

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism. By Bradley G. Shreve

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/16h9s4kz>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 36(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Rindfleisch, Bryan

**Publication Date**

2012-06-01

**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/>

**Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism.** By Bradley G. Shreve. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011. 272 pages. \$34.95 cloth.

Bradley G. Shreve asserts that the origins of the Native activism of the late 1960s and 1970s owed much to a historical continuity of indigenous political advocacy enunciated during the mid-twentieth century. Like Daniel M. Cobb's trailblazing scholarship, which disabused scholars of twentieth-century American Indian history of the notion that the Red Power Movement sprang out of a historical vacuum during the Alcatraz occupation of 1969, Shreve argues that previous scholarly obsessions with the Red Power Movement disguises the vital educational and political experiences of indigenous youth (both urban and reservation) who later constituted both the leaders and members of the 1960s and 1970s Native civil rights organizations. (Notably, the term *Red Power Movement* itself is inaccurately attributed to Native activism at Alcatraz and the subsequent American Indian Movement.) In particular, Cobb and Shreve highlight the role of the "Workshops on American Indian Affairs," which inculcated pan-Indianism, an "ideological agenda" attuned to Native self-determination and sovereignty as a means to combat the continuing legacy of Euro-American colonialism, and which imparted the tactics of direct action that Native protestors exhibited in the 1960s and 1970s (66, 77).

Despite these similarities, Shreve departs from a number of Cobb's conclusions, especially those pertaining to the importance of indigenous cooperation with the federal government's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) programs in providing impetus to late twentieth-century indigenous politicization. Instead, Shreve determines that, more than any other indigenous civil rights organization, it was the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) that first and foremost aspired to and agitated for the political goals of "Red Power" ("tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, self-determination, and cultural preservation"), spearheaded by Native youth from the Workshops on American Indian Affairs such as Clyde Warrior and Mel Thom (3). Organizations such as the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), or indigenous peoples working with the OEO, relied on litigation, lobbying, and collaboration to address the political and economic marginalization of Native peoples. In contrast, Shreve argues, the NIYC "started something new and different," a "militant pan-Indian ideology" that utilized "intertribal direct action methods" (16). In actions ranging from the 1961 American Indian Chicago Conference to the "Fish-in" campaigns in Washington during the mid-1960s, the NIYC dramatically demonstrated their frustrations with the federal government, NCAI, and lack of perceived attentions to Native peoples. The NIYC assertively fought for Native sovereignty, treaty rights, and self-determination, and

Shreve asserts this set a precedent for future indigenous politicization and protest from Alcatraz to the American Indian Movement (AIM).

Historians traditionally depict the Fish-ins as the apex of the NIYC's activism, but Shreve illustrates how the organization thrived into the 1980s, albeit plagued by internal factionalism as leaders divided over whether to direct the NIYC as "a respectable educational agency [or] a militant Red Power front" (161). Shreve insists that the 1969 election of Gerald Wilkinson suppressed the organization's squabbling and successfully reoriented the NIYC's agenda to *both* education and direct-action political protest, resulting in the establishment of the Clyde Warrior Institute for American Indian Studies, its Urban Indian Job Training and Placement programs, and participation in the government's American Indian Task Force, picketing with AIM in Colorado, and during the Trail of Broken Treaties demonstrations with the Navajo against coal corporations, and defense of sacred lands and Native religions with the Native American Rights Fund (198). Ultimately, Shreve maintains that "for all its drama, inspiration and influence," Alcatraz and later exhortations of "Red Power" were "still a continuation of an ongoing struggle guided by young people that had begun nearly a decade earlier by the NIYC" (185).

Testifying to the author's thorough research and insights, Shreve juxtaposes the history and legacy of the NIYC with that of its African American, Latino, and "white" contemporaries, including the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Weather Underground, the Black Panthers, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), as well as the Crusade for Justice. From this cross-pollination of civil rights histories Shreve notes that a general sense of urgency for change pervaded these predominantly student movements, a sense that "young people could bring about change and make a difference [that] resonated beyond ethnic or racial boundaries," which contributed to their confrontational and militant tactics during the 1960s and 1970s (96). Despite this shared belief, Shreve argues that the overall goals of these political associations differed significantly. Whereas African American organizations agitated for civil rights and against segregation, indigenous peoples expressed concern over the federal Indian policies of termination and relocation, treaty rights and tribal sovereignty, objectives that contrasted greatly with those of their other contemporaries. More controversially, Shreve singles out the NIYC as the most enlightened of these civil rights movements because it "lacked the stifling sexism that distorted the power sharing and decision making" that plagued organizations like SNCC and AIM (209). Indeed, he stresses throughout that the NIYC valued the role of its female leadership

and membership and that they assumed a “pivotal role” in the day-to-day operations of the movement (4).

A major strength of Shreve’s scholarship is the wealth of primary sources that supports his insights, many of which have been neglected by those historians who previously attributed the origins of Red Power to Alcatraz and AIM. In addition to traditional documentary evidence, such as the records and correspondence of the NIYC, NCAI, and Bureau of Indian Affairs, Shreve delves into the minutes, proceedings, letters, mailing lists, constitutions, petitions, and speeches of regional and local indigenous affiliates of the NIYC, such as the Kiva Club; the educational curriculum of the Workshops on American Indian Affairs, including assignments, exams, surveys, and resumes; the NIYC’s annual financial reports and statistical analyses; and oral interviews with former NIYC leaders such as Herb Blatchford, Gerald Brown, and Della Warrior, including interviews with lesser-known members such as Sam English and Ted Holappa.

Of even greater interest is how Shreve depicts the publications of the NIYC and other indigenous political organizations throughout the 1960s and 1970s as a medium of Native voice and agency. Most importantly, in order to elicit the agreements and contestations over Native political activism between indigenous groups, Shreve contrasts the NIYC periodical *Americans Before Columbus* and its newsletter *Aborigine* with indigenous journals, magazines, and newspapers produced by others, such as the United Native Americans who occupied Alcatraz (*Warpaths*), Workshops on American Indian Affairs (*Indian Progress*), and the Iroquois (*Akwesasne Notes*).

However, Shreve’s work is not without its detractions. Shreve’s use of gender to differentiate the NIYC from other contemporary civil rights organizations lacks adequate support. Establishing the egalitarian power relationships that existed between Native males and females in the movement largely hinges on his e-mail correspondences with NIYC women in positions of leadership (Shirley Hill Witt, Karen Rickard, Viola Hatch, and Della Warrior), but since e-mail correspondence cannot be cross-checked by other scholars, it falls short as a legitimate historical source of information. Further, Shreve does not fully engage the major historiographical works pertaining to some of his conclusions. Missing from Shreve’s account of the history of pan-Indianism from the seventeenth to twentieth centuries is Gregory Evans Dowd’s seminal work on the subject, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745–1815*. Likewise, in illustrating the NIYC’s involvement in the Washington state Fish-ins and the intensity of hostility and violence exhibited by white Americans, Shreve does not draw upon Thomas Biolsi’s “Deadliest Enemies” hypothesis, which illuminates this issue.

These shortcomings aside, Shreve's work significantly enhances scholarly understandings of twentieth-century American Indian history, particularly in reconfiguring conceptions of the indigenous political activism of the mid-to-late twentieth century. Together with historian Daniel M. Cobb, Shreve rightfully situates the origins of Red Power political protest prior to the Alcatraz occupation of 1969 and AIM militancy. The author successfully places a welcome emphasis on a youth generation motivated by a heightened sense of urgency during the mid-century Cold War era, the emerging consciousness of a Native student youth movement throughout the United States in particular, and their struggle to reconcile the lingering legacy of Euro-American colonialism.

*Bryan Rindfleisch*  
University of Oklahoma

**Red, White & Black: Cinema and the Structure of US Antagonisms.** By Frank B. Wilderson III. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010. 408 pages. \$94.95 cloth; \$26.95 paper.

Frank Wilderson's forceful, complex, highly conceptual theorization of the "structure of US antagonisms" seeks to revive a revolutionary ethic that he contends was abandoned after the US suppression of transformative movements of the 1960s and 1970s (the Black Panthers, the American Indian Movement, and the Weather Underground, for example). Wilderson argues for privileging "a new language of abstraction" and paradigmatic structural positionality over the current focus on "specific and unique experiences of . . . myriad identities," working against what he sees as a tide of "multicultural positivity" and a critical tendency to "hide rather than make explicit the grammar of suffering which underwrites the United States and its foundational antagonisms," all of which leave the larger configurations themselves unexamined (6, 55). His return to a radically structuring analysis has a clear center of gravity in Black studies and is aligned with a particular movement that Wilderson calls Afro-pessimism; he draws particularly from the work of Frantz Fanon, Hortense Spillers, Ronald Judy, and Saidiya Hartman, among others.

Inquiring into the ways that "White film, Black film, and Red film articulate and disavow the matrix of violence which constructs the three essential positions which in turn structure U.S. antagonisms," the author incorporates an extensive discussion of Native American positionality in relation to Black resistance, as well as to settler society and the slave estate (26). In Wilderson's formulation, a matrix of social death and gratuitous violence (rather than