

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Beyond Red Power: American Indian Politics and Activism since 1900.
edited by Daniel M. Cobb and Loretta Fowler.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3w73d92w>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 32(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Johnson, Troy

Publication Date

2008-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

histories and contemporary writing; the Canadian nation did not possess a comparable metaphysical foundation from which it could legitimize its current history" (181).

Despite Aboriginal Canadians' and their allies' struggles to understand each other genuinely, troubling lacunae continue to plague these efforts. McKenzie aptly deliberates on George Ryga's "The Ecstasy of Rita Joe" as a critical example of a non-Native playwright honoring the memory of a murdered Native girl whose body was found in the inner city of Vancouver in 1966. Joy Coghill produced the play and remembers the visceral response of the audience to Ryga's play. Only after the actors had left the theater and found their way to a nearby bar did the audience gradually disperse after sitting immobilized for several moments in stunned silence. No one clapped at the end of the play.

McKenzie reports on the vitality of Canadian Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal literature in a crucial dialogue between Native and non-Native Canadians: her text provides an important antithesis to romantic nationalism and obscure euphemisms that serve no purpose in reconciliation between Aboriginal Canadians and non-Aboriginal Canadians.

Naomi McIlwraith

University of Alberta

Beyond Red Power: American Indian Politics and Activism since 1900. Edited by Daniel M. Cobb and Loretta Fowler. Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press, 2007. 368 pages. \$34.95 paper.

There is no concept or reality more important to Native people and Native nations than that of sovereignty. Native people assert, and rightly so, that they were sovereigns over their lands (unless displaced/conquered by other Native nations) prior to European contact. This is a difficult concept for non-Native people to comprehend. President George W. Bush exhibited his naiveté on this subject and came under criticism from Indian leaders in August 2004 when he stated, "Tribal sovereignty means just that, it's sovereignty. You're a—you've been given sovereignty, and you're viewed as a sovereign entity" (*Seattle Post-Intelligencer Reporter*, 13 August 2004). The difficulty arose over his use of the word *given* because Native people view sovereignty as an inherent standing held since time immemorial, and that the United States has moved consistently over the years to reduce sovereignty and had no ability to "give" or "grant" sovereignty. Jacqueline Johnson, a Tlingit Indian and executive director for the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) told the *Post-Intelligencer Reporter* that "It's not something that was given to us . . . we've always had [it]."

The sovereign relationship between Native nations and the United States was determined by early comprehensive federal legislation and by three leading court decisions. Three court cases dominate the legal landscape and the opinions written by Chief Justice John Marshall: *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1923),

Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1837), and, most importantly, *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832). The legislative roots are found in the Constitution of the United States (Indian Commerce Clause, art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3), which states, "The Congress shall have Power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." This clause established the plenary power of Congress and was the first attack on true Native sovereignty: Indian people and Native nations were subordinated to federal power. Until 1871, Congress set about to extinguish Indian land title through the use of treaties with Indian tribes. One of the basic elements of treaties was that tribes had governmental status: Indian tribes were recognized as sovereigns, and state law did not apply within reservation boundaries without congressional consent. Federal Indian law does not remain a constant, however, and in 1953 Congress passed Public law (PL) 280, which was the first general piece of federal legislation that extended state jurisdiction into Indian country. PL 280 provided for state jurisdiction over most crimes and many civil matters in the states of California, Nebraska, Minnesota (except for the Red Lake Reservation), Oregon (except for the Warm Springs Reservation), Wisconsin (except for the Menominee Reservation), and Alaska. States that were included later under PL 280 included Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Iowa, and Nevada. A provision in the later group allowed for tribes to retrocede (take back) that authority and most did.

As can be seen from this introduction, different Native nations have differing levels of sovereignty: that not taken under the guise of congressional plenary power, that not taken with the passage of PL 280, and that not taken in other US Supreme Court decisions. This anthology is a collection of articles that document the Native American struggle for recognition of retained sovereignty, the freedom to exercise that sovereignty, and the self-determination to enjoy that sovereignty as sovereign nations since the year 1900. Because of the romanticism that surrounds Native American overt activism between 1960 and 1975, the organizations that carried them out, such as the American Indian Movement (AIM) and Indians of All Tribes, have garnered much of the attention from scholars, press, and filmmakers. This collection goes, as the title of the book suggests, *Beyond Red Power* to analyze and discuss the deep-rooted American Indian tribal political activism that developed outside of, supported, and sometimes opposed the Red Power Movement activism of the 1960s and 1970s.

Beyond Red Power is an edited work published as part of the School for Advanced Research Global Indigenous Politics Series, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Many of the authors whose articles are included in this anthology share unique experiences and similarities: five have been associated with the Newberry Library or the Newberry's D'Arcy McNickle Center for American Indian History; four are or have been associated with the University of Oklahoma; and three others have connections to Oklahoma in other capacities. The anthology is divided into three parts: "Contexts," "Continuing Encounters: Historical Perspectives," and "Sovereignty in Action: Contemporary Perspectives." The thread that weaves the three parts together is the authors' theses that tribal community activism and a form of Legislative

Red Power emerged that provided the backdrop for the Activism Red Power movement that by and large ceased to exist after 1975. The Legislative Red Power movement then carried the fight into local, state, and federal legislative arenas and courtrooms in order to complement what the Activism Red Power movement had begun: the protection of tribal sovereignty, tribal self-determination, and ultimately tribal self-governance free from state and federal oversight and control. This localized activism, often at the band, clan, community, tribal, and supratribal levels arose specifically to address issues of Indian fishing rights, Indian education, language preservation, water rights, hunting rights, reservation poverty, Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) government formation, allotment of land, termination of Indian tribes, and the resultant urban Indian problems.

In part 1 the authors set the historical context in which the Red Power movement and the lesser recognized tribal and community activism arose. Donald Fixico places this in the context of the US government policy of termination, the cold war movement of 100 percent Americanization, and the push to get the country out of "The Indian Business." Treaties were to be abrogated, tribes and reservations were to be terminated, and Indian people were to be absorbed into the dominant society. The Indian backlash against this movement led to the formation of groups such as the Society of American Indians (SAI), NCAI, the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC), AIM, and the Congress of Energy Related Tribes (CERT). The questions that arose from these groups and that drive the remainder of this collection were: How do some survive in a colonial system as a minority, how do indigenous communities survive, and why do they persist? As Fixico points out, "Many of the chapters in this volume explore how Indian people answered these questions." Frederick Hoxie writes that "the chapters in this volume represent a new chapter in the history of American Indian politics. Specifically . . . to understand Native communities as active nodes in a network of assessment, thought, and action" (16).

Part 2 of this collection provides a critique of the state of American Indian historiography at the end of the twentieth century. Daniel Cobb, co-editor of this collection, states that a "generation of scholars completely revised our understanding of the nature of the first 350 years of contact . . . [with] emphasis on diplomacy, negotiation, treaty making, cultural brokerage, ethnogenesis, and exchange" (157). The chapters in part 2 demonstrate the sharp distinctions between the political histories of the past and the more recent period. Cobb challenges historians to scrutinize and view assimilation and allotment as a two-way rather than a one-way street. Rather than focusing on the negative aspects of assimilation and allotment Cobb asserts that "Native people accommodated themselves to new ways of making a living, including wage labor, farming, ranching, playing professional sports, and carving out careers as actors, writers, artists, singers, and white collar professionals." Cobb then goes on to challenge a one-sided view of IRA, the termination and relocation era, and the early tribal self-determination era. In summation Cobb states that "to look at federal policies as anything other than contexts for Native action is to create the false impression that indigenous peoples are no longer makers of their own histories" (66).

In the chapter “At the Headwaters of a Twentieth-Century ‘Indian’ Political Agenda” D. Anthony Tyee Clark focuses on the period between 1900 and the founding of the SAI in 1911. Clark sets the tempo for his article when he writes, “Not until the 1970s did scholars begin to take seriously Native peoples’ perspectives on how they survived this harrowing period.” Clark examines the early-twentieth-century Indian political agenda through the lens of the SAI and its members. Complementary groups addressed include the Indian Memorial Association, the SAI, and the Brotherhood of North American Indians, which represented the efforts of local, regional, and national issue-based bodies to address shared concerns. Participants included Christians, non-Christians, attorneys, doctors, laborers, and tribal leaders. Clark states that “the Society’s origin is just one instance of a larger pattern for how we need to recast the twentieth-century history of American Indian activism” (70). From these groups came a new intertribal identity and perhaps a nascent national or transnational community and Indigenous nation’s identity.

Part 3 of this anthology focuses on the exercise of tribal sovereignty in contemporary perspectives. Loretta Fowler begins this section with the recognition that “Congress and federal courts have affirmed, at least in part, the inherent sovereignty of tribal nations” (201). Fowler goes on to state that this has provided both opportunity and obstacles for Indian tribes and Indian people. The recognition of sovereignty has allowed tribes to contract for control of programs previously under the purview of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Under tribal self-determination tribes exercise control over mineral extraction, education, criminal and civil law enforcement on reservations (except for major crimes and state jurisdiction in PL 280 states), environmental regulations, and economic development. Fowler points out that scholars such as Thomas Biolsi feel that tribal contracting is a new form of termination because contracting removes federal oversight and responsibility. Randel Hanson postulates that tribal control of economic development in a market-based economy can undermine the quality of life on reservations at the same time it creates jobs. Bruce Miller argues that competition has arisen between federally recognized Indian tribes and non-federally recognized Indian tribes as tribes move to redefine identity and tribal membership. This has most recently come to public attention in California where Native nations have begun to examine tribal membership rolls. Critics, including former tribal members, feel that this is a way to pare down tribal rolls for per-capita payout of gaming proceeds. The tribes say that is not the case but rather is a way to remove individuals who should never have been recognized as tribal members in the first place. Individuals who are considered for removal (disenrollment) are given the opportunity to appear before the tribal counsel in order to provide evidence and history of their relationship to the tribe.

Loretta Fowler’s article “Tribal Sovereignty Movements Compared: The Plains Region” is perhaps the most compelling article in this anthology. The article provides an in-depth look at the energy-rich Indian tribes of South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Oklahoma. She argues that although oil, gas, coal, and uranium are important to both state and tribal economies, the

tribes of these states are “isolated from markets, are impoverished despite their mineral wealth” (209). The Blackfeet of Montana for instance have a 1.5-million-acre reservation with significant wealth in oil and gas. Despite the mineral resources, 64 percent of the tribal population was unemployed in the 1990s. The Crow, also a Montana tribe, have a 2.2-million-acre reservation with large deposits of oil and coal. In the 1990s unemployment on the Crow reservation was 57 percent. The Fort Peck Assiniboines had the largest income from oil in the state of Montana, and in the 1990s the unemployment rate was in excess of 50 percent. Other tribes experienced equally high unemployment rates: Northern Cheyenne at 43 percent and Fort Belknap at 37 percent. Statewide for Montana the Indian unemployment rate was 39 percent. In this article Fowler presents equally disturbing unemployment rates for the other Plains region states as well.

Tribal community organizations demanded change from within. They understood that the exercise of tribal sovereignty, free from US government intervention, was the answer. A grassroots commitment to a sovereignty agenda at the tribal level became an important part of recovery. Fowler makes clear that “tribal officials in all the Plains communities saw the exercise of sovereignty as entwined with control over tribal land and resources.” Ultimately it took constitutional reform and revision and an aggressive pursuit of sovereignty agendas, as defined by Indian people, who took the initiative to develop localized versions of sovereignty to fit their specific goals and situation.

However, it takes community, legislative, and the overt form of Red Power activism represented by the 1969 occupation of Alcatraz Island to bring about change. I am reminded of a conversation that I had in 1993 with the late Vine Deloria Jr. Deloria was reflecting on the overt activism of the 1960s and stated that “you can have all of the marches and occupations you want, but in the end you have to have someone to walk the halls of Congress to write bills and bring about change.” In *Beyond Red Power* we see the other side as well. Co-editor Daniel M. Cobb points out that “talking the language of the larger world, no matter how conceptually powerful it proved to be, did not necessarily produce results for it was one thing to speak, another to be heard and still something different to be understood.” Cobb calls on the example of Mel Thom, a Walker River Paiute activist who had become exasperated with the failure of the proposing, talking, and waiting for change. Thom described the Termination Act as a “cold war” being fought against Indian people. In 1968 Thom said that “the day is coming when we’re gonna move and when we move . . . watch out!” (Mel Steiner, *The New Indians*, 1960, 45). His words proved to be prophetic as the occupation of Alcatraz Island, the occupation of the Washington, D.C. BIA headquarters building, and the occupation of the village of Wounded Knee, South Dakota followed on the heels of his statement. More than fifty occupations of government and nongovernment buildings and facilities forced President Richard Nixon to repudiate the termination policy and move the government to adopt a policy of Indian self-determination. In addition to ending the government policy of termination, President Nixon returned the Taos Blue Lake and

forty-eight thousand acres of land to the Taos Pueblo; twenty-one thousand acres of Mount Adams in Washington State to the Yakima tribe; eighty acres to the Washoe tribe in California; and some sixty thousand acres to the Warm Spring tribes in Oregon. At the signing of the document that returned the Sacred Blue Lake, Bradley Patterson, special assistant to President Nixon stated, "I hope the significance of the return of the Taos Blue Lake will not be lost to the occupiers on Alcatraz Island and their call for self-determination" (185). Co-editor Loretta Fowler acknowledges that the sovereignty movement among the Cheyenne-Arapaho in Oklahoma was kept alive in part because of "individuals who were exposed to American Indian Movement ideology in the 1970s while being in cities away from western Oklahoma" (224). It is also worthy of note that every US President from Nixon to the present time has issued formal statements recognizing tribal sovereignty and a government-to-government relationship between the US government and Indian tribes.

Beyond Red Power is an important book and should be part of every tribal library and Native American studies program. Much can be learned about the grassroots sovereignty movements that preceded and followed the Red Power movement. Indian tribes and Indian people often took measures into their own hands to fill the voids that were left because of the US government's failure to live up to its trust responsibility. From these grassroots movements emerged new tribal constitutions, federal regulations, and federal laws that reinforced tribal self-determination and provided a superstructure for the growth of tribal self-governance.

Troy Johnson

California State University, Long Beach

The Head in Edward Nugent's Hand: Roanoke's Forgotten Indians. By Michael Leroy Oberg. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007. 232 pages. \$32.50 cloth.

A single, gruesome murder is the central act upon which *The Head in Edward Nugent's Hand* pivots. In the summer of 1586, Edward Nugent, who was an Irish indentured servant of the military governor, Ralph Lane, pursued an Algonquian *weroance*, or leader, named Pemisapan (formerly known as Wingina) into the woods and cut off his head. After this murder, any hope of peaceful coexistence vanished. Both sides became increasingly partisan and prone to violent confrontation.

Historian Michael Leroy Oberg invites readers into the multiple contexts of Pemisapan's murder in an attempt to recover a uniquely American Indian history of Roanoke. Previous studies of the "lost colony" have focused on English privateers such as Sir Walter Raleigh and his less-well-known compatriots, including Thomas Harriot, John White, and Ralph Lane. In contrast, Oberg has created a book that explores the lives of their Algonquian counterparts, men such as Pemisapan, Granganimeo, Manteo, and Wanchese. *The*