

***Ethnic Studies Review* Volume 21**

North American conquest saga. Thus this book not only establishes the African American pioneers' "physical presence" but shows these pioneers as active players in the saga and as contributors to the cultural, social, and political development of the North American Frontier.

The author's admission that the text would not stress "historical analysis" of the evidence does not excuse some questionable statements in the narrative. This aside, the photographic evidence is truly a remarkable showcase of the varied existence for blacks on the frontier. This is a very readable book that I highly recommend to academics and general readers. It is a welcome addition in the mode of William L. Katz's pioneering pictorial work on African Americans' westering experiences.

Nudie Eugene Williams  
University of Arkansas

**Peter C. Rollins and John E. O'Connor, eds. *Hollywood's Indians: The Portrayal of the Native American in Film.* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1998). 226 pp., \$15.00 paper.**

Hollywood inherited conflicting myths of Native Americans: barbaric savages or "Noble Savage." Influenced by the latter romantic view, James Fenimore Cooper in print and George Catlin and Edward Curtis in art conveyed to an American public a portrait of a noble but vanishing race of America's first people. The dime store novels and Wild West shows of the late 1800s played with the dueling idea of a noble yet menacing Red Man, and Hollywood picked up this created myth of American Indians which, while ostensibly sympathetic, actually perpetuated stereotypes of a depraved and primitive race. Hollywood then packaged these images, made them her own, and secured for generations of people the predominant image today held of Native Americans. Since, as Hannu Salmi theorizes, movies are the myth by which Americans understand Western history, this is an alarming state of affairs.

Rollins and Collins, two scholars well steeped in film his-

tory, have assembled and edited an impressive group of fourteen essays which help explain why, even to this day with the Red Power Movement and the raising of a social consciousness about ethnic stereotyping, Hollywood remains married to its created myth of Native Americans. This collection of essays convincingly outlines the degree to which the myth of Indians that Hollywood inherited and constructed has been and continues to be an affront to Native Americans. The book's notable features include an excellent introduction by the editors, Ted Jojola's (Isleta Pueblo) five page annotated filmography, and Steven Mintz's bibliography of Western Films, the main context for Hollywood's Indians.

The first three essays establish the history of Native Americans in film and catalogue the degree to which Hollywood creates and perpetuates its own version of Indians. This background information also appears in many of the following essays and, although often repetitious, explicates the many problems with Hollywood's Indian: non-Indians playing Indians, like Sal Mineo whose picture on the book's cover assails readers; tribal differences being erased; Indians speaking English sounding like idiotic robots; and always the Native Americans as the foil to pioneering Americans seeking to fulfill their Manifest Destiny.

The majority of the essays discuss movies which have significantly contributed to Hollywood's Indian. Ever since John Ford set the standard for Westerns and depictions of Indians, Hollywood has faithfully followed his template, which Ken Nolley discusses in his informative article. Even those producers and directors who professed sympathy for Indians, like Ford, did little to revise Hollywood's image.

Yet, there is reason to hope that Hollywood's Indian is changing and that the more socially conscious films of the 80s and 90s can revise the stereotypes of ethnic people which demean them, rob them of a tribal identity, flatten out their character, and relegate them to conquered relics of America's past. The essays on *Tell Them Willie Boy is Here* (1969), *Little Big Man* (1970), and *Powwow Highway* (1989) convince the reader that Hollywood's invented myth of Native Americans is being challenged. John Sandos urges Anglo Hollywood to revise the story of the American West, like Indian filmmakers

Greg Sarris (Miwok), Sherman Alexie (Spokane/Coeur d'Alene) and others are doing who bring "Native American voices, stories, and viewpoints to the media mainstream from which they have been historically excluded" (Kasdan and Tavernetti 134). These films are long overdue.

Connie Jacobs  
Fort Lewis College

**Katheryn K. Russell. *The Color of Crime: Racial Hoaxes, White Fear, Black Protectionism, Police Harassment, and other Macroaggressions.* (New York: New York University Press, 1998) 148 pp., \$24.95.**

Is Crime a problem or color or race? What about the question of disproportionality: Do blacks commit more crimes in proportion to their percentage of the total population? Does disproportionality, as one measure of crime statistics, tell the whole story? What is black protectionism? Probably the most critical question Russell raises is does a racial bias exist in the reporting of crime statistics in the United States? This is not the first time such an issue has been raised. These are among the major questions dealt with in *The Color of Crime*.

In Russell's view—and there is much evidence to support her—the answer to the last question is yes. She is highly critical of some of the criminal justice literature published as recently as the 1980s, and she discusses it in the section on "Discrimination or Disproportionate Offending."

Although not all the research in the field is guilty of one sidedness, misreporting and faulty analysis is still a major problem in the field, as she correctly points out. Russell's main criticism is that much of the criminal justice literature still focuses far too much attention on "black crime" in the United States. In so doing it lacks an historical basis and tends to ignore long-standing socio-political factors. Russell goes on to suggest that arrest rates reflect many different kinds of indicators of social marginality. Furthermore not all arrests or even convictions are necessarily absolute measures of criminal behavior