

Transmotion

Vol 1, No 1 (2015)

Editors: David Carlson (California State University, San Bernardino)
James Mackay (European University, Cyprus)
David Stirrup (University of Kent)
Laura Adams Weaver (University of Georgia)

Editorial Assistant: Nell Perry (University of Kent)

Editorial Board: Jennifer Andrews
Scott Andrews
Kimberly Blaeser
Jill Doerfler
Hsinya Huang
A. Robert Lee
David Moore
Margaret Noodin
Jace Weaver

We are grateful for the support of the University of Kent, the European University of Cyprus, California State University, San Bernardino, and the University of Georgia. *Transmotion* is hosted by the University of Kent.

This journal provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge. Its contents are published under a Creative Commons Attribution License:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

For submission details, please consult our guidelines at:

<http://journals.kent.ac.uk/index.php/transmotion/about/submissions#onlineSubmissions>

To contact the editors: transmotionjournal@gmail.com

CONTENTS

Editorial	i
<i>Articles</i>	
The White Earth Constitution, Cosmopolitan Nationhood, and the Fruitful Ironies of Relational Sovereignty Joseph Bauerkemper	1
The Sovereignty of Transmotion in a State of Exception: Lessons from the Internment of ‘Praying Indians’ on Deer Island, Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1675-1676 Deborah L. Madsen	23
Vizenor and Beckett: Postmodern Identifications Paul Stewart	48
The Unmissable: Transmotion in Native Stories and Literature Gerald Vizenor	63
<i>Creative</i>	
Kansas Diane Glancy	76
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Review Essay: The Next Wave of Native American Writing? <i>Off the Path: An Anthology of 21st Century Montana American Indian Writers</i> (Adrian L. Jawort, ed.) David L. Moore	77
Review Essay: The Song Maps of Craig Santos Perez Michael Lujan Bevacqua	84
<i>The Gift of the Face: Portraiture and Time in Edward S. Curtis's The North American Indian (Shamoon Zamir) and The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000-1927 (Jace Weaver)</i> Chris LaLonde	89
<i>Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance</i> (Mark Rifkin) Scott Andrews	91
<i>Progressive Traditions: Identity in Cherokee Literature and Culture</i> (Joshua B. Nelson) Kirby Brown	94
<i>Voices of Fire: Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi'iaka</i> (ku'ualoha ho'omanawanui) Maile Arvin	99
<i>Imagining Geronimo: An Apache Icon in Popular Culture</i> (William Clements) David J. Carlson	102

<i>Creative Alliances: The Transnational Designs of Indigenous Women's Poetry</i> (Molly McGlennen)	
Mishuana Goeman	104
<i>Scalping Columbus and Other Damn Indian Stories: Truths, Half-Truths, and Outright Lies</i> (Adam Fortunate Eagle)	
Michael LeBlanc	107
<i>Legacy</i> (Waubgeshig Rice)	
Angela Semple	109
<i>The Road Back to Sweetgrass: a Novel</i> (Linda LeGarde Grover)	
Martha Viehmann	111
Pointing with Lips: A Week in the Life of a Rez Chick (Dana Lone Hill)	
Brian J. Twenter	113
<i>Peace in Duress</i> (Janet Rogers)	
Patricia Killelea	116
<i>Singing at the Gates: Selected Poems</i> (Jimmy Santiago Baca)	
Leigh C. Johnson	118
<i>From the Extinct Volcano, A Bird of Paradise</i> (Carter Revard)	
A. Robert Lee	120
Halfling Spring: An internet romance (Joanne Arnott)	
James Mackay	122
<i>Dawnland Voices: An Anthology of Indigenous Writing from New England</i> (Siobhan Senier)	
Rachel Bryant	124
A Flowing Stream: review essay for <i>A Favor of Crows</i> (Gerald Vizenor)	
Diane Glancy	126
Contributor Biographies	129

Editorial

Gerald Vizenor has for over forty years been the voice of innovation in native literatures. From his campaigning early journalism and delicate natural haiku scenes, through his raucous satires and powerhouse unification of tribal tradition with continental critical philosophy, to his latest emergence as imaginative historical novelist and framer of constitutions, Vizenor has continuously embodied both the modernist credo of “make it new,” and also (paradoxically?) the continuing vitality of tribal narrative traditions. In founding *Transmotion*, only the second journal with Indigenous North American literatures as its primary focus, it is our intention to encourage this continuing spirit of creative *jouissance* in the field of Native critical studies. In particular, we are looking to promote the academic study of experimental and avant-garde Indigenous writers, and equally to encourage innovative, surprising, unexpected and creative critique of American Indian literatures and other creative arts.

It has been frequently perceived that Native American and First Nations studies are wary of overt theorizing, particularly of theoretical models derived from outside writer-specific tribal traditions. For instance, Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith describe in the introduction to their edited volume *Theorizing Native Studies* (2014) a “turn against theory” (1), and note that activist praxis and community engagement are seen as inherently, or at any rate ethically, more valuable scholarly interventions than a seemingly abstracted and rarified theorization of indigenous literary output. (It’s an attitude that they and the contributors to their landmark volume decisively disprove). On top of being seen as ethically removed, the spirit of philosophical play that motivates theoretical innovation also runs counter to both the anthropologically-inflected criticism of early studies and more recent emphases on archival research and a historicist approach to tribal literatures.

Yet imaginative literature is not the same thing as historical documentation, and writing a poem is not lobbying. Literary works slip and wriggle under the microscope: influences and intentions blur and contradict themselves. Writers self-contradict knowingly and unconsciously, and no writer can be reduced to being a robotic representative of culture. Literary interpretation of works by Native writers must take as its watchword Vizenor’s seven-word manifesto: to “elude historicism, racial representations and remain historical.” The fact that this manifesto issues from a wheelchair-bound hermaphrodite trickster’s dialogue with a cultural anthropologist, and thus is already unstable, ironic and contextual, further emphasizes just why literature in particular is best served by an imaginative, open and un-predetermined criticism. We hope that, if nothing else, the founding of this journal will allow for new critical perspectives to complicate the reading of Native literatures. We will also host new creative work, and welcome submissions of critical/creative hybrid pieces. Finally, it is our intention to host as many reviews of relevant books as possible, to ensure that the breadth and depth of the scholarship devoted to Native American, First Nations, and Indigenous literatures more broadly is brought to light in one place.

The journal itself is open access, thanks to the generous sponsorship of the University of Kent: all content is fully available on the open internet with no paywall or institutional access required, and it always will be. We are published under a Creative Commons 4.0 license, meaning in essence that any articles or reviews may be copied and re-used provided that the source and author is acknowledged. We strongly believe in this model, which makes research and academic

insight available and useable for the widest possible community. We also believe in keeping to the highest academic standards: thus all articles are double-blind peer reviewed by at least two reviewers, and each issue approved by an editorial board of senior academics in the field (listed in the Front Matter above).

We chose *Transmotion* as a title to reflect the sense of intellectual movement and energy characterizing the Vizenorian project, and it is only right that this inaugural issue should concentrate in the main on this theme. We are particularly honored that Gerald Vizenor has himself contributed an original essay explicating the theme of transmotion, one that updates and expands his challenge to writers and critics to now “elude simulations, description, causation, denouement, and cultural victimry.” Joseph Bauerkemper in his examination of the Constitution of the White Earth Nation, a document that brings an artistic irony to the process of forming a nation, argues that the “Anishinaabeg are [through its adoption] reconstituting themselves as transnational citizens” and making transmotion a foundational part of their identity as a nation that refuses the dominant paradigms of statehood. Deborah Madsen takes this further in her discussion of the 17th century imprisonment of “praying Indians” on Deer Island: invoking Agamben’s “state of exception,” Madsen demonstrates the threat that transmotion poses to settler narratives. Finally, Paul Stewart places Vizenor’s communal and comic vision of continuance in *Dead Voices* against the agonized attempt to refuse identity found in one of his professed inspirations, Samuel Beckett. Rounding off the issue, Diane Glancy’s original poem “Kansas” brings transmotion to life, as the driving narrator muses that “In travel, I become the moving place that distance is.”

James Mackay
David Carlson
David Stirrup
Laura Adams Weaver

April 2015

The White Earth Constitution, Cosmopolitan Nationhood, and the Fruitful Ironies of Relational Sovereignty

JOSEPH BAUERKEMPER

We are nowhere near the “end of history,” but we are still far from free from monopolizing attitudes toward it. These have not been much good in the past [...] and the quicker we teach ourselves to find alternatives, the better and safer.

- Edward Said

As its title suggests, this is an essay about apparent absurdities. It is a hopeful pursuit of contradiction, a straightforward affirmation of irony. Among the scholarly debates it observes is the enduring tension between perspectives that continue to see nationhood as the paramount paradigm of societal orientation and those that emphasize the ascendancy of globalization. This terrain is both well trodden and continually trafficked. In 1966, international relations theorist and frequent U.S. government consultant Hans Morgenthau wrote, “Modern technology has rendered the nation-state obsolete as a principle of political organization; the nation-state is no longer able to perform what is the elementary function of any political organization: to protect the lives of its members and their way of life” (9). While the cold war angst of nuclear destruction would slowly recede across subsequent decades, many scholars would continue sharing Morgenthau’s sense that nation-states were waning in geopolitical importance. In 1990, Eric Hobsbawm speculatively characterized the world of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century as “a world which can no longer be contained within the limits of ‘nations’ and ‘nation-states’ as these used to be defined, either politically, or economically, or culturally, or even linguistically. It will [...] reflect the decline of the old nation-state as an operational entity” (191). A few years later, French diplomat Jean-Marie Guéhenno similarly observed, “Too remote to manage the problems of our daily life, the nation nevertheless remains too constrained to confront the global problems that affect us. Whether it is a question of the traditional functions of sovereignty, like defense or justice, or of economic competences, the nation appears increasingly like a straitjacket, poorly adapted to the growing integration of the world” (12-13). Looking back

at these twentieth-century declarations, Anthony Smith sees the emergence of a “constructionist” critique of nationalism, asserting “that nationalism and nations have fulfilled their functions and are now becoming obsolete in an era of globalization” (92).

The general strain of the constructionist critique endures in the twenty-first century. For Jayantha Dhanapala, “the nation—along with its associated ideology, nationalism—continues to provide a formidable obstacle to constructive international cooperation on an enormous variety of common global problems” (34). Dhanapala suggests not only the nation’s waning relevance in a globalizing world, but that it increasingly stands in the way of desirable development. Despite commitments quite distinct from Dhanapala’s affirmation of globalization, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s book *Empire* makes a conceptually allied argument:

The decline of the nation-state is not simply the result of an ideological position that might be reversed by an act of political will: it is a structural and irreversible process. [...] The declining effectiveness of this structure can be traced clearly through the evolution of a whole series of global juridico-economic bodies, such as GATT, the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and the IMF. The globalization of production and circulation, supported by this supranational juridical scaffolding, supersedes the effectiveness of national juridical structures. (336)

These networked institutions that regulate legal and material life under globalization orient to and reiterate a logic of power that Hardt and Negri theorize as “Empire” (xii). While it can make use of nations and their structures, “Empire” primarily displaces them.

For many other scholars, however, nationhood and nationalism continue to have prevalence. According to Craig Calhoun, “globalization has not put an end to nationalism—not to nationalist conflicts nor to the role of nationalist categories in organizing ordinary people’s sense of belonging in the world” (171). “Indeed,” Calhoun writes, “much of the contemporary form of globalization is produced and driven by nation-states—at least certain powerful nation-states” (169). In alignment with Calhoun and in stark contrast to Hardt and Negri, Martin Wolf argues that “globalization is not destined, it is chosen. It is a choice made to enhance a nation’s economic well-being” (182). “Integration is a deliberate choice,” Wolf continues, “rather than an ineluctable destiny, it cannot render states impotent. Their potency lies in the choices they make” (183). And in an even more precise departure from Hardt and Negri, Wolf writes, “Institutions

such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, the EU, and the North American Free Trade Agreement underpin cooperation among states” (184). And finally, “Global governance will come not at the expense of the state but rather as an expression of the interests that the state embodies. As the source of order and basis of governance, the state will remain in the future as effective, and will be as essential, as it has ever been” (190). While Morgenthau, Hobsbawm, Guéhenno, and Hardt and Negri partake in a shared emphasis on the nation-state’s receding significance, Calhoun and Wolf share the sense that nation-states remain formidable agents within an increasingly unified global market system.

In the 2011 edition of his dynamic and insightfully ambivalent book *Globalization and the Nation State*, Robert Holton synthesizes so many of these and other scholarly perspectives, indicating that “global and national processes often interact and adapt to each other, creating processes that reflect both global and national or local elements” (2) and that “some versions of nationalism are compatible with globalization and cosmopolitanism” (227). Historian and historiographer David W. Noble—a friend and mentor to whom I am deeply indebted—shares with Holton and many others an unwillingness to champion either nationalism or globalism. Noble does, however, contribute to this discussion a unique suggestion that both nationalist and globalist imaginaries are subtle iterations of the same commitment to an aspirational exodus out of the mess of history. In his studies of historians, authors, composers, artists, economists, and scientists, Noble has argued that in recent centuries middle classes on both sides of the Atlantic (most notably Britain, France, and the settler colonies they spawned) have consistently imagined themselves to be building nations that embody the culmination of history. According to Noble, these nations imagined that “their cultures had grown out of their national landscapes, those virgin lands whose naturalness and purity were protected by national political boundaries” (*Death* xxvi). These ostensibly organic nations had achieved the end of history by securing political sovereignty congruent with their respective fatherlands. This achievement thus marked a transcendent exodus from a timeful world of dynamic complexity and tradition into a timeless world of stable simplicity and modernity. The state-oriented concept of nationhood has been imagined by these middle classes as a signal achievement of modernity’s exodus. According to this imagination, the nation-state is the mode of socio-polity situated at the end of history’s arduous march of progress out of culture into nature, out of limits into infinitude.

Yet across recent decades, it has been an important task of transnational studies to disclose the stratifying and violating power undergirding this imagination. Contemporaneously with these efforts an alternative imaginary has gained formidable traction. Many of the inheritors of nation-states have maintained faith in historical progress while revising their understanding of the telos in order to point eagerly toward the unfettered global marketplace as history’s culmination. “Modern nations as sacred spaces had been replaced by the sacred space of the universal marketplace,” Noble writes. “For the middle classes, that marketplace now represents the end of history” (*Death* xxxvii). In his most recent book, Noble continues in this vein, noting that across the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries, perspectives both within and beyond the academy “replaced the nation with the global marketplace as the end of history. Particular nations did not represent the timeless laws of nature; only the global marketplace expressed those universal patterns” (*Debating* 6). Dominant political and economic discourses and the array of scholarly voices cited above reveal that the frictions and intimacies between state nationalism and globalization remain heated and complex. Noble’s analysis of these sentiments tells us that they are both fantasies with little to offer either the intellectual work of constructing critical histories or the material work of facilitating functional societies. Neither paradigm has the potential to envision and foster a just world. Imagining otherwise and creating cultural, political, and economic relations between and beyond state nationalism and market globalism is therefore crucial.

Among many other possibilities, indigenous writing and intellectual histories serve as important resources for this vital endeavor. When informed by the work of indigenous writers and intellectuals, efforts to reimagine structures and processes of societal affiliation might more effectively foster reconfigured, enhanced, and expanded recognitions of Native sovereignties while also facilitating the deliberation and pursuit of justice in various contexts and on various scales. For the purposes of this essay, I will explore this possibility by focusing first on some of the ways in which Native writing is currently studied within the academy and second on a particularly noteworthy piece of Native writing: the Constitution of the White Earth Nation. What I am suggesting here is that a meta-critical rumination on some of the primary critical approaches to Native literary and intellectual traditions should help reveal for us key contributions that indigenous narratives make to the vital work of imagining ethical modes of polity.

Within the overlapping fields of Native American literary studies and Native intellectual history, recent years have witnessed a cumulative drive to systematically organize major scholars and their work into critical taxonomies. This tendency seems to be due at least in part to academic anxiety in the face of the exponential growth that these fields have enjoyed. In many instances, scholars of Native writing are associated with one of two opposed categories, often termed the “cosmopolitan” and “nationalist” factions.¹ Upon initial consideration, this appears to be a compelling and functional schema: While the cosmopolitan critics emphasize the ways in which Native literatures and intellectual histories resist the legacies of colonialism through the foregrounding of cultural fluidity, adaptation, subversive resistance, and cross-cultural engagement, nationalist critics insist that Native writing remain accountable to specific tribal histories, epistemologies, and sovereignties while also aggressively confronting land dispossession and other colonial injustices. Yet this dichotomy oversimplifies a wide array of available critical approaches while also ignoring the ways in which diverse, dynamic, and mutually illuminating perspectives interact and resonate with one another. As Jace Weaver notes, “the space between nationalism and cosmopolitanism is not as wide as some have contended” (“Turning West” 33). An oppositional taxonomy thus constrains our scholarly capacities to explore the conceptions of polity remembered, imagined, and articulated in Native writing. By better observing and honoring the nuance of critical voices, we can better observe and honor the significant extent to which ethics and affiliations commonly attributed to cosmopolitanism are integral to the forms and processes of Native nationhood. We might thereby account for the national orientations, the cultural and historic specificities, the multivalent adaptability, and the transnationally mediated sensibilities of the community formations narrated within Native writing.

Even a cursory consideration of the most prominent critical figures associated with the cosmopolitan and nationalist tendencies reveals the inadequacy of these categories. Gerald Vizenor is regarded by many (and repudiated by some) as the foremost practitioner of the cosmopolitan approach to Native American Studies. Vizenor’s association with the cosmopolitan critical faction arises in no small part from his affinity for poststructuralist and continental theory, his skepticism toward authenticity, and his celebration of mixed-blood subjectivity. According to Arnold Krupat, “Gerald Vizenor has explored the possibilities of Native cosmopolitanism in his fiction and criticism, celebrating the once pitied, or despised ‘halfbreed’

as the ‘mixedblood’ or ‘crossblood’” (20). Yet it is increasingly clear that Vizenor should be recognized as a noteworthy theorist and advocate of sovereign tribal nationhood. Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair, for example, notes that “Vizenor’s writing is deeply applicable to one of the most important processes happening in Anishinaabeg communities: the redefining, reestablishment, and reassertion of practices and processes necessary for Anishinaabeg notions of nationhood to be reactualized” (128). Citing Sinclair, Lisa Brooks has likewise noted that “through his fiction, Vizenor has long participated in a process of imagining community survivance” (58). Most recently, Jace Weaver has observed that “[a]mong Native Americans, there is no more erudite or cosmopolitan critic than Vizenor. No one is more conversant with critical theory or more adept at deploying it. Yet he is also a nationalist” (“Turning West” 32). This nevertheless understudied trajectory of Vizenor’s work is evident in the deep cultural and linguistic inflections present throughout his writing and also in his enduring and increasingly explicit examination of both orthodox and innovative theories of sovereignty.

In his 1991 novel *The Heirs of Columbus*, for example, Vizenor offers a narrative of the making of a “new tribal nation” explicitly described as “a sovereign nation” (119, 123). In a collection of essays from late in the same decade, he takes up a keen and sustained interest in what he terms the “*sui generis* sovereignty” of tribal nations (*Fugitive* 15). For Vizenor, “natives are neither exiles nor separatists from other nations or territories” (181). “The presence of natives on this continent,” he continues, “is an obvious narrative on sovereignty” (182). Vizenor’s commitment to Native sovereignty--a key hallmark of nationalist criticism--could not be more clear. Of course, Vizenor’s conception of sovereignty here is neither absolutist nor separatist; it is relational. He deliberately emphasizes “the diplomatic narratives of treaties, executive documents, and court decisions that acknowledge the rights and distinctive sovereignty of native communities” (181).

In his book *Native Liberty*, Vizenor’s increasing gravitation toward nationhood is evident in his engagement with various conceptions and critiques of polity and sovereignty in the work of Giorgio Agamben, Stephen Krasner, David Wilkins, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, Michel Foucault, John Boli, and T. Alexander Aleinikoff, among others. Through his discussion of these theorists, Vizenor asserts that “sovereignty must be reconceived” and he posits the “distinctive sense of sovereignty” (162) maintained by indigenous peoples as a resource for doing so. “Natives, in the past century,” Vizenor writes, “have articulated, emulated, and

litigated the notion of state sovereignty as independence and autonomy; that minimal view of state or territorial sovereignty, however, has lost significance in the economic globalization of the world” (114). Vizenor thus gestures toward an innovative “visionary sovereignty” (108) that complements and resonates extensively with critical theorist Nancy Fraser’s critiques of the “Westphalian political imaginary, which sharply distinguished ‘domestic’ from ‘international’ space” (*Scales of Justice* 12). According to Fraser, the Westphalian concept of sovereignty “has been challenged from at least three directions: first, by localists and communalists, who seek to locate the scope of concern in subnational units; second, by regionalists and transnationalists, who propose to identify the ‘who’ of justice with larger, though not fully universal, units, such as Europe or Islam; and, third, by globalists and cosmopolitans, who propose to accord equal consideration to all human beings” (“Abnormal Justice” 401). Vizenor’s theoretical and applied narrations of sovereignty synthesize components of each of the interventions observed by Fraser. Of course, Vizenor cannot but also posit a most fruitful and fundamental fourth: the politics of indigeneity.

If Vizenor—who in the early 1990s claimed that “nationalism is the most monotonous simulation of dominance” (*Manifest* 60)—can be reasonably characterized as a writer and intellectual with substantial nationalist inclinations, we might conversely cast Robert Warrior—perhaps the most prominent critic associated with the nationalist critical tendency—as a scholar with a cosmopolitan bent. In 1995 Warrior published his first book, *Tribal Secrets*, which carries the subtitle “Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions.” An exploration of American Indian “intellectual sovereignty,” the study marked a watershed moment in what I have come to call the “nationalist turn” in Native Studies. (We might note that this nationalist turn in Native Studies, having emerged in the 1990s and only increasing in momentum through the present, is fully contemporaneous with the “transnational turn” that has come to so enamor much of the humanities and social sciences.) Warrior set about the creative recovery of an American Indian critical tradition that would neither spring from nor be sublimated within intellectual frameworks brought to the American hemisphere by colonization. *Tribal Secrets* has had significant and sustained impact on the field of Native Studies, informing and influencing subsequent books by each of the foremost scholars of the nationalist orientation: Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, Jace Weaver, Craig Womack, and Daniel Justice, among others. In 2006, Warrior joined Weaver and Womack to co-write *American Indian Literary Nationalism*, in which the three jointly sustain the assertion

that “being a nationalist is a legitimate perspective from which to approach Native American literature and criticism” (xx-xxi).

Yet despite this explicit affirmation and avowal of the nationalist critical cause, there are intriguing indications in many of Warrior’s works that suggest cosmopolitan commitments. While as far as I know he has never had a moment of full-on Kantianism like that in which the otherwise vociferously nationalist critic Cook-Lynn suggested “the American Indian voice might [...] stir the human community to a moral view which would encompass all of humanity, not just selected parts of it” (64), Warrior has nevertheless made plain within his contribution to *American Indian Literary Nationalism* that “it is possible to be a critic, a nationalist, a cosmopolitan, and a humanist all at the same time” (192). As Warrior writes in *Tribal Secrets*, “the process of sovereignty, whether in the political or in the intellectual sphere, is not a matter of removing ourselves and our communities from the influences of the world in which we live” (114). It is, instead, a process of dynamic relationality.

To suggest that the prevailing associations of Vizenor with cosmopolitanism and Warrior with nationalism have not adequately accounted for the complexity of their contributions is not to dismiss these categorizations in any comprehensive fashion. Rather, it is to join the chorus of theorists calling into question the general oppositional schema through which cosmopolitanism and nationalism are conventionally counter-defined. In his essay “Cosmopolitan Patriots” Kwame Anthony Appiah proclaims that “the cosmopolitan patriot can entertain the possibility of a world in which everyone is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of one’s own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different places that are home to other, different people” (618). Bruce Robbins has more explicitly noted that “cosmopolitanism sometimes works together with nationalism rather than in opposition to it” (2). And Paul Rabinow complements Appiah and Robbins with his definition of cosmopolitanism as “an ethos of macro-interdependencies, with an acute consciousness [...] of the inescapabilities and particularities of places” (258). The grounded cosmopolitanism suggested by these and other scholars accounts for particular relations between peoples and their local places while also compelling ethical inter-community interactions of relational sovereignties.

Tim Brennan posits an important and resonant intervention into cosmopolitan discourse, observing its tendency to drift “into an imperial apologetics” (147). Yet Brennan also maintains hope that we might realize “a cosmopolitanism worthy of the name” (309) that would affirm and

defend the “sovereignty of existing and emergent third-world polities [...] in the face of futurist prognoses that they have ceased existing” (316). Brennan’s incisive sense of the cosmopolitan vis-a-vis the national resonates extensively with the ways in which I am understanding the sophisticated critical positions of Vizenor and Warrior. For these and many other indigenous writers and intellectuals, sovereignty is itself an extensively cosmopolitan endeavor. This is radically different than a conception of sovereignty marked by a governmental prerogative to decide the state of exception and to suspend the rule of law in order to uphold a disciplinary legal domain, whether isolationist or imperial. It is instead an acknowledgement that sovereignty is always relational, that it is necessarily and unavoidably rooted in culture, and that it is most operative at the interfaces where recognition and reciprocity reside.

We can witness the presence of a sophisticated and vitally enduring tradition of cosmopolitan nationhood in a multitude of sites, moments, texts, and actions. In Warrior’s discussion of the 1881 Osage Constitution, for example, it becomes clear that late nineteenth-century Osages were concerned not only for their own national interests but also for Kaw rights and aspirations (*The People* 77-78). And well over a century later we can now witness a growing transnational wave of constitutional reform sweeping across Indian Country. This wave is impelled in part by enduring and increasing dissatisfaction with the mode of constitutionalism promoted in the mid twentieth century by the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA). Departing from prior federal policies aimed at assimilation and land dispossession, the IRA encouraged tribes to establish constitutional governance structures based on municipal practices (Wilkins xxii). Willfully ignoring and marginalizing tribal traditions and cultural frameworks, the IRA sought a systematic reorganization of tribal government in order to serve federal purposes. The resultant frameworks, based in many instances on a “Model Constitution” distributed by the U.S. Department of the Interior, have sometimes failed to garner sufficient regard from tribal citizens and have thus contributed to intra-tribal tensions and crises (Cohen *On the Drafting* 173-177). Moreover, the “self-governance” approach promoted by the IRA entrenched paternalistic federal oversight and brought disruptive pressure to bear upon tribes as they crafted their formative governing documents. This intrusive pressure came heavily to bear in the early 1960s as the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe—a confederation of Ojibwe nations including White Earth—updated its IRA-oriented constitution. The current efforts of White Earth to implement their own constitution is driven in part by dissatisfaction with facets of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe’s

constitution that were manipulated by the federal government (Doerfler “Anishinaabeg Society” 22).

Both as a departure from IRA-style tribal constitutionalism and a foray into community-based indigenous governance, the White Earth Constitution offers a conceptual and material manifestation of Native nationhood that illuminates and is illuminated by the tension-laden debates within Native American Studies regarding nationalism and cosmopolitanism. More importantly, the Constitution also serves as a political instrument necessarily oriented to material functionality in the complex contexts of United States settler-colonial federalism. The White Earth Constitution does not mark a culmination, an end of a developmental history; rather, it marks a transition which entails both the maintenance and transformation of relations—most centrally those within the White Earth Nation and those between the White Earth Anishinaabeg, the confederated Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and the United States.

Because Vizenor led the team charged with drafting the Constitution, it should not come as a surprise that the document is thoroughly marked by his characteristic literary hand. Creating a national constitution is perhaps the most patently nationalist task a writer can take up. As the principal scribe of a legal instrument through which the Anishinaabe of White Earth “constitute, ordain and establish” themselves as a nation, Vizenor clearly and firmly positions himself as a writer, intellectual, and political actor deeply invested in nationalist discourse and advocacy. Yet this in no way sets aside his pronouncements and positions that diverge from nationalism. Indeed, as both a narration of nationhood and a framework for its practice, the constitution is both necessarily and emphatically cosmopolitan. It reimagines nationhood in ways that resonate with, enhance, and challenge the increasingly sophisticated discourses regarding nationhood, cosmopolitanism, settler colonialism, and constituency currently at the core of Native Studies.

Of course, the Constitution of the White Earth Nation is not a solitary work of literary craft. It is born of a collaborative process detailed in the book *The White Earth Nation: Ratification of a Native Democratic Constitution* and in James Mackay’s interview with Vizenor. Through debates, dialogs, collaborations, and constitutional conventions, the Constitution bears the voices of numerous White Earth Anishinaabeg. Each article and revision was subject to a dedicated convention procedural vote, and the final version of the Constitution was ratified by a two-thirds supermajority at the final convention in April 2009. In November 2013 the Constitution was affirmed by eighty percent of voting White Earth band members and thereby

adopted. According to Vizenor, “The Constitution of the White Earth Nation was inspired by native reason, narratives of survivance and cultural traditions, totemic associations, cosmopolitan encounters, and modern democratic constitutions, and was ratified by Native delegates with a determined sense of Native presence, of resistance, and survivance over absence and victimry” (“Constitutional Consent” 15). These terms, familiar to most readers of Vizenor, here find perhaps their most practically-oriented application.

Even with an inherent and necessary Anishinaabeg-centric orientation, it remains important to recognize that the White Earth Constitution also must assert itself in relation to the fraught and ironic terrain of settler federalism where political and legal authority is divided between federal, state, and tribal governments. Vizenor has noted that “the Constitution of the White Earth Nation is neither similar to nor commensurate with the federal executive structures of governance” (“Constitutional Consent” 16). Despite this dissimilarity and incommensurability, the Constitution necessarily positions itself amid the complex overlapping sovereignties of United States federalism. While the White Earth Nation is not appealing to the United States for a permissive right to collective indigenous political existence (something of a distinction from the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe Constitution which situates itself as a “privilege granted the Indians by the United States under existing law”), the White Earth Constitution does affirm the shared political and legal intimacies most centrally rooted in the 1867 treaty between the U.S. and the Chippewa of the Mississippi, an ongoing diplomatic relationship through which these Anishinaabeg have made (under intense pressures) a sovereign investment in United States federalism. Acknowledging that treaty-making involved “coercion, deception, misunderstanding, [and] fatalism” and observing that “the hundreds of treaties made between Indians and Americans during the nineteenth century were a mixed bag on every level,” Scott Richard Lyons also asserts that “Natives understood what was at stake in their treaties” and in affirming them “signified agency and consent—yes, limited on both counts” (127). White Earth’s conflicted yet committed sovereign investment in treaty federalism was and is cosmopolitan in character. American Indian sovereignty can be understood as both inherent and federated, even while extra-constitutional. Tribes are, as David Wilkins and Tsianina Lomawaima have noted, the “senior sovereigns” of this continent (249). Vizenor has likewise written that “Native liberty, natural reason, and survivance are concepts that originate in narratives, not in the mandates of monarchies, papacies, severe traditions, or federal policies” (“Constitutional Consent” 11). It is a

fundamental doctrine of Indian law in the United States that the settler government does not create, gift, or delegate governing authority to tribes. Sovereign power inheres in tribes, arising as it does from deep histories of human and institutional interaction that predate and endure under colonialism. This authority is acknowledged, not established, by the United States in statute, case law, and diplomatic accords. In his fundamental treatise on federal Indian law, Felix Cohen writes:

Perhaps the most basic principles of all Indian law supported by a host of decisions [...] is the principle that those powers which are lawfully vested in an Indian tribe are not, in general, delegated powers granted by express acts of Congress, but rather inherent powers of a limited sovereignty which has never been extinguished. Each Indian tribe begins its relationship with the Federal Government as a sovereign power, recognized as such in treaty and legislation. The powers of sovereignty have been limited from time to time by special treaties and laws designed to take from the Indian tribes control of matters which, in the judgment of Congress, then, must be examined to determine the limitations of tribal sovereignty rather than to determine its sources or its positive content. What is not expressly limited remains within the domain of tribal sovereignty. (*Handbook* 122)

As Cohen’s realist account indicates, a correlating doctrine of federal Indian law holds that Congress has the power to diminish unilaterally the sovereignty of tribes. American Indian nations thus currently enjoy and are subject to federal recognition and containment of their nevertheless resilient inherent sovereignty.

Through the variously diplomatic and exploitative relations shared by Native nations and the United States, both are currently compromised sovereigns. Sovereignty is always relational, never absolute. Sovereign polities necessarily have the capacity to manage intra- and inter-political relationships. This sine qua non of sovereignty entails compromise. This includes the sense of weakness, marked by regret and disappointment. As we well know, Native nations in the United States have been severely curtailed and violated in their intertwined political, legal, cultural, economic, and ecological dimensions. While far less consequential, the settler nation state’s commitments to universalizing neoliberalism are frustrated by the endurance of indigenous peoples, polities, claims, and obligations. Tribes and the United States can also be

seen as compromised sovereignties in the sense that they have made mutual co-promises of interdependence. While not existentially crucial to tribes, the treaty and trust obligations associated with Native-settler diplomacies have formative import for Native nations. Treaties did not create tribes, but they did often delineate tribal land bases and establish federal recognition of tribal nations. More starkly, the fragile and partial legitimacy of the United States' jurisdictional claims fundamentally relies upon relations—both historical and contemporary—with Native nations. Without tribally affirmed diplomatic land cessions, there is no such thing as legitimate U.S. territory. “The authority of Indian tribes to enter into treaties with European states and the United States,” writes Phillip M. Kannan, “is a prerequisite to the validity of land title in the United States” (813). While discourses of U.S. and international law continue to assert a legal doctrine of discovery in which the land claims of indigenous peoples are reduced to mere rights of occupancy, David Wilkins and Tsianina Lomawaima argue that a more historically accurate and legally sound conceptualization of this doctrine would and should recognize that it merely grants to certain aspirational settlers a preemptive right against other aspirational settlers (19-63). Wilkins and Lomawaima's preemptive account of the doctrine of discovery emphasizes relations between colonizing polities rather than direct relations between colonizers and Native nations. The legitimate establishment of settler sovereignty therefore requires Native assent.

Within the morass of federated, always-relational, and often-chafing Native and settler sovereignties resides the Constitution of the White Earth Nation. The cosmopolitan nationhood envisioned and formulated within the Constitution is neither determined by, completely liberated from, nor neglectful of settler imperatives. This is evident, for example, in the Constitution's primary articles on citizenship:

Article 1: Citizens of the White Earth Nation shall be descendants of Anishinaabeg families and related by linear descent to enrolled members of the White Earth Reservation and Nation, according to genealogical documents, treaties, and other agreements with the government of the United States.

Article 2: Services and entitlements provided by government agencies to citizens, otherwise designated members of the White Earth Nation, shall be defined according to treaties, trusts, and diplomatic agreements, state and federal laws, rules and regulations, and in policies and procedures established by the government of the White Earth Nation.

The move to lineal descent resonates with Vizenor’s prior warnings against “political reversions to exclusive consciousness” (*Fugitive* 67) and marks a radical—even if not completely unproblematic—distinction from the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe’s blood quantum-based membership criteria to a kinship-based mode of affiliation. While these emergent citizenship criteria depart from the federally generated and encouraged regime of blood quantum, they do not actually depart from relational federalism itself, which clearly remains a formative presence in these articles. Indeed, while the racist logic of blood quantum is not explicitly invoked here in Article 2, that logic remains operative by way of the “laws, rules, and regulations” referenced. Moreover, the move away from blood quantum is itself in certain ironic respects a move on behalf of the maintenance of federated tribal status. Within her contribution to *The White Earth Nation: Ratification of a Native Democratic Constitution*, constitutional writing team member Jill Doerfler notes,

Based on current citizenship requirements, many tribes will have no new citizens in fifty years and even more will face the same fate in a century. Blood quantum is mathematical termination. Once Native nations ‘disappear,’ the U.S. government will finally be free of their treaty and fiscal responsibilities. In an effort to prevent this situation, many tribes are changing citizenship requirements to ensure that their nations will continue in perpetuity. (“A Citizen’s Guide” 83)

Unless Native nations recover and redevelop more inclusive, even cosmopolitan, approaches to defining and cultivating their citizenries, the federated political status of American Indian tribes will dissolve. While blood quantum regulations do not have the direct capacity to vanish cultures or peoples, they do have the actuarial power to disappear federated polities. Despite the distributive and cultural anxieties associated with Native citizenries of lineal descent, the people of White Earth have determined to pursue such a path in order to affirm their kinship customs and in order to ensure their own endurance as a federated Native nation.²

A commitment to the relational sovereignty of federalism also explicitly arises in Article 10 of the Constitution’s chapter on “Rights and Duties”: “The People shall have the right to possess firearms except for convicted felons in accordance with state and federal laws.” This article recognizes the tenuous ecology of gun control within United States federalism and also makes a tacit gesture toward Public Law 83-280, which authorizes state criminal jurisdiction on the White Earth Reservation (among many others). Article 17 of the same chapter also situates

the White Earth Nation in relation to United States federalism while still asserting inherent Native sovereignty:

The Constitution of the White Earth Nation is inspired by inherent and traditional sovereignty, and contains, embodies, and promotes the rights and provisions provided in the articles and amendments of the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968, and the United States Constitution.

This article conveys the White Earth Constitution's most assertive affirmation of the federated dimension of tribal sovereignty. Yet it does so, of course, in the context of an explicitly emphasized and prioritized inherent tribal sovereignty. In his essay on the Constitution David Carlson notes this complex, observing that the document seeks "to integrate aspects of Western law (certain forms of rights consciousness, for example) into the realm of *mino-bimaadiziwin*, to redefine Anishinaabeg legal and political identity, dialectically, in a way that speaks to the realities and contingencies of the present moment" (36).

The relational and cosmopolitan orientation of Native nationhood within the Constitution is not at all limited to its federalist gestures. The preamble, which reads as follows, conveys the far-reaching yet intimately local scope of White Earth nationhood:

The Anishinaabeg of the White Earth Nation are the successors of a great tradition of continental liberty, a native constitution of families, totemic associations. The Anishinaabeg create stories of natural reason, of courage, loyalty, humor, spiritual inspiration, survivance, reciprocal altruism, and native cultural sovereignty.

We the Anishinaabeg of the White Earth Nation in order to secure an inherent and essential sovereignty, to promote traditions of liberty, justice, and peace, and reserve common resources, and to ensure the inalienable rights of native governance for our posterity, do constitute, ordain and establish this Constitution of the White Earth Nation.

Reflecting both the Constitutions of the United States and of Japan, this preamble also conveys its immersion in Anishinaabe culture, history, and kinship. Within the White Earth Constitution's first sentence, the Anishinaabe of the White Earth Nation define themselves in relation to their tradition of spatial liberty. The document enshrines movement across the place of North America as a central attribute and practice of White Earth nationhood. Because this liberty is continental

in scope and range, we know right away that this tradition of movement—which includes the Anishinaabeg migration to the places where food grows on water—brings the White Earth Nation and its citizens into transnational realms and discourses. Furthermore, the preamble goes on to suggest that many of these interactions are informed by and become themselves stories of “survivance” and “reciprocal altruism.” As Vizenor has written elsewhere, interdependence is “an honorable mandate of sovereignty” (*Manifest* 147). And as Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair explains, “The migration path teaches Anishinaabeg that motion is the way geographical, social, and spiritual relationships have been forged, maintained, grown, and fortified. And while the Anishinaabeg nation's borders, citizens, and cultures have shifted and moved as others were met and warred with, and knowledge was traded, the nation as a whole has continued” (147). In order to reiterate and explain its emphasis on diplomatic interaction, the version of the Constitution published upon convention ratification included a supplemental glossary explaining that “reciprocal is to share a mutual obligation, and altruistic is to be unselfish, benevolent, and compassionate.” That a national constitution gives voice to relational responsibilities and cosmopolitan commitments indicates the extent to which its mode of nationhood is mediated by transnational interactions. As Warrior explains, indigenous nationhood “is born out of native transnationalism, the exchange of ideas and politics across our respective nations’ borders” (“Native American Scholarship” 125).

Both in relation to and well outside of the federated contours of White Earth nationhood, these Anishinaabeg are reconstituting themselves as transnational citizens, navigating a cosmopolitan constellation of national affiliations, obligations, and liabilities. One of the pragmatic ways the Constitution accounts for this constellation is through the establishment of legislative representation for off-reservation citizens. Such an arrangement affirms the extra-reservation scope of White Earth nationhood and the overlapping citizenships of its members. In Vizenor’s book *Fugitive Poses*, something like this constellation of affiliations and responsibilities is given articulation through the term “transmotion.” He writes, “transmotion is personal, reciprocal, the source of survivance, [...] an original natural union in the stories of emergence and migration that relate humans to an environment” (182-183). And he continues, “Clearly, the notions of native sovereignty must embrace more than mere reservation territory” (190). The active presence of transmotion within the Constitution of the White Earth Nation underscores its grounded cosmopolitanism that accounts for particular relations between peoples

and their local places while also enjoining the ethical inter-community interactions of relational sovereignties. An embrace of “more than mere reservation territory” is not an abandonment thereof. In the same ink strokes in which the Constitution’s preamble asserts its cosmopolitan breadth, it also posits straightforward nationalist pronouncements and aspirations. These include claiming and securing the Nation’s essential sovereignty, preserving its resources as National commons, and asserting a perpetual right of self-determination. The Constitution of the White Earth Nation thus synthesizes and materializes many of the most sophisticated scholarly insights on offer from various corners of Native Studies. By uniting theoretical sophistication and practical functionality, the Constitution puts forth a cosmopolitan decree of Native nationhood that challenges us to reconsider the conceptual and practical oppositions prevalent in political and critical thought and action, and it suggests that—in accord with Kwame Appiah, Bruce Robbins, Paul Rabinow, and Tim Brennan—grounded and materially relevant cosmopolitanism may very well be a central practice of beneficent nationhood.

David Noble’s broad view of historiography and intellectual traditions reveals that the twin conceits of an ostensibly transcendent modernity—liberal nation-states and market neoliberalism—have little to offer to communities of people hoping to dynamically sustain themselves and their relations. The lack of beneficial capacity brought by liberal nation-states and market globalism makes necessary the pursuit of alternative modes of polity and economy. History has not been resolved, nor shall it be. Rather, we find ourselves—like all generations before and after—learning how (and how not) to take better care within both space and time. In part, this necessitates acknowledging, responding to, and learning from the complex claims, aspirations, and political status of indigenous peoples. As Felix Cohen famously observed, “Like the miner’s canary, the Indian marks the shifts from fresh air to poison gas in our political atmosphere” (“Erosion” 390). Even while inconsistently and often in spite of themselves, federated and international systems of law do provide venues and opportunities for the articulation and hearing of indigenous concerns and ambitions that are not so easily absorbed by unitary nation-states or accommodated by neoliberalism. Not only do these concerns and ambitions illuminate the inadequacy of those dominant structures, they also gesture toward alternative trans/national possibilities.

As narrated in the White Earth Nation’s constitutive political instrument, a Native nation is transforming itself in relation to the struggles and opportunities it encounters. In doing so it

has a great deal to teach us about how communities might live in relation to one another as we continually identify and strive for justice on a wide range of scales. We do so not in pursuit of some bliss that awaits at some end of history, but rather to remember and to imagine otherwise.

Notes

¹ Other terms for the cosmopolitan tendency include “dialogic,” “cross-culturalist,” “constructivist,” and “hybridist”; the nationalist tendency has been variously referred to as “sovereigntist,” “tribally centered,” “indigenist,” “materialist,” and “separatist.” I first worked with nascent considerations of some of the meta-critical concerns of this essay in a 2007 article published in *Studies in American Indian Literatures*. Appleford, Brooks et al., Christie, Krupat, and Weaver (“Turning West”) have also characterized and considered these critical tendencies.

² Scholars addressing (among many other things) anxieties associated with determining Native citizenship include Barker, Dennison, Garrouette, Harmon, Lyons, Russell, Spruhan, Sturm, TallBear and (in Canadian First Nations contexts) Palmater.

Works Cited

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. “Cosmopolitan Patriots.” *Critical Inquiry* 23.3 (1997): 617-639. Print.
- Appleford, Rob. “A Response to Sam McKegney’s ‘Strategies for Ethical Engagement: An Open Letter Concerning Non-Native Scholars of Native Literatures.’” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 21.3 (2009): 58–65. Print.
- Barker, Joanne. *Native Acts: Law, Recognition, and Cultural Authenticity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011. Print.
- Bauerkemper, Joseph. “Narrating Nationhood: Indian Time and Ideologies of Progress.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 19.4 (2007): 27-53. Print.
- Brennan, Timothy. *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997. Print.
- Brooks, Lisa. “The Constitution of the White Earth Nation: A New Innovation in a Longstanding Indigenous Literary Tradition.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 23.4 (2011): 48-76. Print.
- Brooks, Lisa, Michael Elliott, Arnold Krupat, Elvira Pulitano, and Craig Womack. “Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism in Native American Literature: A Panel Discussion.” *Southern Spaces*. 21 June 2011. Web 08 August 2011.
- Calhoun, Craig. *Nations Matter: Culture, History, and the Cosmopolitan Dream*. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.

-
- Carlson, David J. "Trickster Hermeneutics and the Postindian Reader: Gerald Vizenor's Constitutional Praxis." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 23.4 (2011): 13-47. Print.
- Christie, Stuart. *Plural Sovereignties and Contemporary Indigenous Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- Cohen, Felix. "The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950-1953: A Case Study in Bureaucracy." *Yale Law Journal* 62 (1953): 348-390. Print.
- . *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1942. Print.
- . *On the Drafting of Tribal Constitutions*. Ed. David E. Wilkins. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006. Print.
- "Constitution of the White Earth Nation." *Anishinaabeg Today* [White Earth, MN] September 2 2009, Special Section 1-4. Web September 25 2009.
- Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. *Why I Can't Read Wallace Stegner and Other Essays*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. Print.
- Dennison, Jean. *Colonial Entanglement: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012. Print.
- Dhanapala, Jayantha. "Globalization and the Nation-State." *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* 13.1 (2002): 29-38. Print.
- Doerfler, Jill. "A Citizen's Guide to the White Earth Constitution: Highlights and Reflections." *The White Earth Nation: Ratification of a Native Democratic Constitution*. By Gerald Vizenor and Jill Doerfler. Introduction by David E. Wilkins. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012. 81-94. Print.
- . "Anishinaabeg Society 100 Years from Now." *Anishinaabeg Today* [White Earth, MN] 7 October 2009, 4+. Print.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Abnormal Justice." *Critical Inquiry* 34 (2008): 393-422. Print.
- . *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009. Print.
- Garrouette, Eva Marie. *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003. Print.
- Gu henno, Jean-Marie. *The End of the Nation-State*. Trans. Victoria Elliott. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995. Print.

-
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. Print.
- Harmon, Alexandra. “Tribal Enrollment Councils: Lessons on Law and Indian Identity.” *Western Historical Quarterly* 32.2 (2001): 175-200. Print.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Print.
- Holton, Robert J. *Globalization and the Nation State*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. *Our Fire Survives The Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006. Print.
- Kannan, Phillip M. “Reinstating Treaty-Making with Native American Tribes.” *William & Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 16.3 (2008): 809-837. Print.
- Krupat, Arnold. *Red Matters: Native American Studies*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002. Print.
- Lyons, Scott Richard. *X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010. Print.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. “Introduction.” *A Working Peace System*. 1943. By David Mitrany. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1966. Print.
- Noble, David W. *Death of a Nation: American Culture and the End of Exceptionalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002. Print.
- . *Debating the End of History: The Marketplace, Utopia, and the Fragmentation of Intellectual Life*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. Print.
- Palmater, Pamela D. *Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing, 2011. Print.
- Rabinow, Paul. “Representations Are Social Facts: Modernity and Post-Modernity in Anthropology.” *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Ed. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986. 234-261. Print.
- “Revised Constitution and Bylaws of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota.” 1963. Web 26 January 2014.

-
- Robbins, Bruce. "Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins, eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998. Print.
- Russell, Steve. *Sequoyah Rising: Problems in Post-Colonial Tribal Governance*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 2010. Print.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993. Print.
- Sinclair, Niigonwedom [Niigaanwewidam] James. "A Sovereignty of Transmotion: Imagination and the 'Real,' Gerald Vizenor, and Native Literary Nationalism." *Stories Through Theories/ Theories Through Stories: North American Indian Writing, Storytelling, and Critique*. Ed. Gordon D. Henry Jr., Nieves Pascual Soler, and Silvia Martínez-Falquina. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2009. 123-158. Print.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2001. Print.
- Spruhan, Paul. "A Legal History of Blood Quantum in Federal Indian Law to 1935." *South Dakota Law Review* 51.1 (2006): 1-50. Print.
- Sturm, Circe Dawn. *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002. Print.
- TallBear, Kim. *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. Print.
- Vizenor, Gerald. "Constitutional Consent: Native Traditions and Parchment Rights." *The White Earth Nation: Ratification of a Native Democratic Constitution*. By Gerald Vizenor and Jill Doerfler. Introduction by David E. Wilkins. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012. 9-62. Print.
- . *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998. Print.
- . *The Heirs of Columbus*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1991. Print.
- . *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. 1993. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999. Print.
- . *Native Liberty: Natural Reason and Cultural Survivance*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. Print.
- Vizenor, Gerald and James Mackay. "Constitutional Narratives: A Conversation with Gerald Vizenor." *Centering Anishinaabeg Studies*. Ed. Jill Doerfler, Niigaanwewidam James

-
- Sinclair, and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2013. 133-148. Print.
- Warrior, Robert. "Native American Scholarship and the Transnational Turn." *Cultural Studies Review* 15.2 (2009): 119-130. Print.
- . *The People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005. Print.
- . *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995. Print.
- Weaver, Jace. *That the People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.
- . "Turning West: Cosmopolitanism and American Indian Literary Nationalism." *The Native American Renaissance: Literary Imagination and Achievement*. Ed. Alan R. Velie and A. Robert Lee. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 2013. 16-38. Print.
- Weaver, Jace, Craig S. Womack, and Robert Warrior. *American Indian Literary Nationalism*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006. Print.
- Wilkins, David E. "Introduction." *On the Drafting of Tribal Constitutions*. By Felix S. Cohen. Ed. David E. Wilkins. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006. Print.
- Wilkins, David E. and K. Tsianina Lomawaima. *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law*. Normal: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001. Print.
- Womack, Craig S. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999. Print.

The Sovereignty of Transmotion in a State of Exception: Lessons from the Internment of ‘Praying Indians’ on Deer Island, Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1675-1676

DEBORAH L. MADSEN

“Natives have always been on the move, by chance, necessity, barter, reciprocal sustenance, and by trade over extensive routes; the actual motion is a natural right, and the tribal stories of transmotion are a continuous sense of visionary sovereignty”
(Gerald Vizenor, *Manifest Manners* ix)

The concept of Native sovereignty in Vizenor's writing is both complex and simple, connected inseparably to his notions of “survivance” and “transmotion.” While he would seem to reject the territorial understanding of “tribal sovereignty” as a restrictive concept that limits the practices of sovereignty to designated geographical boundaries (like the reservations described as “federal enclaves where tribal people are contained” in *Earthdivers* 34), the sovereignty that “transmotion” encompasses is, as Michael Snyder explains, “rooted in traditional Native uses of land and cultural practice” (47-48). These land usages and cultural practices assume the fundamental right of unrestricted movement, a right which is highlighted in the Preamble to *The Constitution of the White Earth Nation* where the Anishinaabeg of the White Earth Nation are initially defined as “the successors of a great tradition of continental liberty.” In his commentary on the Constitution, David Carlson cites the list of definitions of selected terms used, published in *Anishinaabeg Today* (Wednesday, September 2, 2009), which includes the phrase “continental liberty”: “Continental liberty refers to the Continent of North American [sic], and native liberty refers to the natural freedoms and rights of natives before contact with Europeans. Natives had established extensive and active trade routes throughout the continent and hemisphere. Trade routes, and other associations of native communities required a sophisticated sense of rights, travel, trade, and native liberty” (19; quoted in Carlson 28).

The sovereignty of transmotion is, then, the right to freedom of travel but not simply the right of motion. Transmotion is the freedom to move across physical and conceptual boundaries;

between what, in *Interior Landscapes*, Vizenor calls “communal tribal cultures and those material and urban pretensions that counter conservative traditions” (162). However, in the absence of that freedom of physical movement, many other freedoms become impossible. This is where the inherent link between transmotion and survivance becomes crucial. As I have written elsewhere,

in its original French meaning ... [s]urvivance signifies the qualification to inherit an estate and formal recognition of the legal status of a survivor. Or, in Vizenor's words to Jöelle Rostkowski, '[s]urvivance ... is the heritable right of succession or reversion of an estate, and, in the course of international declarations of human rights, a narrative estate of native survivance.' What this means in a Native context is the readiness of individuals and communities alike to continue the transmission of tribal cultures, values, and knowledges to future generations, through international and domestic legal instruments, through creative storying in literature, art, music, and through the practices of everyday life. (XIII)

Transmotion, then, is the practice of transmitting tribal cultural practices across time as well as spaces of travel and trade. Above all, it is the freedom explored by Jodi Byrd in *The Transit of Empire* to resist “the cultural and political modes [by which] 'Indianness' [is] regulated and produced by U.S. settler imperialism née colonialism” (xv), a regime of production that generates an understanding of indigeneity, Byrd continues, “as rooted and static, located in a discrete place” (xvi).

Christopher Schedler opens his essay, “Wiindigoo Sovereignty and Native Transmotion in Gerald Vizenor's *Bearheart*,” with an incisive account of the criticisms of Vizenor's tricky position on the issue of tribal sovereignty—made from the perspective of American Indian literary nationalism by Elizabeth Cook-Lynn and Sean Kicummah Teuton—in which Schedler defends Vizenor's vision of “the inherent Native rights of presence, motion, and survivance on this continent as an 'originary' form of sovereignty, which is sustained through treaties but is not limited by them,” quoting Vizenor's claim that “Sovereignty as transmotion is not the same as notions of indigenous treaty sovereignty; transmotion can be scorned and denied, but motion is never granted by a government” (Schedler 35; *Fugitive Poses* 188). As Schedler goes on to explain, treaty sovereignty is constrained by the context in which it is granted: the authority of the US federal government. But as Vizenor insists throughout his work, indigenous sovereignty,

ultimately, is not a power that can be granted. The sovereignty that is indigenous “presence, motion, and survivance” – transmotion – inheres in Native peoples and not in the settler state.

This conception of Native sovereignty, as articulated by Vizenor, has always been in conflict with the claims to sovereignty made by settler-colonial authorities: not only the federal US government but, much earlier, those colonial governments and the European Crowns they served that initiated the symbolic economy of “Indianness” that Jodi Byrd addresses. Metacom's War (or “King Philip's War” 1675-1676) offers a dramatic instance of this early conflict, as well as the process of clearing colonial space through the settler-colonial “logic of elimination” defined by Patrick Wolfe as the separation, dispossession, removal, and disappearance of indigenous peoples from their homelands (Wolfe 387).¹ Among the many grievances that Metacom presented to the deputy governor of Rhode Island colony, John Easton, during their negotiations in June 1675 were the increasing pace of land loss, the threat posed by Christian proselytizing, and the loss of tribal jurisdiction. These grievances represent two major dynamics of later US settler colonialism: territorial and cultural dispossession. However, at the outset of hostilities, the settler colonies employed a further strategy of Native displacement and sequestration, culminating in the internment of so-called “praying Indians” on Deer Island in Boston Harbor: the focus of this essay.² Atrocities committed against Christian “*indians*” have a special resonance: as subjects of the English Crown, a fact acknowledged by Metacom in his negotiations with Easton, these “friendly” Natives should have enjoyed the protections accorded English subjects.³

The denial of such protections through the suspension of English sovereign law makes this internment an instance of Giorgio Agamben's “state of exception.” Agamben's exploration of the concept draws heavily on Carl Schmitt's *Political Theology* (1922), in which he theorizes sovereignty as arising from the assertion of authority rather than the normative power of law, demonstrated in the sovereign's capacity to suspend law in states of emergency. Indeed, the suspension of law is neither only nor most importantly an assertion of the sovereign's authority; in its performance, this act is constitutive of sovereignty itself. It would be inaccurate to assume that Metacom's grievances were complaints about rights actively taken away from passive Native communities by English settlers; rather, the settler assertion of the right to Christianize, the right to claim land, the right to legal jurisdiction, were performative assertions that produced the colonizing authority that settlers claimed. The power of Agamben's reworking of Schmitt's

fundamental idea of sovereignty, and much of its appeal to scholars of settler colonialism, lies in his topographical mapping of the concept into spatial or territorial terms: “Being outside yet belonging, this is the topological structure of the state of exception” (2005, 35). Through this paradoxical construction, the exception defines “the very space in which the juridico-political order can have validity” (1998, 19). Native space, while belonging to the territory that is to be colonized and yet placed outside it in juridico-political terms, is rendered exceptional by the assertion of sovereign settler authority to claim land, jurisdiction, and cultural control. In the spaces of New England “praying towns,” the rule of Judeo-Christian law produced an exceptional discursive and material space in which “praying Indians” both belonged to the category of English subjects and yet were placed outside it. As Mark Rifkin so cogently points out in his analysis of the frontier as a space of exception, “being within the sphere of state sovereignty but not covered by the normal legal principles of national law ... bespeaks the fundamental anxiety that animates the settler-state” (2014, 176). Though he is referring to an historical context some hundred or more years after Metacom's War, the discursive dynamics that Rifkin identifies can be seen clearly at work in this earlier moment of the historical record. That is, the state of exception exploited by the US after 1776 had been animating the settler-state at least since the seventeenth century.

Beyond the battles, bloodshed, and unprecedented destruction in New England of Metacom's War, the conflict was essentially one of stories, the “authorizing” power of rhetoric, in what Vizenor calls “the word wars” (*Wordarrows* viii). Granted, the war was motivated by conflict over legal jurisdiction and ownership of land; the imposition of English judicial structures and the worldview embedded in those structures—urgent issues related to Native sovereignty. But these grievances were grounded in a system of conflicting symbolic meanings expressed in cultural narratives, most notably the nascent ideology of American exceptionalism. As I hope to point out, the “exceptional” state of New England Native communities—and specifically the so-called “praying Indians”—represents the attempt to create a state of discursive stasis, of rhetorical immobility: a state imposed by the English Crown, through the government of the settler colonies, as an act of imperial sovereignty. I want to suggest that this symbolic discursive condition contributed materially both to the confinement of Christianized Natives first in the enclaves known as “praying towns” and later the internment camps on Deer Island and Long Island, and also to the enduring simulation of the “*indian*” (*The Everlasting Sky* xiii-iv;

Manifest Manners vii; *Fugitive Poses* 15-14) that is located outside the historical space of European modernity and its conceptual space of rights discourses.⁴

In *Fugitive Poses* Vizenor refers to “[t]ricky stories, totemic pictures, and mental mappery [as] the embodiment of native transmotion and sovereignty” (170). Transmotion then is an expression of native ontology, located in narratives that bring together the physical land with an expression of Native cultural presence. This Native presence is, as Niigonwedom James Sinclair describes in his essay “A Sovereignty of Transmotion,” a vision of “both the physical and psychological realms of the universe [as] made up of interconnectivities and relationships” (127). Words that express transmotion, he continues, are “not only mythic vehicles and vessels for Anishinaabeg spirituality, philosophy, and 'traditional' teachings ... but [are] historical, subjective, and political Anishinaabeg-centered creative, critical, and activist acts” (127). The right to physical spatial movement is a key aspect of indigenous sovereignty, as is the Native spiritual, philosophical, and subjective engagement with material space, without which sovereignty can be rendered precarious and vulnerable to domination by settler-colonial interests. A fully-realized sovereign politics addresses not only the right to land but also the right to express a specifically Native-centered relationship to land through physical and conceptual mobility. The example of the internment of converted Native communities on Deer Island (and elsewhere) highlights the necessary interconnection between territorial and cultural sovereignty.

Exceptional “Indians”

The events of 1675 to 1676 constitute one of the major turning-points in early settler-Native relations. Metacom's War was bloody, brutal, and devastating for both sides. More than a series of violent martial encounters, however, the war highlighted the fundamental incommensurability of Native and settler ontologies, focused on the issue of sovereignty. In this essay, I want to think about this ontological incommensurability in relation to issues of mobility and confinement. As Jean O'Brien notes, in *Dispossession by Degrees*,

Because Indians moved their fields every few years to avoid soil exhaustion, landownership shifted with land use as well as the seasons. Ideas about property rights in hunting, fishing, and gathering related to ecological use ... But principles of mobility existed alongside notions of fixity, as in movements between central village sites and, for example, the annually abundant fish spawning sites. (21)

These practices, related to Native mobility and fixity, were increasingly denied to the Native communities of New England in the period leading up to and following the war; mobility not only in territorial space but also in judicial, cultural, and spiritual terms was at issue for Metacom from the start. In June 1675, in negotiations with the deputy governor of the Rhode Island colony, John Easton, Metacom presented a series of grievances which included the increasing pace of land loss through fraudulent land sales protected by English law, the invasion of Native cornfields by the settlers' cattle, the threat posed by Christianization and the selling of alcohol, and the loss of tribal jurisdiction.⁵ Of course, the latter complaint—the expansion of English legal jurisdiction over Native communities—had been rankling since the treaties agreed in the aftermath of the Pequot War. The extension of colonial judicial sovereignty intensified in the wake of John Sassamon's death in 1674, but the assertion of settler sovereignty that culminated in the internment of Christianized Native communities on Deer Island went beyond the imposition of English law—in a manner illustrative of Schmitt's account of sovereignty as an artifact of authority rather than law—to assert the Crown's sovereign right to suspend the application of legal rights to certain subjects. As acknowledged subjects of the English Crown, the “praying Indians” who were removed to Deer Island should have enjoyed the protections extended to all English subjects. But they were not. In this respect, “praying Indians” occupied a discursive position that increasingly reduced the capacity to exercise the sovereignty of transmotion by enforcing a cumulative regime of sequestration, confinement, and immobilization.

In his account of the establishment of the “praying towns” by the missionary John Eliot, between 1651 and 1674, Neal Salisbury argues that the fourteen towns deliberately isolated Native converts from “both settlers and independent Indians” (1974, 32). Town government was structured on a biblical model and the court system was analogous to that of an English county court; while Native men played a role in town governance, all decisions were subject to approval by the “superintendent of subject Indians” (32), a position occupied by Daniel Gookin at the time of the war. The legal code enforced by the town courts, designed by Eliot, regulated a range of customs and behaviors in the interests of pursuing the colonial project of “civilizing” the Christian converts. Through territorial isolation and acculturation, Salisbury claims, “[i]n countless subtle ways the Indians' distance from their past was reinforced while they were as far as ever from being accepted as members of 'civilized' society” (34).

The settler or migrant rhetoric of American exceptionalism, which has roots in this colonial period, posits the United States and its founding Pilgrim Fathers as the nation uniquely able, and indeed charged, with the mission to bring into being a perfected world. From the colonial period, the understanding of New England's exceptional destiny has depended upon the "visible sainthood" of leaders who guide God's mission into the wilderness of the New World. But the assumption of sainthood for some relies upon the conviction that others are diabolical agents, active agents of evil, determined to destroy the divinely-sanctioned New World experiment. The prominent Boston minister Cotton Mather, in *The Wonders of the Invisible World* (1693), describes the land colonized by New Englanders as having originally belonged to Satan, who is just waiting to claim his lands back: "The *New-Englanders* are a People of God settled in those, which were once the *Devils* Territories; and it may easily be supposed that the *Devil* was Exceedingly disturbed, when he perceived such a people here accomplishing the Promise of old made unto our Blessed Jesus, *That He should have the Utmost parts of the Earth for His Possession*" (xi-xii original emphases). In these settler terms, the exceptional nature of colonial New England lies in the ability to win over, for Christians, territory (both literal and spiritual) that is Satan's. But in order to do this, those visible saints must engage in continuous combat with the invisible agents of Satan who will use any means to retake what they believe is theirs.

Within this symbolic context, seventeenth-century Native communities occupied an ambivalent position. On the one hand, Natives were seen as heathen, as barbarous, uncivilized, and often as the agents of Satan. On the other hand, Natives were also interpreted as tools in the hands of a punishing God. So sometimes their attacks on English settlements were interpreted as the acts of Satanic agents, working on behalf of the Devil who was trying to recapture his lost territory. At other times, Native people were interpreted as God's scourge, punishing the colonists who were failing to advance in their exceptional mission. This is how Metacom's War was interpreted by Daniel Gookin, a sympathetic observer: "To make a rod of the barbarous heathen to chastise and punish the English for their sins" (*Historical Account* 437). Since gentle chastisements had not worked to produce among colonists "effectual humiliation and reformation, hence the righteous and holy Lord is necessitated to draw for this smarting rod of the vile and brutish heathen, who indeed have been a very scourge unto New England, especially the Jurisdiction of Massachusetts" (437-8).

Elsewhere, Gookin is more ambivalent in his inscription of Christian converts into the Puritan providential scheme. J. Patrick Cesarini's account of the interconnections between Gookin's empiricism and providentialism highlights the complexities of his thought concerning the exceptional position of “praying Indians.” In his *Historical Account*, Gookin writes the active presence of Native allies into the historical record of Metacom's War, in ways that caused the book to be refused publication in 1677. As Cesarini points out, he presents the hostility of settlers as the justification for Native mistrust and, in some cases, defection to unconverted communities (492). Indeed, Gookin claims that the “praying towns” were at one point during the war offered as a kind of human shield or “wall of defence [sic] about the greatest part of the colony of Massachusetts” both as evidence of the fidelity and loyalty of the inhabitants and their desire to “take off the animosity and displeasure that they perceived was enkindled in some English against them” (*Historical Account*, 436). He then takes the opportunity to observe that the English could have avoided much of the suffering of the war if only they had embraced converted Natives as their full allies. At its most radical, Gookin's writing portrays the “praying Indians” as victims of what Cesarini calls “a Puritan colony unable to control itself – either politically or spiritually” (500). This view leads Gookin then to propose a dramatic reversal of the providential role played by Puritans and “praying Indians” respectively: in order to test the authenticity of their conversion, God has transformed the settler community into a scourge of indigenous converts. This is a radical subversion of the providential scheme in which, as Cesarini explains, “the Indians were considered the *objects*, the special instruments, of God's agency, but the English alone were God's *subjects*. God spoke *through* the Indians, but he never spoke *to* them” (497 original emphases). The perception that the settlers may be in need of reminders of God's disfavor was not, as Cesarini notes, confined to Gookin; contemporaries like Increase Mather saw Metacom's War as a providential sign of the colonists' sinful backsliding and so called for a general renewal of the covenant that joins all members of all New England churches with each other and with God.

Gookin claims that his “primary appeal on behalf of the converts was to remind colonial authorities that they were bound by their covenants to deal justly with them” (Cesarini 506). Here then is a further “exceptionalization” of Christian Natives: they were English subjects but denied the protections of that status; they were members of the Puritan covenant but they were denied the rights of membership.⁶ Even such a sympathetic commentator as Daniel Gookin

admits as much, in a striking use of typological rhetoric to express his providentialism. Describing one of the “praying towns”—Okommakamesit—he writes: “This town doth join so near to the English of Marlborough, that it was spoken of David in type, and our Lord Jesus Christ, the antitype, *Under his shadow ye shall rejoice*: but the Indians here do not much rejoice in the English men's shadow; who do so overtop them in their number of people, stocks of cattle, &c. that the Indians do not greatly flourish, or delight in their station at present” (*Historical Collections* 45).⁷ By failing to answer the biblical promise (“spoken ... in type”) of flourishing in the shadow of the “godly,” the “Indians” fail to answer (in the antitype) the exceptionalist promise of the New England mission. The symbolic promise symbolized by David and fulfilled by the coming of the Messiah has not been fulfilled by the promise of the converts' delivery into a new dispensation. They are excluded from the divine destiny of the New England colonies by biblical authority, which Gookin interestingly spatializes. Thus, even converted “Indians” can never become sufficiently converted to participate fully in the exceptionalist colonial mission and so can never possess the full rights that attach to a Puritan subject of the English Crown.

There is no doubt that converted Natives submitted formally to the sovereignty of the colonial government and hence to the Crown. Neal Salisbury traces the events that led the Massachusetts sachem Cutshamekin to submit formally to the Massachusetts Bay government in 1644, in a move designed to protect his standing among his people but that instead opened his community to the influence of missionaries, which soon challenged his authority. Salisbury remarks, “The Massachusetts thereby became the first Indians in New England to enter a new legal status, one in which they were neither independent nor assimilated into white society” (1974, 36). Four years later, the Massachusetts General Court, at the session held on 4 November, announced that two ministers would be sent each year to preach in Native communities because of the fact that “divers of them [Indians] are become subjects to the English, and have engaged themselves to be willing and ready to understand the law of God” (Shurtleff, 178). Daniel Gookin, in his *Historical Collections of the Indians in New England*, explains that “The reason, why the English government is concerned with the Indians' affairs in point of rule and order, is because all those praying Indians in Massachusetts colony did long since, before they began to worship God, actually and solemnly submit themselves unto the jurisdiction and government of the English in the Massachusetts, as the records do declare” (39). And in his “Notes on the Nipmuc Indian Reservation at Hassanamesit,” quoting from the

Massachusetts Bay Records (MBR, 30:146), Thomas Lewis Doughton highlights the moment in May 1668 when Nipmuc sagamores formally “submitted” to English colonial authority, which is worth quoting at length:

The humble submission and subjection of the Native Indians sagamores and people of the Nipmucks inhabiting within the bounds of the pattens [sic] of Massachusetts and near adjoining unto the English towns so-called of Mendon and Marlboroug[h]

We the inhabitants of Mongunkachogok Chaubunkongkomuk Asukodnogest Kesapusgus Wabuhquoshish and the adjacent parts of Nipmuk being convinced of our great sinns & how good it is to turn unto the Lord and be his servants by praying or calling upon his name ... do give up ourselves to God ... we finding by experience how good it is to live under laws & good government and how much we need the protection of the English. We doe freely out of our own motion and voluntary choyce do submit our selves to the government of Massachusetts (n.p.).

Despite this symbolic and material “subjection” to the Crown, in the course of the war, “praying Indians” were denied their fundamental rights as English subjects. The order for their removal was passed by the General Court in Boston in October 1675; survivors were permitted to return to the mainland in May 1676. The notion that an entire community can be deemed a security risk is a recurrent theme in American history, but this settler logic reaches back into the colonial heritage, and produces the enduring image of the threatening unassimilated “Indian.” That the people could be removed to Deer Island so efficiently was the consequence of their earlier confinement to so-called “praying towns” – notably Natick, from which *everyone* was removed to Deer Island.

In the 1647 tract, “Day Breaking if not the Sun Rising of the Gospel with the Indians of New England,” John Eliot describes the missionary effort to persuade the Massachusetts General Court to establish a separate town for converted Natives (9, 27). The request came from Native leaders and, as scholars such as Jean O'Brien have noted, represented one strategy by which Native communities attempted to retain some formal title to what land they could claim, as well as allowing Native participation in political and legal matters. However, as she goes on to explain in relation to Natick specifically:

The commonwealth elaborated a special judicial mechanism for Indians when

Daniel Gookin was appointed as superintendent of Indians in 1656. The system Gookin implemented followed the precedents of the submission agreements and Praying Town codes, while creating a structure of Indian magistrates operating under the ultimate supervision of the English. There was to be no mistaking who gained ultimate power. (*Dispossession by Degrees*, 50)

And, in the course of the war, towns such as this became effective prisons for converted Native people. Interestingly, in his account of the establishment of the “praying towns”, Daniel Gookin cites two reasons why objections to the grant of land are invalid. The first and foremost is “forasmuch as it was all their native country and propriety, before the English came into America; the answer is ready: First, that the English claim right to their land, by patent from our king” (*Historical Collections* 39). Gookin implicitly draws on the doctrine of *vacuum domicilium* but explicitly links the right to land with the sovereignty of the English Crown. There is a contradiction here: if land is rightfully granted to his subjects through the sovereign power of the English King then, as English subjects, Christian Natives should not need to justify their claim to the land. And yet they do. It is here that Gookin captures the paradox of indigenous exceptionalism, the consequences of which are formulated so clearly by Mark Rifkin:

The knowledge of the prior presence and continuing existence of Indigenous peoples in now-'domestic' space ... enters settler law as the difficulty of legitimizing the state's jurisdiction over Native peoples. The attendant series of logical and normative confusions, contradictions, and crises generated by this problem leads to the legal and administrative construction of a state of exception for Native Peoples. (177)

Movement, Stasis, and the State of Exception

The internment of the inhabitants of the fourteen “praying towns” was not a sudden move on the part of the colonial authorities but a process: the culmination of the erosion of the sovereign Native freedom of movement that intensified during the period of the war. Starting in 1675, in a process of ever-increasing confinement and immobilization, these Native people were first prohibited from leaving their villages, and then were removed from their homes to Deer Island in Boston Harbor, where many perished of hunger, disease, and exposure. In June 1675 all the

“praying Indians” in New England were relocated to five towns; in October 1675 the General Court removed the people to two camps: one on Long Island, the other a larger camp on Deer Island—including, as I remarked earlier, the entire population of Natick (Clark 22). On 5 May 1676, the General Court ordered the removal of the Native people confined at the Long Island camp to English garrisons, where they were to stay on pain of death (Shurtleff 86). Granted, the detention of the “praying Indians” took place in the context of the most vicious conflict ever fought on American soil. In the fourteen months between June 1675 and August 1676 more than half the settler towns were destroyed, according to Jill Lepore's account, pushing English settlement back to the coast, and coming within only a few miles of Boston.⁸ Thousands of Native people died, many of starvation or disease, and later many were sold into slavery in the West Indies.

The session held on 9 July 1675, where Gookin was present, voted to repeal the law allowing licensed persons to sell to “any Indian or Indians, not in hostility wth us, powder, shott, lead, guns, hand gunnes, rapier blades, swords, &c” (Shurtleff, 45). In the August 1675 session the Massachusetts Council ordered all converted Natives to be confined to “praying towns” and, according to Gookin's report of the Court records, a series of further constraints on Native mobility was imposed: hunting in the woods was prohibited, as was entertaining “any strange Indians,” and a limit was set of one mile from their “dwellings” unless accompanied by English persons (*Historical Account* 450). This issue of Native “dwellings” is supplemented by the Court's assertion that “The places of the Indians’ residence are, Natick, Punquapog, Nashobah, Wamesit and Hassanamesit. And if there be any that belong to other places, they are to repair to some one of these” (*Historical Account* 451). This proclamation defines “Indianness” according to the occupation of space, constraining indigenous identity to specific spaces and enforcing through the threat of death the identification of place with “Indianness.” For a Native person to be “out of place” would be to become a “not-Indian” or a “strange Indian” who can be killed with impunity because such a person has no ontology within this exceptional scheme, once they are located outside the circumscribed paradoxical space of “the Christian Indian.”

The provision for enforcing these orders was death, for which Native people found outside their designated place would be to blame. In this way, the exercise of the sovereignty of transmotion – which so clearly subverts the immobility of the state of exception – was effectively deemed a capital offence. Native people could move between towns only with the

express authorization of the General Court and the confinement of Christian Natives was further intensified during the following legislative session, on 13 October 1675, when the Massachusetts Council ordered that Christian Indians be forcibly removed to Deer Island. This is the opening article of the session: “WHEREAS notwithstanding the councils former prohibition of all Indians coming to, or remaying in, the toune of Boston, wee finde that still there remajnes ground of feare that, vnless more effectuall care be taken, wee may be exposed to mischiefe by some of that barbarous crew, or any strangers, not of our nation, by the coming into or residing in the toune of Boston, this Court doeth therefore order”... and eight separate orders follow (Shurtleff 47). Firstly, that no one will “entertain or countenance” *any* “Indian” under penalty of treason; secondly, guards will prevent the entry of *any* “Indian” into Boston and armed guards will accompany any “Indian” allowed access and those who are “employed upon any message or business” of the Council will be taken directly to the Governor and by him be “disposed of & secured during their necessary stay for the dispatch of their business,” while no other “Indian” will permitted to stay in the town “unless in prison”; thirdly, any unguarded “Indian” could be lawfully “secured” by any person; fourthly, that the military are instructed to be alert for the approach of canoes; fifthly, that the Charles Town ferry is prohibited from allowing any “Indian” to disembark unless accompanied by an armed guard; sixthly, that any person may lawfully “apprehend and secure” any “Indian” approaching the town; seventhly, and I want to quote this order in full:

That account be taken of all straingers who are not his majestjes subjects, and that they remajne not in toune vnless security be given for their fidelity, and that none be admitted but vpon the like security, and that no master of any vessell bring in any wthout acquainting the Gouvernor therewith, & presenting their persons in order to their examination, who, if vpon their examination can give no good account of their business, and security for their good behaviour, shall be sent to prison vnless they doe forth with depart (Shurtleff 47).

The final order in this list of constraints on Native mobility specified that no inhabitant of Boston could lawfully entertain “any stranger” in their house, under pain of any penalty the Court might see fit to impose (Shurtleff, 46-7). I have quoted the seventh order in full because, again, it formally if implicitly, excludes converted Natives from the category of “his Majesty's subjects.” In the state of exception, subject Native people were rendered immobile by these

orders and those that specified the condition of capital punishment under which detainees were interned. The Court Record states:

Whereas this Court haue, for weighty reasons, placed sundry Indians (that haue subjected to our goum^b) vpon some islands for their and our security,--

It is ordered, that none of the sajd Indians shall presume to goe off the sajd islands voluntarily, vpon pajne of death; and it shallbe [sic] lafull for the English to destroy those that they shall finde stragling off from the sajd places of their confinement, vnlesse taken of by order from authorjty, and vnder an English guard. And it is further ordered, that if any person or persons shall presume to take, steale, or carry away either man, woeman, or child of the sajd Indians, off from any the sajd islands where they are placed, wthout order from the Generall Court or council, he or they shall be accounted breakers of the capitall law printed & published against man stealing; and this order to be forthuith posted and published.

The whole Court being mett, it is ordered, that the country Tresurer take care for y^e provision of those Indians that are sent doune to Deare Island, so as to pvent their perishing by any extremity that they may be put vnto for want of absolute necessaries, and for that end he is to appoint meet persons to vissit [sic] them from time to time (Shurtleff 64).

The effects of this confinement are described by Gookin as follows: “By this order ... the poor Christian Indians were reduced to great sufferings, being hindered from their hunting and looking after their cattle, swine, and getting in their corn, or laboring among the English to get clothes, and many other ways incommoded also, were daily exposed to be slain or imprisoned, if at any time they were found without their limits” (*Historical Account* 451). And even while acknowledging the severe sufferings and the brutal conditions of Deer Island, the Court enforced the detention of Christian Natives with the threat of summary execution. At the end of December 1675, Gookin accompanied John Eliot on a visit to the Island. In his account of this visit he reflects that

I observed in all my visits to them, that they carried themselves patiently, humbly, and piously, without murmuring or complaining against the English for their sufferings, (which were not few), for they lived chiefly upon clams and shell-fish, that they digged out of the sand, at low water; the Island was bleak and cold, their

wigwams poor and mean, their clothes few and thin; some little corn they had of their own, which the Council ordered to be fetched from their plantations, and conveyed to them by little and little; also a boat and man was appointed to look after them. (*Historical Account* 485-86)

The Paradoxical Rhetoric of the Exception

The tone of Gookin's account is apologetic; he explains parenthetically that the Council was obliged to take these measures “to quiet the people” (451) but rhetorically he is caught between a sympathetic view of the Native right to freedom of movement—the sovereignty of transmotion—and the impact of settler violence against all indigenous people, including “praying Indians.” Indeed, he attempts to navigate the complex position of Native communities that are acknowledged as sovereign nations, on the one hand, and domestic combatants, on the other. He cites the opinion of the Council that restrictions on Native mobility are necessary because the hostile tribes act “contrary to the practice of civil nations” (450). Trapped physically and rhetorically between the status of “civil nations” and hostile subject peoples, Gookin's communities of “praying Indians” were exceptionally marked for forced removal, immobilization, and summary execution should they exercise the right to transmotion. Rendered “strangers” in their traditional lands, but at the same time subjects of the Crown before the representatives of which they rhetorically prostrate themselves, “praying Indians” were placed in the exceptional rhetorical position of being “out of place” *wherever* they were placed. Being “out of place” for any Native person, who could not justify being in the place where (s)he was apprehended, was treated severely. For example, in the same session of the Court, “Two Indians, one an old man named Mannapaugh, & Mannanesit, a young man, his sonn, pretending themselues to belong to Vncas, being found at Chelmsford, where the haystacke was fired, giving no reason of their coming & staying here, was judged to be spyes, and ordered to be sent away by the Treasurer” (Shurtleff 58). This phrase, “to be sent away by the Treasurer,” was a euphemism for being sold out of the colony to the West Indies as a slave. And here we have perhaps the most scandalous exemption from the protections of law suffered by the Native peoples of New England during this conflict—the selling into slavery of loyal “Indians,” who had no real part in the conflict. As Jill Lepore explains, a dramatic case was that of Metacom's son. When Metacom's wife and 9-year-old son were apprehended, they were imprisoned in

Boston while the Court debated the child's fate. Contradictory scriptural passages were invoked to determine whether or not the child should be executed: on the one hand, the injunction that the crimes of the father should not be visited upon the child and, on the other hand, biblical examples where children grow up to be the scourge of future generations. After eight months delay, the boy was sent into exile – sold and shipped to Barbados or Jamaica. As Lepore notes, the legality of enslaving this child was debated but the legality of enslaving Native subjects of the English Crown, interpreting them instead as sovereign enemy combatants, was not debated. Indeed, as she observes: “This ambiguity, over whether Indian peoples are sovereign or subjected, would lie at the heart of Indian-white relations in the colonies and later the union, until the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* in 1831, in which John Marshall would assign Indians the unique status of 'domestic dependent nations'” (164).

This contradictory and ambivalent condition – the *subjected* sovereign subject – represents Agamben's state of exception as the situation in which the rule of law is exceptionally suspended in an act that validates in its very exercise the sovereignty of the power that suspends the law. In this case, the General Court of Massachusetts, threatened in its very existence by Metacom's resistance, asserted its sovereignty over communities of converted Natives by first accepting their formal subjection to English rule and then exempting those Native subjects from the protections of English law. The denial of such protections through the suspension of English sovereign law makes this internment an illustrative instance of Agamben's state of exception. According to Agamben, exemption from the law through the intervention of a sovereign power confirms that power's sovereignty and transcendence of law by the act of creating the exception. Though this exception is enacted as being itself exceptional, Agamben points out that in fact such exceptions prove the rule of sovereign power: “The paradox of sovereignty consists in the fact the sovereign is, at the same time, outside and inside the juridical order. ... The sovereign, having the legal power to suspend the validity of the law, legally places himself outside the law” (*Homo Sacer* 15).⁹ For example, Gookin recorded Joseph Tuckapawill's remarks when he and his family were offered hospitality by English friends of John Eliot before they were sent to Deer Island:

... I am greatly distressed this day on every side; the English have taken away some of my estate, my corn, cattle, my plough, cart, chain, and other goods [Tuckapawill explained]. The enemy Indians have also taken a part of what I had; and the wicked

Indians mock and scoff at me, saying ‘Now what is become of your praying to God?’ The English also censure me, and say I am a hypocrite. In this distress I have no where to look, but up to God in heaven to help me; now my dear wife and eldest son are (through English threatening) run away, and I fear will perish in the woods for want of food; also my aged mother is lost; and all this doth greatly aggravate my grief. But yet I desire to look up to God in Christ Jesus, in whom alone is my help ... I never did join with them against the English. Indeed, they solicited me, but I utterly denied and refused it. I thought within myself, it is better to die than to fight against the church of Christ. (qtd. Doughton, n.p.)

Here we see the space of the exception at its most brutal. Immobilized juridically so he has no recourse to either English or Native justice (both steal from him with impunity), caught discursively between the categories of Native and English, and confronting the prospect of internment at the hands of his fellow English subjects and covenant members, John Tuckapawill is left with only the thought of death. He has no other place to go.

The losses experienced by exceptional “praying Indians” like Tuckapawill are suggested by Michael Clark who, in his introduction to the *Eliot Tracts*, describes the profound changes undergone by converted Native people:

the shift to permanent residence versus a seminomadic [sic] lifestyle, the need for European farming techniques to make the permanently cultivated fields productive, corollary changes in gender roles and generational expectations regarding children and the elderly, and new British names, clothes, and hairstyles, ... name only the most obvious examples of how life changed for the Indians who moved into the Praying Towns. (18)

To these factors Neal Salisbury adds those that were the indirect consequence of environmental changes. For example, the scarcity of bear's grease prevented its use on skin and hair, while furs required for clothing and the construction of wigwams were inaccessible (1974, 34). Harold W. Van Lonkhuyzen, in his “Reappraisal of the Praying Indians,” makes the same point about changing material lifeways but takes this further to observe the ways in which these changes are related to profound shifts in tribal ontology: so the increasing reliance on domesticated animals produced an alteration in relations with animals and animal spirit masters (412), the building of fences changed attitudes towards property, land, and the earth; the influence of heteropatriarchy

disrupted gender and social roles; and education, especially reading, “altered the converted Indians' cognitive appreciation of the world” (413). These transformations, for Christian Natives like Tuckapawill, were the consequences of their choice to live within the territorial jurisdiction of New England and to accept the sovereignty of the English Crown. And yet they were imprisoned in murderous conditions because they remained “Indians” despite their religious conversion and cultural assimilation. Why? Salisbury shows convincingly that while the “praying towns” may have seemed to be in transition to a state of full assimilation into English culture, the greatest opposition to the towns came from those settlers in closest proximity to them, revealing that full integration was never, in fact, on the colonial agenda (1974, 41-42).

The experience of the “praying Indians” exposes the fact that race, and white supremacy specifically, underpins the settler-colonial state of exception.¹⁰ The General Court Record reports multiple cases where the “wrong kind of Indian” was inadvertently sold into slavery – because all Native people looked alike to English eyes. Those who could not be sold were indistinguishable from those who could; the enemy was indistinguishable from the ally. As the Court reflected, “It being difficult to Discern between Friends & Foes ... This Court doth order and appoint that ... such [Indians] as are not [abroad] are forthwith to return to their respective stations, as also such as are Sojourning within any of our Towns excepting only those who are constant dwellers in English Houses” (quoted O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees* 70; Mass Archive, 30: 315, 1689/90). The only way to protect friendly Natives was to imprison them. The bodily markers of difference operated only to distinguish “White” from “Red,” not to signify degrees of political and cultural allegiance. Gookin, in his *Historical Account*, is only one of many proponents of the view that internment on Deer Island was a good thing for converted Native people because confinement offered protection from violently hostile settlers (485). Jean O'Brien explains that the term “Friend Indians,” to signify allies, was agreed between the English and the Mohawks who had been raiding “praying Indians” since the 1660s. She describes how “[t]heir negotiations centered on the problem of how to tell the difference between the two” (*Dispossession by Degrees* 65). Mohawks, thinking militarily, would ask: “Why would 'Friend Indians' require 'stockadoes' for protection? 'Friend Indians' resided 'in ye woods,' not barricaded within a fortress in the shadow of English settlements” (65); in contrast, English thinking was in terms of allies and the Council specified four towns where “friends” lived: Natick, Punkapoag, Hassanamisco, and Wamesit. O'Brien notes that “These Indian

settlements carried English implications about boundaries, and the sedentary organization of town activities,” unlike the Mohawk who had different ideas about where friends and allies would be located (*Dispossession by Degrees* 66).

In discursive terms, the category of the “*indian*,” to which enemies and allies of the English alike were subject, reduced all Native people to the cultural binaries of civilization versus savagery. In these terms, all “Indians” were “savages” and of necessity excluded from the exceptional destiny of English America. Placed under erasure as Native yet un-erasable as Christians, the rhetorical or categorical immobility of the exception to which Christian Natives were subject can be seen as the symbolic counterpoint to their material confinement – in praying towns, in English garrisons, on Deer Island and Long Island – and in the continuing restrictions on indigenous mobility, on Native transmotion, imposed in the aftermath of Metacom's War.

Conclusion: Transmotion, Survivance, and the Lessons of Deer Island

Harold Van Lonkhuyzen highlights the profound consequences of immobilization or what he calls the increasing “sedentarism” (412) of the New England tribes during this period, a tendency that was accelerated under the influence of missionaries like John Eliot: “sedentarism impeded mobility and disrupted traditional subsistence cycles of food gathering and production” (412). In addition to changing usages of the land through the abandonment of indigenous forms of agriculture—and the changing material lifeways to which this gave rise—converted Natives experienced changes in their ontological orientation to the world. Among the examples that Van Lonkhuyzen offers is fences, the impact of which he traces directly to missionary influence: “The fences Eliot encouraged the Natick men to build simply could not be integrated into the Indians' traditional ethos but instead required and simultaneously reinforced a new one. Many other bands never made the significant change in behavior and cognitive understanding such enclosures necessitated. Fences went unbuilt; those that were, were not maintained” (413). We might recall here Stone Columbus' proclamation: “The notion of sovereignty is not tied to the earth, sovereignty is neither fence nor feathers” (*Heirs of Columbus* 67). The new tribal nation imagined at Point Assinika is aligned with a vision of borderless sovereignty that exceeds but does not deny territorial sovereignty: Stone Columbus continues, “The essence of sovereignty is imaginative, an original tribal trope, communal and spiritual, an idea that is more than metes and bounds in treaties” (67). Immobilization in place, secured by the discourse of exceptionalism,

works to oppose the sovereignty of transmotion. Many scholars have addressed the ironic outcomes of the acculturative efforts of Native people in this period; the effort to adapt English social, judicial, and cultural structures to traditional tribal practices in the interests of maintaining claims to land, but which resulted in losses in terms of land and cultural practices, and sovereignty over both. In the aftermath of the war, those survivors who escaped enslavement were sequestered in the four remaining “praying towns” that Salisbury describes as “no longer havens for those making conscious commitments to Christianity; they were reservations for an entire Native population” (1974, 54).

Reserved and exceptional, the indigenous inhabitants of towns like Natick found, in the decades following the war, that the material necessities of traditional tribal life became increasingly scarce (such as deer and timber); in the 1680s the first white settlers arrived on the Natick reserve; and Van Lonkhuyzen ventures to guess that the practice of communal habitation was abandoned around 1700 (424). Over the following fifty years or so, whites came to occupy all the offices of town government, Native languages fell into disuse, and rights to common land were vested in family inheritance rather than communal membership (Van Lonkhuyzen 423-427). In the state of exception, converted Natives were immobilized discursively and territorially in place; while bounded and fenced this space was not quarantined from the material impacts of the wider settler-colonial environment. Consequently, the capacity of these Native communities to create the conditions for an inheritable estate, a fundamental aspect of survivance, were compromised (though not destroyed) along with the denial of imaginative freedoms that constitute the sovereignty of transmotion.

The legacy of this history then is twofold: insight into the discursive workings of settler colonialism and the possibilities for indigenous resistance highlighted by Vizenor's concept of “transmotion”: “that sense of native motion and ... active presence, [which] is *sui generis* sovereignty” (*Fugitive Poses* 15). The liminal discursive position of “exceptional” Native people during Metacom's War was materialized or symbolized by, but also enabled, their detention on Deer Island and elsewhere. The very denial of indigenous mobility highlights its crucial importance in the structure of settler colonialism. As Niigonwedom Sinclair notes in the essay cited at the beginning of this essay, transmotion in Vizenor's Anishinaabe conception “is the practical combination of perception and expression, thought and action, imagination and motion. ... Transmotion is not about giving up tribal identities, knowledges, and beliefs when you leave

the imaginative world, but bringing them into being. ... It is this movement between imaginative and 'real' worlds that brings sovereignty into being" (145). It is perhaps to historical events such as Metacom's War that Vizenor responds in his emphasis on the symbolic importance of mobility as a fundamental aspect of Native sovereignty, an emphasis that characterizes the imaginative and discursive sovereignty asserted by The Constitution of the White Earth Nation. An emphasis on issues of territorial treaty sovereignty risks the stasis of the exceptional, liminal figure of the "*indian*"—as the fate of the Deer Island "Indians" shows. In contrast, transmotion, an indigenous understanding of mobility that brings together discursive and territorial practices of sovereignty makes possible a Native-specific, "*sui generis*" sovereignty.

Notes

1. Patrick Wolfe describes settler colonialism as a structure that works in two dimensions: "Negatively, it strives for the dissolution of native societies. Positively, it erects a new colonial society on the expropriated land base" (388). Here, I focus on the negative dimension of settler colonialism as it works to erase not only physical but also conceptual traces of prior Native presence.
2. I am suggesting that the internment of Native communities on Deer Island in 1675-76 is an early colonial instance of what became the federally imposed Native "enclaves" that Vizenor references, for example, in *Wordarrows* as reservations (82), and in *Chair of Tears* where the museum enclaves (115) that exhibit Native subjects contrast with actual Natives who are, significantly, "museums *in motion*" (116, emphasis added), and in *Earthdivers* where he describes how "[t]he curse of racism rules the ruinous institutions and federal enclaves where tribal people are contained" (34).
3. In view of Vizenor's comprehensive critique of the term "Indian," throughout I have used the term "praying Indians" where it is used in the documentary record but the terms "converted Natives" and "Christian Natives" in my own usage.
4. On the erasure of Native people from the discourse of modernity in general and the colonial New England discourse of nation-building in particular, see Jean O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (2010).
5. See John Easton, "A Relation of the Indian War" (1675) in *A Narrative of the Causes which led to Philip's Indian War of 1675 and 1676*, ed. Franklin B. Hough, 1-31. See also Neal Salisbury's introduction to his edition of Mary Rowlandson's *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, and Yasuhide Kawashima's compelling account of the aggressive extension of legal jurisdiction by Plymouth Colony, which shifted discursive relations between settlers and indigenous peoples in the direction of war, in *Igniting King Philip's War* (2001).
6. On the central discursive importance of the federal covenant to proto-national identity, see Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* (1975).
7. In reference to settler opposition to the establishment of praying towns, Salisbury observes: "The most intransigent opposition came from the residents of Marlborough, whose conflict with the praying town of Okommakamesit, immediately adjoining, persisted into King Philip's War"

(1974, 40).

8. Edward Randolph was sent to New England as an emissary of King James II to report on the extent of the losses occasioned by the conflict. In 1685 he reported: “No advantage but many disadvantages have arisen to the English by the warre, for about 600 men have been slain, and 12 captains, most of them brave and stout persons and of loyal principles, whilst the church members had liberty to stay at home and not hazard their persons in the wilderness.

The losses to the English in the several colonies, in their habitations and stock, is reckoned to amount to [£]150,000/ there having been about 1200 houses burned, 8000 head of cattle, great and small, killed, and many thousand bushels of wheat, pease and other grain burned (of which the Massachusetts colony hath not been damaged one third part, the great loss falling upon New Plymouth and Connecticut colonies) and upward of 3000 Indians men women and children destroyed, who if well managed would have been very serviceable to the English, which makes all manner of labour dear” (460). Benjamin Trumbull, in his *History of Connecticut* (1818; I. 351) notes that “All the buildings in Narraganset, from Providence to Stonington, a tract of about 50 miles, were burned, or otherwise destroyed” (editorial note; Gookin, *Historical Account*, 437n).

9. See Mark Rifkin's essay in which he offers a revision of Agamben's concept of the state of exception from three perspectives: “the persistent inside/outside tropology he uses to address the exception, specifically the ways it serves as a metaphor divorced from territoriality; the notion of ‘bare life’ as the basis of the exception, especially the individualizing ways that he uses that concept; and the implicit depiction of sovereignty as a self-confident exercise of authority free from anxiety over the legitimacy of state actions” (90).

10. We might recall here Samson Occom's similar recognition at the end of his *Short Narrative of my Life* (1768) that although he exercised imaginative transmotion, moving between Mohegan and English cultural worlds, still he was confronted with the daily racism of white supremacy. Occom concludes, “I must Say, I believe it is because I am a poor Indian. I can't help that God has made me So; I did not make myself So.” (*Collected Writings*, 58).

Works Cited

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen.

Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. Print.

----. *State of Exception*. Trans. Kevin Attell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. Print.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1975. Print.

Byrd, Jodi. *The Transit of Empire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Carlson, David J. “Trickster Hermeneutics and the Postindian Reader: Gerald Vizenor’s Constitutional Praxis.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 23. 4 (Winter, 2011): 13-47. Print.

Cesarini, J. Patrick. “‘What Has Become of Your Praying to God?’: Daniel Gookin's Troubled History of King Philip's War.” *Early American Literature*, 44. 3 (2009): 489-515. Print.

-
- Clark, Michael P. Ed. *The Eliot Tracts, with Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. Print.
- Doughton, Thomas Lewis. "Notes on the Nipmuc Indian Reservation at Hassanamesit or Hassanamisco and the Nipmuc People of Hassanamesit, later Grafton, Massachusetts." 1990, 1997. *Indian History and Genealogy*. Web. 28 May 2012. Ms held at the Indian and Colonial Research Center, Old Mystic, CT.
- Easton, John. *A Narrative of the Causes which led to Philip's Indian War of 1675 and 1676*. Ed. Franklin B. Hough. Albany: J. Munsell, 1858. University of Pittsburgh Library System. Web. 28 May 2012.
- Eliot, John. *Day Breaking if not the Sun Rising of the Gospel with the Indians of New England*. 1647. Rpt. New York: Joseph Sabin, 1865. Print.
- Gookin, Daniel. *Historical Collections of the Indians in New England. Of Their Several Nations, Numbers, Customs, Manners, Religion and Government, Before the English Planted There*. 1792. 1st ed. Vol. 1, 1st series *Collections of the Mass. Hist. Soc.* Rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1972. Print.
- . *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England, in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677. Impartially drawn by one well acquainted with that affair, and presented unto the right honourable the corporation residing in London, appointed by the King's most excellent majesty for promoting the Gospel among the Indians in America. Archaeologia Americana. Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1836. Vol. 2. 423-534. Print.
- Kawashima, Yasuhide. *Igniting King Philip's War: The John Sassamon Murder Trial*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001. Print.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York: Knopf, 1999. Print.
- Madsen, Deborah L. "Preface: Tragic Wisdom and Survivance." Joelle Rostkowski, *Conversations with Remarkable Native Americans*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012, XI-XVIII. Print.
- Mather, Cotton. *The Wonders of the Invisible World. OBSERVATIONS As well Historical as Theological, upon the NATURE, the NUMBER, and the OPERATIONS of the DEVILS*.

- (1693). Ed. Reiner Smolinski. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011. Zea E-Books. Book 4. Web 28 May 2012.
- O'Brien, Jean. *Dispossession by Degrees: Indian Land and Identity in Natick, Massachusetts*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.
- . *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010. Print.
- Occom, Samson. *The Collected Writings of Samson Occom, Mohegan: Literature and Leadership in Eighteenth-Century Native America*. Ed. Joanna Brooks. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.
- Randolph, Edward. “The Causes and Results of King Philip's War (1685).” In *American History Told by Contemporaries*. Ed. Albert Bushnell Hart. New York, 1898. Vol. 1, 458-60. Internet archive. Web. 28 May 2012.
- Rifkin, Mark. “The Frontier as (Movable) Space of Exception.” *Settler Colonial Studies*, 4. 2 (2014): 176-180. Print.
- . “Indigenizing Agamben: Rethinking Sovereignty in Light of the 'Peculiar' Status of Native Peoples.” *Cultural Critique*, 73. (Fall 2009): 88-124. Print.
- Salisbury, Neal. “Red Puritans: The 'Praying Indians of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot.” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 31. 1 (Jan. 1974): 27-54. Print.
- . ed. *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God by Mary Rowlandson with Related Documents*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1997. Print.
- Schedler, Christopher. “Wiindigoo Sovereignty and Native Transmotion in Gerald Vizenor's *Bearheart*.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 23. 3 (Fall 2011): 34-68. Print.
- Schmitt, Carl. *Political Theology. Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* (1922). Trans. G. Schwab, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. Print.
- Shurtleff, Nathaniel B. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, vol. V, 1674-1686. Boston: William White, 1854. Print.
- Sinclair, Niigonwedom James. “A Sovereignty of Transmotion: Imagination and the ‘Real,’ Gerald Vizenor, and Native Literary Nationalism.” *Stories Through Theories/Theories Through Stories: Native American Storytelling & Critique*. Eds. Gordon Henry Jr. et al. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2009, 23-58. Print.
- Snyder, Michael. “Gerald's Game: Postindian Subjectivity in Vizenor's *Interior Landscapes*.”

-
- Gerald Vizenor: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Deborah L. Madsen & A. Robert Lee. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2010, 46-66. Print.
- Van Lonkhuyzen, Harold W. "A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians: Acculturation, Conversion, and Identity at Natick, Massachusetts, 1646-1730." *The New England Quarterly*, 63. 3 (Sept. 1990): 396-428. Print.
- Vinx, Lars. "Carl Schmitt." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2014 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta, URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/schmitt/>>.
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Earthdivers: Tribal Narratives on Mixed Descent*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. Print.
- . *The Everlasting Sky: New Voices from the People Named the Chippewa*. New York: Crowell-Collier Press, London: Collier-Macmillan, 1972. Print.
- . *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998. Print.
- . *Heirs of Columbus*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1991. Print.
- . *Interior Landscapes: Autobiographical Myths and Metaphors*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990. Print.
- . *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994. Print.
- . *Wordarrows: Native States of Literary Sovereignty*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003. Print.
- Vizenor, Gerald and Others. "The Constitution of the White Earth Nation." *Gerald Vizenor: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Deborah L. Madsen & A. Robert Lee. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2010, 290-306. Print.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8. 4 (2006): 387-409. Print.

Vizenor and Beckett: Postmodern Identifications

PAUL STEWART

“The danger is in the neatness of identifications.”

Samuel Beckett, “Dante... Bruno. Vico.. Joyce”

Although epigraphs may be amongst the final things an author considers, they are one of the first things that the reader encounters. Gerald Vizenor’s epigraphs at the beginning of *Dead Voices*—as taken from Samuel Beckett, John Neihardt and Maurice Blanchot—seem to prepare the reader for a confluence of European postmodernism and Native American literature in the pages that follow. As such, the epigraphs function to provide a framework through which the novel can be viewed; they may even go so far as to recommend an appropriate framework through which the novel *should* be viewed.

However, how does the epigraph gain signification? What exactly is meant by the signifier “Samuel Beckett” in this context? Where to place Beckett’s name has long been a source of contention, with the competing claims of modernism and postmodernism, or Irishness as opposed to a general (European) humanity, played out across some sixty years of Beckett scholarship. The question that Vizenor’s use of Beckett as an epigraph for *Dead Voices* raises is exactly which Beckett is being invoked? In turn, what does Vizenor’s relation with *this* Beckett mean for the novel itself?

One immediate answer to the question of which Beckett is at play may be deduced from the inclusion of Maurice Blanchot amongst the epigraphs. Blanchot was one of the first French critics to recognise the importance of the novels of Beckett. In “Where now? Who now?”, a 1959 essay in the *Evergreen Review*, Blanchot delineated a Beckett that would be influential on initially the French and subsequently the Anglophone reception of the works. Crucially, the Beckett that was delineated was one in whom delineation was precisely at issue, as was the supposed security of the name “Beckett.” Asking “who is this ‘I’ condemned to speak without respite” in *The Unnamable*, Blanchot claimed that “by a reassuring convention, we answer: it is Samuel Beckett” (143). Such reassurance is short-lived for although we “try to recover the

security of a name, to situate the book’s ‘content’ at the stable level of a person,” the focus of the novel undermines such attempts as “the man who writes is already no longer Samuel Beckett but the necessity that has displaced him, dispossessed and dis-seized him, which has made him surrender to whatever is outside himself, which has made him a nameless being” (144). Ultimately, the voice of *The Unnamable* is one that inhabits “that neutral region where the self surrenders in order to speak, henceforth subject to words, fallen into the absence of time where it must die an endless death” (148). The Beckett that Blanchot gestures towards is one in which identity—however one might have characterised it—has been attenuated in the act of writing to such a degree that words take precedence over subjectivity; indeed the subject is only of words and in words or, as *The Unnamable* puts it “I’m in words, made of words” (104).

Blanchot’s account can be seen as sketching out the case for a postmodern Beckett: a sketch that has now been fully rendered, if not entirely accepted. The stress on dispossession, displacement and the dis-seized also foreshadows Blanchot’s later contemplation on the prefix “dis” (*dé*) that runs throughout *L’Ecriture du désastre* and which provides the final epigraph of *Dead Voices. The Writing of the Disaster* recognises the “horror—and the honor—of the name, which always threatens to become a title” (7). (“Title” is the translation given of *sur-nom*, which Blanchot delicately balances with *sur-vie*, survival.) Naming may be attractive given a certain nostalgia for certainty, but it is ultimately a containment against which a literature of fragmentation must be deployed. Yet, in its oppositional structure, fragmentation may itself inadvertently provide a means of coherence. Hence, Blanchot warns: “The fragmentary promises not instability (the opposition of fixity) so much as disarray, confusion.” The fragmentary, which Blanchot recognised in Beckett, is always shadowed by the possibility of giving credit to its opposite; fixity. Even the dispossessed, displaced and dis-seized can fade into possession, placement and the seized.

The Beckett-Blanchot axis of the epigraphs suggests that it is in a certain postmodern tradition that *Dead Voices* should be situated. Given Beckett’s and Blanchot’s “horror” at the name, it is ironic that their names are given such a position of authority within Vizenor’s work, but this might only be to yet further recognise the complexity of maintaining a discourse free of a restrictive subjectification. This is, of course, very much in keeping with Vizenor’s contention that “Postmodernism liberates imagination” and that the “trickster is postmodern” (*Narrative*

Chance 9). However, one wonders if the postmodern is a single entity in and of itself, or a multiple site in which Vizenor and Beckett engage, or fail to do so.

The site of that engagement is marked by the traces of Beckett's *The Unnamable* throughout *Dead Voices*. The most obvious relation between the two novels that the epigraph commends is the fragmentary nature of the stories that Bagese tells and through which she embodies a series of tribal personas: bears, fleas, crows, beavers and so on. *The Unnamable*'s central consciousness—who necessarily remains unnamed—momentarily adopts, or is forced to adopt, a series of “avatars” or “vice-existers” whose stories are then related. At times he appears to be the creator of these “puppets” and at other times the victim of their narrative attempts to say him into existence. The novel moves between first and third person narration and the question of appropriate pronouns is as crucial to the text as it is in *Dead Voices*, as shall be seen. Hence, the Unnamable “is” Basil and then the decrepit tramp Mahood, who is later found limbless and stuck in a jar outside a chop-house near the shambles, and then the more enigmatic Worm whose precise nature is radically at issue. We are told that previous avatars include major figures from Beckett's prior fiction, including Molloy, Malone, and Murphy from the novels *Molloy*, *Malone Dies* and *Murphy* respectively. Initially, this relation between the Unnamable and his vice-existers bears some similarity to Bagese's identities within the wanaki game. Just as the Unnamable is Mahood “for the space of an instant” (27), so Bagese “is” Bear or Praying Mantis for the duration of their tales. When the wanaki game is described, the question of agency and responsibility seems untroubled:

The player rises at dawn, turns one of the seven cards, meditates on the picture, and imagines he has become the animal, bird, or insect on the card of the day. Then stories are told about the picture and the plural pronoun *we* is used to be sure nature is not separated from humans in the wanaki game. (*Dead Voices* 28)

To enter into the game is a willing act of the imagination in which one adopts the identity of the animal on the card, in an attempt, as Kimberly M. Blaeser has put it, to make a “reconnection with life through imaginative story” (192). The self is effectively suspended as the player adopts a position of mediation, reinforced by the choice of “we” as the governing pronoun which plays across strict boundaries of discrete identities. As such, there is a momentary dislocation of identity in the hope of a shared, beneficial experience.

When one considers the problems the Unnamable has with pronouns, a very different tone and set of concerns emerge. At one stage, he abandons the first person as being “too farcical” (69), yet is unable to keep his resolve, realising that “...it’s the fault of the pronouns, there is no name for me, no pronoun for me, all the trouble comes from that, that, it’s a kind of pronoun too, it isn’t that either, I’m not that either, let us leave all that, forget about all that” (123). Rather than an acceptance of a voluntary “we,” the Unnamable rails against the inability of language to coalesce with his condition (one hesitates to say “identity”) coupled with the inevitability of language asserting some form of identity, even if it is merely a “that.” Indeed, his relation with his avatars is at times one in which he is coerced into accepting that he is they; a form of enforced “we” along the path of becoming an indissoluble “I.” In this sense the “we” of *The Unnamable* would also be a mediating position, but the effects of this mediation are repeatedly rejected throughout the novel. So, the Unnamable claims that all “these Murphys, Molloys and Malones do not fool me. They have made me waste my time, suffer for nothing, speak of them when, in order to stop speaking, I should have spoken of me and me alone” (14). In order to be brought into existence, the Unnamable must adhere to one of the stories of his delegates, accepting their words as his, or “pronouncing my own words, words pronouncing me alive, since that’s how they want me to be” (48). The stories of the delegates adopt a principle of degeneration to tempt the Unnamable into adherence, but he maintains his indifference, claiming that they “could clap an artificial anus in the hollow of my hand and still I wouldn’t be there, alive with their life, not far short of man, just barely a man, sufficiently a man to have hopes one day of being one, my avatars behind me” (27). Although the Unnamable claims from the outset to be alone, the discourse quickly posits not only the avatars who foist their stories and identities upon him, but also a mysterious “they” who are intent on bringing the Unnamable into being, usually with suffering functioning as a guarantee of existence. The “[t]hey say they, speaking of them, to make me think it is I whom am speaking” (86). This dialectical approach is one through which the Unnamable is coerced into taking up a subjective position—indeed, to become a subject as such—when he desires nothing more than to stop speaking: “Ah if only this voice could stop, this meaningless voice which prevents you from being nothing...” (87). Rather than the beneficial, communal “we” of *Dead Voices*, Beckett’s Unnamable is harried by a (possibly

imaginary) “they” intent on coercing the voice of the protagonist into an identity which can then be assimilated into a “we.”

However, *Dead Voices* is also aware of the coercive possibilities of exterior voices. In opposition to the wanaki “we” as employed in the “war with loneliness and with human separations from the natural world” (29), Bagese fears the “they” in the form of “the dead voices of civilization” (16). Throughout the novel, these dead voices threaten the immediacy of the wanaki game’s series of identities and the plural pronoun they promote. The “wordies” who wield these dead voices are inimical to the living voices of survivance and threaten to fracture the “we” of the game. For Blaeser, the “[t]rickster’s identity is itself a subversion of the Western mode of classification, resisting singularity...” (138), and, as such, a singular identity is to be resisted as being amenable to appropriation. So, Bagese as bear claims that “wordies held our name in isolation, even caged us on the page. We are bears not cold separations in the wilderness of dead voices” (31). To seize the name is to reify the fluidity of identity into one readily definable subjectivity that can then be studied, manipulated or (possibly most dangerously) dismissed. This claiming of the name is, of course, a question of power, as the metaphor of the hunter and prey makes clear: “We remember the world with stories that wordies would rush to discover, hunt, and capture in a name. The hunters pretend to own the world with names” (42). In *Narrative Chance*, Vizenor identifies these dead voices as those of the disciplines of the humanities and the social sciences: “The narrow teleologies deduced from social science monologues and the ideologies that arise from structuralism have reduced tribal literatures to an ‘objective’ collection of consumable cultural artifacts” (5-6). The teleological aspect is crucial here. The drive towards an end-point from which something can be judged effectively curtails any form of continuance. Hence, in “Bears,” the narrator’s “mouth moves with dead voices. How can he be so young and so dead? [...] How can he go on? He has no stories to remember because he asks us about our stories” (*Dead Voices* 31). Nicknamed the Laundry Boy because of the dead voice that is modern fastidious cleanliness, the narrator is unable to go on as his own stories have been subjected to the deadening effect of “civilized” voices and his querying of the wanaki stories suggests that the same deadening effect threatens their survival.

In the matter of the dead voices, two related aspects of Beckett’s work can be discerned: remaining unnameable as a form of resistance to subjectification, and the question of

continuance. The first aspect unearths a facet of Beckett that has often been downplayed: the political dimension. Beckett’s interventions in public political discourse were few and far between, and rarely unambiguous. A concern for the direction of travel of the Irish Free State in the 1930s led to some essays—such as “Censorship in the Saorstat” which condemned the wide-ranging censorship law of the Free State—that combined a hope for literary freedom with wider social, religious and political freedoms. When the Left Review canvassed writers and artists for their opinions regarding the Spanish Civil War in 1937, Beckett submitted only “¡UPTHEREPUBLIC!” [sic]; quite a departure from the earnest submissions of Ford Madox Ford, Aldous Huxley and W.H. Auden and others in favour of the Republican government. After fighting with the resistance in World War II, Beckett again seems to have made few overt political statements, although his private abhorrence of apartheid and other oppressive regimes has been attested to widely. The exception which one might say proves the rule would be the dedication of *Catastrophe* to the then dissident author, Vaclav Havel. In part because of the apparent lack of any obvious engagement with the wider political world, until the late 1990s it was almost a critical consensus that Beckett was an apolitical writer. Indeed, Peter Boxall has argued that up until that point

Beckett’s cultural capital in the west has been amassed on the back of his apoliticism. His value as a writer is directly related to his widely perceived ability to give aesthetic expression to a condition that precedes and underlies being in the socio-political world. [...] That he seems to offer a writing which can reach the limits of non-specificity, which can speak so generally about the pre- or trans-cultural truths of being, has been read as confirmation that art can do something that isn’t political, that transcends the political, that puts the political in its place. (208)

The apolitical view of Beckett could not be further removed from the deeply politically engaged work of Vizenor, in, for example, his framing of the constitution for the White Earth Nation. The activist Vizenor would appear to be some distance from the aesthetic Beckett. However, one should not forget that before such activism, Vizenor was often criticised for not being sufficiently engaged in practical political struggles. Craig Womack, for example, argues that practical political intervention might be marred by the style of writing adopted by figures such as Vizenor. Womack questions the “relevance of an inaccessible prose style toward intervening in

the real world” in which injustices towards Native peoples are rife. For Womack, the fluidity of identity within a book such as *Dead Voices* fails to realise that “Native literature [...] is a part of sovereignty” (*Red on Red* 72). As such, Womack argues that postmodern style is a barrier to political action in the name of sovereignty. However, one could counter that for Vizenor and Beckett, style is precisely political, as David Carlson has argued for Vizenor: “debates about whether political concerns should trump aesthetic ones in critical assessments of Vizenor are, in fact, misguided; his aesthetic *is* [...] deeply political” (14). Indeed, it is in the frame of style and the political that Beckett’s importance for Vizenor might ultimately lie, and it is a frame bound together with a notion of resistance. Michel Foucault, writing in the Foreword for Deleuze and Guattari’s *Anti-Oedipus*, in which Beckett is frequently referenced, argues that “the strategic adversary is fascism. [...] And not only historical fascism, the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini [...] but also the fascism in us all, in our heads and in our everyday behavior, the fascism that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us” (xiii).

In order to counter such a fascistic love of power, Beckett—whose work is repeatedly marked by impotence and failure—struggled with the basis of such a love; the process of subjectification itself. Terry Eagleton has argued that “in a world after fascism, self-affirmation has too sinister an infinity with mass murder. It is as though all action after Auschwitz is garbage. Better to suffer the pains of self-dispossession than court the perils of dominion” (xxiv), and that, for Beckett, “the word ‘perhaps’ is an anti-fascist weapon” (xxv). Such a fear of becoming a subject can be seen in the Unnamable’s refusal to be seized by any of the narratives and identities that are told of him, thus allowing him to retain his unnameable status as something proper to him but which cannot be defined as a subject. This refusal to enter into the name and thereby assume an identity is maintained throughout the novel, leaving the Unnamable still “on the threshold of my story, before the door that opens on my story, that would surprise me, if it opens, it will be I, it will be the silence, where I am...” (134).

Such a refusal is double in nature: firstly, the Unnamable will not be subjected to violent appropriation and, secondly, he will not be responsible for the violent appropriation of another. “All these Murphys, Molloyes and Malones” are imagined as a distraction from supposedly speaking of the self, yet it is clear that the Unnamable is also responsible for the suffering of his avatars in his capacity as their creator: “I thought I was right in enlisting these sufferers of my

pains. I was wrong. They never suffered my pains, their pains are nothing, compared to mine, a mere tittle of mine, the tittle I thought I could put from me, in order to witness it” (14). So the Unnamable foists suffering on to his characters in order to better assess that suffering, yet that process of witnessing indicates a return of the suffering to its source, as if getting to know the suffering of the avatars will lead the Unnamable to a better understanding of his own condition. Crucially, the Unnamable denies this return and throughout the novel the lines of relation are fraught and often highly ambiguous, if not improbable. Rather than accepting identification based on a shared suffering, no matter to what degree, the Unnamable denies such an identification through an assertion of difference. This refusal to give assent might, as Anthony Uhlmann has argued, be “one way in which [...] processes of subjection and enslavement might be resisted” (66).

Similar aspects to Beckett’s ethical and political aesthetic can be heard to echo throughout Vizenor’s novel and can be seen to coalesce in a single paragraph in the chapter entitled “Voices”:

There are more bears at the tables in the town than there are on the reservation. Our animals and stories have been hunted down to the last sanctuaries in the cities. The choice is between the chance of tricksters and the drone of cultural pride on reservations. The tribes were invented by these word demons who hunted our animals and buried our voices. The tribes are dead voices. We must go on, but there is nothing to be done. (136)

The final sentence is an amalgam of Beckett texts: “We must go on” echoes the “I can’t go on, I’ll go on” which closes *The Unnamable*, whilst “nothing to be done” is a refrain from *Waiting for Godot*, initially made in reference to Estragon’s ill-fitting boots, but also later used in reference to Vladimir’s hat. Less obvious is the passage’s Beckettian fear of the reification of subjectivity. In keeping with Vizenor’s comment that “social science monologues and the ideologies that arise from structuralism have reduced tribal literatures to an ‘objective’ collection of consumable cultural artifacts” (*Narrative Chance* 5-6), the tribe itself is here seen as an imposition of restrictive subjectivity. The tribe is circumscribed by some supposed essence—hence Vizenor’s claim that this arises from structuralism—which, whilst recognising the existence of the tribe as such, thereby condemns the tribe to a bound, locatable identity.

The question of location is an important one. Writing against a form of “blurry and limp hybridity” (205) in theoretical readings of tricksters figures, Daniel Morley Johnson has highlighted the emphasis of place in Vizenor’s use of trickster stories, arguing that Vizenor repeatedly allies trickster hermeneutics to “the tribal-national, the situated-ness of Indigenous knowledges in nations, homelands—in Anishinaabe people” (207). In contrast, Blaeser has emphasised the key to Vizenor’s trickster consciousness as “vitality, adaptability, continuance” (143), and “the *creation* of the place they will call home” (148 my emphasis), suggesting that location is achieved through the stories rather than a fixed resource from which the stories arise. In *Dead Voices*, rather than identifying the tribe with a specific, supposedly ancestral space, the stories of the novel are dislocated: they are both fragmentary and displaced into the modern city which one naively might have thought would have been inimical to the continuance of the tribal stories themselves. However, the alternative of a preservation of the stories within the reservation might only signal the decline of those stories into the dead cultural artefacts that Vizenor deplors. By displacing the stories onto the city, the deadening links to a culturally restricted locale are broken. A similar sense of displacement and dislocation also permeates *The Unnamable*. In order for identity to take hold of the Unnamable, he must be situated. He speculates that “since to me too I must attribute a beginning, if I could relate it to that of my abode” his beginning, and therefore identity, would be more assured (6). One notices that origin is as much a question of location as it is of chronology. Similarly, location is given due prominence in the series of questions which open the novel: “Where now? Who now? When now?” (1). “Who” cannot be answered unless the “Where” is identifiable. Unsurprisingly, then, the specifics of place within the novel seem contradictory as it combines recognisably Irish landscapes linked to *Molloy* with specific indicators of a French setting, such as the citing of the Rue de Brancion in the midst of Mahood’s tale. Just as the identity of the Unnamable cannot be seized, so the question of location is necessarily unanswerable as one is a facet of the other.

This relation between Beckett and Vizenor on the issue of location and identity suggests Vizenor intuited that what many regard as Beckett’s almost exemplary post-modernity needs to be viewed within a post-colonial context. To recognize Beckett’s Irishness—and in particular his Protestant minority status within an emerging Catholic inflected Free State—is not to limit him to a geographical, ethnic and social identity, but to assess how those limits informed his repeated

attempts to undo such impositions in his works. Writing of *Murphy*, which sees the eponymous Irish protagonist undergoing voluntary exile in London as Beckett himself had done during 1934 and 1935, Patrick Bixby has argued that:

The signs of a nomadic, unsettled, and decentred subjectivity, Murphy's perambulations transform his life story into an extended narrative of displacement that belies any grounded notions of personal or national identity and denies any passive victimization by the structures of socio-political power. (104)

Beckett, who was in London to pursue a course of psychoanalysis under Wilfred Bion, appears to have experienced the very imposition of identity that his texts would later scrupulously undo. James Knowlson reports that Beckett “hated London and was infuriated by the patronising English habit of addressing him in the pubs and shops as ‘Pat’ or ‘Paddy’” (186). In the *Letters*, he laments the countryside around Dublin—although not Dublin itself—and a week-long sense of “relief and vitality” on returning to London in 1935 is rapidly replaced: “now I feel beyond description worthless, sordid and incapacitated” (245). Beckett's escape from Dublin into an Irish-diaspora boarding house does not so much mean an escape from Irishness as a reaffirmation of Irishness; a reaffirmation which might be all the more irksome because it is imposed from the outside. All this is reflected in *Murphy*, not least when Murphy applies for a job as a chandler's smart youth. The cockney chandlers comment that “‘E don't look rightly human to me [...] not rightly” (50). One should hesitate here to compare the experiences of an individual to those of a collective, abstract notion such as Native peoples. However, such a hesitancy indicates the complex of problems associated with the imposition of a communal identity upon the individual which does not account for the particularities of that individual. Moreover, Beckett's experience of classification as a stereotypical Irish “Paddy” is the experience of being classified according to an abstract notion of national identity that one does not recognise oneself. Certainly, the particularities of Irish and Native peoples' experiences of imposed identity vary widely (both in comparison to each other and within the groups designated as Irish or Native peoples), yet the underlying structures of such an imposition remain to be read in similar terms in Beckett's and Vizenor's works and not least in the strategies to undo or avoid restrictive subjectivities in *The Unnamable* and *Dead Voices*. It is perhaps in this sense that we should treat Vizenor's claim that

he is “a hybrid document, unnamable on delivery” (*Native Liberty* 15); a claim that already puts Beckett’s sense of the unnamable within a post-colonial frame of reference.

If Vizenor’s and Beckett’s forms of resistance function to escape the imposition of coercive, subjectifying forces, one wonders why Vizenor claims in the very same paragraph that there is “nothing to be done”. If resistance is at stake, surely something *must* be done? Of course, one could define “nothing” as a positive, as a form of radical passivity towards those forces ranged against one. Alternatively, and more in keeping with the strategies of resisting restrictive subjectivities, one might ask from whose perspective nothing is indeed nothing? The Mantis story, which includes a wanaki-camouflaged bid for freedom through revolt, would seem to suggest that some form of physical resistance is necessary, yet the success of that revolt depends on the mantises being nothing in the mind of the female scientist they rebel against. Using the wanaki to access the flea and then the bear, the mantises succeed in being unidentifiable to the rational categorisations upon which the scientist depends: “She was so rational that if we were not wordies, or could not be seen in printed words, then we were not there at the end of the world” (86). From a rational perspective, the mantis-as-flea-as-bear is so multiple as to be no one thing, and so not amenable to appreciation and appropriation. On the level of the tribe, the drive towards categorisation entailed a further discipline of the dead voices; history. Hence, the rational anthropological history of the tribe that provides the mark of definition and makes the multiple into a single thing is to be feared. Two pasts are therefore played against each other in the novel; one of “history” and the other an alternative form of living continuance of stories as voices in the blood. “The past, not death, is our silence, because the past is the end of the war, the deception of peace. There is no past in the mirror, no past in stones or stories” (138-9). Of course, for a peace to be signed the warring parties must be indentified: one makes a treaty with a tribe or nation, not a multiple, complex identity which, quite literally, cannot be brought to book.

To do nothing, in this sense, is to not do something which is definable by the very dominant discourses and ideologies that are ranged against one. Even accepting that we are the one against which such discourses are ranged is to accept a dangerous, identifiable position. With reference to a radical *kenosis* or “self-emptying” within his works, Eagleton argues that, for Beckett, one cannot react against the crimes of Stalinism and fascism “with vigorous actions of

your own [...], since to do so would be to remain within the same noxious frame of reference, make a move within the same lethal game” (xxiv). As with Vizenor’s form of resistance, there is a refusal of the dubious solace of adopting an oppositional position to what is being fought; instead, a strategic evasion of the terms of the conflict as such is adopted. In a similar fashion to Vizenor’s mistrust of the languages of the social sciences, so the Unnamable is ultimately not amenable to the application of reason and the rhetoric of reasonableness. If he were to adopt an identity as “they” wish, it would be to enter into the world on their terms and perhaps for their benefit: “Ah a nice state they have me in, but still I’m not their creature, not quite, not yet. To testify to them, until I die, [...] that’s what they’ve sworn they’ll bring me too” (37). To become something on these terms would merely bolster the power of “they” and so the Unnamable trusts that “my inability to absorb, my genius for forgetting, [will be] more than they reckoned with. Dear incomprehension, it’s thanks to you I’ll be myself, in the end. Nothing will remain of the lies they have glutted me with. And I’ll be myself at last” (37). This evasion is given its most vivid, and one might argue most poststructuralist, form when the Unnamable “is” a tympanum: “I’m neither one side nor the other, I’m in the middle, I’m the partition, I’ve two surfaces and no thickness, [...] on one hand the mind, on the other the world, I don’t belong to either” (100).

This shared form of resistance between Beckett and Vizenor is, however, not as neat an identification as one might wish. The corollary of resistance is some form of continuance and as *The Unnamable* and *Dead Voices* move towards their ends the imperative to “go on” becomes evermore in evidence. There is, though, a difference in pronouns: “I can’t go on, I’ll go on” has become “we must go on.” As has been repeatedly shown, the “we” of Vizenor is a crucial aspect in the resistance to modes of subjectification. It is the “we” within the wanaki game that acts as a form of mediation to the natural world and to the voices in the blood that have been threatened by the dead voices. It is a refusal to be captured by a singularity. It is, however, also a commitment to a form of the communal, to a social entity, even if that entity is not to be identified as a tribe, or a nation. “I can’t go on” is very different. With the first person, two possible alternatives emerge: to enter into a social relation (to become a “we”) or to utterly sever any such relation and to “be” a not I. The same alternatives do not apply to Vizenor; already “we,” the alternatives are to become a “they”—the very thing being resisted—or the disappearance of the communal, for the social relation itself to collapse. For the Unnamable this

is a threshold of absolute aporia: in order to be a non-subject he must adopt an imposed subjectivity for an instant in order for it to be then negated; but even that negation would be a recognition of its opposite. As such, he is condemned within the space between the I and the not-I. He may reject the game of identity, but there is no alternative to that game. Ultimately, the Unnamable is left in a neither/nor space, unable to go on and yet with no other possibility but to do so. This may be Beckett's final ethical sense of what is possible as resistance: only by an utter denial of affirmation can one slip the strictures of restrictive subjectivity. That this entails a sacrifice of the social may be the regrettable price Beckett is willing to pay.

In contrast, Vizenor's imperative to "go on" is by definition already social as a call to the "we." Thus, for Vizenor, the "postindian warriors create a new *tribal* presence in stories (*Manifest Manners* 12, my emphasis) and "trickster consciousness [...] creates the possibility for discourse that's *communal* and comic" (qtd. in Blaeser 162, my emphasis). Here might be the difference, then, in Beckett's and Vizenor's postmodernity. Both deploy a literature of dislocation and fragmentation as tools to avoid the restrictive imposition of subjectivity but, for Vizenor, this is part of a process, whereas, for Beckett, this is a point of aporetic impasse. Against the "simulations [that] are the absence of the tribal real" Vizenor deploys a strategic literature of fragmentation out of which can arise "new stories of survivance over dominance" (*Manifest Manners* 4), in what Blaeser has characterised as a deconstructive act with a view to a subsequent reconstruction (145). The Unnamable, in contrast, is left before the threshold of his story that is not passed, and reconstruction is left in abeyance, quite possibly because any reconstruction would merely replicate the structures by which a restrictive identity had previously been imposed. Beckett's ethical response is, then, one of withdrawal and denial; Vizenor's one of continued creativity with a view to an ultimately communal affirmation. Maintaining a sense of the social whilst undoing forms of restrictive identity is perhaps Vizenor's most difficult but most important task. Beckett's work suggests that, for him at least, such a task might not be possible.

These differences of an asocial Beckett and a social Vizenor might account in the end for the very different tones of *Dead Voices* and *The Unnamable*. For Vizenor, alongside a serious ethical commitment to social continuance, there is a certain joy to be had in the free-play of fluid identities. The cards of the wanaki are, amongst other things, a game to be freely played within

an almost ritualistic set of rules; not as in Beckett, a game one is condemned to play and for which the rules are indecipherable. The breathless frenzy of the close of *The Unnamable* is one of desperation that the threshold to the story will not be crossed and the Unnamable will not stop talking and fall into the silence he never stops desiring. In contrast, silence is feared in *Dead Voices*, for “our death would be silence” (137). Bagese may be harassed by the dead voices within modernity, but the game remains to be played as a possible means of joyously surviving those deadening influences and preserving the “stories in the blood” against silence (47). In Vizenor’s postmodernity *jouissance* is a possibility; in Beckett’s it is just a bad joke told too often.

Works Cited

- Beckett, Samuel. “Censorship in the Saorstat.” *Disjecta*. Ed. Ruby Cohn. London: Calder, 1983. 84-9. Print.
- . “Dante... Bruno. Vico.. Joyce”. *Disjecta*. Ed. Ruby Cohn. London: Calder, 1983. 19-34. Print.
- . *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Vol.1, 1929-1940*. Eds. Martha Dow Fehsenfeld and Lois More Overbeck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.
- . *Murphy*. London: Faber and Faber, 2009. Print.
- . *The Unnamable*. London: Faber and Faber, 2010. Print.
- . *Waiting for Godot. The Complete Dramatic Works*. London: Faber and Faber, 1990. 7-88. Print.
- Bixby, Patrick. *Samuel Beckett and the Postcolonial Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.
- Blaeser, Kimberly M. *Gerald Vizenor: Writing in the Oral Tradition*. Norman and London: Oklahoma University Press, 1996. Print.
- Blanchot, Maurice. “When Now? Who Now?” *On Beckett: Essays and Criticism*. Ed. S. E. Gontarski. New York: Grove Press, 1986. 141-149. Print.
- . *The Writing of the Disaster*. Trans. Ann Smock. Lincoln, N.E.: University of Nebraska Press, 1995. Print.

-
- Boxall, Peter. "Introduction to Beckett/Aesthetics/Politics." *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui Beckett and Religion; Beckett/Aesthetics/Politics*. Eds. Marius Bunning, Matthijs and Onnon Kusters. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000. 207-214. Print.
- Carlson, David J. "Trickster Hermeneutics and the Postindian Reader: Gerald Vizenor's Constitutional Praxis." *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 23.4 (Winter 2011): 13-45. Print.
- Cunard, Nancy, et.al (eds) *Authors Take Sides on the Spanish Civil War*. London: Left Review, 1937. Print.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. London: Athlone Press, 1984. Print.
- Eagleton, Terry. "Foreword: Nothing New." *Beckett and Nothing: Trying to Understand Beckett*. Ed. Daniela Caselli. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010. xiv-xxvi. Print.
- Johnson, Daniel Morley. "(Re)Nationalizing Naanabozho: Anishinaabe Sacred Stories, Nationalist Literary Criticism, and Scholarly Responsibility." *Troubling Tricksters: Revisioning Critical Conversations*. Eds. Deanna Reder and Linda M. Morra. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2010. 199-220. Print.
- Knowlson, James. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett*. London: Bloomsbury, 1996. Print.
- Uhlmann, Anthony. "Withholding Assent: Beckett in the Light of Stoic Ethics." *Beckett and Ethics*. Ed. Russell Smith. London: Continuum, 2008. 57-67. Print.
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Dead Voices*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992. Print.
- . *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln N.E. and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1999. Print.
- . *Narrative Chance: Postmodern Discourse on Native American Literatures*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993. Print.
- . *Native Liberty: Natural Reason and Cultural Survivance*. Lincoln, N.E.: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. Print.
- Womack, Craig S. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999. Print.

THE UNMISSABLE: Transmotion in Native Stories and Literature

GERALD VIZENOR

The presence of natural motion and transmotion is obvious in native stories, but the sense of motion is not always evident in literature. The migration of birds, traces of the seasons, shadows in the snow, and tropes of totemic animal and bird are unmissable, easy gestures of motion in stories and literature.

Yet the erudite taxonomies and literary practices of commercial literature weigh the obvious sense of natural motion, and empire names and doctrines become at times more significant than the irony and tropes of literary natural motion. The learned botanical name *cypripedium acaule*, for instance, inadvertently denatures the exquisite poetic blush of a moccasin flower in the moist shadows, and other more common names and comparative similes lessen the motion of images, such as the heavy breath of bears, the marvelous shimmer of early morning dew, twilight favors on a spider web, ravens tease of hunters in camouflage, stray shadows lean over the fence, or the perfect dive of a water ouzel in a mountain stream.

The most memorable native stories are ironic, and the scenes of natural motion are sometimes parodies. Native ceremonial clowns, cultural and communal teases are ironic because the original sources are not rubric sacraments, and never certain, and the spirit, imagination, and hearsay of the moment are never the same in the continuous imaginative recount of stories.

Likewise the printed scenes in literature are ironic by the selection of names and teaser words. The definitions of words are inconclusive, no more precise than tropes, and the connotations of words are deferred to yet another situation and literary act of writers and readers. The literary scenes and notions are shelved in libraries, and wait for readers to hear the natural motion in the books.

The means of natural motion are easily grasped in the singular tropes and gestures of innovative literature, but the pleasures of ironic motion are hardly perceived in ordinary comparative similes, such as, walks like a duck, eats like a dog, or dumb as a donkey. Comparative similes are facile, and cynical similes sideline the spontaneous imagination and tropes of natural motion.

“Overhanging clouds, echoing my words, with a pleasing sound, across the earth, everywhere, making my voice heard,” and, “the first to come, epithet among the birds, bringing the rain, crow is my name,” are ironic dream songs and tropes of natural motion by a nineteenth century native Anishinaabe (Densmore 15).

Kobayashi Issa, the generous haiku poet of eighteenth century Japan, created a poignant image about the death of his young daughter, “the world of dew, is the world of dew, and yet. . . and yet” (Issa 103-4). The imagistic scene creates a natural sense of motion, a world of dew, and at the same time a trope of memory and impermanence. The scene is elusive and in motion, not a descriptive contrast or closure.

Stephen Addiss in *The Art of Haiku* provided a rather reductive interpretation that the image “captures the moment when sincere religious understanding meets the deepest feeling of the heart.” The natural motion of that concise image of sorrow and a world of dew was not a captured scene, instead the scene continues as a visionary motion of memory (Addiss 260).

Literature is a tricky voice of the past, and customarily omniscient in style. Native stories tease a sense of presence, an ironic presence, and create an elusive consciousness that is more than the mere simulations of similitude and sincerity, or the editorial investments of culture, intrigue, adventure, and petitions of conceited reality in commercial narratives.

Native stories are not priestly liturgies. The stories of creation and the marvelous scenes of trickster transmotion and transformation are related in motion and visual memory without recitations, storyline or plot resolutions, shibboleths of character development, or the denouement of commercial literature.

Consider, for instance, the concept of transmotion and the literary perception of other words with the *trans* prefix such as transcendentalism, the spiritual sense of natural motion and cultural survivance, or notions of transpacific, transhistorical, transracial, transsexual, and the common practice of transactions. The *trans* prefix initiates a sense of action or change, a literary and unitary motion, and a wider concept of the motion in images and words.

The literary inspiration and spirited totemic portrayals of birds, animals, ocean waves, and whales are transmotion, more than mere denotation, or simile. Scenes of transmotion are not syntactical clauses or closure, not simulations, and not an outline of absence, of want or scarcity of motion and presence.

The stories of native survivance are instances of natural motion, and transmotion, a visionary resistance to cultural dominance, the practices of monotheism, policies of federal reservations, and the heavy loads of industrial conversions. Regrettably commercial literature about natives has often been structured with the familiar themes of classical, heroic tragedy, and modern victimry, but scarcely classical irony or comedy. Native stories, however, are imagined and related with a sense of natural motion and survivance, not cultural denouement and victimry. The publishers of the most saleable themes of romantic victimry have obligated many native storiers and writers to convert a native sense of survivance to absence and victimry, including the popular *Black Elk Speaks* by John Neihardt, and unfortunately *The Surrounded* by D'Arcy McNickle.

The discussion of transmotion, a spirited and visionary sense of natural motion, has evolved in my critical studies as an original aesthetic theory to interpret and compare the modes, distinctions, situations, and the traces of motion in sacred objects, stories, art, and literature.

Native literary artists, those who pose in the emotive shadows of natural motion and totemic cultures, are clearly obligated, in my view, to create innovative narratives and poetic scenes that tease and reveal the fusions of native ethos, transmotion, and stories of survivance. Commercial editorial dominance, and crave of cultural victimry, must be outwitted, ridiculed, and controverted in the chance and future of native stories and innovative literature.

Native transmotion is directly related to the ordinary practices of survivance, a visionary resistance and sense of natural motion over separatism, literary denouement, and cultural victimry. Survivance and transmotion are original critical philosophies and ethical convictions derived from personal experiences of ceremonies, critical examination of sacred objects in museums, and relative observations of natural motion and totemic associations in native art, stories, and literature.

Leslie Silko encircles the reader with mythic witches, ironic creation stories, and a sense of natural motion in her novel *Ceremony*. "That is the trickery of the witchcraft," said the old man. "They want us to believe all evil resides with white people. They will look no further to see what is really happening. They want us to separate ourselves from white people, to be ignorant and helpless as we watch our own destruction. But white people are only tools that the witchery manipulates; and I tell you, we can deal with white people, with their machines and their beliefs.

We can because we invented white people; it was Indian witchery that made white people in the first place” (Silko 132-3).

The witches contrived a customary binary structure of race, a mythic colorant of cultural separation. The literary witchery is ironic, of course, a lively trace of transmotion in a contemporary novel.

Toni Jensen creates a sense of transmotion and native survivance in “At the Powwow Hotel,” a short story published in *From the Hill*. The story starts with the natural motion and visionary presence of corn. “When the cornfield arrived, I was standing in our hotel’s kitchen, starting Lester’s birthday cake. It was raining outside, foggy too, for the sixth day in a row, and there was flour all over my blue jeans. . . . We live in West Texas on a three-hundred-acre cotton farm at the edge of Blanco Canyon. We own the Blanco Canyon Hotel, all twelve rooms, though everybody in town calls it the Powwow Hotel on account of Lester and me being Indian” (Jensen 55-7).

Other natives arrived at the Powwow Hotel that day and the conversations continued with gestures to the miraculous arrival of corn, a field of corn. The Navajos “talked about why the corn had skipped them, had set its course east of their tribes.”

“But tonight,” the narrator declares, “there was the sound of feet, moving counterclockwise, the smell of coffee and bread and the raw, greenness of the field. And tonight, there were my legs, still at first, but surprising me by doing anything at all, and then there I was, part of it, moving.” Jensen creates marvelous scenes of natural motion, corn, greenery, and cultural survivance. The arrival of the corn is a crucial and memorable scene of totemic and visionary transmotion at the Powwow Hotel (Jensen 67).

“I have no state but my visionary portrayals in art, no native nation but a sensual, totemic landscape of memories, and the unreserved resistance of dominance and nostalgia,” declared Dogroy Beaulieu, the native artist and narrator of my recent novel *Shrouds of White Earth*. “Does anyone ever experience a native state, a secure place of stories, solace, and sentiments that never torment the heart and memories? Yes, of course, my friend, you create marvelous literary scenes and stories of the reservation, and yet your characters are always in flight from the mundane notions of reality. You write stories not to escape, but to evade the tiresome politics of native victimry.

“I create traces of totemic creatures, paint visionary characters in magical flight, native scenes in the bright colors of survivance, and you create the same scenes by the tease of words and irony” (Vizenor, *Shrouds* 3; 5-6). Dogroy relates that the name Beaulieu, his surname, is a visionary place, and an actual township on the White Earth Reservation. He creates shrouds of animals and birds, the traces and shadows of natural motion.

“The books have voices. I hear them in the library,” writes Diane Glancy in the first scene of native poetic motion in *Designs of the Night Sky*. “I know the voices are from the books. Yet I know the old stories do not like books. . . . I hear the books. Not with my ears, but in my imagination. Maybe the voices camp in the library because the written words hold them there. Maybe they are captives with no place to go” (Glancy 5).

N. Scott Momaday, the novelist, points out in *The Way to Rainy Mountain* that his grandmother “lived out her long life in the shadow of Rainy Mountain, the immense landscape of the continental interior lay like memory in her blood.” Aho, his grandmother, told stories about the great native migration, a visual journey that continued for some five hundred years. “I wanted to see in reality what she had seem more perfectly in the mind’s eye” (Momaday 7).¹ The stories of that memorable native migration are inadvertent sources of the theory of transmotion, or visionary motion, clearly a trace and presence of native continental liberty.

Yes, transmotion, the presence of visionary narrative voices and stories are overheard at universities, libraries, in the book, and with the same sense of natural motion in nature. Many readers are creative, truly inspired by literary scenes, and enriched by a sense of presence with native voices on great migrations, and the visionary motion of birds and animals. The most memorable stories are in natural motion, but not, of course, with the literary construction of denouement and victimry, or the commercial guidance that writers must turn visionary scenes and natural motion into mere descriptive characters with ideologies and wearisome representations of motivation and development. Native trickster stories start with motion, visionary transmotion, but not the closure of descriptive nominations.

Trickster was going along, and the listener or reader can easily sense and imagine the motion and the visionary transmotion of the story. Some listeners and readers have lost the capacity to appreciate the transmutations of time, gender, water, myths, ironic scenes, and the many mutations of trickster figures by gesture, word, imagination, and tricky maneuvers. These trickster gestures create a sense of visionary motion. The stories of native creation and trickster

scenes were seldom told in the same way, and visionary characters must elude simulations, description, causation, denouement, and cultural victimry. These commercial nominations, along with facile comparative similes, would never inspire or provide a native sense of visionary presence and survivance.

“Call me Ishmael,” an ironic biblical name, and the first sentence of the novel *Moby-Dick* by Herman Melville, is one of many first person voices that are overheard in libraries, trickster stories, and in literary adventures. Melville creates a truly memorable sailor of natural motion and spectacular survivance, and pursues the ironic visionary and moral transcendence of a crippled sea warrior and transmotion of a mighty white whale.

Ishmael is an everlasting trope and trouble of natural motion and transcendence, and the very tease of reality and mortality. “But this deepest fear is not death; he fears that there is nothing beyond our shell of existence; there is no ideal reality beyond the material; there is nothing,” observed John Bryant in “*Moby-Dick* as Revolution.” Nothingness is a paradox, of course, but nothingness is a “universal constant with no higher reality” (Bryant 73).

Herman Melville is a master of the tropes of motion, and he creates an essential sense of visionary motion, or transmotion in almost every scene of *Moby-Dick*, but his mastery and perceptions of natural motion are more direct and descriptive in the chapter “The Tail.” He is noticeably more representative than visionary, and describes five specific motions of the tail. The fifth motion is “the ordinary floating posture” (Melville 373).

Melville's descriptions of the motions of the tail are knowing and necessary, and yet he declares, “The more I consider this mighty tail, the more do I deplore my inability to express it. At times there are gestures in it, which, though they would well grace the hand of many, remain wholly inexplicable.” The motion of the tails may be “mystical gestures.” He concludes the chapter with references to signs and symbols, an ironic conversation “with the world” (374). The cetology and whale tail discourse in this chapter mimic the creative transmotion or the visionary scenes of motion in the novel *Moby-Dick*.

Ishmael related in the first scene of *Moby-Dick* that when he was sidetracked on a dreary day he paused at “coffin warehouses” and then “quietly took to the ship. There is nothing surprising in this,” and “almost all men in their degree, some time or other, cherish very nearly the same feelings towards the ocean with me” (3).

That portrayal of sentiments of the ocean is an obvious invitation to stories of natural motion, and no matter the tease or chance of a whaler, the crease, thrust, and surge of waves, the natural motion of the sea always provides a sublime transcendence of sorrow, cultural closure, and victimry.

“So ignorant are most landsmen of some of the plainest and most palpable wonders of the world,” Ishmael declared, “that without some hints touching the plain facts, historical or otherwise, of the fishery, they might scout at *Moby Dick* as a monstrous fable, or still worse and more deplorable, a hideous and intolerable allegory” (204-5).

The reference to an “intolerable allegory” is a literary gesture that respects the natural motion of the great whale, and not the mere parable or moral stories that reveal an obscure and covert sense of absence and literary closure. *Moby Dick* is a trope of transmotion, and the menace of the mighty white whale outmaneuvers the similes of literary whalers and the missionaries of enlightenment.

Natural motion and transmotion are portrayed in the scenes of the ocean, and sailors in search of whales. *Moby Dick*, the great white whale, however, is an obscure presence in the novel, and the outcome is not an unbearable or mere nihilistic allegory of vengeance or victimry.

Natural motion is a heartbeat, ravens on the wing, the rise of thunderclouds and the mysterious weight of whales. Transmotion is the visionary or creative perceptions of the seasons and the visual scenes of motion in art and literature. The literary portrayal and tropes of transmotion are actual and visual images across, beyond, on the other side, or in another place, and with an ironic and visionary sense of presence. The portrayal of motion is not a simulation of absence, but rather a creative literary image of motion and presence.

Ishmael related that he would paint “without a canvas something like the true form of the whale,” and announced that it was time to prove that some pictures of whales were wrong. It may be that the primal source of all those pictorial delusions will be found among the oldest” sculptures of the Hindus, Egyptians, and Grecians (261-2).

“The French are the lads for painting action,” Ishmael declared, and the “natural aptitude of the French for seizing the picturesqueness of things seems to be particularly evinced in what paintings and engravings they have of their whaling scenes. With not one tenth of England’s experience in the fishery, and not the thousandths part of that of the Americans, they have

nevertheless furnished both nations with the only finished sketches at all capable of conveying the real spirit of the whale hunt.”

The French portrayed scenes of whales with a visionary sense that conveyed transmotion and the surge of the ocean. The “English and American whale draughtsmen seem entirely content with presenting the mechanical outline of things, such as the vacant profile of the whale; which, so far as picturesqueness of effect is concerned, is about tantamount to sketching the profile of a pyramid” (268).

The portrayals of whales that Ishmael so admired were in natural motion, a visionary image that transcended the closure of a “mechanical outline” and created a sense of the presence of whales. He favored the painterly show of transmotion, the surge of the ocean, and likewise revealed the same sense of motion in narratives.

Moby Dick, the great white whale, is a spectacular portrayal of literary transmotion, a spirited and mysterious image of natural motion in the ocean, in the book, and in the imagination of the reader.

“One often hears of writers that rise and swell with their subject,” declared Ishmael. “How then, with me, writing of this Leviathan?” The “mere act of penning my thoughts of this Leviathan, they weary me, and make me faint with their outreaching comprehensiveness of sweep, as if to include the whole circle of the sciences, and all the generations of whales, and men, and mastodons, past, present, and to come, with all the revolving panoramas of empire on earth and throughout the whole universe, not excluding its suburbs” (Melville 447-448).

Rightly so, the great portrayals of whales are in natural motion, the transmotion and “panoramas” of the universe. Likewise the notable diction of the narrator and his astute manner and maneuvers of words created images of the natural motion of science, ideologies, and history. Ishmael created a figurative sweep of humans and whales, and a distinct sense of motion in a narrative of irony and chance.

Moby-Dick is a “mediation on democracy” declared Stephen Zelnick in “*Moby-Dick: The Republic at Sea*.” Consider the scenes of equality in the novel, “the exalted imagery of common workmen. . . .” Ishmael “tells us more about the embattled American experience in liberty and democracy than most have chosen to recognize” (Zelnick 691; 703).

Melville created contentious characters in natural motion, and the scenes of visionary transmotion, political ideologies, moral transcendence, and vengeance were carried out in the spectacular pursuit of the mysterious white whale.

John Bryant asserted in “*Moby-Dick* as Revolution” that the novel “depicts the struggle to understand the relation between the promise of transcendental thought and its abnegating opposite, the fear of nothingness.” *Moby-Dick*, “at first glance. . . seems a revolution almost exclusively in its aesthetic modernity. The long, rhythmic lines, the prose poetry, the mixture of genres and multiplicity of voices, the experiments in point of view, symbolism, and psychology,” however, the “novel’s radical politics seem strangely submerged. Surely, we can extract from the novel’s veil of allegory a prophetic warning that the American ship of state is heading toward the disaster of Civil War” (70).

The narrative structure, chase of whales, luminous waves, and figurative portrayals of the ocean, create a literary sense of natural motion. “Ishmael knows the transcendental problem. He begins in crisis, seeing death,” but “his deepest fear is not death; he fears that there is nothing beyond our shell of existence” and the absence of a reality. “Ishmael takes to sea democratically to confront his fear of nothingness, just as Ahab takes to seas autocratically to kill that fear in the form of the white whale” (Bryant 72).

The Whale by Herman Melville was first published in London in 1851, and later in the same year *Moby-Dick* was published in New York. Melville, once a neglected author, was not widely recognized or celebrated as a literary artist until the end of the First World War. The secure cultural representations of the enlightenment were in ruins at the time, and the breakdown of rational structures and institutions turned many young survivors into extremists, creative storiers, and innovative artists. *Moby-Dick* was discovered in the context of the ruins of empires, rational governance, and the rise of modern abstract art at the end of the First World War.

Melville created a wild whaler, and a direct, expressive narrator of survivance. Ishmael was a sailor portrayed in natural motion, a storier of great ocean waves and exotic scenes of liberty. Ishmael was a sailor of resistance, inspired by chance and transcendence, and he became the sole survivor and storier of the mighty whale Moby Dick, the demise of the tormented and crippled captain Ahab, and the absolute visionary destruction of the whaleship Pequod.

Natural motion and the literature of survivance create a vital and astute sense of presence over absence in stories, art, and literature. “The nature of survivance creates a sense of narrative

resistance to absence, literary tragedy, nihility, and victimry. Native survivance is an active sense of presence over historical absence” (Vizenor, *Native Liberty* 1; 162).

Herman Melville clearly conveyed the natural motion of sailors and the sea, and he portrayed the tease, trouble and havoc of whalers. Ishmael created a sense of presence and situations of transmotion with tropes, diction, character expressions, irony, and comparative scenes. Consider these selected scenes of natural and visionary motion from various chapters of *Moby-Dick*.

But Queequeg, do you see, was a creature in the transition state—neither caterpillar nor butterfly. He was enough civilized to show off his outlandishness in the strangest possible manner. (29-30)

Queequeg is seen as a creature in “transition,” or natural motion, change, and the evolution of an incredible and memorable character of literature.

Thou shalt see it shining in the arm that wields a pick or drives a spike; that democratic dignity which, on all hands, radiates without end from God. (114) The description of the action is direct, the trope wields and drives, and the visionary motion is “democratic dignity.” God surely “radiates” a constant course of eternal splendor and the steady oceanic ironies of whalers.

While their masters, the mates, seemed afraid of the sound of the hinges of their jaws, the harpooners chewed their food with such a relish that there was a report. (150) This ironic scene favors the natural chewing sounds of harpooners over the manners of the masters at sea on the Pequod.

The Sperm Whale blows as a clock ticks, with the same undeviating and reliable uniformity. And thereby whalemens distinguish this fish from other tribes of his genus. (214) The Sperm Whale is distinctive and the natural motion of breath from a blowhole is a reliable count. Melville frequently creates scenes of motion with precise and singular similes, or with comparative images that are common, such as “blows as a clock ticks.”

Now, sometimes, in the Japanese sea, the days in summer are as freshets of effulgences,” Melville writes in Moby-Dick. “That unblinkingly vivid Japanese sun seems the blazing focus of the glassy ocean’s immeasurable burning-glass. The sky looks lacquered; clouds there are none; the horizon floats; and this nakedness of unrelieved radiance is as the insufferable splendors of God’s throne. (487) Melville created some scenes with ornate words, such as “freshets of

effulgences” and “unblinkingly” to enhance the image of motion, or visionary transmotion of the sun and sea near Japan.

Upon the stranger’s shears were beheld the shattered, white ribs, and some few splintered plans, of what had once been a whaleboat; but you now saw through this wreck, as plainly as you see through the peeled, half-unhinged, and bleaching skeleton of a horse. (526) Consider the words “shattered” and “splintered” to recount the whaleboat. These two words create a concise scene of breaking that lingers as an image and then the narrator turns to a comparative phrase, “as plainly as you see,” a verbal gesture to create a new trope, and a sense of motion in the point of view, the peeled and “bleaching skeleton of a horse.”

And thus, through the serene tranquilities of the tropical sea, among waves whose hand-clapping were suspended by exceeding rapture, Moby Dick moved on, still withholding from sight the full terrors of his submerged trunk, entirely hiding the wrenched hideousness of his jaw. (534-35) Moby Dick was a presence in natural motion, and the clapping of waves on a serene tropical sea was “suspended” by “rapture.” The image creates a crucial convergence of natural motion, and the sense of visionary transmotion continues in memory.

Moby Dick swam swiftly round and round the wrecked crew; sideways churning the water in his vengeful wake, as if lashing himself up to still another and more deadly assault. . . . Meanwhile Ahab half smothered in the foam of the whale’s insolent tail, and too much of a cripple to swim,--though he could still keep afloat, even in the heart of such a whirlpool as that; helpless Ahab’s head was seen, like a tossed bubble which the least chance shock might burst. (537) Moby Dick was in natural motion and the narrator portrays the scene with a direct, ordinary, poetic, and rhythmic phrase, “round and round the wrecked crew.” The first image is common, “round and round,” and then the water churns in a vengeful scene.

So suddenly seen in the blue plain of the sea, and relieved against the still bluer margin of the sky, the spray that he raised, for the moment, intolerably glittered and glared like a glacier; and stood there gradually fading and fading away from the first sparkling intensity, to the dim mistiness of an advancing shower in a vale. (544-45) The “blue plains of the sea” is a magical poetic scene in the natural motion of memory. Bluer yet against the sky, and then in visionary transmotion “glittered and glared like a glacier” and faded away “to a dim mistiness of an advancing shower in a vale.”

Suddenly the waters around them slowly swelled in broad circles; they quickly upheaved, as if sideways sliding from a submerged berg of ice, swiftly rising to the surface. . . . Shrouded in a thin drooping veil of mist, it hovered for a moment in the rainbowed air; and then fell swamping back into the deep. Crushed thirty feet upwards, the waters flashed for an instant like heaps of fountains, then brokenly sank in a shower of flakes, leaving the circling surface creamed like new milk round the marble trunk of the whale. (555) Melville once again creates the natural motion of the ocean. Ishmael the narrator was a master of these images, and mainly when he observes the uncertainty of an expansive sea slowly swelling in “broad circles.” The poetic images and visionary transmotion of this scene are magnificent, the shrouds and veils of mist and “rainbowed air” are the mysterious motion of *Moby Dick*. The rise of the great white whale “crushed thirty feet upwards” and with “heaps of fountains” leaves the surface of the sea “creamed like new milk round the marble trunk of the whale.”

Herman Melville portrayed the marvelous character Ishmael as a painter might have done with natural hues of visionary motion, with memorable scenes and tropes of transmotion, and with a sense of survivance over victimry.

Gerald Vizenor, September 21, 2014.

Notes

¹ A fuller discussion in *Manifest Manners*, 57.

Works Cited

Addiss, Stephen. *The Art of Haiku*. Boston: Shambhala, 2012. Print.

Bryant, John. “*Moby-Dick* as Revolution.” *The Cambridge Companion to Herman Melville*, ed.

Robert S. Levine. Cambridge University Press, 1998. 65-90. Print.

Densmore, Frances. *Chippewa Music*. Minneapolis: Ross & Haines, 1973. Print.

Glancy, Diane. *Designs of the Night Sky*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002. Print.

Issa, Kobayashi. *The Year of My Life. Ogara Haru*, translated by Nobuyuki Yuasa. Berkeley:

University of California Press, 1960. Print.

Jensen, Toni. “At the Powwow Hotel.” *From the Hilltop*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010. 55-68. Print.

Melville, Herman. *Moby-Dick*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976. Print.

Momaday, N. Scott. *The Way to Rainy Mountain*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1969. Print.

Silko, Leslie Marmon. *Ceremony*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1977. Print.

Vizenor, Gerald. *Native Liberty: Natural Reason and Cultural Survivance*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. Print.

----. *Shrouds of White Earth*. Albany: State University of New York Press, Excelsior Edition, 2010. Print.

----. Ed. *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994. Print.

Zelnick, Stephen. "Moby-Dick: the Republic at Sea." *Moby-Dick, Herman Melville*, ed. Mary R. Reichardt. San Francisco, California: Ignatius Press, 2011. Print.

KANSAS

DIANE GLANCY

According to [the physicist, Richard] Feynman, a system has not just one history but every possible history—
THE GRAND DESIGN, Stephen Hawking

There is land and sky and the car passing between them making a small rip in the passage as it goes. The moving car unzips the sky from the land. I remember this as a child. The oppressive life in my house opened to the land.

In the early days, we traveled from Kansas City to my grandparent's farm near Fulton. Then my father was transferred to packing houses across the great plains. Slaughter houses they were called. The cattle entered and were killed. 1. The cutting off. 2. The slitting of sky from land.

It was a hollow place between parents. 3. Feudal and 4. futile. The starkness of their lives. The land. The sky. The grass between them.

My moving life continued moving when my father's transfers continued— 5. Kansas City, 6. Indianapolis, 7. St. Louis, 8. Reading, 9. Kansas City, 10. St. Joseph, 11. Denver, 12. Chicago, 13. Sioux City.

My great ship of exploration was a moving van. 14. Atlas. 15. Mayflower.

I had more than one beginning. I have travels from multiple beginnings. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30.

Kansas is named after an Indian tribe. The name means 31. *people of the wind*, though I remember hearing it also meant 32. *blue smoke* from Indian campfires on the prairie. Kansas became a state in 1861.

In travel, I become the moving place that distance is. Driving the land has every possible history encamped in rock and stone and soil and voices smack against the windshield. Smackie. Smackie.

Have I ever known who I am— but in the placement of thought in travel? Travel is the establishment of a moving place so I can't be swallowed by storms that thunder. I can be 33. one place, then 34. another.

Travel is a map of connections. A group of correlations in the (t)rip. My mother was born in Hume, Missouri on the Missouri / Kansas border. My father was born in Viola, Arkansas and died in Sioux City, Iowa. The moving car exhumes the past. It is a travel of associations. 35. Exhaust and 36. exhumation. 37. Pastward and 38. forward to every possible future—

The Next Wave of Native American Writing?

Jawort, Adrian L. Ed. *Off the Path: An Anthology of 21st Century Montana American Indian Writers*. Billings, MT: Off the Pass Press, 2014.

<https://www.facebook.com/pages/Off-the-Pass-Press-LLC/656769057706973>

It's hard not to be hyperbolic about this book. This new anthology grabs an Indigenous literary baton and runs with it in full stride. A new generation of Native American writers in Montana bursts on the scene. Indeed, their short fiction claims to open a new perspective, a chosen new trail in *Off the Path*. I won't presume in this short review to fully map or name what is or is not new about it—that will take later literary historians—but I'll open with that question. The dark stories in this volume are suffused with reservation blues, and as Sherman Alexie has explained, such music is a song of mourning that is also a song of celebration. If transmotion shifts things with a certain trickster temper, with flair and force and precision, then this collection is an act of transmotion. It bends, deconstructs, and transcends certain hierarchies and categories. It plays with gender and race and class, even as it pushes on right and wrong, communal and singular, life and death. As it does so it moves the reader into new perceptions—like showing us that ravens are not black but blue.

If one mark of a good story is how it breaks into the reader, how it stays with you, how it carves new synapses in your brain and body, then this collection has nine pretty good ones. These short fictions by five young Montana writers work beyond merely moving you to tears or frightening you or renewing your sense of understanding. They haul you into material realities of reservation life and thought rare in print yet familiar in Indian Country. Incisive and original voices inhabit a painfully candid set of human stories behind the statistics. The prose lives inside scenes of community pathology and strength, violence, addiction, abuse, insight, and quiet, compelling realization.

The significance of this contribution to Indigenous publishing is both aesthetic and political. It consciously aims to add another stark chapter in American Indian literature, and it does so with convincing force. The new press's website describes the stories as "beautifully bleak." Editor, publisher, and writer Adrian L. Jawort launched this series, *Off the Path*, with Vol. 1 as *An Anthology of 21st Century Montana American Indian Writers*. Transmotion resonates in the title itself, clearly setting out to open new ground, as well as in the title's playful near-confusion with the name of the publishing house: Off the Pass Press LLC.

Yes, the website offthepasspressllc.com has a tendency toward campy, self-satirizing hyperbole. Jawort has announced the imminent Volume II, adding "and Indigenous" to the subtitle and going global: "Off the Path Volume II continues to forge a new trail to a place your mind has never been. Up and coming contemporary writers from the Northern Plains, the American Southwest, Hawaii, and on over to New Zealand are represented in this powerful book." In addition, Jawort's noir novel, *Moonrise Falling*, is scheduled as well, which he describes as "wild and sure to offend!" In an interview with Craig Lancaster, Jawort says that upcoming volumes in the series include a "female Native writer anthology edited by Cinnamon Spear," plus a poetry anthology.

Jawort is confident and convincing about his approach to publication as an independent press, which in the digital era simply cannot be equated with vanity publishing. Grassroots publishing might be a better term, or democratic publishing. As Jawort explains in an interview, “But why wait for someone else to give us permission to go forward, you know?” A dynamic of transmotion works first in the project itself as a series, which feels like a phenomenon, an event. There is room on these pages for another layer of copy editing to filter out some minor typos, but this is literary activism, legitimated for the bookstore market by its LLC business license and its own ISBN bar code numbers. “The faster production and lower costs of getting books these days out were certainly huge factors,” he explains, revealing another subversive stratagem of transmotion in this project. “I’ve studied the publishing industry closely for years and there have rapid and major changes lately like ebooks that big publishing houses have been slow to grasp because nothing much changed with the status quo for decades but the names, and they were the proverbial gatekeepers and that was that... but now it’s easier to merely take all of those middlemen out and speed up the process and do things like hire your own freelance editors or cover designers if need be, et cetera. With diligent work, I was able to get out a high quality, handsomely printed product that does justice to the content within. And although ebooks are free to make, a print book has seemed to be by far the preferred reading medium of Montanans at least.” As he goes global with Volume II, it will be interesting to see if ebooks outpace print.

The accomplished young writers in this inaugural volume seem as fascinating as the stories themselves, and we can be grateful to Jawort as editor and publisher for bringing them to center stage. As Jawort mentions of his model, “the late and great Montana Blackfeet and Gros Ventre writer James Welch” in the book’s introduction, “it was writing about what he knew as an American Indian growing up in his ancestral and present day territory that ultimately propelled him to literary eminence.” Welch’s realistic, seemingly non-fictional dynamic is intensified and complicated here by seven of the nine pieces being in first-person point of view, the other two in similarly limited third-person. However convincingly autobiographical this prose may seem, it is accomplished fiction rather than autobiography.

Perhaps this intensely gritty personal voice is the next wave, following on Sherman Alexie and Debra Earling and so many others, who themselves followed on the now canonical generation of Momaday, Vizenor, Welch, Silko, et al, many of whom are still writing at the height of their powers. Indeed, this volume amplifies the kind of exposure of the reservation underbelly that Louise Erdrich offers recently in her fourteenth novel, *The Round House*, focusing on violence and abuse. When asked by interviewer Craig Lancaster what had been missing from western writing about reservations, Jawort explained, “Our own specific voices as told by younger Natives themselves. Although we Natives have, respectfully, Sherman Alexie and Louise Erdrich and older writers representing us on the best seller lists, their experiences don’t mirror our own, and I wanted to showcase rising talent... Reservations and tribes may be similar in many ways in that we can always relate on some base level, but to note Natives as one singular conglomerate and say ‘Alexie speaks for all of us!’ is to negate all of those factors like language and cultural beliefs unique to individual tribes, and would be like claiming England and Germany and France are all alike just because they’re mostly white people.” Jawort suggests more layers of personal, generational, cultural, and national discourse emerging in this prose. The reasoning of his project is not unlike music production on the reservations, where for a generation young artists have been producing digital recordings of Hopi hiphop, Navajo heavy metal, and Lakota blues.

So on the way to the fiction let's take a look at the five contributors before we discuss their absorbing prose.

Jawort (Northern Cheyenne) is a veteran journalist who writes for various indie newspapers as well as for national periodicals such as *Cowboys & Indians*, *Native Peoples*, and *Indian Country Today Media Network*. He offers three of the nine stories here, in addition to a short, open-hearted introduction to the volume, inviting readers to “hop on this war pony of life and take a ride to a place you've never been.” As editor, Jawort addresses insiders also: “For those of you who do know these places and feel these characters from your own personal trials and tribulations, I hope this helps tell your story as well.” He describes how these writers have journeyed away from home and back, and how, “while away from it they experienced revelations about how truly unique their homeland is, as other people were truly fascinated and yearned to hear more about the area they came from.” It's a generous invitation, though gentler than some of the rough terrain in the pages themselves. I'm reminded of the contrast, noted by many of us who met the late Jim Welch, between the author's warm personality and his cold narratives. This is, however another generation. As Jawort says, “... this anthology will nonetheless open a portal into that world as told from one living in the 21st Century—because it is a unique viewpoint.”

Cinnamon Spear (Northern Cheyenne) also offers three tales. The notes on contributors explain that as “the only student from Lame Deer High School to receive an Ivy League education, she regularly returns as a motivational speaker for youth.” If anything, her bachelors and masters degrees from Dartmouth College give voice in her fiction to even more heart and vulnerability. She writes with a level of honesty that reaches healing proportions. Her profile is telling: “As she flew back and forth between poverty and privilege (both states existing on and off the reservation), Spear realized that her super-exposed, bi-cultured hybrid state allowed her to teach the world about the Northern Cheyenne people, and likewise, to teach her people about the world.” If her stories have an instructive edge, it is not didactic, but dramatic and lyrical even as it looks forthrightly through brutality and anguish.

Luella Brien (Apsáalooké/Crow), a graduate in journalism from the University of Montana with numerous writing awards, has worked for *reznetnews.org*, *The Ravalli Republic*, and *The Billings Gazette*. Now, as the contributors' notes put it, she “serves her community as a communication arts instructor at Little Big Horn College in Crow Agency,” one of the three dozen long-standing institutions in the tribal college network nationwide. That professional engagement is a measure of the intimate community engagement that animates hers and the other pieces in this collection.

As with some of the others in this anthology, I've attended readings by Eric BigMan Brien (Apsáalooké/ Crow) here in Missoula. In a bookstore panel, he wore a shiny grey-green suit and a porkpie hat, and bore a stage presence that certainly lived up to his name. His bio in the “About the Authors” section is also worth quoting: “He credits his numerous teachers, Grandmother Beverly and sister Luella as those who have inspired him to write. When he is not writing he moonlights as an Elvis impersonator and enjoys reading religious tracts, travel brochures and medical pamphlets. He is fond of Carnivals and Cosplay, and describes being a member of the Crow Native American tribe as, ‘Swell.’” The irony of that sincerity is its own story. Such undercurrents of self-reflective humor and irony, sometimes cryptic, sometimes loud, rise out of the dramatic and traumatic depths in each entry of the collection.

Sterling HolyWhiteMountain (Blackfeet), also a graduate of the University of Montana, holds a Master of Creative Writing from the prestigious Iowa Writers' Workshop and was a James C. McCreight Fiction Fellow at the University of Wisconsin. As the notes explain, "he lived the first part of his life according to the laws of the local basketball religion" on the Blackfeet Reservation. Currently he has returned to UM to work toward an additional bachelor's degree in Native American Studies. His is the final story in the anthology, and indeed it rounds out the collection thematically, as I will suggest below.

Jawort's project to publish a series for contemporary Indigenous voices launches here from his Montana ground, and these five young writers indeed set a remarkable standard. There's a magnetic quality to their prose, each charged by polarities of professional stylistic accomplishment, on the one hand, and unique, expressive realism, on the other. Montana has a long literary tradition, both Native and non-Native, and this anthology bodes well for the future of the art.

So let's look at their offerings.

Cinnamon Spear's first story "God's Plan," opening the volume like a slap in the face, is an inside look at the morning after another "Friday night tornado" of drunken domestic abuse when her mother has again been brutalized. It is a harrowing and perfect emotional map through the eyes of a daughter who understands her father as victimizer and her mother as victim all too well. With quiet dramatic intensity, the traumatized narrator is trying to gauge whether her father, a "blood vein-bulging, raging lunatic from the night before," might again "wake up being the soft-spoken nice guy who wants to take the kids fishing." Perhaps because of its realistic emotional poignancy, the narrative conveys not only the numbing "carnage" wreaked upon her mother's body, not only the twisted parental manipulation of the children, and not only the bitter failure of prayer, but also the girl's strength to "never ever forgive him for as long as I lived."

Her second piece, entitled "Sweetheart," profiles "a young, motivated, drug and alcohol free, 'goody two shoes' kind of girl"—who falls "insanely in love" with a "kingpin drug dealer" doing time in federal prison. She keeps justifying her delusional adventure by insisting, "He was a sweetheart." The story works on several levels, satirizing such an adoring crush with its clichéd language of love under the close watch of prison guards during visiting hours, and marking predictable pitfalls of addictive romance even as it affirms a certain desperate freedom.

Spear's third offering, "Bloody Hands," probes at the impact of a teenage pregnancy on a family, through the eyes of an older sister off at college. She clearly maps the alienated domestic terrain, "Imagining what the space between my sister and mom looked like" and "how far away my dad could set himself emotionally and physically from what was happening." Operating on the fundamental meaning of kinship, the prose segues naturally to family questions of abortion and sacrifice, of how to succeed with and without community support. Through it all, there remains a tangible personality in the narrative voice. Without any pretense or theatrics, Spear validates kinship in both its tragic absence and its understated presence.

Jawort's three pieces in the collection take a strangely refreshing and light-hearted, if uncanny, look at the afterlife, murder, and suicide, respectively. His lucid, and contemplative prose brings these topics out of the shadows into a remarkable sense of humanity. Without waxing

metaphysical, he invokes spiritual ethics. In “He Doesn’t Know He’s Dead Yet,” the narrator decides that the first anniversary of his brother’s murder is the time to quit drinking with him and to let him know he’s dead. “Tonight I think I’ll tell him.” We never know for sure if it’s the narrator or the deceased who is living—or dying—in an illusion. Jawort doesn’t overwork the ambiguity. Instead, he lets it resonate into unspoken levels, allowing without comment that other people did “seem to notice” the dead brother “—at least some of the time—and even acknowledged him. That at least made me feel not so schizophrenic... I’d have to come straight out with it.” As a kind of extended joke, the effect on the reader can be both heartening and disorienting.

The longest piece in the collection, “Where Custer Last Slept” by Jawort, could become a powerful film script—as could several of these stories. This one is a complex portrait of an interracial group of friends dealing with a vicious bully in their midst, even as it portrays rez party night life on the open prairie, near the Little Bighorn Battlefield. In the aura of that historical context, the voices in this narrative face the most sinister of dilemmas. There are echoes here of Welch’s *Fools Crow* facing the threat of the evil *napikwan*, the white hunter who wastes his kill. At the denouement, the narrator explains, “I guess it was just a story that needed to be told—needed to be let out of my blood. However, I see no reason to ‘pretty it up’ by excluding the alcohol and drug references or violence to make myself or anyone else seem noble... I hope this finally puts my restless mind at ease. I hope the ghosts will let me as well as themselves rest now. Most of all, I want people to know that this story did happen, and lives on some little reservation town where General George Armstrong Custer last slept are forever different—for better or worse—because of it.” It’s brilliant realism, beyond “suspension of disbelief” into a realm of restless questioning in the reader’s, if not the writer’s, mind.

In “The Stereo Typer,” Jawort takes us inside the agonizingly ironic mind of a homeless suicide: “She was the epitome of the starving artist.” The remarkable drama is entirely internal. Having blown her college career, “pretty much decimated her education prospects for the foreseeable future,” by getting “busted for having marijuana on her in an essentially illegal search and seizure” during finals week, “She got out of jail to a cold reception of nothing...” Even her alcoholic mom resents her, ““And now you think you’re better than me? Going to some college? You watch now, you won’t amount to nothing!” But she feels guilty for having had to punch her way out of the abuse: “She never felt so good, so liberated, and so sickened at the same time in her life. She’d defended herself finally, but at what cost? No one should ever hit their own mother like that, no matter what they’d done. Geezus.” The roller coaster of her thoughts includes an appropriate literary allusion from Tennyson’s “The Lotus-Eaters” and her ominous comment “What a lovely poem to die to.” Then she veers to bizarre self-assertion: “Most normal girls attempted suicide as lame cries for help and never succeeded, but she wasn’t like them.” Strangely, inside the insecure egotism there remains a faith in herself, in the face of such disasters.

Luella Brien’s remarkable “Green-Eyed Regret” starts and ends with seventeen-year-old Maddy lying “on the concrete thinking she was cold.... Yearning for a blanket... she never made the connection that she was cold because of the excessive amount of blood she’d lost.” The story of a fractured prom night, bracketed neatly in death, is split along a racial divide that turns romance into senseless, even unconscious violence. It’s another measure of endemic brutality in

reservation life, even as the prose is punctuated with great lines throughout where we learn to feel Maddy's promise and pain: "As her spirit escaped towards the thin layer of clouds covering the stars, she became the statistic she never wanted to be." "The tension between cowboys and Indians was palpable and Maddy never knew which side of the battle she was on." Of her parents: "An Indian rodeo queen and a white cowboy? It just didn't seem like it'd be even plausible. So he left with a bit of guilt, but it was nothing a few beers couldn't cure." "Madeline Jean Thompson was born with green eyes and freckles. It was enough to make Sydney hate her baby instantly. She hated her so much that she gave her the lanky cowboy's last name." Of grandma: "She never made her only grandchild feel bad for not being Indian enough; her mother did that all the time." Maddy's family residue grows more convoluted: "But she didn't want to watch as the meth ate her mother away like she was a walking corpse.... People whispered about her mom's beauty like it was a ghost that haunted the town.... Maddy couldn't quite figure out how having a baby could ruin someone's life 17 years later." And as the plot thickens: "He only drank on the weekends and his parents were still actually married. For any other girl he was a catch. He wrote sad, sad poetry about the Creator and owls or coyotes. He wanted to grow up to be a tribal chairman. It made Maddy want to gag. But she kept telling herself that he was a catch, and even if she couldn't stand his self-serving political dreams and stereotypical Indian poetry, she stayed with him. She smiled and played the part. Besides, the prom was coming up." The limited possibilities constrict the clear intelligence of the narrative voice. It's again an affirmation of strength in spite of radical loss.

Eric Brien's excerpt from a novella, "My Brother's Keeper," is another confident, unique voice. It drives the reader along with lively, well-timed dialogue, mostly an early-morning telephone conversation between the narrator and his estranged, dying brother, but it is punctuated by erudite and ironic asides. "After 30 years I still recognized my brother Solomon's incredibly thick and unnecessary Crow accent. What I mean by 'unnecessary' is that our mother never actually spoke the Crow language, and our white father was unknown to us.... My brother in English, however, always sounded like he was teaching the oral traditions around a campfire for tourists; and it always seemed more well-rehearsed and got even stoically deeper when he thought he was saying something especially profound." Brien's critique of self-inflicted stereotypes echoes Sherman Alexie's sarcasm televised on *60 Minutes* (in 2001) about Indians playing Indian for white audiences: "It's that whole 'corn pollen, four directions, Mother Earth, Father Sky' Indian thing where everybody starts speaking slowly, and their vocabulary shrinks down until they sound like Dick and Jane. And it's all about spirituality, and it's all about politics...." Brien's application of this irony is particularly telling in its brusqueness, because the "annoying" brother's phone call, after thirty years of resentful silence, announces a pending death. "This was already a long day of questions, and it was just starting." It's a compelling and intriguing start to the novella that I want to get my hands on.

The final piece in the collection doesn't answer questions neatly either, but as a coming-of-age story it underlines the challenges and questions and values at work throughout the volume. "The Education of Little Man False Star Boy" by Sterling HolyWhiteMountain combines teenage longing with the persistent trauma of violent death on the reservation, plus poignant feeling and gestures of traditional Indigenous respect, and finally with a reminder of what everyone there is really living and dying for: the land and the people on the land.

Appropriately, the tale earns its ageless value of Indigenous ground through irony, inaugurated in the first line: “That was the summer I got the one and only claim check of my life and spent my own small piece of the Sweetgrass Hills.” It was also a summer of unrequited love followed by an ample sexual education. On turning 18 in their graduating year, he and his friends receive “settlement money,” each spending it on a new set of wheels—by which too many die in drunken car accidents that first year out of school. “I wrote out the names of the dead on a piece of paper. I counted them up and tried to picture each of their faces. I put checks next to the ones who were related to me. I put an x next to the ones who had died in a claim check car.”

As his uncle eventually educates the narrator, “Claim checks are settlement money, he said. Money to us from the government to make up for not paying for all that land the first time. So think of it like this—every cent you spend is you spending your piece of those hills. That’s what that money is. Pretty weird, enit.” As the narrator begins to grasp the sinister history tainting that money, and as he tries “to give my last hundred to my grandpa,” the beloved old man refuses. “I don’t want nothing to do with that money, he said. Let me pay the phone bill, then, I said. Nope, he said. Go pay somebody else’s bills. So I did—I paid my auntie’s phone bill...” At the finale, again with precise absurdity, he gives the remainder away to a mooching cousin, who gestures, “Bro, I’ll get you back for it, he said.... Don’t worry about it, I said. I don’t want it anymore. He smiled his huge smile. Now that’s a good Indin, he said.”

The words perfectly express the perfect irony. In his political and cultural awakening to the value of the land—in its absence—his rejection of blood money for that land is misinterpreted by his cousin as traditional generosity. Like Welch’s Fools Crow who grows beyond his childhood name of White Man’s Dog, here the narrator has grown from Little Man to False Star Boy, a name with—now ironic—sacred resonance in Blackfeet mythology. It’s a fine mixture of rugged rez life, told through the eyes of an acute observer and participant, punctuated with nuggets of wisdom and vulnerability. Plus humor, as the narrator’s grandfather sums it up: “Not much is funny... but you got to laugh anyway.”

Driven by this energetic momentum of *Off the Pass Press*—and its Whitmanesque self-promotion (“Without missing a stride from the original and beautifully bleak Montana-based *Off the Path*... Volume II continues to forge a new trail to a place your mind has never been”)—there may be two or three more new publications by the time this review posts. That publishing energy is its own transmotion. It affirms the ancient and post-postmodern, postindian art of tricking boundaries. It navigates the world’s judgments, expectations, and divisions with a clear eye, where personal and political, artistic and historical, new and old, mind and matter, right and wrong, alienation and compassion move.

David L. Moore, University of Montana

Works cited

Lancaster, Craig. "Going off the Path with Adrian Jawort." Craig Lancaster. N.p., 20 June 2014. Web. 29 Jan. 2015.

The Song Maps of Craig Santos Perez

Perez, Craig Santos. *from unincorporated territory [hacha]*. Kaneohe: Tinfo Press, 2008.

<http://tinforess.com/?projects=from-unincorporated-territory>

Perez, Craig Santos. *from unincorporated territory [saina]*. Richmond, CA: Omnidawn, 2010. 136 pp.

<http://www.omnidawn.com/products-page/current/from-unincorporated-territory-saina-craig-santos-perez/>

Perez, Craig Santos. *from unincorporated territory [guma']*. Richmond, CA: Omnidawn, 2014. 96 pp.

<http://www.omnidawn.com/products-page/current/from-unincorporated-territory-gumacraig-santos-perez/>

In Micronesia there is a tradition that some islanders have kept, but that Chamorros, the natives of the Mariana Islands, lost due to colonization long ago: the creation of song maps. After journeys were completed, a song would be created that would weave geographic, biological, and sensory elements together in order to form a map. These songs would take on features such as the stars, the color of the water, the features of shorelines, changes in clouds, the songs of birds. So long as these songs were remembered and passed on, a return journey was always possible. You could find your way back there, even generations later.

The work of Chamorro poet Craig Santos Perez in his series *from unincorporated territory: [hacha]*, *[saina]*, and *[guma']* represents a similar technique. Through his poetry, he weaves together different languages, citations, and spatial configurations in order to challenge old maps and to retrace the steps of Chamorros through their ancient past and challenge the ways in which key points on that journey have come to be represented, remembered, or forgotten. In challenging colonialist, Eurocentric maps, he is also in essence creating new song maps meant to lead Chamorros in new directions in terms of their consciousness and their identity. His work represents a poetic and a political decolonization, whereby the sites that once constricted and constrained us can now help us imagine our liberation.

The *from unincorporated territory* books share an emphasis on Chamorro history and language, chronicling both the centuries of foreign colonization and the myriad forms of native resistance. Interspersed in his poems are lines from conversations with his elders, found textual objects, and collaged documents of many kinds: footnotes, theoretical essays on poetry and postcolonialism, government edicts, religious texts and others. A common focus in his poetry is the commodifying aspects of Guam's tourist economy and the dangerous realities of Guam being a strategically important base for the United States.

These themes also link the Chamorro people to many other island nations in the Pacific suffering under continuing U.S. imperialism, including Perez's current home of Hawai'i, where he is the

director of the creative writing program at the University of Hawai'i in Manoa. Perez writes, in *[saina]*, his second book, “no page is ever terra nullius—each page infused with myth legends talk story—” (65). He is arguing for a poetics informed by postcolonial theory in which the Chamorro archipelago, and other Pacific islands, are viewed not as virgin territory to be discovered and plundered by foreigners, but as distinct, sovereign states with their own civilization and culture long in place.

His words remind us of where we have been and of things we may have forgotten or learned not to remember, and, in doing so, he pushes us into directions we have not considered for centuries. Even a foreign reader not familiar with Chamorro culture, language, or politics will experience life under the weight of imperialism when reading or studying Perez's work—the experience of colonialism, and of decolonizing activism.

A passage from his first work, *[hacha]*, provides a key insight into the theoretical underpinnings of all three books. He writes:

On some maps, Guam doesn't exist; I point to an empty space in the Pacific and say, “I'm from here.” On some maps, Guam is a small unnamed island; I say, “I'm from this unnamed place.” On some maps, Guam is named “Guam U.S.A.” I say, “I'm from a territory of the United States.” On some maps, Guam is named, simply, “Guam”; I say, “I am from Guam.”

Guam is a place that is small compared to most nations in the world but large compared to most islands in the Pacific. Although it has been on the maps of Europeans longer than any others in the Pacific, its existence has always been in flux, in more ways than one. In *[hacha]*, Perez produces a map formed of the list of names that Guam has had or been given by Europeans and other invaders on their maps over the centuries. They range from the Guåhan to Isla de los Ladrones, San Juan, Bahan, and “first province of the great ocean.” In addition to those he lists, there are forty other variations of Guam's name that appear on European maps.

This lability of meaning is not simply a list of mistakes, but part of Guam's colonial past and present. The undecipherability of meaning for the island, the in-between nature of it, is not a misperception, but it is the truth of its formal existence. As a longtime colony, Guam's meaning is flexible and moves constantly between the invisible and the hypervisible. Guam is, after all, the first in the Pacific to be colonized and one of the last now yet to be “free.” It is both a tourist paradise for Asian travelers and a military fortress. For the United States, it is a location that is foreign in a domestic sense. It is both a tiny, insignificant dot on the map and one which global security analyst John Pike argues the US can use to rule the world.

Guam is a place that represents itself as where America's day begins, but you will not find it on the flag or even included on most maps of the US. A place which boasts the highest per capita enlistment in the US military forces, but whose residents don't even get (the pretense) to vote for their commander in chief. Through his three books, Perez draws out the contradictions in Guam's existence. Challenging on the one hand its invisibility, but also the hypervisibility that is derived from US military strategic interests whereby it becomes the USS *Guam*, Fortress Guam, an Unsinkable Aircraft Carrier.

Perez draws on many different voices from Guåhan. He brings in conversations with his elders in his family, government documents, history books, song lyrics, quotes, and poems. His use of “Guam Mentions” is particularly apt: instances, oftentimes ephemeral, momentary, or even slips

of the tongue, where Guam is somehow, in some foreign context, invoked or mentioned. For most academics, these mentions would be meaningless, but, as I have argued, for a place where its formal existence is an obscene liability, those moments carry the trace of Guam's colonization. They expose aspects of Guam's reality as a historical and contemporary colony.

The phrase that Perez constantly untangles and reweaves in his work—"put Guam on the map"—is oftentimes used on Guåhan itself, firstly for the arrival of Magellan during his attempt to circumnavigate the globe in 1521. As Guåhan was the first island in the Pacific to be found by Europeans, it represents the tip of the so-called spear of modernity in the region. That idea of being put on the map is analogous to realizing the promises of modernity. Chamorros entangled in a colonial framework feel compelled to reenact that scene of "being seen" again. As a result, Chamorros can sometimes retrace their lives through the Guam Mentions that they have collected. They can recall the names of Bob Hope, Gloria Estefan, Johnny Carson, Ben Stiller, Hank Johnson, Howard Stern, Mariah Carey, and others who have mocked Guam or mentioned it in movies. There is a colonizing dependency here that Perez seeks to dismantle. Missionaries and explorers supposedly "discovered" us. They "gave" us modern meaning: without them we would be too obviously part of the obscene underbelly of modernity, and so we must continue to crave the gaze of the colonizer in order to continue to exist and move forward into the future.

Across his three books, Perez reminds us of what these perverted maps of meaning look like. In *[hacha]*, he reproduces maps that show Guam as crossroads in the Pacific, linking together the West and the East. Maps that show battlefields during World War II. Maps that show the fact that 29% of Guam's 212 square miles are US military facilities off-limits to the island's ancestral people. In both *[saina]* and *[guma']*, he continues to create maps, albeit not through literal reproductions but instead helping to illustrate Guam's place in the maps of US strategic interests in the Pacific and maps on colonial/imperial violence from Spanish, American and Japanese sources.

But Perez's intent, as already mentioned, is to go beyond these maps to create new ones. His use of Guam Mentions subverts the colonial "common sense" and instead accurately connects the gaze of the colonizer not to possibility but to impossibility, to trauma, to damage, to loss. In *[guma']*, he quotes Ezra Pound, whose Guam Mention is both bewildering and insulting. During World War II, when the Japanese were massacring and enslaving the Chamorro people, Pound proposed giving Japan the island of Guåhan as a spoil of war in exchange for films of *Noh* theater. The colonial structure of Guam's relationship to the U.S. is clear in this mention, as the island and its people matter little, but exist to be used and traded off by poets seeking Japanese culture or imperial powers seeking strategic nodes on military maps.

Perez seeks to turn the reader away from those mythical maps of modernity, whereby inclusion and assimilation lead to viability and universality. He seeks to push them in new directions not beset by those limiting politics of recognition. While his colonial citations challenge, he includes a number of native Chamorro citations as well, which change from conversations with his grandparents to discussions of Chamorro culture during different epochs. The Chamorro language often provides the basis for these alternative paths, like echoing sonar, leading us through layers of language and time. Even if the poems are primarily in English, many of them are written atop foundational Chamorro terms, such as *hånom* (water), *unai* (sand), *tåno'* (land), *tåsi* (ocean). These archetypal terms are meant to reclaim things, most importantly the land and

the sea, which have long been claimed to belong to the imperialist fist of the U.S. but for thousands of years have truly belonged to the Chamorro people.

Guam's visibility is heavily dependent upon its militarization, the history of it being used for military purposes by the United States. For Chamorros the land is *tāno'*, *tano'-hu* (my land), *lina'la'* (life), but for the US, it is territory, a base, a colony to be utilized. But as the island, its land, its people are weighted beneath layers of colonial ideology, this requires the kind of unpacking that Perez does. One cannot just try to re-signify the meaning, but must rearticulate it, change the hue from colonial to decolonial, move the land from something that is used to project power for another to something that sustains and nurtures life.

On the surface of representation, Guam appears to exude American benevolence and excellence. It is a site of American victory over the Japanese in WWII. It is a base that has played a key role in every American conflict in the name of "freedom" and "democracy" in Asia and the Middle East since 1945. It is a minefield of American patriotism, where the largest holiday each year is "Liberation Day" meant to commemorate the American expulsion of the Japanese and celebrate America's ability to fight for freedom. Perez works hard, over the course of all three books, to challenge this particular false representation of Chamorros and their island by representing Guam not just as a place of American victories and patriotism, but also one inundated with Spam and brown tree snakes.

Spam and brown tree snakes don't signify glorious gain, but instead loss—the loss of beauty, health, vitality, sustainability. The brown tree snake is a pest that was brought into Guam accidentally by the US military, which led to the wiping out of most of the island's native bird population. In *[hacha]*, Perez provides an analogy between the death of a treasured relative and the arrival of the brown tree snake. In "descending plumeria," he places on the bottom of the page information on the brown tree snake and its deadly environmental impacts, as he recounts the loss of his cousin who created beautiful artwork that has faded over the years. In *[guma']*, several passages talk about the centrality of Spam to contemporary Chamorro culture. The meat came into the island after World War II, and, along with other lifestyle and diet changes, has led to numerous health problems for Chamorros.

This theoretical intervention is also found in *[saina]*. While Perez cites various texts that represent Chamorro patriotism and eager participation in the American war machine, he fills *[saina]* with the names of soldiers from Micronesia (Guåhan and the other islands around it) who have been killed while serving in America's "War of Terror." He crosses out the information that surrounds their names, as to how they died, leaving only their names untouched. It is a reminder to not be caught up in the metrics by which islanders sometimes judge themselves, as being small and not really mattering. Guåhan and the other islands in Micronesia boast both the highest rates of enlistment and also the highest killed-in-action statistics per capita. We are encouraged not to remember these names and these people in the context of their military service but as our neighbors and friends. Perez's critique exposes the cost of their participation and prompts us to understand that our island's forced participation may be too high.

Many would position Perez's work as being "diasporic." He articulates his own positionality as such, in the way he talks about his youth being spent in Guam, but formative years being spent in California and now Hawai'i. Many commentators would argue that the maps that he is developing are part of his reconnection to his "home." These maps are meant to help him and other Chamorros with feelings of lost identity find their "roots." But I would argue that his work

is far more than that. It is less a geographic journey, more a theoretical, temporal and even spiritual one. Much can be said of his spatial placement of words, *carmina figurata* or concrete poetry made to look like iconic forms such as the island of Guam or the latte, massive stone pillars upon which Chamorros of the past built their houses. But in those spatial arrangements there are temporal ones as well. The citations echo textual traces throughout time. On a single page you will find fragments of a number of different historical periods. You will find Chamorro mixed with Japanese, English, and even Spanish.

The journeys that we are meant to take through his texts are just as much through time and history as they are across oceans in the Pacific. The height of colonial commonsense is the linking of the possibility of the colonized subject to dependence on the colonizer. In Perez's poetry we delve into that history, seeing pieces with new eyes, to see past that dependency, where the maps don't take us back to the Pentagon, don't take us back to the Vatican, don't take us back to Magellan. It is important, however, not to conceive of these decolonial maps as being time traveling endeavors. They are meant to take us into the future, not the past. As we see Perez creating, with his ever-expanding archive of texts, we are meant to look past questions of who put us on the map or which maps we are on and which we aren't. We are meant to reflect on the ability we have to make our own maps, and regardless of the past or present, to decolonize and chart our own course into the future.

Michael Lujan Bevacqua, University of Guam

Zamir, Shamoon. *The Gift of the Face: Portraiture and Time in Edward S. Curtis's The North American Indian*. University of North Carolina Press, 2014. 1-282, Notes, Bibliography, and Index 283-316, 319-334.

http://www.uncpress.unc.edu/browse/book_detail?title_id=3515

Weaver, Jace. *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000-1927*. University of North Carolina Press, 2014. vii-xiv, 1-278, Notes and Index 279-340, no Works Cited.

http://www.uncpress.unc.edu/browse/book_detail?title_id=3499

In this era of ever-shrinking library budgets, not to mention individual purchasing power, both *The Gift of the Face* and *The Red Atlantic* deserve to find a home in an institution's library shelves, albeit for different reasons. The former asks that the reader take another, fuller, look at the images and words that make up Edward S. Curtis' multi-volume *The North American Indian*. The latter that the reader sees, perhaps for the first time, the role the natives of the Americas played in the making of the modern world.

Zamir's text asks that, contra those scholars who see in Curtis's images instances of the "imposition of colonialist stereotypes" (179), we read the photographs as rich in, again to quote Zamir, "the activity of a knowing self-fashioning" (179) on the part of Curtis's native subjects. Zamir is quick to note that he does not want to dismiss as incorrect the claims already made by earlier readings of Curtis and his work; rather, he wants to "insist on Curtis's insensitivity" as part of the study's effort to reveal Edward Curtis as a "man inextricably entangled within the reigning beliefs and attitudes toward race and culture of his own time *and yet* a man simultaneously capable of remarkable artistic and scholarly achievement. This contradiction runs through the whole of *The North American Indian*" (188 emphasis added).

Zamir asks that we take particular note of Curtis's decision to use copperplate photogravures in *The North American Indian*, arguing the decision indicates that Curtis was situating his work in the tradition of pictorialism rather than "realist or straight photography" (24). For Zamir, this serves as ground for Curtis's artistic composition of shots and manipulation of image in the developing and printing process. An attention to composition, manipulation, and "the language of pictorialist discourse" (35) in turn help the reader see the artistic achievement of Curtis' work. Portraits, which Zamir notes early on account for roughly forty-four percent of the nearly quarter million images in *The North American Indian*, are read as instances of co-authorship between Curtis and the Native subject and moments of Native agency and intentionality. Zamir would have us read the images as moments of Native self-expression and self-representation.

Zamir offers close readings of a number of Curtis's images. He would, as have others before him, have the reader think of the clock that is removed from "In a Piegan Lodge." He asks that we pay attention to safety pins in "New Chest—Piegan" and "Tsawatenok Girl" and to the machine manufactured blanket in "The Blanket Maker—Navaho." He would have us think hard about the composition of many Curtis images. These close readings call to us, demanding our attention and engagement, as do, Zamir argues, the images themselves. For me, the close

readings are at once the strength and the weakness of *The Gift of the Face*. All too often I find myself not seeing what Zamir both is seeing and asking us to see when it comes to the body language and faces in the portraits. Where he sees in “A Medicine Pipe” the “self-possession and confidence of the face” (51) of Philip Flat Tail, for instance, I see weariness and resignation; I do not see the “evident, if theatrical, sense of dignity and pride” (180) in “Upshaw—Apsaroke” that he sees. These two examples are not meant to undo the work being done by *The Gift of the Face* and its close readings, mind you, but to sound a note of caution. It bears noting that recent studies by Lisa Barrett and others have called into question the universality of facial expression and thus underscored the difficulty in reading the face. With very nearly its last word *The Gift of the Face* sounds this difficulty and, I think, lights on the necessary limits of its readings: “It is only if we work through Curtis’s images as argument-making pictures that they bring us to the enigma that is the gift of the face” (280).

The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000-1927 is devoted, Jace Weaver writes, to restoring “Indians and Inuit to the Atlantic world and [to] demonstrat[ing] their centrality to that world, a position equally important to, if not more than, the Africans of [Paul] Gilroy’s black Atlantic” (x-xi). Early and late Weaver stresses that the Red Atlantic is, in part, the story of how Natives “contend[ed] with modernity” (xii), their “encounter and struggle with, and adaptation to,” it (205). To cite one example, it offers the life and work of Mohawk performer and poet E. Pauline Johnson not merely as “pandering to white expectations” (210) but of articulating a “commitment . . . to a growing sense of unity among all North American Native nations as they struggled with the colonialist modernity of the turn of the twentieth century” (212). In short, and here there is a connection with *The Gift of the Face*, *The Red Atlantic* wants us to look again at Atlantic studies in order to see the role played by indigenes, all too often either erased or marginalized and without agency by works in the field.

On the one hand, *The Red Atlantic* is nothing new: Weaver notes in his Preface that “It is not my intent in defining the Red Atlantic to catalog and discuss every known Native from the Americas who traveled to one or another colonial metropole—sometimes multiple metropolises. This work has been done by various other scholars” (x). In its scope and emphasis, however, in its richness, the text serves as a valuable resource for students new to Native Studies and both to those teaching surveys of Atlantic history, Introduction to American Studies, or Introduction to Native American Studies. On the other hand, in addition to introducing the reader to voices and figures familiar to Native Studies scholars, *The Red Atlantic* asks us to look again at figures such as Johnson, Anishinaabe writer and clergyman Peter Jones, and Mohegan minister Samson Occom and the texts they produced.

What Weaver notes is the case with Paula Gunn Allen’s biography of Pocahontas, or rather Matoaka, is equally the case with his *The Red Atlantic*: they are labors devoted to recovering indigenous identity. These labors are necessary. These labors bear fruit. The structural fluidity of the work, as figures appear in multiple sections, should not put off the reader as it tacitly remarks the presence of natives in multiple arenas and at multiple times across the course of the Red Atlantic. Nor should the text’s conversational tone, which I take it serves to invite the reader into the necessary discussion of the role natives played in the shaping of the modern world.

Chris LaLonde, SUNY Oswego

Rifkin, Mark. *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014. Xxii, 293 pp.

<http://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/settler-common-sense>

As I read Mark Rifkin's *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance*, I was reminded of British literary critic Frank Kermode's description of his relationship to the advent of Deconstruction in the 1980s:

A good part of the pleasure I derived from my profession had come from finding out what texts seemed to be saying as it were voluntarily, and in conveying this information to others; and I should have felt uneasy to join a party whose sole business it was to elicit what they were saying in spite of themselves. (5)

Rifkin's project may be labeled Queer (perhaps even Decolonization) rather than Deconstruction, but in reading works by Nathaniel Hawthorne, Henry David Thoreau, and Herman Melville, he attempts to do the latter of the projects Kermode describes rather than the former. *Settler Common Sense* explores ways that these canonical American writers expressed their rebellion against conformist pressures within their nation and communities while being dependent upon those power structures to have cleared space (figuratively and literally) for their rebellion by dominating native nations. *Settler* in the title of course refers to settler colonialism; *Common Sense* refers to the "quotidian" ways the mechanics of settler colonialism operate, many times doing so in ways the settler/author does not recognize. In the texts Rifkin examines, the past and ongoing domination of the native nations has been naturalized or disappeared from view, and so he looks for traces of those acts of domination in the language of Hawthorne, Thoreau, and Melville. He also historicizes the moments of composition for key texts, describing the many ways the authors would have or could have been fully aware of native presence in New England, despite their texts' refusal or reluctance to acknowledge it.

The readers of this journal may be surprised that Rifkin mentions Gerald Vizenor just once, in an endnote. There he states that his project is different from Vizenor's in *Manifest Manners: Narratives in Postindian Survivance*, but that his "discussion of tropes of Indianness owe a debt to [Vizenor's] theorization of the ways figuration of Indianness substitute for (rather than point to) engagements with Native peoples and 'the tribal real'" (198). Rifkin's notion of "settler common sense" could be understood as a version of (or at least akin to) Vizenor's "manifest manners." Vizenor states, "Manifest manners are the simulations of dominance" (5); those simulations are the narrative representations of native conquest that produce and reinforce the dominant ideology (made most clear in Manifest Destiny). The ideological work of those simulations is more important than their veracity, and so they misrepresent actual native people. Vizenor has in mind texts (including films) that take "Indians" as their explicit topic, while Rifkin considers texts that may refer to Indians only in passing, but still he explores ways that Hawthorne, Thoreau, and Melville enable the continued dominance of native communities by the United States of America, even in the process of critiquing it; in this sense, Rifkin's readings, although informed by critical theories that have come to the forefront since Vizenor's book was published in 1999, seem to outline these texts as examples of "manifest manners."

For Hawthorne, Rifkin analyzes *The House of the Seven Gables*. The novel represents the tensions among various ways of owning land on the “Maine Frontier”: inheriting it, speculatively buying and selling titles to it, and taking possession of it through one’s labor. Hawthorne represents the last of these as the most democratic, as a method for escaping the normative pressures of society and the state. However, all of these methods of ownership require the mitigation of native claims to the land. The novel suggests working the land is a means of ownership beyond the authority of the state, but, ironically, this requires the state to have cleared the land of tribal people and their claims of ownership. The novel presents inherited fortunes (built upon an obligatory heterosexuality) as suspect because they limit democratic access to property and because they descend from treaties and purchases from the region’s tribes, and it suggests those original native claims of ownership (by the Penobscot, in this case) were illegitimate, since native people did not labor on the land in ways John Locke would have recognized.

For Thoreau, Rifkin examines *Walden* and its binary oppositions of city and nature. The city is a space for the corrupting and conforming pressures of civilization, especially “expanding and intensifying capitalist networks” (92), while nature is a space for the individual to enjoy unrestrained personal exploration with no regard for productivity—or reproductivity, as Rifkin emphasizes Thoreau’s escape from heterosexual conformity. Despite associations of the Indian with nature, in Thoreau’s formulation the regenerative qualities of nature require the absence of Indians—“living *like* an Indian, not among them” (92). Rifkin cites Thoreau’s famous example of the Indian who made baskets no one wished to purchase; for Thoreau, this Indian represented a misunderstanding of commercial endeavors and a desire to escape a system built upon such exchanges. But Rifkin cites examples of the Mashpee (quoting William Apess) and the Penobscot in Thoreau’s time and region who were engaged in commercial exchanges and who understood how to make that system work for their benefit (or at least their survival). In this case, Thoreau projects his fantasies onto the Indian, disregarding the very real Indians around him.

For Melville, Rifkin examines *Pierre*, which represents the city rather than nature as the site for escaping social, economic, and sexual pressures to conform. Rural land is held by the wealthy, so people must go to city to compete for wages, and there they can escape the “institutionalized regulation” of their desires (167). However, Rifkin describes the ways New York City in the 19th century “depends upon the continued displacement of Native peoples” (172) and is dependent upon the continued domination of the region’s native people, making this “queer urban liberation... a form of settler fantasy” (172). Melville’s novel is historicized with Seneca and Oneida resistance to dispossession.

Rifkin’s project of finding a text’s internal contradictions, its unspoken ideologies, or its unconscious desires has much in common with the style of criticism that made Kermodé uncomfortable but which became the dominant methods of literary criticism in the 1990s; and those methods have much in common with the project of decolonization, which reveals to the dominant culture the contradictions and disavowed consequences of its own ideologies. However, Rifkin may strike some readers as stretching a bit too far with a few points. He perhaps makes too much of Hawthorne’s single use of the word “tribe” in *The House of Seven*

Gables, and he perhaps too eagerly finds veiled references to masturbation wherever he looks in Thoreau's discussion of life alone in the woods.

If I may paraphrase Kermode in reference to Rifkin's writing style: Sometimes his sentences can challenge a reader to find what they are trying to say voluntarily, as it were, in spite of themselves. Kermode was famous for his eloquence; Rifkin's book, meantime, can be tough sledding; they are dense with references (a fourth of the book is devoted to Notes and Bibliography), and sometimes the sentences are constructed like Russian nesting dolls or are simply too long scan easily. The references are much appreciated and will be useful to other researchers and students, though the style will limit its audience and usefulness in classrooms.

Scott Andrews, California State University, Northridge

Works Cited

Kermode, Frank. *The Art of Telling: Essays on Fiction*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983. Print.

Vizenor, Gerald. *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln, Neb.: Bison Books, 1999. Print.

Nelson, Joshua B. *Progressive Traditions: Identity in Cherokee Literature and Culture*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2014. 278 pp.

<http://www.oupres.com/ECommerce/Book/Detail/1908/progressive%20traditions>

Equal parts literary, cultural, social, and political analysis, *Progressive Traditions* is a full frontal assault on intellectual and political paradigms still problematically structured on a binary that pits tradition against modernity, resistance against acquiescence, conservatism against progressivism, nationalism against assimilation, and authenticity against rote performance. Locating the study in debates between literary nationalists and cosmopolitanists that have defined Native literary studies for over two decades, Nelson claims that both schools fail to rigorously theorize the central terms of their analyses, and remain troublingly committed to centralized political/state authority (12-25). “If we look at traditionalism and assimilation [i.e. progressivism] as they play out within tribal groups,” Nelson writes, “we can see that tradition is not an unadulterated force of unalterable conservatism nor is assimilation one of unrestrained avant-garde progress, but that both are oriented toward the support of community cohesion, collective values, and basically making people’s lives better” (26). Placing discussions of Cherokee cultural practices and beliefs in conversation with the cultural theories of Pierre Bourdieu, Nelson identifies in writings by Catherine Brown, Elias Boudinot, John Ross, and Sequoyah Guess, flexible “dispositions,” “principled practices,” and shared values that regulate change while also maintaining and innovating tradition (26, 32). These include deep commitments to local, distributed authority; consensus decision-making, open deliberation, and a respect for dissent; values of diversity, multiplicity, and pluralism; and ethics of hospitality and inclusivity, to name a few. Taken together, they suggest for Nelson a larger Cherokee disposition toward what he terms “indigenous anarchism,” or “a pluralist, community-centered political philosophy that looks to practices that preceded and surpass the nation-state as ways of helping Cherokee people prosper” (4). With this anarchic frame as its foundation, *Progressive Traditions* is interested less in defining or identifying what counts as “progress” or “tradition” than in exploring the “surprising range of strategies ... principles and practices”—some recognizable, some anomalous—through which Cherokees “[combine] old and new ways of doing things as they employ traditional adaptive strategies to resolve cultural and historical problems” (xiii).

In six chapters, divided into two sections, Nelson puts this approach to work, exploring everything from religious practices and community ethics of cooperation and hospitality to philosophical debates over political authority and conflicting measures by which Cherokees have reckoned identity, community, and belonging across history. “Part I: We Worship” historicizes Cherokee spiritual traditions and the multiple affiliations and associations that have characterized religious and political life in the Nation. With this history as context, Nelson turns to Brown’s and Guess’s work, identifying in both what he terms “Cherokee sacred humanism” (40) and a “religiously minded pluralist pragmatism” (112) rooted in practices of worship, prayer, education, and community edification, and in principles of cooperation, hospitality, and respect geared toward establishing and maintaining “right relations” between Cherokee and non-Cherokee peoples. “Part II: We Argue” highlights the movement from clan based social relations and town politics toward increasing nationalization in order to reframe conflicts between John Ross and Elias Boudinot (and Cherokee history more broadly) from narratives inevitable factional conflict to an ongoing philosophical debate about centralized social and political

authority in the Cherokee state, and its increasingly coercive restrictions on local governance, consensus decision making, and modes and mechanisms for open dissent. Highlighting the very real stakes involved in the historical encounter—the massive loss of life attending removal, reprisal killings attending relocation, and factional strife continuing into the present—Nelson turns in the conclusion to practices of hospitality, adoption, and political naturalization as “anarchic” dispositions better equipped to address the often toxic and seemingly intractable politics of race, identity, community, and nation evident in Cherokee country today.

Drawing on a wide range of anthropological, sociological, historical, and local archives of knowledge, Nelson provides some of the most nuanced readings of Cherokee identity and culture in literature that I’m familiar with. Part of this novelty is due to his methodological focus on dispositions and practices rather than on definitive political positions, cultural markers of authenticity, racial identities, or theoretical “models” delimiting what does or doesn’t constitute either “tradition” or “progressivism.” For instance, though scholars have broadly understood Catherine Brown’s memoir as an assimilationist text, Nelson argues in chapter two that Brown’s text demonstrates a Cherokee disposition toward “gaining knowledge” in its investigation of Christian theology and practice, and its commitment to community vetting as a potential “solution” to the “problem” of assimilation and removal. Contextualized within a larger history of women finding agency and asserting political influence through educational and religious institutions, as well as a Cherokee communities openly soliciting religious missions as a strategy to establish educational infrastructure, Nelson convincingly argues that Brown’s “improvised” synthesis of Christian theology with Cherokee practices of dreaming, open air worship and prayer, fasting, and purification, evidences an explicitly gendered, distinctly Cherokee practice of Christianity. Combined with the text’s subtle, rhetorical indictments of US hypocrisy, the *Memoir* stands not as a tragic artifact of assimilationist pressures but the record of a young woman committed to the survivance of her immediate and larger relations *as Cherokees and Christians* (107-09). Through close readings of language, plot, character, and imagery, Nelson turns in chapter three to Guess’s 1992 science fiction novel *Kholvn* as a model of dispositions and practices through which contemporary social and political factionalism in the Nation might be more productively mediated. Situated within the context of the revitalization of the Keetoowah Society and stomp dance communities in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Nelson highlights the “improvisational” innovations the Society worked through to develop a membership policy capable of reckoning stomp and Christian theologies and practices while also maintaining their opposition to allotment and coercive political authority (114). In its valuing of multiple spaces of worship and concepts of faith, commitments to cooperation and hospitality, understanding of knowledge as bounded and contingent, and view of difference and multiplicity as resources rather than liabilities, a related “deliberate,” “moderated pluralism” structures Guess’s novel (120-21). Advancing “an ethic of democratic, populist—that is, indigenist anarchist—cooperative confederation” as long-standing and valued dispositions in Cherokee social and political history, Nelson positions novel as a model to negotiate political conflicts over identity, politics, and community in Cherokee Country today (131-32).

Having laid the groundwork for a more “compassionate,” inclusive, and responsive theoretical and political praxis, Nelson then turns his dispositional approach explicitly to questions of Cherokee governance represented in writings by John Ross and Elias Boudinot. Vehemently resisting understandings of 19th century political conflict as a narrative of Ross patriots versus

Treaty Party traitors or resistant full-blood traditionalists against self-interested, assimilationist, mixed-blood elites, Nelson instead situates the conflict in a growing divide over the course Cherokee governance and the location of social and political authority. Chapter four chronicles the movement away from localized consensus politics in autonomous towns toward the assumption of social *and* political authority vested in an increasingly centralized Cherokee nation-state. Though critical of how such moves subsumed local interests and intimacies into “the national” and circumscribed open deliberation and political dissent, Nelson cautions against reactive condemnations of nationalization altogether, emphasizing the carefully-considered, “volitional” responses to intensifying removal pressures, rooted initially in Cherokee practices of consultative deliberation and caucusing (143, 145), that was (and is) “attended by both successes and failures as it drew from, improved on, and betrayed traditions” (138). From this perspective, it becomes possible to see figures like Ross and Boudinot—and the constituencies, positions, and trajectories they have come to represent—in more complicated (and compassionate?) terms. Chapter five engages in precisely this project, situating both as Cherokee nationalists committed to a qualified program of acculturation and social change who came to hold strongly divergent views on the course of Cherokee governance, and who at times acted unilaterally according to those convictions. Lest the analysis descend into a relativist apologia for both men, Nelson turns again to Cherokee dispositions of consensus, deliberation, persuasion, and dissent to explain the implications of both the Treaty Party’s subversion of popular will and Ross’s—and the state’s—violent suppression of dissent. What emerges through Nelson’s nuanced readings of Boudinot’s and Ross’s work is a complex story of a people attempting to navigate tradition and innovation amid impossible circumstances that often forced them into positions and conflicts in which they might not have otherwise engaged. The stakes of this reorientation from rupture, loss, and victimization to continuity-through-dispositional innovation is clear: “[A]lthough political centralization aspired to defend the nation’s physical and cultural boundaries, its attendant strategies for establishing hegemony ran counter to the irrepressible dispositions of deliberation and dissent ... there is no better way to start bringing Cherokee people together than by learning how to hear them differ” (166).

Attending to and navigating difference is the subject of the book’s concluding chapter and Nelson’s explicit foray into contemporary Cherokee politics (231). Framed by both the political context of the disenfranchisement of Cherokee freedmen and his unsuccessful attempt to navigate the bureaucratic and legal machinery of the Indian Child Welfare Act, “Strangers and Kin” looks to concepts of hospitality, adoption, and naturalization as dispositional tools through which to mediate acute crises over identity and political belonging. Noting the longstanding conflicts between governors and the governed, between the people and the state, as they play out in Cherokee and other political communities, Nelson suggests that a return to dispositional values of local governance, consensus politics, and a healthy valuing of multiplicity and dissent would enable Cherokee people to re-envision “a more compassionate” nationhood “built upon the participatory consensus of the people” and the recognition and restoration (political and otherwise) of “definite, organic historical connections tying ... excluded others to Cherokee people” (231, 204). At issue is not simply the question of whether or not to “recognize” freedmen as citizens or how best to account for the interests of Cherokee children against those of Cherokee state and federal bureaucracies. Rather, the question for Nelson seems to be how Cherokees might reckon contemporary conflicts with “traditionally progressive” dispositions that locate authority, identity, and belonging in ostensibly more flexible and responsive social

structures independent of the state (i.e. family, town, religious community, benevolent organizations, etc.). Though left implicit, Nelson here is calling for *political project* to re-vision Cherokee governance legible as a centralized, sovereign political authority in *external* affairs with settler-states and other tribal nations, while distributing social authority, expanding political participation, and guaranteeing mechanisms for dissent and local self-determination in *internal* matters. This political project is also tied to an *ethical* project to honestly and critically reckon contemporary understandings of identity, family, citizenship, and community belonging (often tethered to settler logics of race, patriarchy, and hierarchical, coercive authority) with the multiple forms and strategies of association practiced throughout Cherokee history.

While I'm deeply attracted to such work, I'm less clear on how it might play out "on the ground" so speak. It remains to be seen whether and to what extent "indigenous anarchism" can function practically to address these tensions, and in what conditions it might more productively be applied. For instance, how does consensus governance work in a tribal-nation with an economically-diverse and geographically-dispersed citizenship exceeding 300,000 and growing, who are often deeply divided on questions of race, identity, culture, and political authority like the Cherokee or Navajo nations? How does it help us makes sense of the emergence of state-endorsed "satellite" communities of citizens forming in urban centers across the country with recent efforts within the fourteen county area to restrict political participation of non-resident citizens and reduce the presumed influence of diasporic communities in local political affairs? As this example suggests, power and coercion aren't always the product of a Cherokee leviathan in the same way that consensus politics and local authority don't always guarantee the dispositions "indigenous anarchism" advocates. At a more prosaic level, considering the largely conservative, Christian influence on Cherokee politics at both local and state levels, it's also doubtful whether the language of "anarchism" would find purchase outside of academic and intellectual circles. While useful as a theoretical framework to engage the important and necessary work of critiquing the limitations and blindspots of other intellectual and political paradigms, exchanging the language of anarchism for Bourdieu's "dispositions" or Nelson's own "principled practices" might prove more useful in the long run.

Put differently, as much as I share Nelson's suspicion of centralized authority and value the dispositions he excavates with such nuance and precision, I hesitate to claim that state power (or related concepts of nationhood and sovereignty) aren't both necessary and useful for Cherokee peoples. Whether we like it or not, states negotiate with states, and nations, not peoples, are invested with sovereignty, however complicated and problematic those relations are. In a world where Native children can be removed from their families against the wishes of both their communities *and* the express designs of federal legislation; where Indigenous trust lands and resources are still routinely stolen as a function of unrelated legislation; where Native women remain vulnerable in a settler legal system where "justice" is denied them at every turn; and where Native bodies are routinely gunned down by racist, overly-zealous, or simply incompetent police forces suggests the continuing need for a strong political authority of some kind. On the other hand, Indigenous nation-states are quite as capable as their settler counterparts of coercion and violence, whether in the rash of disenrollment and disenfranchisement campaigns tied to profit and material resources; in citizenship and residential laws that privilege racial identity and blood quantum over kinship, family, and cultural/local ties; or in privileging state priorities over and above those of local communities. As *Progressive Traditions* makes plainly evident, these

are neither neat nor easy questions to work through. Without question, we need to theorize these relationships further within both tribally-specific and trans-Indigenous contexts, and hold tribal states accountable to the people in the same measure that we hold settler states accountable to the trust relationship. I am convinced that part of doing so will involve “refashion[ing] contemporary communities in healthy alignment” with the dispositions, principles, practices, and values explored throughout the text as a means to better negotiate difference (204) and revalue “historic and organic connections” across race, religion, culture, geography, politics, and family (215). By advancing a tribally-specific conversation about *formalizing* these dispositions into a social and political program not exclusively tied to or moderated by Cherokee state power, Nelson goes a long way to realize both projects. That it ties this project to an ethical mandate ultimately designed to extricate Cherokee communities from settler-logics of elimination by drawing our attention to the multiple forms and strategies of association practiced throughout Cherokee history situates *Progressive Traditions* alongside some of the more exciting, innovative, and provocative work currently taking place in the field. I fully expect it to find a wide readership among Cherokees as well as Native/Indigenous scholars alike.

Kirby Brown (Cherokee Nation), University of Oregon

ho‘omanawanui, ku‘ualoha. *Voices of Fire: Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi‘iaka*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014. 312 pages, photographs, notes, glossary, bibliography, index.

<http://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/voices-of-fire>

Kanaka Maoli scholar ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui’s *Voices of Fire* powerfully analyzes the mo‘olelo (stories, histories, narratives) of Pele and Hi‘iaka, two sister akua (goddesses) and kūpuna (ancestors) of the Hawaiian nation. While Pele and Hi‘iaka are well-known as goddesses of the volcano (specifically the currently active volcano Kīlauea on Hawai‘i Island) and hula, respectively, most people only know small, distorted pieces of their stories, as recorded by nineteenth-century white folklorists such as Nathaniel B. Emerson. Seeking to kahuli (overturn) settler colonial accounts like Emerson’s, which ho‘omanawanui argues often “intentionally ignored, romanticized, infantilized, or vilified Kanaka Maoli intellectual history and cultural practices” (xxviii), *Voices of Fire* opens up a wealth of other, previously unanalyzed sources about Pele and Hi‘iaka, largely from serialized accounts published in Hawai‘i newspapers between 1860 and 1928, most written in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, Hawaiian language.

Pele and Hi‘iaka have long been cherished figures for Kanaka Maoli, especially among practitioners of hula, as many dances are dedicated to and tell the stories of either or both of the pair. As ho‘omanawanui suggests, in their opposing natures—Pele as a fiery, temperamental, and at times destructive force of nature, and Hi‘iaka as Pele’s beloved younger sister, a calmer force of new growth and regeneration—the goddesses suggest a model of balance, or pono (xxvii). *Voices of Fire* does not attempt to tell their definitive story, but instead emphasizes the Hawaiian value of makawalu, or multiple perspectives, noting that different serialized versions were all treasured even when their narratives varied (xxxii, xl). Thus, rather than seek one definitive version of the Pele and Hi‘iaka narrative, *Voices of Fire* masterfully shows that debates and divergences were honored by Kanaka Maoli authors. There are many revelations in ho‘omanawanui’s analysis, from her meditations on Pele arriving to Hawai‘i from Kahiki (an ancestral homeland) that links Kanaka Maoli ancestrally to Tahiti and other parts of the Pacific to the last chapter’s incorporation of contemporary Kanaka Maoli poetry about Pele and Hi‘iaka. Overall, the book is attentive to the specific places the mo‘olelo take place in, including Puna on Hawai‘i Island as a birthplace of hula (Hi‘iaka learns hula from Hōpoe, her ‘aikane—intimate friend and lover—and teaches Pele) and Kaua‘i island (where Hi‘iaka must journey to complete a task at Pele’s request). It is also attentive to the historical context of the mo‘olelo’s publication, such as the political statements implied in their publication especially regarding the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, as well as to the relevance of the mo‘olelo’s themes to contemporary Kanaka Maoli.

Voices of Fire accomplishes the reclamation and revitalization of the Pele and Hi‘iaka mo‘olelo brilliantly, and yet its contribution is much more than this already remarkable feat. As ho‘omanawanui notes, *Voices of Fire* is the “first book-length study of Hawaiian literature” (xxviii), and it is certainly the first to put Hawaiian literature in conversation with Indigenous literary nationalism, as developed in Indigenous and Pacific Studies fields by scholars including Lisa Brooks, Scott Lyons, Robert Warrior, Alice Te Punga Somerville and Albert Wendt, among many others. “What is a Hawaiian literary tradition?” (xxxii) is one of the key questions the book

asks. In answering this question through the example of the varied, broad scope of the Pele and Hi‘iaka mo‘olelo, the text covers an enormous amount of ground and is truly innovative in its theoretical and rhetorical frameworks. In terms of coverage, for example, the book’s first chapter provides an extremely comprehensive but succinct overview of Kanaka Maoli history, which (unlike many conventional historical accounts of Hawai‘i) highlights the continuous existence of Kanaka ‘Ōiwi (synonymous with Kanaka Maoli, Native Hawaiian) resistance to colonization through to the present day. This chapter deserves to become standard reading for any course teaching about Hawai‘i and the history of its colonization. In terms of theoretical innovation, a key contribution is the text’s insistence that mo‘olelo are an important source of the Kanaka Maoli lāhui’s (nation’s) intellectual and political genealogy, and that the knowledge they contain are passed down to contemporary Kanaka Maoli mai ka pō mai, from the beginning of time to now, and mai nā kūpuna mai, from the ancestors to us (xxxii). In this way, ho‘omanawanui theorizes mo‘olelo as an original and expansive Kanaka Maoli literary genre which functions as a kind of literary lei (garland of flowers), or lei palapala, as it interweaves oral and written histories together into a gift for a beloved one—namely, the Kanaka Maoli people (xxxix).

The book deeply considers the ways that traditionally valued oral performances (including mele, or song, and hula) of mo‘olelo influenced the ways mo‘olelo were written down, after the introduction of the written word and printing by missionaries in the early nineteenth-century, especially in Chapter 2. While acknowledging that printing was introduced as part of the missionary effort to convert and civilize Kanaka Maoli, ho‘omanawanui also argues that Kanaka ‘Ōiwi quickly learned to use Ka Palapala (written literature) as a technology that could “save mo‘olelo previously recorded only in memory—traditions, histories, genealogies, and related mana‘o [knowledge]—from extinction” (39). Chapter 2 also introduces meiwī, or traditional poetic devices used in the Hawaiian language, which ho‘omanawanui shows were important to the advent of a written Hawaiian literary tradition and also aimed to perpetuate rather than replace mo‘olelo ha‘i waha (orature), especially through devices encouraging memorization. Drawing on the work of Hiapo Pereira, Noenoe Silva, and Mary Kawena Pukui, among other noted Hawaiian Studies scholars, ho‘omanawanui identifies over twenty meiwī, such as pīna‘i (repetition of words, actions), kaona (veiled, poetic meaning), and ‘ēko‘a (opposites) (42-3). These devices then become important to the detailed analysis of the Pele and Hi‘iaka mo‘olelo in the book’s later chapters.

Voices of Fire itself productively challenges and disrupts the standard format of an academic book through the use of its own kinds of meiwī. The book opens and closes with pule, or prayers, printed on facing pages in Hawaiian and English that follow Kanaka Maoli protocols around asking permission to enter a sacred place and to begin and close an event. In doing so, ho‘omanawanui frames the book as a space of reverence and sanctity, akin to the space of a hula hālau (the space where a hula group dances) (xli). This also creates an elegant counter-discourse to the conventions of the Western academy by reminding readers that respect and permission is required to gain certain forms of knowledge. Each chapter similarly opens with a mele (song) from the Pele and Hi‘iaka mo‘olelo, which frames and reflects the themes of the coming chapter.

Additionally, within each chapter, ho‘omanawanui weaves accounts of her own mo‘olelo, engaging stories drawn from her own experience, into the narrative. Several chapters open with a variation of the statement, “It is [year] and I am in a particular place, doing a particular thing.”

For instance, Chapter 5, which focuses on mana wahine (women’s power or powerful women), as a central aspect of the Pele and Hi’iaka mo’olelo, draws the reader in with an opening story about the author drawing strength from her own mana wahine ancestors as she braves the challenges of learning to (and from) sailing a wa’a kaulua, a traditional Hawaiian double-hulled canoe. Through these personal narratives, readers learn not only of ho‘omanawanui’s diverse and impressive intellectual journey (including her experiences as a haumana, or student, of hula and Hawaiian language) and what it has meant to her, but also a partial but strongly felt sense of the many challenges and achievements of Kanaka ‘Ōiwi efforts to restore and revitalize the lāhui’s cultural, political, and intellectual life over the past several decades.

As a Kanaka Maoli scholar myself, I cannot see *Voices of Fire* as anything less than a substantial gift to the Native Hawaiian people, which indeed, as ho‘omanawanui notes early in the book, was her intention, “he ho‘okupu kēia i ka lāhui—an offering to the Hawaiian nation” (xxvi). As such, it “seeks to encourage ‘Ōiwi agency in our continuing rediscovery and reevaluation of our kūpuna (ancestral source) texts in culturally relevant ways, approaching and discussing these cultural treasures from within the paradigm of ‘Ōiwi perspectives and analysis” (xxviii). Indeed, I am deeply moved and inspired by this text’s rigorous and creative contribution to Kanaka Maoli intellectual, political, and cultural sovereignty. Yet, *Voices of Fire* is also a gift to scholars across many disciplines invested in Indigenous survivance, including literature, history, and Pacific, Native American, and Indigenous Studies, as it is a beautiful example of scholarship that both demonstrates and enacts Indigenous presence and power mai ka pō mai, from the beginning of time to now, and certainly well into the future.

Maile Arvin, University of California, Riverside

Clements, William B. *Imagining Geronimo: An Apache Icon in Popular Culture*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2013. 305 pp.

<http://unmpress.com/books.php?ID=2000000005364&Page=book>

From the time that he first emerged as a figure of interest in news reports emanating from the southwest in the 1870s, the Apache shaman and war leader Geronimo has endured as a recurrent, and ambivalent image of “Indianness” in American popular culture. This, essentially, is the thesis of William Clements’ copiously researched new volume. Over the course of seven chapters, Clements surveys Geronimo’s presence in newspapers, folklore, film, literature, photography, and public appearances. Largely refraining from in-depth analysis of his examples, Clements instead aims to provide readers with a useful and provocative archive of material from which to draw for further study. Readers in Native American Studies will be particularly interested in his discussion of how Geronimo attempted (with mixed results) to exert some control over his image during his own lifetime. And readers with a particular interest in Gerald Vizenor’s work will find a variety of provocative examples of Geronimo’s “postindian” presence, examples sure to reward further consideration.

Clements begins his book with a discussion of the contemporaneous newspaper coverage of Geronimo’s exploits, his eventual capture by the U.S. military, and his relocation to Florida and Oklahoma, where he would live out his days in exile from his Arizona homeland. Not surprisingly, this survey reveals that the majority of the early accounts of Geronimo tended to depict him as an archetypal savage, or “red devil,” with only a handful of instances where his later image as a freedom fighter and patriot began to emerge. Suggestive of the complex role that the colonial construct of Indian “savagism” plays in American history, though, Clements also draws attention to the emergence of a genre of “Geronimo stories” in the oral culture and folkways of the American Southwest. Anglo settlers, in particular, employed both the spectral figure of Geronimo and a range of tall-tales regarding their encounters, or near-encounters, with him, as a means of legitimizing their presence in this newly tamed “frontier.” This corpus of Geronimo stories identified by Clements thus comes across as one rich with potential for further analysis. This type of material clearly cries out to be situated within the framework of recent revisionist paradigms in western history.

The best-developed section of the book is Clements’ discussion of Geronimo’s agency vis-a-vis his own image. He takes up this topic in a long chapter dealing with Geronimo’s presence at three World’s Fairs between 1895 and 1904 and his participation in Theodore Roosevelt’s inauguration in 1905. Clements here makes good use of key concepts in post-colonial theory (such as Spivak’s notion of the subaltern) as well as James Clifford’s important interventions into our understanding of ethnography and museum studies to provide a historically grounded and persuasive account of semiotic struggle. The battle over Geronimo’s image (waged between Geronimo himself and a wide-range of American actors with their own economic and ideological motives) emerges here as an emblematic story whose implications extend well beyond its turn-of-the-century context. Clements is not always as successful in making these broader connections; his linkage of Geronimo’s reported conversion to Christianity to the literature surrounding Black Elk in a subsequent chapter is thin, by comparison. But the gestures that he makes along these lines are always welcome ones, as they offer still further evidence of the symbolic potency surrounding Geronimo as an “icon.”

Clements' discussion of photographic representations of Geronimo's is both particularly stimulating and representative of the way that his book draws attention to an archive in need of further analysis. He grounds his discussion of the photographs with a brief nod to the philosophical distinction between idea (here understood as an image that becomes emblematic or representative) and event (here understood as an image where the subject retains its individuality). The resulting insight that Geronimo's image functions as *both* image and event is a provocative one. For many American viewers, in his time in particular, Geronimo has provided the "face to savagism" (155). His intense stare, never-smiling face, and willingness to pose well-armed are well-known features in his photographic portfolio. Interestingly enough, this side of Geronimo has also been repurposed in recent years; one of the most famous photographs depicting him along with three other armed Apache men now symbolizes pan-Indian patriotism in a poster bearing the label "Homeland Security: Fighting Terrorism Since 1492." At the same time, as Clements notes, Geronimo's face remains one of the most distinctive and inimitable images in American culture. It is suggestive, in this regard, that in presenting Geronimo as one of the emblematic "vanishing Indians," Edward Curtis was forced to render him in profile, thus blunting much of the effect of his visual distinctiveness. Clements concludes his discussion of Geronimo in the photographic record by loosely invoking Vizenor's notion of trickster discourse. While he does not pursue this insight with any specificity, it seems clear that much could be achieved in applying Vizenorian critical concepts to these powerful images. Minimally, the photographed Geronimo (viewed as idea/event) represents an intriguing example of visual irony.

It should be noted that, because of the nature of Clements' project, there is a certain amount of unavoidable unevenness in *Imagining Geronimo*. For example, the long chapter on literature reveals, first, that Geronimo is often only invoked in the title of works in which he makes no actual appearance and, second, that when he does play a larger role he is usually "flat and undeveloped" (192). With little interpretive interest inherent in the material, then, Clements' discussion of the "literary Geronimo" seldom rises above the level of listing and describing sources. The concluding chapter's discussion of Geronimo's presence in film, on the other hand, provides evidence to support Clements' central claim about the fluidity of his image. Nevertheless, this chapter is surprisingly short (about one third of the length of the literature chapter) and undeveloped. Contrasting the earlier chapter on the World's Fairs with the chapter on film is suggestive, in this respect, for in the former Clements' efforts to thicken the historical and critical context yields a much more complex survey of the archive itself. One imagines he could have done some of the same in his treatment of film.

There are moments in *Imagining Geronimo* where the reader is confronted with an impressive collection of material that cries out for a theory with which to approach it. To be sure, Clements' book does achieve what it set out to do; it provides readers with a comprehensive overview of Geronimo's appearances in popular culture that avoids the suggestion of a "simplistic developmental contour" that Clements finds in the work of earlier scholars (4). Where this book really shines, though, is in those moments when it moves beyond being a largely bibliographical study toward becoming a full-fledged analysis. It does so often enough to suggest some of the ways that future scholars will be able to build on the foundations Clements has established.

David J. Carlson, California State University San Bernardino

McGlennen, Molly. *Creative Alliances: The Transnational Designs of Indigenous Women's Poetry*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014. 230 pp.

<http://www.oupres.com/ECommerce/Book/Detail/1897/creative%20alliances>

In *Creative Alliances: The Transnational Designs of Indigenous Women's Poetry*, McGlennen takes the much-welcomed approach of foregrounding gender and genre in the field of Native American and Indigenous Studies. Best of all, she engages this task as a poet collaborating with the voices of other Indigenous women poets and is deliberate in her choice to take on a “poet-critic lens” in order to “forward more inclusive analytical models so to stave off the anthropologization and ownership that has often framed the work of Indigenous writers” (23). In doing so, McGlennen creates a narrative around the importance of poetry in the everyday of poets whose crafts form alliances throughout Indian Country and often beyond in transnational circles. While the poets she primarily addresses are U.S.-based, she does account for the ways poetic words see beyond nation-state borders, as well as tribal jurisdictions, to make connections with other Indigenous peoples. For McGlennen, poetry works in the service of alliance making between Indigenous peoples and fosters what she refers to as a generative process of pushing boundaries, adjusting margins, and decolonizing colonially-informed knowledge of the spatial and temporal. In her book, McGlennen states that poetry is a “mediating mechanism” between various communities (38) that carries “transformative properties” to see beyond colonial structures that create divisiveness (63), as the “form’s mobilizing and politicizing capacity” (46) is key to resistance. By focusing on Indigenous women’s poetic collaborations, the author also emphasizes how the collaborative nature of poetry enables a “revision of politics” and “transfer and continuance” of Indigenous lifeways. Poetry makes clear, according to McGlennen, that these lifeways are living and do so within and beyond boundaries of the reservation, a point especially made in her examination of “Home Girls” (120) Luci Tapahonso and Kimberly Blaeser. All in all, McGlennen is consistent with her rightly justified emphasis on the importance of creativity and poetry’s ability as a genre to build alliances.

In six chapters, McGlennen speaks to the various places that creative alliances occur and communities are built. In her first chapter, she sets out the relationship between gender and the genre of poetry, focusing primarily on poets’ work that has addressed various aspects of gender’s influence on the everyday. Yet, engagement with the burgeoning field of Indigenous feminism or the inclusion of examinations of gendered colonialism would help to flesh out her arguments and many of the excellent points she makes. While the author, for instance, takes on western science and its “misogynistic undercurrents that stimulate” it, she does not address the array of feminist work in Indigenous studies on this matter. The specific and important work of Indigenous feminist scholars, such as Kim Tallbear, Aileen Moreton-Robinson, J. Kehaulani Kauanui, Sandy Grande, and Maile Arvin, who have examined the discourse of science and effects on nation-building and its gendered forms, would be incredibly beneficial to her argument. This move to include Indigenous feminist scholars inside and outside of Native poets and literary scholarship would support her as she moves out into the specifics of how poetry upsets spatial and temporal logics in her next chapters.

Poetry as “alternative documentation” to colonial writings that erase Indigenous presence in traditional territories and urban settings becomes the subject of Chapter 2, where McGlennen examines Esther Belin and Allison Adelle Hedge Coke’s poetry as a form of knowledge

production. Her examination of the Earthworks site and insight she provides through interviews of the poets is especially illuminating in regards to poetry and the complexity of Native places, as well as relationships to those places through time. Are all processes of making place the same, however? What does the shift from a historic site to an urban site tell us about the varying ways that Native people process place? At times in the book, the quick jumping from different kinds of places from poem to poem or poet to poet left the reader with more questions. At one point, the author speaks to the ways that urban poets “reclaim these territories as Indigenous homelands because of the forms mobilizing and politicizing capacity.” Yet, she does not continue down a path to question what it means that LA and Oakland already and always have had an Indigenous presence of Ohlone, Tongva, Tataviam and other tribal nations complete with expansive trade routes, artistry, and relationships with those who came west with the development of US industrialized cities. This is an important point, and an ethical one, that Belin makes clear in her poetry. McGlennen does, however, upset the urban as a place of force, or dislocation, and loss. She positions poetry and spoken word circles in urban contexts as an assembly of various tribes that “rekindle centuries old systems” that become more than an act of making a “surrogate nation” (52).

McGlennen affirms poetry’s ability to unravel colonial discourses through language that is situated in tribal epistemologies and also its ability to move out from the center or, in her words and title of chapter three, poetry’s ability to “adjust the margins.” I very much appreciated this intervention in her examination of several poets that employ the genre in order to mend the rifts of “limited points of access and spiritual disconnects” (153) caused by colonialism’s on-going effects.

In chapter four, she extends an analysis of the politics of enrollment and blood quantum by exploring Luci Tapahonso and Kimberly Blaeser’s poetry on migration and cross tribal alliance work. This analysis provides a substantial critique of literary nationalism, while not dismissing the crucial work it has accomplished (106), by examining the genre of poetry as “collaboration and celebration of influence” (109). Particularly useful in the approach to privileging poets’ voices, is McGlennen’s use of amendments, that is poems that return to earlier poems and address similar topics, themes, or issues that are on-going but have changed either through politics, awareness, or in the personal lives of the poets themselves. Looking at over thirty years of a poet’s collective work, especially in light of tribal citizenship, has many benefits that could be explored even further in future work. I appreciate this idea and its unfixeness of the knowledge production, particularly in the case where she speaks of the effects of discourses of racial purity. This move is emblematic of the thoughtfulness I associate with Indigenous feminisms. You must return to ideas and revisit in order to, as McGlennen puts it, “chart new directions” forward. I do wish, however, more attention was paid to historical context in these moments as the poets are also reflecting with others around them. For instance, Indigenous women’s interactions with women of color poets influenced these early moments of poetry alliances. This moment also resulted from the need to make room for non-patriarchal and non-racist forms of knowledge production, as Lisa Hall’s Indigenous feminist work makes evident, in both Indigenous and Non-Indigenous communities.

In chapter five, McGlennen examines poets who engage a “land ethics” that is collaborative and a genre that promotes “streamlined methodologies that only a reliance on shared Indigenous

antecedents can bring about” (130). Here she contends that elements of poetry perform the reparative task of thinking through the fragmentation caused by imposed gender and racial hierarchies resulting from Western science. This task, however, requires the collaboration and listening that the genre of poetry demands and McGlennen compellingly asks that we take this seriously for survival and growth of Native communities.

To end her chapters, McGlennen takes up poetry as a gathering place, particularly by examining the space of the anthology, early moments of collaboration, and queer identity. It is a fitting end to examine, in the words of the author, “how one might rethink boundaries as a means to understand *what brings people together* across colonial, tribal, and hemispheric divides—and not just what separates them” (183). The repositioning of the question above to emphasize the creative rather than loss or colonial destruction is representative of the consistent positive relation the author has to poetry and critique. She has definitely written a text where the warmth and sustenance that stems from poetry’s creative alliances shines through colonial quagmires.

Mishuana Goeman, University of California, Los Angeles

Fortunate Eagle, Adam. *Scalping Columbus and Other Damn Indian Stories: Truths, Half-Truths, and Outright Lies*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014. 216pp.

<http://www.oupress.com/ECommerce/Book/Detail/1827/scalping%20columbus%20and%20othe%20damn%20indian%20stories>

In the opening Acknowledgements of his fourth book, Adam Fortunate Eagle (Red Lake Chippewa) gives thanks to his editor for transcribing his handwritten stories and arranging them into the loosely chronological order in which they are presented. Clearly it was no easy task—the collection includes stories about outhouses, “TP,” and flatulence alongside those that recount the Indian occupation of Alcatraz, the “discovery” of Italy, and an audience with the Pope. Five short paragraphs of thank-yous introduce the threads that hold the stories together—Fortunate Eagle’s American Indian identity, his “Shoshone wife, Bobbie,” his distinctive narrative voice, and his appreciation for “one of mankind’s oldest oral art forms: bullshit” (xi).

Scalping Columbus and Other Damn Indian Stories: Truths, Half-Truths, and Outright Lies is a celebration of storytelling and stories—“bullshit” and not. Through the telling of stories, Fortunate Eagle shares the story of his life journey—in bits and pieces. Not all of the 50 “stories” (including front and back matter) are autobiographical, but the fabrications and remembered jokes that he chooses to share tell us as much about him as the accounts of his numerous escapades as a child, businessman, social activist, ceremonial dancer, artist, and more. The Appendix, entitled “Percentage of Bullshit per Story,” ostensibly provides a quantitative guide to each chapter’s veracity, but beware—“[t]hese tales test not only the literary creativity of the author but also the gullibility of the reader” (xv). At 84 years of age, Fortunate Eagle has led a full life, and it is a life that he is proud to share. While some readers might find him a bit too proud of his own accomplishments, none could argue that he’s afraid to say what’s on his mind.

The humorous tone set by the title and author’s introductory comments is sustained, often in almost slapstick fashion, throughout the book. But it would be a mistake to pass judgment based only on his frequent references to the passing of bodily byproducts—Fortunate Eagle’s sense of humor extends beyond the outhouse. The “Scalping Columbus” chapter expands on the version of a true story told by Fortunate Eagle in *Heart of the Rock: The Indian Invasion of Alcatraz* (53–4), making the 1968 “scalping” of a local (San Francisco) Italian American part of an international saga that includes a 1973 trip to the Vatican wearing his “beaded buckskin shirt and all the trimmings, along with human hair scalp locks” (43). The story documents Fortunate Eagle’s ironic affront to colonization and its devastating effects. Although his showmanship and the enjoyment with which he accepts being cast as an ambassador for all Native Americans are at times disconcerting because they promote stereotypical portrayals of Indians, his antics can be seen as acts of survivance. By generating international attention to specific concerns of contemporary Native Americans—by living these stories and then by telling them over and over again—he “creates a sense of native presence over absence, nihilism, and victimry” (Vizenor 1).

In “Tell Me Another Damn Indian Story, Grandpa,” like other funny stories in the collection, Native presence, culture, and family are central to the narrative. Driving through Montana with his wife and granddaughters, Fortunate Eagle makes it a point to stop at “the famous Crow Fair” for a “reunion with [his] adopted Crow family, the Old Elks” (124). He explains: “My wife, Bobbie, and I have always believed it is important to immerse our children and grandchildren in

the Indian ways and traditions. Perhaps they can pass that knowledge down to future generations” (124). As the trip continues, he passes the time by telling “Indian stories and legends” for his granddaughter Mahnee, “who demonstrated a genuine interest in her tribal past” (125). Fortunate Eagle highlights the importance of family and kinship while he demonstrates the power of stories to entertain and teach. In this context he sets up the punch line of the story—which is about picking up an odiferous hitchhiker and dropping her off as quickly as possible. When the excitement of the encounter with the hitchhiker subsides and Mahnee requests “another damn Indian story,” her grandpa replies, “You just experienced one, my dear” (126). By characterizing the story of their lived experience as another of the “Indian stories and legends” that pass on tribal knowledge and traditions, Fortunate Eagle not only asserts Native presence, but he also challenges us to think about what makes “Indian stories” Indian.

If Fortunate Eagle’s hitchhiker story is an Indian story, does that mean that all of his silly anecdotes are Indian stories, too? Perhaps. This is a question that I have been asking myself since I picked up the book and recognized the chapter “TP” as a story that my father (a white, French-Canadian American) told me as a child. Does Fortunate Eagle’s telling the tale of the “Chief” who drowns “in his own tea pee” make it an Indian story? (10) Or does his telling accentuate the ridiculous ways in which many stories about Indians fail to acknowledge Indian presence—the ways in which such stories continue to exercise the kind of racism that often gets trivialized by those who tell them? Or is it simply a bad joke, a childish pun? It’s difficult to tell what Fortunate Eagle thinks—because the fabricated “BS” stories and the “100% true” stories are told in the same voice and style, and there is no context provided to explain where many of the stories come from or when they were first heard. The answers to these questions are left for readers to contemplate—which is clearly the intention of the author, who asks us directly in the Preface, “don’t you agree that bullshit is the fertilizer of the mind?” (xv).

The nature of the stories in *Scalping Columbus and Other Damn Indian Stories*—short, stand-alone, and straightforward—makes it a book that can be read from cover to cover or one story at a time. Reading it from start to finish, however, enables us to more fully understand its most serious offering, the epistolary chapter “Peace and Friendship.” In this letter Fortunate Eagle remembers the stages of his long life—the stories of his life—and he recognizes in those stories the process of “trying to find meaning through his work and his being in the Indian past and the Indian present” (162). Adam Fortunate Eagle’s adventures as a self-proclaimed “contrary warrior” (xiii, 39) and his willingness to play *the* American Indian certainly invite controversy, but it’s the kind of controversy that, like his bullshit, promotes thinking critically about how we fit into the world around us.

Michael LeBlanc, University of Massachusetts Boston

Works Cited

- Fortunate Eagle, Adam. *Heart of the Rock: The Indian Invasion of Alcatraz*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2002. Print.
- Vizenor, Gerald. “Aesthetics of Survivance: Literary Theory and Practice.” *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence*. Ed. Gerald Vizenor. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2008. 1-23. Print.

Rice, Waubgeshig. *Legacy*. Pendicton: Theytus, 2014. 192 pp.

<http://www.theytus.com/Book-List/Legacy>

At once both heartbreakingly devastating and breathtakingly hopeful, Waubgeshig Rice truly gifts his readers a *Legacy* with his debut novel. Published by Indigenous-owned and operated Theytus Books, this work acknowledges the hardships facing today's Indigenous communities, while simultaneously affirming the resilience of Indigenous, and specifically Anishinaabe, identity.

Legacy opens with the story of Eva, a young Anishinaabe woman who has left her home on the Birchbark Indian reservation to attend university in Toronto. With his first chapter, Rice captures the uncomfortable reality of Indigenous students leaving the close-knit communities of home and being thrust into the urban world of Academia where our Indigeneity is an unavoidable reality. Being Indian becomes a badge that Rice's characters struggle to wear proudly in the face of institutional and individual racism. As an example of this, Eva is challenged by an ignorant professor in her Intro to Canadian Politics class who essentially tells her to "get over it," in regard to issues of "poverty and despair" on Native reserves. While non-Indigenous readers may be surprised at the tone this professor takes, or may accept it based on the fact that *Legacy*'s first chapter is set in 1989, Indigenous Academics will see all too familiar echoes of our own experiences in university as we read Eva's frustration.

Though much of the novel is set in Ontario cities, shown as dark and dangerous places where the Indigenous characters struggle (with some failing) to survive, the heart of the book lies in the Birchbark Indian Reservation, a fictional community located on the beautiful north shore of Lake Huron. Between tragic and sometimes violent moments, Rice weaves intricate details depicting the beauty of the land, helping to transform the stereotypical images of a reserve life setting into something deeper—an acknowledgement of the spiritual connection that his Anishinaabe characters hold with this place. We see Eva reflecting on her favorite memories of the beach she grew up on, remembering her mother asking, "You see all the sand on the beach here? This is all ours to share, but it's yours to use however you want." In moments like these, Rice gives us insight into Anishinaabe ways of knowing—concepts about how land connects us as a community.

Notably, *Legacy* does not solely subsist on celebrating the beauty that can and does exist in reserve life. There is a consistent undercurrent of suffering and the desire to numb the pain throughout Rice's novel that points to the complexities behind Indigenous issues in Canada. We learn within the first few pages that Eva's parents have been killed by a drunk driver, and without giving too much away, later on, how death continues to ravage the family. Rice masterfully illustrates the suffocating and never-ending affects of grief in the way he formats the novel—every chapter following Eva's gives us a different perspective from one of her four siblings, Stanley, Maria, Norman, and Edgar, and simultaneously moves us through time, each story beginning two years from where the last chapter has left us. Even as years pass through every chapter, propelling the story forward, the reader is consistently brought back to the vivid moments of each character experiencing the news that their parents had been killed as if it had just happened. We see each sibling grappling with various reactions to grieving: Stanley heading

off to school to try and follow in his sister Eva's footsteps; Norman and Maria stumbling their way through, numbing the pain with alcohol and drugs; Edgar, the eldest, trying to raise his younger siblings, as well as a family of his own, after dropping out of university himself.

Rice courageously gives us an honest picture of Indigenous life in Ontario, from alcoholism, violence, racism, and tragedy, to the uplifting connections with language and land, honouring important Anishinaabe teachings by sharing them with his reader. In the end, what allows each of these siblings to come through their darkness is a strong connection to Anishinaabe tradition and ceremony. Culture is celebrated in Rice's book as we see both Maria and Norman healing from their alcoholism through learning about sacred medicines and sweat lodge teachings. Far from painting a bleak future for Indigenous peoples, Rice illustrates the power of reconnecting with Indigenous traditions as we see this family begin to overcome their haunting past and strengthen their bonds with each other by learning the teachings of their ancestors.

If there is one thing I can say as a criticism of *Legacy*, it would be that there are a few moments where pronoun use can get a little choppy. While this may be a deliberate choice to create a dream-like quality (especially in chapters where we see characters under the influence of alcohol) there were some moments where it was simply distracting having to go back and re-read more than once to understand which "he" was "him." Also, on a personal note, Rice sets up his final chapter with an agonizing feeling of dread, which left me almost wishing he had left the ending out so as to save me from a harsh dose of reality. That being said, the finale of this novel carries on the distinct honesty found throughout Rice's work, which illustrates the author's in depth understanding of Anishinaabe thought, where truth and honesty are highly valued. Therefore, Rice's ending lends to the authenticity of his voice, and without it the story would be left unbearably incomplete.

Overall, *Legacy* is an important read for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous readers alike. For Anishinaabe readers, it is a celebration of Indigenous identity: a look at the resilience of our communities and the power of connecting to our traditional languages, homelands and cultures. For non-Indigenous readers, Rice allows a window into Indigenous life that resists stereotypes by actively acknowledging the inescapable truths of colonialism. On the surface, Rice gives us a story of tragic deaths in an individual Anishinaabe family, but this work goes much deeper than that in examining the larger legacy of Canada's colonial history and the continued effects of it on our communities, broken only by reconnection to our truths as Indigenous peoples.

Angela Semple (Ktunaxa), Trent University

Grover, Linda LeGarde. *The Road Back to Sweetgrass: A Novel*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014. 208 pp.

<http://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/the-road-back-to-sweetgrass>

The Road Back to Sweetgrass tells the story of how Margie Robineau came to be “the hands-down best frybread maker on the entire Mozhay Point Indian Reservation” (5), which is the story of how young Margie coped with unrequited love, overcame her insecurities, and, over the years, became an upstanding member of her Ojibwe community. It is a coming-into-maturity novel rather than a coming of age story. And like other Indigenous variations on the bildungsroman, it is not simply the story of an individual. Grover also tells stories about and from the perspective of others with ties to Mozhay Point, all of whom are essential “ingredients” in Margie’s life (11). The narrative shifts among characters, switches between third and first person, and jumps back and forward through time with such grace and power that readers are never lost. The different parts add up to a satisfying and coherent tale that nonetheless leaves much unsaid, just like the well-mannered Ojibwe refrain from prying despite their obvious curiosity or from speaking aloud their ill-tempered thoughts. Grover says just enough to show us how Margie approaches elderhood without telling us exactly how she got there. She provides a straightforward surface story with depths to ponder.

For example, “the road back to Sweetgrass” is literally the road to the family land and cabin where Margie lives at the chronological end of her story, the road the Dionne sisters take in the first chapter to bring their mother for a visit. But Sweetgrass is also elusive. The scent arises from the old LaForce allotment (Margie Robineau is a LaForce, but if the novel explains the lineage, I missed it), but there is no patch of that plant on the land. Zoo Wash, who is not a LaForce but lives in the cabin, brings Margie sweetgrass and teaches her how to make baskets (only after Margie and her friend Theresa, back in the 1970s, the chronological beginning of Margie’s story, mention they do not know how to make them). The scent arises in the prologue, wafting over the ricers who gather at Lost Lake: “the scent reminds us that we have been blessed by the Creator in all ways, understood or otherwise, here during our time on Mother Earth, and so we accept the mystery for what it is” (1). Margie finds her way back to the Sweetgrass cabin on the LaForce allotment in the 1970s, and over the next forty years she travels the road of acceptance to embrace the blessings in dropping out of college, loving with no hope, and moving back into a “wreck” of a cabin. This sounds awfully earnest, but the novel is not. The misunderstood blessings are the source of much humor. Those Dionne sisters had me laughing out loud as they fumed over their mother’s favoritism and insisted that Margie must be withholding the secret of her perfect frybread.

Margie’s maturation and her renovation of the tiny Sweetgrass cabin parallel the revitalization of the Mozhay Point reservation. Superficially, the economic development made possible by the building of first a bingo hall and then a casino would appear to be the source. But the narrative structure of *The Road Back to Sweetgrass* suggests otherwise. Michael turns his back on the American Indian history professor who seeks validation from her first Indian student (because she doesn’t see Theresa—history is about warrior men). Michael returns to Sweetgrass, his father, and his traplines. Dale Ann returns to Mozhay Point from her relocation placement in Chicago and slowly establishes herself as the beloved daughter. The characters survive forced

sterilization, children being adopted outside of the tribe, and insults and stereotypes of all stripes. They return home and become solid people, not the images outsiders project upon them. Through the careful attention and selective truth-telling of the elders, the young people are guided to tend to themselves and their community. Out of the careful cultivation of relationships, the economic success arises. Throughout *The Road Back to Sweetgrass*, Grover acknowledges larger historical forces, but the pain or blessings they bring carry no more significance than the everyday blessings of which characters take note, like a child's touch or ice crystals glittering in the sun that shines through a break in the clouds.

There's much in Grover's novel that will seem familiar. The setting on an imaginary Ojibwe reservation with ties to an urban area is like Erdrich's novels. An English language novel sprinkled with Ojibwe words, many but not all translated, reminds me of Treuer's use of names in *The Translation of Dr. Apelles*. Satirical descriptions of a white professor who claims to be an expert on Indians and of the bumbling behavior of an outsider remind me of Vizenor's biting humor. The emphasis on the seasonal activities that mark the Ojibwe year echo Jim Northrup's stories. Yet Grover's voice is hers alone, one that clearly has a place in this growing body of contemporary Ojibwe literature.

There's a reason Linda LeGarde Grover has won prizes for her short story collection and her first novel. Like Margie Robineau's light and golden frybread, Grover's prose is "so tasty that the very thought" that the stories will come to an end creates "an undertone of sorrow" that adds to the pleasure of reading (5). In *The Road Back to Sweetgrass* and in *The Dance Boots*, Grover has already brought to life a large cast of characters whose lives are only partially revealed. I can't wait for the next tale about the goings-on at Mozhay Point.

Martha Viehmann, Sinclair Community College

Lone Hill, Dana. *Pointing with Lips: A Week in the Life of a Rez Chick*. Greenfield: Blue Hand Books, 2014. ISBN: 978-1-4959-4529-8. 326 pp.

https://www.createpace.com/4670234?ref=1147694&utm_id=6026

Humor. There is much one can say about this important first novel by Dana Lone Hill, *Pointing with Lips: A Week in the Life of a Rez Chick*, but humor is at the forefront of her work. On nearly every page there is something to make the reader smile, chuckle, or tear up with laughter. To be sure there are serious issues dealt with in the novel, but humor sustains the reader through the work, as humor sustained the author growing up on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, the setting for *Pointing with Lips*. In *Custer Died for Your Sins*, Vine Deloria, Jr. argues, “One of the best ways to understand a people is to know what makes them laugh. Laughter encompasses the limits of the soul. In humor life is redefined and accepted. Irony and satire provide much keener insights into a group’s collective psyche and values than do years of research” (140). Lone Hill uses laughter as a setting for growing up Oglala Lakota on Pine Ridge. In order to understand what encompasses being a “rez chick,” the reader must understand the importance of humor in the Lakota Nation. Likewise, one must know Lakota culture to understand the clear portrait of what it means to be a member of contemporary Lakota reservation life as portrayed in *Pointing with Lips*.

In a recent interview I conducted with Lone Hill, I asked her about the humor in the novel. She responded, “My grandmother Dod was the funniest woman I know... my uncles, my brothers, my father, so many people in my life and people I grew up with have the best sense of humor. I believe it is something we have always had and always will—it gets us through life. Especially when you grow up in poverty, I mean you can’t always cry.” For Sincere Strongheart, known primarily as “Sis,” the protagonist and narrator of *Pointing with Lips*, survival is her daily existence. Sis, single mother of three children by two different men, lives and works a dead end job at the Great Sioux Shopping Center on Pine Ridge. Before the reader is ten pages into the novel, Sis explains her entire family structure. I was struck with the oddity of a narrator clearly laying out a family tree so quickly in the story, until I remembered the importance of Lakota kinship relationships. Lone Hill discussed the emphasis on kinship in the novel: “I try to emphasize [kinship] so much because we keep our families close, and I think we do it because we lose so much and lost so much. I introduced her whole family first, even those absent in the book, because it is our reality.” Reality is what comes across in her delightfully drawn words, Lakota reality. Sis observes, “If an Indian woman’s worth is finding out a way you’re related to her then the women in my family are priceless” (146). *Wolakota oyna skanpo*, can be loosely translated, “to do this is in the Lakota way.” It became readily clear to me that Lone Hill was writing a novel *wolakota oyna skanpo*, or what I call “writing Lakota.” In *Pointing with Lips*, Lone Hill translates modern reservation life through the lens of Lakota customs, traditions, and lifeways.

First words of a novel have always been important to me, a map to guide the reader through the novel. Sis begins her story: “The pow wow grounds on my reservation are always dusty. Actually, the whole village of Pine Ridge, South Dakota is dusty.” To those familiar with Lakota creation histories, the little brother of the Four Winds, the Four Directions, *Yumnimni* (*Yum*), the “little whirlwind or dust devil,” can be seen in these opening lines. Lone Hill acknowledged that

she is familiar with Lakota origin stories, and at least “subconsciously,” she references, at the very least, the lessons handed down to her through these stories. Throughout the text I kept finding characteristics that Yum and Sis share. For amusement they will risk anything, they are governed by chance and favor, and they cannot protect others or even themselves until they find themselves. Sis protects her family, particularly her *winkte* cousin and best friend Boogie and her children, only to realize that she cannot until she confronts her own burden, alcohol.

Critics will surely have much to say about another comedic take on the “drunken reservation Indian,” but I am reminded of what Muskogee poet Joy Harjo said in an interview with Laura Coltelli; “Alcoholism is an epidemic in native people, and I write about it. I was criticized for bringing it up, because some people want to present a certain image of themselves. But again, it comes back to what I was saying: part of the process of healing is to address what is evil” (140). Lone Hill is writing her reality:

When I wrote *Pointing with Lips*, I was incarcerated, awaiting sentencing. My future was up in the air and I had no idea how long I was going away. All I knew was I was so absolutely lonesome for my kids, my family... my home, my land... I was hoping, in a way, I can show people on the rez, reckless behavior will never let you advance; you have to do it yourself. I was tired of the “I am a victim” society I grew up in, and I wanted to show we are survivors.

The seven days Sis narrates cover drunken and drugged out mothers who do not take care of their children, and she translates the extremely horrific consequences of those actions through her own family’s history, but there is hope too, as when she believes, “If someone wants to quit drinking it has to come from within them self” (181). The connection to Yum is readily apparent and it is in this connection to Lakota tradition and customs where Lone Hill demonstrates a means for survival.

The connection to Lakota humor and Landscape are also a means of survivance. Sis describes a drunken scene in a corn field following a night out in a border town:

We are throwing the cans in some farmer’s field, I am sure in the morning some fat farmer, riding his tractor will be raging and shaking his fist at the Lord in the sky, “These damn drunken Injuns!”

Fuck him I think, as I throw a half full can into his field. This is our land!”

Whoa, now I know I am shit faced. I hate littering. I really do, not to the point where I am the fake Indian letting a tear roll down my cheek. But I do care to the point where I do give a hoot to not pollute. (65-66)

Pointing with Lips is filled with wonderful inside jokes about PSA Indians, recycling owls, commod cheese, *wateca*, and pointing with lips, but there are also Lakota lessons being passed along in the picturesque descriptions of the Black Hills, Badlands, and even the Pine Ridge Reservation. In our interview, Lone Hill told me, “People see our reservations and they see poverty, broken down communities and families. What they do not see is the beauty I see and respect. Landscapes tell a story, they tell [us] we need to continue with educating the next

generation that we belong to this land and we need to care for the land that feeds us, shelters us, gives us water.” The stories are passed down from generation to generation in the novel and in Lone Hill’s life, “I think my biggest influences for storytelling were two of my grandfathers. I was never presented them in written form, always oral and I try to remember them and tell them to my children. It is a way of keeping our history... alive.” The story Lone Hill passes down and the stories Sis narrates are Lakota histories recorded for survivance.

There are a number of critics who have lamented Sis’s “white boyfriend” Mason Thomas, “Mase,” riding to the rescue of Sis at the end of the novel. I asked Lone Hill what she thought of this characterization: “I don’t think Mase saved her at all, I think it was the first time in her life she felt appreciated by a man. I think Sis has to save herself; however, much support from Mase and mainly her family will get her there.” If the text is read in a Lakota way, lessons from origin histories, like the tales of Yum, and kinship relationships, can guide the reader to better understand how Sis has to save herself, with the help of her family and friends, including Mase.

While *Pointing with Lips* can be seen as just another comedic “rez chick” novel, (though Lone Hill acknowledges she labels it as such) it is really much more when read through a Lakota lens. Writing Lakota is a challenging task. To fill a novel full of traditional Lakota kinship relationships, stories, language, landscapes, and humor is demanding, but to do so *and* portray real contemporary reservation life, the good, the bad, ugly and sad, in a thoughtful, honest, and humorous portrayal is what makes writing Lakota and Dana Lone Hill’s *Pointing with Lips* uniquely wonderful.

Brian J. Twenter, University of South Dakota

Works Cited

- Deloria Jr., Vine. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998. Print.
- Harjo, Joy. “A Laughter of Absolute Sanity: An Interview with Angels Carabi.” *The Spiral of Memory: Interviews*. Ed. Laura Cotelli. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996. 133-42. Print.

Rogers, Janet Marie. *Peace in Duress*. Vancouver: Talon Books, 2012. 128pp.

<http://talonbooks.com/books/peace-in-duress>

Rogers, Janet Marie. *Janet Marie Rogers Stream on Soundcloud*. 2013. Web. 3 Jan. 2015.

<https://soundcloud.com/janet-marie-rogers>

Peace in Duress is Janet Rogers' fourth poetry collection available from Talon Books (214). As a recent poet laureate of Victoria, British Columbia, Rogers hails from the Mohawk-Tuscarora Nations and engages a staggering range of timely themes such as environmental justice, First Nations sovereignty and struggles for decolonization, gender and sexuality, oral traditions (see "Sky Woman Falling" and "Red-Black" especially), critiques of capitalism and more. This list is hardly exhaustive, and the collection itself resists easy reductions, as hers is a powerful, edgy voice that simultaneously thunders and soothes, aggravates and celebrates-- sometimes in the very same breath. Hers is a voice that thunders as it demands political change—"We want more/And we want it now"—and she urges readers/listeners to do the same in "Move Like a Mountain," writing "you better walk loud." Yet even as she painfully points our eyes to the "Fractures/In the Sacred," and reminds us that we are, "standing on stolen territories," Rogers likewise declares that the people are "Singing new songs" and implores the audience to "Resist the hate/keep praying." Whether she is taking aim at attacks on the land and tribal sovereignty, or rejoicing in a kiss or other act of human kindness, *Peace in Duress* is overflowing with the spirit of resistance to confining notions of both poetry and indigeneity.

Skillfully blending images and rhythms of contemporary urban experiences with Original Instructions and "the Great Laws of being" (28), Rogers' pages present "Raven/dancing on fresh concrete" (53) alongside "Visions of medicine/Dropping like acid on the skin" (38). The poet reminds the People early on in the collection that "Our greatest asset/is memory" (6) in a colonial world forcefully urging cultural and spiritual amnesia. Here, Rogers is a poet-warrior writing from the trenches, bearing witness to the epidemic of disappeared First Nations women in "Move a Mountain (Walk a Mile in Her Shoes)," which picks up the discourse of the Walking with Our Sisters activist campaign as the speaker darkly narrates, "If we could really walk in her shoes/[We'd be] running for our lives." The poet later intones, "Come back," repeating impassioned phrases meant to return the disappeared women and heal both self and community, a rebalancing poetics that links with another piece in the collection, "Giving a Shit." Here, in the second to last poem, the reader finds Rogers' telling account of the Idle No More movement, particularly a description of a round dance addressing Canadian Prime Minister Harper's failure to address Chief Theresa Spence's (Attawapiskat) request to meet with First Nations peoples to discuss the government's failures to honor the treaties and the earth. Rogers writes, "Have you nothing to say" and warns that, "The movement has just begun."

But *Peace in Duress* is far more than a catalogue of violence against peoples and the earth, for even as her poems offer harsh testimonies, "telling the stories, willingly," these are also pages filled with sensuality and love. For example, in "The Sexual Revolution Will Be Televised," Rogers speaks of the rejection of colonial shame surrounding sexuality and the reclamation of positive conceptions of erotic, what she calls "the rez-erection." Here, the very personal is very

political as, "we can have power over our own bodies/Imagine: we can have authority over our own skin." The book is likewise brimming with celebration and "powerful pleasure" (85) from front to back, resulting in a collection centered on (re)balancing and forging connections even in the midst of so much disruption and disconnection.

Rogers' rhythms pulse on the page, and I was immediately drawn to the musicality of her repetition and galloping cadences, like in "Three-Day Road" and "Forty Dayz," where "dirt doesn't want to stay down" and "welcome winds whip." Even the earth itself moves to the rhythm of the poet's voice, as "this land is my favorite song that skips at my favourite part." For these reasons, it is no wonder that Janet Rogers identifies as a spoken-word artist and maintains an active Soundcloud page devoted to experimental vocal-musical performances (Rogers, "Janet Marie Rogers Stream on Soundcloud"). Although her digital poems unarguably complement any reading of *Peace in Duress*-- sometimes even offering exciting, alternate versions of the written text-- they also function as stand-alone works in their own right, suggesting that one element of Rogers' activism as a poet is ultimately structural in nature since she not only resists easy binaries in her content but also in terms of genre as she fluidly moves from the page to the air. Some of Rogers' performances of poems in the book utilize microbeats that sound like anxious heartbeats or drops of rain hitting the sidewalk, but all along the focus still remains on her voice and the materiality of language itself. Many of Rogers' spoken works turn to reverb and delay vocal effects (see especially "Love and Protection"), which emphasize and elongate critical lines and syllables, creating haunting and, at times, chaotic and dreamlike, sonic atmospheres. Such repetitions reinforce the lingering nature of Rogers' content, where issues like violence targeting First Nations women and the destruction of nature are ongoing, or in other places where the listener is made to dwell on a single word in all of its sonic permutations. In this way, Rogers as an artist is a master of echoes, both on the page and in performance, where her poems talk back to the listener/reader as well as to each other, and necessary visions retrace their steps, audibly stumbling into one another again and again.

In these ways, Janet Rogers' *Peace in Duress* and her accompanying spoken performances on Soundcloud come together to form a sonic tour-de-force of contemporary indigenous resistance. They will appeal to readers and listeners interested in works that are both experimental and at the same time accessible, as well as audiences eager to engage narratives of survival, resistance, and strength from an unwavering voice that isn't afraid to speak the truth no matter the cost.

Patricia Killelea, University of California, Davis

Baca, Jimmy Santiago. *Singing at the Gates: Selected Poems*. New York: Grove Press, 2014. 249 pp.

<http://www.groveatlantic.com/#page=isbn9780802122100%20>

Jimmy Santiago Baca's long career is well-represented in the collection *Singing at the Gates* (Grove Press 2014). From his early prison poetry to longer lyric poems to accompany art exhibitions, the collection solidifies the major themes in Baca's poetic oeuvre. The poems chart a move from self to other that embraces a hybrid identity seeking to understand the ways of injustice that act on men and women of color.

The collection opens with "Excerpts from the Mariposa Letters" as a way of grounding Baca's poetic journey in its earliest incarnation. The young speaker fairly jumps off the page with passion—for love, desire, fear. The letters expose the pleasure and pain of being able to express emotion and thought through the written word. The work is raw and makes a nice introduction to the more familiar poems of Baca's early collections.

The individual in captivity appears to remind readers of Baca's early start, and his continued interest in the ways that individuals fare in prisons. Readers familiar with Baca's early work will welcome the return of some of the vivid images pervading his poems: The young prisoners who "gnaw their hearts off / caught in the steel jaws of prison" ("Just Before Dawn" 20-21) take on a new resonance when one considers Baca's active engagement with writing workshops in prisons and juvenile detention centers. The collection offers retrospective look at the ways in which poetry can heal wounds both self- and society-inflicted.

Chicano scholars have focused on Baca's relationship to the land through forging a Native/Chicano identity. Poems such as "A Handful of Earth, That is All I Am" offer a poignant return to the land politics that pervade northern New Mexico history. The lines "My blood runs through this land, / like water thrashing out of mountain walls / bursting, sending the eagle from its nest" (8-10) highlight mestizo claims to the land and culture of the US Southwest. However, these themes of land, ancestors, and home find new significance when read with newer works. Ranging from Mexico to Kansas, "Rita Falling from the Sky," examines the life of a Chihuahuan woman found in Kansas and locked in a mental institution. Later, a doctor discovered that she was speaking a native language of the Rarámuri Indians, and she was released to return to her village. The long, lyric poem gives voice to Rita as it imagines her journey through the desert walking north. The folk images of chile, peyote, maize, clay, and more underscore that the land she traverses is actually Aztlan (Baca 189). As a new poem in the collection, "Rita Falling from the Sky" makes visible the move from self to other in Baca's quest for a universal exploration of hybridity and identity, yet the effect is less haunting than the earlier poems.

Newly-collected, recent poems are also noteworthy for their desire to speak in different voices. The poetic focus on a transvestite prostitute in "Smoking Mirrors" and a young woman in "Julia" offers a speaker that initially seems jarringly different from the speaker in the early sections of the collection. The poems are an attempt to negotiate a "psychic split" that Baca felt evident in his earlier work; the leap from bicultural to transvestite is not so far, after all, he argues (xxii). While the subject matter is worthy and challenging, there seems to be something missing from the context of the poems. Baca notes in the Preface that some of these new poems were written

to accompany photography exhibits about the Juarez border and Northern New Mexico. It would be interesting to view the photos alongside the poems.

While the collection relies heavily on early work, the title poem provides an apt theme for the assemblage's ambition. "Singing at the Gates" reads as a welcome update to Corky Gonzales's "I am Joaquín," anthem of the Chicano Movement. This poem's images include women of La Raza and myriad reimagining of ways Chicanas/os endure, from men carrying babies, to Chicanos with backpacks, to abuelas on Harleys. This poem is a testament to the strength of Baca's vision. In attempting to move beyond the stereotypes of culture, class, and gender, Baca has presented the possibility of a thought-provoking reinterpretation of his early work.

Leigh C. Johnson, Marymount University

Revard, Carter. *From the Extinct Volcano, A Bird of Paradise*. Norman, Oklahoma: Mongrel Empire Press, 2014. 100pp.

<http://mongrelempire.org/catalog/poetry/from-extinct-volcano.html>

One thing you can be sure of with the authorship of Carter Revard: it never fails to offer a full menu, what the French call *une bonne bouche*. How else to designate this New and Selected with its span of Osage and other tribal creation stories, the community role of song, evolutionary biology (especially dinosaurs), astrophysics and the cosmos, hummingbirds, Oklahoma dust and history, Wall Street, the Iraq War, and not least a run of haiku? Drawing upon the early collections *Ponca War Dancers* (1980) and *Cowboys and Indians, Christmas Shopping* (1992) and the composite *How The Sings Come Down* (2005) in Salt's Earthworks series, together with new work, Revard lays it on you: intertextual Milton and Shelley, troves of learning from Bible and Latin sources through to entomology. If all this sounds a touch professorial it no doubt is. But the upshot is engagingly redeemed by the writing's slivers of vernacular wit, the ready intervention of speaking voice.

The thirty-plus contributions include a number of pieces now standard in the Revard repertoire. "What the Eagle Fan Says," from *An Eagle Nation* (1992), reflects his longtime university work in Old and Middle English, a poem structured as *kenning* with due use of caesura and parallel phrasing. But far from any Anglo Saxon or Norse landscape the world at hand is Native American, one of powwow dance, South Dakota's Wakonda, ceremonial bead and rattle, and above all, the poet's obligation to honor and remake legacy. "Dancing with Dinosaurs," originally to be found in his collagist and hugely engaging *Winning The Dust Bowl* (2001), exploits a fine seam of avian imagery, dinosaur into bird, the transition from the poet's own tribal naming as Thunder Person into verse maker and songster. "In Chigger Heaven," from *Cowboys and Indians*, links the mites being referenced to the poet's itch to articulate Creation's infinitudes large and small. "Dreaming in Oxford," first issued in *Yellow Medicine Review* (2010), remembers a 4AM college waking to a lyric-oneiric landscape that spans Lewis Carroll, Robert Frost and swans patrolling the River Isis.

"Parading with the Veterans of Foreign Wars," from *An Eagle Nation* (1992) has understandably become one of Revard's signature compositions ("almost a found poem" says the accompanying note). Opening with the lines "Apache, Omaha, Osage, Choctaw,/Comanche, Cherokee, Oglala, Micmac: our place was ninety-fifth," it plays allusions to Custer and the Seventh Cavalry and Jefferson Barracks Park ("where the dragoons were quartered for the Indian Wars") into a savvy riff on what the parade now signifies, to include cleaning up horse poop and heading to KFC in its aftermath "given the temporary/absence of buffalo here in the/Gateway to the West, St. Louis." Allusion is made to the Judging Stand, a tacit invitation to history's necessarily far larger judgment, that of how America might or should assess its treatment of the tribes and their plies and skeins of cultural life. Whose "foreign war," runs the sub-text, most applies?

There can be no want of further choice. "Songs of the Wine-Throated Hummingbird" turns as much on the "language" of humpback whales and dolphins as of hummingbirds. The poem celebrates the natural world's different musics—whales "in the sapphire ocean," the "arias" of the dolphins, the "varied outpourings" albeit for a minute only of the hummingbirds. Each, non-humanly, and in Revard's envisioning, contributes "the smaller ripples that we call Meaning." The concluding lines bespeak a near Whitmanesque note, the earth's land and sea as yielding symphony, an ecological chorus. The grasp of global span is typical:

Deep
in the blue Antarctic seas, high
in the green Guatemala jungle, here
in these cracked English words,
can you hear the sing,
the hummingbirds, the humpback whales,
a neutron star, a human soul?

“Living in the Holy Land,” which made its appearance in *Stand Magazine*, ostensibly memorializes the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial in 2006. But its evidently more inclusive purpose is to remember “our Diaspora,” the history that predates frontierism, runs through Empire and the Civil War, and continues into the Oil regimes (“And then the Oil Men came,/their rivers of black liquid gold washed away/too many of our people, to many of our ways.”). The poem nicely begins from Osage creation story as though an anticipation of the Declaration of Independence (“our Osage forebears brought forth,/ on this continent, a new nation,/ conceived in liberty and dedicated to/the proposition that all beings are created equal.”). It closes with homage to song and drum “*that we may live, that we may yet remain/a sovereign Nation in this holy land*” (italics in original). Revard’s keen sense of heritage, tribal past-into-present as never to be forgotten, can hardly be doubted.

Along with a number of wry prose pieces (try his Buck Creek picture of winter moths in “Meadows, Moths, Slatebeds, Dictionaries” or his Dylan Thomas whippoorwill and booze story set in Osage County, Oklahoma, “He Should Have Drunk Goat’s Milk Maybe”), not to mention the often assiduous notes and glosses, *From the Extinct Volcano*, *A Bird of Paradise* supplies a due and timely reminder of the Revard oeuvre. He brings an expansive mind to bear, a beckoning appetite across science and the arts, across geographies from Oklahoma and the other southwest to Bethlehem. The menu’s poetry indeed comes over full, a degustation.

A. Robert Lee

Arnott, Joanne. *Halfling Spring: An internet romance*. Illus. Leo Yerxa. Neyaashiinigiing, ON: Kecedonce, 2013. 127pp.

<http://www.kegedonce.com/bookstore/item/55-halfling-spring-an-internet-romance.html>

The story starts with two usernames in what the first poem of this collection calls an internet geography: in (cyber)reality, this is *riverspine*, an e-group for poets to exchange and comment on each others' work. Here *teaandoranges*, another user, intrigues *specificallyjo*, who scents something intriguing, draws her head back to sense the "taste in the air" (1). Maybe the Leonard Cohen reference draws her, given the similarity in delicate imagery. The two meet via *dadababy*, a third user or possibly a forum: as is often the case in this collection, the phrasing is indirect and imagistic. The introduction leads to showing each other their "dusty / back rooms"—a poetic phrase for what I think must mean allowing each other into the private areas of the forum where their creative works are stored—and talking in the public "foyer." By the end of the first poem of this linked collection, *teaandoranges* has a name, Alastair, and a more confident sub-title announces that the two are "e-dating."

And so begins, as the subtitle would have it, an internet romance. As the Acknowledgements section at the end makes clear, the poems in this collection document a real relationship between *specificallyjo*, a name which a quick Google search shows to be Joanne Arnott's real handle on such sites as Wikipedia, Youtube, Soundcloud and (presumably) many more forums, and Alastair Campbell. Not, thank goodness, the foul-mouthed Scottish politico, but rather a distinguished historian and anthropologist who has carried out extensive work for First Nations organisations including the Assembly of First Nations and the government of Nunavut. In other words, this is a relationship conducted via the written word—and, later, phone conversations—between two mature adults, in the no-space of the internet. It's unusual territory for First Nations writing, which as has so often been remarked is distinguished by an emphasis on physical geography and close relationships (or alienation from ancestral geographies and kin-ties, which amounts to the same thing).

Yet what stands out immediately in this collection (aside from the wonderfully spare illustrations) is precisely that it neither drifts off into cyber-abstraction nor absents itself from the real world. The relationship begins with early days in which the poet ("not an elder yet" (55)) opens herself up to the possibility of becoming once again giggly, silly, flirtatious, willing to trade experiences and believe in the possibility of romance. In the poem "savour," for example, she remarks that "i think i used the word 'love' twice / how indiscreet" (7). From there, the emotional forward drift of the relationship pulls us along to the full blossoming of a desire that "calls me in a low crowmoan, distracting" (63), including brief side-stops into jealousy or uncertainty, eventually leading the speaker and listener to their first physical meeting. Through all this are threaded the more mundane and the more sacred concerns of the world, which does not stop for this relationship (nor, it seems, would either participant wish it to do so). The early poems are filled with natural imagery, with Canadian animals (jaybird, watermoccasin) and a Métis/First Nations consciousness of landscape. Dropping like a stone into the lighthearted early section comes the poem "climate change," which meditates upon an earth destroyed "by the greed of wealthy nations" (17), an earth who "may shift about any time she chooses" (18). Given the lover's location in Inuit territory, it is obvious how this destruction of polar ice and northern habitats feeds into the main theme of the collection. Yet it also points up the ways in which the

poet refuses to see her and her lover as being in any way walled off from the larger political concerns for social and environmental justice that have always centered Arnott's work. The earth is wounded, and the work of healing does not stop at the border of the computer screen. Equally, Arnott shows how the virtual conversation infects and inflects the real world. As she comes to accept that "there is someone in this world" (27) and as desire builds through poems such as "delving" (41), with its multiple explorations of pocket imagery, so the sight of "on the sidewalk across the street / crow is fucking crow" (51) takes her back to her own insecurities within the relationship.

As the poet travels around Canada, she adopts local nations' traditions, referencing sacred totemic animals such as crow, hummingbird and water glider. Given Alastair's location on Baffin Island, it is not a surprise that Inuit traditions, particularly the sacred cairns known as *inuksuit*, are particularly on her mind. She wrestles with the ways she can image an "urban *inuksuit*," a single figure I think for Indigenous continuance and change in a ravaged and colonised landscape. Of the many and varied cultural references (e.g. Chanticleer), one in particular stands out, namely the employment of Audre Lorde's title "Uses of the Erotic (The Erotic as Power)." The entire collection can be seen as a poet's claiming of her erotic self and refusal to allow any of her lived experiences—as mother, as Métis person, as older woman, as pseudonymous internet presence, as traveller, as survivor—to preclude or occlude any other. The tenderness and willingness to open oneself to another is a feature of the lover and of the ethical inhabitant of the land: the two are not separable and should not be seen as such.

Possibly Arnott's most successfully intertwined work yet, this collection delicately yet firmly brings First Nations poetry into a digital age, insisting on a continuing transmotion into a new (un)colonised space that nonetheless can be inscribed with traditional imagery. Leo Yerxa, who according to Arnott's Afterword was given the entire corpus and allowed to choose which poems to illustrate, has done a fantastic job of capturing the feel of Arnott's deft blend of the simple and direct with the allusive and symbolic, using the simplest possible pencil lines to create images of natural landscape and human body.

James Mackay, European University, Cyprus

Senier, Siobhan, ed. *Dawnland Voices: An Anthology of Indigenous Writing from New England*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014. 716pp.

<http://www.nebraskapress.unl.edu/product/Dawnland-Voices.675948.aspx>

In what is surely among the most self-consciously edited anthologies ever published, Siobhan Senier enlists the help of eleven Indigenous community members—from ten tribal nations—to generate a snapshot of “Native people’s continuous presence” in northeastern North America. The result of this editorial collaboration is more than just an exciting new collection of Indigenous voices—though it is certainly that. This is a volume that grapples earnestly and productively with prevalent notions of what literary anthologies—and their editors—are capable of.

As a non-Native scholar of Indigenous literatures, Senier’s editorial self-consciousness is both refreshing and, one could easily argue, vital to her task. In fact, the scholarly values outlined in her introduction—the enthusiastic spirit of collaboration, the relative lack of academic ego, the unconditional willingness to learn, and the steadfast commitment to a model of editorial control that listens more than it speaks—reflect precisely what has made Senier such a trusted and respected figure in northeastern Native studies today. It would be misguided, she compellingly argues here, for a non-Native editor to act as an intellectual invader of Indigenous cultural territory—to perpetuate an academic doctrine of discovery in which Indigenous writers, however well known among Native peoples or within tribal communities, are supposedly “found” by outside scholars and then counted for “credit” within Western institutional value structures. From Senier’s perspective, this conventional model of editorial practice would threaten to sever Native writers from their distinct community contexts, disrupting and distracting from the important ways in which “tribal literature connects people to homeland, kin, and neighbors, to tribal language, histories, and traditions.” Instead of acting as a compiler seeking to capture and contain her subject, then, Senier acts as a conduit—or as a facilitator alongside whom eleven impassioned community editors speak and exhibit the works of their nations on their own terms.

These community editors provide brief but dynamic introductions before each of the volume’s ten sections, which Senier organizes first by tribal nation and then from north to south. Jaime Battiste invokes the late Rita Joe in his introduction, appropriately stressing the importance that Mi’kmaq peoples actively “create writing, instead of just being written about.” Juana Perley reflects on the frustrations that Maliseet peoples on both sides of what is now the Canada/U.S. border have faced when dealing with powerful settler governments who are simultaneously meddlesome and unresponsive. And after describing the natural beauty and power of traditional Passamaquoddy territory, Donald Soctomah pays homage to an equally mighty people who “bravely have been battling against assimilation into the European civilization” for centuries—a nation in which youth leaders of late have been working hard to revive the old ways. Carol Dana describes a thriving Penobscot literary tradition that “has been passed down to us by our elders mostly, but also in written records”—through stories, petroglyphs, etchings, birch bark maps, rock markings, and mnemonic devices. And Lisa Brooks eloquently explains how Kwinitekw, or the Connecticut River, functions as the “central character” throughout the selected Abenaki writings, connecting “the people and places of the Abenaki ‘home country’” across time and distance.

Next, Cheryl Watching Crow Stedtler describes and justifies her “addiction” to Nipmuc country, inviting the readers of these selections to “journey with us and walk our path.” Joan Tavares Avant (Granny Squannit) introduces writings by the Mashpee Wampanoag and the Wampanoag of Gay Head, providing brief histories for each tribe before emphasizing the crucial role that writing can play in communicating the oft-neglected perspectives of tribal peoples. Introducing the Narragansett writings, Dawn Dove urges readers to “hear the historical grief in our voice”—and she speaks powerfully of the challenges her people have always faced when attempting to communicate with Euroamerican populations who would rather believe their own lies than listen. Stephanie M. Fielding introduces writings connected by “a love for Mohegan” and “a compassionate eye for the land and its inhabitants.” And finally, Trudie Lamb Richmond and Ruth Garby Torres introduce key writings from the three major families of the Schaghticoke tribe—Harris, Cogswell, and Kilson.

Each of the ten sections ends with a list of recommendations for further reading, and while the selections that are presented here span centuries—from shortly after the arrival of Europeans in the northeast to the present day—each chapter inevitably contains “large historical gaps” that Senier hopes readers will take as invitations to dig deeper. She also notes that a number of northeastern nations are absent from the volume entirely. Hopefully, these invitations will lead readers to the anthology’s sister website, *Writing of Indigenous New England* (indigenousnewengland.com), an initiative that grew out of the editors’ understandably difficult decisions about what to include in the pages of *Dawnland Voices* and what to set aside. This exciting ongoing process of what Senier calls “web-based anthologizing” involves many of the same editors mentioned above, along with other northeastern Native writers, historians, and community members, who together are working to upload, annotate, and share cultural materials for public view.

This online initiative represents what is perhaps the most revolutionary aspect of Senier’s approach as editor, and in her introduction, she urges her “colleagues at other universities” to likewise “partner with tribal historians, authors, museums, and other entities to produce new knowledge about regional indigenous literary traditions.” She asks the readers of *Dawnland Voices* to imagine the volume as a hub, out from which come multiple “spokes”—the collaborative bibliography at the end of each chapter, the online exhibit space, and the associative activity taking place on various social networking sites. Again, Senier reminds us that this is not a book that tries to contain its topic; rather, it makes connections outwards into the universe. It speaks to its readers, and it invites those readers to speak back—to engage, to invest, to fill in the silences, to actively contribute.

It is curious that Senier uses the term “New England” in her title to refer to the northeast in its entirety—an area that includes territory that has never been part of what is usually referred to as New England. As an inhabitant of what is now known as Atlantic Canada, I would be interested to hear Senier’s explanation for this usage. In the end, this is a very minor criticism. *Dawnland Voices* is the product the many years Senier has spent working tirelessly to build partnerships between Native communities and the classroom, and the significance of her efforts in this regard is reflected by the beauty of her achievement. Whether she would accept such “credit” for this volume is immaterial: we will give it to her anyway.

Rachel Bryant, University of New Brunswick

Vizenor, Gerald. *Favor of Crows: New and Selected Haiku*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2014. 168 pp.

<http://www.upne.com/0819574329.html>

“The first to come / I am called / Among the birds. / I bring the rain. / Crow is my name” *Song of the Crows*, Henry Selkirk

Gerald Vizenor poses a hefty 26-page introduction that gives insight into his fifty years of working with the form. “My very first literary creations were haiku scenes, and since then, that imagistic sense of nature has always been present in my writing. I may never know if my haiku are right by nature, only that the scenes are my best memories. In this way, my sense of presence, haiku creations, and survivance is in nature and in the book.”

Books such as this are fortunate to have introductions in them. They give direction. They are a map of where the book is going. A history of where the form has been. Giving the reader a handle on more than the reader knew would be there.

Recently I have had to rethink my idea of nature. The native ideal of the earth as a living being, a relative, is still true. But I’ve also seen another side. I live part-time on a county road in rural Texas to help a part of my family. The dust, drought, heat, hot wind, occasional cats abandoned on the road, the litters born from them. The animal fights I hear in the night. The grasshoppers, red ants, a multitude of small brown ants, bugs and spiders—large brown fiddle-back spiders. The harshness.

“from the half / of the sky / that which lives there / is coming / and makes a noise” [an early Anishinaabe song recorded by the ethnographer, Frances Densmore].

Occasional intense storms come across the land with nothing to hold them back. It must be a cumulative hardship I pick up in the air. A historical longing, hunger and need. The horses in the field pull up roots of grass as they eat, making a ripping sound.

I think of haiku as a clutter of fragility with a wham of recognition on rice paper. The termites would eat them here. Words would be gulped. But haiku is sturdy enough in Vizenor’s hands to handle the hardness of the Texas terrain.

This one—“dusty road / horses at the rusted gate / scent of mown hay” Of course, the smell of the diesel tractor and the roar of mowing is implied in the smell of hay. And maybe the desire of horses to leave the enclosed field.

And another—“ant mounds / flooded in a thunderstorm / restored by morning.” Yes, that is exactly the way it is.

The vibrancy of haiku lives in Vizenor's new collection. The crows have brought their blessing—the distant likenesses, the reverberations, the tenuous link of one thing to another, the bright and unexpected connections.

It was Vizenoresque to find the word “tease” on the first line of the introduction. The haiku is a tease of nature. The winnowing of an impression. The opening of an image. The haiku on the page seem like clothes hanging on a line in the country. Or with three haiku on each page, the view from a three-story building.

“Haiku is visionary, a timely meditation, an ironic manner of creation, and a sense of motion, and, at the same time, a consciousness of seasonal impermanence.”

Vizenor's images are startling—the pressure of ice that pushes a hole in the bucket of frozen water. Large ice chunks floating on a river reflecting the full moon in the river itself broken with ice and in turn breaking the moon hurtful yet playful almost as a ball bouncing. The union of water across the stones and birds copying the sound in a tease or costume of mimicry. River stones under thin ice like an ancient bridge of little people.

The haiku is fleeting as milkweed fuzz in the wind and transitory as understanding a passage of eternity. Vizenor's work opens the human soul—“honeysuckle climbs / a withered fruit tree / reach of memory.” You see how the universe can be held in the smallest seed—the withered past that once bore fruit, but no longer does, still has life of another kind growing upon it. To me, there is a longing for something past, or someone. It even could be the story of the loss of the native way of life, but with acculturation, another life has come.

Vizenor's word, *survivance*, also is there in the opening of the introduction. It is the *survivance* of the native mindset after all that survives. Vizenor explains that he sees the virtual world in haiku. Almost as if they were film. Or images on a scrim. “The fugitive turns and transitions of the season.”

Vizenor, an expansive writer of all genres, finds the largeness of his craft even in the haiku. [It] “was my first sense of totemic *survivance* in poetry, the visual and imagistic associations of nature, and of perception and experience. The metaphors in my initial haiku scenes were teases of nature and memory. The traces of my imagistic names cut to the seasons, not to mere imitation, or the cosmopolitan representation and ruminations of an image in a mirror of nature.”

I think what is important in *FAVOR OF CROWS* are the towers of the haiku, the essay on the form itself, and the overall sense of not what it is, but what it causes—a living energy, a *causer* in its own right. A generator of a comprehensive city that is built within the book. All of which haiku is for Vizenor.

I also need to say something about the haunting cover, *Crow's Mortality Tale*, Rick Bartow. It is the head of a creature that looks something like a bear or maybe a bald man. It has one human eye and one animal eye. The chartreuse ghost in the background. The blue hand in the foreground that often is seen imprinted on Ghost Dance shirts in museums. It is an accretion of

thought, memory, artifact, innuendo that provides a conceptual shadowing of the haiku Vizenor writes.

He also ties together Japanese and Chippewa cultures. The White Earth Reservation in Minnesota and the pine islands of Matsushima. Basho to Vizenor who sees haiku as a native dreamsong. "...the dispositions of *manidoo* and *shi* are perceptive moments of presence in nature..."

The solid world is pulled apart like a milkweed pod, and the fuzz spreads its down on the wind. The coilings and connectives. The taking apart of a part of the world to see beyond the world. The interpretations and exigencies. The governmental agency for dispersing rations. Or Vizenor's haiku as totems like the small stone bears I have in my china closet. One with a book in its mouth. The other with a parchment tied on its back.

"The anishinaabe dream songs and tricky stories of creation that bear the totemic nature, elusive ironies, and tragic wisdom of natives were traduced and depreciated by the hauteur of discovery, the cruelties of monotheism, and the pernicious literature of dominance."

Vizenor also mentions the history of his family as well as the removal of his Anishinaabeg tribe to the White Earth Reservation. The wounded in spirit.

Vizenor's new collection still finds him in his waders in the steady stream of the evocative.

Diane Glancy, Macalester College

Author Biographies

JOSEPH BAUERKEMPER is an Assistant Professor in the Department of American Indian Studies at the University of Minnesota Duluth where his scholarship, outreach, and teaching emphasize politics, literature, governance, and law. Before joining the UMD faculty Joseph earned his PhD in American Studies from the University of Minnesota Twin Cities, enjoyed one year at the University of Illinois as a Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellow in American Indian Studies, and enjoyed two years at UCLA with concurrent appointments as an Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow in the program for the study of Cultures in Transnational Perspective and as a Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of English.

DIANE GLANCY is professor emerita at Macalester College. Her 2014-15 books are *Fort Marion Prisoners and the Trauma of Native Education*, creative nonfiction, University of Nebraska Press, *Report to the Department of the Interior*, poetry, University of New Mexico Press, and three novels, *One of Us*, *Uprising of Goats*, and *Ironic Witness*, Wipf & Stock.

DEBORAH MADSEN is Professor of American Studies and Director of the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Geneva. Her research focuses on issues of settler-nationalism, indigeneity, and migration, exemplified by her work on American Exceptionalism and the white supremacist ideology of Manifest Destiny. She has written extensively on the work of Gerald Vizenor, including the monograph *Understanding Gerald Vizenor* (2009) and the edited books *Gerald Vizenor: Texts and Contexts* (co-edited with A. Robert Lee, 2010) and *The Poetry and Poetics of Gerald Vizenor* (2012). She is currently editing the *Routledge Companion to Native American Literature* (scheduled for publication in 2015).

PAUL STEWART is Professor of Literature at the University of Nicosia, Cyprus. He is the author of two books on Beckett: *Sex and Aesthetics in Samuel Beckett's Works* (Palgrave 2011) and *Zone of Evaporation: Samuel Beckett's Disjunctions* (Rodopi 2006). He is a regular contributor to *The Journal of Beckett Studies* and *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*. He is currently working on questions of narrative and ethics in Beckett and Coetzee, as well as the radio and stage adaptations of *Lessness*. He is also a creative writer; his first novel *Now Then* was published by Armida Press in 2014 and his first volume of poetry, *And Other Elsewheres*, appeared in 2009.

GERALD VIZENOR is Professor Emeritus of American Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. He has published more than thirty books including *Blue Ravens*, a historical novel about Native Americans in the First World War. He was the Principal Writer of the Constitution of the White Earth Nation in Minnesota.