had many changes in clothing. Young girls would often set traps for small
animals in order to obtain their skins for the clothing of their dolls. These skins would become parkas with the legs of the creatures becoming the doll’s arms (ibid: 54).

Other variations in the dolls of this region were dolls made with wood or ivory as the torso and stuffed sealskin as the legs. This variation allowed the dolls to be able to sit and also carried like mother’s carried their babies (ibid: 54). The variation in clothing styles, hairstyles, and faces found in the dolls reflect the regional variation of the Arctic and Sub-arctic (ibid: 54).

Figure 4: Set of dolls from the Shishmaref tribe of the Sub-Arctic
Historical/Sociocultural Impacts caused by European Contact

There are many techniques and materials that have been used and changed over time by various regions. This is expressed in the example of Plains Indians who would use shells traded from the Woodlands people in their ornamentation. The cause of these changes can be found in various aspects of life—trade, wars, political affiliations—but none had as large of an impact as European contact and colonization.

Before the arrival of the Europeans, the Native Americans had connections between different tribes and regions for various reasons. One of the largest connections was through intertribal trade (Feder: 43). Although there are vague lines drawn by scholars between the various cultural regions, there are limited—but not a complete lack of—well defined boundaries. This allowed for major trade routes and an easier spread in ideas and development across the continent through trade. Pertaining to material culture, these ideas and developments included appliqué and embroidery techniques, various uses of different natural materials, and different traditions in style (Johnson 2011: 23). Trade is commonly found between peoples within relatively close proximity, although this is not always the case. Traded items can include a variety of things, including items of material culture. Although dolls were used to convey cultural values, it is most likely safe to assume that there were dolls made specifically for trade that existed before the arrival of the Europeans.
because dolls were aspects of material culture and, therefore, could have been traded (Lenz 2004: 123).

Another reason for adaptation comes most predominantly from the Southwest, although there are other examples in the Plains. This reason is war and raiding. The Athabascan people were well known for their raids on the Pueblo people. As agriculturalists, the Pueblo had access to many different products the Athabascan could use. Although much of their contact with the Pueblos was through raiding, the Athabascan people eventually adopted many aspects of Pueblo society including simple agriculture, weaving of textiles and baskets, and various ceremonial concepts that suited their needs (“Southwest” 2000: 232). As stated above, during the pre-contact era, the Navajo specifically did not traditionally make dolls; it was not until dolls were developed as a commodity that they began to be made. Among the materials the Navajo adapted from the Pueblo, weaving was most certainly one of the major adaptations used and developed with doll making. This is not the same for the other Athabascan peoples, the Apache, who did traditionally make dolls. (Lenz 2004).

After the arrival of the Europeans in the Native world, there were greater changes throughout American Indian life. This stemmed from the effect of colonization on commerce and the economy as discussed in the history of the Material Culture section. Although there are some generalizations that are possible, using dolls as commodities did not happen the same way in each
region or tribe because each group reacted to foreign contact in a different way, but, eventually, the purposes of using dolls as objects of commerce became the same. According to Mary Jane Lenz, this happened in the form of three periods: as the by-product of other forms of trade, deliberate production of dolls as souvenirs, and the careful replication of traditional arts and creation of contemporary arts for a specialized art market (2004: 128). The final form does not directly pertain to the topic of this thesis or the Doyle doll Collection because the timeframe of this form comes after the dates of the collection and, therefore, I will not discuss this aspect.

The initial form of dolls as commerce through trade began with the earliest arrivals of Europeans. During the seventeenth century along the Atlantic Coast and the eighteenth century in Alaska, dolls became a byproduct of trading. The dolls were often traded alongside the real business—furs, pelts, hides, and other commodities that built fortunes for the European merchants—that was being conducted (ibid: 131). During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, European expansion around the globe and this side-trading with Native Americans led to a European interest in cultural exotica, which they called “artificial curiosities”, and an interest in the ethnographic “Other” (ibid: 128).

Many forms of material culture, including dolls, began to be seen as expendable or disposable within their own society (ibid: 131). By the nineteenth century, Europeans, even those who had not set foot in the
Americas, began to collect these exotic curios and curio cabinets became part of the middle- and upper-class houses. Dolls took on new meanings—becoming integrated into the Euro-American world of “traditional” or “tribal arts and crafts.” Out of this process, ethnographic museums began to develop to display the objects of “The Other” (ibid: 128).

The second form of dolls as commerce was a continuation of trade and the Euro-American and European desire for curios. With a heightened interest in “The Other”, American Indians began to realize they could profit from such an interest. This also resulted in Euro-American and European tourism. Where the earliest traded dolls came from the Atlantic Coast and Alaska, this is also true of the first dolls made specifically for profit (ibid: 132). There are certain conditions that need to be met in order for tourism to take place. Tourism is conducted by peoples living in conditions of high productivity with the available means for travel and leisure (Nash 1997: Figure 5: Birchbark teepee with doll and canoe from the Ojibwa tribe of the Woodlands’ Great Lakes)
36). The inhabitants of tribal territories must also be friendly and not hostile towards the tourists.

Nash argues that this analysis of the underlying framework of tourism is similar to Malinowski’s “three orders of sociocultural reality: the native or traditional, the modern or industrial, and the transitional” (1997: 44). Studying the differing forms of touristic contact between Native Americans and Europeans, Malinowski’s hierarchy can be applied. Beginning with the earliest form, only a few members of each society had interaction and were fully aware of the other. These sociocultural impacts are the products that occur from the social relationships of the tourists and the Natives and are the major influential factors in the eventual evolution into the transitional consuming the traditional and the adaptation of the Native social system to fit this new sociocultural reality (Mathieson 1982: 135, Nash 1997: 43). Wolf defined sociocultural impacts as “people-impacts”, meaning, they were the effects on people by other people (Mathieson 1982: 133). These new dolls, which were considered to be “Indian artifacts” by their buyers and started to be made at the rise of tourism, must be considered in this new sociocultural context (“Woodlands” 2000: 28).

For some families, the sale of these “Indian artifacts” as souvenirs became an important source of income; what was once a way of teaching children important truths about a culture became a business (Lenz 2004: 133-134). This caused a major shift throughout the tribes that participated in tourism to a monetary based economy. From this, one can assume that the
tourist is the cause of change (Nash 1997: 33). According to some of the receipts and letters that go with the Doyle Doll Collection, Ruth and Agnes paid as much as $10 for some dolls. Employing Wolf’s theory of power and its impact on “the peoples without history”, the tourists represent the mark of structural power—an economic and cultural directive—and controlled the direction and distribution of monetary flows and the devotion of time and energy (Moore 2012: 320).

Some argue that the tourists have preserved and revived traditional art forms. Clickingbeard argues that “craft traditions are deeply rooted in the cultural history of Native Americans” and claims the only true change is in the purpose (1999: 22). He continues by saying that the art markets keep the production of such art forms alive, for they would die out if the Native Americans could not find an economic purpose (idem). Feder and de Kadt agree that the economic purpose keeps the traditions alive, but recognize that this mass manufacture of souvenirs is not the same as the original crafts used by pre-contact Native Americans and the only skills that have survived from that time are the skills that are profitable in this new economy (Feder: 55, de Kadt: 1981: 244).

With the consideration of these new sociocultural contexts, the forms of crafting the dolls have been shifted. A complete study of these dolls cannot be conducted without these considerations. As previously stated, Native Americans’ material culture was not static and the crafters had always
implemented new techniques and styles, but the new implementations after the introduction of European materials were the most drastic. That is not to say that Native Americans completely abandoned their own traditional uses for dolls. We know that *kachinas* are still made even today as part of a spiritual aspect of culture. Unfortunately, my sources do not state what happened to other dolls used for the purpose of teaching children after the implementation of trade.
Older Craft versus Newer Craft after European Contact

To reiterate, the arrival of the Europeans to North America caused major changes throughout Native American life. It is important to mention that among the changes in material culture there were other changes that impacted Native American societies—such as conquest and disease—, but I will not be discussing them for the purposes of this paper. Initially, the Europeans gave the Native Americans the new materials as gifts to win alliance, but, soon, the Europeans were requiring trade (Feder: 33).

It would be wrong to assume that Native Americans had not searched for and integrated new materials into their material culture long before the arrival of the Europeans. It can be assumed that many of the improvements they made during the pre-contact period pertained to clothing, ornaments, and other forms of material culture because we would assume that their improvements would parallel the improvements made during the post-contact period. This was one of the major reasons the Native Americans were so accepting of the new materials the Europeans had brought (ibid: 57). This integration of the newer European materials was the leading cause for the disappearance of older, native traditions and techniques, but it cannot be ignored that as techniques and traditions developed within Native American culture during the pre-contact era, previous traditions and techniques were replaced and disappeared (idem). As previously stated, the materials that were accepted into Native American culture were not any more functional that the
natural materials they already had, often the materials were just more pleasing aesthetically. However, there are instances in which the European supplements were more functional (idem). Below, I will further discuss materials that had functional value, aesthetic value, or both. For instance, cloth was more functional for doll making as it was easier to use, but beading was aesthetically more pleasing and was functionally easier to use and obtain than the traditional quills and animal hair. Ribbonwork is the best example of a material adopted for aesthetic purposes. Ribbon was not any more functional, but was aesthetically pleasing to many Native American tribes.

Another reason for the easy acceptance of European goods that has to be examined is closely related to the reason that Native Americans often searched for and developed new techniques and integrated new materials. When the Europeans arrived with their new goods, many of the goods that they had brought had been produced in ways that Native Americans had yet to develop or even dream of. Essentially, the Europeans were introducing industrial age products into a basically organic world (Johnson 2011: 6). These new manufactured goods replaced the indigenous fauna and flora that had been used for centuries. However, it can be said, this integration of new materials did help to develop and extend the range of Native American arts (ibid: 6).

For instance, without the introduction of ribbon, the Native Americans would not have developed ribbon appliqué at that time because they had not yet developed the technology for it. The method of ribbon appliqué was not
found anywhere in Europe at that time. It was a combination of European innovation and Native American interpretation that created this new technique. Thus, there is a hybridity to much of the material culture that developed during this period. Particularly in the Northeast, there was a longer period of contact that resulted in a greater loss of techniques and their material culture giving little indication of their earlier forms (ibid: 18). The only connection that can be made is in the use for the newer materials; often, these newer materials were integrated into the techniques they already had. With others, new techniques had to be developed, which will be covered later.

Before contact with Europeans, the materials available were naturally found within the region. If they were processed at all, they were only processed lightly; processing usually involved tanning a hide or dying a material with dye derived from roots, berries, or other plants. The most obvious and well known materials introduced were the glass beads. These beads had arguably one of the largest impacts on Native American material culture (“Woodlands” 2000: 45). They replaced all other forms of embroidery previously used and are still the most common form of decoration found among dolls.

Beads were first introduced by the earliest travelers. These beads were manufactured in Venice and had to be imported to other European nations. Once there, they could be transported on ships across the Atlantic to the Americas. In order for a quill to be usable, it must be boiled and chewed in order to soften it; when it was finally soft enough, it then had to be woven into
tough hide. Therefore, beads were not only easier to work with, but they also came in a wider range of colors that the Native Americans could not produce with their own techniques. The beads also had reflective qualities that were believed to have religious qualities (Johnson 2011: 91). The change in materials offers an opportunity to reflect upon the changes in religion that came about as a result of European contact. For example, according to Curtis Hoffman (personal communication May 19, 2014) “[it is] possible that the virgin soil epidemics contributed to a sense that the Europeans’ god was more powerful than Native deities, and thus to a change in the willingness of people to adopt European trade goods.” While this is not within the purview of this thesis, it does raise important questions to consider for future researchers about the impact of suffering on belief systems that ultimately affected the use of particular resources and commodities.

Naturally, because of the geography of North America, beads were first introduced to the tribes of the Northeastern Woodlands. In the Plains region,
quillwork was still dominant over beadwork until 1830 because of the limited availability of beads in this region; although, travelers, explorers, and traders had introduced a particular form of beads, known as pony beads, into the Plains by 1800 (Kant 1989: 66, Johnson 2011: 91). It was not until 1850 that smaller beads, known as seed beads, were introduced and became readily available. These seed beads are still the most common form of beads used today in Native American material culture because of the wide range of colors they are available in (Johnson 2011: 91).

Although beads were arguably the most dominant of the materials introduced, there were still other materials that had been introduced that had substantial effects on Native American material culture. One introduction that is often forgotten is thread. Before the introduction of manufactured thread from Europe, animal sinew was most commonly used. Animal sinew was much harder to work with and the process to acquire it was difficult. The threads that were introduced were dyed and came in more colors than the original animal sinew (Horse Capture 1986: 10).

Another introduction that had arguably one of the largest impacts on Native American material culture was cloth. Cloth had numerous applications within Native American material culture and it is evident in even today’s material culture. In the Northeast, broadcloth had largely replaced hide in terms of its use for clothing as skirts, blouses, and dresses by the eighteenth century (Johnson 2011: 22). In the Plains, broadcloth was also quickly and
eagerly adopted for the creation of blankets and clothing reminiscent of the
traditional clothing made from hide; the scraps left over from such creations
would be used for the creation of dolls and their clothing and accessories (Lenz
2004: 61-62). It was common for the dolls to reflect the actual traditions and
material customs of a tribe; therefore the use of cloth was often reflective of the
respective culture.

Most often, when Europeans introduced materials into Native American
culture, the materials were not used in the same ways they were used in
Europe. The Native Americans would interpret the materials for their own uses
within their own context (Axtell 1981: 256). For instance, the Plains Indians
used cloth to replace the hide they had used for clothing. When they began to
make clothing out of cloth, it was not in the same style as the Europeans.
Although the Europeans had displayed their clothing for the Native Americans,
the Native Americans still decided to keep making their traditional forms of
clothing. Thus, their shirts, leggings, and dresses remained in the same style
with only the materials they were made from changing (Lenz 2004: 61-62).

When Native Americans began creating souvenirs for the tourist market,
they began to improvise and change their designs and techniques to fit the
tastes of the tourists. Initially, many Native American craftsmen attempted to
salvage their artistic heritage by incorporating the traditional techniques and
materials such as moose hair embroidery and quillwork (Johnson 2011: 23).
As time passed, Native Americans began to adapt further into European
material culture and adopted many of their likes and designs. During the
nineteenth century—and particularly in the Northeast—souvenirs began to
take on a Victorian floral style (ibid: 22). These designs did eventually drift and
blend into Native American clothing, blurring and confusing the meaning of
many native symbols. Further, according to Joyce Rain Anderson there was
both a more pernicious and rebellious aspect to this change; pernicious
because the “missionaries often subjected bead and quill workers to adopt
more European or ‘Christian’ designs’ and resistant, because the “blurring and
confusing” of “native symbols was a form of survivance (survival+resistance)”
(personal communication, Joyce Rain Anderson, May 19, 2014). After a time,
the traditional clothing of Native Americans became reserved for council
meetings or other private and wholly Native American functions (ibid: 23).
Eventually—and unfortunately—traditional crafts and other forms of material
culture were all but discarded and created an economic dependence on the

For the purpose and continuation of tourism and trade, new materials
were sometimes introduced to doll makers. This could be for a variety of
reasons, but one that stands out is the story of a variation of cornhusk dolls:

In the 1930s, for example, corn blight struck the Tuscarora area and
cornhusk to make the dolls were (sic) unavailable. A young Tuscarora
man who had on a hand a supply of dyed leather offered the store
manager dolls with leather heads instead, and when the manger ordered
1,000 of them, the man and his family “got a production line going” to
turn out the dolls. (Lenz 2004: 134)
As a result of this happenstance, some of the women in this region began to specialize in leather headed dolls. Further, this created a variation in the original and well known cornhusk doll.

Variations such as these continued into the arts and crafts of contemporary Native Americans. As colonization expanded, so did the Native American tourist and souvenir market. This expansion coincided with the development of better forms of travel such as trains and steamboats which could bring travelers to destinations they would not have previously been able to reach (Libhart 1989: 39). As a result, there was a major commercialization of Native American crafts that developed and what began as a way to earn extra income became a major economic industry (Clinkingbeard 1999: 22). As previously noted, the dolls that were made for the tourist market began to reflect the tastes of the tourists and buyers. This factor has been a major cause of diffusion among Native American traditions, but has been largely ignored as a cause or source of new ideas and traditions; most often, anthropologists have studied the effects of trade, migration, war, and missionary contact (Deitch 1977: 173).

The most dominant and noticeable impact tourism has had on Native American dolls is the creation of romanticized dolls. Outsiders and tourists began to generalize what they believed to be Native American based on stereotypes that swung between the noble savage or the depraved savage. Moreover, for the most part, they related Native American traditions with those
of the Plains Indians with decorative styles also taken from the Native Americans of the Northeast (Lenz 2004: 131-132). This is largely due to stereotypes of horse-back riding, feather headdress-wearing Indians. However, in the southwest, there were certain dolls that were sold to tourists that were thought of as “truly native”; these dolls were known as *kachina* dolls. As a reminder, *Kachinas* were carved by the Pueblo people and were originally meant to represent the spirits they worshipped. With the introduction of the tourist market, tourists viewed the *kachinas* as “grotesque” figures that implied a “savage” connotation; to the tourists this suggested primitive and heathen beliefs and made the Native Americans even more interesting as “The Other”. They were so often bought because they were small and lightweight, but because of their spiritual connection to the culture, their esoteric symbolism was changed for the tourist market in order to keep their true cultural beliefs away from commercialization (Deitch 1977: 179).

Later in the nineteenth century, Native American arts and crafts began to be distributed not only by their makers as souvenirs, but they also began to be sold in department stores and through traders’ catalogues (Lenz 2004: 135). Today, dolls are sold in...
museum gift shops and are obviously mass produced. These dolls are often made of plastic and pseudo-buckskin and are light-skinned. There is even a Native American Barbie that is mass produced for little girls (ibid: 18-19).

As the original purpose of the dolls was mainly a teaching tool, they continue to do the same if one looks hard enough into the symbolism. Native American dolls convey cultural information that can be valuable to their audiences and can teach them about native culture (Evans-Pritchard 1989: 95). This can have positive and negative connotations: on one hand, Native Americans can convey their cultures to outsiders in hopes of gaining new respect for their cultures and beliefs from their patrons; on the other hand, Native American merchants must deal with encounters with their patrons and often must answer questions about the cultural significance of their crafts. On the surface, this would seem like a good thing, but tourists are often trying to find a particular design, symbol, or representation. This can be seen as insulting to the craftsmen who work hard on everything they sell, as if one craft is going to be any more authentic or “Indian” than another (Evans-Pritchard 1989: 95).

Much of this is reminiscent of Victor Turner’s study of symbols and symbolism within cultural contexts. In Turner’s studies, he argued that symbols were more than just images, they had meaning and the meaning of a symbol is culture specific and they must be studied within more than one context, they must be studied beyond their surfaces into their structures and
properties (Moore 2012: 229). There were numerous symbols incorporated into the original traditions of doll making; the best and easiest example would be the Pueblo kachina. Kachina dolls are meant to represent different spirits. These different spirits have different symbols connected to them and are thus incorporated in different ways. As noted, with the coming of the tourist and souvenir market, much of the esoteric symbolism was left out in the creation of the kachinas—this is not to say that the Pueblo peoples no longer make their traditional kachinas. Thus, they lost much of their symbolic connection to the culture. This happened throughout all of the cultural regions. Without this connection, the symbols eventually lose their associated meanings and aspects of culture can lose their meanings (Moore 2012: 230).

With respect to the Doyle Doll Collection, not many of these traditional dolls are found. Although many of the dolls are representational, very few, if any, were meant to teach children about their culture or about their gender roles. Kachinas are still found within this collection, but not all of them are made in the traditional ways nor are the traditional materials used. Throughout the collection’s regions, there is a vast change in materials. This is reflective of the influence the Europeans had over the Native Americans. There is another doll collection, specifically on kachinas that would be beneficial to look at if you would want more information on kachinas. This collection is held by the Heard Museum of Northern Arizona. It is one of the largest and most extensive collections of kachinas.
Case Study

Representations of material culture changes can be found throughout the Doyle Doll Collection. Because of Agnes Baptist’s personal connection to many of the Native American tribes that the dolls were purchased from, many of the dolls do not have the touristic connotations other dolls purchased from the craftsmen may have had for other outsiders. Even still, they do reflect the impacts of other aspects of colonization. Unfortunately, I cannot provide a full iconographic report for each doll. Instead, I have chosen three dolls from different regions that can display the impacts of colonization and the different effects colonization has had on material culture represented through dolls. I will mention here that there is a catalog that is paired with the collection, and some of the more detailed information comes from this catalog; the catalog had been made by Tom Doyle in part with the personal notes of Ruth Doyle.

The first case study I have chosen is a pair of dolls from the Plains region (see Appendix A). According to Ruth Doyle’s notes on this set, they were among the first dolls that her sister, Agnes, had sent her from the Rosebud Sioux Reservation she was living and working on. They were purchased from Rosebud Sioux Handicrafts and were made by a couple who were craft workers together. These dolls have many traditional representations of Plains and Sioux dolls and their full-sized counter parts.

The male doll is named “Chief Doll” on its tag. It has a wood carved head painted yellow, and a sort of buckskin for the clothing and body. This doll is
wearing a war bonnet of magpie feathers and is carrying a medicine bag. The hair on this doll is also made from hair, unlike many other dolls that have yarn for hair. The female doll is named “Squaw Doll” on the label. It also had a wood carved head which is painted yellow and has real hair attached to its head. This doll also is made from buckskin. These dolls retain many of the original techniques of the Sioux tribe and reflect many of the traditions formerly used by the craftsmen in making the dolls.

Each doll’s attributes has symbolism and variations that relate to colonization and a diffusion of cultures and ideas. The war bonnet that the male doll wears is not in the style of the Sioux; instead, it is in the style of the Blackfoot and is known as a “Straight-up War Bonnet” (Johnson 2011). This is reminiscent of the generalization of Native American traditions in the style of the Plains Indians. The yellow painted faces were used in dances. The beadwork is probably the most noticeable aspect of both dolls. The male doll has the beadwork along the fringe of his pants, just as a male member of a Plains nation would have. He also has some beading on his shirt around his collar and on his sleeves and chest, and some light beading on his moccasins.

The female doll has much more beading than the male doll. The female doll’s cape is fully beaded with mostly blue beads, but also with some geometric designs in various colors. She also wears a necklace that is meant to represent a bone breastplate. The most noticeable aspect of this doll is her fully beaded moccasins. Mainly men would have their moccasins fully beaded.
This was meant to show wealth, meaning that the owner no longer had to walk because of the horses he owned ("Plains" 2000: 133). They were also often made by a man’s wife or betrothed to show her superior beading skills and to confer her love for her husband (Markoe 1986: 93). According to the catalog, her fully beaded moccasins indicate that this doll was meant to represent a deceased person, but I am unable to conclusively state this for lack of corresponding information from other sources.

The second doll I chose is an Abnacki doll from the Northeastern Woodlands (see Appendix B). This doll has a traditional apple-head, but does not have a cornhusk body; instead, this doll has a cloth body and the rest of her is mostly made from cloth. She has a stand because of which she can stand on her own. An apple-faced doll takes time and dedication to make. In order to make an apple-faced doll a green apple is used, it is then peeled and hung to dry. Over the course of several days, the apple is poked and pinched in order to make features that will dry as part of the apple (Lenz 2004). This doll’s head is very dark, but this does not mean it is going bad. According to the catalog, the doll’s head will get darker over time, but will not spoil because it has been dried properly. She wears a wool blanket around her and has leather moccasins. She also has yarn for hair and has pony beads for decoration as a necklace and earrings. This doll reflects colonization due to the fact that this doll is mostly cloth. The Native Americans did not have cloth during the pre-contact period, thus this style of doll would not have been made before the importation of European goods. Because of this doll’s stand, it is
unlikely she would have been used for play by a child, but a doll of this type would most likely have been used for play with a teaching purpose.

The third doll I chose is a Navajo doll (see Appendix C). This doll is meant to be a *kachina* representing the god Kei. I will note that I was unable to find any information on who Kei, what the cultural significance of this spirit is or was, and why the Navajo may have adopted him. I am stating this is a *kachina* doll because according to this catalog, this is a Navajo *kachina* and it is meant to represent the god Kei. Traditionally, the Navajo did not worship *kachinas* until they adopted the practice from the Pueblo and they did not make dolls until they discovered their value as a source of income. This doll is made of two pieces of cloth that were stitched together. It has a cloth skirt that has half a zipper, thread embroidery, and small brass pieces. This kachina is wearing leather moccasins and has feather hair. The kachina also has a fur collar with ribbons hanging down the back. The materials used in the making of this doll are all European innovations.

The traditional Pueblo *kachina* would have been made from wood and painted brightly. This doll is neither carved from wood nor painted. This doll does not take on the traditional form of a *kachina*. Before colonization, the entire making of this doll would not have been possible. There is also evidence of cultural diffusion between the Navajo and the Pueblo tribes in the use of *kachinas*.
Just in the three dolls represented here, it is evident that European contact has altered and impacted Native American material culture. Mainly it is in the form of the materials used in the contemporary creation of dolls, that colonization is evident. There are also the new innovations found within the dolls and the purposes of the dolls in their creation for tourists. Although these dolls were made several centuries after first contact, they still bear evidence of colonization and contact.
Conclusion

Through the study of the Doyle Doll Collection the changes and variations in material culture overtime has given insights into patterns in the histories, ethnohistories, and some of the fundamental cultural cores as significant cultural patterns and values of past and contemporary Native Americans. As I have discussed, there have been numerous ways in which colonization and Western contact had influenced the creation and craft of dolls. The most discussed and most prominent is that of the actual materials that have been introduced into the cultures of the Native Americans. From the innovation of novel materials, new techniques were developed in order to incorporate them into their material cultures. Thus, designs changed as the techniques and materials changed. However, the change with the largest impact was the change in purpose of the dolls.

Agnes Baptist’s personal connections with the Native Americans allowed for the collection of the Doyle Dolls to be less like a touristic collection. It was because of this that very few of the dolls are romanticized and many are made in the traditional sense of how earlier dolls were made during the contact period. There are still a good number in the collection that were purchased in a formal sense through a shop or store.

Beyond what I have studied and argued within this paper, there are still other aspects of this collection that can be studied. Beyond the scope of this paper, there are also other forms of material culture that can be studied, such
as baskets, pottery, blankets, accessories, and ceremonial objects. All of these items can give different insights into different aspects of material culture and thus the wider cultural practices and even values and beliefs associated with them. This has implications beyond the collection as well. Various forms of material culture from around the world can be studied to give insights to their cultural cores and into their histories and ethnohistories. This allows history to be studied in an alternative way rather than written records. There are also implications for archaeology. Archaeologists can use this framework to study the artifacts they find. This would also allow for a development of a history through a material record. It would also allow for a reforming of past histories through artifacts of material culture.

If someone else were to study the Doyle Doll Collection through only the dolls, there are other angles of the collection that can be studied. One could focus more on the political aspects of the collection or give a greater focus to the religious iconography using other theoretical frameworks and the impact colonization had on Native American religion. Given the time period the dolls were collected, they could have easily been studied in relation to many of the Native American movements that were occurring at the time. They could also be studied in relation to past events or current events.

This study has given major insights into the effects of colonization on Native American material culture and has also shown how these effects had impacted the whole culture of Native Americans across the continent through
the dolls. By studying a wide range of material culture and by focusing my study on the Doyle Doll Collection—which until my study had been given very little attention—I have been able to make the argument that there are reflections of the impacts of European contact and the magnitude and diversities of these impacts. There has been a lot to learn about Native American cultures through this study and there is still more that can be learned, but it is certain that material culture is a viable way to gain insight into numerous aspects of a culture.
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