UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Red, White & Black: Cinema and the Structure of US Antagonisms. By Frank B. Wilderson III.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/168622g5

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 36(3)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Hearne, Joanna

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, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

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

violence contingent upon transgression against civil society) positions Black as Slave, a fungible object for accumulation, a "hybrid of person and property" (77). Blackness thus represents the anti-Human, "a position against which Humanity establishes, maintains, and renews its coherence, its corporeal integrity" (11). In this schema of antagonisms, Native Americans are positioned in relation to settler society as half-human or "Savage," and within a "Savage" "grammar of suffering" Wilderson identifies two modalities: sovereignty and genocide. He sees an "interpretive community" being built between settlers and Natives, and is particularly troubled that "Masters were not building with Slaves" a similar community; indeed, he sees an Indian "positional tension . . . imbricated with—if not dependent on—the absolute isolation of the Slave" (46, 53). At times, Wilderson puts considerations of Native positions aside, such as in his comparison of the histories of Black and non-Black film theories based in Lacanian psychoanalysis and alienation, in which he argues that non-Black theories are both parasitic upon, and unable to portray, the structural interdiction against Blackness and its dispossession and suffering.

Though he gestures to a range of other films in passing, Wilderson's book takes up a very small sample of films—just four across the last three parts of the book's twelve chapters. In the book's second part, Wilderson contrasts the 2002 film *Antwone Fisher* with the 1976 *Bush Mama* and its cohort of features from the 1967–1977 LA Rebellion school of Black cinema, with particular attention to their representations of the Black home and the prison-industrial complex. Wilderson contends that *Bush Mama* emerged in historical synchronicity with the consciousness of Black militants. His comparison of the film's protagonist, Dorothy, and the imprisoned member of the Black Liberation Army, Safiya Bukhari-Alston, provides the matrix for his analysis of a "brief moment in history" when "Black film assumed the Black desire to take this country down" through violence, by unflinchingly depicting the gratuitous violence that politicizes the film's Black characters and the violence that emerges from their politicization. By contrast, in an analysis that convincingly aligns this more recent film's aesthetics with the contemporary legal structures of California's Street Terrorism Enforcement and Protection Act, he concludes that *Antwone Fisher* "proffers captivity as the highest form of freedom, and it dramatizes life with unambiguously Black women as the lowest form of bondage" (113).

In part three, Wilderson considers the ways that Native American film (which he terms "Savage" cinema) has taken up images of Blackness. He argues that what he calls "'Savage' Negrophobia—a Native American brand of anxiety as regards the Slave" is fundamental to both an emergent Native cinema and Native political theory (152). Leaning not only on the work of Vine Deloria Jr., Taiaiake Alfred, and Haunani-Kay Trask on sovereignty, but in particular

on Ward Churchill's writing about genocide, leads Wilderson to adopt a vision of sovereignty as a form of "intra-Indian containment, self-governance" that imposes settler "civil society on the Native body politic" while requiring Native people "to perform a pageantry of social mimicry" (168, 206). For Wilderson, sovereignty represents "the dream of a cultural alliance between the 'Savage' and the Settler" while it "simultaneously crowds out the dream of a political alliance between the 'Savage' and the Slave" (160). In order to heighten the "political demand embedded in films like *Skins*" as well as to "raise the stakes of Native American revolutionary theory and practice," the author advocates that a more antagonistic position be gained by immersion in "the incomprehension of genocide" (161).

In a subsequent analysis of the 2002 film *Skins*, a drama about two Lakota brothers directed by Chris Eyre (Cheyenne/Arapaho), Wilderson locates the film's portrait of genocide in the character of Mogie, an alcoholic Vietnam war veteran, while its discourse of sovereignty is articulated through the character of Mogie's brother Rudy, a tribal cop and secret vigilante. Wilderson also briefly addresses Eyre's first feature film, *Smoke Signals*, as well as Leslie Marmon Silko's epic novel, *Almanac of the Dead*. Wilderson closely reads the film's confounding treatment of Blackness using two teenagers' cultural appropriation of hip-hop style and language, and, to a lesser extent, Rudy's donning of blackface disguise on his vigilante errands. Wilderson locates his critique of the film's "hypersovereign" acts in Rudy (192), a character who, viewers are asked to understand, is psychologically ill by virtue of his vigilantism (Rudy wounds the teenagers in the knees, surely a comment on the Wounded Knee massacre). In this focus on Rudy, Wilderson seems to be asking us to understand sovereignty as a form of self-directed violence. Yet it is Mogie who advocates a symbolic form of nation-to-nation enunciation when he suggests that Rudy direct his energies towards blowing up the carved face of George Washington at Mt. Rushmore.

In this same section Wilderson mounts an extended critique of the 2001 film *Monster's Ball*, categorizing it with *Antwone Fisher* as among the "sentimental apologies for structural violence" in contrast to *Bush Mama* and *Skins*, which he sees as flawed, but admirably engaged (341). He consistently shows that the formal qualities of *Monster's Ball*—lighting, image, soundtrack, editing—function contrapuntally to the screenplay's assumption of empathy, shared alienation, and "universal grammar of suffering" in ways that reaffirm racialized structural separation (277). Wilderson asserts that white film theorists such as Kaja Silverman and Mary Ann Doane, and Marxist theorists such as Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, "leave the Slave unthought" because they assume that Black positionality allows "access to dramas of value," thereby

erasing the structural exclusion of Blacks from temporality, cartography, and embodied action (315).

Red, White & Black is both brilliant and idiosyncratic, and bound to be controversial. An increasingly important focus of indigenous studies is the intersections between African American and Native American histories, cultures, aesthetics, and politics, and indigenous scholars will likely find counterarguments as well as points of agreement with this book. Oddly, Wilderson does not cite work by such scholars and writers in this area as Jack Forbes, Malinda Maynor Lowry, and Tiya Miles, and this omission of larger indigenous and comparative studies frameworks extends throughout the work. For example, he does not summarize and historicize the emergent body of indigenous film theory: there are no references to Jacqueline Kilpatrick, Beverly Singer, or Faye Ginsburg and indigenous media theorists from visual anthropology. The final section includes a substantial discussion of representations of the "mulatta" that uses the character Leticia in *Monster's Ball*, but there is no consideration of Native mixed-blood histories or their considerable attendant complexities of identity, legal status, and popular culture representation. Despite these omissions, Wilderson's book is a thought-provoking read and an important one for comparative studies of racial representations in cinema because it so vehemently departs from current critical channels in order to reach for the revolutionary power of paradigmatic vision.

Joanna Hearne
University of Missouri

Rich Indians: Native People and the Problem of Wealth in American History. By Alexandra Harmon. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010. 400 pages. $41.95 cloth; $27.95 paper.

During a 1984 interview with *Student Lawyer* magazine, distinguished Dakota scholar Vine Deloria Jr. recalled a journalist's 1969 visit to his Denver home to discuss *Custer Died for Your Sins*: "This team came out and saw that we had a basketball hoop on the garage and that I wrote on an electric typewriter. When they were all done interviewing, they said, 'You're a phony. You're not an Indian.'" Notoriously sarcastic, Deloria retorted, "What do you think—that I was going to live on South Table Mesa with a fat wife and 17 kids and a whole bunch of dogs and old cars in the yard?" "You're taxpayers," he jabbed, "you've been putting half a billion dollars a year into Indian programs. Don't you want to see a guy like me who wears button-down shirts and shiny boots and who's starting to show that your tax money's paying for something?"