

Transmotion

Vol 4, No 1 (2018)

Editors: David Carlson (California State University, San Bernardino)
James Mackay (European University, Cyprus)
David Stirrup (University of Kent)
Theodore C. Van Alst (University of Montana)

Editorial Assistants: Alla Holovina

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/>

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

Transmotion will publish new scholarship focused on theoretical, experimental, postmodernist, and avant-garde writing produced by Native American and First Nations authors, as well as book reviews on relevant work in Vizenor Studies and Indigenous Studies.

The broad use of Vizenor-created theoretical terms in many different academic fields (e.g. law, literature, anthropology, sociology, museum studies, etc.) highlights the fact that Vizenor Studies represents a significant interdisciplinary conversation within the broader field of Indigenous Studies. As such, the editors of *Transmotion* will look for submissions that do any of the following:

- Look at Vizenor's work directly, as well as the work of related authors and theorists in

the field

- Employ Vizenor's theory to look at other writers
- Continue Vizenor's project of bringing together traditional indigenous knowledges and Asian or European continental philosophy
- Explore the inter-relation of image and text, art and literature, in Vizenor's work
- Contribute to recent developing conversations in contemporary Native American art and literature, in relation to questions of visual sovereignty, visibility, and ethics.
- Offer innovative, surprising, unexpected and creative critique of American Indian literatures or other creative arts
- Emphasize experimental, theoretical, and avant-garde Native North American work

The journal will also accept creative or hybrid work, provided that such work aligns aesthetically with the aforementioned editorial emphasis. The editors particularly welcome submissions of innovative and creative works that exploit digital media.

Transmotion is hosted by the University of Kent and produced in collaboration with European University Cyprus, California State University San Bernardino and the University of Georgia, under a Creative Commons license. All submissions will be double-blind peer reviewed, in a process reviewed by our editorial board, who will also approve each issue.

Enquiries regarding submission are welcome and may be sent to the editors at transmotionjournal@gmail.com. Scholarly articles should be 20-25 pages in length, prepared according to the MLA Style Manual. Creative work can be of any length. We are also very keen for scholars to put themselves forward as potential book reviewers and to volunteer to be anonymous peer reviewers.

Information regarding on-line submissions of full drafts can be found at:
<http://journals.kent.ac.uk/index.php/transmotion/about/submissions#onlineSubmissions>

To contact the editors: transmotionjournal@gmail.com

Special Issue: Red Readings, edited by Scott Andrews

CONTENTS

Red Readings: Decolonization through Native-centric Responses to Non-native Literature and Film

Scott Andrews i

Articles

The Red Wall-Paper: Reservation Policy, The Dawes Act, and Gilman's Literature of Argument

Becca Gercken 1

Nokaa-Zagaakwa'on Gaawiin Zagaakwasiiag: Tender Buttons Unfastened

Margaret Noodin 11

“Whitman’s Song Sung the Navajo Way”

Kenneth M. Roemer 25

On the Mysterious 1831 Cherokee Manuscript or Jisdu Fixes John Locke’s Two Treatises of Civil Government

Brian Burkhart 40

Policing Resource Extraction and Human Rights in The Land of the Dead

Shaawano Chad Uran 77

Reflections

REDWASHING: Sedgwick’s *Blood Moon*, a Case Study

Jace Weaver 94

Creative

Me & My Monster

Andrea L. Rogers 104

When White People Talk About Their Country Being Stolen

Tiffany Midge 108

Nemuel Island

Tommy Orange 110

Pre-Occupied

Heid Erdrich html only

Book Reviews

- Indigenous Engagement with Christianity: A Review Essay**
Rachel R Luckenbill 114
- Review Essay: **Monahsetah, Resistance, and Other Markings on Turtle's Back: A Lyric History in Poems and Essays (Maurice Kenny) and The Homing Place: Indigenous and Settler Literary Legacies of the Atlantic (Rachel Bryant)**
Siobhan Senior 121
- Review Essay: **Changing Debates in Museum Studies since NAGPRA**
Max Carocci 127
- Indigenous Women's Writing and the Cultural Study of Law (Cheryl Suzack)**
Sarah Deer 133
- Learn, Teach, Challenge: Approaching Indigenous Literatures (eds Deanna Reder and Linda M. Morra)**
Alexander Cavanaugh 136
- As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance (Leanne Betasamosake Simpson)**
Adar Charlton 140
- John Joseph Mathews: Life of an Osage Writer (Michael Snyder)**
Lionel Larré 144
- Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit: What Inuit Have Always Known to Be True (eds Joe Karetak, Frank Tester & Shirley Tagalik)**
Keavy Martin 146
- Unlikely Alliances (Zoltán Grossman)**
John Gamber 148
- A Bag Worth a Pony: The Art of the Ojibwe Bandolier Bag (Marcia G. Anderson)**
Celeste Pedri-Spade 153
- Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age (Victoria L. LaPoe and Benjamin Rex LaPoe II)**
Patricia Killelea 156
- American Indian business: principles and practices (Deanna M. Kennedy, et al eds)**
Sara Jane Hudson 159

| | |
|---|-----|
| Frederick Weygold: Artist and Ethnographer of North American Indians (eds Christian F. Feest and Charles Ronald Corum) | |
| Léna Remy-Kovach | 162 |
| The Medicine of Peace: Indigenous Youth Decolonizing Healing and Resisting Violence (Jeffrey Paul Ansloos) | |
| Tiffanie Hardbarger | 165 |
| Specter of the Indian (Kathryn Troy) | |
| James Mackay | 168 |
| Seven Feathers: Racism, Death, and Hard Truths in a Northern City (Tanya Talaga) | |
| Brett Douglas Burkhart | 171 |
| The Place of Stone: Dighton Rock and the Erasure of America's Indigenous Past (Douglas Hunter) | |
| Joshua Anderson | 173 |
| Everyday Exposure: Indigenous Mobilization and Environmental Justice in Canada's Chemical Valley (Sarah Marie Wiebe) | |
| Hilary Noel Weaver | 176 |
| Eyewitness to the Fetterman Fight (ed. John H. Monnett) | |
| Jennifer Andrella | 178 |
| Notes Toward a Review of IRL and Nature Poem by Tommy Pico | |
| Jeanetta Calhoun Mish | 181 |
| Arachnid Verve (Shauna Osborn) | |
| Kim Shuck | 187 |
| #NotYourPrincess: Voices of Native American Women (Lisa Charleyboy and Mary Beth Leatherdale eds) | |
| Kimberly Robertson | 189 |
| Full Metal Indigiqueer (Joshua Whitehead) | |
| Francisco Delgado | 192 |
| Of Cartography (Esther G. Belin) | |
| Annita Lucchesi | 194 |
| Iep Jaltok: Poems from a Marshallese Daughter (Kathy Jetnil-Kijiner) | |
| Rebecca Hogue | 196 |
| Story for a Lost Child (Carter Meland) | |
| Scott Andrews | 199 |

How a Mountain Was Made (Greg Sarris)

David Carlson

202

The World Is One Place: Native American Poets Visit the Middle East (eds Diane Glancy and Linda Rodriguez)

Dalia Ebeid

204

Contributor Biographies

207

**Red Readings:
Decolonization through Native-centric Responses
to Non-Native Film and Literature**

SCOTT ANDREWS

The idea for this issue of *Transmotion* came from the bottom of the sea. While watching the 2014 film *Godzilla*, I was struck by ways in which the famous lizard's battle with a flying, radiation-eating monster resembled the dynamic relationship between the Anishinaabe creatures of Mishebeshu (water monster) and Animiki (thunder beings). I wrote up my thoughts then about those similarities in a blog posting titled "Godzilla is Red: An American Indian Reading of the King of Monsters" (Andrews).

This issue's theme became more fully developed when I proposed a "Red Readings" panel for the Native American Literature Symposium in 2015. This issue's essays from Becca Gercken and Ken Roemer were presented in shorter versions then; at that session Margaret Noodin presented a paper on Sapho and Gertrude Stein, but for this issue she focuses only on Stein. I proposed "Red Reading Rides Again" for the 2017 NALS, and Shawaano Chad Uran presented a shorter version of his essay on *The Land of the Dead*. Both sessions were well-attended, and they provided lively, intelligent, and often funny presentations. Brian Burkhardt submitted his re-imagining of John Locke's work through the Cherokee trickster of Jisdu independent of those sessions, but he will present it at NALS this year on a panel devoted to Cherokee culture. So I want to thank the organizers of the Native American Literature Symposium for indulging me and creating a space to conduct such thought experiments. I encourage people interested in native literature, film, and art to consider attending the annual event (<https://nativelit.com/>).

First I should say the name "red reading" is not an attempt to racialize or essentialize a particular literary response. I thought of the name simply to create a catchy title for my panel at the symposium. The reader does not need to be native for this practice, but the reading should be native-centric; the reading process should be grounded in issues important to native communities and/or native intellectual histories or practices. Put most simply, a red reading produces an interpretation of a non-native text from a native perspective.

Once I came up with the title for the panel, I discovered that James Cox had used this phrase in his book *Muting White Noise* (attributing it to Jill Carter’s 2010 doctoral dissertation). For Cox, a red reading re-interprets representations of native people in non-native texts; this “is an act of liberation from the imaginative foundations of colonialism” (9), and he demonstrates several such readings in his book. (I also learned that Daniel Heath Justice had used the phrase in his chapter of *Indigenizing the Academy*, but he used it to describe centering college classrooms on texts by native authors.)

For my NALS panels and for this issue of *Transmotion*, my approach to a red reading is different from Cox’s. While his fine book deconstructs narratives about American Indians that enable colonization (narratives that have been weaponized against native people), the red readings in this issue work in one or more ways: they reveal the pervasive mechanisms of settler colonialism in American culture; they re-imagine those mechanisms in order to resist and alter them; they build bridges between native literatures and canonical American literature, but they do so by placing native perspectives at the center of the discussion; and they are imaginative and playful. The essays in this issue were written in the same spirit that Kimberly Blaeser describes for the works of Gerald Vizenor: they are dedicated to "liberation, imagination, play, and discourse." In *Gerald Vizenor: Writing in the Oral Tradition*, she claims: "His writing seeks to function as both the presentation of an idea and as an invitation to discover where that idea might lead, an invitation to engage in a dialogue" (4).

How do they do that? By interpreting, re-interpreting, transposing, or deconstructing non-native texts from a native perspective, sometimes playfully and sometimes seriously. What happens when you read a non-native text from a native perspective? What disruptions in a text are made possible by reading it with native assumptions? What latent meanings can become apparent? What new meanings can be produced?

I think of red reading as similar to “queering,” which also is an invitation to discover where ideas might lead. In the introduction to a special issue of *Art Journal* in 1996, Jonathan Weinberg wrote that queering things such as works of art or literature has the objective of “making them strange in order to destabilize our confidence in the relationship of representation to identity, authorship, and behavior” (12). Making things strange in this way was part of a larger effort by queer artists and academics to “investigate the mechanisms by which a society claims to know gender and sexuality” (11).

Weinberg's description of queering parallels Cox's goal for red reading. A red reading can destabilize the dominant culture's confidence in the relationship of its representations of American Indians to actual native people. In this sense it also is similar to what Gerald Vizenor called "trickster hermeneutics," which is the process by which those representations of American Indians are deconstructed as tools for dispossessing native people of their lands, identities, and political and cultural sovereignty. Trickster hermeneutics is a corrective to the misrepresentations fostered by the dominant culture, and those misrepresentations are elements of what Vizenor called "Manifest Manners," the methods by which the United States of America tries to realize its dreams of Manifest Destiny. Trickster hermeneutics and other examinations of race representations are (to again echo Weinberg's language) efforts to investigate the mechanics by which the dominant culture of the United States claims to know race, including whiteness – since the role of the Indian in many representations is to be the Other against which American whiteness defines itself.

The essays in this issue do not try to destabilize representations of American Indians; instead, they seek to destabilize, among other things, the dominant culture's confidence in representations of itself. That includes, for example, destabilizing fundamental conceptions upon which America's settler colonial nationhood has been built; Burkhart does this by imagining Jisdu (Rabbit, the Cherokee trickster) helping correct John Locke's thinking. It also includes shaking the dominant culture's assumption that its literary canon is the standard against which all others are measured; Noodin and Roemer do this when they measure canonical authors (Gertrude Stein and Walt Whitman) according to native standards. The essays in this issue also investigate the mechanisms by which the dominant culture knows nationhood and the narratives that enable it.

But back to queering. Craig Womack also sees an affinity between queer and native responses to texts, and he also sees the trickster potential of such responses. In the last chapter of *Red on Red*, Womack writes: "Also, the thinking behind the term 'queer,' which seems to celebrate deviance rather than apologize for it, seems embodied with trickster's energy to push social boundaries" (301). Reading non-native texts from a native perspective similarly celebrates the difference between the native and the non-native, between native epistemologies and a settler colonial state that seeks to erase or appropriate them. In that chapter, Womack interprets the play *The Cherokee Night* by Lynn Riggs through a queer lens; Womack suggests that Riggs conflates

Cherokee identity with homosexuality in the play – native and queer being things oppressed by the mainstream and things repressed by some people who are native and/or queer but who wish to live in that mainstream. Womack suggests homosexual desires and denials are never named in the play but greatly influence the play’s plot and the actions of its characters – a reading that Riggs, as a closeted homosexual, perhaps would have denied. This is trickster-like since Womack evokes meanings the original speaker would have not intended, twisting a speaker’s words into a different message – perhaps even into the truth (or another truth). Gercken does this with “The Yellow Wallpaper” and Uran does it with *The Land of the Dead*. Like Womack reading *The Cherokee Night* through a queer lens, they read their texts through a lens of settler colonialism. Womack asks something like this: “What if Riggs’s lived experience as a closeted gay man influenced the content of his play?” Gercken and Uran ask, “What if being immersed in a colonizing culture influenced Perkins and Romero in the creation of their narratives, even in ways they would not have recognized?” While the native-centric readings offered in this issue of *Transmotion* may not upset social boundaries (I doubt they will offend anyone), they imaginatively push on intellectual or academic boundaries.

Reading non-native texts from a native perspective can be seen as part of the larger project of cultural studies and criticism. That project tries to understand cultures through their various expressions and representations (including “high” and “low” culture, such as canonical literature and Hollywood films or Gothic cathedrals and Las Vegas casinos). In their contribution to *What is Cultural Studies?*, John Frow and Meagan Morris state that cultural studies examines

... practices, institutional structures and the complex forms of agency they entail, legal, political, and financial conditions of existence, and particular flows of power and knowledge, as well as a particular multilayered semantic organisation; it is an ontologically mixed entity, and one for which there can be no privileged or “correct” reading. It is this, more than anything else, that forces cultural studies’ attention to the diversity of audiences for or users of the structures of textuality it analyses - that is, to the open-ended social life of texts...” (355-356).

Native-centric readings add another voice to the diversity of audiences that Frow and Morris mention. The readings may consider non-native texts, but they are texts likely to be experienced

by native readers, whether directly in a school classroom or on a television screen, or indirectly through the governmental policies established upon or supported by them.

If we understand red reading as a kind of reverse-appropriation (the colonized stealing from the colonizer and repurposing those cultural tools), we can also acknowledge that many acts of interpretation are a kind of appropriation, even when no cultural boundaries are crossed. Much of cultural studies (including literary criticism) examines texts from the past, and we can understand those interpretations as a kind of appropriation through time. While an interpretation may claim to know *new things* about old texts, it may instead be finding *new uses* for them, regardless of their original meanings. Herbert Grabes wrote something similar to this in “Literary History and Cultural History Relations and Differences”:

And we know that the signifiers of the past lend themselves not only to an attribution of meanings informed by a knowledge of the culture within which they were produced.

Their selection and interpretation are also subject to the inclinations and needs of the later culture within which they are newly approached. The functional history of literature will therefore also have to integrate the history of reception – at least in part – a history of “misreading”; which is, of course, only a misreading in respect to its being different from the one most likely at the time of the texts’ production. (28)

If what Grabes says is true, then we could say that a functional history of American literature will need to integrate a history of native reception or native “misreadings.” How does a native perspective make sense of non-native texts? What uses can a native perspective find for a text that was not produced with it in mind? For instance, Gercken’s pleasurable misreading of “The Yellow Wallpaper” in this issue. A native perspective could find that short story to be a useful allegory for experiences with federal Indian policy. Who cares what Charlotte Perkins Gilman intended with her story?

The first version of my panel title for NALS was “Red Reader Response” (I changed it simply to make the panel title shorter), and Grabes’s emphasis on the importance of reception in literary history and criticism illustrates how this issue’s theme arises from interpretative methods such as Reader Response Criticism. In fact, I consulted *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-structuralism* in preparing this introduction. Several ideas from that famous

book are helpful in describing the goal of the essays in this issue, but I will discuss only one here. It comes from Walker Gibson and his chapter titled “Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers.” Gibson states that each text has two readers: the actual human who is reading and a mock reader “whose mask and costume the individual takes on” (2) to participate in the imaginative experience being created by the text. Sometimes this could involve the actual reader pretending to be a character in an author’s fictional universe, such as when Nanapush in Louise Erdrich’s *Tracks* tells stories to his granddaughter, Lulu; this includes directly addressing her, but the actual reader knows she is not present; the actual readers are pretending at some level to be Lulu and trying to imagine her responses to Nanapush’s stories while also tracking their own responses. A different example would be readers of Leslie Marmon Silko’s *Ceremony*. Her novel famously is built from Laguna Pueblo cultural capital that most readers do not possess, relying as it does upon Pueblo beliefs and storytelling traditions. Silko’s mock reader is steeped in Laguna Pueblo history and culture, and the actual readers must realize there is much they are missing from the experience of reading the novel. (We hope that actual readers are persuaded to learn some about that history and culture and then return to the novel to more fully appreciate its artistry and its message.)

Of course, Gibson had neither Erdrich nor Silko in mind when he wrote “Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers.” The examples in his chapter come from American canonical authors such as F. Scott Fitzgerald and Nathaniel Hawthorne. But in considering the reception of various texts by a mock reader, including the challenges that some texts present for mock readers, Gibson makes a statement that is relevant to red readings. He writes: “A bad book, then, is a book in whose mock reader we discover a person we refuse to become, a mask we refuse to put on, a role we will not play” (5). We can easily imagine native readers being uncomfortable with the masks a settler colonial text asks them to wear, even those texts that do not involve representations of native people. We can imagine, for example, native readers refusing to share the spoken and unspoken assumptions made by John Locke in his “Second Treatise on Civil Government.” We can imagine their alienating experience of reading that and other texts in the canon of literature produced by settler colonial nations. We also can imagine the useful exercise of non-natives reading those same texts as a native mock reader, using a native perspective to defamiliarize their own cultural texts. Perhaps if more non-native readers

examined the works in their canon from a native perspective they would be liberated from some of the dangerous ideas found there.

Works Cited

- Andrews, Scott. "Godzilla is Red: An American Indian Reading of the King of Monsters." May 24, 2014.
<http://scottseesthings.blogspot.com/2014/05/godzilla-is-red-american-indian-reading.html>
- Blaeser, Kimberly. *Gerald Vizenor: Writing in the Oral Tradition*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1996.
- Carter, Jill. *Repairing the Web: Spiderwoman's Children Staging the New Human Being*. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 2010.
- Frow, John and Meagan Morris. "Australian Cultural Studies." Ed. John Storey. *What is Cultural Studies?: A Reader*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997, pp. 344-367.
- Gibson, Walker. "Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers." Ed. Jane P. Tompkins. *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, Boston: Johns Hopkins U P, 1980, pp. 1-6.
- Grabes, Herbert. "Literary History and Cultural History: Relations and Difference" No. 17 *REAL: Yearbook of Research in English and American Literature*, Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2001. *Literary History/Cultural History: Force-Fields and Tensions*. Eds. Winfried Fluck, Herbert Grabes, Jürgen Schlaeger, Brook Thomas. Pp 2-34.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. "Seeing (and Reading) Red: Indian Outlaws in the Ivory Tower." *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*, edited by Devon Abbot Mihesuah and Angela Cavender Wilson, U of Nebraska P, 2004, pp. 100-123.
- Weinberg, Jonathan. "Things Are Queer." *Art Journal* (Winter 1996) pp. 11-14.
- Womack, Craig. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 1999.

The Red Wall-Paper: Reservation Policy, the Dawes Act, and Gilman's Literature of Argument

BECCA GERCKEN

Charlotte Perkins Gilman's short story "The Yellow Wall-paper," which follows the deterioration of its nameless narrator as she descends into madness while undergoing the "rest cure," perhaps as a result of post-partum depression, has been interpreted both as a ghost story and as a feminist story. And while feminists have claimed this story as part of their canon and Gilman herself declared that the story was written "not... to drive people crazy, but to save people from being driven crazy" (820) by the rest cure, I suggest that it is time we consider other sources of inspiration for Gilman's masterpiece of realism and the literature of argument. The inspiration for my analysis is a red reading, which, as Scott Andrews notes in his introduction to this issue, "produces an interpretation of a non-native text from a native perspective" (i). This "imaginative and playful" (Andrews ii) methodology allows me to ground my reading in federal Indian policy broadly and the Dawes Act of 1887 specifically. What new meanings might be produced if we engage with this canonical Euro-American feminist text from a native, "red reading" perspective? How might questions about America's Indian policies be answered if rendered through the literature of argument of the late 19th century that took class and gender inequities to task but neglected America's first people?

"The Yellow Wall-paper" was published in 1892, more than a decade into the reservation period and five years after the passage of the Dawes Act. This policy, known as the General Allotment Act, was designed to force Indians to adopt a Euro-American concept of individual land ownership through the allotment of communally possessed reservation land. A red reading appropriation of Gilman's short story reveals a harsh critique of reservation policy and the Dawes Act; it also invokes America's federal Indian policy in broad strokes, with references to both the Marshall Trilogy and The Indian Removal Act. In this red reading, the wallpaper's pattern represents the Dawes land allotments and their devastating effect on indigenous peoples and their communities while the country manor setting signifies both the removal and reservation policies that circumscribed Indian existence as the 19th century drew to a close.

As the story opens, the narrator, our proxy Indian, has been “removed” to a country house, her “reservation,” to recuperate from what her doctors—including her husband—term a “temporary nervous depression” (808). Her treatment, called the “rest cure,” requires that she stay on the removal site with no interaction from the outside, just as Indians were required to stay on their reservations. Moreover, those in charge of her treatment insist that it is for her own safety, just as federal policy addressing removal and reservations characterized the segregation of Indians as being for their benefit rather than the benefit of whites. For example, the Indian Removal Act of 1830 states that “it shall and may be lawful for the President to cause such tribe or nation to be protected, at their new residence, against all interruption of disturbance from any other tribe or nation of Indians, *or from any other person or persons whatever*” (qtd. in Prucha 52 emphasis added). This issue of contact was still an issue almost 3 decades later in 1858 when Commissioner of Indian Affairs Charles E. Mix wrote in his annual report that “Great care should be taken in the selection of the reservations, so as to isolate the Indians for a time from contact and interference from the whites... No white persons should be suffered to go upon the reservations” (qtd. in Prucha 94). This point is made explicit in Gilman’s text when the main character and her husband discuss the possibility of visitors: “John says we will ask Cousin Henry and Julia down for a long visit; but he says he would as soon put fireworks in my pillowcase as to let me have those stimulating people about me now” (811). Gilman’s protagonist, like Indians in the removal and reservation eras, is being told that her isolation is for her own protection rather than the protection of others.

The control shown over the main character extends to her physical location, with the limited space of the reservation being too broad to ensure the government’s goal of assimilation, characterized here by Gilman as the “rest cure.” Thus, even within the “reservation” space of the house, the narrator is not given a choice of where she will spend her time:

I wanted [a room] downstairs that opened on the piazza and had roses all over the window, and such pretty old-fashioned chintz hangings! but John would not hear of it. He said there was only one window and not room for two beds, and no near room for him if he took another. (809)

John, her husband, functions as the story’s Indian agent. Reservation agents and “special agents” were vital to the implementation and enforcement of the Dawes Act: “the allotments provided for in this act shall be made by special agents appointed by the President for such purpose, and the

agents in charge of the respective reservations on which the allotments are directed to be made... shall be certified by such agents to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs” (171). In John’s determination to keep a close eye on his subject, he follows the rules established by reservation and Dawes policy, rules that demand his constant presence to facilitate the surveillance of his wife. He thus insists that she occupy the nursery at the top of the house, choosing her “allotment,” although the Dawes act declares that “all allotments set apart under the provisions of this act shall be selected by the Indians” (qtd. in Prucha 170). Gilman writes that “It is a big, airy room, the whole floor nearly, with windows that look all ways, and air and sunshine galore. It was nursery first and then playroom and gymnasium, I should judge; for the windows are barred for little children, and there are rings and things in the walls” (809). The fact that the windows are barred “for little children” reminds readers of *Cherokee Nation v Georgia* (1831), the second case of the Marshall Trilogy in which Chief Justice Marshall writes that Indians’ “relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian” (qtd. in Prucha 59). Additionally, the windows that look in all directions suggest the increasingly panopticon-like surveillance of reservation life as the Dawes Act was implemented. The narrator later realizes that the bed in the nursery is fixed to the floor—“it is nailed down, I believe” (812)—and thus further constrains her movement and her desire to determine the layout of her increasingly small “allotment” in the house. Thus, by the end of the opening sequence, Gilman establishes the narrator as a victim of removal and reservation policies who is under surveillance by someone who deems her to be child-like, just as Indians had been removed in the 1830s and confined to reservations by the 1880s, treated as children by a federal government that attempted to control all aspects of their lives.

The narrator’s interaction with the few people in the house, her husband John, her sister-in-law and caretaker Jane, and her nanny Mary, reinforces Gilman’s red reading argument against the oppressive nature of federal Indian policy and the legacy of the Marshall Trilogy in particular. John, the Indian agent watching over his tribe of two, repeatedly refers to his wife as child-like. He calls her “a blessed little goose” (810) and “little girl” (814); the narrator also tells us that John “gathered me up in his arms, and just carried me upstairs and laid me on the bed, and sat by me and read to me till it tired my head” (813). John expects the narrator to trust in him implicitly—“can you not trust me as a physician when I tell you so?” (814)—and tells her that

her own ideas are dangerous to her health: “There is nothing so dangerous, so fascinating... [as]... a temperament like yours” (814). Indians cannot be left alone with their dangerous and fascinating temperaments; they must follow the guidelines established by federal Indian policy and enforced by Indian agents. As the Supreme Court observed in the first case of the Marshall Trilogy, *Johnson and Graham’s Lessee v William McIntosh* (1823),

to leave [Indians] in possession of their country, was to leave the country a wilderness; to govern them as a distinct people, was impossible, because they were as brave and as high spirited as they were fierce, and were ready to repel by arms every attempt on their independence. (qtd. in Prucha 36)

Readers familiar with the end of Gilman’s tale recognize how well the words “high spirited” and “fierce” describe the nature of her protagonist as the story comes to a close.

And who is in charge on a reservation when the agent is absent? The most egregious enforcer of federal Indian policy—the Indian policeman or, in Gilman’s case, the Indian policewoman. Jane, by virtue of her gender, is identified with the narrator; in the context of a red reading, then, she should be read as Indian. Jane supervises the protagonist while John is away at work, making sure that she is not allowing her own temperament to take over. The narrator is aware of Jane’s role and sees her surveillance as much more despicable than John’s, likely due to the women’s shared origins. Jane even goes so far as to try to supervise the narrator while she sleeps, but the protagonist escapes her influence: “Jennie wanted to sleep with me—the sly thing! but I told her I should undoubtedly rest better for a night all alone” (818). Like many Indians in the reservation period, the protagonist is hiding her actions, her efforts to preserve her way of life, from those who are trying to assimilate her through the Dawes Act. It is only through this subversive strategy that the narrator can hope to overcome the crushing weight of allotment policy and the government’s broader assimilationist agenda.

Gilman saves her harshest critique for the Dawes Act itself, represented here as the wall-paper that pushes the narrator into madness. The wall-paper and its effects are foreshadowed by the gardens outside the house. When the protagonist first arrives at the manor, she is intrigued by the beauty of the gardens, which she describes as “*delicious!*” (809 emphasis in original). She goes on to say that she has never seen “such a garden—large and shady, full of box-bordered paths, and lined with long grape-covered arbors with seats under them” (809). This European-American style garden appeals to the narrator because of its newness, its separateness from her

experience. She does not yet understand that its patterns will be forced upon her, although she hints at some of the estate's more ominous qualities:

It is quite alone standing well back from the road, quite three miles from the village. It makes me think of English places that you read about, for there are hedges and walls and gates that lock, and lots of separate little houses for the gardeners and people... There was some legal trouble I believe, something about the heirs and coheirs. (809)

The house's "removal" from the village and the main road echoes the country's removal of Indians, first to Indian Territory and later to reservations. Moreover, the "little houses" suggest allotments while the "legal trouble" with "heirs and coheirs" suggest the devastating Dawes practice of dividing allotments among heirs, leaving families and individuals with ever-smaller parcels of land. But the narrator seems largely unaware of the problems the garden foretells and it is not until she grapples with the wallpaper that she fully understands the implications of the General Land Allotment Act of 1887.

In her description of the wall-paper, Gilman invokes the legal intricacies of the Dawes Act, revealing its contradictions and foreshadowing its disastrous impact on Native Americans' lifeways and their land base. The narrator tells us that "I never saw a worse paper in my life" (809) and says that it is

One of those sprawling flamboyant patterns committing every artistic sin. It is dull enough to confuse the eye in following, pronounced enough to constantly irritate and provoke study, and when you follow the lame uncertain curves for a little distance they suddenly commit suicide—plunge off at outrageous angles, destroy themselves in unheard of contradictions. (809-10)

The pattern is indeed deadly; the Dawes Act, represented here by the wall-paper, will lead to the loss of 90 million acres of Indian land (*iltf.org*). Moreover, the pattern is a "constant irritation" because there was no escaping Dawes policy for most Indians. The legislation decreed that

in all cases where any tribe or band of Indians has been, or shall hereafter be, located upon any reservation created for their use either by treaty stipulation or by virtue of an act of Congress or executive order setting apart the same for their use, the President of the United States be, and he hereby is authorized... to allot the

lands in said reservation in severalty to an Indian located thereon. (qtd. in Prucha 170)

The legislation helps readers understand Gilman’s attention to the details of the wall-paper, which here are read as the allotment maps showing individual parcels as well as land taken for development at the hands of the government or private industry and land lost to Euroamerican farmers. The “lame uncertain curves” (809-10) and the “outrageous angles” (810) suggest the checkerboarding of the Indian land base under Dawes policy, a federal strategy that would be reinforced in the coming decades through the Dead Indian Act of 1902 and the Burke Act of 1906; it would not end until the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 finally put an end to federally sanctioned land theft (and federal land theft itself).

Even though the narrator does not initially grasp the wallpaper’s meaning, she quickly recognizes that the wall-paper is about surveillance and is affecting her agency. She says that the “paper looks to me as if it knew what a vicious influence it had!” (811)—shades of Teddy Roosevelt describing Dawes as the “mighty pulverizing engine to break up the tribal mass” (*digitalhistory.uh.edu*)—and describes part of the pattern as “two bulbous eyes” that “stare at you” (811)—the eyes of the Indian agents and the Dawes commission, working to force Indian assimilation to Western lifeways. As the story progresses, the narrator begins to fear that the paper will outlast her: “I get positively angry with the impertinence of it and the everlastingness” (811). She also becomes increasingly aware of the paper’s violent capabilities, observing that “You think you have mastered it, but just as you get well underway in following, it turns a back-somersault and there you are. It slaps you in the face, knocks you down, and tramples upon you. It is like a bad dream” (815). This passage speaks to American Indians’ feelings of futility in fighting the Dawes Act, which they could not escape, a notion Gilman reinforces with the paper’s odor. The paper not only visually dominates the narrator and leaves marks on her clothes, it also permeates the house with its smell: “I noticed it [the smell] the moment we came into the room, but with so much air and sun it was not bad. Now we have had a week of fog and rain, and whether the windows are open or not, the smell is here” (816). As the narrative—and thus allotment policy progresses—its effects become inescapable. Even when one is not confronted with a visual representation of the land lost via the wallpaper’s pattern, one is forced into awareness of allotment, which “creeps all over the house... hovering... skulking... hiding” (816). It stays with the narrator even on the rare occasions that she is allowed to leave the

reservation of the ancestral mansion: “Even when I got to ride, if I turn my head suddenly and surprise it—there is that smell!” (816). Like many Indians who at first may have not understood the potential catastrophic effect of Dawes, the narrator initially finds the smell of the paper annoying but of little concern: “It is not bad—at first—and very gentle, but quite the subtlest, most enduring odor I ever met” (816). However, as she starts to understand the power of allotment policy, she also recognizes the danger of the paper’s odor, commenting that she “wake[s] up in the night and find[s] it hanging over” her (816) and that while she “thought seriously of burning the house—to reach the smell,” (816), she is now “used to it” (816). But her familiarity does not signify her willingness to comply with the Dawes Act; rather, it sets the stage for her resistance to it. And while the narrator does overcome the paper and her Indian agent, Gilman’s story remains ambivalent about the fate of American Indians and their homelands.

One reading of the story’s ending suggests that Gilman falls prey to the vanishing Indian stereotype, giving her protagonist a hollow victory that affirms America’s belief in the inevitably of Dawes, the government’s assimilationist doctrine, and the decline of American Indian civilizations. While the narrator “frees” the woman she sees trapped behind the wallpaper—freeing natives from allotment policy—and crawls over her husband, the Indian agent, who has collapsed in the face of Indian resistance, readers may feel that this victory is not only short-lived, but self-defeating, as the narrator seems to have descended into madness. But the fact remains that the narrator has in fact stripped the room of many of its “allotments”—giant swathes of wallpaper—and she, not her Indian agent husband or her tribal policewoman caretaker, is in control of the scene. The protagonist’s final act thus suggests the persistence of Native Americans even in the face of federal Indian policy that worked to strip them of their cultures. It is not the Indians who have been stripped of their culture at the end of the story; it is the room that has been stripped of its wall-paper.

You may be asking yourself “but what about the narrator’s baby?” After all, in the feminist reading of this story, the baby plays an important part and contemporary readers are likely to understand the protagonist’s illness as post-partum depression. In this red reading, the baby is largely missing—as it is in the text of the story, appearing in only three brief mentions—

because an Indian child would be removed from its mother and sent off to boarding school to endure a different assimilationist model from that which its mother fights here.

If only “The Yellow Wall-paper” were about the plight of the Native American. But what few sympathizers there were for the Indian in late 19th century were misguided, hoping only to offer a less traumatic transition to a Western way of life. Perhaps if they had read Gilman’s story as “The Red Wall-paper,” they would have had a change of heart.

Why I Wrote “The Red Wall-paper”¹

Many and many a conference goer has asked that. When I first read the paper at the Native American Literature Symposium in Albuquerque in 2015, the reading got appreciative laughs as I transformed this canonical American short story through a red reading. The laughter ended, however, when I explained why the narrator’s baby was not mentioned in my paper, and the audience was reminded of the seriousness of the subject matter and the lasting historical trauma of the Dawes Act and other federal Indian policies.

Gilman grounds her reasons for writing “The Yellow Wallpaper” in her personal experience, observing that she was subjected to the rest cure “for some three months” and that she “came so near the border line of utter mental ruin that [she] could see over” (820). Like many of her literary realist peers, Gilman used the literature of argument in an effort to create social change and sought to secure a safer method of treatment for women and also grant them agency over their own bodies and wellness. In constructing this reading, I asked myself what change might have been precipitated had more authors used their literary skills to effect change for America’s indigenous people. And while one might think of an example or two, such as Helen Hunt Jackson’s non-fiction study *A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States Government’s Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes* (1881) and her novel *Ramona* (1884), scholars of American literature know that American literary realism focused on gender and class and the urban experience while overlooking federal Indian policies that transformed Indian life in ways that are still felt today.

As this reading suggests, the experience of American Indians in the 19th Century, particularly in the Dawes era, was ripe for the kind of analysis found in stories like “The Yellow

Wallpaper” and perhaps offers us a lesson. The absence of American Indians from the literature of argument mirrors decades-old concerns with the absence of women of color in the American feminist movement while the relative ease with which this canonical white feminist text can be transformed into a red text offers a model for alliance. What empathy might be gained and new sites of literary resistance found through red readings like the one modeled here?

Towards the close of her expository essay on the origins of “The Yellow Wallpaper,” Gilman notes that “the best result [of her story] is this. Many years later I was told that the great specialist had admitted to friends of his that he had altered his treatment of neurasthenia since reading ‘The Yellow Wall-paper’” (820). This red reading of Gilman’s story cannot influence any of the policymakers long dead who enacted Removal or Reservation policy, the Dawes Act, or even the Indian Reorganization Act. But it can make a space—an allotment, if you will—in the American literary canon for literature that echoes the experience of American Indians a full 76 years before the American Indian Renaissance.

This red reading was not intended to drive people crazy, but to save scholars of Indigenous literature from being driven crazy at the absence of Indians in American literary realism, and I hope it works.

Notes

¹ The opening and closing language of this section mirrors Gilman’s in “Why I Wrote “The Yellow Wall-paper.””

Works Cited

- “Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831).” *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, edited by Francis Paul Prucha, 3rd ed., U of Nebraska P, 2000, pp. 57-59.
- Dole, William P. “Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.” *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, edited by Francis Paul Prucha, 3rd ed., U of Nebraska P, 2000, pp. 94-95.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. “The Yellow Wall-paper.” *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, edited by Nina Baym, Jeanne Campbell Reesman, and Arnold Krupat, 7th ed., Volume C, Norton, 2007, pp. 808-819.
- . “Why I Wrote ‘The Yellow Wall-paper.’” *The Norton Anthology of American*

- Literature*, edited by Nina Baym, Jeanne Campbell Reesman, and Arnold Krupat, Seventh Edition, Volume C, Norton, 2007, p. 820.
- “Indian Removal Act (1830).” *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, edited by Francis Paul Prucha, 3rd ed., U of Nebraska P, 2000, pp. 52-53.
- “Johnson and Graham’s Lessee v William McIntosh (1823).” *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, edited by Francis Paul Prucha, 3rd ed., U of Nebraska P, 2000, pp. 35-37.
- “Land Loss.” *ILTF.org*. Indian Land Tenure Foundation, 2017, iltf.org. Accessed 31 March 2017.
- “The Dawes Act (1887).” *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, edited by Francis Paul Prucha, 3rd ed., U of Nebraska P, 2000, pp. 170-73).
- “The Struggle for Self-Determination.” *Digitalhistory.uh.edu*. Digital History, digitalhistory.uh.edu. Accessed 6 April 2017.

Nokaa-Zagaakwa'on Gaawiin Zagaakwasiiag: Tender Buttons Unfastened

MARGARET NOODIN

Gertrude Stein's signature line, "a rose is a rose is a rose is a rose," first appeared in her poem "Sacred Emily" in 1913 and was used by her throughout her life, becoming a red signature of repetition and linguistic machination. Her writing is often a circuitous exploration of the play between sound and meaning in language that disrupts the standard use of words, allowing alternate connections to be made. Stein once explained:

When I said.

A rose is a rose is a rose is a rose.

And then later made that into a ring I made poetry and what did I do I caressed completely caressed and addressed a noun (Stein 1985, 231).

The idea of nouns caressed and addressed is sensual and evocative. Stein does not offer romantic realism; she sketches a monologue of fragments. She uses sound and meaning the way a kaleidoscope uses refraction and reflection to create new patterns with familiar objects. Her method of taking language apart in order to understand it better is useful in the work of language revitalization. She demonstrates how to fall in love with language as it falls apart and is reconstructed each time we speak. Stein spun phrases into being in order to question the very nature of writing, representation, and interpretation, which speakers of all languages do. These operations are the fundamental defense of linguistic diversity. Variety in linguistic engineering makes the potential of the entire system greater. And while language is focused first on the work of assisting survival, it is through pleasure, play and manipulation that languages come to life. The more different ways different languages can reflect the human experience, the more we are able to appreciate our shared and complex existence.

This essay is a digression Gertrude Stein might have enjoyed if an Anishinaabe poet had joined her Saturday salons in Paris with Pablo Picasso, Ezra Pound, Mildred Aldrich and others who practiced modern ways of fastening and unfastening words and images. The act of translating Stein's English into Anishinaabemowin serves as a method of linguistic and artistic analysis. The Anishinaabemowin lines offered here are experimental word play in response to the spirit of her work, not definitive equivalents. Stein evokes the senses in writing to center

identity on angles and dimensions not often included in verse. She offers social commentary in the form of images that can benefit from a range of diverse readings. Anishinaabe-based explorations of the way she combines sensation, location, and history are not lessons in grammar or explication; they are ventures into a territory co-created by Stein’s imagination and the overarching aesthetics of Anishinaabemowin. Consider the following an example of *nindinendaamin izhitwaawinan epiichi gaawiin zagaakwa’igaadesinoog gaye geyabi zagaakwa’igaazoyaang*, unbuttoning and rebuttoning ideas across traditions.

Oginiwi – Being a Rose

When Stein’s signature rose-phrase moves from English into Anishinaabemowin the definition of a rose and the purpose of repetition can be called into question by speakers willing to bend and stretch the common rules of Anishinaabemowin.

A rose / *Oginigaade* (The idea of roseness)

is a rose / *oginiwi* (is to be a rose)

is a rose / *ogininaan* (to rose something)

is a rose. / *oginimaa*. (to rose someone)

In English, Stein’s repetition of “rose” without change is a matter of meter and a lack of adjectives. Her unnatural redundancy calls for an unnatural focus on the noun. From an Anishinaabe perspective, repetition often shifts identity creating a spiral of contrasting relationships with an object. One option for an Anishinaabemowin translation, which achieves a similar level of unnatural, or forced, focus on the rose, might allow the rose to move through all of the various states of animacy foundational to Anishinaabemowin but not available in English. As the rose is re-imagined through different verb forms, the symbolic nature of the rose becomes an action and a potential point of re-interpretation. Experimental wordplay with repetition allows the rose to take different endings, indicating different levels of animacy. Animacy, it should be noted, is a difficult term, not explained. More than something that is simply living or non-living, or in motion versus still, the term is used to differentiate noun classifications and the four major types of verbs in Anishinaabemowin. Something “inanimate” is an event not defined by or viewed as being in an active relationship with other beings or objects. As the “animacy” of a person, place, thing, idea, or observable state shifts, it enters into more complex relationships

with other animate and inanimate nouns. Returning to the repetition of the rose, in Anishinaabemowin a rose can be described as inanimate, an *oginigaade*, the essence of rose identity. Or the rose could be described as an animate noun, opening up the possible ways the rose can be in the world. You or I could *oginiwi*, become a rose, which is similar to, but not the same as, *oginikaazo*, pretending to become a rose. This play with the “rose” is strange in both languages and does not follow the rules of vernacular conversation. Just as a student of English would be told to replace repetition with adjectives, a student of Anishinaabemowin would be told, “those words have not been used before.” Yet in both cases the speaker or writer uses recognizable language and attention is unquestionably focused on the nature of a rose. Patterns of repetition and word construction can lead to an expansion of meaning and perspective. Stein’s English reframes linguistic experimentation and any translation and alternate reading of her work must do the same, which is why contemplation of a creative response to her writing is a worthwhile exercise. All translations call both sides of the equation into question.

Ezhi-Gikendamaazoyaang - Sensation

One of Stein’s most iconic poetic texts, *Tender Buttons*, was published in 1914. While it may seem rooted in a specific Parisian expatriate moment, there are instances where its content is surprisingly aligned with a North American indigenous perspective, as when she writes, “a canoe is orderly” (29) or “a white hunter is nearly crazy” (16). An Anishinaabe poet might also appreciate the statement, “a feather is trimmed, it is trimmed by the light and the bug and the post, it is trimmed by little leaning and by all sorts of mounted reserves and loud volumes. It is surely cohesive” because it speaks of something animate “trimmed” or decorated and specially recognized (14). The text is primarily viewed as aesthetic experimentation and has been read many ways including as extra-textual exploration, linguistic cubism, feminist sound poetry, and experiments in somatic writing (Poetzsch, Dubnick, Marchiselli, Bruner). It is certainly some of that for some readers, but it is not much of that for a reader using an Anishinaabe frame of reference for whom the world cubed is a not-new concept; the gender signals “he, him, she and her” are not articulated the same way; a “modernist” break from the past was navigated through assimilative resistance, and automatic writing echoes the very familiar practice of listening

beyond the plane of human understanding. For Anishinaabe readers *Tender Buttons* is a rewarding challenge in translation and an affirmation of a shifting, sensory, spatial aesthetic.

Tender Buttons is organized around sections featuring objects, food and rooms, but the assembly of words reveals the “centre” to be anything but the nouns. Speaking about her own work in the context of what artists were doing at the time, Stein said:

“The painters were looking... and they too had to be certain that looking was not confusing itself with remembering... I began to make portraits of things and enclosures that is rooms and places because I needed to completely face the difficulty of how to include what is seen with hearing and listening” (Stein, *Portraits*).

As cubism on the canvas is a refraction of multiple visual viewpoints, *Tender Buttons* is an attempt to create multiple sensory perspectives in poetry. She uses language in layers, which is, of course, appealing to speakers of agglutinative languages which by definition are constructed of multisyllabic layers of meaning with words that begin in the center and radiate description in multiple directions through meaning and inflection. For example, one translation of “cubism” might be “*dawimazinbiige*” to clear space, or make space while using lines to create an image. To say Pablo Picasso, George Braques and Gertrude Stein all did this well becomes a single variation of the verb: *Ogii-nitaadawimazinbiigewag*.

Stein creates a system of perceiving nouns from many visual directions. Her writing is at times transformational, *aanjisemagad*. Objects can move between states of inanimacy and animacy. In one case, “a carafe, this is a blind glass... an arrangement in a system to pointing” suggests an unseeing water vessel, which in English is an awkward and unusual phrase with one word originating in French (3). Anishinaabemowin has a tendency to not absorb words from other languages and has a mutable approach to nominalization. Thus, the fancy “blind carafe,” could be described as: a *zhaabwaate omooday*, an inanimate bottle seen through; a *gagiibiingwe-minikwaajigan*, an object used for drinking that is unable to see; or part of an *izhinoobii’igan*, a system of pointing. In Stein’s writing things come apart and are reassembled in new forms from various alternate angles. This same transformation is easy to echo in Anishinaabemowin due to the way objects can be animate or inanimate depending on how speakers wish to represent them. Stein speaks of: “four choices and there are four choices in a difference, the time when there are four choices there is a kind and there is a kind” (23). Stein and other modernists were often

inspired by global indigenous art and ideas, often taking “primitive” art as inspiration for cubist abstraction. Techniques considered “modern” from a 20th century post-industrial perspective can be reconsidered from an indigenous angle as a continuation and affirmation of traditional semiotics. Although new and unusual to Stein’s contemporary audience, this cubed approach is not *avant-garde*, forward advancing, *niigaani-minisinoog*, for Anishinaabe readers; it is precisely what one should do, move between two word classes and four verb types to represent reality as precisely as possible within the realm of Anishinaabe science and epistemology. An Anishinaabe reading of *Tender Buttons* involves analysis of topics and translation. Stein focuses primarily on the waves and elements of the universe as she experiments with the syntax and structure of her sentences. She explores color, light, sound, air, water and celestial bodies as a way of being in the universe.

In Anishinaabemowin, speakers often create their own descriptive terms for color based on personal experience and perspective. This is precisely what Stein does. For example, a common word for “gray” in Anishinaabemowin is *akakanzhewaande*, meaning “coal-colored” matching exactly with Stein’s line: “Color is in coal. Coal is outlasting roasting and a spoonful, a whole spoon that is full is not spilling.” (23). In translation this could become: *Akakanzhewaande akakanzhe*, literally, “coal is coal-colored,” which capitalizes on the coincidence that the word for the color of coals is already commonly used as a color in Anishinaabemowin. The morphemes “*akak*” and “*aanzhe*” in the word “coal-colored” call to mind edges on fire leading to the further play on words *akakanzhewaanzhe akakanzhe*, which is a Stein-like instance of repetition. Meanwhile, the second line about coal might become, “*Wenda-abwaadaan, akakanzhe-emikwaanens, mooshkine emikwaanens gaawiin ziigwebinigaadesiinoon.*” (Completely roasted, the coal spoon is a full spoon that is not spilling.) As with many parts of Stein’s texts, staying true to the assonance and consonance of the original sometimes leads to the meanings taking a slight turn. The idea of outlasting slips to completeness in order to allow several consonants to repeat.

As *Tender Buttons* continues, Stein’s overall use of color decreases and several specific colors dominate the visual conversation. The summary below shows which colors appear most often.

| Color | Objects | Food | Rooms | Total |
|--------|---------|------|-------|-------|
| Red | 33 | 25 | 15 | 73 |
| White | 20 | 14 | 9 | 43 |
| Green | 10 | 8 | 2 | 20 |
| Yellow | 7 | 5 | 3 | 15 |
| Black | 8 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| Blue | 8 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| Brown | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Orange | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Total | 91 | 57 | 32 | 180 |

With no obvious explanations for the focus on *miskwaa* (red) and *waabishkaa* (white) readers are left with supposition. One interpretation might view the focus on *miskwaa* as a gesture toward *miskwaa* (red), the color of a rose. An Anishinaabe cultural analysis might interpret the focus on *miskwaa* (red) as a reference to *miskwaabik* (copper), a metal prominent in the culture, common in the Great Lakes, and found in both *miskwi* (blood) and *okan* (bone). The emphasis on *waabishkaa* pulls into the conversation concepts of *waabi* (sight), *waaban* (the light of dawn) and *waabanong* (the east). In some cultures, white is purity and privilege, in others it is viewed more scientifically as waves of color combined and reflected, and specifically in Anishinaabe words that contain “*waabi*” are tied to light and heat energy as well as the ability to see. The act of translation shifts possible interpretations.

Stein writes of color as something to be traded and exchanged between object and observer. More than purity she implies the need to perceive the mixing. She declares, “an ordinary color, a color is that strange mixture which makes, which does not make a ripe juice” (*bagakisin enaandeg, mayagiginigawinigaadeg gaawiin aditewabookesii*) (27 – 28). A translation of the phrase requires use of the prefix *mayagi*, which is close in meaning to “strange” but can also mean “unusual.” In English one can more easily label and separate nouns, while in Anishinaabemowin one can be clear about *ginigawinan* and *ginigawin*, the nature of what is being mixed and by whom. Whether each language offers clarity or obfuscation relates to the information organizing priorities of each culture. Stein’s tender buttons are unusual in English because buttons are not typically described as tender. Tender buttons are unusual in

Anishinaabemowin because buttons, *zagaakwa'onag*, are animate but nearly the same as *zagaakwa'iganan*, nails, which are not, and furthermore the act of buttoning *zagaakwa'* is just one sound separate from *zagaa'oozo*, to be entangled. This incorporation of images and meaning is a logical response to reading Stein, who works to broaden the range of description in her work. This practice also makes great sense to speakers of Anishinaabemowin, which rarely imposes strict rules for description and places value on including all possible angles in a word or interpretation. For example, on the one hand, *ozhaawashkwaande* is all the blue-green between the sea and the sky while *ozaawaande* is the full spectrum of yellow-brown from yolk to earth. On the other hand, any highly specific item can be transformed into a color, as noted with coal becoming the standard for “gray.” Stein’s desire to expand options for description occurs naturally in Anishinaabemowin. She affirms the belief that every whole can be described as made of many parts when she asks: “Why is there a single piece of any color, why is there that sensible silence, why is there resistance in a mixture...” (*Aaniin dash enaandeg, aaniin dash mikigaade bizaanayaan, aaniin dash nanaakonaan ginigawinigaadeg...*) (47).

After mixtures of color in *Tender Buttons*, Stein turns to sound. As the focus moves from objects to rooms, sound begins to take up space. For readers who are also singers this representation of sound is reminiscent of the world’s great improvisation traditions. For Anishinaabe readers specifically, this move from patterns of meaning to patterns of sound is familiar as part of the drum and rattle tradition. Some of the oldest songs and healing lyrics are heavily dependent on repetition marked by subtle variation. As Stein uses the familiar global tradition of sensory disruption to create new rhythms, her line, “cadences, real cadences, real cadences and a quiet color” (*madwe mii wenda-madwe mii sa wenda-madwe gaye bizaanenaandeg*) harmonizes with her sentiment, “should there be a call there would be a voice” (*giishpin ganoozhaad, ganoondiwaad*) (48). It is a simple equation. Sounds are measured and cut like objects or lines of text. Stein echoes the patterns of oral traditions based on observation. Her technique is familiar to many cultures in which repetition is used to record reality, aid memory, and alter states of being. As with healing chants, her verse moves from literal data to a musical mantra and can easily flow between languages: “A no, a no since, a no since when, a no since when since...” (*gaawiin mii gaawiin mii igo gaawiin apii sa gaawiin apii*) (38). Discourse markers *mii, sa* and *igo* parse the oral narrative tradition in the way commas and other punctuation are used in English to provide in Anishinaabemowin what is often provided by

punctuation and word stress in English. These little words are often literally translated as “so,” “then” or “really,” but the lesson learned through the experience of translation is one of the ways in which sound adds to meaning. English is a language that bends now toward literature while Anishinaabemowin still retains much of its oral past. Stein was breaking English “rules” but acting in ways that conform to Anishinaabe expectations.

Omaa Aayaayaang - Location

Related to the subjects of color and sound found in *Tender Buttons* is a discussion of *wiikwiiwin*, a form of energy that crosses distance, such as a wavelength or current. When Stein asks, “What is the current that makes machinery, that makes it crackle... what is this current, what is the wind, what is it” (8), she draws important correlations to Anishinaabe epistemology. Stein connects currents to machinery drawing a connection between science and society but does not explore those connections any further than to simply gesture toward crackle, control and the need to understand our physical environment. Wind in Anishinaabemowin is *noodin* and can be found as part of many words including: *waasnoode* (the northern lights), *ganoodan* and *ganoozh* (to speak to something or someone) and *noodenim* (to flirt with someone). Embedded in an Anishinaabemowin translation, Stein’s questions of connections and control are more visible.

Not the same kind of current, water is also a thread through the text. She writes: “Water astonishing and difficult altogether makes a meadow” (*Nibi maamakaanendaagwad gaye zanagag ezhi-omashkosiwibiigeyang*) (12). Water is powerful and can shape the land. Translating this phrase into Anishinaabemowin it is possible to emphasize the way a meadow is written onto the landscape. The nature of water, *nibi*, when separated is both *ni* (there) and *bi* (here), which a poet might read as location and perception. Certainly an Anishinaabe reading would highlight her phrase “water, water is a mountain and it is selected and it is so practical that there is no use in money” (*nibi, nibi aawan wajiw miinawaa nawaj aapiich zhoonyaa*) (28). In Stein’s text water is climate, geography, and a base for artistic innovation. Water and weather become music. “A climate, a single climate, all the time there is a single climate, any time there is a doubt, any time there is music” (*izhiwebad agwajing da madwechige*) (49). Water can be a symbol for systems of transfer, “cloudiness what is cloudiness, is it a lining, is it a roll, is it melting... a transfer, a large transfer” (24), all of which could be reduced to two words

aanjisemigad aanakwadoon, the way clouds change, if the translation aims for a core equivalency and a relative amount of initial and internal alliteration. At times, Stein's repetition does lead to a distillation of meaning, which works well with an Anishinaabe reading. For life on earth, water is the center of being as Stein agrees when she writes "any little thing is water" (46), which can be echoed as the common Anishinaabe phrase, *nibi aawiyang* (we are water). Water is life. Stein writes as if she is familiar with this phenomenology based on relationships between both human and nonhuman elements and actors. Although she was not overtly working from this perspective, an Anishinaabe reading highlights the ways in which she shifts human and non-human relationships on earth to align within a more complex network than one where humans are necessarily the center.

Her ability to situate her subjects in a network of knowledge beyond the human is another reason to read Stein. *Tender Buttons* includes several references to the way scientific, seasonal, astrological, and meteorological ways of knowing influence the human world. Stein asks and then answers: "Star-light, what is star-light, star-light is a little light that is not always mentioned with the sun, it is mentioned with the moon and the sun, it is mixed up with the rest of the time" (*Anangaazhe, aanii abiskaakonesed, ezhi-zaagiiasiged gaawiin apane dibaajimaasiiwangid miinawaa giizis gaye dibiki-giizis, mii ginigawinangwaa daso-diba'iganeg*) (48). To represent the possibility only alluded to in English, an Anishinaabemowin translator must account for the fact that *anangoog* (stars), *giizis* (the sun), and *dibiki-giizis* (the night-sun, or moon) are all animate, which changes the way a reader might view the possibility that they influence perceptions of time. Many Anishinaabe readers will recognize the ways the universe is pulled into human lives. For instance, they might read into Stein's discussion of virgins the relationship between elders and youth who are coming of age. Stein writes: "A virgin a whole virgin is judged made and so between curves and outlines and real seasons" (14). One direct translation could be: *Oshkiniigikwe, gigi-oshkiniigikwe, dibaakonaanaan mii ge-waagishkaaged, izhibii'amawaanaan epiichii aandakiwang* (a new woman, a whole new woman, she is judged by them as she curves and is written by them as the seasons change). Stein describes a young woman as changing, like the seasons, in a way that could be part of an Anishinaabe vision quest, berry fast, or simply a portent of what she calls "a peaceful life to arise her, noon and moon and moon", literally translated as "*bizaanibimaadizi, ombishkaa, naawakweg gaye dibiki-giizis,*

dibiki-giizis” (15). In Stein’s writing and an Anishinaabe interpretation, a young woman becomes a part of moontime and an eternal system of cycles that define experience as more than civility.

Connections between the human and non-human elements continue in *Tender Buttons* as Stein writes of immovable clouds and thunder bridges:

This cloud does change with the movements of the moon and the narrow the quite narrow suggestion of the building (*O’o aanakwad anjiseemigad apii giizis gaye dibiki-giizis mamaajiseewaad miinawaa idamang agaasadeyaagamig*)... A bridge a very small bridge in a location and thunder, any thunder, this is the capture of reversible sizing and more indeed more can be cautious (*aazhogaans endaazhi-animikiikaang gakina aanjiseemagad*) (51).

Affixing the gathering on narrow crossings in space and time not measured by clock or calendar is reminiscent of annual gatherings dictated by the relationship of earth to sky and is not as random to Anishinaabe readers as it might have appeared to early industrial capitalists.

Gaa-Ezhiwebag – History

In many ways *Tender Buttons* can be read as a means of undoing of assimilation, which, according to Stein, and many Anishinaabe readers, might be a sensible decision.

The sensible decision was that notwithstanding many declarations and more music, not even notwithstanding the choice and a torch and a collection, notwithstanding the celebrating hat and a vacation and even more noise than cutting, notwithstanding Europe and Asia and being overbearing, not even notwithstanding an elephant and a strict occasion... not even with drowning and with the ocean being encircling, not even with more likeness and any cloud, not even with terrific sacrifice of pedestrianism and a special resolution, not even more likely to be pleasing. (52).

Is she writing against society or exploring the beauty of communal anarchy as led by a troupe of tricksters? To translate these sentiments possibly interpreted as an interrogation of cultural dominance, names for nations are needed along with a word for “notwithstanding.” It is a problem that the words for Europe, “*Waabishkiiwed Odakiim*” (white ones’ homeland) or “*Agaaming Gichigami*” (the other side of the sea), are both simply indicators of distant shores.

Just as the terms “eastern” and “western” are not the global cultural and philosophical binary they are sometimes used to imply, the Anishinaabe use of *gaming* (the sea) and bodies of water larger and smaller to locate other cultures does not do justice to actual national variation. This lack of cultural specificity reveals a gap in contemporary Anishinaabemowin that will need to be filled by new descriptions for nations based on their actual history and self-declared identity if a full translation of Stein’s work is ever attempted. The term “notwithstanding” is a bit easier; both *zhaagooch* and *booch igo* imply an air of diffidence in spite of any reasoning. In her meandering metaphor of assimilation, Stein celebrates the ability of perception to vary infinitely. She leans toward the encircling oceans notwithstanding. Many of Stein’s culturally specific passages highlight this challenge of finding ways to accurately name nouns not a part of Anishinaabe culture and identify meaningful terms for a number of English prepositions.

But challenges in translation should not be considered reasons to avoid the task. As an expatriate poet living in Paris, Stein understood the meaning of dislocation and relocation. Born in 1874 to Jewish American parents, emigration and migration held a particular meaning for Stein, but as she disassembles the term it can be read in many ways. Her line in the passage based on a room, preceded by reflection on cardinal directions and followed by rhetorical discourse focused on seduction asks: “giving it away, not giving it away, is there any difference?” (47). This phrase could productively be read as a post-constitutional, post-treaty critique about the shape and nature of gifts and what and why specific acts are defined as giving. In Anishinaabemowin, there is no way to speak of giving without clarifying what is given, who is giving, who is receiving. There is no gift followed by the idiomatic fragment “thanks” used in English. Instead, the word “*miigwe*” (the act of giving) is used to reflect a relationship based on “*miizh*” (giving to someone) often followed by “*miigwechiwi*” (thanks). A speaker of Anishinaabemowin must determine:

- Does “we” includes the listener or not (*gimiizhaanaanig* or *nimiizhaanaanig*)?
- Are we are giving to them or they are giving to us (*nimiizhaanaanig* or *nimiizhigoonaanig*)?
- Are the giving and not giving always parallel with us giving to them and then not giving to them (*nimiizhaanaanig mii gaawiin miizhaasiiwangidwaa*) or are we sometimes giving to them and they are not giving to us (*nimiizhaanaanig mii gaawiin miizhaasiiyangidwaa*)?

Native nations were deconstructed through warfare, treaty-making and legislation. When the Dawes Act of 1887 used accounting as a means of erasure, who was doing the giving and whose land it was to give? Translating the facts of history can be as difficult as verb paradigms. Those who survived the giving often became forced and voluntary immigrants in a home rapidly becoming unfamiliar. Stein’s *Tender Buttons* offers ways to think about nationhood and identity.

Oginiig – The Roses

This essay began by noting Stein’s desire to use alternate means of expression to deconstruct perception and find the “center” of an object or idea. An indigenous reading of her work might identify the search for a center as a post-national enterprise. As Stein moved to new angles to discern different truths she exchanged one view for another. First color, then sound, then wavelengths and dimensions led to new views. She composed strings of syllables as simultaneously readable and unreadable as Picasso’s *Woman in a Blue Hat*, eyes bulging, shapeshifting, trapped in two dimensions. The polysyllabic nature of Anishinaabemowin easily lends itself to such a practice. The verb as the center of most words, is surrounded by prefixes, suffixes, tenses and other various possible additions radiating outward in both directions changing the meaning ever so slightly with each addition.

Stein’s system for reflecting on reality mirrors the economy and precision of perception long practiced by Anishinaabe people, as well as many other indigenous groups, where there is no definite binary, no unidirectional chronology, but rather a living center of knowledge that is maintained through continual reinterpretation. The reason for holding fast to ceremony and tradition is not one of savage simplicity but rather sophisticated understanding of an ever-evolving universe. Sustainability is not a romantic relationship to nature; it is a scientific response to shifts in space and time. Perhaps Stein was writing about a feast, some buttons and a roast, but in her words we can find the metamorphosis of mountains, the light of stars, and the sound of ideas. We find a center that defines better than edges. She sums it up well when she states, “what is the custom, the custom is in the centre” (*izhitwaayang naawayi’iing*) (26). And in this center, wrapped in phenomenology and physics is spiritual tradition and the insistence that change is inevitable and survival depends on embracing it. Her writing is dense and rambling perhaps, but so is life and the methods of healing and persistence.

A religion, almost a religion, any religion, a quintal in religion, a relying and a surface and a service in indecision and a creature and a question and a syllable in answer and more counting and no quarrel and a single scientific statement and no darkness and no question and an earned administration and a single set of sisters and an outline and no blisters and the section seeing yellow and the centre having spelling and no solitude and no quaintness and yet solid quite so solid and the single surface centred and the question in the placard and the singularity, is there a singularity, and the singularity, why is there a question and the singularity why is the surface outrageous, why is it beautiful why is it not when there is no doubt, why is anything vacant, why is not disturbing a centre no virtue, why is it when it is and why is it when it is and there is no doubt, there is no doubt that the singularity shows. (49)

In the deconstruction of morphemes and translation of ideas, meanings do not always align and cannot always be tied to etymological history, but the structure and content of *Tender Buttons* can still cause questions to arise, new alignments to be realized, centers to be rebuilt.

As Stein writes of sensation, location and history, her words hold additional meaning for readers familiar with Anishinaabe language and culture. This attempt at translation and Anishinaabe reading, this *bakonaan dibaajimowin*, a skinning of the story, is not the only, or even the most productive method for reading Stein, but it does produce new cross-cultural linguistic and literary comparisons. Her atomic disassembly questions standard ways of perceiving nouns, actions, and relationships. Her words render obvious the way patterns of language lead to different interpretations. *Tender Buttons* can be a source of cross-cultural inspiration. Stein had her own dance in mind when she wrote: “Dance a clean dream and an extravagant turn up, secure the steady rights and translate more than translate the authority, show the choice and make no more mistakes than yesterday” (51). I will, Gertrude, I will:

Biinishimoyaan bawaajimoyaan gaye maamakanendaagoziyaan, zhaabwitooyaan gweyakonakoniigeyaan, aanikanootamaan, aanikanootawagwaa, ayaangwaamendamaan gaye gaawiin waa awashme wanichigesiiyaan.

Works Cited

-
- Agnes Smedley. *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview*. Westview Press, 1999.
- Bruner, Belinda. "A Recipe for Modernism and the Somatic Intellect in the Alice B. Toklas Cook Book and Gertrude Stein's Tender Buttons." *Papers on Language & Literature* 45.4 (2009): 411.
- Dubnick, Randa K. *The Structure of Obscurity : Gertrude Stein, Language, and Cubism / Randa Dubnick*. 1984.
- Marchiselli, Chani Anine. "Queer Sonorities: Sound as Persuasion in Gertrude Stein’s Tender Buttons." *Women's Studies in Communication* 39.1 (2016): 69-85.
- Poetzsch, Markus. "Presence, Deixis, and the Making of Meaning in Gertrude Stein's Tender Buttons." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 75.4 (2006): 946-56
- Stein, Gertrude. "Poetry and Grammar," *Lectures in America*. Beacon Press, 1985.
- . "Portraits and Repetition." Collected in *Gertrude Stein: Writings and Lectures* by Patricia Meyerowitz ed. Penguin Books, 1971.
- . *Tender Buttons*. Dover Publications, 1997.

Whitman's Song Sung the Navajo Way

KENNETH M. ROEMER

I

For decades, controversies have roiled over the implications of analyzing indigenous texts, particularly Native American texts, with EuroAmerican critical theories. The Winter 2005 issue of *The American Indian Quarterly* exposed many of these antagonisms in its review section. There were no less than six reviews (that must be a record) of one book (316-40)—Elvira Pulitano's *Toward a Native American Critical Theory* (2003)—and several of those reviews were review-essay length. There is praise for the book. Chris Teuton thinks Pulitano is “at her best” when she examines the critical approaches of Greg Sarris, Louis Owens, and Gerald Vizenor. But the reviewers in general argue that Pulitano “privileges a postcolonial theoretical notion of cultural hybridity to the exclusion of ‘separatist’ critical movements” (Teuton 336). Barbara K. Robins speculates that Pulitano favors Native critics such as Sarris, Owens, and Vizenor because she “seems less threatened” (324) by critics who favor “crosscultural mediation, aimed at embracing differing discourses and world views” (Robins 117). James Cox proposes that Pulitano’s criticism of nationalist/separatist critics such as Paula Gunn Allen, Craig Womack, and Robert Warrior, who “foreground Native sources in their analyses,” indicates that Pulitano “is responding to the repatriation of Native authority from the possession of non-Native people” (318). As wide-ranging as the arguments are in Pulitano’s book and the reviewers’ responses, they don’t include major emphases on some of the many other issues about appropriate theory for studying Native texts raised by feminist and transnational scholars, including Shari Huhndorf and Chad Allen.¹

The *American Indian Quarterly* review fest is just one example of the ongoing debates about using non-Native interpretive approaches to analyze indigenous oral and written literatures. There has been much less discussion of turning the looking glass in the opposite direction: what might be the implications of using concepts of form and function characteristic of traditional oral texts as theoretical and critical lenses for analyzing canonical non-Native texts written in English? There certainly have been American poets and critics who, at least indirectly, championed the use of indigenous concepts of literary form as the true or original American

literature; for example, in the early 20th century the Imagist poets who praised indigenous songs and images, cultural critics like Mary Austin who imagined indigenous “American rhythms,” and, in the mid- and late 20th century, the leaders of the ethnopoetics movement.² And I have made a minor foray into using concepts derived from oral narratives as interpretive tools (Roemer, “Women and Violence” 97-117).

But compared to discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of using non-Native criticism and theory to interpret Native texts, discussions of using indigenous concepts of form and function to interpret non-Native literature have been rare. There are obvious reasons for this. Not many introductions to theory courses in English departments include Native oral narratives or books such as Gary Witherspoon’s *Language and Art in the Navajo Universe* (1977). Even if a critic is attracted to using traditional Native forms as a critical lens, there are challenges, especially for a non-Native who is not fluent in relevant indigenous languages. If s(he) has to depend on translations, there will always be mediation, even, as Robert Dale Parker argues, if the text is performed and filmed with subtitles, or, I might add, Skyped, or performed live in standard or “Red English” (97-100). Even if the critic is fluent and Native, the assimilation process of taking English courses can condition critics to privilege certain questions and emphases that can distort, obscure, or render invisible important characteristics of the indigenous forms and functions.

I am aware of these limitations, especially since I do not claim a tribal affiliation, and I am not fluent in any Native language, including Navajo, the language relevant to this article. But at least I have been fortunate enough to have read extensively about Navajo practices, including the observations of the late Navajo educator and Nightway celebrant (*hataalii*), Andrew Natonabah (Natonabah, “By This Song”); have taught parts of courses and directed an M.A. thesis (Lightfoot) that included Navajo Nightway-Whitman comparisons; have been employed by the Gallup Indian Community Center, which was run by a Navajo and served many Navajo; was briefly instructed about the importance of Navajo ceremonialism by a Navajo, Will Tsosie, who is fluent, has sung in many Nightways and is related to a Nightway *hataalii*; and have been invited to attend parts of several Nightway ceremonies that are open to non-Navajos (“Nightway Questions” 819, 828, 829, n. 7, n. 14). These elements of my background and the surface similarities between particular sections of the complex nine-day Navajo Nightway and Walt Whitman’s “Song of Myself” led me to consider the implications of using major elements of the

Nightway's forms and functions as interpretive lenses for reading "Song of Myself." (For a brief introduction to the Nightway [*tl'éeji hatáál*], see Roemer "Nightway Questions" 819-20).³

First, I need to clarify what this article does *not* intend to do. It is not an examination of Whitman's contact with Native Americans or possible influences of indigenous forms and functions on "Song of Myself." Readers interested in excellent brief introductions to the former should consult the entries entitled "Native Americans" by Ed Folsom and "Racial Attitudes" by George and David Drews in *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia* (1998). For a more complete study of the contacts with Native Americans, see Folsom's *Walt Whitman's Native Representations* (1994). For an examination of similarities between Native oral stylistics and Whitman's poetry, see James Nolan's *Poet-Chief: The Native American Poetics of Walt Whitman and Pablo Neruda* (1924), especially his discussions of "repetition, direct address, spells, prayers, antiphony, parallel construction and enumerative and associative organization" (Wong 228).

My intent is to use significant characteristics of the Nightway as critical lenses to interpret the forms and functions of "Song of Myself." Examining similarities and differences between the two texts invites speculation about how "revolutionary" Whitman's use of repetition was, the impact of intended or implied audiences, the possible curative nature of Whitman's poem, the extent to which innovation and conservation are privileged in criticism and theory, and the degrees to which curative agency and definitions of illness and health are community or individual based. The primary representation of the Nightway I use is the most complete English translation, Washington Matthews's *Night Chant* (1902). I use the version of "Song of Myself" from the 1881 edition of *Leaves of Grass*.⁴

My foray into comparative criticism is certainly not intended to suggest that the primary reason for studying indigenous literatures is to enhance our understanding of non-Native literature. Rather, I hope to demonstrate that one of the many ways to expand awareness of the importance of studying Native literatures, especially traditional oral literatures, is that they can offer sophisticated ways of representing and seeing reality, within and beyond their cultural origins. Of course, this claim is "nothing new." Almost fifty years ago, in *We Talk, You Listen* (1970), Vine Deloria, Jr., advocated using indigenous worldviews to evaluate non-Native realities.

II

We certainly don’t need to know the Navajo Nightway to be aware of the repetition in “Song of Myself.” According to James Woodress, “[s]ome 41% of the 10,500 lines of *Leaves of Grass* contain initial reiteration” (320). Teachers and scholars typically present Whitman’s multiple uses of repetition as innovative, even revolutionary, in comparison to his pre-*Leaves of Grass* poetry and to the conventional stanza, meter, and rhyme forms of nineteenth-century poetry in America and England. Matthews’s often anthologized translation of one of the four long prayers that precede the first dance of the *Atsálie Yei-be-chai* on the final night of the ceremonial exhibits complex progressions of exact repetition, repetition with variation, parallelism, and balance of binary opposites (Matthews 143-45). An awareness of this prayer reveals the impact of Navajo forms of expression on contemporary Native American fiction. For instance, N. Scott Momaday’s *House Made of Dawn* title came from a similar Nightway prayer performed earlier in the Nightway. But an awareness of this prayer and other songs and prayers in the Nightway also demonstrates to readers unfamiliar with Native oral texts that, long before Whitman wrote “Song of Myself,” complex uses of repetition were performed in what is now the United States. James C. Faris observes that on rock drawings created in the late seventeenth century “in the caches of the San Juan drainage,” there is evidence of performance of the Nightway (18). Within the specific context of written poetic genres in English in the 19th century, Whitman’s use of repetition was inventive. But an awareness of the Nightway gives us a much broader performance context, one that demonstrates that Whitman’s use of repetition was centuries old and quite conventional for the North American continent.

A Nightway *hataalii* would, however, consider Whitman’s use of various forms of repetition quite untraditional from a traditional Navajo ceremonial viewpoint. Consider the contrasts, for example, between two sections that both dramatize travel: lines 771-817 from section 33 of “Song of Myself” (47-48) and lines 15-35 in Matthews’s version of the prayer mentioned above (143). The motion in Whitman’s poem begins with “Through patches of citrons and cucumbers with silver-wired leaves” (line 771). “Through” begins the next two lines, which are each followed by the specific natural and human environments passed through and include internal repetition of “through”: “...salt-lick or orange glade, or under conical firs... gymnasium, through the curtain’d saloon, through the office or public hall” (lines 771-73). Then Whitman drops the initial repetition of “through,” the motion proceeds with a series of unrepeated action

word lead-ins to the lines: “Looking,” “Wandering,” “Coming home,” “Voyaging,” “Hurrying,” and “Walking” that build to a triple lead-in repetition of “Speeding” followed by “Carrying” and “Storming” lead-ins (lines 779-95).

In the Navajo prayer, the words of the *hataalii* move a Holy Being (*diné diyinni*) who is one of the four thunder beings traveling from the “house made of dawn” to the earth to bring help (restoration of balance, *hózhó*) to the one or ones “sung over” (143). This momentous journey takes fewer lines (lines 15-35) than the on-going journey in “Song of Myself” (which doesn’t stop at line 817). In the Holy Being’s journey, every line begins with “With your”; the images used to describe the Holy Being are much less specific than in Whitman’s poem; and the motion is expressed in incremental stages in the middle and the ends of the lines. For example, here are lines 15-22:

With your moccasins of dark cloud, come to us.

With your leggings of dark cloud, come to us.

With your shirt of dark cloud, come to us.

With your head-dress of dark cloud, come to us.

With your mind enveloped in dark cloud, come to us.

With the dark thunder above you, come to us soaring.

With the far-darkness made of the dark cloud over your head, come to us soaring. (lines 15-22; 143)

The prayer continues to build, balancing he-rain (downpour) and she-rain (light rain) and adding, among other images, “zigzag lightning flung out” and “the rainbow hanging high over your head” until the *hataalii* replaces “far darkness” with “near darkness” (lines 23-35). The journey ends on the earth.

With the rainbow hanging high on the ends of your wings, come to us soaring.

With the near darkness made of the dark cloud, of the he-rain, of the dark mist and of the she-rain, come to us.

With the darkness on the earth, come to us. (lines 33-35; 143)

The narrative of the journey of the Holy Being places much less emphasis on the specificity of what is traveled through than the narrative in “Song of Myself” and much more on two vertical axes (from lower extremities to upper and above for the Holy Being’s body and the downward movement from “house” to “far darkness” to “near darkness” to “earth”) and one horizontal axis

(the appearance of the wings and then their extension to the “ends of your wings”) (lines 1-35; 143).

Reading the repetitive language of this travel section of “Song of Myself” through the journey of the Holy Thunder Being invites us to ask significant questions about audience and evokes feelings of expansiveness. Whitman’s audience was becoming increasingly diverse; witness the catalogues of different people he enumerates in “Song of Myself” (for example, see Section 15, lines 264-329; 31-33). Whitman could not assume that his diverse audience shared common worldviews. They certainly didn’t all share common experiences. In order to create the illusion of grand expansiveness for this particular journey in section 33 and the poem in general, he obviously assumed that he had to shower the readers with a wide variety of specific visual, sound, and tactile images in hopes that some of the images would resonate with some of the readers at least some of the time.

The *hataalii* of the Nightway performs before very different sizes of audiences. At some points in the Nightway, only the patients and a few helpers attend; at other times there are hundreds attending, particularly on the final night. The nature of these audiences is strikingly different from Whitman’s diverse audience. Definitely before the forced removal of the “Long Walk” in 1864 and probably continuing through the boarding school era that extended well into the 20th century and much later for many Navajo living on the Diné reservation, a substantial portion of these audiences shared and still share common traditional stories and similar worldviews, as well as common language—“Navajo is the most widely spoken indigenous language in America” (S. A. P.).

Compared to the narration of the journey in section 33 of “Song of Myself,” the Holy Being’s journey’s brevity and relative vagueness can be explained by an observation offered by the most famous collaborator in a Tohono O’odham life narrative, Maria Chona: “The song is very short because we understand so much” (Underhill 51). The traditional Navajo audience would know many songs and stories, whole communities of songs and stories or, as T. C. S. Langen termed them extensive “collections” (6). The *hataalii* in a Nightway had in the past and still today for traditional Navajo, the authority of speaking or singing words given by Holy Beings and the reassurance of performing before an audience with a shared language, knowledge, and worldview, a worldview that includes the importance of directionality (vertical and horizontal) and motion (“to go” in Navajo is in many ways the equivalent of “to be” in

English⁵). And of course the rituals, dance, and regalia all give additional meanings to the words. Hence, what may seem vague in an English translation on the page in comparison to the travel descriptions offered by Whitman's speaker/singer is full of detail and complex meanings to a traditional Navajo audience.

Reading the traveling lines of Section 33 of "Song of Myself" through the comparative brevity and vagueness of the repetition and parallelism of the traveling section of the Thunder Beings' descent to earth can enhance readers' awareness of the importance of assumed audience; in this case, the impacts of the diversified evolving audiences of Whitman's "Song of Myself" and the evolving but much less diverse and more culturally traditional audiences of a Navajo *hataalii*. Another potential result of reading "Song of Myself" through the Nightway would be to invite readers to rethink the functions of Whitman's poem, specifically the curative functions. I am not straying into an argument that turns Whitman into a "shaman," an approach that Nolan in *Poet-Chief* was tempted by when he presents Whitman as a "shamanic personae" whose poems take him on "shamanic journeys" (184). That could take us down the road of controversies about "white shamans," a persona attacked with vigor by Leslie Marmon Silko ("Old-Time Indian Attack" 213-15). Instead, I'm raising the possibility that reading the Nightway, even in the highly mediated form of Matthews's translation, invites readers to remember that the origin of poetry was oral performance and many of the performers used their words with an intent to cure people. Certainly, this is the case with the Navajo Nightway's hundreds of songs and thousands of spoken lines and rituals, which the Holy Beings gave to the Diné to help people whose state of imbalance is manifested in paralysis or illnesses concentrated in the head, for example, eye and ear disorders, headaches, or mental disorders (Roemer, "Nightway Questions" 819-20).

Whitman's speaker/singer does not explicitly claim physical curative powers for his song.⁶ But he does perceive an illness in the reader as s(he) reads the poem and, very early in his performance, claims that he can cure that illness. A crucial part of the illness is the inability of the reader (and by implication most people) to perceive reality directly; all is seen "second or third hand" or "through the eyes of the dead" or through the "specters of books" (line 35; 24). The process of reading his poem will cure this perceptual illness. Not only will the reader come to "possess the origin of all poems" (line 33; 42), s(he) will also no longer perceive reality mediated. This transformation of perception is not even sullied by the speaker/singer as an

intermediary: “You shall not look through my eyes either, nor take things from me, / You shall listen to all sides and filter them from yourself” (lines 36-37; 24).

This curative process, reminiscent of Ralph Waldo Emerson’s experiencing the “transparent eye-ball” epiphany (*Emerson—Texts, Nature* ch.1), involves surrounding the reader with the speaker/singer’s words. Readers of Matthews’s translation of the *Nightway* or listeners at a *Nightway* performance may have a heightened awareness of a process that also surrounds listeners with words. Many of the powerful songs and prayers conclude with an often anthologized ending similar to the penultimate lines of the prayer spoken before the first dance of the *Atsálie Yei-be-chai* on the final night:

With beauty before me, I walk.

With beauty behind me, I walk.

With beauty below me, I walk.

With beauty above me, I walk.

With beauty all around me, I walk. (lines 92-96; 144)

The *hataalii* surrounds the patient(s) with a form of the powerful word *hózhó*, which Washington translates as “beauty.”

Again, because of the difference in the audiences and Whitman’s love of piling on a pounding of word images, his speaker/singer’s performance of the surrounding with words uses more words and space. But the above, below, and all around is evident, and is placed, as in the *Nightway*, at the conclusion of the poem:

I sound my barbaric yawp over the roofs of the world (line 1333, 66)

....

I depart as air, I shake my white locks at the runaway sun,

I effuse my flesh in eddies, and drift in the lacy jags.

I bequeath my self to the dirt to grow from the grass I love,

If you want me again look for me under your boot soles. (lines 1337-40, 66)

....

Failing to fetch me at first keep encouraged,

Missing me one place search another,

I stop somewhere waiting for you.” (lines 1344-46; 66)

An awareness of the Nightway also fosters an awareness of significant differences between the agencies “behind” the curing. This awareness can, furthermore, highlight a fundamental difference between Navajo, and indeed many indigenous curing performances, and the healing process in “Song of Myself” and many non-Native physical and psychological healing processes: the difference between community- and individual-focused agency.

Despite the compulsion Whitman’s singer/speaker has to enlarge his individual identity by aligning himself with many types of people, including children and women, and despite his claim that “every atom belonging to me as good belongs to you” (line 3; 23)—despite these transcendental creations of a community of selves, the agency of the curing comes from the one ecstatic speaker/singer. The final version of the poem’s title is, after all, “Song of Myself,” and that self, though capable of denigrating his identity, has the power to cure the readers’ perceptual illness, in part, by the authority of his divinity: “Divine I am inside and out, and I make holy whatever I touch or am touch’d from” (line 524; 40).

The Navajo *hataalii*’s power comes from communities of people, of Holy Beings, and of the rituals and words given to the Navajo by the Holy Beings. The *hataalii* must perform with assistants—singers, sand painters, dancers, hundreds of witnesses during the last night, and the patient(s), since s(he)/they must repeat words and ritual actions in order to be cured. The powers of the words themselves are just as or possibly more important than these visible performers and performances. Certainly Whitman’s speaker/singer would claim power for his words, and the reader must “perform.” S(he) must read. And it is true that if the performance of the sender and receiver of “Song of Myself” is done correctly, the reader will, according to the speaker/singer, be cured. But the emphasis is still on the agency of the individual speaker/singer; not hundreds of people, some of whom have highly specialized duties in the Nightway.

Even more important are the differences between the agency of the communities of words and their goals. There is certainly a large community of words in “Song of Myself”—1,345 lines of words, and the speaker/singer would claim that these words have power to cure readers. There is an even larger community of words spoken and sung over the nine days of the Nightway. But the differences are more profound than suggested by simple contrasts in word counts. As the previous comparison of the traveling in Section 33 of “Song of Myself” and the traveling in the prayer delivered on the last night of the *Nightway* reveals, a knowledge of the assumed audiences of the speaker/singer and of the Navajo *hataalii* invite an awareness of

difference in the specificity and repetition of the words. During that discussion, I omitted mention of one crucial part of the *Nightway* audience—the Holy Beings. They gave the Navajo the songs and words, but in one sense the words they gave are more powerful than the Holy Beings. If the *hataalii* performs the words properly, not only do the Holy Beings delight in hearing them (Natonabah, “By This Song”), they must also do what the words say. Whereas Whitman’s speaker/singer words have the power to describe his travels and those descriptions can help to cure the reader, the prayer words spoken by the Navajo *hataalii* literally move the Holy Being from his “house” through the “far darkness” to the “near darkness” to the earth. Once there the Holy Being can directly help cure the patient(s) physical and psychological ills. The Navajo community of words have direct agency far beyond the power of the individual *hataalii*.

Reading “Song of Myself” through the *Nightway* thus raises awareness of the emphasis on individual agency in Whitman’s poem as differentiated from communal human/divine agency in the *Nightway*. The “red reading” of “Song of Myself” also highlights the privileging of innovation over conservation and restoration as the goal of literary agency. In the tradition of Emerson’s liberator poet,⁷ Whitman’s speaker/singer hopes to free the reader from his or her mitigated epistemologies. The ultimate goal of the *Nightway* is to restore the type of balance in the patient(s) that the Holy Beings created before the creation of the human Diné. This difference, highlighted by the comparison of the two curative texts, may help to explain one of the reasons why Whitman’s “Song of Myself” is almost always part of the American literary canon, whereas the *Nightway* and other indigenous songs, narratives, and ceremonial texts are often not. Despite the move away from New Critical criteria for “great literature,” one of the dominant criteria for most critical scholarly interpretive communities (and by implication for most Americans who celebrate America as the land of change and “The New”) remains evidence of innovation, not conservation. Becoming aware of the beauty and power of the *Nightway* juxtaposed with the beauty and power of “Song of Myself” invites students, teachers, and scholars to consider restorative literature as great literature.

III

As I conceded at the beginning of this article, we don’t need to read “Song of Myself” through the *Nightway* to discover its general characteristics of repetitive language, implied

diversified audience, curative qualities, and concepts of agency. Nor is the Nightway the only indigenous lens that could invite the types of readings I have offered. We could use many South American, African, Asian, or South Pacific indigenous performance texts as interpretive lenses. But using the Nightway as a critical lens to interpret “Song of Myself” does suggest that in order to “answer” the criticism of the over-use of EuroAmerican literary, historical, and anthropological critical approaches to interpret Native American literatures, we need to go beyond considering the usefulness of indigenous concepts articulated by, for example, the Native American intellectuals examined by Robert Warrior⁸ and beyond the concepts offered by contemporary 20th- and 21st-century Native critics like Warrior, Weaver, Womac, Allen, Owens, Saris, Teuton, Huhndorf, Vizenor, and many others. We need to consider how the aesthetic, philosophical, and cultural concepts articulated by Navajo *hataalii* like Andrew Natonabah and the concepts imbedded in other indigenous performance texts can help us to understand meanings in non-Native texts we might not otherwise have emphasized if we had only seen them through well-known EuroAmerican critical lenses.

Another obvious advantage of this comparative approach is that, potentially, it could expand an awareness of the importance of indigenous literatures. Native literature is no longer “in the margins” the way it was forty years ago. My website archive of the tables of contents of American literature anthologies and histories demonstrates the significant increase of Native texts in the American literary canon during the past three decades (*Covers, Titles, and Tables*). It is crucial to teach these texts separately in order to place them in relevant historical, legal, and cultural contexts. I have done this many times. But if they are never presented comparatively, they may be relegated in survey courses and histories of literature to separate, historically time-bound sections. The worst-case scenario is the “Ok-we’ve-done-the-Indian-unit-now-we-can-move-on” attitude. If, on the other hand, in our classes and scholarship, we can demonstrate how indigenous concepts can help us to understand and evaluate many types of literature, historical periods, and cultures, then we can expand the appreciation of indigenous literature and do it without undermining crucial concepts of sovereignty and nationalism. Again I return to the model offered by Deloria’s *We Talk, You Listen*. His arguments are firmly grounded in his Yankton-Standing Rock Sioux worldviews. But he realized that there was a need (a desperate need) to read/evaluate contemporary American culture through his worldviews. I think we still need to listen to that message.

Notes

I would like to thank Lucy Tapahonso for introducing me to Will Tsosie, who helped me to understand the Nightway. Scott Andrews and the anonymous reader for *Transmotion* offered valuable suggestions for revising the article.

¹ See Huhndorf’s *Mapping the Americas* (2009) and Allen’s *Blood Narratives* (2002). One of the first book-length feminist studies was Paula Gunn Allen’s *The Sacred Hoop* (1986).

² See for example, the “Indian Songs” section in the February 1917 issue of *Poetry*, Austin’s *The American Rhythm* (1923), Jerome Rothenberg’s *Shaking the Pumpkin* (1972), and Dennis Tedlock’s, *Finding the Center* (1972).

³ For an intensive study of the Nightway, see James Faris’s *The Nightway* (1990). John Farella’s “Forward” to *The Night Chant* (1995) provides an excellent introduction. A master’s thesis I directed offers interesting insights about canon formation and “Song of Myself” and the Nightway: Kody Lightfoot’s “Expanding the American Literary Canon” (2000).

⁴ The 1881 version I use appears in the Ninth Edition of *The Norton Edition of American Literature 1865-1914*, edited by Michael Elliott (2017), 23-66.

⁵ See Larry Evers’ “Song and Traveling” subsection of *By this Song I walk with Andrew Natonabah* website: http://parentseyes.arizona.edu/wordsandplace/natonabah_intro.html.

⁶ I designate Whitman’s speaker/singer as male, though arguments can be made for considering the speaker/singer as a voice that transcends gender binaries.

⁷ See Emerson’s essay “The Poet” (1844).

⁸ See, for example, Warrior’s *Tribal Secrets* (1995).

Works Cited

Allen, Chadwick. *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*. Durham: Duke UP. 2002.

Allen, Paula Gunn. *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*. Boston: Beacon, 1986.

Austin, Mary. *The American Rhythm*. New York: Harcourt Brace. 1923.

Cox, James H. Review of *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*, by Elvira Pulitano. *American Indian Quarterly* 29. 1 & 2 (2005): 316-21.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. *We Talk, You Listen: New Tribes, New Turf*. New York: Macmillian, 1970.

Drews, George, and David Drews. ““Racial Attitudes.”” *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia*. Eds. J. R. LeMaster and Donald D. Kummings. New York: Garland, 1988. http://whitmanarchive.org.8080/criticism/current/encyclopedia/entry_44html.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. “The Poet.” *Selected Writings of Emerson*. Ed. Donald McQuade. New York: Modern Library, 1981. 303-25.

- _____. *Texts*. Chapter 1. <http://emersoncentral.com/nature.htm>.
- [Evers, Larry]. "Song and Traveling" from *By This Song I Walk with Andrew Natonabah*. *Words and Place: Native Literature from the American Southwest*.
http://parentseyes.arizona.edu/wordsandplace/natonabah_intro.html.
- Farella, John. "Forward." *The Night Chant: A Navaho Ceremony*. Washington Matthews. Salt Lake City: U of Utah P, 1995. Xvi-xlvi.
- Faris, James C. *The Nightway: A History and a History of Documentation of a Navajo Ceremonial*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1990.
- Folsom, Ed. "Native Americans." *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia*. Eds. J. R. LeMaster and Donald D. Kummings. New York: Garland, 1988. http://whitmanarchive.org/criticism/current/encyclopedia/entry_34html.
- _____. *Walt Whitman's Native Representations*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Huhndorf, Shari M. *Mapping the Americas: The Transnational Politics of Contemporary Native Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2009.
- "Indian Songs." *Poetry* 9.5 (February 1917).
<https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poetrymagazine/toc/detail/70370>.
- Langen, T. C. S. "Estoy-eh-mutt and the Morphologists." *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, Ser. 2. 1.1 (1989): 1-12.
- Lightfoot, Kody. "Expanding the American Literary Canon: A Comparative Analysis of the Navajo Nightway and Walt Whitman's 'Song of Myself.'" MA thesis. U of Texas at Arlington, 2000.
- Momaday, N. Scott. *House Made of Dawn*. New York: Harper, 1968.
- Natonabah, Andrew. [transcript of] "By This Song I walk with Andrew Natonabah." *Words & Place: Native Literature from the American Southwest*.
parentseyes.arizona.edu/wordsandplace/natonabah.html.
- Nolan, James. *Poet-Chief: The Native American Poetics of Walt Whitman and Pablo Neruda*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1994.
- Owens, Louis. *Other Destinies: Understanding the American Indian Novel*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1992.
- Parker, Robert Dale. *The Invention of Native American Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002.
- Pulitano, Elvira. *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2003.

-
- Robins, Barbara K. Review of *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*, by Elvira Pulitano. *American Indian Quarterly* 29. 1 & 2 (2005): 325-30.
- Roemer, Kenneth M. “Native American Women and Violence: Fiction, Critical Perspectives, Narrative Transformations.” *Journal of Contemporary Thought* 5 (1995): 97-117.
- _____. “The Nightway Questions American Literature.” *American Literature* 66 (1994): 817-29.
- _____. “The Study of American Indian Literature Can Illuminate the Classics in New Ways.” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 12 July 1989: B1-B2.
- _____. *Covers, Titles, and Tables: The Formations of American Literary Canons in Anthologies*. library.uta.edu/ctt.
- Rothenberg, Jerome. Ed. *Shaking the Pumpkin: Traditional Poetry of the Indian North Americas*. New York: Doubleday, 1972.
- S. A. P. “Johnson/ Speaking Navajo: Minority—language report.” *The Economist* 13 Nov. 2014. <http://www.economist.com/blogs/prospero/2014/11/johnson-speaking-navajo>.
- Sarris, Greg. *Keeping Slug Woman Alive: A Holistic Approach to American Indian Texts*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon. “An Old-Time Indian Attack Conducted in Two Parts.” *The Remembered Earth: An Anthology of Contemporary Native American Literature*. Ed. Geary Hobson. Albuquerque: Red Earth Press, 1979. 211-16.
- Teuton, Christopher B. *Deep Waters: The Textual Continuum in American Indian Literature*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2010.
- _____. Review of *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*, by Elvira Pulitano. *American Indian Quarterly* 29. 1 & 2 (2005): 334-37.
- Tedlock, Dennis, trans. *Finding the Center: Narrative Poetry of the Zuni Indians*. New York: Dial, 1972.
- Underhill, Ruth M. *Papago Woman*, 1979. New York: Waveland, 1985.
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance*. Hanover: Wesleyan UP, 1994.
- Warrior, Robert Allen. *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1995.

- Weaver, Jace. *That the People Might Live. Native American Literatures and Native American Community*. New York: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Whitman, Walt. "Song of Myself." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, Vol. C. 1865-1914, 9th ed. Ed. Michael A. Elliott. New York: Norton, 2017. 23-66.
- Witherspoon, Gary. *Language and Art in the Navajo Universe*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1977.
- Womack, Craig S. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1999.
- Wong, Hertha D. Sweet. Review of *Poet-Chief: The Native Poetics of Walt Whitman and Pablo Neruda*. By James Nolan. *Walt Whitman Quarterly* 16.3 (1999): 226-28.
- Woodress, James. "Whitman, Walt(er)." *American Literature to 1900*. Introd. Lewis Leary. New York: St. Martin's P, 1980.

On the Mysterious 1831 Cherokee Manuscript or *Jisdu* Fixes John Locke's *Two Treatises of Civil Government*

BRIAN BURKHART

At the time that he read John Locke's original manuscript, around the year of 1691, *Jisdu* did not know the weight those printed words would have on his relatives, the Cherokee people (*Anijalagi Aniyuwiya*). What *Jisdu* did know was that Locke was upset with the printing of his words, that the printers had made many mistakes. *Jisdu* was of the opinion that such mistakes might explain what appeared to be quite a bit of nonsense in the printed material that was before him. Since Locke appeared otherwise to be reasonable and sensible, at least for a human, *Jisdu* concluded that the errors made by the printers might explain what seemed like childish nonsense in the actual printed words he was reading. *Jisdu* had also thought of a more sinister explanation for the bizarre nature of the book before him: it might be a *didahnesesgi* (a conjuring text), as these often "bear little resemblance to ordinary discourse" (Kilpatrick 25). Or perhaps it was even a *didagalenvdhodiyi*, "the most venomous" of the conjuring texts that was meant to separate things, where the things to be separated in this instance are the people and the land (Kilpatrick 39). Either way, *Jisdu* set himself onto the life-long path of the fixing of Locke's manuscript.

The corrections that *Jisdu* made with his own hand to his personal copy of Locke's original manuscript were not set to type until 1831 when the Cherokee had a printing press and after Chief Justice John Marshall's use of Locke's original ideas in the Cherokee Trilogy of Supreme Court cases had set the stage for the Trail of Tears. It was the confluence of those events that sent *Jisdu* to my relative's cabin on a cold December night in 1830. *Jisdu* had just heard of the execution of Corn Tassel by Georgia, which Governor Gilmer had done with haste to avoid a review from the highest court in the land—Marshall had just sent Georgia a writ to appear before the court to defend their racist and imperial incursion into the Cherokee homeland. *Jisdu* believed, and there is indication that he was correct, that if his corrected edition of Locke's original manuscript would have been published as a revised edition anytime between 1689 and the present (1830), the horrific events that were taking place in the Cherokee nation at the hands

of the settlers of Georgia might have been avoided, since these events were shaped by the settler logic and perhaps even settler witchcraft that was at the core of that original manuscript.

Part of this story is about *Jisdu*, the Cherokee rabbit trickster, and part is about my relative James Dougherty, since it was Grandpa James who was given *Jisdu*'s copy of Locke's manuscript and the instructions on setting it to type in the winter of 1830. James Dougherty was born in Hightower on October, 17, 1785, a Chickamauga Cherokee village on the land of what is now Rome, Georgia. He was born eight years to the day of the famous battle of Hightower where Kingfisher was killed by the Tennesseans and the village of Hightower was moved up the river to what is now Cartersville, Georgia. As an eight-year old, James witnessed some of the conflict between Doublehead and The Ridge that spilled out from that fateful day, fateful for both men and even for the Cherokee Nation as a whole. I think those events of 1793 in his village helped set him on the path to the Foreign Mission School of Cornwall, Connecticut in 1802. The years that followed, under the benefactor Elias Cornelius, saw him study the venerable John Locke and dine with Virginia statesmen Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe—the same Jefferson who said that Locke was one of the “three greatest men that ever lived, without exception” (Jefferson).

Upon returning to his family in Cherokee Nation East, James began working with other Christian educated Cherokees to translate the New Testament into Cherokee using Sequoyah's syllabary. In 1828, He began working with Boudinot and Worchester on the Cherokee Phoenix newspaper. It was at that time that James encountered *Jisdu*, and this mysterious manuscript was finally given printed life. In the story that Grandpa James told, he spent several months, under the personalized instruction of *Jisdu*, transcribing and setting to type this manuscript from the hand-corrected version that *Jisdu* brought him. On March 18, 1831 (the day the Cherokee Nation v. Georgia Supreme Court decision was rendered), he set the manuscript to type and printed it on the Phoenix press.

It is from James Dougherty, my many times great grandfather, that this *Jisdu* formula/manuscript comes to me. After producing it on the Cherokee printing press in early 1831, he guarded it like one of the handwritten Cherokee formula books that families kept and passed down for generations, as he perhaps hoped one day to bring this manuscript to the wide circulation he believed it deserved, or maybe because both Grandpa James and *Jisdu* considered this manuscript to be one of the *idigawesdi* (magically protective and transformative texts) that

have power to change the world and are inviolable and not to be knowingly altered by the descendants to whom they are passed. Either way, it was so precious to Grandpa James that it became one of the few items that made the journey with him to Indian Territory in 1838. It was passed down in the Dougherty-Langley family until it finally came to me. I present it here for the first time because as Grandpa James said, “If this manuscript could have been included in the printing of the original Two Treatises, perhaps the horror of what is happening now with our removal might have been avoided.” What follows here is, first, my representation of the note from the hand of James Dougherty that was included with the *Jisdu* manuscript and, second, the original *Jisdu* manuscript printed in 1831 but never before published. Both are included here with very little editing on my part. *A caution to the reader: Jisdu* has been known at times to manifest the ability to see the future as well as to speak to the future. He then often speaks in a dialectical form that is foreign to his contemporaries but well known to his future interlocuters. Thus, it can prove rather difficult to situate *Jisdu’s* corrections to John Locke’s original manuscript into a particular time and space.

Brian Burkhart

January 20, 2017

Los Angeles, CA

§ Concerning this Manuscript and its Origin Story §

To the Reader.

I have attached a letter to this manuscript because bearing upon its face, it would appear to be more the offspring of an excited mind than the sober dictate of political philosophy. What appear as misrepresentations and illegal constructions of the writings of one John Locke, a philosopher and physician, are rather the corrections of one *Jisdu*, a rabbit and trickster. The annihilating sarcasms of the new editor of this revised edition, one rabbit trickster, to the performance of which he appears strictly to have adhered, might give cause to apply the epithet of calumniator upon him if it were not with highest spirit of friendship, truth, and love that he set forth to make these corrections to the manuscript of the man, whom he names as friend, John Locke. The faithful followers of John Locke will surely conclude that they have never witnessed a similar spirit of high resentment in the cause of one who names himself as collaborator else, in turn, fall to the irresistible conclusion that this edition strains completely the faculties of the human mind.

Only a hasty effort to establish conclusions to these questions will originate such preposterous allegations. In the support of the true position of original corrector and editor set forth by John Locke himself, *Jisdu* is in a supreme and immutable position, which it will test all the scrutiny of Philosophy to overthrow. So far as virtue and ability are hand in hand, and accompanied by a strict regard to consistency, again in so far as virtue and ability will allow, I testify that this corrected edition of John Locke's *Two Treatises on Civil Government* is the true and faithful heir of the original manuscript set forth in the year 1689. Altho' some may proclaim an excessive use of liberty on the part of the editor, *Jisdu* has every authority and cause to claim that his version of Locke's text to be the truer manuscript of all thus produced. If the reader has preference for the old one, let him with industry gratify himself in the enjoyment of the unfit claim of faithfulness to what is true and earnest from the start. Yet if there has been no abandonment of the principle of faithfulness and a great disposition is manifested to approach

nearer to the true intention of the mind of the original author and the great Philosophy to which his intention was directed, these printed words will find root in that man and grow to hitherto unseen bounds. If there are missteps and mislocutions in this edition of Locke's manuscript, let it be unequivocally acknowledged to be an unintentional trespass and laid squarely upon the shoulders of this human being.

From the Printer and Translator

James Dougherty

New Echota, 1831

Two
T R E A T I S E S
o f
Government
In the Former,
The False Principles and Foundation
o f
Jani Lagwv
And His F o l l o w e r s,
A R E
Detected and Overthrown.
The Latter is an
FORMULA
FOR
The Origrinary Manifestation
o f
Government from the Land

BOOK I

AN ESSAY CONCERNING CERTAIN FALSE PRINCIPLES

CHAPTER I ON PROPERTY AND SELF-SOLITUDE

§1. The concepts of Property and Political Power as they exist in the Settler State of my future reader—that are as ubiquitous as the notion of the modern nation state itself—are so Vile and Miserable and so directly opposite to the *dejadaligenvdisgesdi* (responsibility for one another) of *anigaduwagi* (the people who come together as one) that tis hardly conceived that our author, *Jani Lagwv*, would plead for them. And truly I should have taken this Treatise as persuading all Beings that the Land, the Plants, and the Animals are all Natural Slaves, for Property and Sovereignty (as the ubiquitous notions of power in the modern state) are nothing more than concepts of Power and Domination over, firstly, *elohi* (the land) and secondly other *aniyvwi* (people) who are variously called Savage and Heathen. The Settler Colonial Logic of Domination that shapes these seemingly common sense concepts does not arise out of a State of Nature, as our author claims, because this State of Nature conceptualized by our author is nothing more than the mirror by which the Logic of Domination conceives itself against a projected and imagined Inferior Other.

§2. I cannot but confess myself mightily surprised at the Vacuous Locutions the author presents as an Exercise of Wit. Rather than a Serious Discourse meant in earnest, which the Manner of this author and the Presentation of his Manuscript would require, this Treatise is mere Noise meant to Blind the People the better to

device them. Instead of providing a Bond of Kinship for all Human Kind, as the author claims, this Treatise provides but an *ayelisgi* (imitation or disease). *Ayelisgi* is the Unmooring of Kinship from the *ayeli*, which is the center, the middle, or the nation. *Ayeli* is grounded in *elohi*. In other words, what Grounds the Kinship of Humankind to the Center as a People is the Land. The Contrary Doctrine of *ayelisgi* (of imitated kinship through abstraction and domination) removes from Humankind even the possibility of Kinship and founds the Being of Humankind in Self-Banishment or Solitude. In this Solitude, Human Reason, Human Knowledge, and Human Power are also banished with the Banishment of the Other. Where there is no Kinship, there is no Knowledge, no Understanding, no human power that is not the imitation power of domination.

CHAPTER II

ON THE KINLESS CONQUEROR AND ITS ORIGIN IN SELF-BANISHMENT

§3. The Kinless Conqueror that defines the coming to be of Civilizing Power and Property, in the mind of our author, is created in Solitude, but a Solitude that deceives itself as Dominating Power. As the Roman Empire becomes the Christian Empire, and as the Dominating Power of Imperial Conquering becomes the Dominating Power and authority of Christendom, the Kinless Conqueror finds itself in a perpetual state of questioning: If I know the supposed Heathen and Savage as she actually is, do I lose the Unquestioning Power I have over her? If I move beyond the Self-Created shell of my Dominating Power to actually touch and see the Other, do I lose my Self-Created Power of Domination? These questions resolve to one: am I truly King of all, or am I truly God on Earth? This is the First Skepticism. It is the Skepticism of Christendom’s *Adawi* (Adam) and *Kastadinv* (Constantine) but only reaches fruition in the Inquisition’s *Gwedinadv* (Ferdinand) and *Isadela* (Isabella) and the Valladolid’s *Segwvligeda* (Sépulveda). When the Inquisition asks who among the Converted are “stained by ancestral heresies” or when the Valladolid asks “do Indians truly have souls,” this is not a Skepticism about the “enemy

within,” but a Methodological Skepticism whose end is the Self-Creation of the Unquestionable Conqueror (Silverblatt 31-32).

§4. This Methodological Skepticism is not directed toward the Settling of the Question of the Savage and Heathen Other, but the Settling of the Doubt concerning whether the Conqueror is truly God on Earth. In order to banish the Doubt concerning whether the Conqueror is King, he creates a sphere in which he becomes Unquestionable and Undoubtable in order to become an *ayelisgi* (imitation) God on Earth. The Conqueror banishes the other from his Sphere of Being in order to banish the Doubt of the Conqueror as truly God on Earth, to banish the Doubt of the Conqueror as King. After banishing the Other from his Sphere of Being, he replaces the Other with the Inverted Projection of the Conqueror himself, the Savage. The Conqueror becomes what he is then, not through True Power, but through Complete Solitude. All of Being and Knowing become a mirror for the Idiosyncratic Personalities and Experiences of the Kinless Conqueror who has banished himself to his Own Solitude. The supposed Enemy Within of the Savage and Heathen Other hides the True Enemy Within of the Solipsistic Universe of his own Mind.

§5. The Savage Other is manufactured, in part, for the purpose of creating a Conqueror who can innocently save this *ayelisgi* (imitation) Other. If the Savage Other violently resists the Conqueror’s will, then the Conqueror becomes the Victim of the Savage Other. Yet Civilizing the Savage or Saving the Heathen does alter the Path of continued domination for the Kinless Conqueror. After civilizing and saving, the Kinless Conqueror must reveal the Bad Faith of his Mission to Civilize and Save the Savage Other in the First Place. The Ceaseless Striving to Save the Savage Other even after she has been Saved reveals the Conceptual and Structural Fallacy of the Mission as one of Salvation at all since the States of being Unsaved, Uncivilized, and Poor for the Savage Other are material and conceptual by-products of the States of being Saved, Civilized, and Wealthy as created by the Forced Solitude of the Kinless Conqueror. This Fallacy of the Creation of Value in absence

of actual Kinship by the Conqueror also reveals that the Freedom and Liberation the Savage Other is supposed to find after being brought out of Darkness by the Salvatory Conqueror is not a True Freedom or Liberation—as these Concepts must be borne out by Reason or Experience—but rather the Freedom to be Shaped in the Image of the Kinless Conqueror, which is of course not a Freedom at all, as our author well knows, but a perpetual State of Bondage.

§6. One world-leader of my future Readers will propose to save a Desert Tribe in a Foreign Land by forcing upon them the So-Called Freedom of Free Enterprise or what is rather the Bondage of Global Capitalism as they will come to Know it. The Real Meaning of being Savage, Uncivilized, Unfree, and so on, is then determined by the Kinless Conqueror, but not on the foundation of any Principle of Reason or Experience but simply on the foundation of the Idiosyncratic Being of the Kinless Conqueror himself. All the Savage Other must do in order to continue to be Savage is to lie outside of the Sphere of Power the Kinless Conqueror has created for his Purpose (for my Future Reader this Sphere of Power manifests itself, in part, as Global Capitalism). The so-called Reason of the Kinless Conqueror becomes the Epistemological Perspective of Future Philosophy. But is not an Epistemological Perspective of the Kinless Conqueror brought to bear on the Savage Other; the Kinless Conqueror *is* the Epistemological Perspective. There is no Reason or Epistemological Perspective to bring to bear for there is no Reason or Epistemological Perspective at all Save the Kinless Conqueror himself in his Solitude. *Segwvligeda* puts it most directly in the Valladolid when he claims that it would be Wrong to exercise Violence against the Savage Other if she were found to worship “the true God,” who of course is None Other than the God of the Kinless Conqueror himself.

CHAPTER III

THE KINLESS CONQUEROR BECOMES THE KINLESS KNOWER OR THE
SECOND SKEPTICISM

§7. When *Degatisdi* (Descartes) gives Birth to the Kinless Knower (I think; therefore, I am) over Five Decades before the Words of Our Author, this birth is a Second Birth of the Kinless Conqueror. The Doubt that seemingly arises out of the Ether in the Mind of *Degatisdi* while watching the Candle Wax melt in his Study is not a True Doubt as he himself admits. His Methodological Doubt and Methodological Skepticism arise from the same Fear of the Conqueror being found Questionable. But rather than facing the Other only to find himself wanting, The Conqueror faces Knowing the Other, the World itself here, by attempting to defeat the Doubt that his Knowledge is King of All, that his Knowledge is Unquestionable, that he is God on Earth. This is the Second Skepticism. The Kinless Knower rises above the Skepticism of his Unquestionable Knowledge, following the Manner of the Kinless Conqueror, by Banishing the Other, the Body, the World. The Kinless Knower knows his own mind in its Solitude and the Other, the Body, the World is imagined as mere Form or Shape that can only be Measured by Geometry. Just as the Kinless Conqueror creates the Illusion of Power over the Other by banishing her from his Sphere of Kinship and into the Imagined Realm of Savagery, so the Kinless Knower creates the Illusion of Knowledge of the Other, the World, by banishing her from his Sphere of Kinship and into the Imagined Realm of mere Body, mere Form, mere Shape, mere Emotion, mere Desire (these are also variously called Savage and Heathen, but also Female and Natural). The World of Knowledge, Reason, Power, Agency exists alone in the Mind and Personalities of the Kinless Knower in his Solitude. These Exist in him by Definition and not by Reason lest the very Question should be Begged: By Whose Lights do You Confirm in Yourself Alone all that is Good, True, and Powerful. This Question cannot be Asked of the Kinless Knower because he is both the Light that Shines and the Seer of that Light.

§8. The Mind of the Kinless Knower over against the Imagined Mere Form and Body of the Other as World is a mirror for the Idiosyncratic Personalities and Experiences of the Kinless Knower who has banished himself to his Own Solitude. A ten year-old *Degatisdi* entered the Jesuit school of La Flèche in 1606. In this school, he received a “modern” education that focused on the “rationalization” of practices of the Catholic Church. In this training, “each Jesuit constituted a singular, independent, and modern subjectivity, performing daily an individual ‘examination of conscience,’ without communal choral hymns or prayers as was the case with medieval Benedictine monks” (Dussel 6) *Degatisdi* was required to “withdraw into silence three times a day, to reflect on his own subjectivity and ‘examine’ with extreme self-consciousness and clarity the intention and content of every action, the actions carried out hour-by-hour, judging these actions according to the criterion [of service to God]” (ibid). These Examinations were kept in a Notebook that Documented the Errors made by the Hour from Morning to Night. The Philosophical Codifying and Justifying and attempted Universalizing of these Practices by *Degatisdi* does not Change but only attempts to Hide their Origin in the very particular Idiosyncratic Practices of those very particular Jesuits at that very particular Moment in Time and Space.

§9. The Duality of Mind and Body by which the Kinless Knower attempts to Conqueror his Doubt is also Grounded in very Particular and Idiosyncratic Practices of Christendom. The Duality of the Soul and Body is a Foundational Tenet of Christendom, even if from One Solitary spot on the Tree of Christendom. The Soul is Saved but the Body is Resurrected as the Culmination of Salvation. The Soul of Christendom becomes the Mind of *Degatisdi* and the Solitary Source of Being, Knowing and Salvation, but only in Relation to an Imagined Inferior Other of the Body and World. During the Peak of the Inquisition, the Body becomes “the basic object of repression,” whereas the Soul becomes “almost separated from the intersubjective relations at the interior of the Christian world” (Quijano 555). *Degatisdi*, for the first time, systematized and “secularizes” the isolated experiences

within this particular branch of Christendom at this particular moment in its History. The Radical Segregation and Self-Banishment of Mind/Soul from the Broader World of Other as Body creates the context for the “scientific” Theorizations on Race and Gender. Nature, Animals, Plants, Indians, Sexuality, and so on are all Body and thus Inferior to the Solitary Conqueror/Knower who is by definition all that is Rational, Civilizing, Knowing, Active, Powerful, and True. Through the “objectification of the body as nature,” The Other as defined by Race and Gender and associated with Body, and merely because of their manifestations of Difference with the Idiosyncratic Features of the Kinless Conqueror/Knower, is “condemned as inferior for not being rational subjects” (ibid). As they manifest any Difference in Nature with the Idiosyncratic Personalities and Experiences of the Kinless Conqueror/Knower, they become trapped in the Being of Body and the State of Nature. The Savage Other, as such becomes “dominable and exploitable” and “considered as an object of knowledge” (ibid).

§10. An author perhaps known to my future reader, will put the Relational Structure of Manifesting Universality over what is an Idiosyncratic Culture Practice of Christendom like this: “Secularization was able to detach God from Nature (which was unthinkable among Indigenous and Sub Saharan Africans, for example; and unknown among Jews and Muslims). The next step was to detach, consequently, Nature from Man (e.g., Frances Bacon’ *Novum Organum*, 1620). “Nature” became the sphere of living organisms to be conquered and vanquished by Man” (Mignolo 87). Secularity then hides the Idiosyncratic Nature of Salvation in the Supposed Civilizing Mission of the Kinless Knower to the Savage Other as Nature and Indigenous. *Amayeli* (between the waters), called *Amayagni* (America) by Lagwv, becomes the Land of Nature or the Exemplar of the State of Nature for the World, and so it is in the Salvation or Settling of *Amayeli* that the Mirror of the Kinless Conqueror comes to be, and it is through this Mirror that the Kinless Conqueror comes to See himself as he Imagines that he Actually is. *Hegali* (Hegel) has put it recently as this: “The human being acquires confidence in himself. Man

discovers America, its treasures and its people, he discovers nature, he discovers himself” (Dussel 13).

CHAPTER IV

THE KINLESS CONQUEROR DOMINATES THE LAND BY CREATING THE SAVAGE AND THE STATE OF NATURE

§11. Our Author also describes *Amayeli* (between the waters) or *Amayagni* (America) as the context out of which Civilization comes to be. “In the Beginning all the World was America,” *Jani Lagwv* (John Locke) beseeches his listener (II.49). *Amayeli* becomes the exemplar of the State of Nature. “America is still a Pattern of the first Ages in Asia and Europe,” he pontificates, and so the *Anijalagi* (Cherokee) as well as the *Aniyonega* (Europeans) who come in contact with them “are perfectly in a State of Nature” (II.14). I do not think our Author so little skill’d in reasoning that he would fall into the Trap of the Kinless Conqueror, so I first supposed it but by Oversight that he comes to this thought or it is again by way of the Banishment to Solitude that his Mind is driven to this Place. The Reflections, for their part, as they occur in this Text are not Reflections of Reason. Yet they do create an *ayelisgi* (imitation) of power that imagines a Justification on the basis of Natural Law for the Appropriating without consent of the land of the *Anijalagi* by the *Aniyonega* as well as the Justification for the Denial of the Sovereign Authority of the *Jalagi Ayeli* (The Cherokee Nation) itself.

§12. In Nature, according to our Author, “All men are naturally in a state of Perfect Freedom to order their Actions, and dispose of their Possessions and Persons as they think fit, within the bounds of the Law of Nature, without asking Leave or depending upon the Will of any other Man” (II.4). Thus, when the *Jalagi Ayeli* (the Cherokee Nation) simply defends its lands and people from the *ayelisgi* of domination by the *Yoneg*, as they are defined as in a perfect State of Nature, the *Jalagi* are Offenders of natural law and as such are “wild Savage Beasts” who “may be destroyed as a Lyon or a Tyger” (II.16). The *Jalagi* are Offenders of Natural Law

in defending their People and Land because as existing on a land that is Yet in a State of Nature, the *Jalagi* have no People or Land as they have no possibility of Gover'nment or Property. The force of these words are Great for our Author, since, during the Time of the Setting of these Words to type, he served as secretary to the Lords Proprietors of Carolina, secretary to the Council of Trade and Plantations, and as a member of the Board of Trade. He was one of a handful of men who helped to shape the old colonial system of *Amayeli* during the Restoration, and on that basis felt the weight of the *ayelisgi* of Settler Domination. His part, in trying to lift this pretense, was a manufactured absence of a government and property system on the part of the *aniyvwi* of *Amayeli* (people of America). My future readers may know a S(cholar of *Jani Lagwv*, who says of our Author's pretense: "Locke's concepts [of government and property]... are inadequate..." because "Locke constructed them in contrast to Amerindian forms of nationhood and property in such a way that they obscure and downgrade the distinctive features of Amerindian polity and property" (Tully 167). *This Scholar* will be one among us, at least, who thinks that *Lagwv* did, in fact, formulate his Concepts of Government and Property through Self-Banishment from the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* (the people of this land). If this *Scholar* is correct, We must conclude, no matter the Great Praise and Wonder with which my Future reader will view our author, that he is, in fact, a Kinless Conqueror and a Mental Wanderer on *Amayeli* (this land).

§13. The result of the Self-Banishment of our Author from *Amayeli*, in order to hide from the True Other (the *anijalagi* as well as all the other *aniyvwiya* of *Amayeli*) while maintaining an *ayelisgi* (Imitation) Other of the Savage, is a manufactured State of Nature for *Amayagni*. In this manufactured State of Nature, *anijalagi* (The Cherokee) have no government or law and no private property, as is required in Nature. The *yvwi* of *Amayeli* (the people of this land) have no Law but the Law of Nature and no Authority but the singularity of each Individual Will. The Law of Nature is all that "restrain men from invading other's Rights," and "the Execution of the Law of Nature is... put into every Man's hands, whereby everyone

has a right to punish” offenders of Natural Law (II.7). In Nature, says our author, it is the individual who perceives what is right according to Natural Law, and it is the individual who is Judge over controversies betwixt himself and others, and executes Punishments proportionate to the Transgression of these Natural Laws. Human Beings in Nature, says our author, are free to order their Lives in Accordance with Natural Law and are equal in the “Power and Jurisdiction” to govern the Transgressions of this Law. All Human Beings are then Laws unto themselves in Nature until such time that they freely release their “Natural Power” with the expressed intention of declaring “a common establish’d Law and Judicature to appeal to, with Authority to decide Controversies between them, and punish Offenders” (VII.88).

§14. Likewise, there is no Property in the State of Nature because in Nature “God hath given the World to Men in Common” to “make use of the best advantage of Life and convenience.” “The Earth and all that is therein is given to Men for the Support and Comfort of their being” (II.26). “All the Fruits and Beasts belong to Mankind in Common,” which is an Idea that I, *Jusdi*, find so Childish that it comes only with a Giggle that I can even Quote such nonsense on the part of our Author since it portends that these “Common Men” own us Rabbits as well as the Grass we eat. Rubbish! A particular person can only come to Own a particular Rabbit (Balderdash!) from out of the Commons by Appropriation. “The Fruit or Venison which nourish’s the Wild Indian, who knows no enclosure, and is still a tenant in common” comes to belong to the so-called Savage when she “hath mixed [her] labour with it, and joined to It something that is [her] own, which is the “work of [her] hands” (II.27). Once the Savage removes the Fruit and Venison from what is Common to all, then that and only that which she Removes becomes her own. When she is “Nourished by the Acorns” she gathers from “Under the Oak,” she is making those and only those particular Acorns that she gathers and eats her own property. But though her labour remove these Acorns from the Commons, she can only take for her own as many Acorns as that will not turn to Rot. The Savage in the State of

Nature can never possess the Oak 'fore she can never appropriate the Wood nor the Deer that Feed upon it, except in what she killeth and only that, from the Commons as long as she is in the Savage State of Nature whereupon there is no Power or Law to Bind all. Until the Savage gives up the "Natural Power" to establish Laws that govern enclosed Space removed from the Commons, she has no Property but what she Now possess with her Hands. Until such time that Natural Power is given up and a common establish'd Law is made over *Amayeli* (this land), in *Amayagni* "there could be no doubt of Right, no room for quarrel," and "no reason of quarrelling about Title, nor any doubt about the largeness of the Possession it gave" (II.51).

CHAPTER V

THE KINLESS CONQUEROR BANISHES HIMSELF FROM THE LAND IN ORDER TO MANUFACTURE THE DOCTRINE OF DISCOVERY

§15. This manufactured Savage, who has no government, law, or land and who only comes into being through the Self-Banishment of the Kinless Conqueror, brings with it an *ayelisgi* of Justification for her Domination and for the Free Appropriation of her land and what is of her Land: The Acorn, the Deer, and the Gold. As *Lagwv* puts it, predicting the Future General Long Hair's expedition into the Black Hills with the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers in 1874 to Freely appropriate the Gold of the Lakota *aniyvwi*, "the Ore that I have digg'd in any place, where I have a right in Common with others becomes mine" (II.28). But our Author is in conflict with One of the Oldest and Most Fundamental Principles of *Yoneg* (Western) Law as spoken in the Ritual incantations of Latin Thusly: *Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari et aprobari debet* (What Toucheth all Must be Approved by all). This *Yoneg* Principle of Law does not provide Room for Appropriation without Consent. Consent is, in the Oldest of Legal Principles, the Principle of Law itself. As far as establish'd property Law at the time of *Lagwv*'s writing and back into Time Immemorial for the *Yoneg* People, settlement and Defense of that

Settlement were understood by all to constitute occupation, and it was Occupation, in this sense, along with Long Use that were the oldest and most settled principles of legal land title.

§16. One of the examples of Self-Banishment that our author then tries to turn into a Principle (which is of course, as a Principle based in Solitude and not in Reason is not a Principle at all) is that what shews where once a Law is establish'd in Europe there could be no Appropriation without Consent is that in these Lands there is “Controversie about... Title’ and the “Incroachment on the Right of Others” and individuals are “Quarrelsom and Contentious”, driven by “Covetousness” as it regards possible Land claims (II.36, II.51, II.34). But in *Amayagni*, by contrast (as it is he supposed in a State of Nature), our author claims of any *Yoneg*, “let him plant in some in-land place” where there are not current plants in the ground, that such would not give “the rest of Mankind” any “reason to complain, or think themselves injured by this Man’s Incroachment” (II.36). This result of this pretense by our author is the *ayelisgi* conclusion that where no foot of an actual *yvwi* (person) now standing is *terra nullius* or vacant land. This *ayelisgi* conclusion creates justification for the further *ayelisgi* conclusion that for any *Yoneg* who comes upon the shores of *Amayeli* that by the mere placing of his foot upon soil where there currently is no foot is establish'd a Natural property right to that soil. Under the accepted principles of occupation and long use (that are ironically denied to the *yvwi* of *Amayeli*) is establish'd *Yoneg* legal title to this soil under accepted *Yoneg* principles of land title. By the early 1600s (and many years before our author puts these words to type) this so-call Doctrine of Discovery gave an *ayelisgi* justification of the assertion of Sovereignty and Property rights by any *Yoneg* if the discovery, occupation, and defense of any part of *Amayeli* was not already discovered by another Monarch of Christendom or warranted by a charter or grant from a King of Christendom, such as the John Cabot charter from King Henry VII for Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies, which included the right “to subdue, occupy and

possess” the *yvwi* of *Amayeli*, “getting unto us the rule, title, and jurisdiction” of their land (Hakylut 21-22).

§17. Chief Justice *Jani Malsgwali* (John Marshall) of the *Yoneg* Supreme Court in *Amayagni* is currently ruling on issues of this so-called Doctrine in the *Jaligi* case against the State of Georgia, but he is no stranger to ruling with the Self-Banishment of Reason that our Author transforms from the mere Solitude of the Kinless Conqueror to an *ayelisgi* of Justification for the Domination over *ayeli dunadotlvsu* (Nations) of *Amayeli* (this land) and Appropriation of their lands without Consent. In the recent (1823) *Yoneg* court case regarding Appropriation without consent of the lands of *ayeli dunadotlvsu* of *Amayeli*, *Malsgwali* judges that the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* are incapable of owning their lands and territories because they are what he calls “savage tribes.” The *Yoneg* upon discovery of these “savage tribes” obtain “the exclusive right to appropriate [their] lands” (Johnson v. M'Intosh 585). The whole *Yoneg* country, he proclaims as justification for this pretense, “has been granted by the crown while in the occupancy of the Indians” (Johnson v. M'Intosh 579-80). Of Course this claim is Manifestly and Patently false just as is *Lagw*'s claim that the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* did not object to the *Yoneg* Incroachment upon their Land and Sovereignty as so-called Nature would have required them. But *Malsquali* is not finished with his Self-Banishment of Reason in this case. As his Final *ayelisgi* Justification he proclaims the “character and religion” of the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* “afford an apology for considering them as a people over whom the superior genius of Europe might claim an ascendancy” (Johnson v. M'Intosh 590). The *yvwi* “inhabiting this country,” he continues, “were fierce savages, whose occupation was war, whose subsistence was drawn chiefly from the forest. To leave them in possession of their country, was to leave the country a wilderness; to govern them as a distinct people, was impossible, because they were as brave and as high spirited as they were fierce, and were ready to repel by arms every attempt on their independence” (Ibid). The *Yonegs*, he concludes, “were under the necessity either of abandoning the country, and relinquishing their pompous claims to it, or of

enforcing those claims by the sword, and by the adoption of principles adapted to the condition of a people with whom it was impossible to mix” (Ibid). As with his predecessor, *Lagwv*, *Malsgwali* creates an *ayelisgi* Savage Other over which he can have Dominion but only through the Self-Banishment of Reason that is the defining feature of the Kinless Conqueror.

CHAPTER VI

THE SELF-BANISHMENT OF PRINCIPLE IN THE CONCEPTS OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND PROPERTY

§18. And Yet the *Jalagi* in part and the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* in whole did not consent to these pretenses on their sovereignty and property. The *yvwi* of *Amayeli* do feel injured by “this Man’s Incroachment” onto their Land and Territories as the daily Proclamations in the *Jalagi Jsulehisanvhi* (Cherokee Phoenix) will attest. The *yvwi* of *Amayeli* did more than feel injured by the *Yoneg* Incroachment, our author knows. In stark contrast to the claimed lack of “No Controversie about... Title” and the “Incroachment on the Right of Others” in a State of Nature, the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* (including the *Jalagi* in the Cherokee Nation v. Georgia case that is before *Malsgwali* and the highest *Yoneg* court in these lands) have presented legal challenges to every kind of Incroachment on their Rights and Land as has been available to them. This contrast alone should render our author’s Claims regarding a State of Nature for *Amayeli* as Reasonless and without Principle since in a State of Nature it is necessary that there be no such Controversie. The *Yoneg*, for their part, shewed the pretense of their reason when they went to War with the Pequot in 1636 over Innumerable land disputes with these *yvwi* of *Amayeli*. The Mohegan, for their part, Appealed to the Privy Council in London in 1670 against the colony of Connecticut for their appropriating of Mohegan Land without consent. The Mohegan continued their legal battles with Connecticut for nearly 100 years. The actions of both *Yoneg*, *Jalagi*, *Mohegan*, and many others alike shew the Self-

Banishment of Reason that appears as an Principle of Truth in Arguments of our author on these Accounts.

§19. *Lagwv*, himself, shows with Great Regularity, most often from his own words, the Self-Banishment of his Reason. The fact that our author thinks one can only have Settled Legal Property when one is “Quarrelsome and Contentious”, driven by “Covetousness” alone threatens to shew the Self-Banishment of the so-called Principles he espouses. *Lagwv* also thinks that the *Jalagi Ayeli* as well as other *ayeli dunadotlvsu* of *Amayeli* (Nations of this Land) do not rise to the level of Nations with accompanying Sovereignty because the Authority by which the Leaders of these *ayeli dunadotlvsu* (Nations) operated was not Absolute. He claims that although these “nations” were “ruled by elected Kings,” these so-called Kings have “very little Dominion, and have but a very moderate Sovereignty” (I. 131). The *ayeli dunadotlvsu* of *Amayeli* lacked both the very particular Moral qualities of the *Yoneg*, such as being Covetous, as well as the particular *Yoneg* institutions, such as absolute or majority rule rather than consensus. Rather than allowing for a Kinship to a True Other, *Lagwv* banishes the possibility of Kinship by claiming that these differences in Values and Institutions are not Real Differences. The *ayeli dunadotlvsu* of *Amayeli* (Nations of this Land) have no need for these Values and Institutions because, our author claims, they have “few Trespasses, and few Offenders, and “little matter for Covetousness and Ambition,” and so no “need of laws” (II.107). The Reason the so-called Savages have few Trespasses and few Offenders is that, according to our author, they have little property because their desires were confined “within the narrow bounds of each mans small propertie” (Ibid). Their “want of money” gave them “no Temptation to enlarge their Possessions of Land, or contest for wider extent of Ground” (II.108). The idea is simply put thus: Greed leads to money, and money leads to more Greed and only on the basis of this unlimited desire to ever enlarge “their Possessions of Land” do Individuals put themselves into the Proper situation for creating a Civil Society. Rather than being a Function of the most Idiosyncratic personalities of the *Yoneg*,

Lagwv defines these idiosyncratic personalities as Universal and even Necessary for the very possibility of Civil Society, Real Government, and True Sovereignty. This is the work of the Kinless Conqueror in all of its true Splendor: the Creation of an Entire Universe of Truth out of the single act of Self-Banishment.

§20. This Self-Banishment work of the Kinless Conqueror as an *ayelisgi* Justification of the Operations of Manifest Destiny on *Amayeli* was not new to the work of our author. *Lagwv* merely adds philosophical clarity to this line of Self-banished Reason in its Operation on the land of *Amayagni*. *Jani Witlodi* (John Winthrop), the Puritan lawyer from England who helped establish the second major Incroachment onto these Lands and Territories (Massachusetts Bay Colony founded in 1628), argued that the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* could only possess what they were currently cultivating (even leaving their fields seasonally for the Clam beds was enough to lose Possession under his version of the Kinless Conqueror’s State of Nature). He rejected the claim that *ayeli dunadotlvsu* of *Amayeli* (Nations of this land) held ownership of their lands and territories so that it would be illegal to “enter upon the land which hath beene soe longe possessed by others.” His *ayelisgi* Justification for this Rejection is the claim that *Amayeli* is in a State of Nature, under which “that which lies common, and that has neuer been replenished or subdued is free to any that possesse and improue it” (Winthrop 140-41). In contrast, the ownership of a territory only comes into being when the enclosure and subduing of land by those who have unlimited desire to enlarge their possession make what lies in common scarce. Yet the idiosyncratic personality of the Kinless Conqueror of Greed is not the only Yoneg idiosyncrasy required to own land. Property rights, in *Witoldi*’s humble estimation, require the very particular sedentary agriculture and improvement practices that are, of course, unique to the *Yoneg*. The “Natiues,” *Witlodi* proclaims, “inclose noe Land, neither have any settled habitation, nor any tame cattle to improue the Land by, and soe have no other but a Naturall Right” (Ibid). The Childish perspective that produces the thought in *Witlodi* that Cows are required in order for *yvwi* to rise to the status of owners of their land and territories

is the final proof that only by complete Self-Banishment into Absolute Solitude does the Kinless Conqueror create a Justification of his right to domination over the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* and even *elohi* (the land itself).

§21. The words of *Witlodi*, *Lagwv*, and *Malsgwali* that claim ownership over *Amayeli* (this land) through the Creation of the Kinless Conqueror in his Solitude are meant to be the Actions of an *didahnesesgi* (putter-in and drawer-out of them), which is the worst and most powerful of evil conjurers. The repetition of these seemingly nonsense words are the practices of an *uya igawasti* (a Speaker of destructive utterances that are meant to destroy the life-force of those conjurered over). The strangeness of *Lagwv*'s text is perhaps not that strange at all, as *didahnesesgi* and *uya igawasti* formulas bear as little resemblance to ordinary discourse "as Chaucer's Old English does to the writings of James Joyce" (Kilpatrick and Kilpatrick 49). *Lagwv*'s particular conjuring formula seems most like a *didagalenvdhodiyi*, "the most venomous" of conjuring text, which is meant to separate things, in this case the people and the land (K 39). *Lagwv*'s conjuring text uses these strange and seemingly nonsensical utterances to put an *ulsgedv* (intruder or illness) into people and the land. This *ulsgedv* creates the symptoms of a real sickness yet this sickness is but an *ayeligagi* (an ayelisgi illness), which are not real ailments but imitation illness that are meant to bring one conjured over to a low place or a place by which they can be dominated. In order to repel the work of these evil conquerors, collectively known as *Anilisgvi* (those who are thinking) one must put forth sacred protective formulas known as *didagwahlvsdodi* (to turn one aside) (A. Kilpatrick 7). Defensive in the nature, these highly potent protective formulas serve to shield *yvwi* from "the evil spirits of the north, south, and west, . . . and, from witches, and wizards, who go about on dark nights, in the shape of bears, hogs, and wolves to spoil people" (Adair 185).

BOOK II
ON THE ORIGIN OF *JALAGI* GOVERNMENT OUT
OF THE LAND OR THE FORMULA FOR
PROTECTION FROM THE INCANTATIONS OF THE
KINLESS CONQUEROR

CHAPTER I
ON THE SUPPOSED STATE OF NATURE AND SUPPOSEDLY RISING ABOVE
IT OR THE FORMULA FOR TELLING THE WAY IT IS

Gha! (Listen!)

Unehlanvhi galvladi

(Provider above)

Nigvnadv higolodisgi

(The One Who Sees Everywhere)

.....

Doyugwudv dijanoja jadi

(You tell the Truth)

.....

Degvyadhvdhaniga

(I have just come to question you)

.....

Usinuliyu sgwadvghlaniga

(Very quickly, you have just come to let me know)

§22. Let me begin to fix the words of this text that I have long suffered but have come to have some pity upon that may even raise to a slight affection. I, Jisdu, will fix these Words with some Stories of my own, some Stories that reveal a bit about *anijalagi aniyvwi ale jalagi ayeli* (the Cherokee people and the Cherokee Nation). The lack of the Idiosyncratic personalities of the Kinless Conqueror (which include a Quarrelsome and Greedy disposition, the desire to enclose and subdue the land (even requiring the placing of *waga* (Cows) upon it), and even, I gather, a distaste for Clams) do not remove the *Jalagi* from having a meaningful civil society and a meaningful relationship to their land and territories. As we have seen from *Segwvligeda* to *Degatisdi* to *Jani Lagwv*, the ground upon which the notions of Civil Government and Private Property are based are settled in the Kinless Conqueror and his Self-Banishment from Reason and into Solitude. The Kinless Conqueror shapes the Ontological foundation of the concepts of Being, Land, Meaning and so on. The Kinless Conqueror shapes the fundamental conception of human being as a Subjectivity that Conquers its Other. The Kinless Conqueror shapes the contours of all *Yoneg* thought from *Jani Lagwv* to the present of my Reader: the mind is set over and against the Other of Body, Humans are set over and against the Other of Nature, the Civilized are set over and against the Other of the Savage, Reason is set over and against Emotion, Man is set over and against Woman, and so on. Human beings are taken out of the land and abstracted into concepts of planetary evolution, history, anthropology, and so on. This Kinless Conqueror becomes a Dominating force that by being Removed from the Land is able to Operate from Above on the Other, including the Land itself. The Land becomes Conceptualized as an Abstract Object of Domination. *Jani Lagwvi* defines Property as existing only over Land that one has Enclosed, made Private and exercised Dominion and control over. My Future reader can follow the line of the Kinless Conqueror through all the *Yoneg* concepts of Power as an abstracted or Kinless power (removed from the land) that comes down from Above. Take the Classic *Yoneg* concept of Political power: sovereignty. In Latin, “*sover*” is over or coming from above, while “*reign*” is to have

dominating power over. Sovereignty is then Coming from Above to exercise Dominating power over. The very Nature of Power of Sovereignty is being removed from the Land in order to operate Abstractly on it or over it through Self-Banishment and Solitude.

CHAPTER II

ON NATURE AND PROPERTY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SELU, THE
CORN MOTHER OR A FORMULA FOR REMOVING A FOREIGN OBJECT
INTRODUCED BY A KINLESS CONJUROR

Gha!

(Listen!)

Jisgili gvhnagei svenoyu

(Black Owl of Night)

Janaqwi uhyoha

(Your heart it hunts)

Unvdodi dihahnesesgi hia

(Conjurors do this)

Halvgidiga ehlawe

(You have just come to unquietly untie)

Nuvtanvda dudandhelidolvi

(The Thinker before he goes away)

§23. *Jani Lagwv*, all his protestations to the contrary, hasn't the faintest notion of Nature, even in the Darkest recesses of his already Clouded and

Shadowed mind. He proclaims that as the “workmanship of one Omnipotent and Infinitely wise Maker” and “servants of one sovereign Master,” “all men are naturally in... a state of perfect freedom to order their actions, and dispose of their possessions and persons” (II. 4). This Freedom for all Human beings comes from their “sharing all in one community of Nature,” which is a Result of Human beings not being “made for one another’s uses” in contrast to what our author calls “inferior ranks of creatures” such as yours truly, Jisdu who are Supposedly made specifically for these Human Beings and for whatever purposes they see fit (II.6). But Nature doeth not Place the Human in such High regard. Human beings do not have Dominion over *elohi* (the earth) and the animal spirits/powers who live in *Galvladi* (above everything) at *galagwogi* (the seventh height). There is no State of Nature where Human beings are free to treat *elohi* and the Animals as inferior property and so only order their Actions in relation to what *Lagwv* calls Natural Reason, which only takes Regard for the Mutual Wellbeing of humans in their shared space of Nature. The Animals of *elohi* have great Powers, and these Powers exist Above Everything in the sacred stone vault. Humans come into the Space of *elohi* with unresolvable Tension and Conflict. The humans must Track and Slay the animals of *elohi* in order to survive. This disruption to the Lifeways and the Life-force of the animals brings the Anger and Antagonism on the part of the animals and the animal spirits/Power down upon the human Beings as they try to live upon *elohi*. The Animal spirit/power brings sickness upon the Human beings for the eating of their Flesh and the wearing of their Skin as clothing. The Bear, the Deer, the Fishes, the Snakes, the Birds, the Insects, and many smaller animals each bring Different Punishments upon the humans for their Offense. But when the Plants of *elohi* hear about the suffering the animal spirit/powers have placed upon the Humans, they feel great Compassion for them as they understand that the Human beings are also trying to simply Sustain their lives. They agree to “help man when he calls upon [them] in his need” (Mooney 1891 319-321). The Plants become mediators for this unresolvable tension between human beings and animals.

§24. But the Plants must also Sacrifice their Flesh and Bones in giving this Help to the Human Beings, for all *aniyvwi* (persons) have Flesh and Bones. There are, in fact, four Spirits in *aniyvwi*, even the Plants. There is one Spirit in the Head or Throat that is a Spirit of Thought and Speech. This Spirit materializes as saliva. There is another Spirit in the liver, another Spirit in the Flesh that is materialized as Blood, and finally a Spirit in the bones that can materialize as semen. The most important Plant for *anijalagi* is *Selu*, and she is Flesh and Bones. *Selu* is the word for the corn, the corn Plant but also the Corn Mother. Her two sons are *Aniyvdagwalosgi* (The Thunder People). One of these Sons was born from *Selu* and *Kana'ti* but the Other is Wild Boy who was spawned from the Blood or the Flesh Spirits of the Animals that the Family killed and cleaned in the River, for it was from that very spot in the River that Wild Boy came to be. The two Boys set free all the animals from the trap of *Kana'ti*, their father, and so it came to be that they Approached their Mother, *Selu*, with their Hunger. She told her Boys that even though there was no Meat that if they waited she would Return with something for them. *Selu* took a *taluja* (basket) and went to the storehouse. The Storehouse was high off the ground and required *Selu* to climb a ladder to reach. *Selu* climbed into the storehouse with an empty *taluja* and returned with a *taluja* full of *selu* (corn) and *tuya* (beans). The Two Boys wondered where all this *selu* and *tuya* came from so the next day when *Selu* went to the Storehouse, they followed her and watch through a hole in the log and clay wall. What they saw astounded and frightened them. *Selu* stood in the middle of the room with her empty *taluja*. As she leaned over the empty basket, she rubbed her stomach. The *taluja* began to fill with *selu*. She then rubbed her armpits, and the *taluja* began to fill with *tuya*. The Boys were terrified. They decided that their Mother was a powerful *didahnesesgi* who was trying to Poison them with this *ayeliski* food, and so they must kill her for their own Safety. *Selu* could hear their thoughts though and told them they were planning to kill her. She told them “when you have killed me, clear a large piece of ground in front of the house and drag my body seven times around the circle. Then drag me

seven times over the ground inside the circle, and stay up all night and watch, and in the morning you will have plenty of corn” (Mooney 245). The Boys killed their Mother with their clubs and placed her Decapitated head on the roof of the House with her Face looking toward the West. The Boys began to clear the Ground in front of the House, but did not follow their Mother’s instructions, and cleared only seven tiny Spots rather than the whole ground. They dragged their Mother’s Body around the Circle and, just as she had predicted, wherever her Blood (the manifestation of her Flesh Spirit) spilled onto the Ground, *selu* began to spring up. The Boys sat and watched the *selu* through the Night, and by morning, it was fully grown and ready to harvest.

§25. The Hunter must try to Balance the contradiction of trying to respectfully Kill and Eat the Animals that are needed to Sustain life but in such a way that does not increase the Ire of the animals and animal spirit/powers so as not to have the sustained Life and Life-force later taken away by some Sickness brought on by animal revenge. The *Jalagi* must balance this contradiction with their Corn Mother as well. Just like with Animals they Hunt and Eat, *yvwi* must try to respectfully Kill and Eat *Selu*, the Corn Mother. *Selu* is their Mother, though, and so her role in the current and future material and spiritual life-force of *anijalagi* is most fundamental. The Nature of Kinship with *Selu* is paramount to the life sustaining or life force milieu of *elohi* (the preconceptual intertwining of being and the land), because if the *yvwi* do not eat *Selu* they physically die, or conceptually die in the sense of being out of balance with the preconceptual intertwining of people and land as *elohi*. The manner in which *anivyvwi* (people) continue to kill *Selu* and drag her body across the earth so that when her blood pours onto the ground determines whether there is more corn and *anivyvwi* continue to live. As *anivyvwi* continue to kill *Selu*, they take the ears of corn, they grind kernels and plant some kernels back in the ground so that *Selu* will come back each time that they kill her and eat her. The process of killing and eating *Selu* while returning some of her bones (the kernels) to the ground is hardly a simple material

process. Firstly, the separation of *aniyvwi* from *elohi* in the construction of a concept of material processes that are separate from social and spiritual relationships is a creation of the Kinless Conqueror. Secondly, in the context of *elohi*, *aniyvwi* take the flesh and blood spirit of *Selu* and mix it with their Saliva spirit in the eating and digesting of the Flesh and Blood and Flesh and Blood spirit of their Mother. They also Grind the Kernels (the bone spirit) and place some of the Bones back in the ground, which returns part of her Regenerative or fertility Spirit to *elohi* so that *Selu* will regenerate. All the different Spirits of the *aniyvwi* and their interactions with the Spirits of *Selu* are part of the Normative structure of this foundational Kinship for *elohi* (people and the land). Not paying proper attention to any part of this normative kinship dynamic can create illness for the *Jalagi* and disrupt the deepest life-force context for humans, plants, and animals on the land: *elohi*.

§26. A *Jalagi* was overheard some years back as he chastised his Fellow *anijalagi* for their mistreatment of their mother *Selu*, which he pointed to as the cause of their current Suffering and Misery: the disruption to their Lifeways and the Incroachment of *aniyonega* on to their lands and territories. It was 1811, some Twenty years ago, at Springplace, the Monrovia mission of John and Anna Gambold, establish'd in the *Jalagi Ayeli* in 1801. This *Jalagi* rebuked his *aniyvwi* (people) for planting the *Yoneg* corn on *elohi* and for grinding *Selu's* bones in the *Yoneg* grinding mills. He proclaimed to them that “the mother of the nation has left you because all of her bones are being broken through the milling.” Get rid of the White man's corn, he says, and "Plant the Indian corn and pound it according to your ancestor's ways. She will return if you return to your former way of life.” He continues his rebuke, “[w]e are made from red earth but they are made from white sand. You may be good neighbors with them but you must get your beloved towns back from them. Your mother is displeased” (McClinton 64). These words by this *Jalagi* are not Primarily a contrast between *aniyoneg* and *anijalag* as different races or *Jalagi* ways set over and against *Yoneg* ways. What this *Jalagi* is expressing is the “intimate knowing relationship” (as future *Oceti Sakowin*

Philosopher Vine Deloria Jr. will put it) of *elohi* as the preconceptual intertwining of *Jalagi aniyvwi ale Jaligi elohi* (Cherokee people and Cherokee land) in contrast to the Kinless abstract understanding of people and land, of corn, agriculture, best practices, most productive use of the land and resources, and so on (Deloria 2).

§27. The land is also *Selu*—Not the earth in the abstract planetary sense but earth as *elohi* in the specific *Jalagi aniyvwi* relationship to *Jalagi elohi*, which includes land, history, and kinship. *Jalagi elohi* is often Conceptualized in relationship to *Selu* or her Sister plants. Cherokee place names and Cherokee towns are often named through correlates of *Selu*. *Ajigvhnagesdhvyi* (Black Cedar Place), *gidhayohi* (Cherry Tree Place), Mulberry Tree Place, and Honey-Locust Place are some common Cherokee place names. *Selu* is then both extended into the land and an extension of the land. The Mulberry Grove is an extension of *Selu* but *Selu* is also an extension of *elohi* as the intertwining of being and the land. This gives cause to our *Jalagi* lecturer to say that *anijalagi* need to get their Beloved towns back. The returning of these Beloved towns is not another topic for our *Jalagi* lecturer since the Beloved towns are *Selu* and *Selu* is the Beloved towns. The Beloved towns are an extension of *Selu* and the *aniyvwi* relationship to *Selu* and the land as *elohi*, which is to say like *Selu* these Beloved towns are like an umbilical cord that maintains the life-force connection of *elohi* in the context of the intertwining of being and the land for *anijalagi* (the Cherokee people). The Property of Beloved towns for the *Jalagi ayeli* (the Cherokee Nation) only exists because *anijalagi* belong to *elohi*. The *Jalagi*, *Selu*, and the Land are all intertwined in the context of *elohi*. Property is then both originally and continually a matter of Kinship and when Property becomes a matter of Domination, as in the words of our author, then Kinship is destroy'd and then so goes the capacity of Land to maintain the life-force connection that exists in the Kinship intertwining of being and the land that is *Selu* and *elohi*.

CHAPTER III
ON THE NATURE OF POLITICAL POWER AND SOVEREIGNTY FROM THE
PERSPECTIVE OF YVWI GANVHIDA, THE RIVER OR A FORMULA FOR
GOING TO WATER

Ka!

(Ka!)

Sge!

(Listen!)

.....

Yvwi ganvhidu jsahlidhohisdi

(Long Person, you are in repose)

Gohusdi halisdisgi nigesvna

(Nothing can overpower you)

.....

Ha! gvwadonvdisesdi

(Ha! He will be able to do it)

§28. The stories of *Selu* and *elohi* teach us that Human beings cannot meaningfully remove Themselves from the conflictual Intertwining of humans with Plants and Animals. One way that this conflictual Intertwining manifests itself is in the particular conflictual Intertwining of Life and Death (of needing to take Life in order to sustain Life or in general that for some things to Live other things must Die). But much more than this, the Stories tell *aniyvwi* that they cannot Meaningfully remove themselves from the Deeper intertwining of Being and the Land that is the foundation of what is the Material Intertwining of Life and Death

as well as the Material Intertwining of humans with plants and animals. The Material sense of the intertwining of Life and Death and humans with plants and animals are particular Manifestations of *elohi*, which is the deeper Preconceptual intertwining of Being and Land. Human beings are, as Manifestations of *elohi*, in inextricable Kinship with the land. Only through Self-Banishment or a Solitude of Pretense can a Human float free from the land as our author attempts through the imagination of the Kinless Conqueror. Knowledge is always a form of Kinship. Knowledge is an Intimate knowing relationship. Knowledge requires Kinship and Kinship not as an afterthought, but as Fundamental and intimate aspect of all Human being and knowing. In order to Reach out and Touch the other, in order to come to know Her, in contrast to the Self-Banishment of the Kinless Conqueror, the possible Knower must understand how she is already intertwining in intimate Kinship relations with the Other (either as People or Land) she is trying to Know. In order to know the Other, the possible Knower must first understand how she is related, and it is this Kinship that is always the foundation and continual intimate manifestation of Knowledge in the context of *elohi* as an intimate knowing relationship.

§29. Nature is not a background out of which Civil Society and Governments arise as a *Julehisanvhi* (Phoenix) out of the ashes of Conquered Nature that the Human takes dominion over. Nature is not a Place of perfect Freedom nor a place of never-ending violence and Chaos. Nature is *elohi* and so the meaning of the concepts of Government and Property are both originary and continual manifestation out of the land as *elohi*. The land as *elohi* is the space where the *Jalagi* people and the *Jalagi* land are intertwined. This space is not merely Historical or Mythical, however, as it is both the original and continual source of life in all the material, spiritual, and social contexts. *Anijalagi*, in contrast to *Laguv*'s founding of Government and Property in the attempted domination of the Other and the Land through the Act of Self-Banishment by the Kinless Conqueror, ground and continue their notions of Government, Law, and Property in the intimate

knowing relationship with the Land as *elohi*. The concept of Political Power as Sovereignty in the Latin sense of Removing oneself from the Land in order to come down from above and have dominion over the Other (both people and land) will not do. The *ayelisgi* Power of the Kinless Conqueror operates, from the start, through the Conceptual Separating of humans from land. This Conceptual Separation opens a Space for the Conception of an Abstract Human Subjectivity that comes to be through the conquering of the Savage Other. The Idiosyncratic personalities and experiences of the *Yoneg cum Kinless Conqueror* are then built into the very notions of the now Universalized Human Being in such a way as to allow the *Yoneg cum Kinless Conqueror* to interject his very particular identity and experiences from his being in the land of Europe into the space between the *Jalagi* people and the *Jalagi* land that has been vacated by Conceptualization of humans as separate from the land. The key to removing the sickness or *ulsgedv* (intruder) from *elohi*, which arises from an *ayelisgi* (imitation disease), is in addressing directly the Kinless Conqueror or the idea that humans are separable from the land. The first step in removing this *ulsgedv* from *elohi* is to reground the concepts of being, meaning, and even the land itself to *elohi* as the source of all Power and Life. Political Power as an original and continual manifestation out of the land will carry a force of power that does not serve to remove people from land, either as conceptual or physical acts. The Political Power that arises from a reconceptualization of power out of *elohi* will not have the force of domination but will carry with it an understanding of how a people can maintain a positive or non-dominating relation with their land or territory as a people and a positive or non-dominating relationship to other land and other people. Political Power in the context of *elohi* will be conceptualized as an original and continual manifestation out of the land in a material, spiritual, social, and philosophical sense.

§30. One place to begin an *elohi* concept of Political Power is with the *yvwi ganvhida* (Long Person), which is the river. A river is a *yvwi ganvhida* (long person) moving through the land. The *yvwi ganvhida* exercises Power on the Land but does

not carry that Power as an ungrounded, delocalized force of Domination over the land but as a Power that literally comes from and moves through the land. The *yvwi ganvhida* is not a Kinless Conqueror in the operations of his Power in relation to the Land around him. The *yvwi ganvhida* carves his way through the Mountains, creating ridges and Valleys, but without ever separating Himself or imagining his Being as rising above or floating Free from the land. It is not strange then that *ama*, the word for Water, can also be *ama* as a Valley. From Kinship with *yvwi ganvhida* in the context of *elohi*, as an intimate knowing relationship, Humans can learn to exercise Power or sovereignty through the land. Just as *yvwi ganvhida*, in every step of its Movement or exercising of Power, remains in contact with the land—literally touching deeply and intimately the land as it goes—human Beings must stay in intimate contact with the Land as they exercise or Articulate human Power. I, *Jisdu*, think that it is an understanding of this power that has the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* (people of this land) walking everywhere. This is a sacred way of moving on the land for *yvwi* of *Amayeli*, for exercising power, for connecting to power, for channeling power into a ceremony. The processions of *yvwi* of *Amayeli* walking with their feet literally on the ground (sometimes barefoot on the ground, moving through the Four directions, or from one place to another place) is not an accident or just some abstract ritual movement. This movement comes from a deep understanding of the nature of being and land where any understanding of Nature, Land, and Being are Originary and Continual manifestations of *elohi*. My Future reader will know that even after the invention of cars the *yvwi* of *Amayeli* will get out of their cars and walk over ceremonial ground. That movement of placing your feet on the ground with every step is making yourself like that river or even like Selu herself, Root'd in the ground, but not Root'd in the way *Lagwv* conceptualizes Political Power coming out of an original state of Nature that no longer exists and necessarily no longer exists in order for that Power to first come to be. The Manner of Being Root'd in the Ground that *yvwi ganvhida* teaches through his intimate knowing relationship with Humans is not a delocalized abstraction but a material

and spiritual grounding in the land that is both ancient and new and covering every moment between. The Manner of Being Root'd in the Ground that *ywi ganvhida* teaches is a Manner of Being that comes out of the ground but is still always there in the ground as well. The people plant their feet as firmly in the ground as *Selu* is firmly planted in the *ayeli* (center) of *elohi*. That's how *anijalagi* have power; that's how the river has power, that's how *Selu* has power. What the *aniyvwi* of *Amayeli* learn from the river is that they must stay in place even as they move across the land. And that is one of the foundational teachings from *elohi* about what Nature is, about who Human Beings are, about what land is, about what Political Power is: All True Power, Knowledge, and Being only exist out of and in inseparable Kinship with the Land.

.....

Ywi ganvhidv
(Long Person)

Hidawehiyu
(Great Wizard!)

Agwadanadhogi dodasgwalehisodaneli
(You are now going to elevate my soul)

Works Cited

- Adair, James. *Adair's History of the American Indians*. Ed. Samuel Cole Williams. Reprint. Johnson City: Watauga Press, [1775] 1930.
- Deloria, Vine Jr. and Daniel Wildcat. *Power and Place: Indian Education in America*. Golden: Fulcrum, 2001.

-
- Dussel, Enrique. "Anti-Cartesian Meditations: On the Origin of the Philosophical Anti-Discourse of Modernity." *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*: 11.1 (2013): 1-40.
- Hakylut, Richard. *Voyages Touching the Discovery of America*. London, 1850.
- Jefferson, Thomas. *To Richard Price Paris, January 8, 1789*. 9 March 2017.
<<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/presidents/thomas-jefferson/letters-of-thomas-jefferson/jefl74.php>>.
- Johnson v. M'Intosh*. 21: US 543, 1823.
- Kilpatrick, Alan. *The Night has a Naked Soul: Witchcraft and Sorcery among the Western Cherokee*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP , 1997.
- Kilpatrick, Jack F and Anna G Kilpatrick. *Walk into Your Soul: Love Incantations of the Oklahoma Cherokee*. Dallas: Southern Methodist UP , 1965.
- McClinton, Rowena, ed. *The Moravian Springplace Mission to the Cherokees*. Abridged . Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 2010.
- Mignolo, Walter. "Dispensable and Bare Lives: Coloniality and the Hidden Political/Economic Agenda of Modernity." *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge* 7.2 (2009): 69-87.
- Quijano, Anibal. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America." *Nepantla: Views from South* 1.3 (2000): 533-580.
- Silverblatt, Irene. *Modern Inquisitions: Peru and the Colonial Origins of the Civilized World (Latin America Otherwise)*. Duke UP , 2004.
- Tully, James. "Rediscovering America: The Two Treatises and Aboriginal Rights." *Locke's Philosophy: Content and Context*. Ed. G.A.J. Rogers. Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Winthrop, John. *Winthrop Papers*. Vol. 2. Boston, 1931. 2 vols.

Policing Resource Extraction and Human Rights in *The Land of the Dead*

SHAWAANO CHAD URAN

The humor, bravery, and rude strength, as well as the vices of the frontier in its worst aspect, have left traces on American character, language, and literature, not soon to be effaced.

– Frederick Jackson Turner



Fig. 1 Water is life?

From their African origins as captured souls, through the Caribbean connections to slave labor, to modernist reanimated cannibals, zombies have always represented subjugation, by being under the control of a master, or driven only by appetite instead of volition (Rushton and Moreman 1-4). Labels of servility, violence, intemperance, and cannibalism have been used to debase Indigenous populations since Columbus, reflecting the oppositional definition of civilization versus savagism present in Europe well before the Renaissance (Berkhofer 71-72). Zombies are likewise “old-fashioned savages, descending immediately into cannibalism and

irrational, uncontrollable violence” (Paffenroth 11-12). They require violent management at every point of contact and interaction. Throughout George A. Romero’s zombie films, there are frontiers, and echoes of Old Western movies. Therefore, Romero’s zombies can only be fully comprehended in relation to European traditions of primitivism, slavery, and colonialism, making them a fitting subject for Indigenous criticism.

While the Frontier Thesis of 1893, unilineal evolutionism, and “race science” may have fallen out of fashion within academic circles, their motivational powers are still found in pop culture artifacts such as films and video games. “Race” as theory arises in response to the Other, and need not depend upon a difference in skin color to locate and seemingly explain the imagined inferiority of that Other (Ahrendt 192). Racialized politics invokes the mechanisms of murder, or at least the policing of access to life, liberty, and property—including, of course, land and resources—as enacted by dominant forces laboring to control the ontological and experiential limits of life itself through racism (Foucault 1990, 137).

The Land of the Dead presents Romero’s most developed critique of inequality through



Fig. 1 They built that wall

zombie film. It moves beyond the indictment of greed and consumerism evident in 1978’s *Dawn of the Dead* to present us with a view of how capitalist hierarchy reproduced itself in the wake of—and, as we shall see, as supported by—zombies as a globalized presence surrounding a frontier outpost. *The Land of the Dead* presents a somewhat critical picture of the colony, but never escapes the romanticism of the

frontier and the dream of *terra nullius*. Zombies remain relegated to being the Other against which the living Self—presumed to be humanity itself—is oppositionally defined. Thus, we can analyze the film through the lens of Frederick Jackson Turner’s Frontier Thesis, especially with Turner’s reliance on social evolutionism.

In 1893, three years after the official closing of the American frontier, Turner argued that the uniquely American national character evolved along the frontier as it moved across the continent between spreading civilization and receding wilderness (Turner 18). The frontier is the site wherein the binary oppositions between savage and civilized play out, and Turner claimed that so long as the frontier kept moving, America reaped the benefits of an ongoing project of social renewal through self-actualization and accelerated evolution (Turner 1). Man's struggle against the wilderness demanded strength and adaptability, and for Turner (and many others, including President Roosevelt) the frontier experience came to be regarded as a rite of passage into manhood and the source of innovation (Deloria 101). Within this story, there was little place for philosophy, for education, for aristocracy, nor for established central authority (Turner 18). The rule of law could be easily abandoned, in favor of ad-hoc social responses guided more by expediency than precedence—inevitably producing states of siege and exception (Mbembé 16). The American notion of liberty itself came to encompass all these values on the frontier, through struggle against wilderness and increased distance from what Turner called the European mindset (Jensen 309).

Historians and other academics have not been kind to the Frontier Thesis (Block 40-41). Despite this disavowal, I will show how its focus on rugged individualism and personal struggle for a presumed common good has folded itself quite securely into the popular imagination, here represented by themes in *The Land of the Dead*. Jack Forbes wrote, "Properly, a 'frontier' is one force opposed to another" (Forbes 210). These forces are populated on all sides. Relegating one side to a state of "wilderness" or abstract primitivity robs "the savages" not only of human volition, but of belongingness to lands deemed "wild" (Klein 187). Zombie films often depend upon the climactic failure of maintaining exclusive frontiers between the living and the dead, so attention to zombies as necessary—if usually unwitting—agents partaking in intergroup conflict with the living may reveal a frontier story that refuses to celebrate one side to the exclusive detriment of the Other. Ultimately, *The Land of the Dead* fails as an Indigenous allegory because even the zombies become settlers. However, the theme may be stated as "the only good civilization is a dead one," and that gives it an appeal unimaginable to early fans of the Frontier Thesis.

According to this hypothesis, the frontier became the driving force of democratic unity, notably in response to the presence of Indians (Turner 8). For Turner, frontier survival depends

upon strategic atavism. Frontier heroes selectively abandon certain trappings of civilization, such as class hierarchy and especially the rejection of interpersonal violence as social control. In fact, violence personally inflicted against the Savage, both as embodied by the “Indian” Other as well as the “uncultivated” landscape, is here celebrated as the means to both establish civilization at the edges of savagism, as well as the best method to prove oneself worthy of survival and settlement around and beyond the frontier. But most of all, the frontier was important “from that day to this, as a military training school, keeping alive the power of resistance” (Turner 8). For Turner, America—and Americanness—was forged through the violent domination of a wilderness and its savages. While Romero’s *The Land of the Dead* seems to critique hierarchy and class domination within the living human populations, zombies remain relegated to the savage slot and denied any rootedness to place or role in the post-apocalyptic social order (Trouillot 7-28).

The opening credits present a quick description of how living humans have organized themselves since the zombie outbreak. Snippets of audio from news reports play under the titles and jarring visual flashes intended to invoke horror. Intermixed with this history are expressions of anxiety over the nature of the zombies themselves, not only the physical threat they pose, but the existential threat they present. “So long as we’re alive, they ain’t never gonna run out of food. The day they do, it’ll mean only one thing: we’re all dead,” one voiceover intones. A different voice worries of what it would mean, and what might happen “If these creatures ever develop the power to think, to reason, even in the most primitive way,” giving us the most salient points from which to consider the anxieties over zombies. The exposition ends noting how living humans have gathered themselves into fortified urban areas and are now “raiding small, rural towns for supplies, like outlaws.” Indeed, zombies have become incorporated into the political economy of living humans despite—and to some extent because of—their Otherness.

The raiders are led by Riley (Simon Baker), the protagonist who intends for this to be his last run before retiring to the wilderness beyond the frontier. Riley built *Dead Reckoning*, an armored and heavily armed vehicle designed to protect the resource extractors. They bring their supplies to the city, where the oppressive class structure is made obvious. The center of the city is dominated by Fiddler’s Green, an exclusive condominium catering to the desires of the pre-apocalypse upper-class. The name is reminiscent of “The Cavalrymen’s Poem” from the 19th

Century, which describes an afterlife earned by good soldiers who would rather commit suicide than be scalped by hostiles (Cavalry Outpost Publications). The last stanza of the poem is:

And so when man and horse go down
Beneath a saber keen,
Or in a roaring charge of fierce melee
You stop a bullet clean,
And the hostiles come to get your scalp,
Just empty your canteen,
And put your pistol to your head
And go to Fiddlers' Green.

The cost to live in this version of Fiddler's Green is exorbitant, and maintenance of the cash economy within the city demands subservience to its owner, a character fittingly named Kaufmann ("Merchant," in German, played by Dennis Hopper). The building is highly secure, protecting not only the residents but also the sanctity of the upscale shops and services that cater to the rich. Surrounding the building are slums inhabited by people who are unable to afford such luxury, but are granted a level of protection from the zombies so long as they contribute most of their labor to the city. Again, the setting mirrors representations of Hollywood Westerns wherein the citizens need rescue from a local despot. Kaufmann has monopolized and perverted the force and rule of law to serve the interests of his own class—even as they, too, are paying him to protect their interests. Kaufmann ventriloquizes George W. Bush and Donald Rumsfeld in parody of War on Terror rhetoric, and his character invites comparison to corrupt emperors, even by the name of his enclave reminding us of Nero who mythically "fiddled while Rome burned" (Russell, 189). Outside the militarized barriers of the city lies the wilderness, occupied by zombies, from which Kaufmann must extract goods and materials to keep his economy going. The film is silent on how it derives its electricity and petroleum products (which even the zombies have), as well as its water. We later learn that Kaufmann is at the center of every market around the city, no matter its legitimacy. "If you can drink it, shoot it up, fuck it, gamble on it," Slack (Asia Argento) says, "it belongs to him."

The film opens with a view of Uniontown, which looks like many other small towns except it is populated by zombies. We are shown decrepit picket fences that were once white, a small church, an early gas station, and a small gazebo at the center of a town park. Throughout,

there are zombies representing a wide cross-section of people, but here firmly embedded in the romanticized nostalgia for small town American life (Jameson 279). There is a young heterosexual couple walking together, sometimes even holding hands. There are people walking up to the church. There is a cheerleader, a butcher, and other familiar roles signified. The gazebo is occupied by the remains of a Dixieland jazz ensemble; each musician still tries to make music even though their instruments and their bodies have fallen into disrepair.

The zombies in Uniontown have attained a semblance of order. However, as pointed out by the living humans, zombie identity seems limited to remembrance of the past. They can only try to be what they once were, and that leaves them in a state of timelessness. It is the same sort of timelessness that has been ascribed to Indigenous populations through imposition of the ethnographic present (Fabian 81). Anthropologists and other outside observers may represent cultural activities as occurring in the present tense, but such representations tend to foreclose upon Indigenous futures by implying that any change or deviation from authoritarian ethnographies can only represent a loss of cultural authenticity.

Big Daddy (Eugene Clark) was the owner, and remains the operator, of the gas station. He notices the living humans, and calls the attention of his fellow zombies towards the interlopers. The judgment of their behavior as witnessed by the raiding humans, Riley (Simon Baker) and the rookie Mike (Shawn Roberts), is important here. The zombies are real here, and stand in physical threat against resource extraction; they are barriers to profit. Mike categorically denies zombies any sense of self-determined subjectivity, and labels the outward appearance of humanity as mere imitation. Thus, the denial isn't itself absolute, which only heightens the tension within the film.

Mike: They're trying to be us.

Riley: No, they used to be us. Learning how to be us again.

There are two observations of the zombie Other happening here, and the ambiguities at stake in the relationship between the living and the zombies are clear in both. Riley's line relegates the distinction between the living and the zombies as a historical shift: something happened to impose the change. The change itself may be less a supernatural anomaly than a simple step backwards along the presumed universal line of human progress, but for Riley the zombies are more of a threat because of their growing resemblance to the living. Mike, on the other hand, characterizes their behavior as “pretending to be alive.” Detractors often accuse Indigenous

peoples of “pretending to be Indian,” or of not being “Indian enough,” as a tactic to avoid consideration of Indigenous rights. Further, when it comes to Indigenous peoples, any change is often taken as evidence of a loss of authenticity (Berkhofer 28-29). “Vanishing Race” discourses are full of such justifications, rationalizing erasure or outright extinction of “primitive” others in the name of social progress while simultaneously denying Indigenous authenticity through monopolization of the terms for recognizing authenticity at all (Said 2). The creation and maintenance of ontological and rhetorical structures to deny recognition and acknowledgement of Indigenous presence is a central tactic of colonial domination (Vizenor 4-5). Both men display a similar disavowal of zombies having a right to exist, though Riley does move beyond treatment of zombies as mere barriers to extractive capitalism, if only after they have manifest the savage destiny laid out by Turner as the objects of developmentally transformative frontier violence.

The greatest fear in zombie films is usually not of the zombies themselves, but of becoming a zombie. In *The Land of the Dead*, the evolutionist reading of zombies is complicated by implying the change from living human to zombie can go both ways. Riley adds the possibility that, somehow, the zombies will become less and less distinguishable from the living. The blurring of the boundary between the living and the zombies is unacceptable for society to continue functioning (Foucault 2003, 61). Mike says, “No way. Some germ or some devil got those things up and walking, but there's a big difference between us and them. They're dead.” Since the “big difference” may not be that big, the distinction must be violently enforced. Enforcement shows how the relationship between the living and the zombies informs how the living see and know themselves, simultaneously rationalizing and demonstrating their dominant position even as they express their fear of losing that position.

This is the core anxiety of the film, common throughout Romero’s zombie movies. The first hints of this anxiety were expressed along Freudian lines, especially through the concept of the uncanny as the return of the repressed (Freud “The Uncanny”). Zombies, according to this analysis, represent suppressed primitive desires taking over civilization; zombies are the Id devouring the Superego. With *The Land of the Dead*, however, we see a move beyond considerations of uncanny



Fig. 2 Return of the repressed

effects as matters of individual psychology and more into socially constructed hierarchies such as race, class, and gender—and the management of different rights packages along these lines. The ability to cleanly demarcate the living from the zombies justifies the treatment of the zombies by the living, which is a treatment in many ways parallel to the treatment of Indigenous peoples—here, as barriers to resource extraction. Rather than bothering to understand the lives of the zombies as a form of life different from that of the living, it is simpler to deny that the zombies have any life at all. No matter how pluralistic or relativistic society is, the distinction that establishes hierarchical dominance of the living over the zombies must be upheld, so that the violence and exploitation waged against the zombies by the living can go on without interruption. Mike identifies traditional objects of fear as possible sources of zombies: evil, and infection. He must portray the cause to be absolutely bad, because moral ambiguity would cast doubt upon how the living humans have justified their own place of superiority over the zombies. The debate between Riley and Mike encapsulates Bhabha’s “Of Mimicry and Man,” where Mike favors the ambivalence of mimicry as signaling an insurmountable difference between zombies and the living, while Riley sees how their mimicry reveals how human society has become an empty shell, the veneer of civilization is merely class politics, rife with mindless, pointless consumption driven by greed. While zombie anthropophagy may be repulsive, at least it isn’t motivated by envy, nor is it a central feature to their social organization.

Riley amplifies the anxiety when he asks, “Isn’t that what we’re doing, pretending to be alive?” Riley is a cultural critic, questioning the old categorical system through which matters of happiness, success, modernity, and progress were defined in the pre-zombie world that we, the audience, are presumed to live in (Vizenor vvii-viii). He echoes many of the primitivist urges that have plagued modernity since at least the 16th Century, when artists and other thinkers questioned the taken-for-granted values of modern life (Berkhofer 72, 75). Coinciding with colonialism and imperialism, as driven by market expansion, resource extraction, and increased socioeconomic inequality around the Industrial Revolution, cultural critics worried that the price paid in human lives, indentured servitude, and “pristine” wilderness might be too high (Barkan and Bush 3).

In Riley’s case, we come to see that his primitivist critique is merely escapism. In an impassioned street speech, Mulligan (Bruce McFee), expresses his class envy as he attempts to incite a revolution:

Mulligan: How long are you going to let Kaufman push you around? You like shining his shoes, pressing his pants? He didn't build that place. He just took it over. Kept the best for himself, and left us with a slum to live in. But if there's enough of us, if all of you would join up, we could make this a fit place to live in.

Riley does not share Mulligan's faith in the city or its people. "You're worried about being locked out," meaning excluded from upward class mobility. "I see that," he continues, gesturing to the fences surrounding the city, "I can't help but think we're all locked in. I'm looking for a world where there's no fences." Later, he makes it clear that he rejects more than fences. He wants to find a place without people—colonialism's myth of *terra nullius*—in which to live his life free from domination of authoritarian class structures. We are told, and shown, that zombies are everywhere, so it remains unclear how Riley plans to deal with them. Obviously, he does not plan to deal with them as "people," despite his earlier expressions of sympathy and recognition. His escapism can only reinforce evolutionary hierarchy, since he only wants to step backwards to a simpler structure where the final definitions of liberty and territorial domination are up to him, and him alone. This is to be his last raid before retiring to the wilderness.

Riley is not the only raider looking to retire. Cholo (John Leguizamo) has been saving up to buy a place in Fiddler's Green. Kaufmann denies Cholo's request by noting that "There's a very long waiting list" to get in.

Kaufmann: This is an extremely desirable location. Space is very limited.

Cholo: You mean restricted, don't you?

Kaufmann: I do have a board of directors, and I have a membership committee.

They have to approve.

In retaliation, Cholo threatens to fire missiles at Fiddler's Green unless Kaufmann pays him \$5M. Cholo and his rebels leave Mouse (Maxwell McCabe-Lokos), alone, to watch the drop point. "Stay real," he says to Mouse as they depart.

The implication of Cholo's comment to Mouse is that zombies are not real. Obviously, this is not a denial of the existence of zombies, nor is it a distinction between presence and absence, since even when absent the fear inspired by zombies remains. Rather, the distinction is between degrees of consideration. This flippant comment reveals some serious ontological questions, not only surrounding the differential distribution of rights and recognition between the living and the zombies, but within the ranks of the living as well (Foucault 1995, 222-223).

Zombies, though they exist in *The Land of the Dead*, do not have the right to exist; this echoes discourses of westward expansion along the American frontier, or the continued disregard of Indigenous rights and Indigenous peoples who stand in the way of resource extraction. What makes zombies less real is their lack of recognition as real, a tautology that shows how important the politics of recognition are to rights discourses. Being usually nonverbal, zombies do not advocate for themselves or their rights. Their motivations and goals can only be surmised from their behaviors, which are represented as antithetical to a social order shared with the living (though, it must be said, they treat each other just fine). These prejudices are exonerated by the categorical denial of zombies possessing life at all, despite meeting many of the qualifications of life that we may remember from Biology 101: motion, reproduction, adaptation, consumption, and response to stimuli. Zombies are less real because there is no role for them. It is not that they fall short on a list of traits for inclusion, it is more that the living would rather not consider including zombies at all. Recognizing a connection, or even comparison, with zombies causes anxiety. Zombies, therefore, must be destroyed without hesitation or remorse, and preferably in large numbers at a time (Mbembé 34). As Mike comments during the opening raid, “I thought this was going to be a battle. It’s a fucking massacre.”

This is the very definition of *Homo sacer*, or the human person absented from life and associated rights, a being that can be killed but cannot be murdered because murder requires recognition of the victim’s humanity (Agamben 47). Several parallels with the political marginalization of Indigenous peoples through the ontologies associated with colonialism follow: Their claims to life are not “real”; they are delegitimized by imposed aesthetics and politics (Vizenor 3). Further, the colonizing state attempts to monopolize the power to determine not only Indigenous authenticity through legal definitions of “Indian,” but Indigenous reality itself through the swarming of



Fig. 3 Smash the system

disciplinary institutions, such as boarding schools, proletarianization, economic development, medical evangelism, resource management, and redefinition of kinship. When imagining a totalizing system of colonial domination, it is impossible to imagine Indigenous peoples having any claims to bodily or social integrity, rights, resources, or lands. Similarly, zombies are denied recognition of all such claims to life, liberty, and property.

The raiders ride into Uniontown under the American flag. The first kill we see is a female zombie being impaled through the forehead by a motorcyclist using an American flag as a jousting pole. The camera focuses heavily on the finial, an American Bald Eagle, just before it penetrates her skull. Patriotic emblems not only excuse but also carry violence against the zombies, while more spectacular patriotic displays are used to render the zombies powerless against their exploitation by the living. Fireworks—even if the meaning of the display is lost on them—mesmerize the zombies while the living do whatever they will. Fireworks reappear at key moments as Romero plays with the irony of patriotism as associated with liberty by showing us that patriotic displays may distract us as an audience from our own



Fig. 4 Getting the point

oppression under a class system, as well as distract us from considering how we viewers are participating in the oppression of others. By riding under the American flag, the egregious violence enacted by the raiders is justified by a presumed common good, even as that presumed good is exclusive and hierarchical, and waged at the cost of lives, lands, and resources.

Class anxieties, however, are not exclusive to the lower class. In a deleted scene (included in the “Unrated Director’s Cut” version), Cholo intervenes when a resident of Fiddler’s Green hangs himself in his family’s condo. His wife is distraught, and his son tries to take him down. Cholo warns against this action, because the father is about to turn into a zombie. The son is bitten, and Cholo dispatches the zombie father by smashing in his skull with a bronze sculpture.

By this time in the post-zombie world, everyone knows how people become zombies. *Dawn of the Dead* and *Day of the Dead* both feature scenes where a character makes the choice presented in the Cavalrymen’s Poem, either shooting himself in the head, or asking another character to do it on their behalf. *Day of the Dead* adds another layer to this by presenting a character who commits suicide by zombie horde, thereby letting the horde in to the bunker and making it into an act of murder-suicide. In *Land*, the father must have known that death by hanging would not prevent him from turning into a zombie, so calling this an act of suicide is imprecise. The father’s act may be the “radical act of self-initiation” described by Clark, in answer to the question “Is it better to be Undead, happy, and free, or alive, miserable, and repressed?” (209).

His son being bitten connects this rite of passage to fears of “going native” in Western films depicting frontier families (Huhndorf). The anxieties are gendered, with fears surrounding daughters and wives being captured and raped, alongside fears that the sons will willingly run off to join the tribe. Here, the father’s rite of passage is also the son’s. The son willingly goes to the hanging father, knowing that his father will not remain dead and, further, will soon become a threatening presence. Even in the classist and racist enclave of Fiddler’s Green, becoming Other is viewed as a potential pathway towards personal liberation.

In another trope from Western films, viewers are treated with a jailhouse scene in which the characters provide exposition. Slack had been sentenced to death against two competing zombies in a cage-match fueled by bloodlust and gambling in the ghetto surrounding Fiddler’s Green. Riley and his trusty, sharpshooting sidekick Charlie (Robert Joy), rescued her, and while they are jailed together, we learn that Slack was being punished for supporting Mulligan’s attempt to organize labor in resistance to Kaufmann’s oppression. Slack is a trained soldier forced into prostitution—she is the hooker with a heart of gold. Charlie notes that the situation is unfair, but that “every place is the same,” indicating his resignation to his own oppression as a lower-class person with a disability. Riley adds, “Places with people. I’m going to find a place where there’s no people.” Riley’s dream reflects the colonizer’s dream of discovery, despite his stance against imperialism as represented by Kaufmann. In short, Riley is unable to imagine an alternative to success and liberty outside of modernist categorical structures, either as remembered in the past or as reconstructed in the post-zombie world. His is a repeat performance of the same mythic rugged individualism that characterized the frontier hero in imaginations of

The Old West of cinema (and the equally imaginative Frontier Thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner).

Beyond the analogy of the crime boss in charge of an isolated town along a fictionalized Western frontier, *The Land of the Dead* criticizes the obvious realities of frontier domination. As Mbembé states, “the colony represents the site where sovereignty consists fundamentally in the exercise of a power outside the law (*ab legibus solutus*) and where ‘peace’ is more likely to take



Fig. 5 Sticking it to the Man

on the face of a ‘war without end’” (23).

This occurs along a frontier between the colonizer and the colonized, and all the oppositional definitions (and moral value judgments) that entails. The colonial definition and management of space, land, and, on balance, various packages of rights are usually bent to privilege the colonizer. All peoples are oppressed to varying degrees under Kaufmann, and all the city residents are complicit to varying degrees in

oppressing others. At the very least, every city resident is participating in the oppression of zombies through dependence on resource extraction beyond the frontier. Colonization is a discursive project, and “ultimately, tantamount to the production of boundaries and hierarchies, zones and enclaves; the subversion of existing property arrangements; the classification of people according to different categories; resource extraction; and, finally, the manufacturing of a large reservoir of cultural imaginaries” (Mbembé 26). *The Land of the Dead* is just such a cultural imaginary. Even if critical of dominant culture, most imaginaries cannot break from foundational colonial ambivalence, or undermine white supremacy, as entrenched in the production—and analysis—of cultural representations (King and Leonard 355). *The Land of the Dead* demonstrates the need to include Indigenous criticism into analyses of zombie films, even and especially if embodied Indigenous presence is absented.

Kaufmann’s abject criminality is justified and rationalized through the colonial structure of the city. His class position is evidenced by and emergent from his domination of the city. The

living exist in relationship to Kaufmann—he is the sovereign, in a Foucauldian sense. On one hand, the living are motivated by envy and self-interest that play into racialized privilege, made most obvious in Kaufmann’s denial of Cholo’s desire to live in Fiddler’s Green. On the other hand, the living are motivated by fear of the zombies—fear of the Other, and of *becoming* the excluded Other—and acquiesce to their own oppression in exchange for a sense of security. This need for security, and the need to maintain profit within the system itself, demands further criminality and violence. The resources extracted from outside the fences of the city are not all for the “good” of the people, and bootlegging contraband accompanies the de facto “gray market” Kaufmann has built up to bolster his domination. As he explains to one of his Board of Directors:

It was my ingenuity that took an old world and made it into something new. I put up the fences to make it safe. I hired the soldiers and paid for their training. I kept the people off the streets by giving them games and vices which cost me money. But I spend it because the responsibility is mine. Now, do you understand the meaning of the word responsibility?

Twice, during the inevitable zombie attack on the city, Kaufmann asserts, “You have no right!” These words—backed with financial, structural, and of course militarized power—mark Kaufmann’s attempt to monopolize the power to define rights within a self-serving social hierarchy, and the privilege marked by this discourse is the only form of capital that trickles down to the underclass of living humans. The living most often define zombies as an utterly negated Other, or can only recognize their similarities to zombies with great existential (and usually violently expressed) anxiety. In either case, even if zombies become sympathetic characters, the characters (and viewers) are always bound to the



Fig. 6 "You have no right!"

role of domination over zombies. For the living to go on living, zombies must be fully isolated, fully controlled, or fully exterminated. This is the same genocidal logic of colonialism (Foucault 1990, 137).

As Big Daddy leads his zombie horde into an uncertain future, as Fiddler's Green burns, and as Riley and his ragtag bunch of outlaws celebrate their own independence day, it finally becomes obvious that the zombies blur the line between colonized and colonizer. Their revolution is driven by class struggle, and not based on connection to place. Their revolution may have been led by an African American gas station attendant, but the horde is a hagiographic take on 50s Americana, and almost totally white. Whatever recognition Riley affords to them is as settlers, or at least severely limited by settler terms (Coulthard). When Pretty Boy takes the joystick to aim Dead Reckoning's cannons at the zombies, Riley stops her by saying, "No, they're just looking for a place to go. Same as us." Even as Riley grants Big Daddy and his comrades the right to exist, there is a denial of their right to place. They are rendered rootless, with Riley seemingly extending allowance of their mimicry of the living by rhetorically constructing the zombies as just a subclass of settlers, a minority that may be tolerated so long as they find a place out of Riley's way. Zombies are often interpreted as the ultimate Other, but in this case they are not Indigenous or even "Indian," despite the title of the land seeming to belong to the dead, and despite the fact that they actually scalp someone during the final assault on Fiddler's Green. But it is this erasure and replacement that makes applying Indigenous and critical social theory to this film even more revealing, and earlier analyses of Romero's zombie works as subversive ring more than a bit hollow.

Works cited

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford UP, 1998.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harvest, 1966.
- Barkan, Elazar and Ronald Bush. "Introduction." *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*, edited by Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush. Stanford U P, 1995.
- Berkhofer, Robert F. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. Vintage, 1979.

-
- Block, Robert H. “Frederick Jackson Turner and American Geography.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 70 no. 1, 1980.
- Cavalry Outpost Publications. “Fiddler’s Green.” 1996. http://www.first-team.us/tableaux/apndx_10/. Accessed May 30, 2017.
- Clark, Simon. “The Undead Martyr: Sex, Death, and Revolution in Romero’s Zombie Films.” *The Undead and Philosophy: Chicken Soup for the Soulless*, edited by Richard Green and K. Silem Mohammad. Open Court Press, 2006.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. U of Minnesota P, 2014.
- Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. Yale UP, 1998.
- Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. Columbia UP, 2002.
- Forbes, Jack D. “The Indian in the West: A Challenge for Historians.” *Arizona and the West*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1959, pp. 206–215.
- Foucault, Michel. “Panopticism.” *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège of France, 1975-76*, edited by Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana. Picador, 2003.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume I*. Vintage, 1990.
- Freud, Sigmund. “The Uncanny.” 1919.
- Huhndorf, Shari M. *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination*. Cornell UP, 2001.
- Jameson, Frederic. “Nostalgia for the Present.” *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Verso, 1991.
- Jensen, Richard. “On Modernizing Frederick Jackson Turner: The Historiography of Regionalism.” *Western Historical Quarterly*, vol. 11 no 3, 1980.
- King, C. Richard and David J. Leonard. “Racing the Matrix: Variations on White Supremacy in Responses to the Film Trilogy.” *Cultural Studies ⇔ Critical Methodologies*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2006.
- Klein, Kerwin Lee. “Reclaiming the ‘F’ Word, or Being and Becoming Postwestern.” *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 65, no. 2, 1996.

-
- The Land of the Dead: Unrated Director's Cut*. DVD, directed by George A. Romero. Universal Pictures, 2005.
- Mbembé, J. Achille. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture*, vol. 15 no. 1, 2003.
- Paffenroth, Kim. *Gospel of the Living Dead: George Romero's Visions of Hell on Earth*. Baylor UP, 2006.
- Rushton, Cory J and Christopher Moreman. "Introduction: Race, Colonialism, and the Evolution of the Zombie." *Race, Oppression and the Zombie: Essays on Cross-cultural Appropriations of the Caribbean Tradition*, edited by Cory J. Rushton and Christopher Moreman, McFarland, 2011.
- Russell, Jamie. *Book of the Dead: The Complete History of Zombie Cinema*. FAB Press, 2005.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1978.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph "Anthropology and the Savage Slot: The Poetics and Politics of Otherness." *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modern World*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Turner, Frederick J. "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." *Frederick Jackson Turner: Wisconsin's Historian of the Frontier*, edited by Martin Ridge, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1986.
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. U of Nebraska P, 1999.

Redwashing: Sedgwick's *Blood Moon*, a Case Study

JACE WEAVER

Over the past several years a new term has entered the lexicon in Native American and Indigenous Studies, and in Indian Country generally. The word is “redwashing.” It is defined by Karen Wonders on the website [*First Nations: Land Rights and Environmentalism in British Columbia*](#) as describing “the deception of the general public by government and industry in trying to cover up their theft of indigenous peoples’ lands, natural resources and cultural riches by pretending that they are acting in the best interests of the native peoples.” As Clayton Thomas-Muller has discussed, often the offenders in an act of legerdemain engage in public relations campaigns to convince people that they are acting benevolently by contributing funding to Indigenous educational, artistic, and cultural programs. It was coined from the term “greenwashing,” in which bad actors appear as if they are environmentally good citizens. As with greenwashing, it occurs “when time and money are spent on ... gimmicks that make a pretense of acting ethically towards the indigenous nations of the New World, when in fact the opposite is done” (Wonders).

In this brief article, I want to talk about a slightly different—but no less pernicious—form of redwashing.

During the 2016-2017 academic year, Colin Calloway, a leading authority on early Native American history, was on sabbatical and in residence at Mount Vernon. Journalist John Sedgwick approached him to discuss the latter’s current book project, a book on Cherokee Removal. The author had published a book on the Burr-Hamilton debate and was taking the

same approach with the new book, looking at the conflict between two individuals, in the Cherokee case between Major Ridge and John Ross. He asked Calloway if he would look at the finished manuscript. Colin agreed and, knowing my wife, Laura Adams Weaver, and I had written a book on Removal that he used in the classroom and that I had otherwise written on the subject, suggested in an email on 25th September that Sedgwick reach out to me as a second reader.

Colin and I subsequently received the book from Sedgwick’s publisher, the trade house Simon & Schuster. Both of us were surprised to be receiving typeset galleys instead of a manuscript. Colin emailed me on 3rd October, saying, “I’m not sure how receptive he’ll be, or how much he can change now it’s in proofs.” Given the costs associated with making changes in galleys, I concurred. Further, these were not to be anonymous readers reports.

Upon reading, what Colin and I both found was a text riddled with factual errors and the faulty interpretations of someone who knew little or nothing about Native culture and history with a narrative derived from secondary sources, some of which were outdated and of questionable reliability in some instances. The author leaned heavily on Grace Steele Woodward’s book *The Cherokees*, published in 1963.¹ He also relied uncritically on Emmett Starr’s *History of the Cherokee Indians and Their Legends and Folk Lore*, published in 1921.²

Sedgwick traffics in hoary stereotypes, with a special preference for the lurid and the patronizing. Indians are described in animalistic terms: “swarming,” “screaming,” “roaring.” They easily become “frenzied” and commit atrocities. Tecumseh is described as “wild-eyed” and

“shrieking” twice in two lines (Sedgwick 90, 92).³ Women dancing the Ghost Dance are described as “dancing wildly, wearing around their ankles tortoise shells filled with pebbles that cracked to the beat of ‘wild uncouth sounds.’”⁴ They “cavort naked.” Full-bloods present were “crazed” (92). Cherokee women engaged in “errant sex” with white traders. The author wallows in Cherokee chief Doublehead’s ritualistic cannibalism and gratuitously wonders, with no source or basis, whether The Ridge partook (52-53). And he follows the pattern of the mixed-blood declension narrative: John Ross, for instance, is described as “white almost to the core” (59). Fullbloods are repeatedly described as “copper” in complexion.

Like many other non-specialists and non-Natives, Sedgwick’s book reflects the “shock of discovery” (i.e., “I didn’t know this, so no one must know it.”). In the Introduction, on page one, the first lines are “This is the last big surprise of the Civil War: It was fought not just by the whites of the North and South, and by blacks who mostly came in after Emancipation. It was also fought by Indians...” (1). Just as David Grann, author of *Killers of the Flower Moon*, and even enrolled Osage citizen Dennis McAuliffe, in his *The Deaths of Sybil Bolton*, did not know of the Osage Reign of Terror prior to writing their books, Sedgwick assumes because he did not know of Cherokee Removal, it must be a little-known story. In fact, the flyleaf trumpets, “An astonishing untold story from America’s past—a sweeping, powerful, and necessary work of history that reads like *Gone with the Wind* for the Cherokee.” That is supposed to be a compliment.

There is, however, one more discovery the author made in the course of his work. On April 12, 2018, the *New York Times* posted on its website an op-ed, “[The Historians Versus the](#)

[Genealogists](#),” by Sedgwick. In it he states at the time he began work on *Blood Moon* (which had dropped two days earlier), he did not know he had a personal connection to the story he was telling. He discovered that he was a distant relative of Harriett Gold, the white wife of Elias Boudinot. He writes, “Suddenly that book was no longer just by me. It was also *about* me.”⁵ This is what Sedgwick would call a “howler.” It is a move reminiscent of that which Hertha Dawn Wong makes at the beginning of her preface to *Sending My Heart Back Across the Years* (1992). She writes, “When I began writing this book in 1984, I had little idea that I was part Native American, one of the unidentified mixed-bloods whose forbears wandered away from their fractured communities.... Did my newly discovered part-Indian heritage now make me an ‘insider,’ someone who might speak with the authority of belonging? ‘Of course not,’ was my first response” (v). Cue the shift to the plural first-person pronoun.

Colin and I each finished our readings and sent detailed reviews to both the author and the publisher. Colin’s went in about a week before mine, and he copied me on it. He spoke specifically to the tone and stereotypes. In my report, I seconded all of his critiques and recommendations. I then went into specific issues not flagged by him. We both said we wished we could be more affirmative. Sedgwick sent a reply to Colin, stating that this was just the kind of criticism he wanted—in fact, *needed* to hear. An encouraging sign, we thought. When he received mine, Sedgwick sent me an acknowledgment but said he had not yet read it. Neither of us ever heard anything more.

While I will not catalogue all its errors, I will list some of the most important specific mistakes and stereotypes Colin and I pointed out. Though I read the published *Blood Moon* quickly, when

one of the errors remains unchanged in the final book, I will note that fact. Otherwise, as far as I can tell, they were corrected. The following then is a list of such errors:

- He referred to Dragging Canoe as a “fearsome spectacle of coiled and snarling nastiness.”
- He provides no context for the Anglo-Cherokee War and attributes it to “some renegade Cherokee” (32).
- He stated that the Timberlake delegation of 1762 met with King George II, not George III, conflating it with the 1730 embassy.
- He attributes St. Clair’s defeat during the Northwest Indian War to Dragging Canoe, though there is no proof he was present, and the victory was that of the Northwest Confederacy, not the Cherokee (50-51).
- He states that Tecumseh gave the Muscogee warriors fighting in the Creek War the name “Red Sticks” (99).
- He credits Dragging Canoe with giving Tecumseh the vision of uniting all tribes, not the Northwest Confederacy—in a war in which Tecumseh himself fought (90).
- He says that Sequoyah and all other Cherokee considered the printed word “black magic” (144).

- He says that John Ross was given a Cherokee name, Tsan Usdi, but was called Little John. Ross’s Cherokee name was Cooweescoowee. Tsan Usdi is just literally “Little John” (59).
- He stated that some event “made John Ross what he had never been. A Cherokee.” (Colin Calloway called this “rubbish.”)
- He stated the name Cherokee came from the Creek, not from the Choctaw “chalaque.”
- He says of The Ridge: “Then he fell in love—if love is the term for a society and culture that largely segregated the sexes, had few romantic traditions, and offered scant privacy” (67).
- He states that prior to the coming of whites, “The Cherokee were a people largely without history, that grand pageant of progress and disaster, possessing mostly legends about what had come before, legends only the conjurers knew” (17).
- In citing James Adair’s book, he says, “It is a remarkably clear-eyed piece of ethnography to modern eyes, with one howling peculiarity:...his argument that the American Indians were a lost tribe of Israel.” Any issues with Adair aside, the “lost tribes” trope was a very common piece of ideology at the time (13).

-
- The Cherokee language, among Cherokee who prized rhetoric, were “the grunts of a harsh language.”
 - The Ridge’s stentorian voice could “shake the leaves off the trees.”
 - He said that clan revenge created “endless cycles of violence.” According to Rennard Strickland, it was in fact a single cycle. A life was taken in exchange for a life. Then it stopped. Things were balanced out.
 - He stated that the 1827 letter to Albert Gallatin was by Major Ridge, who was not literate. It is by John Ridge. He uncritically quotes from it a passage that is not accurate and reflects John Ridge’s Christian bias (or his effort to tell Gallatin what he expected to hear). He corrected the attribution and nothing else (69-70).
 - His description of the execution of Doublehead (72-75) is confusing and does not match any single account, including that of Thurman Wilkins in his book *Cherokee Tragedy*.

I fear, dear reader, that I have tried your patience with this litany. I will stop there. I trust it gives you an idea of both the problematic nature of *Blood Moon* and our efforts to try to redress it.

At the outset of this brief essay, I termed the book a case a case of redwashing. How is this so?

In his acknowledgements, Sedgwick writes:

I’ve also turned to two of the most authoritative contemporary scholars of Native Americans to make sure I have kept up with the latest understanding of the Cherokee. I owe great debts to Colin Calloway, a professor of Native American Studies at Dartmouth College, and to Jace Weaver, the director of the Institute of Native American Studies at the University of Georgia, for scrupulously going over the manuscript to correct errors of fact and interpretation. They have made this book much better for their efforts. Needless to say, I take full responsibility for any mistakes that remain” (417-418).⁶

The author thus has it both ways: he avers the imprimatur of two respected, established scholars of the field, while saying that we may be absolved of any (minor) errors in the final book.

Books like this continue to get published because they prove popular and sell. They are dangerous because a public interested in learning about Native history snaps them up, thinking they are getting accurate information when they are not. Just as on Wall Street there is a maxim that “bad money forces out good,” bad information forces out good, leading the general reader to bypass accurate and nuanced information and scholarship in favor of books such as this.

Sedgwick’s effusive thanks to Colin and me implies to his audience that we endorse the finished book when we did not and when the author ignored most of our comments. He made some, but far from all, of our corrections. He did nothing to address our concerns about the tone and his stereotypes. Lesson learned. Though John Sedgwick doubtless thinks his “recovery” of an unknown topic is pro-Indian, on many levels it is a deeply anti-Indian monograph. It will lead many innocent, well-intentioned readers to believe that Indians traditionally were frenzied, mindless, bloodthirsty savages. Why care if they were dispossessed of a continent?

 Notes

¹ The Woodward is so outdated that the publisher had contacted me to see if I was interested in revising it. It nonetheless remains in print.

² There is much of value in Starr's book, and it is especially prized by genealogists. The author, however, has some questionable beliefs, such as when he claims that what was thought of as Cherokee religious traditions had actually been taught to them by the German utopianist Christian Priber (1697-1744), and that within seventy years the Cherokee had forgotten its origins.

³ When I quote something that remained unchanged between what Colin and I read, I will cite to the published book.

⁴ Around Tecumseh and among some Cherokee what is sometimes described as a Ghost Dance movement grew up. It is second in a chain of four related movements. Because the movements in 1870 and 1889-90 actually are known by that name, I prefer to denominate them either "revitalization" movements or "raising up" movements, because a salient feature is often that the dead ancestors will be raised.

⁵ Emphasis in original.

⁶ As previously noted, we did not see the book in manuscript, but in typeset galleys.

Works Cited

Calloway, Colin. Personal email. 25 Sept. 2017.

---. Personal email. 3 Oct. 2017.

Grann, David. *Killers of the Flower Moon*. Doubleday, 2017.

McAuliffe, Dennis. *The Deaths of Sybil Bolton*. Times Books, 1994.

Sedgwick, John. *Blood Moon: An American Epic of War and Splendor in the Cherokee Nation*. Simon & Schuster, 2018.

---. "The Historians Versus the Genealogists," *New York Times*, 12 Apr. 2018, www.nytimes.com/2018/04/12/opinion/historians-versus-genealogists.html. Accessed 20 Apr. 2018.

Starr, Emmett. *History of the Cherokee Indians and Their Legends and Folk Lore*. Warden, 1921.

Thomas-Müller, Clayton. "We Need to Start Calling Out Corporate 'Redwashing,'" *CBC*, 20 Mar. 2017, www.cbc.ca/news/opinion/corporate-redwashing-1.4030443. Accessed 20 April 2018.

Weaver, Jace and Laura Adams Weaver. *Red Clay, 1835: Cherokee Removal and the Meaning of Sovereignty*. W.W. Norton, 2017.

Wilkins, Thurman. *Cherokee Tragedy*. MacMillan, 1970.

Wonders, Karen. "Redwashing." *First Nations: Land Rights and Environmentalism in British Columbia*, 2008, http://www.firstnations.de/indian_land/misrepresented-redwashing.htm. Accessed 20 Apr. 2018.

Wong, Hertha Dawn. *Sending My Heart Back Across the Years: Tradition and Innovation in Native American Autobiography*. Oxford University Press, 1992.

Woodward, Grace Steele. *The Cherokees*. University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.

Me & My Monster

ANDREA L. ROGERS

“He’s a monster,” Gina whispered, describing the one she loved. Her grandmother sipped her medicine.

“All boys are monsters, sweetie. I’ve been telling you that since you were no taller than a tiger lily.”

Gina wrote a letter to the *Star-Telegram*. The city was currently in the midst of Lake Worth Monster madness. The paper ran daily monster updates and blurry photos that might have been tall skinny people in gorilla suits running away from the camera. Blonde Sasquatches with goat horns and cloven hooves were described. These were details not discernible from the pictures, but relayed through eyewitness accounts of people claiming to have seen a goat boy, who reeked like white crappie, in the dark, half a mile away.

Gina, however, knew the “Goat Man.” She had held his hoof while they watched the moon rise over the lake from a secluded bluff. She left that detail out of her letter.

Dear Mr. Editor,

The Lake Worth “monster” is no monster. He is a perfect gentleman. If he threw a tire at you, then you had it coming. I was talked into going to the lake to look for the “monster.” Moments after we parked my date had his hands all over me. Let that be a warning to you other girls: Teenage boys have more than monsters on their minds!

I argued with my date and got out of his vehicle. He followed me and knocked me to the ground. I screamed for help. It immediately arrived in the form of an individual your readers are calling the “Goat Man.” He towered over us and my terrified date fled. He gave chase. My date drove away, leaving me behind.

I panicked. I curled into a ball and wept for several minutes. Finally, I looked up and saw those beautiful red rimmed, baby blue eyes staring at me from several yards away. I got up and dusted myself off. I walked in the direction of the highway. He stayed a ways behind me, following me slowly. When I turned back to see if he was still there he waved at me shyly. Once I got to the road I flagged down what turned out to be a nice Baptist couple on their way home from choir practice. As I looked back, he gave me one more long wave. Then he dropped to all fours and bounded away like a deer, not a goat.

Sincerely yours,

Lady in Distress

Class of 1969

When Gina returned later that week to thank him for saving her she learned the Lake Worth Monster’s name was “Matt.” She offered him a plate of fresh chocolate chip cookies. Their first visit was interrupted by jeering onlookers from below the bluff. Matt rolled a tire in their general direction.

Matt was goatish, but the fishiness was an exaggeration. The lake smelled of dead fish in several places, so perhaps this accounted for the misperception. Gina kept a scrapbook of all the Lake Worth Monster articles and was thrilled to see her letter to the editor when it was

published. She cropped out the introduction, though she still remembered every word. They wrote that her “fictional account” had given the newsroom such a big laugh they felt they owed it to their readers to spread the mirth.

Inevitably, it was a star-crossed romance beset with challenges.

First, she didn't own a car. Borrowing her father's Oldsmobile required a complicated chain of deceit.

Second, Gina quickly realized she would not be getting any love poems from him. And, he immediately ate whatever notes she proffered.

Third, his taste in romantic gestures ran to gifts of prickly pear cactus fruit and bleated love songs.

Fourth, she was set to go to Bacone College in Muskogee, Oklahoma soon. While it was obvious to her that her cloven-footed boyfriend was no demon, she wondered if her love for him would survive four years of a Baptist education.

Still, she persevered. She was more comfortable when he wore clothes. She salvaged a torn pair of jeans from the laundromat and handily patched the ripped knee. She also gave him a shirt of her father's, though it was much too large for Matt and missing several buttons. The blue set off Matt's strange, electric azure eyes. She had to remind Matt to put the outfit on each time she came to see him.

As the summer drew to a close she became melancholy. They wouldn't be exchanging letters. Their courtship had stalled. Their romance was based on little more than baked goods, unwanted gifts of clothing, and wordless gallantry.

The evening before she was to leave for college she borrowed her father's car. She wanted to discuss their future one last time. Gina found Matt sitting on their log wearing his

jeans and button up shirt. From somewhere he had obtained a tie and wrapped it haphazardly around his throat. He absentmindedly chewed on its short end as she drove up.

She sat next to him and took his cloven hoof into her hands. She talked. He quickly became agitated and withdrew his foot. He cried a long mournful bleat, stood up, stepped out of the jeans and then dropped to all fours. His head swiveled back and forth as he struggled with the removal of the tie. Eventually the tie fell to the ground and he trampled on it while dragging the cuffs of the shirt over the rocky, sandy soil. Without ever looking back, he disappeared into the scrubby growth between the parkway and the lake.

There will be no salvaging that shirt, Gina thought, as she stood watching him disappear into the dark. She heard a splash and soon saw the moon glinting off his back as he swam towards Goat Island. Tears ran down her cheeks as the distance between them grew. Dating teenage boys had been more dangerous than she had expected, more dangerous than being courted by the Lake Worth Monster. In the end, long distance relationships are always hard.

When White People Talk About their Country Being Stolen (I Throw Up in My Mouth a Little Bit)

TIFFANY MIDGE

The morning after the election results, while our country was waking up from one of the biggest hangovers of its life, Lawrence and me had the complicated and compounded misfortune of waking to the telltale sounds of what I assumed was a celebratory victory rut of our upstairs neighbors, who happened to be ardent Trump fans.

“The upstairs neighbors are going at it! A victory bang.” I posted on my Facebook. Then deleted. Then re-posted. Then deleted again. I have no filter.

Our neighbors have Trump signs all over the yard, a poster sized “VOTE TRUMP” sign taped to the back of their minivan, along with year-round Christmas lights and miniature American flags all up and down the concrete path to their porch. When I ruptured my tendon, these same untoward neighbors gave me a walker, offered help, visited me and sympathized with my trouble. Yes, they are good people. *They know not what they do* goes the refrain inside my head.

I know how to deal with Trumpsters. Their narrative is simplistic, transparent, and in my face.

What’s not so simple, what isn’t an easy-to-follow recipe, are those white folks stomping through our yard in pink pussy hats and safety pins stuck to their lapels, on their way to another Saturday rally in the park across the street. These socially conscientious liberals who want *their* country back.

“There’s a lady kicking over the planters in the walkway.” Lawrence says from the window.

“Shit. Is she wearing a pussy hat?”

“Yes. Should we call the police?”

“No. Tell her to get off our lawn.”

We laugh.

The Lakota and Nez Perce couple raising cane at hippies who’re tearing around on their front lawn. That’s rich.

“I feel a little sorry for them. They look so lost.” I say.

“Don’t. One of them broke our planter. This here’s frontier justice.”

We laugh.

“We could join them?” I say. “They don’t know what hit them. Trump is going to turn the whole country into a banana republic.”

“Or a reservation.” Lawrence says.

“Welcome! We’ve got a chair for you right here at the kid’s table.” I say.

“We should teach seminars called ‘Dispossession is a Bitch.’”

We laugh. *In that good way.*

From the distance we can hear a woman’s voice amplified through a megaphone. In the park, a sea of pink assembled like a coral reef. We part the curtains and peer through the window as if we’re Jacques Cousteau surveying a mysterious new species.

So much *pink*.

If I take my glasses off, all I see is a blur of cotton candy. It makes me feel nauseous, as if I’d stayed at the carnival too long.

Lawrence takes my hand and opens the front door. We step out into the morning air and reluctantly join the parade.

Nemuel Island

TOMMY ORANGE

“I want to feel the approach of sleep as if it were a promise of life, not rest.”
—Fernando Pessoa, *The Book of Disquiet*

His name is Nemuel Island, and he is convinced that this, the fact of his full name being what it is, permanently damaged his life—as a burn victim might feel about their post-burn seen face. To hear his own name has always meant he is alone. On an island. Ruined. Half of him is Native American—Cheyenne if you’re asking—but he looks white. The simple chance of having less melanin distributed to him—both his sisters are brown—and there you have it, a boy and then a man struggling to understand what him being Native American and not looking like it could possibly mean, and why fight for it?

Meanwhile his name is Nemuel Island. Most people don’t have to navigate or the negotiate the fact of having an uncommon name. In fact most people, statistically speaking, are Johns, Juans, Muhammads, etc. Nemuel is a name from the bible which means: *the sleeping of God*.

Nemuel sits up in bed thinking all the time because he can’t sleep. Thinking does not bring sleep but sleeping isn’t not thinking either. Sometimes he dreams of not being able to sleep—sitting up in bed worried and thinking. Everything feels impossible.

He believes everyone is happier and sadder, both hate and love themselves more than we’re comfortable admitting. Admission itself feels impossible. Because we don’t know what we aren’t willing to admit to ourselves just like we don’t know what we don’t know. All of which makes him both happier and sadder than he’d like to admit.

He got a phone call from his sister recently. When was that? They used to talk more and now they don’t. Time slips more often than it ticks or tocks or stops. She tried to point back. At what happened to them. Meaning their childhood. Let’s say experience.

“Uh huh. Yeah. No I get it,” Nemuel had said, with the TV on some judge show. He stepped outside for a smoke.

“Look up historical trauma,” she’d said. “All we been through doesn’t come from nothing,” she said.

“That was a long time ago. People think we’re complaining,” Nemuel said, as he walked away from the open windows of the house.

He normally doesn’t smoke unless the sun’s down. Now it was in his eyes so he looked down at the broken ground there. Rootbusted, cracked bark, hungry crimson streams of redbrown anttrails. Memory is quicksand when it catches you, or you catch it. Him and his older sisters used to be afraid of the silver reflection in their dad’s glasses while he drove and didn’t speak. Their mom bent the silver light away from them when she turned around smiling, telling them there wasn’t far to go, but not saying how little left there was to go after Nemuel had asked too many times. She looked away from that old Indian sorrowrage—like he wasn’t there anymore. Their dad could just say a few words, even just one to make them all go quiet the whole way—wherever they were going.

“No you’re right,” Nemuel said to what his sister had said about how much it matters, what happened to the people you come from. “But what can we do?” he asked. He really didn’t know what. He still doesn’t.

He didn’t say bye on accident before hanging up. He drove to the store more to get out of the heat than to shop. He wandered the aisles. Stopped here and there not looking for anything. To stand still in a grocery store—or perhaps anywhere—isn’t allowed. Or would maybe be frowned upon. Regarded with suspicion. Risks possible scorn. Loitering comes from a German word he can’t say that means: to make smaller. His eyes slid over the blur of random colors—at his many boxed choices. At the deli window he kept thinking: *It’s okay*—about what he didn’t know. He thought: *There there*.

There were an unreasonable number of flies around the deli area as if some fresh dead meat lay nearby. He swatted at the flies repeatedly but never made contact. He wondered if there is some thing too big to see, comprehend, like what humans are to flies, swatting at us all—annoyed at our buzzings and wanderings in a room bigger than the world. In a deliverse we don’t know about. Changing our fates with their swatting influence—ending our lives over nothing. He thought about how we ourselves are invisible. Too big to see. To comprehend. And how we wander aisles and rooms we think are worlds, hoping hands too big to see won’t crush us.



Nemuel sits at his computer watching a video of himself several years back when he was thinner, when there was more brightness in his eyes. He hates something about his mouth, the way it moves when he talks, when he sees it in videos. His mom just now emailed the video without any note about why she'd sent this particular video. This makes him watch it again and again like the secret to why she sent it is in there somewhere. But he hates to see himself talk over and over. Still, he keeps watching. He's talking to someone outside of the shot. He smiles like he knows more than who he's talking to. Nemuel doesn't remember this moment, or who he was talking to. Like was he talking to his mom or was she recording it? He was thinner then, but his cheeks were so big. His eyes too small. And his crooked bottom teeth jut out. He never should have stopped wearing his retainer. It was that he couldn't keep it on at night, the version of himself he could barely claim was him, that version of him who closes his eyes to the world nearly every night, lies down—leaves. The etymology of the word when he looked it up says Old English has it meaning: "Repose of Death." That dead or zombie version of himself, sleeping Nemuel, he would pull his retainer out of his mouth and throw it. Nemuel would find it the next morning in the corner of his room—dry and with that sick spit smell all things get when spit dries on them.

Nemuel switches from watching the video of himself his mom sent him to watching the news. Why he keeps watching the news is similar to why he kept watching the video of himself his mom sent mysteriously. To find something there. Instead of nothing, plus fear. Fear from an unknown place is maybe dread, and dread at nothing is maybe the way it feels to live now in this year in particular—or maybe every year for all of time? What Nemuel knows is that he can't stop watching. He wants be wrong about them being wrong. He wants to be told it's not fake, with fake news headlines, with a news report about a news report from a disreputable station. He wants to read fake news about fake news to get at what fake news is, how to avoid our need for the truth behind its fakeness so bad we can't stop participating in it. He wants to be told he hasn't known anything. All this time. He wants who tells him to say it with blood in their eyes because they can't sleep either. He wants it to be—if not right or true—than just okay, the actual way it is

now. From the left, right—from a mountain on the moon. Because what it looks like. What it looks like it has to be, is the end.

Nemuel grew up afraid of the end. Because of religion. Church people were all hoping the end would come. To leave this old world behind. Get to a better one. Can anyone blame them for that? When he grew up and stopped caring what church people thought, what his parents thought, he noticed there were still religious devotees everywhere. He was one himself. Rare moments he could feel it in his pulse. Things getting bigger and smaller and keeping still for moments at just the perfect size. The thing he was and is and has to be.

Nemuel noticed there is another kind of sleep. That we all practice a private religion, privately. Bow our heads to it. Bend like the air from sound—sight unseen. Pray with our teeth. In how we chew. In how we stay hungry. In the why of why we keep breathing without even meaning to.

He believes in words. Language. He says this to himself out loud because he believes in the power of saying things out loud: “Past-participle accelerator, help us go from going to gone without the crushing kinds of pain.”

†

Sometimes he walks at sunset to watch the gradient color and light drop behind the mountains. After the sun sets he gets that kind of sad related to feeling like you’re not ever actually *here* enough to feel what it means to actually be here. That feeling like you’re gone already, or like you don’t belong, or like you’ve done something wrong.

He’s grateful for gratitude when he feels it, and the presence of mind that comes when he’s trying to stay present. But he can’t get around this removed feeling. Like he once belonged somewhere, but was moved, removed, and not told that he couldn’t come back, but like things happened in such a way that there was no place to go back to.

He’s still just thinking and it’s not doing anything. Or is he? When we only think we’re thinking, what else could we be doing, in such a world as this, than dreaming.

Indigenous Engagement with Christianity: A Review Essay

Covered in this review:

Tolly Bradford and Chelsea Horton, eds. *Mixed Blessings: Indigenous Encounters with Christianity in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2017. 236 pp. ISBN: 9780774829403.
<https://www.ubcpress.ca/mixed-blessings>

Timothy P. Foran. *Defining Métis: Catholic Missionaries and the Idea of Civilization in Northwestern Saskatchewan 1845-1898*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2017. 240 pp. ISBN: 978-0-88755-774-3. <https://uofmpress.ca/books/detail/defining-metis>

Julius Rubin. *Perishing Heathens: Stories of Protestant Missionaries and Christian Indians in Antebellum America*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2017. 276 pp. ISBN: 978-1-4962-0187-4. <http://www.nebraskapress.unl.edu/university-of-nebraska-press/9781496201874/>

In an essay titled “Rethinking Edward Ahenakew’s Intellectual Legacy,” Tasha Beeds, an Indigenous Studies scholar of Cree-Métis origin, resists scholarship’s dismissal of Christian practice among First Nations individuals merely as evidence of assimilation, arguing instead that a person could both adopt Christianity and maintain strong allegiance to an Indigenous culture. She writes specifically about Edward Ahenakew, “one of the first nēhiyaw [i.e. Cree] people in the post-reserve era to bridge the Indigenous and non-Indigenous worlds in terms of language, spirituality, and politics” (120). His contributions to Cree society are, according to Beeds, often discounted because of his commitment to Christianity (121). Without dismissing Christianity’s involvement in colonization, Beeds asserts Ahenakew’s powerful ability to use his experiences as a Christian for the benefit of the Cree people while still retaining his nēhiyaw identity.

Featured in the edited collection *Mixed Blessings: Indigenous Encounters with Christianity in Canada* edited by Tolly Bradford and Chelsea Horton, Beeds is one of a number of contemporary scholars reinvestigating the complexities of Indigenous interactions with Christianity as part of the necessary and challenging task of decolonizing academia. In recent decades in both Canada and the United States historians, literary critics, and theologians have indicted Christians as perpetrators of colonial violence, identifying Indigenous people as their victims. This assessment, vital for decolonization, is in many ways long overdue, preceded by years of denial of wrongdoing by both church and state and celebration of narratives that diminish Indigenous perspectives. However, some contemporary scholarship, like that produced by Beeds, complicates the conversation, considering the harm perpetrated by Christians alongside possibilities of Indigenous acceptance and/or subversive use of Christianity. *Mixed Blessings* co-editors Bradford and Horton and *Defining Métis* author Timothy Foran have created book-length studies that creatively interrogate settler and missionary source material and consider “Indigenous agency” (Bradford & Horton 5) as the First Nations of Canada interacted with Christianity. In *Perishing Heathens*, Julius Rubin likewise contributes to the scholarly project of re-examining Indigenous engagements with Christianity, but he pairs indictment of the colonial impulse of antebellum American missionaries with sympathy for early evangelical Christians, a combination that may trouble some readers. Read together, these three books

function like a primer on the project of decolonizing scholarly perspectives, evidencing the possibilities and pitfalls involved in studying often tense and ambiguous moments of interreligious and cross-cultural encounter. This review offers an overview of each text and then highlights ways in which all three situate themselves in relation to Indigenous perspectives, address the difficulty of accessing Indigenous history through archival sources, and contribute something significant to the field of Indigenous Studies.

Mixed Blessings is the strongest of the three in terms of careful framing, breadth of coverage, and the dynamism of a collection grown directly out of dialogue. Bradford and Horton present an interdisciplinary study that spans multiple centuries, allowing space for both historical and theological considerations of First Nations interactions with Christianity. Contributors to the volume first participated in a workshop entitled “Religious Encounter and Exchange in Aboriginal Canada,” and the resulting responsiveness of many of the contributors to one another creates a sense of community and relationship when their essays are read as a collection. Divided into three sections that focus on “community, individual, and contemporary sites of encounter” respectively (6), *Mixed Blessings* progresses from detached to increasingly personal analyses and also moves forward in chronology from investigations of the 18th century all the way through the present day. To some extent, all nine essays consider the political implications of Christianity’s arrival among the First Nations of Canada, acknowledge the transnational context of encounters with Christianity, and take “seriously the role of spiritual experiences and knowledge” (7).

Bradford and Horton acknowledge that Canada is only just grappling with Christianity’s involvement in colonization, most especially “the traumatic histories of violence associated with Christian missionaries, churches, and the residential schools” (5). Both the workshop and collection of essays move the dialogue beyond uncomplicated indictment of Christianity toward privileging “Indigenous agency” while questioning “singular stories of powerful churches and powerless Indigenous subjects” (5). In the conclusion, the editors call for an investigation of “Indigenous-Christian interactions” that “balance[s] the harsh realities of colonialism with the possibility that Christianity had, and continues to hold, deep spiritual and political meaning for some Indigenous people” (207). Without Bradford’s and Horton’s thoughtful framing remarks acknowledging the potential dangers of exploring First Nations acceptance of Christianity, the collection might be perceived as moving too quickly past the egregious intertwining of Christianity with colonization in favor of taking a more positive look at historical experiences between First Nations individuals and the Christian religion. But the editors are careful to acknowledge their precarious position between long-overdue acknowledgment of Canada’s dark past and more complex investigation of the nuances of Indigenous religious identity and experience throughout the missionary era. Without trying to oversimplify the diverse perspectives represented by their contributors, Bradford and Horton make it clear that they compiled this book with a “decolonizing spirit” in the hope of catalyzing “ongoing innovative investigation” of First Nations experiences with Christianity (3).

All contributors to the volume grapple with the problem of access to early First Nations voices and cultures, given that most source material was produced by settlers. Section One, “Communities in Encounter,” highlights this dilemma through three complementary essays that reinterpret archival sources in order to understand Indigenous religious practices as a form of political and social power. Both Timothy Pearson and Elizabeth Elbourne use knowledge of specific First Nations cultures to infer how Indigenous communities might interpret the

observations recorded by Euro-Canadian missionaries. For example, Pearson examines First Nations religious rituals of the 18th century, reading between the lines of missionary documents to construct interpretations that privilege Indigenous social and spiritual values. Elbourne's study dovetails nicely with Pearson's, focusing specifically on Anglicanism and how its practice, texts, and symbols were used by both Euro-Canadians and First Nations people to form and break political alliances, to affirm communal identity, and to express obligation or resistance to other communities. While both of these writers depend entirely on archival sources, Amanda Fehr uses a combination of Euro-Canadian historical documents and Indigenous ethnographic sources. This difference is possible largely because Fehr focuses on a more recent subject, a 1930s public memorial featuring a cross erected by members of the Stó:lō community. Fehr provocatively interprets the cross as an authentic expression of Stó:lō beliefs and resistance to government encroachment, not as evidence of missionary influence (73). Throughout her article, Fehr acknowledges that, even with ethnographic sources, the religious and political histories she attempts to piece together are ambiguous and partial at best. All three scholars in this section read their sources creatively in order to maximize their limited access to earlier First Nations perspectives.

The remaining two sections continue this theme of seeking access to and understanding of Indigenous perspectives. "Individuals in Encounter" features studies of the lives of missionary wife Eliza Field Jones, architect of the 1885 Métis rebellion Louis Riel, and Cree leader Edward Ahenakew. "Contemporary Encounters" concludes the volume with three dynamically written essays on present day interreligious negotiations. Sipiwe Dube's theoretical analysis questions whether Christianity's prominent involvement in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada is productive. Denise Nadeau offers an insightful and practical guide for decolonizing any classroom in which faculty teach Indigenous traditions or knowledge. Carmen Lansdowne's essay is definitively more personal than those in the rest of the collection: the second of only two Indigenous contributors in the volume, Lansdowne writes an autoethnography, an analysis focusing on herself, the researcher, as the essay's subject. Significantly, Lansdowne reflects on her experiences researching First Nations Christians who evangelized her own ancestral village (193). She makes a strong case for integrating the personal with the academic, especially when investigating Indigenous tradition, experience, and knowledge.

Coeditors Bradford and Horton acknowledge that the majority of voices in the collection, with the exception only of Tasha Beeds and Carmen Lansdowne, are those of "settler heritage" (206). While this is a weakness, the volume's primary strength lies in the ability of the workshop and the written work to sustain in-depth provocative dialogue between scholars with often competing methodologies. This type of collaborative dialogue produces a study that is both intellectually rigorous and heartfelt, a combined effort from multiple disciplinary perspectives to decolonize and complicate existing approaches to First Nations encounters with Christianity. Marked by tension and depth, *Mixed Blessings* is timely, bold, and sensitive.

Timothy Foran's *Defining Métis: Catholic Missionaries and the Idea of Civilization in Northwestern Saskatchewan 1845-1898* is much narrower in scope but no less considered in its approach and organization. In contrast to *Mixed Blessings'* coverage of First Nations encounters with Christianity from the 18th century to the present, *Defining Métis* offers a "micro-history," an intensely focused investigation of the 19th century Catholic mission called Saint John Baptiste, at

Île-à-la-Crosse. Through creative historical analysis and careful structuring, Foran offers a fascinating, instructive, and decolonizing exploration of this precise but significant slice of Canadian and First Nations history.

Instead of focusing his analysis on the Métis themselves, Foran studies the lives and correspondence of the Catholic missionaries who evangelized them, thereby centralizing the problem of access to First Nations perspectives. More specifically, he studies the development and use of the term “métis,” suggesting that historians have given too much credence to Catholic missionary perceptions of the Métis that originally portrayed them as faithful Catholics and later as a once faithful population now vulnerable to corruption and in need of reform (2, 114). While his focus is on the missionaries, Foran’s study shares the decolonizing spirit of *Mixed Blessings*. He differentiates himself from historians who have traditionally placed great trust in records kept by religious officials without considering that the missionaries’ “origins, education, affiliations, and clerical status” would influence those very records (3). Foran notes a change in scholarship, a growing skepticism of most missionary writings but a persistent trust in a specific set of records including censuses and logs of baptisms, marriages, and burials (3). Using newly available archival sources, Foran sets out to interrogate the record keepers themselves, specifically the Oblates, laypeople or clergy devoted to serving the Catholic Church but not as monks, friars, or nuns. He ultimately concludes that “the Oblates’ revision of the term *métis* was as much a product of disruption in their apostolate as it was a reflection of objective change in an historical Métis population” (118). His study complicates existing histories and challenges scholars to move beyond overly simplistic understandings of the Métis and the missionaries, to explore the complexities of both Métis culture and Catholic identity and experience.

The complexity of this volume is impressive and effective. Foran divides his study into an introduction, four chapters, a brief conclusion, and an appendix of maps that are especially helpful if consulted while reading the chapters. The chapters are dense and extremely detailed. Of the 229 page book, 76 pages are devoted to notes. Still, Foran structures the text to make this micro-history as accessible as possible. Each chapter focuses on a specific aspect of Saint Jean Baptiste: the Catholic network supporting it, its relationship to the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC), the operation of a residential school on the premises, and the use of the term “métis” by the Oblates who ran the mission. Read consecutively, each chapter builds on the previous one. By the end of the volume, a reader can understand relationships between the availability of Oblates, the influx of Euro-Canadian settlers south of Île-à-la-Crosse, HBC’s altering trade routes, and Oblate perception of Métis religious beliefs.

In many ways, chapter three, “Oblates and the Beginnings of Residential Education,” is most pertinent for scholars interested in Métis experiences at the mission. It closely examines the residential school established by the Oblates and the Grey Nuns. Not only does Foran trace the ebb and flow of the school as it coincides with the rise and fall of the mission and changes in the HBC, he also offers original source material that describes, in startling language, Oblate attitudes toward the plan of civilizing Indigenous people. Here is where readers see, intimately and troublingly, a religious community’s commitment to forceful assimilation. Foran notes that historians have traditionally focused on residential schools that opened after the treaties of 1877. These same historians have often asserted that Catholic missionaries who cooperated with the government did not fully believe in the program of assimilation. Foran’s detailed attention to the Saint John Baptiste mission and school demonstrates that these particular Oblates vigorously

pursued assimilation even without government oversight or support (65-66). This is all the more reason to question their seemingly empirical observations and categorizations of the Métis.

Though Foran's study focuses on the missionaries rather than on the Métis, he makes a significant contribution to Indigenous Studies. His methodical and detailed attention to the historical record and those who wrote it creates space to question the way scholars interpret histories constructed from these records. Foran provides a rigorously detailed, well-organized, and insightful study of changing Oblate attitudes toward this particular group of First Nations people.

In *Perishing Heathens: Stories of Protestant Missionaries and Christian Indians in Antebellum America* Julius Rubin holds a magnifying glass up to the lives of early settler evangelicals and Native American converts. As a historical sociologist, Rubin explores individuals, both Native and non-native, many of whom are underrepresented in the historical record. The book emphasizes the melancholic nature of early American evangelicalism and its failure to bring about widespread Native conversion. Rubin appears to have three primary goals: to understand and honor the early American evangelical missionary spirit and the individuals who committed their lives to it, to identify the tension between early evangelical Christianity and Native American cultures, and to wonder about the effectiveness of such a missionary spirit by looking at its shortcomings.

Like Foran and the contributors to *Mixed Blessings*, Rubin acknowledges the insufficiency of access to Indigenous experiences in the historical record. For example, in the preface he attempts to piece together the life story of Ann Cornelius, of whom no record exists except a tombstone labeling her "an Indian girl" (xi). Because of his focus exclusively on Christian perspectives, Rubin turns to written "religious intelligence" (xx) rather than oral tradition. He consults mission records, diaries, memoirs, letters, and reports produced by missionaries and Native converts. Though he acknowledges colonial and Christian biases among his sources and makes an effort to understand the incongruities between Native and Christian worldviews, he also expresses sympathy for the missionaries whose devotionism took the form of intense and often isolating self-examination, heightened awareness of and anxiety about death, and a fervent desire to build the kingdom of God by converting the "heathen" into followers of Christ (12-13). Rubin emphasizes the difficulties faced by missionaries and their converts, demonstrating throughout the entirety of the text that the lives of antebellum American evangelicals were often marked not by successful conversions and faithful long-term service but by suffering, illness, debt, and loss. Because of this emphasis, Rubin foregrounds Christian perspectives in archival sources.

Rubin's analysis of the antebellum evangelical missionary spirit is problematic from an Indigenous Studies perspective because it functions in many ways as a eulogy for that spirit. In the preface he announces his intention to "awaken in contemporary readers a sociological and historical imagination — the capacity to engage with empathy the lived experiences of missionaries and Christian Indians from past times" (xxii). This is an admirable goal, challenging readers to more deeply understand the experiences of others, and Rubin's enthusiasm as a sociologist who wants to reclaim narratives of individuals from the past is evident. However, this enthusiasm is at times unbridled and, at least for this reader, resembles admiration. At the end of his introduction, Rubin describes both the missionaries and Native converts as living with "heroic, tragic, and melodramatic fervor" and asserts that "their stories merit retelling to remind us of how evangelical Protestant culture helped shape American identity" (22). He frequently

identifies a “need” to remember. For example, in the preface he writes, “We *need* to reflect on what we share in common with those who forged a distinctive evangelical American identity and what we have lost” (emphasis added, xxii). Calling the missionaries “true believers,” Rubin emphatically addresses readers in the introduction: “we *need* to view the men and women called to domestic Indian missions as representative lives who forged [. . . an] identity founded upon religious values” (emphasis added, 4). While Rubin does highlight the failures of the missionary endeavor, in the introduction he chooses to punctuate the “meaning and purpose [early Christians found] in the fulfillment of religious values” (22). He appears to honor the missionary spirit adopted by both settlers and Native converts even as he purposefully identifies fatal flaws within that spirit, such as complicity in colonization. This contrast produces tension throughout *Perishing Heathens* and will render the book insufficient for some readers and challenging to others.

Rubin’s indictment of Christian participation in forced assimilation, though accompanied by an insistence on remembering early evangelicalism’s contribution to American identity, is present throughout the text. For example, at the outset of chapter two, Rubin notes the seemingly inseparable link between missionary endeavors and manifest destiny. Likewise, in chapter five, perhaps his strongest and most tightly organized of six chapters, he explores how the Euro-American plan of civilization permanently altered Cherokee culture specifically by examining the lives of two Cherokee Christian women, Catherine Brown and Sister Margaret Ann. Taking up the question of cultural identity, he wonders to what extent each woman replaced or combined her Cherokee ways with her newfound faith. Elsewhere he acknowledges the starkness of evangelical life compared to the vibrant and communal experiences had within many Native cultures. He asserts that Native experiences with religious devotion were marked by intense suffering and often accompanied by the political motivation of securing survival for Native people as Christianity and Euro-Americans encroached upon them. Multiple times throughout the text, Rubin evidences his understanding of Christianity as antagonistic to Native Americans. This means that his call for readers to empathize with the missionaries remains in constant tension with the historical realities of Christianity’s role in colonization.

The extensive attention Rubin gives to women like Catherine Brown and Sister Margaret Ann who devoted themselves to evangelicalism but have not received much attention is one of the book’s primary strengths. Throughout the text, he argues that the lives of evangelical women were harder than those of their male missionary counterparts because of the physical toll of childrearing and the constraints of early gender roles. Sister Margaret Ann’s story, in particular, highlights the relationship between Christianity and gender roles in Indigenous communities. Rubin identifies a “benevolent religious paternalism” (150) that involved white male missionaries pressuring Sister Ann to marry in order to pursue her religious life. Sympathetic to Sister Ann’s reluctance to accede to the missionaries’ plan, Rubin notes that she was newly a widow of an abusive husband and was just beginning to experience “relative autonomy” (154). While stories of other women punctuate many of the chapters, chapter three focuses almost exclusively on the sacrifices made and disappointments experienced by early female missionaries. Rubin provides a compelling critical analysis of how enmeshed the concept of “true womanhood” was with the missionary spirit and articulates how, surprisingly, some early 19th century women sought out lives as missionaries so that they could have public influence disallowed to women who led private domestic lives. However, maintaining his focus on the melancholy nature of missionary lives, Rubin records in tragic detail countless stories of female

missionaries whose high expectations met with “disease, disability, discouragement, and death” (85-86).

Though complicated by sympathetic treatment of the early missionary spirit, Rubin’s book makes a valuable contribution to Indigenous Studies through his detailed investigations of individual life stories that illustrate how this antebellum evangelical worldview influenced the lives of Native converts to Christianity. Perhaps his most significant contribution, though, is to the study of American religious history as he illuminates the fervent but tragic lives of early missionaries who participated in westward expansion by passionately pressuring Native Americans to adopt civilization as a hallmark of Christian belief. While Rubin calls readers to a deeper understanding of “how evangelical Protestant culture helped shape American identity” (22), he simultaneously documents the failure of that early Protestantism to accomplish its goals. He attributes these failures to a mismatch between expectation and reality, the disparity between the intense individualism of early Christian piety and the call to evangelize others, the harsh conditions of life in early America, and an insistence upon a Europeanized Christianity that was oppositional to cultures and beliefs of Native peoples.

The three volumes featured in this review offer readers multiple models for what a journey toward decolonization looks like in academia. In *Perishing Heathens*, it looks like paying careful attention to little-known archival sources and examining the failures of the missionary spirit. Rubin’s text also evidences the tension inherent in sympathizing with both white missionaries who married evangelism with civilization and the Native Americans negatively affected by such colonization. In *Defining Métis*, decolonization looks like a re-examination of settler source material long considered empirical and authoritative. And in *Mixed Blessings*, decolonization takes the form of dynamic interdisciplinary dialogue between Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars all of whom confess a desire to more deeply understand First Nations experiences with Christianity outside of a colonial framework. *Mixed Blessings*, *Defining Métis*, and *Perishing Heathens* all move scholarly dialogue past mere indictment of the colonizer’s religion toward the possibilities of Indigenous refusal, acceptance, adaptation, and politically motivated use of Christianity.

Rachel R. Luckenbill, Southeastern University

Maurice Kenny. *Monahsetah, Resistance, and Other Markings on Turtle's Back: A Lyric History in Poems and Essays*. Norman, OK: Mongrel Island Press, 2017. Print.

Rachel Bryant. *The Homing Place: Indigenous and Settler Literary Legacies of the Atlantic*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier, 2017. Print.

When asked to consider reviewing Maurice Kenny's *Monahsetah* and Rachel Bryant's *The Homing Place* for *Transmotion*, I took the opportunity to consider together these two seemingly disparate books—one a famous Indigenous poet's last lyric collection, the other a young settler scholar's first academic analysis. They turn out to have quite a bit in common. Both toy with the lines between the creative and the scholarly, the Indigenous and the European. Both contribute thoughtfully to our field's ongoing conversations about sovereignty and survivance, territoriality and land. And both are firmly grounded in, and determined to *(re)indigenize*, northeastern North America, known to many of its first peoples as the Dawnland.

If transmotion defies statist, territorial definitions of sovereignty, Indigenous people in this region have exceedingly long histories of transmobility. According to some of their oldest stories, people have always been inclined to travel across boundaries—geological boundaries, boundaries between kin groups and clans, boundaries between human and other-than-human. To this day, the violence of settler colonialism denies formal “recognition” to many northeastern tribal nations, while segregating them in the remote past, on fixed territories. Yet Indigenous people have continued to protect their lands, cultures and kin, here--as elsewhere--through story. Writing in this journal's first issue, Deborah Madsen defined transmotion as “the practice of transmitting cultural practices across time as well as spaces of travel and trade (24). Kenny and Bryant are two traveling, trading intellectuals who devote considerable thought to precisely how Indigenous people have moved, exchanged, and endured.

Maurice Kenny died in April 2016, gifting us with a final collection of prose and poetry that revisits characters and ideas he pondered for much of his life. It's in two parts. For this reader, the second, “Markings on Turtle's Back,” is the more compelling. Rooted in his home in Haudenosaunee territory, this section reflects on the people and places, historic and contemporary, that Kenny knew and loved. There is a charming catalogue of the beloved “knick-knacks” that decorate his work-space and remind him of his friends and kin, such as poems and essays about Indian stereotypes, or recipes for maple mush and shepherd's pie. There is also a long piece on Molly Brant, wife of the British diplomat Sir William Johnson, sister to the Mohawk chief Joseph Brant, and subject of Kenny's highly regarded 1995 book, *Tekonwatonti: Molly Brant: Poems of War*.

In this piece, Kenny comes to terms with *why* Tekonwatoni fascinated him for so many decades. Originally, he says, he believed that her story (not familial, and not even transmitted familiarly) was “not *personal* to me, but merely *persona*” (161)—that is, until a young PhD student named Craig Womack came along. Womack's research helped Kenny understand that “if Molly was not actually based on my birth-mother, she was possibly the mother I ‘had always desired’” (161). With this new insight, Kenny poignantly starts to excavate the story of his mother, a woman who was “Seneca by descent,” though she “held no ties, no sentiments and little knowledge of that culture.” (Intriguingly, she was also “an ever so great-granddaughter of the English poet Robert

Herrick.”) Doris Herrick Kenny Welch was reserved; she was strong. Like Molly Brant, she experienced war and family disruption, moving to New Jersey to work in a defense plant during World War II. Like Molly Brant, too, she risked being forgotten without someone to write her story, a fate on which Kenny, at the end of his life, seems to be ruminating. “Few of us are remembered,” he writes, though by exploring such stories and genealogies, he hopes we might discover “a line of blood between all of us on Turtle’s back” (169).

The first and longest part of this book, “Monahsetah,” is a little more uneven. Kenny’s relationship to this figure is a little more vexed and ambiguous, though he spent decades writing about her, too. She first came to the poet’s attention in Mari Sandoz’s 1953 bestseller *Cheyenne Autumn*, which reported that this daughter of a Cheyenne chief was captured in the 1868 Battle of Washita River, and later gave birth to a son by George Armstrong Custer. Historians disagree about this last part: Adrian Jawort (Northern Cheyenne) accepts written Cheyenne oral histories reporting that Monahsetah had Custer’s son and even that she was devoted to him; others believe that Custer was likely sterile from gonorrhea (Agonito 96). Monahsetah’s story has been written, indeed *overwritten*; since Sandoz’s book, google N-gram tells me, she has been periodically and enthusiastically taken up by settler historians captivated by that old trope of a complicit Indian princess (most recently and horrifyingly in a romance by Custer’s great-great-granddaughter).

Other writers, including Charlotte DeClue (Osage) have represented Monahsetah as a resistant, unwilling captive. Kenny certainly paints her that way, at least at first:

You ask why
did I not take my knife and rush it
into his belly allowing his enemy blood
to river into my people’s Oklahoma earth.

He called me to his bed.
 . . . I was his war treasure,
his hunk of gold, a pot of flesh. There was no escape. (2)

If Kenny found in Molly Brant a mother, he seems to have looked to Monahsetah for some kind of sister or twin. “In 1966,” he says, “I began looking for her, and somewhere along the way, I found myself” (15). His method of recounting this search is to alternate prose poems dated to the 1860s, imagining Monahsetah’s story, with pieces dated to the 1960s, charting his own political, aesthetic and sexual awakening. Kenny recalls reading Sandoz as he was returning home from a long stay in Mexico, and witnessing the violence of Vietnam, and suddenly grasping the global and temporal continuities of Indigenous people: “up and down two continents. . . a program of extermination of Indians”: “It took courage to truly observe the land of my birth where part of my blood was hated and the other part imported into a land knee-deep in genocide and bloody with racism, sexism and homophobia, blockades to liberty and happiness let alone sexual fulfillment” (4).

These pieces, then, evoke a sense of mixed-blood ambivalence and alienation perhaps more common to Native American literature and criticism of the late twentieth century than we tend to see in the present, more tribal-centric literary moment. Sometimes the parallels to Monahsetah’s

story in this vein are quite powerful; for instance, Kenny endows her with a political awakening of her own when she watches male Cheyenne leaders capitulate to plans to remove the tribe to Sand Creek: “When Monahsetah asked her father who the soldiers were protecting the people from, he could only shake his head that he did not know” (35).

Less comfortable are the poet’s attempts to represent this Cheyenne woman as chafing against ostensibly restrictive traditional gender roles: for instance, she deplores “the life of a common woman, the drudgery and slavery to lodge and husband” (10). One senses, perhaps, the queer poet’s own desire to depict and imagine tribal life outside of heteronormative patriarchy, but it’s hard to separate a passage like this from garden-variety stereotypes of Plains Indian women as “drudges.” It’s equally uncomfortable to read the intimate scenes with Custer, and the rape passages when Monahsetah is temporarily married to a Cheyenne husband against her wishes.

Monahsetah and Other Markings is edited by Chad Sweeney, Kenny’s student, friend and collaborator, and it would be fascinating to know exactly what his role was in editing and arranging these various pieces. He says that he worked with Kenny for over a year on this project, and that Kenny died while still working on those Custer sections. He was in too much physical pain to keep writing, and understandably “reluctant to guess at Monahsetah’s level of complicity” (v). Some parts of the Cheyenne sections do indeed feel rushed, like Kenny was hastening to make sense of everything he had read, written, thought and felt. The strongest sections—vintage Maurice Kenny, empathetically imaginative when it comes to depicting Indigenous women, history, and space—remind us that the subaltern does speak, but that we can never know whether heard her correctly:

Monahsetah went into story
long tales and short talks
probably imagined
perhaps a handful true
to a few facts of her breath (16, 125)

Indigenous writers from Craig Womack to Cheryl Savageau and countless others have paid Maurice Kenny due homage for his support of Indigenous literature, and for the gathering places he created at his Strawberry Press and the magazine *Contact/II*, as well as at his own home in Saranac Lake, New York. But where “the gathering place” is conceptualized as a place where Indigenous people have traditionally and continually regrouped, shared and exchanged, the “homing place” is Rachel Bryant’s way of trying to understand how Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have struggled to live together and to communicate across cultural, political and epistemological divides.

Bryant is a settler Canadian scholar, currently at Dalhousie University as a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council postdoctoral. Her book takes seriously sovereign treaty relationships between First Nations and Settler Canadians on every level—political, epistemological, cultural and literary. Writing is (or should be) an attempt to communicate across these many divides, but Bryant finds an invisible and too often impenetrable wall between Western imaginaries and Indigenous knowledge systems. In her reading, Anglo-Atlantic writing has built a “system of self-protection” that has sought to contain Indigenous geographies and

indeed Indigenous agency. Indigenous writings, she argues, have challenged and chipped away at those Western imaginaries, though Western readers have nevertheless managed to absorb those challenges, often remaining stubbornly unchanged by them.

Because Bryant reads regionally, with a focus on English-language writing on both sides of the US/Canadian border, she is able to unpack settler exceptionalisms in new ways. The homing place (continuous present) is a process, Bryant's revision of an influential theory of "home place" proposed by Gwendolyn Davies to apply to Maritime writing, one that will be familiar to scholars in American Studies as a gambit connecting place and identity. Where Davies theorized the "home place" as a trope that allowed settler writers to become Maritimers, feeling that they owned places as intellectual property, Bryant proposes *homing places*:

In the non-human world, homing is the process through which beings such as pigeons, lobsters, salmon, sea turtles, and butterflies navigate unfamiliar locales as they work to return to a state of familiarity. It is a process that only works in cooperation with all other forms of life; intrusive human-made elements, like pesticides and commercial ships, adversely affect the ability of insects and sea animals to receive crucial navigational cues from their surroundings. Of central importance to the process of homing, then, is the constant struggle to *receive* essential information across the various barriers and interruptions that have been systematically built into the everyday workings of the Western world's industrioscience culture. (27)

This lively construction suggests the broad interest of Bryant's study, touching on concerns common to Canadian, American and Indigenous Studies, as well as to Ecocriticism and the Environmental Humanities. Indeed, in one of her most innovative, *transmobile* chapters, she reads across Passamaquoddy territory, bisected today by the US/Canadian border, yet enduring in Indigenous people's lives and knowledge as a hom(ing) place, Peskotomuhkatik. Settlers on both sides of this border, she shows, have used maps, diplomatic and legislative documents, and histories to control access to Indigenous resources. At the same time, Indigenous people and the land itself have maintained their own opposing narratives of continuity--in oral traditions, wampum belts, and rock formations. For Bryant, understanding these conflicting positions is an ethical stance with ongoing urgency; as she writes in a later chapter, it "challenges Settlers, the direct beneficiaries of North American colonization, to consider for a moment that ours is not the only world and that the ground beneath our feet has a history and an identity that we have actively and anxiously hidden from ourselves" (181).

Three other chapters also examine the work of settler writers: John Gyles, a New England Puritan who wrote a captivity narrative about his years with the Maliseet people during King William's War; Anna Brownell Jameson, an English settler and nineteenth century feminist essayist; and Douglas Glover, whose 2003 novel *Elle* re-imagined the popular story of Marguerite de la Rocque, a sixteenth-century French noblewoman who was abandoned on an island during Jacques Cartier's final voyage to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Bryant shows how such writers, especially Gyles and Jameson, install their identities in settler space, disrupting Indigenous communities and "divest[ing] land of any pre-existing (or pre-contact) meanings or agency" (21). In Glover she finds a little more willingness to un-settle a sense of unitary imperial

identity. She calls this “cartographic dissonance,” as Glover’s protagonist gradually comes to apprehend, to *see* competing cultures and epistemologies located in the same geographic space.

The remaining two chapters turn to two Indigenous poets. Bryant reclaims the more famous of the two, Rita Joe (Mi’gmaq), from a tradition of literary criticism that has tended to frame her as a cultural mediator. This older way of reading Indigenous women was not uncommon in Native American and Indigenous literary criticism, especially during the 1990s, and Bryant’s insistence that Joe *challenges* settler violence and settler refusal to listen is refreshing and persuasive. Her chapter on Josephine Bacon (Innu), who is perhaps better known among Canadian/First Nations scholars than among Indigenous Studies scholars elsewhere, similarly shows how Indigenous writing counters colonial violence. This chapter situates Bacon’s poems squarely within Innu cultural history and tradition, reading them as alphabetic tshissinuatshitakana, or message sticks that reconnect Innu people with their unceded land.

The Homing Place is published by Wilfrid Laurier Press, which is producing intellectually groundbreaking, materially gorgeous books in Indigenous Studies. Their series, under the dynamic editorship of Deanna Reder (Cree-Metis), includes the excellent collections *Read, Listen, Tell* and *Learn, Teach, Challenge*; as well as Daniel Heath Justice’s much-anticipated *Why Indigenous Literatures Matter*. The generous, professional production given to *The Homing Place* is a wonder to behold: the typography and cover alone are stunners, but the book also gets a good number of plates to show off significant images like wampum belts. The real glory is the treatment given to a 1939 address written by Chief William Polchies: four full-page, full-color plates that reveal in extraordinary detail the birchbark on which Polchies wrote, the leather binding at the spine and the edges, and the fully legible text, first in English, then in Maliseet. These images powerfully underscore Bryant’s persuasive argument that the birchbark book is a “distinct Indigenous material form,” one that “evokes and engages the ‘place-world’ from whence [Polchies’s] diplomacy emerges, subsuming Settler Canadian relations, traditions and ruling structures under the necessarily higher authority of laws and practices that, for centuries, allowed the Maliseet people to use and care for their land” (15). At the level of scholarly content and visual production, this book could not be more beautifully done.

Siobhan Senier, University of New Hampshire

Agonito, Joseph. *Brave Hearts: Indian Women of the Plains*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.

DeClue, Charlotte. “To the Spirit of Monahsetah.” In Beth Brant, ed., *A Gathering of Spirit*. New York: Firebrand Books, 1988. pp. 52-54.

Jawort, Adrian. “Did Custer Have a Cheyenne Mistress and Son? Native Oral History Says Yes.” *Indian Country Media Network*, 1 Feb. 2017, <https://indiancountrymedianetwork.com/history/events/did-custer-have-a-cheyenne-mistress-and-son-native-oral-history-says-yes/>.

Kelly-Custer, Gail. *Princess Monahsetah: The Concealed Wife of General Custer*. Bloomington: Trafford Publishing, 2007.

Madsen, Deborah. "The Sovereignty of Transmotion in a State of Exception: Lessons from the Internment of 'Praying Indians' on Deer Island, Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1675-1676." *Transmotion* vol 1, no 1 (2015): 23-47.

Savageau, Cheryl. "Letter from the Editor [special issue memorializing Maurice Kenny]." *Dawnland Voices* Issue 4 (May 18, 2017). <https://dawnlandvoices.org/letter-from-the-editor/>

Womack, Craig. "The Spirit of Independence: Maurice Kenny's *Tekonwatonti/Molly Brant*." In Penelope M. Kelsey, ed., *Maurice Kenny: Celebrations of a Mohawk Writer*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2011. pp. 75-96.

Review Essay: Changing Debates in Museum Studies since NAGPRA

Titles under review:

W. Richard West. *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian: Museums and Native Cultures.* Washington: University of Washington Press, 2000. 119 pp. ISBN: 978-0295984599. <http://www.washington.edu/uwpress/search/books/WESCHA.html>

Maureen Matthews. *Naamiwan's Drum: the Story of a Contested Repatriation of Anishinaabe Artefacts.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016. 356 pp. ISBN: 978-1442650152. <https://utorontopress.com/us/naamiwan-s-drum-2>

Chip Colwell. *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017. 336 pp. ISBN: 9780226298993. <http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/P/bo21358784.html>

Cultural politics after NAGPRA (the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) have generated a flurry of scholarly and public interest in indigenous affairs all over North America since the act was passed in USA in 1990. Covering more than simply burials, exhumations and repatriations, this historic piece of legislation was meant to provide a framework for re-assessing power imbalances between museums and indigenous North American communities, which for many decades were left out of even the most basic decisions about the fate of their cultural heritage lying in museums, storage facilities, and research laboratories. The three books here reviewed together offer an interesting snapshot of the historical contingencies that characterised subsequent phases of public and academic debates surrounding issues of repatriation, ethics of museum display, and the private/public face of these intricate matters in the period after NAGPRA, which in these volumes covers over forty years. Each of them, in its distinctive way, addresses key questions about the multiple, and often clashing, interests of the many players involved in legal negotiations and museum practice, actors who are ultimately driven by very different priorities, values, ethical principles, and distinct perspectives on the world of humans and their relationships to things.

The first of the three to be published is *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian* (2000), which focuses on images and representations, a concern typical of canonical Cultural Studies approaches of the 1990s. The second is *Namiwaan's Drum* (2016), which deals with the controversial repatriation of a ritual object to a band of Canadian Ojibwe, and the third and final one, *Plundered Skulls* (2017), concerns the politics of repatriation of both human remains and cultural objects from the perspective of an anthropologist directly involved in negotiations. The last two books radically move away from the Cultural Studies model to fully embrace anthropological theory (*Namiwaan's Drum*), and what could be a scholarly version of investigative journalism (*Plundered Skulls*).

The strategies each book takes to talk about these topics are substantially different in style, genre, and pitch. The older one is an edited collection of essays that provides an overview of different regional cases interspersed with essays of more general, and introductory nature. The

second is a solid ethnography of a repatriation case in one of Canada’s several Ojibwe bands that is strongly rooted in new theoretical and methodological approaches. The third, and most recent monograph, is an account of four cases of repatriation from different indigenous North American communities that rests on more modest theoretical premises – in fact one could say that is mostly descriptive, but instructive nonetheless.

Going chronologically, *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian* gathers papers from the homonymous symposium that happened in 1995 at the NMAI, and it is divided into six chapters. It has an introduction by Richard West (Cheyenne) former Director of the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI), and an afterword by Professor Richard Hill Sr. (Tuscarora) (who interestingly is not mentioned in the front page index!). Some of the essays are by indigenous authors such as curator James Nason (Comanche), member of the board of directors of the Warm Springs Museum Janice Clements (Warm Springs), and Director of the Mille Lacs Indian Museum Joycelyn Wedll (Ojibwe). The remaining papers are by non-indigenous contributors such as established curator of American Indian art David Penney, former director of Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia Professor Michael Ames (who died in 2006), and former director of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts Evan Maurer (retired in 2005).

Essays in this collection are different in length, thematic scope, and regional coverage. The book starts with a foray into visual representations of American Indians in a conventional historical trajectory that much owes to previous illustrious studies by Chiappelli, Honour, and Berkhofer, and optimistically ends with the hope that the future will take Indians outside the cabinets of curiosities, which as transpires between the lines, do not seem to be too different from museums, after all. Each of the essays has its own unique intellectual gravitas. Some papers are longer and more academic, others are short and descriptive. Seen as a collection, these contributions result as the product of a distinct historical period dominated, as it was, by the Cultural Studies paradigm. So issues of perception and representation, topical between the mid-90s through the mid-2000s, feature prominently as the guiding principles of this collection edited by the very museum in which the original symposium took place. Undoubtedly useful for the cases included in the discussion, the book exposes to the wider public concerns and ideas about now not-so-new perspectives on museology, with a deliberate emphasis on indigenous North American cultures. Examples from the Plateau region (Clements) and the Great Lakes (Wedll) fluctuate between more speculative chapters, some of which indicate how provocative questions advanced by these thinkers about issues that were relevant in the mid-90s paved the way for new themes that in later years would become as controversial and topical as the public debates on representations had been in previous decades. Michael Ames for instance alarmingly asked in his essay ‘What happens to museums when their objects becomes the speaking subject?’ Surely referring actual human persons, Native Americans as the focus of scientific enquiry, this question aimed at recovering the presence of real people behind the things that helped create cultural representations.

In an almost prophetic mode, Ames’s question anticipated the move towards a distinctively indigenous cultural activism that now presents museum professionals with an analogous question, perhaps yet more disconcerting for institutions. It is a question that, while putting “things in museums” again as the focus of enquiry, does not so much envisage them as objects of

study, but rather as active agents within negotiations. This is the idea that thoroughly permeates the second book here considered, Maureen Matthews' *Naamiwan's Drum: the Story of a Contested Repatriation of Anishinabe Artefacts*, published by University of Toronto Press sixteen years after the publication of the first but almost twenty years after the very first symposium conversations took place that eventually ended up in the NMAI book.

Naamiwan's Drum is a compelling *tour de force* across the difficult theoretical terrain that sits within the boundaries of anthropology's most recently discussed ideas: the animacy of things, and the ways in which this concept may relate to notions of personhood and agency in art circles and museums alike. Evidently proficient in navigating anthropology's intricate arguments on the matter, the author (a journalist turned anthropologist) skilfully interweaves theory with a detailed account of the adventures of an Ojibwe drum once used in the *Midewiwin* ceremonies in the nineteenth century. Aided by Ojibwe texts, Matthews builds a case for the necessity of anthropological fieldwork in museum dealings regarding repatriation. Bringing into the discussion linguistic data through translations and lengthy explanations of Ojibwe cosmological principles about animacy, action, and volition, she lodges her treatment of this complex case study in firm ethnographic evidence taking readers on a captivating journey through the various phases of what could be rightfully regarded as a *cause célèbre* of repatriation of cultural property in North America.

What this book does excellently is to uncover in subtle ways how objects *are* actors in the drama of repatriation whether one takes a First Nations' perspective or not. Readers need not be persuaded by the argument, promoted by some Indigenous groups, that things have agency, but Maureen Matthews' composed style guides us to reflect on the effects that objects have on real life situations whether one believes that drums 'choose to go home', or are taken back by human actors. Although the thorny issue of philosophical incompatibilities and the (im)possibility of building bridges between different ontologies and epistemologies outlined in this book may stay with us for a long time, the book demonstrates the relevance of fine-grained research for the recovery of dignity and pride for disenfranchised groups whose cultural heritage may reside in what Euro-American parlance are called things. The recovery of indigenous epistemologies and ontologies discussed in *Namiwaan's Drum* is just one step among the many needed to recuperate a sense of control over community lives promoted by the proverbial notion of 'self-determination' first uttered in the mid-70s under Nixon's policies, and then further endorsed by the following presidents. What this book also does is to follow the invitation of a new strand of anthropology associated with the so called 'ontological turn'; it takes indigenous views and perspectives seriously, and encourages all its readers to do the same. This is an imperative that come through very strongly in Matthews' book, one that re-orientates once again anthropological practice, this time towards a new engagement with ethical issues.

Several of these issues are taken up by the third and last book published of the three. This volume addresses these current museological concerns through a passionate engagement with human remains, living statues, and once again, the utterly confused category of what most of us call 'objects'. *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture* takes the reader on a journey in time and space to appreciate the intricacy of repatriation claims, at once singular and universal. The singularity of each of the four cases brought to bear to the author's arguments is indicative of the very different views in different tribes on what

repatriation is actually *for*. Going from the Southwest to the Northwest, and from the Plains to the Southeast, Chip Colwell (curator of anthropology at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science) recounts with systematic precision the events that eventually led to the repatriation of distinct items to various indigenous communities. The cases chosen to illustrate Native North Americans’ universal concern with repatriation are: the so-called Zuni War Gods; a prestigious Tlingit blanket; Native scalps from the Great Plains; and a prehistoric skull from Florida. Clearly supportive of the claims, Colwell calls for a respectful treatment of both people (whether dead or still living), and ‘things’, which also in this book once again emerge as more than passive objects. One of the most significant contributions of the volume is its capacity to persuade outside observers that objects that are often seen as mere things are in fact bursting with life. Their power for Native Americans should thus not be underestimated in order to honour Indigenous peoples’ right to culture, and in order to offer them and their relatives a respectful, dignified, and humane treatment.

While generally sympathetic, the author presents the cases with detached objectivity, giving insightful and useful information about each instance treated in the book. Each example benefits from additional supporting material from other repatriation cases, which helps readers to contextualise the dealings in the broader framework. Overall the book is easy to read, and is accessible to a wide audience that is not accustomed to following intricate scholarly arguments. It may, on the other hand, have a very deep emotional impact, especially among those who are not familiar with Euro-American cruel, brutal, and discriminatory attitudes that have tinted much of the history of their relationships with Native Americans. Without ever descending into sensationalistic tones, the author exposes delicate facts about massacres, beliefs, desecrations, and illegal activities, deploying evidence with a measured distance that is difficult to argue against. Native American voices are given plenty of space to support their cases. They emerge as strong and determined and this is what the author wants use to perceive as a way to sensitise the public to the deep ethical implications that these, like many other cases, present us with.

All three books essentially touch upon moral and philosophical questions about agency, authority, and communication. What may be interesting, and perhaps intriguing for some readers, is that two of these books expand commonsensical ideas about these three themes, including in the discussion objects as actors. Especially the two most recent publications make abundantly clear that in indigenous North American communities objects are often seen as living entities rather than inert matter. This perspective, while paramount for claimants from the source communities, may not necessarily be adopted by museum professionals and academics working with Native North Americans. Yet, as it becomes clear reading *Plundered Skulls* and *Naamiwan’s Drum*, museum directors and curators now have to be aware of this crucial aspect of the relationship between Native Americans and what those specialists might think of as ‘objects,’ in order to conduct effectively negotiations with indigenous groups in the new regime created after NAGPRA. The three books overall convey that the new state of affairs, while generating the conditions for fresh approaches to intercultural communication, is also the source of intense debate, one that can be frequently tinted by heartfelt reactions from both sides. Luckily, at least one of the three books (*Naamiwan’s Drum*) avoids facile polarizations, by presenting the multiplicity of voices that make up the cacophony of positions taken by the many individual and institutional actors involved in the debates over objects’ repatriation. Although different

viewpoints are obvious in the other two books, the implications these have for negotiations are left more implicit, whereas in *Naamiwan's Drum* they are the core of the matter.

Irrespective of the level of explicitness of such arguments, one could say that all three books are fundamentally about the status that things and persons, however loosely conceptualised, have in museums. *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian* however stands in stark contrast to the two later books because its treatment of things is firmly articulated around the idea that objects are functions of cultural representations, or at best metaphors, or symbols for other places and times (Penney). Early conversation of the role of objects in museums did not touch upon the animacy of objects, possibly because research about this fundamental aspect of Native philosophies had not been thoroughly investigated, and certainly was outside Cultural Studies' main concerns and expertise. It took academia and museums years to absorb the lessons derived from anthropological work on these matters, and the latter volumes show the effects of this important shift on twenty-first century's cultural climate.

Whatever areas these early debates left untouched, they were historically necessary. Postcolonial critiques of museum approaches to things came from literary and Cultural Studies that ultimately interpreted cultural facts as texts to be decoded along power axes that operate on the continuum between hegemonic and subaltern positions. As a result, the *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian*, recently reissued by the University of Washington Press, now reads and feels like it belongs to a former period in which criticism centred round notions of representations and resistance, one that however tended to polarise positions in antagonistic competitions over the right name and represent. As such, this book should now be treated as a document of, or as reference for, the historical developments of repatriation debates over its long history.

Although sharing the overarching theme of things in museums, the three books provide different perspectives of what a 'thing' is and does, and this is probably the most significant contribution to museological literature produced today. Whereas things in *The Changing Presentation* are instrumental in eliciting questions about the authority to speak for entire communities and worldviews, in the two later books things are understood in their ontological complexities across linguistic registers and worldviews. Readers will learn that whether displayed or reclaimed, perceived as things or 'other-than-human' beings, objects are the main characters in the three books' stories. Two of the books (*Plundered Skulls*, and *Naamiwan's Drum*), explicitly make the theme of objects' agency and personhood the core of their most poignant arguments about repatriation, ethics, and conservation. Upon reflection, what is at stake for all the three is the ability of certain arguments to convince, and in so doing, to allow the wider public to understand indigenous peoples' world views and perspectives on material culture, heritage, and more specifically what Euro-Americans understand as objects. If properly contextualised, these three volumes can lift Native North American world views from epistemological oblivion to the limelight of intense philosophical ponderings common nowadays among museum curators, directors, and conservators dealing with indigenous communities. Truly, if we see the three books together as signposts of historical changes in museums' attention to indigenous claims, we can see their collective value as opposed to what they can each contribute to the current debates in their own right. Seen in chronological perspective, the cases described in the three books mark subsequent epistemological shifts by means of salient examples from Zuni requests for their

sacred items in the 1970's (*Plundered Skulls*), to *Naamiwan's Drum's* monographic treatment of a divisive dispute over ritual implement between different Ojibwe groups in the mid-2000s.

In highlighting different viewpoints, rhetorical strategies, discursive, and epistemological domains embraced by the various constituencies, the three books not only put in sharp focus the difficulties in entertaining efficient inter-cultural communication, but underline the crucial issue of fragmentation of knowledge, authority, cultural competence, and language proficiency among indigenous constituencies. What surfaces from the reading of these books is that far from being homogeneous entities, tribes, linguistic groups, and urban communities are extremely diverse. What the books highlight however, is that repatriation claims and controversies over the treatment of indigenous cultural material are further complicated by the uneven perceptions of the same matters among museum specialists. The different levels of accommodation of repatriation claims by various institutions is, in fact, evident in *Plundered Skulls*. What is more, and this is probably one of the most relevant points for all the three books, each constituency holds a different view on what museums are and they are supposed to do. This obviously has implications for museum policies and protocols, which ideally ought to be flexible enough to be able to contingently adapt to the multiplicity of scenarios presented by the extreme heterogeneity of indigenous communities. In addition to being a warning to museum practitioners, consultants, and collectors, the three books collectively stress the role of indigenous agency in reshaping decision making processes over the repatriation of objects. Or, readers are left to wonder, is it the objects themselves that are now finally asking ‘to go back home’?

Max Carocci, Goldsmith's College

Cheryl Suzack. *Indigenous Women's Writing and the Cultural Study of Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017. 208 pp. ISBN: 978-1442628588.

<https://utorontopress.com/us/indigenous-women-s-writing-and-the-cultural-study-of-law-2>.

As an Indigenous attorney, I work within the boundaries of the law. Even when crafting unique and novel legal arguments, I am still situated in the dominant society's discourse about law, rights, and governance. The principles of precedent and *stare decisis* still hold great weight in the approach of the legal profession to social problems. Thus, I am challenged and intrigued by Cheryl Suzack's *Indigenous Women's Writing and the Cultural Study of Law*. Suzack's approach to legal principles and indigenous feminisms offers liberating and forward-thinking approach to justice for Native women. By exploring how Indigenous women articulate conceptions of justice in storytelling, Suzack transcends the typical critiques of anti-Indian jurisprudence and offers a fresh perspective on landmark judicial decisions. As such, her project touches on a wide variety of academic disciplines and activist communities. This monograph should be required reading for anyone interested in gender and law.

As Suzack explains in Chapter 2, "Literary texts question legal appropriations by articulating the gender injustice that follows from legal reasoning..." (49). Thus, Suzack uses literary analysis to present cogent critiques of four cases. Suzack's project is divided into four main chapters, each with a focus on one court case and a corresponding novel authored by an indigenous woman. By juxtaposing the judicial decision-making with the fictional texts, Suzack offers novel ways to critique the judicial decision that often aren't part of typical legal critique. The pairings and alignments are illuminating. Even those already intimately familiar with the cases will find themselves challenged to re-think their common assumptions.

In Chapter 1, *Gendering the Politics of Tribal Sovereignty*, Suzack tackles one of the thorniest United States Indian law cases of the 20th century – *Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez* (1978). The *Martinez* case is widely celebrated as a victory for tribal nations in the United States, because it articulated a clear principle of tribal sovereignty and preserved the right of tribal nations to make citizenship decisions without federal interference. For many Native women, however, the substantive result of the decision is devastating. Julia Martinez was a citizen of the Santa Clara Pueblo who challenged the Pueblo's patrilineal rules for citizenship. Her children, fathered by her Navajo husband, were denied citizenship in the Pueblo because they did not have a Santa Clara father. In her appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, Martinez argued that the Pueblo citizenship law violated her (and her children's) constitutional rights to due process and equal protection. The Supreme Court rejected her arguments, holding that tribal nations cannot be sued in federal court for alleged violations of the Indian Civil Rights Act. The Court also noted that issues such as "tribal custom and tradition" (e.g. citizenship laws) should fall under the exclusive purview of tribal nations. In many Federal Indian law texts, this case is represented as a rare "victory" for tribal nations and that concludes the story. Suzack, through her critical reading of Leslie Marmon Silko's 1977 novel *Ceremony*, problematizes the outcome of the *Martinez* case through the lens of a "dignity-based consciousness" (21) for Indigenous women. Because the *Martinez* decision prioritizes tribal sovereignty over gender discrimination, many Native women's voices on the outcome have largely been silenced. A major theme in Silko's *Ceremony* concerns the "legally enforced social disability" (36) of Native women. Silko's novel

beautifully articulates how the disenfranchisement of Indigenous women presents a direct threat to the existence of tribal nations. By exploring Silko's prose, Suzack is able to push back against dominant narrative that *Martinez* was the correct result because it purported to protect tribal sovereignty. Suzack challenges us to understand *Martinez* as a case that failed Native women which, in turn, has significant implications for tribal survivance. This insight encourages the reader to think critically about the interconnection between Native women and tribal sovereignty. Instead of adopting the mainstream "tribal sovereignty above all else" discourse, Suzack skillfully argues that recognition of Native women is not something to be sacrificed on the federal altar. In doing so, she encourages the reader to remember that recognition and dignity of Native women is the foundation of tribal sovereignty and self-determination.

Chapter Two, *The Legal Silencing of Indigenous Women*, considers the decision of *Racine v. Woods*, a Canadian case, alongside Beatrice Culleton Mosioner's fictional autobiography, *In Search of April Raintree*, both published in 1983. *Racine v. Woods* is a troubling case about child custody, in which an Indigenous woman, Linda Jean Woods, permanently lost custody of her seven-year-old daughter in part because of perceptions of Woods' "bad choices" and "false consciousness." *Racine v. Woods* represents a disconcerting approach to tribal custody decisions because the Canadian Court elevated the abstract "best interests of the child" over the fundamental importance of raising Indigenous children within Indigenous communities. Mosioner's autobiographical character, April, likewise suffers through several of the common tribulations of Indigenous women and girls – including out-adoption, foster care and sexual assault. Suzack draws parallels between April and the litigant Linda Jean Woods, exploring how the Western legal system simultaneously exploits and dismisses their testimonies as Indigenous women. For both Woods and April, Western courts "create the conditions of social segregation" by cruelly separating families and denying the collective rights of Indigenous women. Suzack's masterful treatment of this topic illustrates the ways that colonial violence continues to be ubiquitous in the courts of the conqueror.

Chapter Three, *Colonial Governmentality and Gender Violence*, combines a somewhat lesser-known case, *Minnesota v. Zay Zah* (1977) with Louise Erdrich's 1998 novel *The Antelope Wife*. Building on the themes from prior chapters, Suzack artfully explores how land dispossession has cogent gender implications that are often ignored in mainstream legal discourse. *Minnesota v. Zay Zah* in the dominant narrative, represented a victory for a tribal citizen whose ancestor's allotment had been illegally forfeited to the state of Minnesota. Embedded within the litigation, however, the question of blood quantum was central – because the United States government had attempted to craft different rules for "full-bloods" and "mixed-blood" Indians. Blood quantum was created by the colonial government as a primary way to separate bodies from land. As Suzack notes, the case illuminated the "failure of the federal government to safeguard Indigenous peoples' land rights..." and exposed the widespread, outright theft of Indian lands in the early 20th century. Suzack's connection of the case to Erdrich's novel is not as strong as the first two chapters (in part because gender is not a direct component of the *Zay Zah* case), but does allow her to explore how dispossession (in all its forms) disparately affects Indigenous women. *The Antelope Wife* tells the story of a family of Ojibwa women who are physically and psychologically displaced through colonial violence over the course of many decades, which nearly severs their familial and social ties. Like colonial blood quantum rules, violence committed against Indigenous women threatens the very fabric of tribal societies by denying Indigenous people their rightful cultural inheritance. The journey of the characters in the novel to

regain cultural continuity form the basis for Suzack's poignant assertion that "...it is only through acceptance and integration rather than separation and denial that women are able to recover a sense of their inheritances and intergenerational community relations." (97).

The final chapter, *Land Claims, Identity Claims* continues the discussion of the White Earth experience by exploring how a failed challenge to the 1986 White Earth Land Settlement Act (WELSA) spearheaded by acclaimed Native activist Winona LaDuke, represented the continuation of colonial entanglements with land and law. Chapter 4 is not as cohesive as the prior three chapters, in part because Suzack uses this chapter to more fully explicate what she means by an "indigenous standpoint" feminist perspective (a section which is well-crafted and argued). The legal text centered in this chapter is the 1991 *Manypenny v. United States* case that denied a challenge to the WELSA, which Suzack situates alongside LaDuke's novel *Last Standing Woman*. This pairing is perhaps the most cogent in the book because LaDuke was a primary plaintiff in the *Manypenny* case. *Manypenny* represents, for many a complete failure of the federal justice system to remedy the historical injustices done to the White Earth people. Instead of returning the stolen land to the rightful heirs of the allottees, WELSA authorized nominal payments for the stolen land in order to settle the legal uncertainty that arose in the aftermath of the *Zay Zah* case. The *Manypenny* plaintiffs sought to challenge the legal framework established by WELSA by seeking to recover the disputed land instead of accepting payment, but their claims were denied. *Last Standing Woman* introduces gender into the story of dispossession by developing female characters who, despite being victims of horrific violence, establish community connections through a shared vision of collective responsibility for the land. By employing a trans-historical narrative, LaDuke artfully establishes White Earth as a sacred homeland – not a mere "remnant of the treaty process". The novel thus serves as the literary antidote to the *Manypenny* decision. It also offers a vision of contemporary movement-building through "mutual respect and cultural obligation."

Early in Chapter 2, Suzack presents a profoundly provocative question: "To what extent can Indigenous women turn to law to fulfill their expectations of justice when law and its social consequences have been the source of their disentanglement and oppression?" (51). As an Indigenous feminist lawyer trained in the American legal system, this question is unsettling. But after reading Suzack's finely crafted monograph, I am left with a sense of hope and gratitude for what Indigenous feminist literature can teach us about the quest for justice, which often takes place far from the courthouse doors.

Sarah Deer, University of Kansas

Deanna Reder and Linda M. Morra, eds. *Learn, Teach, Challenge: Approaching Indigenous Literatures*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier, 2016. 485 pp. ISBN: 9781771121859.

<https://www.wlupress.wlu.ca/Books/L/Learn-Teach-Challenge>

In *Learn, Teach, Challenge: Approaching Indigenous Literatures*, editors Deanna Reder (Cree/Métis) and Linda M. Morra take on the extensive project of assembling a critical introduction to Canadian Indigenous literary studies. Their anthology brings together major figures in North American Indigenous literary criticism such as Janice Acoose (Saulteaux), Emma LaRocque (Métis), Gerald Vizenor (Anishinaabe), and Craig Womack (Creek/Cherokee) while introducing emerging scholars like Niigaanwewidam Sinclair (Anishinaabe), Qwo-Li Driskill (Cherokee), and Keavy Martin. The anthology offers a rigorous introduction to Indigenous literary studies, with a particular concern for pedagogical interventions providing a jumping-off point for contemporary and ongoing discussions within Indigenous literary, political, and cultural scholarship.

Reder and Morra separate *Learn, Teach, Challenge* into five key approaches that oscillate around the modes of inquiry captured in the book's title. They organize the first of these sections around critical positioning, recognizing the importance of acknowledging one's position in relation to place and Indigenous presence in scholarship and critical movements. Many of the writers in the "Position" section express their investment to communities as scholars, teachers, and thinkers. The selected pieces the importance of articulating the relationship of scholars to their work and their role in academia or literary discourse writ large, as in Janice Acoose's "Iskwewak Kah' Ki Yaw Ni Wahkomakanak: Re-memembering Being to Signifying Female Relations." Acoose weaves her experience as a Nehiowe-Metis and Anishinaabe woman brought to the Cowessess Residential School into her later resistance in university classrooms to dominant settler narratives of Canadian literary history. Through her experience, Acoose found "that literature and books are powerful political tools," encouraging "students to read critically and with an awareness of their own cultural position" (33). As Acoose and the section as a whole remind us, as scholars of Indigenous literature—whether Indigenous or non-Indigenous—we would be well-served to consider our position in relation to the works we are reading and teaching, to the debates we are bringing into our classes, and most importantly to the peoples and places we are thinking and writing about, even from what may seem a textual or historical distance.

The second section, "Imagining Beyond Images and Myths," makes a critical intervention often necessary in non-Indigenous literary survey courses by bringing together several texts that challenge the stereotypical images of Indigenous peoples that came to dominate literary canons. The first essay in the section is the oldest publication in the book: Kanien'kehá:ka writer E. Pauline Johnson's "A Strong Race Opinion: On the Indian Girl in Modern Fiction," in which she makes a call for cultural specificity in the late 19th century that still resonates today. Reder and Morra note the preponderance of critical work that identifies and challenges stereotypes, but they emphasize texts that theorize Indigenous alternatives, such as Gerald Vizenor's seminal "Postindian Warriors," rather than those that simply call out racist images. The section therefore equips students and teachers to move their inquiry into images and myths of Indigeneity beyond simply calling out stereotypes, opening a productive discourse into the ways that Indigenous

writers and thinkers actively resist these images and claim a radical presence in the literary and representational world.

In “Deliberating Indigenous Literary Approaches,” the third section of the anthology, Natalie Knight (Yurok/Diné) distills a set of key questions that have served as the foundation Indigenous literary criticism:

What is the relationship of Indigenous literature to Indigenous politics? What is the relationship between an ethics of reading and writing and a politics of engaging with community? How do we, as Indigenous or non-Indigenous scholars, “‘present ourselves’ to our communities as whole persons” [...] within the economic, political, social, and spiritual realities of settler colonialism? How is our art and criticism accountable, and to whom? And what are some methodologies that do justice to living relationships, history, *and* the future? (222)

Responding to these questions, the section includes debates over the utility of Western philosophical or theoretical frameworks to reading Indigenous literatures, critiques of representing Indigeneity on national or pan-Indigenous terms in scholarship, and approaches to scholarly ethics. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson’s “Gdi-nweninaa: Our Sound, Our Voice” demonstrates the importance for Indigenous scholars to ground their approaches in the specific teachings of their communities and languages. Simpson shares four Nishnaabeg perspectives “to deepen our understandings of decolonization, assimilation, resistance, and resurgence from within” these perspectives, a process that centers Indigeneity in approaches to scholarly ethics, careful critiques, and conscious engagement with the ideas and stories of others (289).

The spirit of this foundational section carries into the fourth: “Contemporary Concerns,” a section that offers a snapshot of major concerns in First Nations scholarship in its current moment, including reconciliation, appropriately representing narratives of Murdered or Missing Indigenous Women, Indigenous two-spirit and gender studies, and political resurgence. Presenting such a section as “contemporary” immediately raises questions of limitation for the anthology in terms of future movements in the field. Nonetheless, offering such a section and defining it as “contemporary” speaks to the editors’ sense of responsibility to a pedagogical project that models engagement with contemporary issues. As in each of the other sections, “Contemporary Concerns” depicts the ways Indigenous studies is dynamic, more so than many other literary fields: continuously articulating the stakes of Indigenous writing in the 21st century, advancing often radical decolonial projects, and upholding expectations of attending to community responsibly.

The fifth section, “Classroom Considerations,” presents commissioned essays on pedagogy, beginning with the difficult question of whether or not certain texts should be taught at all, which reminds teachers to acknowledge their position and familiarize themselves with protocol in their discourse community and in the communities tied to texts. Other essays in the section engage alternative genre and media possibilities for teaching Indigenous literature and media. Expanding the boundaries of what “counts” as a text in a literary classroom is an ongoing endeavor, one that Reder and Morra attend to but could even more substantively draw out in regards to visual or aural media. As the final section demonstrates, the anthology provides a working foundation

with a set of approaches to teaching and thinking about Indigenous texts, but at no point is it a manual for teaching Indigenous literatures. I see this as an important characteristic of the collection. To presume that there is or should be a prescribed way to teach (beyond recognizing protocol and being aware of one's critical positioning) would contradict the rich debates and diverse perspectives brought together in the collection. Those voices and perspectives *are* the offering; they are the best instruction for thoughtful teachers.

Even so, the editors and contributors open each section with an articulation of their organizing rationale, pointing out key interventions by the scholars and theorists whose work populates the sections. This consideration makes the anthology accessible on multiple levels: those looking for a brief overview of the field can read these introductory overviews and selections from some or all of the sections and come away with important perspectives on scholarly discussions and practices. Those looking to substantively engage the material—such as those designing a course or planning a discussion of Indigenous literary scholarship—will find a deliberate, thorough immersion into prescient perspectives and debates over the last quarter century and beyond. Finally, the anthology stands as a rigorous and very useful introduction to First Nations literary criticism for scholars outside Canada. Such was my encounter with the anthology—as a U.S. based student of Indigenous literatures, I have noticed an absence of Indigenous theory and criticism from north of the U.S.-Canada settler border in the bibliographies that I come across. This anthology opens a door to a field of scholarship that is at once in dialogue with and a part of the discourses more familiar to U.S.-based students.

Given the often overlapping historical, political, and economic issues that Indigenous literary studies on both sides of the U.S./Canada border take up, the anthology brings together voices and perspectives that have seemed separate for far too long. This move serves as a reminder of the long-standing relationships between Indigenous nations on both sides of that interruptive settler border; it therefore makes sense to turn to critical anthologies like *Learn, Teach, Challenge* at a period when the field is turning toward the global. This turn, I found, was absent from this anthology; while some essays make explicit moves toward Indigenous globality, such as Kateri Akiwenzie-Damm's "Erotica, Indigenous Style," the collection itself does not address the emerging field of global Indigenous Studies. As the anthology looks semi-hemispherically at Indigenous literary criticism in its contemporary moment, the next step, in my mind, is to pivot from the hemispheric to the global, a move that will bring these many strong voices and the field into a greater position as a major critical discourse.

In my estimation, however, *Learn, Teach, Challenge* succeeds at perhaps its most pertinent goal: to provide a solid foundation for teachers outside the field of Indigenous studies who wish to include Indigenous literature in their classes. In its organization and contents, the anthology offers specific ethical guidelines and approaches to protocols (not protocols themselves) regarding how, why, and whether certain texts and issues should be approached in a classroom environment. Following Reder and Morra's thoughtful organization and collation, the book is a resource that can help prevent the problems that come from mishandling, misrepresenting, or tokenizing Indigenous texts in literature classrooms. As Reder puts it, Indigenous literature, when approached properly:

might inspire you to search for wisdom and to value humility as you take on the responsibilities involved in making meaning; to integrate contemporary concerns into

your analysis and pedagogy throughout the process, because there is no literature today that is as relevant to general society as that by Indigenous authors (3)

Reder and Morra offer this anthology as a way to facilitate positive representation and inclusion of Indigenous texts and to foster solidarity in university settings that have historically marginalized Indigenous voices. Their offering is a valuable contribution to the field for teachers and students alike, for those extensively familiar with or new to the rich discourses of Indigenous literary studies. For teachers and readers looking to approach Indigenous literatures ethically and productively, *Learn, Teach, Challenge* will make an invaluable resource.

Alexander Cavanaugh, University of Oregon

Leanne Betasamosake Simpson. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017. 320 pp. ISBN 978-1-5179-0386-2.

<https://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/as-we-have-always-done>.

Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar, writer, and artist Leanne Betasamosake Simpson's latest book continues the work of *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence* in articulating and recentering Indigenous radical resurgence. *As We Have Always Done* holds Indigenous freedom as a guiding vision and manifesto, initially posing the brilliantly human question "what does it mean for me, as an Nishnaabekwe, to live freedom?" (7). Simpson goes on to detail the powerfully complex and multifaceted relational, ethical, reciprocal, procedural, and embodied answers that come from a deep engagement with Nishnaabewin, the "lived expression of Nishnaabeg intelligence" (25) or Nishnaabeg ways of being, and Biiskabiyang, the decolonial, resurgent, and embodied processes of return, reengagement, reemergence, and unfolding from the inside out. In her own words, "This is a manifesto to create networks of reciprocal resurgent movements with other humans and nonhumans radically imagining their ways out of domination, who are not afraid to let those imaginings destroy the pillars of settler colonialism" (10). Simpson recenters Indigenous political resistance, not as a response to the settler colonial state, but instead as an act and process of Indigenous nation-building.

Simpson enacts Nishnaabewin in her writing by reinscribing kwe (woman within a spectrum of gender variance) as method, refusing to separate body and life from research or "be tamed by whiteness or the academy" (33). The knowledge she shares is generated from different practices than those centered in the academy. She instead centers Nishnaabewin knowledge generated through the kinetics of place-based practices that produce both heart and mind intelligence. She seamlessly weaves together Nishnaabeg stories, teachings from her Elders Doug Williams and Edna Manitowabi, lived experiences and realities, relationality to other Indigenous theorists, and examples of resurgence. In this way, the experience of reading is cyclical and generative as ideas appear, reappear, and overlap in various contexts and modes in relationship to each other, navigating the reader through interconnected networks of Nishnaabewin knowledge.

Through this journey, two main principles of Indigenous radical resurgence emerged for me: the practice of reciprocal recognition and the practice of generative refusal. Reciprocal recognition starts with knowing and expressing "who we are" (67) as Nishnaabeg and Indigenous peoples, through Nishnaabewin and grounded normativity. Simpson recurrently draws upon Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard's concept of grounded normativity as a procedural, lived, and engaged nation and place-based ethical framework. From this place of internal and grounded intelligence and ethics, Simpson presents a simple but radical act of love when she advocates for collective reciprocal self-recognition: "the act of making it a practice to see another's light and to reflect that light back to them" (184). This act of reflection and recognition becomes a radical tool of resistance in the context of settler colonialism, because colonialism strategically employs shame as a mode of dispossession.

One of the most powerful images of recognition that Simpson puts forth in the book comes from her “favourite part” of Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson’s work *Mohawk Interuptus*, where Audra interviews a fellow Mohawk about his definition of community membership. His response is simply, “When you look in the mirror, what do you see?” “Genius,” Simpson remarks (179). The image of the mirror reminded me of work done on settler colonial cognitive imperialism and the insidious effects of shame on Indigenous self-identification within colonial structures and institutions, particularly in education. James Sákéj Youngblood Henderson describes the effect of Eurocentric education on Indigenous students as “the realization of their invisibility [...] similar to looking into a lake and not seeing their images” (59). This also echoes what Adrienne Rich has famously described as *physic disequilibrium*, “as if you looked in a mirror and saw nothing” (199). In a complete refusal of the position of victim, Simpson, instead of merely looking for a reflection, embodies the whole mirror: “So at the same time I am looking into the mirror, I also am the mirror” (181). I will assume that Simpson would also advocate for reclaiming the whole lake as part of an intact Indigenous land base, where grounded normativity and Nishnaabewin emerge from and are practiced on. She asks, “What if the driving force in Indigenous politics is self-recognition rather than a continual race around the hamster wheel of settler colonial recognition?” (180).

Refusing settler colonial recognition becomes integral to radical resurgence because, as Simpson explains, colonialism begins from a want for land, but materializes in a series of complex and overlapping processes that maintain expansive dispossession of Indigenous bodies and lands (45). In Nishnaabeg thought the opposite of dispossession is not possession, but consensual attachment – reestablishing reciprocal recognition, reconnecting to networks of relationships to the land, and reenacting Indigenous relationality and thought. Refusing dispossession through attachment generates the alternative to capitalist, white supremacist and heteropatriarchal state control beyond the structures of that control.

This brings us to the second main principle, the embodied act of generative refusal: refusal to participate in colonial structures and processes, and stepping outside or simply leaving as resistance. Through various interwoven threads, Simpson shares the Nishnaabeg story of the Hoof Nation leaving Nishnaabeg territory in reaction to being disrespected and overhunted. They retreat in order to recover, and rebuild before renegotiating terms of treaty with the Nishnaabeg. Actualizing teachings from this story, Simpson asks, “What if no one sided with colonialism?” (177).

The day I was writing this review, I was able to see this type of generative refusal in action. On Feb. 28th, 2018 the Indigenous Students’ Council at the University of Saskatchewan released an official statement calling for Indigenous student non-participation in all of the university’s administrative indigenization and reconciliation efforts. The students are asking for support for Indigenous student autonomy through the creation of an Indigenous Student Union and the renaming of the current Indigenous student centre to the Gordon Oakes Red Bear Indigenous Student Union Building. These students are enacting precisely what Simpson is calling for – generative refusal and reciprocal recognition by building an alternative system outside of the settler colonial structure of the university (and reclaiming space to do so). In part this action is in response to the inaction of the university following the unjust not-guilty court rulings in the deaths of Coulten Boushie (Red Pheasant Cree First Nation) and Tina Fontaine (Sagkeeng First

Nation). While the Boushie and Fontaine families necessarily, strongly, and resiliently fight to seek justice within a system not meant to serve Indigenous peoples, but to uphold the settler colonial state, these students recognize and are putting into action their capacity to envision what it means to refuse recognition from the university and strive for self-recognition outside of the system. As they state, “the greatest resource we have on campus is each other” in this “step toward building a decolonial future.” The work they are doing is inspirational and I stand in full support and solidarity with them.

To pull only these two principles out of the interwoven complexity they are situated within in *As We Have Always Done* does them a great disservice for the purposes of summary. Simpson carefully enmeshes critical interventions and critiques of colonial capitalism, heteropatriarchy, and white supremacy into the unfolding of these two concepts. She also stresses the necessity of recentering and recovering woman, two-spirit queer, and child identities, because heteronormative policing of sexuality and gender, and the implementation of heteropatriarchy is at the heart of colonial dispossession. Heteronormativity is a tool of colonization used to control bodies and sexualities as sites of sovereignty and political governance that threaten settler claims to land. Simpson also recognizes accountability to the Black communities within Kina Gchi Nishnaabeg ogamig and beyond in a shared struggle against domination.

Ultimately, Simpson beautifully imagines constellations of coresistance – clusters and relational networks of local artistic and political resurgence that “create mechanisms for communication, strategic movement, accountability to each other, and shared decision-making practices” (218). And she encourages what she terms flight paths out of colonial shame and violence that include everyday practices at home, being on the land regardless of colonial divisions of reserve, rural, and urban spaces, claiming collective and private physical space to think, and simply acting with Indigenous presence. In other words, radical resurgence is also normal: “just Indigenous life [...] as we have always done” (247).

Though a necessarily fully immersive read, Simpson’s cerebral and multifaceted theories continually emerge, clarify, and, then slip from grasp, reinforcing process over fixity. The book requires a read, and a reread, and then maybe a reread with friends, but in my opinion is essential for anyone studying any aspect of Indigenous decolonization, politics, law, and settler colonialism, and signals a vital shift away from current neoliberal discussions and policies of indigenization and reconciliation in order to rebuild and recover Indigenous nationhoods.

Adar Charlton, University of Saskatchewan

A Note to White Readers: I purposefully put this note outside of the main review, because it is a position we need to get used to being in. We do not need to see ourselves in this book. Simpson works to decenter whiteness as a necessary part of working outside of settler colonialism. She offers the humbling and somewhat underhanded advice that real white allies will “show up in solidarity anyway” (231). So, show up anyway - read this book and educate yourself!

Henderson, James Sákéj Youngblood. "Postcolonial Ghost Dancing: Diagnosing European Colonialism." *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*, edited by Marie Battiste, UBC Press, 2000, pp. 57-76.

Indigenous Students' Council. Official Statement of the Indigenous Students' Council. *Facebook*, 28 Feb. 2018, 3:20pm, <https://www.facebook.com/iStudentsCouncil/posts/1649172661784694>. Accessed 28 Feb. 2018.

Rich, Adrienne. "Invisibility in Academe." *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose 1979-1985*. Norton, 1986, pp. 198-201.

Michael Snyder. *John Joseph Mathews: Life of an Osage Writer*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2017. 264 pp. ISBN: 978-0806156095.

<http://www.oupres.com/ECommerce/Book/Detail/2198/john%20joseph%20mathews>

John Joseph Mathews: Life of an Osage Writer is the first book-length biography of the Osage writer, author of *Wah'Kon-Tah* (1932), *Sundown* (1934), *Talking to the Moon* (1945), *Life and Death of an Oilman* (1951), and *The Osages: Children of the Middle Waters* (1961), to mention only the most famous of his writings. John Joseph Mathews, who was born in 1894 in Pawhuska, Indian Territory, and died in 1979 in Pawhuska, Oklahoma, was one of the major Native American writers of the pre-Native American Renaissance era, along with D'Arcy McNickle and John Milton Oskison. These authors have attracted scholars' attention for quite a few years now, and a biography of Mathews fits nicely into this scholarly production.

By meticulous research in Mathews's diary and personal collections, and thanks to correspondence and conversations with family members, Michael Snyder has been able to produce a biography in which the reader gets a glimpse at the writer's intimate life and shortcomings. These the biographer exposes honestly, as when he writes about how Mathews seems to have concealed his first marriage and the children he had with his first wife, children that he did not see for about a decade (72). The passages about Mathews's private and intimate life, however, are not the most appealing and sometimes come close to speculation, as the biographer admits (139). A few remarks on the writer's psychology, however, gleaned through testimonies left by family members can sometimes shed light on his work, as when he is described as an "elitist" (107). Although Snyder defines Mathews as a regionalist writer in a more and more standardized nation, a writer who "influenced later generations of writers, including Kiowa author N. Scott Momaday, Larry McMurtry, and Cormac McCarthy" (63) and who even formed a "Southwestern regionalist circle" (69), the reader might wish the biographer had dwelt more on Mathews' work than on his life. At least, more attention could have been focused on how his life nourished his work. In any case, the passages dedicated to the life of Mathews's children or to what he may have thought about his gay dentist (174-175) are unnecessary.

Mathews was a cosmopolitan world traveler who studied at Oxford and traveled through Europe and parts of Africa, a life he could afford mainly thanks to the Osage headright payments (42). He was also a sportsman, in the Rooseveltian tradition of the turn of the century: he hunted in Scotland, in Africa (50-51), and of course in his Osage Blackjacks, in the masculine conviviality that sportsmanship implied (179). Some of his first stories were animal or hunting stories. What is remarkable, and what should prove very useful to future Mathews scholars and readers is that Snyder brings the reader's attention to many short texts that Mathews published in periodicals such as *Sooner Magazine*. Many of them are animal or hunting stories and form with *Talking to the Moon* a coherent body of nature-writing. If Snyder does not proceed to analyze these texts in detail, his bibliography of "Works by John Joseph Mathews" (235) will prove to be a valuable guide to future students of the Osage writer.

Michael Snyder has also researched the role Mathews played in Osage politics as a member of the Osage Tribal Council and a supporter of John Collier and the Indian Reorganization Act.

Mathews lived at a time of great changes for the Osages, a time when they were rushed into the capitalistic Euro-American world, notably after the discovery of oil in their underground. This is illustrated by what aging Chief Fred Lookout said to him and other young councilmen:

“You are young men. You have the thoughts of white men but you have the interest of your people in your hearts. Do what you think best. You know how to say things so that people will understand. Old men should advise young men, but those things which we meet today are not the things which I know about. The things which I know are gone. If you let your white man tongues say what is in your hearts, you will do great things for your people” (83).

If we are to believe Snyder’s sources, it was as he was travelling the world, and particularly when he met Kabyle tribesmen in the Algerian desert, that Mathews realized he should take an interest in Osage culture. Belatedly, then, he started to focus his attention on his people, meeting the elders of his tribe, working at the creation of a tribal museum, and researching for what would become his last book, a history of the Osages published in 1961.

In “An American Land Ethic,” N. Scott Momaday wrote that “once in his life a man ought to concentrate his mind upon the remembered earth... He ought to give himself up to a particular landscape in his experience, to look at it from as many angles as he can, to wonder about it, to dwell upon it” (45). After seeing the world, Mathews did dwell on the Osage landscape, in both meanings of the word: he inhabited it, in a little sandstone house he built in the Blackjacks; and he turned his thoughts towards it. It can be argued that Mathews’s literary work, including the biography of “oilman” E. W. Marland, is the result of the attention he paid to the landscape that gave birth to the Osage culture, a process he analyzes in *Talking to the Moon* (1945). As Snyder writes, when Mathews became “a professional writer,” between 1929 and 1934, he wrote nature and Osage stories, published in *Sooner Magazine*. Mathews firmly believed that the land expressed itself through everything that stemmed from it, including culture and people. The “people of the hills, the blackjacks, the shortgrass, the desert, and the mountain creeks have not yet interpreted the soil through their own idioms, metaphors, dialects, and song,” Mathews wrote in an article quoted by Snyder (141). Throughout his work, Mathews attempted to understand what the soil said through these manifestations, that he called “ornamentation” in *Talking to the Moon*:

I had thought ... that I might find some connection between man’s artificial ornamentation and the useless ornamentation among the creatures of my little corner of the earth. I realized that man’s artistic creations and his dreams ... as well as his fumbling toward God, must be primal, possibly the results of the biological urge which inspires the wood thrush to sing and the coyote to talk to the moon” (*Talking to the Moon* 3).

Michael Snyder writes the most interesting pages when he touches upon this close relationship between the land and the writer’s work, and that he endeavors to analyze it. In spite of the shortcomings mentioned before, this biography of John Joseph Mathews does give a positive impression that the Osage writer’s work, taken as a whole, forms what LeAnne Howe later called a tribalogy (172). It is definitely a welcome addition to scholarly sources about John Joseph Mathews and pre-Native American Renaissance literature.

Lionel Larré, Université Bordeaux Montaigne

Joe Karetak, Frank Tester & Shirley Tagalik, eds. *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit: What Inuit Have Always Known to Be True*. Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2017. 268 pp. ISBN: 9781552669914.

<https://fernwoodpublishing.ca/book/inuit-qaujimajatuqangit>

This collection presents essays by nine Nunavut elders on topics related to Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit—what Inuit have known for a very long time. Right off the bat, co-editors Joe Karetak and Frank Tester problematize the connotations of ‘traditional’ knowledge, emphasizing that instead of belonging to a now-fading past, the lessons that the elders have to share are profoundly relevant for contemporary life. The resulting book is a rich archive of experiences, reflections, and clear teachings for the future, which are relevant not only to contemporary Inuit, but—as the editors emphasize—for non-Inuit as well.

Most striking about this volume is its consistent emphasis on family life and childrearing—or inunnguiniq, making a human being. Readers may already have some sense of the depth of Inuit knowledge as it pertains to living in Arctic environments, for instance when it comes to the harvesting of wildlife, the navigation of sea ice, etc. But the stories told in this book (by male and female elders alike) emphasize that the development of able human beings—who can manage the challenges provided not only by the land but also by life in contemporary communities—begins in early childhood, and the teachings around this are rich and complex. Mark Kalluak (himself a writer and editor who dedicated his life to the preservation of Inuit language and culture) notes that when children are scolded, “they become sad and lose interest” in things (47). A child’s feelings, he suggests, are central to their ability to learn. Rhoda Akpaliapik Karetak explains, meanwhile, that children should neither be coddled as if they were eggs nor hardened into rocks (143). Atuat Akittiq notes that evidence of a child who is inuttiavaungittuq—who often displays a bad attitude—is that “little things will get him or her upset. The child won’t care if the tension inside of them spills out on everyone around them” (112). Maturity, resourcefulness, a commitment to helping others: these things spring from a bedrock of emotional wellbeing that benefits not only the child themselves but also the community around them.

Many elders note with concern the changes in the ways that children are being raised—and the introductory chapter by Frank Tester provides the sobering context for these cultural shifts, as it describes the impacts of tuberculosis epidemics, paternalistic government relocation policies, and the residential school system. The elders’ essays extend this critique with their emphasis on the vast pedagogical differences—and the interruption in traditional childrearing—represented by the contemporary school system. “It was like the parents gave up their right to control their children when they sent them to school,” says Rhoda Akpaliapik Karetak. While some note the potential for Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit to be integrated into the schools and other Nunavut institutions, elders like Atuat Akittiq also question the dominance of Eurowestern structures and their often token inclusions of Inuit ways of doing things: referencing the justice system, she points out, “We are invited to sit in a court case, but everything is already arranged. They’ve already planned the case even before we are invited.... No other power is given to us” (123-124). The many challenges facing contemporary Inuit youth render the task of passing along Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit even more pressing—and elders like Rhoda Akpaliapik Karetak apply these

teachings to their own pedagogical practice, centering adaptability and a concern for emotional intelligence: “I often try to live in my children’s and grandchildren’s way a little bit... just so they are comfortable with me....” Karetak says. “We can still make a human being in such a way that it will not seem too much—or too different—by collaborating with today’s ways of learning” (119-120). Near the end of the book, Joe Karetak’s gripping tale of having survived with his son after being swept out to sea during a seal hunt—reminding his son to stay calm, carefully parcelling out his own remaining energy, and using his mind to combat hypothermia, even as he was required to save the rescue pilot who managed to crash his helicopter through the thin ice—provides a illustration of the nuance, adaptability, and ongoing relevance of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit.

Co-editor Shirley Tagalik relates that the elders’ “most sincere wish is that the book will provide Inuit with access to their own process of healing by reconnecting them with the unique knowledge and perspectives of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit” (xv). This idea seems to be in tension, however, with the book’s production, which appears in some ways to prioritize accessibility to a broader (non-Inuit) readership—most notably through the fact that the elders’ essays have been translated into English. It may be that this eases the complexity of publishing contributions written (or dictated) in multiple dialects of Inuktitut—perhaps English is being used as a textual lingua franca for the Inuit readers whom the elders wished to reach? Perhaps the Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun originals, whether written or recorded, will be made available in another venue? But the editors—and the epilogue written by Cree academic Margo Greenwood—emphasize the significance of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit to non-Inuit, as well. This rings true, and yet the shift in audience changes the nature of the conversation somewhat, given the worry that the elders are said to have felt “about how the book might be used” (xi). Norman Attangalaaq provides context, explaining that “when we are asked about Inuit laws it is extremely awkward to answer instantly, knowing that Inuit have been chastised and made to feel embarrassed about rituals or practices...” (107). While the book most certainly does provide an invaluable resource for non-Inuit seeking to better understand Inuit ways, one hopes that its publication does not compare to the story that Rhoda Akpaliapik Karetak tells about her brand new embroidered white kamiik (boots), which she was required to give away to a visiting stranger for a pittance.

Southern audiences can remain grateful in any case for the existence of this volume, which both educates readers and also provides guidelines for ways in which we might become more adept educators ourselves—by situating learning within relationships, emotional landscapes, and hands-on experience; by embracing the adaptability of tradition; and by choosing our words with extreme care. The example that the elders have provided in this volume is indeed the most generous gift.

Keavy Martin, University of Alberta

Zoltán Grossman. *Unlikely Alliances: Native Nations and White Communities Join to Defend Rural Lands*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2017.

<http://www.washington.edu/uwpress/search/books/GROUNL.html>

As I write this, from what is currently called the state of Utah, United States, a struggle is taking place. Tribal activists are working to oppose the stripping of federal protections under the National Antiquities Act of massive sections of Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monuments. A coalition of Navajo, Hopi, Zuni, and Ute people, among others, are protesting the reduction of that National Park by some 85% by the current US president (undoing the creation of the park created under the Obama administration). His administration hopes to open the space to uranium and oil extraction. The fight to protect the park's initial boundaries will rage for some time, and it is likely that tribal opposition alone will not secure their protections. Allied politicians and non-Native Utahns and Arizonans have entered the fray as well. Nonetheless, many of the region's non-Native (and overwhelmingly white) residents oppose the National Park designation, feeling those lands should be made available to cattle ranching, and often welcoming the jobs that might accompany the aforementioned extractive enterprises.

We've seen such tensions before, of course. Time and time again Native people fight on the front lines of protecting their land, often in the face of vocal (and frequently violent) opposition from their white neighbors, whose livelihoods draw upon those threatened lands. We are so used to this narrative that we often assume it to be the natural order of things. Enter: Zoltán Grossman's book, which examines examples of Native and rural white alliance and cooperation resisting ecological degradation.

Such a project is fraught with pitfalls. When I first picked up the book, I worried that it would wander down a path of multicultural feel-good cherry-picking, or worse, tales of white folks riding in to save Native people from themselves. Fortunately, Grossman's text offers something far more nuanced and more realistic, replete with stories of successes and failures. These stories emphasize Native sovereignty as a multifaceted good, in the face of ongoing histories and legacies of white settler ideologies that in a few hard-fought cases seem to abate. Grossman asserts his thesis overtly:

I hope this book functions as a type of guide to Native and non-Native community organizers and leaders in the beginning stages of building alliances against new mines, pipelines, or other projects, to see precedents elsewhere in the country and what strategies have worked and not worked. I also hope that the book can stimulate discussion among students, faculty, and researchers studying innovative ways to alleviate racial/ethnic conflict, create populist movements across cultural lines, and roll back the centuries of dispossession and colonization of Indigenous nations (xv-xvi; the Preface is also available in its entirety [online](#)).

In each of these goals, it succeeds. This is not a how-to sort of textbook though, at least not in terms of an abc checklist. Rather, it serves as a text of recent history, an ethnography of the kinds of organizers Grossman hopes to support. *Unlikely Alliances* offers four traits that seem to recur as necessary for the success of those alliances in securing their aims. Grossman's findings come over the course of examining dozens of Native/non-Native alliances. In each successful instance,

the alliances were able to 1) build grassroots rather than only institutional relationships, 2) emphasize local place identity, 3) define local place in territorial (rather than social) and inclusive terms, and, 4) recognize and respect particularist (rather than universalist) identity differences (287-88). Ultimately, the examples Grossman offers create an interesting, valuable, and useful text for people working with or interested in Native American rights and sovereignty, environmentalism, coalition building, and activism broadly speaking. It is a text that largely anticipates readers' concerns (especially those regarding Native issues), but also one that seems to struggle with escaping certain settler positions—perhaps by design. This text offers itself as a pragmatic guide, and, as such, its ideology tends to privilege finding *immediate* solutions for the crises it addresses. This immediacy is fitting, of course. Ecological threats aren't the kind of thing that can wait to be resolved. *Unlikely Alliances* is also, ultimately, a hopeful text, one that celebrates a kind of progress in these alliances. Grossman explains, "The collaboration of Native Americans and rural whites to defend their common home against outside interests was a rare anomaly in the 1980s....But by the 2010s, cooperation between Native and non-Native rural organizers [became] almost commonplace" (273).

The breadth of Grossman's work is impressive and laudable, melding history, law, and ethnography. The reader encounters an extensive and impressive host of interviewees (just over one hundred). Among these are "sport-fishing group leaders and fishing guides, farmer and rancher group leaders, tribal government leadership, Indigenous elders, Native community organizers, and rural white community organizers, schoolteachers, small business owners, and others" (7). Moreover, the scale and breadth of the interviews, topics, and regions covered serves to bolster Grossman's claims. The text moves about the Pacific Northwest, Intermountain West, Northern Plains, and Great Lakes covering a wide array of topics: spear fishing, legal interventions (especially the Boldt decision), dams and dam breaching, resistance of military projects (base expansion, low-level flights, the MX missile system), Environmental Justice, coal and gold mining, Black Hills preservation and treaty rights, climate justice, pipelines (including KXL and DAPL), coal locomotive transportation, ports, and oil terminals. Grossman discusses movements for environmental protection ranging from the 1970s to the contemporary moment.

The chapters tend to follow a pattern that introduces a particular environmental struggle and its major players, discusses attempts, successes, and failures in alliance building (all via interviews with parties involved), and concludes with a quick listing of related, nearby, and later examples that mirror those successes and failures. In the early chapters that listing can come off as a bit jarring: so many rapid-fire details, facts, and figures. But, as one gets further along, one comes to expect them and to understand what Grossman is doing with them; namely, strengthening his claims with abbreviated examples that parallel the longer examples at the chapter's opening.

Grossman describes successful collaborations as going through four broad and not necessarily distinct phases. "First, Native peoples asserted their autonomy and renewed nationhood. Second, a right-wing populist backlash from some rural whites created racial conflict over the use of land, water, or natural resources. Third, the racial conflict declined in intensity as the neighbors initiated dialogue over common threats to land and water. Fourth, Native and white neighbors collaborated on the protection of their community, livelihood and natural resources using a cross-cultural anticorporate populism" (5). In example after example, these phases play out, and this is one of Grossman's most interesting findings. Native people wielding or enacting their

sovereignty comes first. Indeed, the text demonstrates that in circumstances where Native nations were more eager to acquiesce to settler expectations of them, less forthright about their sovereignty, the alliances generally failed. He notes that this was, more often than not, followed by a white backlash. We might wonder, of course, whether we can really call anti-Indian racist actions a backlash when they are sown into the fabric of our nation. After all, they didn't spring up as a result of Native actions; they have been enacted and reinforced in settler ideology. Grossman's text does make these last points, demonstrating, for example, the irony of white people who protested Indigenous sovereignty lamenting their own loss of land.

Along with the four phases discussed, Grossman identifies three primary connections that allow these alliances to succeed. "First, they address the common 'sense of place' of Native and non-Native communities" (6). That is, they draw on a shared connection to physical landscape (these connections may be material and/or spiritual). "Second, they examine the common purpose of the communities in facing a common enemy" (6). These alliances refuse to be divided, for example. Throughout the text the common enemy tends to come in the form of corporate extractive industries. (I found myself wondering whether the same practices of vilifying Indigenous people were at play in the psyches of their white neighbors mobilizing against not only the toxification of their communities, but the *people* involved with those industries.) "Third, they explore the common sense of understanding that could extend beyond a short-term alliance of convenience to long-term cooperation" (7). The most successful cases Grossman studies show formerly adversarial relationships blossoming into friendships, or at least relationships of true respect.

One of the strengths of the text, and one of the ways that it allays fears that it will engage in the kinds of ethnographic treatment of Indigenous peoples common in so much of academic writing, comes in the form of Grossman's self-awareness and self-reflexivity. In the Preface foregrounding his own positionality as relates to his project, Grossman narrates that he is descendent on his father's side of a Hungarian Jewish family, many of whom did not escape murder at the hands of Nazis. Owing at least in part to this familial history, he explains, "I learned to mistrust cultural pride and difference, because of the horrors it could lead to, and to instead find and appreciate *similarities* among peoples that transcend religious, ethnic, or racial divides" (xii). Oh no, we might think, this *is* going down that multicultural road. However, Grossman quickly assuages some of those concerns. He goes on to explain that his mother's side of the family, also Hungarian post-WWII immigrants, retained much of their culture, including their language and food (retentions facilitated by living in "Buffalo's large Hungarian community"), and connections to their former "small village in western Hungary" (xii). One could go so far as to argue that Grossman is either having some fun with those readers who would likely be suspicious of a universalist text, or drawing in those who would be attracted to one, setting them up for a more complicated position. Either way (or neither way) the device works. Grossman's book has an uncanny way of anticipating a reader's objections, of starting down one of those dangerous paths only to veer back, to correct any homogenizing narratives one might worry it is drifting into.

The text's central ambivalence seems to center around the binary it constructs from its inception, its attempt to simultaneously embrace universalism and particularism. While *Unlikely Alliances* works to fix these as mutually constitutive, and does so fairly well in the conclusion if not

throughout the entire body of the text, it seems mainly to vacillate between them—again, seeming to topple over into multiculturalism and then wobbling back away from it. Grossman asserts, “Many [scholars] are deconstructing racist institutions and structures, but fewer are discussing how to construct just institutions and structures in their place” (10). He continues, “fewer have speculated what ‘geographies of inclusion might look like’” (10). This longing for inclusion smacks of the liberal multicultural state impulse. But, what if the inclusion of settler descendants like Grossman (and myself) isn’t what justice looks like? What if the mandate of such inclusion is a replication of, or at least a not-so-distinct riffing off of, those racist institutions and structures? Right on cue, Grossman cites Glen Coulthard, noting that “appeals to ‘common ground’ accommodation fail to acknowledge that the ‘commons’ has belonged to Indigenous nations” (11).

Ultimately, Grossman’s book hinges on the concept of cooperation, specifically privileging grassroots organizing over governmental alliances. He argues, “Cooperation needs to sink roots into local communities to sustain government-to-government relations at the top” (52). His examples point to these local connections as the primary mode by which successful alliances not only come to be, but prove fruitful moving forward as well. He contends, “A ‘paradigmatic shift’ toward lasting relationships that promote justice can prevent the regeneration of social tensions” (62). In many of the alliances he studies, those involved come to see one another as friends. They recognize that if they want a better neighborhood, they need to be better neighbors. Grossman refers to these grassroots interactions as connecting “on a human level” (91). (One wonders how humans have ever connected on a non-human level, but I digress). By contrast, he contends that when people have foregrounded “‘government-to-government’ cooperation at the top [in hopes of translating that] into cooperation at the grassroots” the results have been mixed (57). Moreover, “Where tribes had the backing of urban-based environmental groups but not local white communities, such as in the Little Rocky Mountains, the alliances could not prevent mining” (149). Again, according to Grossman, success lies in a coalition of the local.

It is important to note that this emphasis on building alliance between Native and non-Native communities does not mean that Grossman looks to weaken Native sovereignty. Instead, as he demonstrates, the unyielding exercise of that sovereignty by Native nations is absolutely integral to the successes of the alliances he studies. Indeed, he points out a clear danger to this approach of prioritizing Native/Non-Native alliances. As one of his informants reminds him, “White people are once again ‘using’ something owned by Native Americans, in this case treaty or sovereign rights, for their own ends—to stop a project that may threaten their livelihoods” (279). With that in mind he also contends that “The most successful alliances [brokered by Native communities] have tended to use a ‘carrot-and-stick’ strategy—using a ‘stick’ to confront racism by white communities and institutions, while dangling a ‘carrot’ that promised a common future based on common land-based values” (150). While Grossman looks to the successes of alliance and community, his reading is hardly naïve. He offers no post-racial fantasy here, far from it. To that end, he contends, “Native nations do not have to compromise their sovereignty in some feel-good reconciliation scheme with the state. Instead, their sovereignty cements their position as a powerful entity in their own watershed or even... as the ‘lead entity’” (97). And, “Instead of accepting the white community’s terms of one-way ‘inclusion’ (meaning official recognition and integration), the tribal nations began to set their own terms of *mutual inclusion*, including a projection of tribal powers in resource management outside the reservations” (272).

Grossman's text offers valuable insights for people thinking through the empowerment of Native communities particularly, rather than marginalized communities broadly, as this centrality of sovereignty plays such a pivotal role. It's a useful text for thinking about coalition building, a mode that some reject for the compromises it requires. It also, honestly, has some very sweet stories of people working not only with, but for one another. It manages these feel-good moments without sacrificing rigor. It calls out a brand of selfish yet self-destructive anti-Indian racism and white supremacist settler ideology throughout (though many of the white informants are far less self-aware than the text is). It's well worth a read.

John Gamber, Utah State University

Marcia G. Anderson. *A Bag Worth a Pony: The Art of the Ojibwe Bandolier Bag*. St Paul, MN: The Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2017. pp.265. ISBN: 9781681340296.

<http://www.mnhs.org/mnhspress/books/bag-worth-pony>

Boozhoo anang onimiwin mukwa nindodem lac des mille lacs first nation nindoonji.

A few months ago I was approached by the editors of *Transmotion* to provide a review of Marcia G. Anderson's recent book about bandolier bags. As an Anishinabekwe (Ojibwe) artist and visual anthropologist committed to both the practice and study of Ojibwe material visual and material culture, I welcomed the opportunity. Yet looking at my own unfinished bandolier bag I started about six years ago for my husband, I also felt somewhat guilty, aware that of the many large-scale beadwork projects planned or started by artists, all too many end up in the category of "started but never finished", a point Anderson aptly makes as well (16). Nonetheless, after cracking the book open for the first time, I knew I was in for something special. I smiled as the first image to welcome me happened to be a photograph of Delina White's son in full regalia proudly dancing her beadwork, including a bandolier bag. As an Ojibwe matriarch Delina has and will continue to be a great family friend and a personal mentor for everything that I hope to achieve with the beadwork that I make for my family. Thus, this was indeed a good signal of what was to come in the subsequent pages, which invite the reader to become part of Anderson's "three-decades-long love affair" (3) with gashkibidaaganag (beaded bandolier bags).

Gashkibidaaganag are perhaps one of the largest and most labor-intensive beaded items created and worn by Ojibwe people. Anderson introduces these bags as cultural icons, embodying specific values and attributes important to Ojibwe including status, respect, gratitude, and leadership. The reference to these bags as *worth a pony* is a nod to their role as a form of currency used in exchanges with other tribes for a pony in the 1870s and 1880s. While the exact origin of the bag is unclear, Anderson reminds the reader that it cannot be interpreted apart from earlier forms of bags and pouches created by Ojibwe for both daily life and special occasions—bags often adorned with various materials including glass beads, shells and porcupine quills. Anderson emphasizes that material culture grows and changes along with people and gashkibidaaganag must not be taken up as static objects but as dynamic and emergent entities continuously affected by changes both inside and outside their communities of origin. Referencing an origin hypothesis common to both ethnographers and Ojibwe community experts, Anderson identifies that the most influential "change" leading to prevalence of the bags was that of colonial war, as she links gashkibidaaganag to "military ammunition pouches worn by the European and American military" (21).

Anderson locates herself personally in relation to gashkibidaaganag as a collections curator with the Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) during the 1980s. Over the course of 35 years, Anderson develops this relationship by committing her work to the stories of over 100 bandoliers within the MHS collection. Her efforts focus on weaving together information gleaned primarily from archives, museums, and ethnographic texts with Ojibwe histories and testimonies from present day Ojibwe bead artists, knowledge keepers and tribal effort governments. Her work culminates into a concerted and careful presentation of their cultural significance during the past two centuries.

Part one of the book presents a detailed history of the bags, addressing their design, structure, motif, material composition, and the various ways that archival records and photographs influence their history. On each page Anderson provides strikingly clear images of gashkibidaaganang, including very detailed close-up shots when possible. She includes historical photographs of Ojibwe men and women both donning and making the bags in a way that assists the reader in contextualizing them within Ojibwe community life. This section also provides detailed sketches and descriptions of how the bags are constructed. Anderson's aim in this section is to stitch together an introductory history of the bags and her thoughtful composition of the photographs, sketches and written text, is not simply a "packaging up" of historical information in order to preserve gashkidibaaganang history; rather, it is a carefully constructed blueprint aimed at ensuring future generations are engaged and encouraged to connect to this history in a meaningful way. Anderson uses her position as a curator and writer to craft something that helps make these bags accessible to a more public audience, including other Ojibwe beadwork artists working to reclaim and revive their material cultural practices.

Early on in the book Anderson emphasizes in several places that despite the fact that Ojibwe women were most often the creative forces behind the design and production of gashkidibaaganang, their pivotal roles and accomplishments often remain obscure or are completely ignored. This points to the androcentric and patriarchal nature of colonial ethnographic texts and their interpretation. Anderson commits her work to addressing this absence/erasure through privileging the stories and perspectives of both historical and present-day Ojibwe women. This work goes beyond identifying the names of women pictured in photographs or connecting specific bags to their respective maker throughout the book when possible. Anderson dedicates the second part of the book to privileging the voices and experiences of Ojibwe women beadwork artists throughout seven different Ojibwe communities in Minnesota.

In part two, Anderson takes the reader on a journey to several Ojibwe communities throughout Minnesota, discussing specific gashkidibaaganang and their makers and wearers from specific places. She introduces the reader to the stories of several Ojibwe women beadwork artists, illuminating their dedication, resilience, creativity, strength, and intelligence. The book privileges the experiences and voices of women who have and continue to accept the responsibility of making the bags out of love and pride for their families and communities. Anderson situates this important work within the context of ongoing colonial violence aimed at severing Ojibwe family and kinship ties and demonstrates how significant gashkidibaaganang have been to reclaiming and continuing significant family histories and cultural teachings. Moreover, through the inclusion of direct testimonies, these artists are able to convey their own unique perspectives and stories, explaining how important these bags have been to their own wellbeing, the transmission of intergenerational knowledge and ongoing camaraderie among Ojibwe women within communities.

It should be noted that their testimonies often work to dispel colonial myths attached to Ojibwe beadwork practice. For example, third generation bag maker Marcie McIntire of Grand Portage addresses the myth that Ojibwe floral designs were simply a "mimicking" or replication of European floral design and aesthetic:

It never dawned on me that my designs could be associated with the colonizers... Whether Anishinaabe [Ojibwe] beadworkers were using geometric or floral designs, they were depicting the flora in the world around them. (123)

By the end of the book, what may have started as a curator's love affair with the beauty and magnificence of gashkidibaaganan, over the course of 35 years of work, has been transformed into what I see as a love affair with the brilliance, creativity and tenacity of their makers—specifically with Ojibwe woman. In her writing, Anderson illustrates how as a distinct visual/material object and art practice, each gashkidibaagan may mediate different experiences and generate different kinds of knowledges, all of which are significant to Ojibwe life. This book is a commitment to moving beyond a surface level reading of the bags to bringing forward the stories embodied within every bead stitch—voices that link generations of proud Ojibwe. As a beadwork artist, this book inspired me to pick up my own in-progress gashkidibaagan and honour the teachings of my ancestors and peers. And so I say miigwetch (thank you) to Marcia for this gift.

Celeste Pedri-Spade, Laurentian University

Victoria L. LaPoe and Benjamin Rex LaPoe II. *Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2017. 98 pp. ISBN 9781611862263.

<http://msupress.org/books/book/?id=50-1D0-3FB2#.Wp7pqOhubIU>.

The latest release from the American Indian Studies Series at MSU Press, *Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age*, is a groundbreaking title. At the point of this writing, no other text has set out to generate an investigation of Native-run newsroom norms and routines. Authors Victoria L. LaPoe (Cherokee) and Benjamin Rex LaPoe II situate Native American journalists in the digital age as building on "the rich tradition of storytelling" (87) already practiced by Native peoples in diverse ways since time immemorial. Building on these oral traditions, as the digital divide in technology accessibility decreases within Native communities, more and more storytellers and journalists are turning to online platforms, which advance the visibility of Native peoples and issues (73). While the text includes traditional newsprint and radio format journalists as part of their study, the authors are especially interested in the ways in which the Internet, social media, and mobile applications have impacted reporting and dissemination of news in Indian Country. In order to understand these impacts, the authors interviewed established and burgeoning Native American news reporters affiliated with the Native American Journalists Association (NAJA), Koahnic Broadcast Corporation (producers of *Native America Calling* and *National Native News*), the *Navajo Times*, Last Real Indians, Vision Maker Media, the *Cherokee Phoenix*, and others. The result is a thoughtful, useful, and very readable text that will serve both Native communities and non-Native allies interested in understanding and improving Native news coverage in the years to come.

While comparing Native and non-Native news reporting norms and routines is not the focus of this book, before getting to the findings of their interviews with Native journalists LaPoe and LaPoe II make it a point to draw several important distinctions between approaches to news coverage within and outside of Indian Country. According to the authors, non-Native media report on stories that are "revenue generating" (2), whereas "sacredness to all living things is where most Native people truly find 'profit,' success, and fulfillment" (89). This does not mean that economic concerns do not impact Native journalists – costs of production and the economic disadvantages disproportionately affecting Native communities cannot be ignored. However, generating revenue was not cited as an important concern, whereas serving the needs of Native communities was privileged in the interviews featured in the book. Additionally, because traditional Native storytelling honors multiple versions of stories, and because perspectives vary within communities instead of trying to craft an "authoritative" account of a news story like in the Associated Press, the interviews show that many Native journalists seek to "get out as many Native voices as possible" when covering an issue (76). The interviews also find that Native journalists are also acutely aware of their own positionality and the historical, legal, and political concerns affecting their people. There is a sense of accountability to their communities that is not seen in non-Native community; the author interviews with reporters at the *Navajo Times* are especially useful in elucidating this point as it relates to privacy and tribally-specific codes of moral conduct.

Additionally, since tribal members are "underrepresented in non-Native newsrooms" (2), most of the time Native peoples are completely ignored by mainstream media. When and if non-Native

coverage of Native issues does occur, it is more often than not reported through a stereotypical lens and evidences "overt and inferential racism" (21). Seen through colonial eyes, the most popular narratives of indigenous peoples perpetuated by culturally-uninformed and/or biased reporters focus on stories that misrepresent Native communities as "frozen in time," impoverished, and criminal. The authors explain that, "one method of defying these stereotypes is to support and recruit additional American Indians who are familiar with Native storytelling to enter the field of journalism" (96). In addition to internships and mentoring with Native professionals in the field, the book argues for mainstream media to increase their recruitment and promotion on reservations and within Native organizations. In this way, even as *Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age* offers a basic survey of Native journalism as it stands today, it also takes a practical approach by offering solutions like these that could easily be implemented. Because of its dialogic nature, Native media is a "communal gathering place" (43) not only allowing for Native people to talk back to one another, but also to talk back to settler colonial culture at large. The authors found that those interviewed largely "viewed the Internet as a vehicle for offering counter-stereotypes and providing more truthful information and images" (93).

Even while *Indian Country* is theoretically and methodologically rich (their transparency and outlining of their research process are especially well-done), the book's primary contribution comes from its interviews. As a snowball sampling, these interviews allow for established and emerging indigenous voices in journalism to tell their stories, share their values, and push back against stereotypical views of Native peoples and communities in media. Some of those interviewed are well-accomplished movers and shakers in the field, such as Paul Natonabah and Marley Shebala, while others have rose to meet community needs only in recent years. The intergenerational scope of the text is, indeed, one of its strong suits. While this book review cannot go into each of their topics in depth, readers will find the book's organization useful. LaPoe and LaPoe II outline the primary themes emerging from their research: history/context, storytelling, digital media, and youth/future. Anyone interested in any of these topics will find those appropriate sections worth an extensive look, but the book reads well from beginning to end, and readers will benefit more by examining how those interviewed both echo and complicate one another's experiences and insights.

While this book would be especially useful for those studying and working in Native American Studies, *Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age* should arguably be required reading for *all* students studying journalism and communication, both Native and non-Native. Not only does the text provide an intelligent critique of mainstream journalism's shortcomings when it comes its treatment of Native peoples and issues, it offers both broad and tribally-specific parameters for what an improved media focus on Native communities might look like in theory and practice. The authors demonstrate how contemporary Native journalism is an extension of traditional oral storytelling, but readers who are unfamiliar with those oral traditions to begin with will have a difficult time understanding the nuances of these connections— additional readings might be needed for those audiences. *Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age* could have benefited from engagement with Native American Studies in general, perhaps turning to texts such as Renya K. Ramirez's (Hochunk) *Native Hubs* and Craig S. Womack (Muscogee) et. al.'s *American Indian Literary Nationalism*. This book, then, might be a great starting point for opening up increased dialogue between Native news reporters and others working in the field of

Native American Studies, especially those within letters, digital arts, and Native-led community development.

Finally, while this book features interviews with Native journalists who are actively trying to recruit Native youth for writing and videography in newsprint and online venues, the scope of the text focuses primarily on traditional news reporting while leaving out more DIY and/or underground, youth-driven reporting and editorials on Native issues. For example, the Instagram account "indigenougoddessgang" is a collective of Native women who post about Native social issues and environmental concerns with an emphasis on indigenous women's justice, such as the epidemic of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women (MMIW). Does this count as a form of journalism? While not traditionally trained in communications studies, such a collective: 1) informs their immediate regional, as well as international, communities about Native women's issues in Indian Country; 2) fosters community dialogue on these issues through encouraging conversation and interaction; and 3) actively redresses stereotypes while disseminating and increasing the visibility of and accessibility to Native perspectives in the media. Beyond Instagram and Facebook, there is also the world of Twitter and Snapchat, as well as YouTube channels produced by and for Native peoples unaffiliated with newsrooms proper. As the digital divide narrows and technology becomes more accessible, platforms draw many users focusing on issues within their communities, but with content generated by writers and documenters who are often not formally educated in journalism—much of this phenomenon is youth-driven. If the future of Native journalism lies in the hands of the youth, it's important to cultivate inclusion and broaden an understanding of the field to include pop culture coverage and untrained writers sharing stories and creating multimodal news media within Native communities.

Because this book investigates the newsroom norms and routines in Native media, *Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age* would be a useful text for those interested in exploring media covering of critical concerns like Standing Rock and #NoDAPL, as well as Idle No More and MMIW activism. Although this book was published in 2017, it does not make mention of any of these issues, even as these key movements were and are driven by social media and grassroots-level reporting. For example, the Indigenous Environmental Network has been around since 1990, covering not just #NoDAPL, but also other rights issues, such as the faulty Enbridge Pipelines, which threaten the safety of the water and the peoples—human and otherwise—here in Anishinaabe territory. This subject also raises another important question not addressed in *Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age*: as Native storytellers and journalists increasingly turn to digital technologies, how will they offset the environmental impacts of those technologies? I think this question is worth considering; however, as LaPoe and LaPoe II importantly point out in their conclusion, "storytelling culture is still the driving force of the content. Their stories are not controlled by the technology," (96).

As more and more Native-operated digital news networks emerge and expand their influence, *Indian Country: Telling a Story in a Digital Age* will be a great starting point for writers, community members and scholars looking to understand the ways in which Native peoples continually adapt to the digital age while also honoring diverse traditional values as they record, respond, and share the stories and voices that matter most.

Patricia Killelea, Northern Michigan University

Deanna M. Kennedy, et al., eds. *American Indian Business: Principles and Practices*. University of Washington Press, 2017. Ix-221 pp. ISBN 9780295742090

<http://www.washington.edu/uwpress/search/books/KENAME.html>

In the process of reviewing this book I shared it with a colleague of mine – an Indigenous Australian woman working in the field of economic development. I thought she would be interested in the concepts as she grapples with many of them in her job. I knew what I thought of the book and I was interested to see if our views aligned. Her response – “this is amazing work and so true” – confirmed my own thinking. This book is more than just a collection of principles and practices relating to American Indian businesses: it speaks of the wider issues facing many Indigenous people establishing and running their own business. The legacy of colonialism and the displacement and destruction of traditional forms of governance, economy and culture, is one shared by most Indigenous people. For centuries, First Nations people have fought to “hold on to their culture, land and natural resources” in the face of increasing encroachment by government and industry (Kennedy *et al* ix). Despite growing recognition of their sovereign rights, the systematic economic marginalisation of Indigenous people continues to this day in the stereotypes applied to their businesses and the discrimination they face in accessing finances. Therefore, although this book focuses on American Indian businesses, the experiences and learnings it contains are relevant to any Indigenous person or community operating or looking at establishing a business. The book is also valuable to non-Indigenous people as it will help them understand the barriers and challenges faced by American Indians (and Indigenous people more broadly) in developing business enterprises and viable economies in their communities.

The editors’ goals in compiling and writing this book were to “contribute to learning about unique aspects of American Indian business” and to provide “different cultural perspectives that could lead to richer conversations about different business approaches.” (Kennedy *et al* xxii). In this regard, the book succeeds, as many of the chapters are devoted to explaining the distinct and valuable aspects of American Indian culture in relation to business. For example, chapters 3, 4 and 14, make the case for business models based on core Indian cultural values and content. The book explores the complexities inherent in operating in two worlds and how to reconcile cultural values and practices with the demands of business. The paradox in having to simultaneously collaborate and compete with neighbouring tribes and to negotiate with rival tribes to develop partnerships and regional economic development opportunities. It discusses how stereotypes – both internally and externally imposed, frequently see “Indian-nous and business as antithetical on one another...” (xii). However, the book exposes the fallacy of such thinking, by providing concrete examples of how American Indians have always been entrepreneurially minded and how historically, individual forms of business coexisted alongside communally run businesses. For example, in Chapter One, the authors cite R. J. Miller (2001), who reports that Indian cultures have always: “fostered, encouraged, and supported their tribal people in private economic endeavours.” (4). Chapter two also argues that private business activity at the family level has traditionally existed within American Indian tribes and that the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) changed the paradigm by placing all the responsibility for economic activity on tribal governments (16, 23).

The value of this book is that the authors do not shy away from discussing some of the more sensitive issues facing many American Indian tribes today. In particular, the tendency for some people to want to pull down those who stand out and succeed. This concept is referred to as “social jealousy” and has been likened to crickets or crabs in a bucket - where any cricket that tries to climb out of the bucket is pulled back in by the others (33). This is an issue also faced by Aboriginal people in Australia and one of the many challenges Indigenous people experience running their own business, particularly if it is successful. Because of this, and other issues, many Indigenous entrepreneurs are making the decision to locate their business off reservations. Yet, this only further compounds the problem. The fewer small business there are, the fewer role models there will be.

According to Harrington *et al* in Chapter 3, there is an absence of small businesses on reservations and Indian people own private businesses at the lowest rate per capita of any ethnic or racial group in the United States (32). However, antipathy towards private business owners is not the main reason for the lack of businesses on Indian reservations. The primary cause is the US government’s policy of holding tribal land in trust, which makes it virtually impossible for on-reservation entrepreneurs to secure start-up financing, as they cannot use their houses as collateral (85). As a result of the absence of private enterprise, Indian reservations suffer from economic leakage – where the majority of Indian dollars are spent purchasing consumables off the reservation (84). Just as economic development can contribute to a virtuous circle (x), the absence of economic activities leads to a downwards spiral wherein because there are few employers there are fewer jobs available, which results in high unemployment and low family incomes. Due to the difficulties residents face in trying to secure employment on reservation land, Indian and indigenous communities worldwide are “bleeding young people into surrounding societies (ix).”

Although this all paints a pretty depressing picture, the benefit of this book is that it is not all doom and gloom. In fact, the authors seem to go out of their way to inspire readers with what is possible given the right conditions. Rather than simply listing a litany of problems as many books about Indigenous people tend to do, the authors provide numerous practical examples of how American Indians could improve their economic development outcomes. In chapter 4, Stewart, a professor of entrepreneurship, outlines the need for a business strategy to help managers identify their area of competitive advantage. According to Stewart, American Indians cultural capital is a particular resource that could be leveraged to set them apart from their competitors (48). He suggests focusing on one strategy not multiple strategies as companies that try to do both often end up “stuck in the middle” and being mediocre on both fronts (52).

In addition to providing advice on business strategies, the book also provides a number of questions and exercises to help people understand the concepts and apply them to real-life situations. For example, in Chapter 9, Black and Birmingham, discussing American Indian leadership practices, provide five group or individual exercises that people could do to practice their disciplining, business analysis and decision-making skills. In Chapter ten, authors Claw, Verbos, and Rosile discuss the concept of a living code of ethics (148), which promotes doing business in a way that honours American Indians’ ancestors (156). Underpinning the ethics discussed are the seven Grandfather/Grandmother teachings which are: wisdom is to be shared; love is to honor others and care for them; respect is to honor all creations; bravery is to persevere

in the face of adversity; honesty is to tell the truth; humility is to remember we are not greater or lesser than others; and truth is for American Indians to honor who they are and have integrity (146). How these ethics could be applied to different areas of business, such as sales and marketing, finance and accounting and human resources, are discussed. A practical exercise is included at the end of the chapter to help people work through the four possible ways that laws and ethics intersect (158), and to help them reflect on how following the seven Grandfather/Grandmother teachings could help improve their business practices.

Chapter 11 also focuses on providing advice to improve the management of a business – in this case a health program. The way the advice is given is unique as it uses traditional storytelling methods to help people learn about organisational management. The story of mouse and coyote is engaging and easy to follow and successfully demonstrates the importance of certain business concepts such as strategic planning, goal commitment and how to address underperforming staff (172).

Overall, this book is an extremely valuable resource, particularly as until recently there has been limited research on the contributions of American Indians, and Indigenous people in general, to business. Some people may not agree with the promotion of business and in particular individual business enterprise in this book. Those people may see it as assimilationist. Yet, while having reservations about the ulterior motives behind policy makers' promotion of the advantageous aspects of commercial activity by Indigenous people could be warranted, there is demonstrable evidence that Indigenous people are conducting business on their own terms and in their own way. Rather than seeing business enterprise as a foreign concept imposed on Indigenous people, this book highlights how Indigenous knowledge is part of the philosophy of economic development in American Indian communities.

Sara Jane Hudson, The Centre for Independent Studies

Christian F. Feest and C. Ronald Corum. *Frederick Weygold: Artist and Ethnographer of North American Indians*. Altenstadt: ZKF Publishers, 2017. 272 pp. ISBN: 978-3981841206.

<https://www.zkfpublishers.de/books/frederick-weygold/>

This biography of the artist Frederick Weygold was co-edited by Christian F. Feest, Professor of Anthropology, and Charles Ronald Corum, a neurophysiologist. The book follows Weygold's life chronologically, from his birth in 1870 in St. Charles, Missouri, USA, through his various travels and career paths, until his death in 1941 in Louisville, Kentucky. This sequential linearity is sectioned in thematic chapters such as "Painted Tipis," "Collecting in Pine Ridge," or "Too Civilized to Go to War."

Given that Corum is a neurophysiologist, his involvement in an artist's biography can appear surprising at first. The preface explains that he learned the Lakota language from David W. Maurer, who himself learned it from Weygold's notes. Interested in Lakota culture since the 1970s, Corum has researched the artist's life for more than forty years. Between 1973 and 1978, as a graduate student from the University of Louisville, Corum visited the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Lakota Sioux reservations in South Dakota. The research material he gathered was later digitized, and donated to his alma mater in 2013. This "C. Ronald Corum Lakota Research Collection" was then shared with the Woksape Tipi Library and Archives at the Oglala Lakota College in Kyle, South Dakota, as an act of repatriation. Unfortunately, some of Feest's wordings in *Frederick Weygold* describing Corum's interest in Lakota culture, such as his "fascination with Native American spirituality", diminish his research and dedication by suggesting a more romanticized and stereotypical generalization of Lakota and Native American peoples. Despite the exemplary biographical research, scrupulous attention to detail, and a striking visual corpus of pictures, paintings, sketches, and reproductions, *Frederick Weygold: Artist and Ethnographer of North American Indians* falls short of our expectation of historically accurate contextualization.

The detailed biographical research done by Corum is truly admirable, but Feest's frequent use of words such as "perhaps," "surely," or the convoluted "it is inconceivable that he did not" constantly weaken the historical reports on Weygold's actions, tainting every chapter with uncertainty and scruple. The corpus of sources for *Frederick Weygold* comprises correspondence with his family, friends, and fellow researchers, as well as letters to and from art dealers and museums both in Germany and the United States. Corum also used Weygold's personal notes and journals, and completed these texts with archival documents from newspapers and museum catalogues. From train tickets to shopping lists and drafts jotted on the back of art school assignments, the amount of textual information gathered by Corum is incredible. He also had access to digitized documents, drawings, and interviews on cassette tapes. Considering such a rich wealth of biographical material, it is even more surprising that Feest's text would express hesitation and gaps so often in its accounts of Weygold's travels.

The compendium of images used to illustrate the text is as diverse and interesting as the compilation of documents. Sketches, drawings, paintings, book illustrations, photographs and postcards are among the visual elements you will find in *Frederick Weygold*. Furthermore, the quality of the reproductions is excellent. The inclusion of letters and documents from German

museums offers the rare opportunity for a glimpse into the politics of what was called “primitive art” acquisition and conservation in the late 19th century. The authors also provide us with the successive steps taken by Weygold to provide his peers with ethnographic studies, when this field of study was only starting to emerge as such in Western academia.

Amateur anthropologists like Weygold were able to speak with authority on Lakota culture in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, but their work and collections are under scrutiny today. As others did at that time, Weygold taught himself the language by studying missionary dictionaries, and then visited Lakota reservations to purchase items such as tipis, regalia, or ceremonial tools for European and American museums and art dealers. Although his legitimacy as an ethnographer was not questioned at the time, it should be contextualized for modern readers, whereas the contemporary colonial contexts and policies are only vaguely brushed upon.

The description of the extermination of the buffalo is a good example of lack of historical contextualization. This act was facilitated by the American government under pressure to secure more land for settlement because of the Gold Rush and transcontinental railroad expansion projects. “Hunting by rail” was advertised, and masses of hunting parties rode the Kansas Pacific trains while shooting buffaloes from the wagon roofs and windows, leaving behind thousands of carcasses to rot on the plains. State governments encouraged the practice, because the decimation of the buffalo helped their colonial policies. These animals were the main source of food, clothing, and shelter, and without them Native populations on the Plains were forced into signing treaties with the government in the hope of getting housing supplies and food rations. This allowed new white settlers to install farms and cattle on the land. In *Frederick Weygold*, this crucial period of colonial history, with all its political, industrial, and economic ramifications, is reduced to a single neutral sentence: “the bison skins had gone out of use among the Lakotas [after] the buffalo herds had disappeared” (19).

Other problematic oversights include the suggestion that ancestral cultural practices were “forgotten” or simply removed from the chain of transmission. The devastating consequences of land theft, boarding schools, and missionary work on Lakota customs are insidiously absent from most of the narrative. Although these accounts were common at the time, it is very problematic to find them unaddressed, and moreover even propagated, in a 2017 publication on North American ethnography. It amounts to dangerous revisionism. Great progress has been made towards more culturally accurate historical studies of American colonization, both in academia and in the political sphere. This book is a step backwards. Moreover, several references are made to Weygold’s admiration for Edward S. Curtis and Karl Bodmer. They too were non-native artists who travelled throughout the U.S. to photograph and paint portraits of Native American people they encountered. Their work has also been praised for artistic qualities as well as ethnographic value, but their reputation has been constantly revised in the last two decades. Their accounts of Native American societies are more recently criticized as partly, if not greatly, fabricated, following the steady fashion for romanticizing of their generation. Like Curtis, Weygold is said to have provided culturally foreign items to Lakota models, or removed elements, such as ribbons (41), to erase visual clues of Western assimilation before photographing them for his postcards. This demonstrates his attachment to unrealistic, romantic notions of what American Indians should look like.

In thoroughly examining this work, it appears as though the authors were aware of Weygold's cultural faux-pas, but chose to try to excuse not only his mistakes, but also the problematic behaviors of ethnographers of his time. His interest in preserving art, and later his activism for the respect of Native American rights, are undeniably commendable. However, his expertise in the field of Lakota studies is shrouded throughout this biography in conspicuous attempts at disguising errors and wrong-doing under the guise of praising his efforts. Weygold's early reports on painted tipis are labelled as careful and insightful, though at the same time it is mentioned that he had never met a real Native person, nor read any scholarly work on the topic at the time of his writing (18). Feest tells us that over the course of his ethnographic career, Weygold made numerous appraisal, identificative, and interpretative mistakes. He also chronically omitted attributions, museum or archival details, and catalog numbers of the objects he traded and/or sketched for his clients (23). He purposely lied on listings, and spread false information on the Plains items he was acquiring for, or selling to, museums (36, 50). These gaps in research and ethical violations are often mentioned but never addressed.

All in all, *Frederick Weygold: Artist and Ethnographer of North American Indians* is a pleasing close-up on a life dedicated to visual arts. Despite questionable oversights concerning the socio-historical contexts of Native American ethnography and policy of the late 19th and early 20th century, as well as numerous typographical errors that were overlooked by the editors, it is a truly original book, full of detailed biographical anecdotes and high-quality representations, pictures, and photographs. It provides comprehensive descriptions of the earliest ethnographic studies of Plains tipi construction and painting. Although it may disconcert some Native American scholars and readers, it is also likely to please early ethnography enthusiasts, and admirers of Plain Indians' visual arts.

Léna Remy-Kovach, University of Freiburg

Jeffrey Paul Ansloos. *The Medicine of Peace: Indigenous Youth Decolonizing Healing and Resisting Violence*. Winnipeg: Fernwood, 2017. 128 pp. ISBN: 9781552669556.

<https://fernwoodpublishing.ca/book/the-medicine-of-peace>

The Medicine of Peace asserts that the impacts of complex historical trauma are tied to the cycles of violence facing Indigenous youth in Canada, with the Western criminal justice and mental health systems being complicit in perpetuating further violence. Ansloos (Fisher River Cree Nation) advocates for a holistic, culturally relevant, and relational approach, versus the current standard procedures in settler nations such as Canada. Ansloos argues that youth are “shaped and situated” within the intergenerational violence of colonialism. Highlighting the disproportionate incarceration rate, growing gang involvement, and internalized violence (including suicide) it is argued that cycles of violence are exacerbated by a punitive criminal justice system and culturally disengaged interventions. A critical reflection on the Canadian psychology field/mental health system is put forth to foreground recommendations for holistic Indigenous approaches that would better address differing notions of self and well-being.

Using a Foucauldian discursive analysis through a postcolonial lens, and drawing upon scholars such as Fanon, Ansloos provides an overview of how colonial processes have caused Indigenous youth to feel culturally inferior and powerless, namely the politicization of language and binary internalized and externalized processes of identity whereby Indigeneity is weakness/bad and settler identity is powerful/good. Ansloos asserts that youth feel dependent and inferior in Canadian society leading to shame being the dominant framework from which they view, and ultimately distance themselves from, their Indigenous culture. He asserts that Indigenous youth are in desperate need of reconnection and cultural and communal revitalization. The colonial history of Canada plays out in the justice system, rehabilitation, interventions, and research that fail to take historic trauma and Indigenous worldviews into account, ultimately harming Indigenous youth. Additionally, youth are at an intersection of unhelpful psychosocial interventions based upon an assumed superiority and universality of Western methods (“cultural imperialism”).

Ansloos calls for the field of psychology to critically reflect on the past and present impacts of colonization and the need for more communal and restorative practices versus individualistic and retributive practices. Potential action steps would include a more relational and contextual approach and the holistic Indigenous concept of *well-being* would replace the prevalent and often overly simplistic, Western views on identity and cultural factors. Ansloos uses theoretical arguments by multiple scholars to tie individual psychological health to community well-being. The sentiment aligns well with many past research studies such as a 2007 study claiming “youth suicide as [being] a ‘coalminer’s canary’ of cultural distress” (Hallett, Chandler et al., 394). The findings of the Hallett, Chandler et al. study indicate cultural continuity factors have a clear

correlation to youth suicide, especially related to language continuance. Specifically, First Nations communities with a higher degree of native language knowledge had fewer suicides and communities with a low degree had a higher suicide rate.

The author advocates for a “critical-Indigenous peace psychology” to be realized through raising the critical consciousness of settler and Indigenous identities to the devastating impacts of colonization and reconnecting youth to “reconstruct a postcolonial identity that is shaped by their own Indigenous conceptions of a non-violent future” (54). *The Medicine of Peace* asserts if youth embody their Indigenous identity, an identity that is “principally opposed to violence”, it will promote an ethical foundation able to resist colonization (85). Keeping in mind diverse audiences, a deeper explanation of this statement is needed to combat prevalent romanticized notions.

In the final chapter, some “pathways forward” are offered using a Medicine Wheel model; however, the suggested model is highly theoretical and not overly grounded in a relational Indigenous cultural context. The suggested strategies would benefit from consultation from youth, elders, or a more localized community-based approach with an analysis of past studies/projects that have used a similar approach. There have been multiple research studies and health initiatives focused on First Nations communities/youth using various “culturally appropriate” methods, with the Medicine Wheel being a popular aspect of many (e.g. Kirmayer, Laurence, et al.; Sasakamoose, JoLee, et al.; Lavallée; Stewart, and others). Examining existing scholarship would have provided an opportunity to compare the approaches and findings across the fields of criminal justice, mental health/psychology, and health and wellness related to potential lessons that could be used for future Indigenous youth programs. In her 1995 article *Peacekeeping Actions At Home: A Medicine Wheel Model for Peacekeeping Pedagogy*, Calliou offers a peacekeeping pedagogy model using the Medicine Wheel, encompassing racism, multiculturalism, anti-racism, and peacekeeping. As an example of health-related research done alongside community and youth, the 2016 study “*Because we have really unique art*”: *Decolonizing Research with Indigenous Youth Using the Arts* took similar theoretical arguments to the ones presented in *The Medicine of Peace* and engaged with Indigenous youth in Canada on their perspectives of how to do the work of decolonization.

Although the book puts forth a thorough theoretical foundation, it lacks a research component or Indigenous concepts that would ground the work in specific Indigenous epistemologies and/or knowledges (e.g. concepts of *well-being*). Indigenous methodologies are mentioned as being salient guiding frameworks to engage in research with Indigenous communities yet there was no engagement or accountability to any community. Working in an Indigenous community would have allowed youth and community members to share their voices and visions of violence prevention and treatment. Since there was no engagement with First Nation communities and/or

youth, the research would benefit from additional context on the author's decisions to remain solely theoretical and how this decision influenced and shaped the work.

Indigenous-led research in this area is sorely needed. I commend the author for laying bare such deeply personal feelings and insecurities surrounding his identity. The complexities of his personal identity struggle open many of the chapters where the author relives experiences of his adolescence “wrestle with the layers of colonial shame that entangle me” (64). The author has obviously thought deeply about his positionality and provides an honest account of how he, as an Indigenous author estranged from his Cree culture and trained in Western methods, can unknowingly objectify Indigenous teachings. This book would be beneficial to audiences looking for an in-depth theoretical analysis related to the need for youth to reconnect with Indigenous cultural identity that could serve as a foundation for further research and application.

Tiffanie Hardbarger, Northeastern State University

Calliou, Sharilyn. "Peacekeeping actions at home: A medicine wheel model for a peacekeeping pedagogy." *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (1995): 47-72.

Flicker, Sarah, et al. "Because we have really unique art": Decolonizing Research with Indigenous Youth Using the Arts." *International Journal of Indigenous Health* 10.1 (2014): 16.

Hallett, Darcy, Michael J. Chandler, and Christopher E. Lalonde. "Aboriginal language knowledge and youth suicide." *Cognitive Development* 22.3 (2007): 392-399.

Kirmayer, Laurence, et al. "Indigenous Populations Healing Traditions: Culture, Community and Mental Health Promotion with Canadian Aboriginal Peoples." *Australasian Psychiatry*, vol. 11, Oct 2003 Supplement, p. S15.

Lavallée, Lynn. "Physical activity and healing through the medicine wheel." *Pimatisiwin* 5.1 (2007): 127-153.

Sasakamoose, JoLee, et al. "First Nation and Métis youth perspectives of health: an indigenous qualitative inquiry." *Qualitative Inquiry* 22.8 (2016): 636-650.

Stewart, Suzanne L. "Promoting Indigenous mental health: Cultural perspectives on healing from Native counsellors in Canada." *International Journal of Health Promotion and Education* 46.2 (2008): 49-56.

Kathryn Troy. *The Specter of the Indian: Race, Gender and Ghosts in American Seances, 1848-1890*. New York: SUNY, 2017. Xxx + 201pp. ISBN 978-1-4384-6609-5.

<http://www.sunypress.edu/p-6414-the-specter-of-the-indian.aspx>

Kathryn Troy's book, though published in an Indigenous Studies context, quite possibly invites rejection by Indigenous readers and anyone sensitive to the impact of Indian stereotypes on Indigenous peoples and cultures in the colonial period. This hard to swallow quality is due to a methodological choice that Troy appears to have made early in her study: she treats the "Indian" ghosts and spirits summoned up by 19th century mediums as entities that were entirely real, at least to the people witnessing them. As she puts it in the Introduction, "To assert at the outset that all Spiritualists were knowing frauds is risky and counterproductive" (xiv). Yet for any Indigenous reader it will be hard to read a passage like the following, printed as a verbatim account of a spiritual message, as being the words of a Native spirit:

Me see among the thorns many beautiful gems, soul gems that sparkles brighter than the sun. Me see they spirit covered with dark shadows, but me is not hindered from seeing they pure spirit, it is much beautiful and me can see what your noble soul would do if unshackled... Me sees much me no tell for want of your words (59)

This sort of racist "Little Plum" mock-pidgin is common among the 19th century spirits Troy surveys, as is a sort of hyperinflated and grandiose rhetoric in the mode of Chief Seattle's (Si'ahl) well-known yet highly disputed speech. Readers can also expect to encounter lithe *indian* maidens, brave warriors, and dead war chiefs issuing words of reconciliation from beyond the grave.

Troy is not a Spiritualist herself, however, and the historical research that has gone into this book is methodical and thoroughly interrogated. It is therefore obvious that her intention is not in any way to validate the racist stereotypes that swam through the minds of 19th century charlatans and the self-deceivers and dupes that they swept up in their wake - just to show my own atheist and anti-spiritual bias for a moment. Rather, her taking of Spiritualist publications at face value allows her to entirely avoid the tricky ground of intentionality, and instead to use manifestations of *indian* spirits (the inauthenticity of which should be immediately obvious to any reader) to map out the psyches of a group of mostly wealthy, liberal, middle and upper class white Americans in relation to the genocides and land expropriations taking place in the country. The result is a fascinating case study of settler guilt made manifest in a Freudian sense, which eventually reveals some unexpected effects on actual Native American peoples of the period. Only by taking these ghosts seriously, Troy argues, can we properly account for their effect on people who witnessed séances or read the various Spiritualist newsletters.

A ghost, after all, is not the same as a dead person. As a liminal presence, *neither* dead *nor* alive, the spirits summoned up by mediums served to attest to their audiences that there would be consequences for genocide, and these would not be the consequences of a white-first version of Christianity. American Spiritualism put itself forward less as a religion than as a form of rational

enquiry. As Troy notes and then extensively shows, “Spiritualists defined the phenomena they witnessed and interpreted them through the lens of accepted contemporary sciences.” As such, when Spiritualists encountered solemn warnings from the celestial spheres that white Americans would suffer serious consequences for their actions in the destruction of Indian nations, these were far more specific in their call to action than general ethical condemnations or Christian preaching would have been. Equally, the existence of *indian* ghosts served, at least at first, as a counter to the eliminationist settler logic analysed by Patrick Wolfe and others. Native Americans could not be simply and permanently disappeared from the land, nor could their cultures be assimilated: rather, for the Spiritualists, *indians* would be an ever-present call to repent, rather in the manner of Jacob Marley.

Knowledge of what was happening in the celestial spheres was necessarily incomplete, fragmentary and on many occasions contradictory. Just as with UFO sightings or Satanic child abuse panics, the very fact that such contradictions were being discussed and analysed within the community fed into the narrative that the movement was at base scientific. One element that was especially hotly debated, in a country plunging into and then recovering from the Civil War, was that of race. Troy follows Robert Cox in arguing that most Spiritualists were persuaded by the messages from beyond that race eventually became irrelevant as spirits progressed through the celestial spheres, and that the afterlife would be “devoid of distinctions and categorizations based on differing religious or political affiliations” (68). As Indian chiefs were seen as spiritually strong and/or pure, they progressed unusually quickly to the higher spheres. Though many historians have stated that *indian* spirits mainly functioned to “forgive” whites, Troy notes that this forgiveness was targeted: only spiritual investigators with the wit to listen, understand and act were sent messages of benevolence.

It needs to be mentioned that this was not a fringe movement. Hardcore Spiritualism certainly counted several hundred thousand adherents, while as many as eleven million people – out of a population of no more than twenty five million – held at least some Spiritualist beliefs, attended the occasional séance or semi-regularly read Spiritualist publications. A significant number of US citizens, therefore, were able to experience Cheyenne Chief White Antelope, who had been murdered in the Sand Creek massacre, telling the still-living Colonel John Chivington that he would not gain access to the higher spiritual realms after death, as his victims had, but would continue to “walk the earth in shadows and thorns will spring up and pierce his feet” (83). And Troy’s research demonstrates that many of these spiritual researchers felt themselves impelled by *indian* spirits to take action to try to actively aid living Native peoples and cultures. Spiritualist editorials fulminated against Indian wars, cast doubt on reports of *indian* savagery, publicised the crimes of Chivington and Sherman, and happily reported the shade of Custer admitting his guilt and shame.

White wealthy do-gooders with a strong urge to help but no real knowledge of the cultures and communities that they wanted to aid – just their own projections and imaginings made manifest in ectoplasm, hair snatched from the spirit realm, and the sound of leather moccasins in the dark of the séance room? What could possibly go wrong? Troy demonstrates that leading Spiritualists such as Colonel Samuel Tappan, husband to Cora Hatch (one of the most renowned mediums in

the country) took an active role in the various “friends of the Indian” societies. Spiritualists raised funds and lobbied Congress until something was done to avert the terrible fate that their spirit guides warned faced the United States. The form that that “something” took, however, was the foundation of boarding schools at Carlisle and elsewhere, and the creation of programmes to turn Indians into self-sufficient smallholders. As Troy puts it, “The Dawes Act made a reality all that Spiritualists hoped to accomplish on behalf of Indians” (149). While Spiritualist influence may have been a brake on overtly genocidal actions (I here follow Wolfe’s distinction between genocide and settler colonial eliminationism), much as today’s superficially woke “colour-blind” white activists may help to forestall the rise of neo-Nazism, Spiritualists failed to understand the impact of seemingly benevolent enforced assimilation. Troy’s well-written and thoroughly researched study, rather depressingly, suggests that the energies from the colonial guilt physically intruding into the séance room was simply diverted into another part of the elimination process.

James Mackay, European University Cyprus

Tanya Talaga. *Seven Fallen Feathers: Racism, Death and Hard Truths in a Northern City*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press. 361 pp. ISBN: 9781487002268.
<https://houseofanansi.com/products/seven-fallen-feathers>.

In the Prologue to *Seven Fallen Feathers: Racism, Death, and Hard Truths in a Northern City*, Tanya Talaga shares the story of a broken promise between Nanabijou and the Ojibwe. The giant Nanabijou offers protection and peace for the Ojibwe as long as they keep secret the silvery metal found in the rocks near Gichigami, known to the white man as Lake Superior. A Sioux man, taken in and cared for by the Ojibwe, surreptitiously discovers and steals some of the shiny metal. The Sioux man is then caught and, with the aid of alcohol, is persuaded to share the secret of the metal with the white man. As the promise is broken, Nanabijou is “turned from warm flesh and blood to solid stone,” leaving the Ojibwe to fend for themselves (3). Talaga continues in the Prologue to provide a brief history of Thunder Bay, Ontario, “a city of two faces” (3). She explains the stark division between the white and Indigenous communities, Port Arthur and Fort William respectively. As the white community grew and the fur trade diminished, Indian assimilation became a white objective to be carried out through residential schooling. Although more than a century has passed since the first residential school was built in Thunder Bay, mistreatment of Indigenous students persists. Talaga writes with precision, grace, and compassion about contemporary atrocities perpetrated on indigenous youth in Thunder Bay, Ontario. She writes

To understand the stories of the seven lost students who are the subjects of this book, the seven “fallen feathers,” you must understand Thunder Bay’s past, how the seeds of division, of acrimony and distaste, of a lack of cultural understanding and awareness, were planted in those early days, and how they were watered and nourished with misunderstanding and ambivalence. And you must understand how the government of Canada has historically underfunded education and health services for Indigenous children, providing consistently lower levels of support than for non-Indigenous kids, and how it continues to do so to this day. The white face of prosperity built its own society as the red face powerlessly stood and watched. (11)

Talaga’s account of seven children who lost their lives as residential school students is as clear and comprehensive as it is heart-wrenching. Her clarity of prose and journalistic proclivity make this book simultaneously easy and difficult to read. That is, the fluidity of her writing does little to ease the dreadful nature of her subject. Talaga painstakingly recounts the lives and deaths of Jordan Wabasse, Jethro Anderson, Curran Strang, Paul Panacheese, Robyn Harper, Reggie Bushie, Kyle Morrisseau, all killed while attending residential school in Thunder Bay. By pointing to the systemic causes and the lack of governmental funding and involvement that allows deaths such as these to proliferate, Talaga seeks to offer hope that Indigenous students can get the support they need so that these atrocities do not continue.

Talaga highlights those in the community who work tirelessly not only for the safety and well-being of students who attend school there in Thunder Bay, but also for justice for those who have lost their lives there as well. She exposes the aftermath of the families who have lost their loved ones and their resiliency as they continue to move forward in spite of the void in their lives of losing a child.

The book can feel repetitive in places, and Talaga's research has provided a lengthy list of names of those involved that can be overwhelming. In Talaga's defense, the occurrences of these injustices and atrocities *are* repetitive and overwhelming, not to mention sickening and demoralizing. Talaga provides the kind of awareness that precedes action and a staunch and noteworthy optimism in the face of adversity that should embolden her readers. In the *Epilogue*, Talaga writes that Alvin Fiddler, grand chief of Nishnawbe Aski Nation and Thunder Bay resident, continues to work in an effort to provide safety for the Indigenous children of Thunder Bay, but that he knows "time is ticking" (314). Every passing moment is vital to the well-being of these children and, therefore, to the future.

Talaga imagines Fiddler as he prepares for the Canada Day Holiday and country's 150th birthday in 2017:

He will be at a powwow in Grand Council Treaty No. 3 territory with his family. He will be standing in a circle with all the nations surrounding him in ceremonial dance, and he will be thinking of the children before him decked out in their beautiful jingle dresses, their bright-coloured ribbons, and their feathers, and he will wonder about their future and what he can do to make sure they make it to the final prophecy – the eighth fire. Can the settlers and the Indigenous people come together as one and move forward in harmony? Fiddler hopes against hope that the colonial past will be overcome and that for the good of the country we call Canada, the Anishinaabe Nation will rise strong. (315)

The final words of Talaga's important book strike a personal note in the *Acknowledgements* section as she writes to her own children, "you two are the next generation: remember who you are and carry the stories forward" (349). It is only through remembering the fallen and telling the stories that we can ever hope to escape a brutal and unjust past and present. This work is important, and not just for Canada. Talaga's attention to detail and willingness to meet with people and help to tell their stories serves as the kind of vehicle of truth that leads to healing for Indigenous people, not only in Canada, but everywhere Indigenous people are subjected to the injustices of systemic racism and the deleterious aftermath of colonial practices. The "hard truths" that Talaga shares in this book are indeed difficult, but she also shares stories of those who are taking action to prevent further violence against Indigenous youth and stories of those who are beginning to heal. And Talaga reminds us that where there are stories, there is hope.

Brett Douglas Burkhart, University of Oklahoma

Douglas Hunter. *The Place of Stone: Dighton Rock and the Erasure of America's Indigenous Past*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017. 344 pp. ISBN: 978-1-4696-3440-1. <https://www.uncpress.org/book/9781469634401/the-place-of-stone/>

In *The Place of Stone* (2017), Douglas Hunter tells the story of Dighton Rock, a forty ton boulder, originally located on the shore of the Assonet River, which is covered in petroglyphic markings. In Algonquin, *Assonet* translates to “the stone place,” or “the place of stone,” and, it is likely that the river that washed and submerged the rock twice daily in tidal waters not only offered its original geographic and cultural context, but was significant to its original and ongoing interpretations. However, in 1963, Dighton Rock was forcibly removed from the river, “dragged in chains” and held in “virtual captivity . . . within a bunker-like museum structure” that now claims for it Portuguese, and not Indigenous, provenance (4). Long before its 1963 removal, Dighton Rock had become an object of inquiry and misinterpretation for European and American antiquarians, seeking to invalidate Indigenous claims to past and place and to assert Euro-American narratives of belonging. From the outset, Hunter explains that in *The Place of Stone*, readers will not find his own non-expert interpretation of the glyphs or “some exciting technological breakthrough in examining the rock’s surface,” noting, instead, that Indigenous provenance “was apparent from the beginning of European and Anglo-American inquiries” (3). Rather than a conventional work of rock art scholarship, then, Hunter sets out to tell “the story of Dighton Rock’s many stories and storytellers,” a story that “uniquely illuminates processes of *belonging*, *possession*, and *dispossession* from the first decades of the colonial period to the present day” (emphasis added; 5-6). Tracing this story of settler misinterpretation from 1680 to the present, Hunter offers a detailed and lucid historical narrative focused on the antiquarians who have long attributed non-Indigenous provenance to the rock’s markings, from Phoenicians to eleventh-century Norsemen to a series of “lost” peoples: the Lost Tribes of Israel, the Lost City of Atlantis, and the lost Portuguese explorer Miguel Corte-Real.

Although Hunter claims that his book is not “about Indigenous cultural survival,” *The Place of Stone* contributes meaningfully to American Indian studies (5). At the center of his historiography are the questions: “who belongs in America?” and, “to whom does America belong?” (14). By raising these questions, Hunter marks Dighton Rock as emblematic of much larger settler colonial projects that assert Euro-American *belonging* and *possession* and Indigenous *dispossession*. Defaced with centuries of graffiti and forcibly removed from its original location, Dighton Rock, as the book’s subtitle suggests, bears the marks of Indigenous erasure and displacement, while its history of non-Indigenous misinterpretation extends to other palimpsestic erasures and re-inscriptions. By recognizing the history of Dighton Rock’s many misinterpretations as a contested and ongoing *process*, rather than a finished or inevitable outcome, Hunter *unsettles* the settler discourse of *belonging* and *possession*. Hunter’s primary objective may not be to tell the story of “Indigenous cultural survival,” but his historiography of Dighton Rock makes a meaningful contribution to the growing canon of scholarly efforts to critique historical and ongoing processes of Indigenous dispossession and to affirm projects of Indigenous reclamation, repatriation, and political recognition. Specifically, Hunter’s project interrogates the fallacies undergirding the rise of object-based archaeology in the U.S. and actively discredits the erroneous, often absurd, misinterpretations and misattributions of Dighton Rock by European and American antiquarians, whose competing narratives shared the common goals of legitimizing Euro-American conquest and dispossessing Indigenous peoples of past and place.

With its emphasis on settler hermeneutic strategies in American archaeology, *The Place of Stone* draws immediate comparison to Jean M. O'Brien's *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (2010). For some readers, Hunter's methodology, which privileges non-Indigenous interpretations of Dighton Rock and proclaims to document "the erasure of America's Indigenous past," may risk reifying the long-standing trope of the "vanishing Indian." As Hunter himself explains in the introduction, Dighton Rock "does not speak in this book in the sense of conveying a message from an Indigenous antiquity," but, instead, "it speaks in the voices of its many Western interpreters," who Hunter asserts "have employed the rock in a never-ending act of cultural ventriloquism" (6). However, in his richly textured and thoroughly researched account, Hunter reveals and critiques these "never-ending act[s] of cultural ventriloquism" through ten chapters that span over three-hundred years. In this ambitious undertaking, we find that Dighton Rock has held many "places" in the settler imagination, where it has been assigned to many non-Indigenous "pasts." And, with its emphasis on settler interpretations of antiquity, *The Place of Stone* might serve as something of a companion piece to Chadwick Allen's recent Indigenous-centric methodologies for interpreting and engaging with Indigenous Earth Works as vibrant, multiply-encoded sites of historical and ongoing "trans-Indigenous" meaning-making (as discussed in Chadwick Allen's chapter "Siting Earthworks" in his monograph).

For scholars of American Indian and Indigenous studies, Hunter's research methodologies are not as immediately relevant as those of O'Brien and Allen. Whereas Hunter's work tells the story of Dighton Rock through its "many Western interpreters," O'Brien develops Indigenous-centric frameworks for interpreting settler historiography and the "vanishing Indian," while Allen develops "trans-Indigenous" methodologies for reading the ongoing presence and relevance of Indigenous Earth Works, and other forms of Indigenous writing on the land and "by the land" (Allen). However, Hunter's book is relevant, both as a detailed reference and a resourceful guide, for scholars whose work seeks to understand and critique settler-colonial discourse through archaeology, anthropology, and historiography. Moreover, in *The Place of Stone*, Hunter demonstrates how the eccentricities of biography inform the broader discourse of historiography—or how the settler story of antiquity interpreted in Dighton Rock is inseparable from the personal and political motivations of its settler storytellers.

For instance, throughout the book's ten chapters, Hunter introduces (or reintroduces) readers to the migration theorists who used scriptural hermeneutics to promote theories to discredit Indigenous claims to antiquity, such as the Bering Strait Land Bridge and the Lost Tribes of Israel. We meet (or are reacquainted) with Cotton Mather, John Winthrop, Samuel Danforth, and other notable New Englanders who interpreted Dighton Rock to promote versions of Transatlantic Gothicism, as well as linguistic interpreters such as Samuel Harris, who died before completing his work which, Hunter notes, seemed "suspiciously like an attempt to turn Dighton Rock into an American Rosetta Stone" (113). Moreover, we see the rise of American archaeology and its new "object-based epistemology" through the work of Samuel Latham Mitchill and other nineteenth-century archaeologists, who developed theories based on interpretations of objects, from "cabinets of curiosities" to large-scale cartographic surveys of Earth Mounds. In chapter 6, titled "Vinland Imagined," Hunter traces how Carl Christian Rafn's *Antiquitates Americanae* (1837), became "one of the most important scholarly works on American antiquity of the nineteenth century," in which Rafn reinterpreted Norse sagas to claim a "Norse presence in the America's some 500 years before Columbus" (133). And, in

particularly noteworthy chapters (ch. 7 and 8) focused on nineteenth century ethnologist and philologist, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, we find the only documented account of an Indigenous reading of Dighton Rock by Shingwauk, member of the Ojibwe Crane Clan. However, Hunter warns that because Schoolcraft was infamous for “shaping (and reshaping) ... his Indian legends for publication,” there is “little doubt that he took the information he gleaned from Shingwauk and composed a literary narrative as much as an ethnographic report” (169). Taken more broadly, Hunter’s work casts doubt (and ultimately discredits) the claims to antiquity interpreted and promoted by colonialist thinkers who have long used the marks on Dighton Rock to shape and reshape narratives of settler belonging and policies of Indigenous dispossession. As Hunter asserts, “the story of Dighton Rock gathers in other places, other artifacts, and illuminates the much larger and more consequential story of how a colonizing society (through its most educated and politically empowered elite) has defined Indigenous people at both the biological and cultural levels, and to what ends” (5).

Through the competing accounts of migration theorists, linguistic and object-based archaeologists, and other professional and amateur interpreters of American antiquity, *The Place of Stone* raises and re-casts the questions “who belongs in America?” and “to whom does America belong?” Perhaps most successfully, Hunter introduces the methodological term “White Tribism,” which he uses to critique settler hermeneutic strategies grounded in the faulty migration theories and racist “ethnogenesis” discourse developed by “writers and theorists largely trading in *imagined* migrations, and *imagined* infusions of White or European genes” (35). As a lucid and detailed account of settler *imagination*, Hunter’s *The Place of Stone* makes for a compelling read, archiving the many “places” Dighton Rock holds in settler-colonial interpretations of antiquity, and the many “pasts” into which it has been assigned. In its pages, readers will discover the story of how Dighton Rock became (and continues to be) a site for settler place-making and home-making, and a strategically misinterpreted symbol for perpetuating and authenticating settler claims to land and history. Moreover, readers will find eleven figures—the interpretative drawings, engravings, and historical photographs of Dighton Rock—that not only add visual detail, but historically served as the basis for ongoing interpretation, at times replacing Dighton Rock itself as the primary text for interpretation. What Hunter leaves to other scholars, however, is the story of Dighton Rock as remembered or re-interpreted by the Indigenous peoples of what is now New England, where the rock remains both a historic and ongoing site of Indigenous meaning-making and place-making, likely with multiple and changing interpretations closely tied to its specific geographic location. As Hunter asserts, “the utility of Dighton Rock to contemporary Indigenous culture is charged with great possibility” (6). *The Place of Stone* does not follow through on this possibility, but it does lay the foundation for future scholarship that builds from Hunter’s efforts to tell the vexed and varied history of Dighton Rock.

Joshua Anderson, Ohio State University

Allen, Chadwick. *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies*. U of Minnesota P, 2012.

Sarah Marie Wiebe. *Everyday Exposure: Indigenous Mobilization and Environmental Justice in Canada's Chemical Valley*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2017. 280pp. ISBN 9780774832649.

<https://www.ubcpress.ca/everyday-exposure>

Aamjiwnaang First Nation, home to 850 Anishinaabek people, is in a perpetual state of alert. For the Native people on this reserve, leaks, spills, and evacuation are normal, every-day events. Wiebe grounds her review of the contemporary issues on Aamjiwnaang Reserve within the context of First Nations-settler relations. She makes clear connections between historical events and current circumstances. The principle of *Terre nullius* that justified the original colonial displacement of Indigenous Peoples now justifies the placement of toxic waste in the “empty spaces” that are home to contemporary Native Peoples. Aamjiwnaang First Nation is surrounded by Chemical Valley, Canada’s densest concentration of petrochemical plants.

Land is intertwined with culture and identity for Native people. By definition, being Indigenous means being connected to and defined by a particular place. For the Anishinaabek and other First Nations Peoples land is an animate being; a relative to be cared for. Conversely, many members of settler societies think of land as a resource or commodity to be exploited. Defining land as a resource rather than a relative makes the toxic environment of Chemical Valley possible. Wiebe describes how Aamjiwnaang First Nation and surrounding territories have become a sacrifice zone; a place where noise pollution and test sirens compound toxic emissions. As Wiebe notes, “sounds mask the silence with which chemicals penetrate bodies” (11).

Wiebe describes the state-sanctioned slow violence perpetrated on the health of humans and the environment. She provides numerous examples that document the expendability of this area and population such as a time when the warning siren system failed due to a dead battery and a communication breakdown where evacuated residents were sent home prematurely before the “all clear.” Such scenarios depicting indifference to public safety are normal around Aamjiwnaang. This is a place where children play a game where they scoop up mercury. In a particularly haunting example, Wiebe describes how black soot covered children’s clothes at the tribal daycare center as well as other areas of the community.

In 2011, the World Health Organization documented that, Sarnia, the town that surrounds the reserve, has the worst air quality in Canada. Native people in Aamjiwnaang First Nation must monitor their own wellbeing in a climate of state withdrawal of responsibility. They become first responders to spills, accidents, and releases as responsible environmental citizens and stewards to the polluted landscape. A maze of jurisdictional ambiguity has led to shifting the weight of responsibility for environmental issues onto individuals, in spite of the fact that environmental risks are generated elsewhere. The story she tells of barrels of waste that fell off a truck almost sounds comical if it wasn’t so tragic. She describes various entities trying to justify shirking responsibility for clean-up based on precisely where the truck was, which way the barrels rolled, where the waste came from, and where it was going. Meanwhile, as this dance to avoid responsibility played out, the wellbeing of the Anishinaabek people and territory was virtually ignored. This has led Native people to become activists with a “heightened sense of commitment,

mobilization, and engagement in order to hold their industrial and government neighbors to account” (81).

As might be expected, living in Chemical Valley has significant health consequences. Cancer, respiratory maladies, and premature death rates are high. Among many challenges for the people living within this toxic area, Wiebe has identified the importance of environmental reproductive justice. Notably, the Anishinaabek people of Aamjiwnaang First Nation have experienced a sharp decline in male births. This book details the experiences of the community in trying to hold someone accountable for the environmental risks associated with living within this territory.

The preface describes the book as “a collection of stories that travel through time, this book aims to engage diverse knowledges, insight critical thought, inspire reflection.” The author contrasts Indigenous understandings of land, culture, and environment with non-relational forms of being and knowing that characterize dominant society understandings. This book is based on doctoral research and provides a detailed description of how the author/researcher approached the project. This includes theoretical and research underpinnings as well as how the author approached and engaged the Indigenous community.

At times the book is heavily immersed in the author’s theoretical analysis. For example, she highlights and dissects the meaning of terms such as citizen and citizenship. She identifies her work as being grounded within a *reproductive justice framework of inquiry*. This in-depth discussion of her theoretical positioning lends transparency to her approach but may feel tedious to some readers. Likewise, some points are made multiple times and may feel redundant. On the other hand, storytellers often repeat their points with slight variations, both for emphasis and to get the attention of different listeners.

Wiebe tells this important story well. Her words are powerful and her analysis insightful. She also uses black and white photographs that juxtapose reserve residents and chemical plants. In this instance, a picture is indeed worth a thousand words. She includes a map of the reserve surrounded by industry. Poetry of band members is included so readers hear their perspectives in their own words.

Documenting this community’s struggle is crucial. People around the world need to be informed about the situation of Aamjiwnaang First Nation and similar challenges faced by Indigenous Peoples in other areas. Wiebe tells the story of a community fighting for justice. She describes their situation and advocacy efforts in detail as well as the many barriers that they face in seeking accountability and justice. She reminds us, however, that the story isn’t over yet. Community members and allies continue to fight for environmental justice and human dignity. In this sense, she leave us with a glimmer of hope and the possibility for justice, albeit within an overwhelmingly indifferent and often hostile context.

Readers interested in Indigenous issues and environmental justice will find this a worthwhile read. It is a poignant case example that illustrates power relations, colonialism, and environmental degradation, as well as hope, resilience, and the importance of place for Native people.

Hilary Noel Weaver, SUNY Buffalo

John H. Monnett, ed. *Eyewitness to the Fetterman Fight: Indian Views*. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 2017. 248 pp. ISBN: 978-0806155821.

<http://www.oupres.com/ECommerce/Book/Detail/2189/eyewitness%20to%20the%20fetterman%20fight>

As with most battles and massacres of the Plains Indian Wars, the historical memory of the Fetterman Fight on December 21, 1866 seldom includes Indigenous perspectives and interpretations. John H. Monnett addresses this predicament through an edited synthesis of Lakota and Northern Cheyenne eyewitness accounts, to reexamine the traditional narrative of this battle. Early twentieth-century ethnographers and historians characterized the defeat of Captain William J. Fetterman's command of nearly eighty soldiers near Fort Phil Kearny in northern Wyoming as a disaster that resulted from Fetterman's disobedience and arrogance. Monnett sheds light on this misconception, arguing instead that the fight was one of the most strategic Indigenous victories on the Northern Plains. Since there were no survivors of Fetterman's command to remark on their experience or Fetterman's frame of mind, scholars previously relied on scant documentary evidence and the maligned impressions of non-participants at Fort Phil Kearny. Until the expansion of ethnohistory in the 1970s, historians did not consider Native sources of historical memory as valid forms of history. Monnett provides an avenue for these Lakota and Northern Cheyenne voices to not only broaden the context, but to reclaim the Fetterman Fight's historical narrative.

Monnett defines the purpose of his work as both historical and methodological. Through the accounts of Joseph White Bull, Fire Thunder, American Horse and others, the alliance of Lakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Arapaho warriors denoted careful strategizing, knowledge of the geography, and tactical skill. Monnett emphasizes that these communities of the lush Powder River region had legitimate reason to defend their accessibility to the ecosystem, hunting ranges, and trade (Monnett 8). For the Lakota, maintaining control over this contested space had been crucial since acquiring the basin from the Crow in 1857. Older, secondary literature eschews this critical understanding of intertribal relations and the culture of Plains Indian warfare. Monnett restores this cultural significance through his assembly of Lakota and Northern Cheyenne perspectives to reveal how the Fetterman Fight had implications regarding both the land and successive generations. Best resonated in the words of Bill Tallbull, a grandson of a warrior in the battle, the Lakotas and Northern Cheyennes "were fighting for their families and their future" (137). Preserving the memory of family members and tribal leaders involved in the Fetterman Fight meant memorializing their legacy as both a personal feat and defenders of the community.

From a methodological standpoint, the impressive arrangement of eyewitness accounts enables readers to interact with the sources in their raw form and approach the production of history from an ethnohistorical perspective. Monnett situates his collection of published and unpublished interviews with historical context and his own scrupulous interpretations and critiques for guidance. In each testimony, he is cautious not to overshadow the strength of Indigenous

narrations with his own voice. Furthermore, Monnett warns the reader to be conscious of the interviewer's positionality in these accounts. Whether ethnographers embellished the oral histories for audience appeal or used the knowledge of their Native subjects for personal advancement, Monnett addresses this predicament of validity in Native testimonies with an approach of transparency. Best exemplified in John G. Neihardt's interview of the Oglala warrior, Fire Thunder, Monnett provides both the original transcription and how it appeared in *Black Elk Speaks*. In doing so, Monnett offers an important lesson in linguistic floridity and manipulation by non-Native interviewers. He emphasizes the importance of this skill again in other, more ambiguous accounts where it is especially challenging to extrapolate the veracity from the interviewer's embellishment. In total, the diverse array of Lakota and Northern Cheyenne accounts develops an organic consistency aided by Monnett's cross-examinations and corroborations.

The mystery surrounding the roles of Red Cloud and Crazy Horse in the Fetterman Fight become a critical subject of inquiry for Monnett. The Fetterman Fight took place in the middle of Red Cloud's War (1866-1868), a broader series of armed conflicts between the Lakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Arapaho alliance against the U.S. government on the Northern Plains. In Plains Indian historiography and popular memory, Red Cloud and Crazy Horse are some of the most familiar figures, but their exact roles in the Fetterman Fight seemed to be at a historical impasse. In the Oglala Lakota testimonies, most interviews attest Red Cloud's presence at the battle, whereas the Minneconjou Lakota and Northern Cheyenne accounts claim that he was absent. As for Crazy Horse, the accounts provided by Eagle Hawk, American Horse, and Rocky Bear all testify to his presence near the battle site (85). Monnett clarifies that although Red Cloud's and Crazy Horse's positions cannot be fully confirmed, it is likely that they participated in some way. What is most significant, Monnett concludes, is the iconic value of Red Cloud and Crazy Horse as leaders in the resistance against U.S. settler colonialism.

While these speculations about Red Cloud and Crazy Horse are plausible, one wishes that Monnett further explained the consequences of their representations in the secondary literature. As Monnett himself proclaims, the Fetterman Fight had an alliance of at least 1500 Native warriors defending their families, communities, and livelihood. Perhaps another interpretation of the disparities regarding Red Cloud and Crazy Horse might suggest that the Lakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Arapaho peoples represented in this history understood their alliance to be predicated on collective agency. Joseph White Bull and others noted the democratized nature of this alliance, with all participants having personal and communal reasons to participate in the battle. As Monnett's argument in *Eyewitness to the Fetterman Fight* encourages, the traditional narratives of such events must be reassessed to acknowledge those whose voices lack representation. It will be up to the younger generation of ethnohistorians to answer these intriguing considerations Monnett presents.

John H. Monnett's thoughtfully crafted assembly of Native voices adds an untold dimension of the Fetterman Fight and reminds readers of the necessity of Indigenous agency in historical production. For the Lakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Arapaho warriors in the battle, the trivial details of the battle were not as important as the main objectives of their fight: securing their communities and defending the Powder River Country. Monnett's fifteen-year commitment to the study of the Fetterman Fight culminates with *Eyewitness to the Fetterman Fight*, which engages students and scholars of ethnohistory to reimagine both the narrative and the craft.

Jennifer Andrella, Michigan State University

Notes Toward a Review of *IRL* and *Nature Poem* by Tommy Pico

Tommy Pico. *IRL*. New York: Birds LLC, 2016. 98 pp. ISBN: 978-0991429868.

<http://www.birdsllc.com/catalog/irl>

Tommy Pico. *Nature Poem*. New York: Tin House, 2017. 136 pp. ISBN: 978-1-941040-63-8.

<http://tinhouse.com/product/nature-poem-by-tommy-pico/>

Tommy Pico's recent collections resist reviewing for three reasons: one, they've already been reviewed in some of the best journals and magazines in America; two, excerpts from his writings do not fully demonstrate the artistry and power of his collections, and three, the intertwined complexity of the two collections leads to shape-shifting—in the first reading, the two books reveal only what they wish to while whispering among themselves and casting spells that take effect in future readings. In subsequent readings, new meanings are created, the world expands and explodes, and the conversation continues. Because the experience of reading the two collections together is one of shift and shimmer and slip, this will not be a final, comprehensive review of these two collections—instead, these are *notes toward* a review.

Perhaps because of the amplitude of *Nature Poem* and *IRL*, thematic elements and stylistic choices are often the primary concerns in previous reviews—the use of text message style, the fast, sometimes shallow, and not always satisfying rhythms of city life, of gay life, of urban NDN-ness—there is no doubt that Pico has offered an epic (*IRL*) and an eclogue (*Nature Poem*) for our time. In this review, I'd like to look more closely at the stunning *poetry* of Pico's two books, the many moments of sheer beauty and pain for which the ground has been carefully prepared by a poet very much in control of his craft. The purpose of this review is to highlight Pico's mastery of poetics—his status as cultural-icon-in-the-making will take care of itself among at least two generations of NDNs, especially urban NDNs, as will, perhaps, among queer communities, the creation of a presence not unlike Allen Ginsberg's (whose ghost, summoned or not, inhabits the books).

Pico's work is as multilayered, hypertextual, and allusive as any of the great poets' work—Eliot, of course, comes to mind. Moreover, Pico's allusions engage at least as large a field as Eliot's: contemporary pop culture and music; poetry of many eras, capital “H” History, Native American history, Kumeyaay culture, Greek myth, gay culture, social media, puns, linguistics, etymology, and more. Looking up text message abbreviations, pop cultural references, and allusions in Pico's poetry might make one wonder why the books weren't published—or simultaneously published—as online/digital media hypertexts instead of only in print. Perhaps, though, an audience that needs to look up the references is not the audience Pico is addressing.

In Pico's writings, inside the world of text message abbreviations and twitter hashtags and an ongoing conversation with his Muse, something like emblem poems arise, poem-sections which often use emblem structure—description / invocation of a thing / idea followed by meditation on the thing / idea—except, in Pico's works, especially in *IRL* but also in *Nature Poem*, the descriptions / invocations and meditations happen cyclically, recur in different forms, and are

sometimes repeated. One might also call *IRL* an emblem-poem because its form and style reveal the *shape* of a hyper-connected world where selfhood is continually renegotiated in conversation with real-time feedback from social media—on the page, *IRL* looks like a scrolling series of text messages or a Twitter feed. The following excerpt reveals the emblem-structure while also offering an example of the text-message style of the text.

The influence of Muse
 is not unlike *being*
 under the influence, the way a poem
 is spontaneously drunk
 on Robert Graves.

 The temple of Muse
 is all around you. Don't patron-
 ize me, tradition
 is a cage Conflict constant . . . (*IRL* 31)

“Tradition” in both culture and poetry is a common theme in Pico’s writings: how to resist it, how to work within it, how to *make it new*. In *Nature Poem*, social-media-speak is also used; one piece begins, “the fabric of our lives is #death” (32) and each line of this page and a half poem ends with the same hashtag, a device, epistrophe, both emotionally devastating in its repetition and disturbing in its accuracy—death sells and is cheapened on social media.

IRL and *Nature Poem* both make use of text-speech, approach many of the same themes, and are narrated by “Teebs,” (Pico’s *IRL* nickname), but differ in their formal choices, density / intensity, and tone. *IRL* uses short lines and is composed as one long poem; its density and intensity lend it the feel of an epic, and the tone, while it varies and ends on a note of personal integration, is, overall, one of loneliness and alienation:

I am so good at being Alone.
 All I need is my phone.
 Subway, elevator, drifting off
 in a convo—no one really seems
 to notice, occupied by their own
 gleaming pool of longing. (*IRL* 32)

Pico’s facility with sonics is displayed here, in the repetition of “o” sounds that intensify the representation of loneliness.

Nature Poem appears on the page as a series of individual poems that are nonetheless intertwined and that work best when read as part of the whole. The lines are longer than those in *IRL*, often crowding the edge of the page, and the tone is somehow more hopeful, more kind to its narrator. Throughout the book, the narrator of *Nature Poem* explores the many reasons he can’t write a “nature poem”: colonialism, noble savage narrative, loss of land, loss of culture, the fact that “nature” contains much more than a pretty landscape and includes the often ugly and mean actions of human nature. Pico notes in a *Rumpus* interview that this book is an attempt “to rewire

and channel the sense of cultural loss that I feel into a new kind of culture, without losing myself or having my identity subsumed into a monolithic ‘Indian’ identity” (Knapp).

I can’t write a nature poem
bc it’s fodder for the noble savage
narrative. I wd slap a tree across the face,
I say to my audience. (NP 2)

Pico’s wry sense of humor is often showcased by his line breaks—breaking the line after “savage” complicates the idea of the sentence because it appears that nature poems are fodder for the noble savage” *poet*; on the next line the completion of the phrase “noble savage narrative” turns this section to a critique of representation, not of (or maybe in addition to) those who represent.

In both collections, Pico’s use of texting acronyms / abbreviations pushes poetic compression near its limit. While e.e. cummings wasn’t composing text messages, his use of abbreviation, of compression in context, word choice, and “story” could be thought of as antecedent to Pico’s use of texting-language. In Pico’s work, abbreviations and acronyms seem to collapse the difference between sign and signal and noise, context and interpretation, a collapse that reflects the shifting contemporary boundaries between self and other, between private and public, and, for Pico / Teebs as for many of the social-media generation, the real-time necessity to negotiate several different constructions of self: NDN, gay, urban, rez kid, child of colonialism-influenced family dysfunction, and more.

Leaving yr status
up to the feed, open
to the scroll, who do you
want knowing you r suicidal?
the obvi answer is every-
body, but the whisper
is more
particular.
Ppl lean in.
.....
. . . Who r you trying
not to text talk
.....
What texture
of the grey audience puts
the “firm” in affirming? (IRL 39)

As an added difficulty to his generation’s all-consuming media-tion, the narrator Teebs, like many young, contemporary, urban NDNs (Pico’s usage), struggles to integrate his Kumeyaay culture, heritage, and history with the fast-paced, tech-mediated life he lives in New York. In a *Hooligan* interview, Pico states, “I think one of the problems I had to overcome was the idea that being Indigenous and contemporary were two different things” (Haparimwi 8). Part of Pico’s

project is rectifying or integrating, for himself and for others, the terms “indigenous” and “contemporary.” And, perhaps surprisingly, for series of writings in which self is constructed through media, Teebs’ complex identity is abundantly embodied: his Native body, his gay body, and his grappling to make them one.

. . . We are mixed (blood) but full NDN.
I cd see my date says, squinting
half Asian? Tho everyone
 can yell I mean tell I’m a fag
 Part of me in sharp
 relief, a part of me half
 hidden. (*IRL* 42)

In this excerpt, Pico tweaks a common trope used in mixed blood Native poetry to express Teebs’ divided self, a fascinating revision which leads to philosophical questions about selfhood as it is expressed through the body as well as interrogating recent claims that racial identity is commensurate with gender identity and that both are *merely* or *only* performative.

Pico has stated in several interviews that his work is influenced by A.R. Ammons’ poetry—in the case of *IRL*, particularly Ammons’ *Tape for the Turn of the Year*, a long poem composed on an adding machine tape. Ammons is present in the text as well, often in references to another book-length poem, *Garbage*. Moreover, Ammons’ compositional style interspersed his meditative, culturally-critical poems with what Robert B. Shaw called “jokes, slang, ironies . . .” a description that would serve Pico’s work as well. However, Pico’s deft handling of “real-time” description, meditation, negotiation, and politically-charged issues calls to my mind Lyn Hejinian’s *My Life*.

Juliana Spahr describes Hejinian’s work as influenced by “language philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein’s aphoristic statement that ‘the limits of my language mean the limits of my world’” (103). Today’s ascendancy of messaging and other written forms of internet communication seems to confirm Wittgenstein’s statement—the networked world is large and interconnected and requires code-switching and constant attention to / policing of language.

In *IRL*, the ubiquity of text is imaged as the writing-over of self, of memory:

. . . I see so much
 text all day—the door-
 way of my memory
 has shit typed
 in Raleway all over it I
 see fonts in my dreams
 oily strings of letters
 in the corners of ppl
 mouths . . . (*IRL* 23)

The remarkable imagery in this excerpt figures text as invading the deepest aspects of personhood and as disgusting “oily strings of letters,” an illness perhaps, affecting everyone. The challenge is to construct a language sufficient to inscribe yourself into the feed while, at the same time, “Saving something for the self,” (*IRL* 79). One way to remain intact in the world of text is to allow one’s sorrow and cultural terror its expression:

The seam
of my skin bursts open
routinely. It’s a condition. In
the valley I lived in for
thousands of years, in trad-
itional times, I’m sure I would
have been a mourner, called
on to cry bc I do it all the time. (*IRL* 86)

There are few metaphors that capture existential sorrow better than the “seam of my skin” splitting along the fracture lines of one’s psyche. There is also the play on skin / Skins and the recognition that the speaker would have had an honored place in his Kumeyaay traditional community. Love, which the narrator Teebs seems always to be searching for, is one respite, one small bastion against the world and its demands:

Knowing the moon is inescapable tonight
and the tuft of yr chest against my should blades—
This is a kind of nature I would write a poem about. (*NP* 26)

In addition to Hejinian and Ammons as influences, there is an aura of Ginsberg and June Jordan in these two collections, the latter poet one whom Pico often names as a major force in his poetic ancestry. Both poets are present in Pico’s deep critique of America and in the straightforward, yet lyrical approach to the critique:

. . . America
never intended for me to live
so the *we* never intended
to include me. (*IRL* 70)

Nothing can fall that wasn’t built

except maybe my self-esteem bc I have a hunch I was born with it
intact but then America came smacked
me across the face said *like it* (*NP* 26)

Not only does this poem revisit Teebs’ defensive announcement about slapping a tree “across the face” in an earlier poem, but America as dominatrix will surely be recognized as one of the most apt and satisfying metaphors ever found in a poem.

While reading Tommy Pico's *IRL* and *Nature Poem*, I was exhilarated and astonished. I felt as if I had washed up on the shore of a new country of language, a new continent of metaphor, a *making* that is likely not available to me but one which I nevertheless recognize as masterful. To preemptively rebut any future criticism which might claim that Pico's writing is all social media style and no poetics and to acknowledge Pico's reference in *IRL* to a similar critique of another American poet's collection, I'll quote one last poem here, a poem that says, quite clearly, that Tommy Pico can write *that* kind of poetry if he wishes and with as much craft as anyone else.

I'm old women scattered
 along the creek
 my little hands squeeze
 my little mouth shut
 drawn into nooks
 within the valley
 like a sharp breath
 while shaggy men on horseback
 following the water
 seek brown bodies
 for target practice strong
 brown backs for breaking (NP 45)

While Tommy Pico *can* write a conventional poem, there are few, if any, American poets today who can compose in his 21st century aesthetic. If you have not yet read *IRL* and *Nature Poem*, I urge you to do so as soon as possible because between the covers of these collections is where the future of American poetry is being birthed.

Jeanetta Calhoun Mish, Oklahoma City University

Haparimwi, Charlene. "Inside Issue #18: Getting To Know Tommy Pico." *Hooligan Magazine*, 29 Apr. 2017, issuu.com/hooliganmag/docs/18. pp. 4-11. E-magazine.

Knapp, Michaelsun Stonesweat. "The Saturday Rumpus Interview with Tommy Pico." *The Rumpus*, October 15th, 2016, therumpus.net/2016/10/the-saturday-rumpus-interview-with-tommy-pico/. Accessed 15 Mar., 2018. Web.

Pico, Tommy. *IRL*. Birds LLC, 2016. Print.

Pico, Tommy. *Nature Poem*. Tin House Books, 2017. Print.

Spahr, Juliana. "Lyn Hejinian." *Dictionary of Literary Biography: American Poets since World War II*. Ed. Joseph Conte. Vol. 165. Detroit: Gale, 1996. 102–107. Print.

Shauna Osborn. *Arachnid Verve*. Mongrel Empire Press, Norman, OK. 91 pp. ISBN: 978-0997251715. <http://mongrel empire.org/media/press-kits/arachnid-verve-by-shauna.html>

from fingers
from feathers black & red
ink drips across the page¹

If writing a review were like sitting on a jury it would be rare for Indigenous writers to get a fair trial. I point this out as a way to introduce my bias in this case. I've been aware of Shauna Osborn's work for some time, if I weren't I wouldn't qualify as a peer. In this corner of poetry we review our relatives. Oklahoma poet Carroll Arnett / Gogisgi pointed out some time ago that if you live in the "two worlds" there are very "few of us" (qtd in Sanchez 144) So, grab a coney and a fried pie and let me give you a tour of *Arachnid Verve*, from someone who has deep roots in a different small Oklahoma town nearby. Osborn is a Numuunu and German poet and this is her first full-length solo collection.

My first reaction to this book was, "Seriously? Why have a glossary and notes?" I don't like that kind of translation. Too many people come with their begging bowl to poems and ask to be given something in exchange for limited effort. I think that poetry deserves deep reading, investigation and empathy. In particular I resist the notion that work that is culturally unfamiliar to larger populations owe the readers a free ticket. Then I grumpily read the glossary. I still resist them, but it is difficult to get too unhappy with a glossary whose clarifications include "my pussy," "to eat toothpaste on toast" and "slow moving warfare marked by repeated stalemate" (89). There are also notes. The poet has made things easier on the reader.

"If you were a man," the poetry avatar is told in the two part poem "Double Standard," and later, "Cause that's the way it is" (p 8-9). Frustration is measured in chopped potatoes, "Furious thick brown skinned cubes" (9). The human identity in many of these poems is an escape artist. She, like the spider in the poem "Truss," is "persistent & intractable" (23). External and judgmental forces create and try to enforce shackles, but locks are picked, handcuffs slipped, and the heroine continues her curious investigations. In "Altitude," "I recognize that my stubbornness, will be the end of me" but in a subsequent section of the same poem, "only clever prey survive" (29-32).

"Guionista Sangre (Blood Writer)" may be the clearest thesis statement of all. The poet with "ink maps [...] carved into her flesh" (81). She is "covered with paths [...] cultural maps." These poems come from the body of the poet like the spider silk or other, more difficult extractions. "We've never been taught geography never known the contours of ourselves" (82). The landscape of body; the identities of women; iconic images of what power looks like in a female form: the poet runs her stories over the topological evidence, finds the unspoken there.

"Song for Nina," exhorts "tell me I'm beautiful, tell me I'm real," because the witness is "right alongside me, and you knew" (69). The poem is lean, almost stripped. It's a cry for recognized identity "in our voice our tongue" (70). In the book's quest, this issue of identity, of beauty, drives on through line break, broken glass and damage and calls for someone powerful to speak. In an environment of erasure and self-imposed invisibility, that of women, that of Native people, that of poverty, this voiced wish itself is a truth telling.

Some wounds are so deep, have caused so much damage that it is difficult to even begin the conversation. In “Wing,” “Someone left an intact left wing on the sidewalk. There are no signs of foul play-” (76). What mayhem caused this? There isn’t enough left to evaluate the crime scene. There is just a beautiful artifact, posed in a public place. The poet wants to change the wing, “strap it onto my arm,” or “carry this wing” (76-77) There must be some way, in this vista of the avatar’s “beautiful war scarred students,” to assemble something vital from all of these pieces.

Invoking social media in a review of a poetry book is probably unforgivable but I’m going to do it. Every day on every group page that filters into my social media there are dozens of challenges to the authenticity, the reality, of some writer or other who claims a Western-Hemispheric identity. It is a prevailing topic, like weather we might not have chosen, and like hard weather it has also swept away some bridges and caused some to drown. For good reasons and for bad ones this issue comes up and up. I have seen the authenticity argument explored in poetry, in prose and in rant. If I look at my newsfeed right now I feel certain that there are a few of these conversation threads underway. When an Indigenous poet contemplates their reality, that contemplation is freighted with more than some residue of a traumatic reading of *Pinocchio*. In *Arachnid Verve* Osborn remains very raw on this subject. The poet isn’t protecting herself or the community in this book any more than in the explorations of poverty or of being a woman. The word is thrown around too often with respect to poetry but this work displays a deep emotional honesty that is recognizable. This material is not easy.

I was always going to love this book. Osborn has a muscular, grown woman style of writing that speaks to me. These poems work hard, they sweat, they have unreasonable relatives, they wear jeans and old boots, they aspire, they read widely and they bleed. This book is an antidote. In a world moment where so many women ask to be allowed to speak, these poems stand, feet planted, in the very center of territory they know is theirs. These poems tell you exactly what they think. Osborn exists as witness for self and fellow travelers. In our own languages, somewhere in the broken glass, next to the scars or down the bike path next to the disembodied wing, there is a place where we are beautiful, whole and real.

Kim Shuck, California College of Art

Notes

¹ Sauna Osborn, from [Antes Taabe \(Before the Sun\)](#).

Sanchez, Carol Lee, *From Spirit to Matter: New and Selected Poems, 1969-1996*. San Francisco: Taurean Horn/Out West, 1997.

Lisa Charleyboy and Mary Beth Leatherdale, eds. *#NotYourPrincess: Voices of Native American Women*. Toronto: Annick, 2017. 112 pp. ISBN: 9781554519576.

<http://www.annickpress.com/NotYourPrincess>

#NotYourPrincess: Voices of Native American Women, co-edited by Lisa Charleyboy and Mary Beth Leatherdale, is a heartfelt and heart-full contribution to the creative productions of Indigenous women, queer, trans, two-spirit, and non-binary communities that have proliferated in Canada and the United States over the past several years. Described by Charleyboy as a “love letter to all young Indigenous women trying to find their way” as well as an effort to “[dispel] stereotypes so we can collectively move forward to a brighter future,” (9) *#NotYourPrincess* is a book *by* and *about* Native women and girls written *for* Native women and girls. It includes poems, essays, interviews, and art from a multigenerational collection of over fifty contributors who belong to a diverse array of Indigenous communities and showcases the voices of Indigenous women and girls as they speak to relationality, the gendered and sexual oppression of colonization, stereotypes, and Indigenous futurity. These themes are organized (respectively) into four sections: (1) the ties that bind us, (2) it could have been me, (3) I am not your princess, and (4) pathfinders.

At its core, *#NotYourPrincess* is concerned with witnessing, refusing, and transcending the violence that settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy directs toward Indigenous women and girls. The magnitude of such violence is described most succinctly in Nahanni Fontaine’s contribution to the collection, “Reclaiming Indigenous Women’s Rights”:

Altering, diminishing, and transforming Indigenous women and girls’ spaces and places within the nation, tribe, territory, community, and family has sown and set the seeds and firmly entrenched the conditions for physical and sexual violence; the break-down of community-based thinking; intergenerational trauma; economic and political marginalization; the regulation and oppression of our reproductive health, including being sterilized by the government without our consent; the theft of our children, taken to residential schools and put up for adoption without our permission; and, ultimately, the theft of our very lives (25).

The taste, touch, and feel of the violence that Fontaine speaks of is explored in more depth by a number of contributors to the collection. For example, in her essay “We Are Not a Costume,” Jessica Deer writes about the relationship between colonization, cultural appropriation, and sexual objectification, speaking specifically to the weight such representations force Native women and girls to bear: “We have to deal with ongoing marginalization and the lingering effects of colonization, like a culture that normalizes violence against us” (61). In “The Things We Taught Our Daughters,” Helen Knott soberly reflects on the ways in which Indigenous communities have come to normalize and replicate the sexual and gendered violences that heteropatriarchal colonialism has introduced into our lives. Lines such as “somewhere we learned to create an asylum / for the very things / that plague our dreams” (44) and “we stuck sexual abuse up on the mantelpiece / picture framed the portrait of rape / and named the old Rez dog domestic dispute” (45) are painful to stomach and demand critical self-reflection. Imajyn Cardinal’s brief plea, “All over the news there are Native girls being hurt and abused. I feel

afraid when I walk around. But I don't want to be afraid," (39) conveys a stark vulnerability that can't easily be dismissed. And Shelby Lisk's photo series "The Invisible Indian" communicates the dehumanization and commodification of Indigenous identity that has occurred through assimilationist efforts. Alongside mugshot-like photographs of Native women and girls holding papers with their tribal registration numbers printed on them, Lisk describes the impossible-to-achieve expectations and desires that colonial powers have of Indigenous peoples and concludes, "They [colonizers] want my culture behind glass in a museum. But they don't want me. I'm not Indian enough" (65).

These contributions to *#NotYourPrincess*, as well as others, are important acts of witnessing the onslaught of violences that Indigenous women and girls are subjected to. Simultaneously, they operate as acts of refusal – blatant rejections of the settler colonial and heteropatriarchal imperative to eliminate the voice, visibility, livelihood, indeed the very existence, of Indigenous women and girls. Equally significant, however, are the contributions to *#NotYourPrincess* that transcend these violences, that dream of and operationalize Indigenous presence/ents and futures. These contributions foreground hope, resiliency, survivance, and life itself. Chief Lady Bird's illustrations are a beautiful example of such work. In "We Are Sacred," she weaves an illustration of the torso and neck of a Native woman with a lush and flourishing landscape out of which the woman (literally) emerges (53). In an untitled illustration that sits opposite Tiffany Midge's essay "What's There to Take Back?" – a refusal of an indie publication's call for submissions aimed at "taking back" the Disney character Tiger Lily – she depicts an intentionally nonplussed Native woman staring unflinchingly into the eyes of anyone who dares to obstruct her journey (66).

Another poignant example of such work is the short essay "Defender of Mother Earth," written by AnnaLee Rain Yellowhammer. The thirteen-year-old, who initiated the petition to halt the Dakota Access Pipeline and who ran 2000 miles alongside 37 other youth to deliver the petition to Washington DC, boldly declares, "We demand 'respect' for our water, our land, and our voices" (85). Yellowhammer's words pair nicely with Dana Claxton's photo contribution "Baby-Girlz-Gotta-Mustang," which pictures two Indigenous girls wearing red polo-shirt dresses and moccasins while sitting regally atop red bicycles and staring confidently into the camera. Claxton's accompanying commentary guides us in reading the photo: "I see powerful and knowledgeable girls who have the enormous potential to lead us into a just future. I see girls who thrive and survive despite the violence of colonialism and settler colonialism" (97). Kelly Edzerza-Bapty and Claire Anderson's presentation of their ReMatriate project in "More Than Meets the Eye" similarly employs photography to resist colonial representations of Native women and girls and make visible "that Indigenous women are not a single stereotyped age; that they hold multiple identities and are much more than meets the eye" (95).

Indigenous cultural worker Tanaya Winder has developed the concept of "heartwork" to describe the labor of finding one's passion, using one's gifts to ignite healing in others, and to live (and create) revolutionary love. *#NotYourPrincess* is a powerful and greatly needed example of heartwork in action. Each of the contributors to the text have passionately and sincerely employed their experiences, their talents, their visions, and their dreams to ignite healing in other Native women and girls. This labor is not easy. Indeed, as Winder herself reminds us, this labor is necessarily (at times) the labor of "div[ing] headfirst into the muck, ugliness, stark darkness of

that wreckage [of colonialism]" (79). But this labor is also transformational. "This is what we do," Winder declares, "We recast wounds in unending light. And so, light, love, and courage are circles we keep coming back to" (79). For this reader, *#NotYourPrincess* is another of those things I will keep coming back to – a light in the settler colonial and heteropatriarchal darkness.

Kimberly Robertson, California State University, Los Angeles

Joshua Whitehead. *Full-Metal Indigiqueer*. Vancouver: Talon Books, 2017. 128 pp. ISBN 9781772011876

<http://talonbooks.com/books/full-metal-indigiqueer>

In *Full-Metal Indigiqueer*, Joshua Whitehead broadens the reach of Indigenous culture by linking trickster and cyber discourses through the figure of Zoa, who defies any reductive take on subjectivity or culture: “though i am machine / you cannot download me / when you enter me / do not decode my dna / as an html story” (Whitehead 76). Although cyborg discourse, as well as the posthumanism that it is often associated with, do not immediately seem relevant to concerns about indigenous sovereignty and language revitalization, Whitehead’s work shows that cyborg and trickster discourses are not only compatible but are in fact perfectly matched. Indeed, both the trickster figure and the cyborg are intended to show us the limits of our ideologies by blurring the boundaries between what is and what is not possible. This liminal role has long been ascribed to Indigenous peoples, who scholars like Lindsey Clare Smith and Susan Scheckel, among others, have pointed out were often used as oppositional figures against which the United States and Canada could develop national identities. Such is also the case with cyborg figures, who often highlight questions about the nature (and scope) of humanity. Speaking directly to this similarity in the poem, “full-metal oji-cree,” Zoa states, “robotics have always been poc” (112).

The collection begins with the genesis of Zoa: readers turn through the first few pages, each comprised of a mostly-black background, approaching a slowly-growing small circle of light, which soon reveals the message “H3R314M” or “Here I Am.” But who is this “I” in this passage? Is this our first introduction to Zoa or perhaps the author himself? True to the spirit of trickster polemics, the speaker of these poems is often hard to determine. In “can you be my fulltime daddy:white&gold [questionmark],” a poem in which Zoa is the presumed speaker due to the installation of music software that occurs at the beginning of it, elusiveness in fact undergirds Zoa’s sense of self: “my mother told me i had a tricksters soul / no moral compass pointing north / no fixed personality, gender / just an inner indecisiveness that was as wide / as wavering as smouldering sweetgrass / on the horizon, blind” (Whitehead 54). This “tricksters soul” seems to relate to Zoa’s two-spiritedness, which the cyborg “ndn” actively and painstakingly expresses through experiences steeped in rejection, hurt, and ultimately acceptance (both by the self and the community). This collection also shows how the trickster’s job is not simply to resist and upset the status quo, just because, but rather that their actions are designed to help their communities: “there is shame here / but there is family too / there is indigeneity / there is truth / & i need all to survive: / hereIamhereIamhereIamhereIam” (Whitehead 88).

The enjambment of words at the end of this passage illustrates the collection’s ambivalence towards language. At times defamiliarized through crowding and at other times merged with numbers (“H3R314M”), the English language remains a constant source of anxiety: “why am i always adapting your words / from latin tongues & french theorists / ive mastered my masters language / ill need a tic tac after this poem” (Whitehead 68). The author desperately strives to make the colonial English language his own – and succeeds in doing so, so that he can illustrate its limitations and challenge us to think beyond it. English is no longer just the “masters language” but the speaker’s, as well (Whitehead 68). The poems’ anxiety towards English also explains their conscious use of Cree, Whitehead’s indigenous language, such as in references to “nikawiy” (mother), “kokum” (grandmother), and “kisâkihitin” (I love you). In one of the

collection's better-known poems, "Mihkokwaniy" (meaning "rose"), winner of Canada's History Award for Aboriginal Arts and Stories (for writers aged 19–29), Whitehead writes about his "kokum," who went by "many names: / the ndn woman / the whitehead lady / a Saskatoon female / [and] the beauty queen" (99). In its telling of the grandmother's story, the poem illustrates how white settlers and other non-indigenous people can use the English language to dehumanize indigenous persons: recalling how his grandmother was often described as beautiful, the speaker explains, "what they meant by beauty was: / cheapdirtybrownprostitutedrugaddictalcoholicfirewaterslut" (99). The power of language is underlined by the ensuing headlines about the grandmother's death, which the speaker points out read "woman found strangled" instead of "the 'strangulation death / of the whitehead woman'" (100). The grandmother is secondary to what happened to her; she is even seen as secondary to her murderer, who is punished with only "six years and fifty words" (101) no doubt on account of "his whiteness [which] is his weakness [which] is his innocence" (100). The loss of the grandmother is felt through the generations, made manifest in the speaker's estrangement from the Cree language: "would you teach me what it means to be 2S / tell me i can be a beautiful brown boy in love [questionmark] / make me say niizh-manitoag – feel the power of the tongue" (102). Here, the collection speaks to the struggle for language revitalization across most indigenous communities: the speaker can only "feel the power of the tongue" when they speak their two-spirit identity in Cree. The fierce retrieval of Cree upends colonialist thinking that indigenous languages are nonsensical and irrelevant in today's world.

The collection's anxiety towards the English language extends to other pillars of western knowledge: Zoa, for instance, downloads naming software to lay claim to "thisbodywhichisrightfullymine" before others may attempt to do so (22). Similarly, by downloading the "disneysoftware," Zoa answers the old question of "What makes a red man red?" posed in the 1953 film *Peter Pan*: "shame makes the red|man| red / makes him injun; makes him feel / makes him real in pictures & in the mirror" (86). Zoa also downloads and learns Shakespeare (39) and Dickens (47) programs to ultimately un- and re-learn them and make them their own: passages like "i am the ghost of natives past;/ the ghost of colonialism present;/ the ghost of settlers yet to come" (Whitehead 48), inspired by Dickens, or "to be or not to be: am i gay is the question" (Whitehead 39), gesturing to Shakespeare, transfer these canonical works into a context much more relevant to the indigenous, Two-Spirit experiences that this collection chronicles. In the Acknowledgements section, Whitehead proclaims, "this is an honour song, this is a survivance song, / this is your song; lets sing the skin back to our bones [period] hereIam: / indigiqueer [period]" (115). These poems do not simply deconstruct language and knowledge; they create an opportunity for readers to create new knowledges, new definitions of self and community, and to "sing the skin back to [their] bones."

Whitehead seamlessly weaves discourses on cyborgs, tricksters, and "2S" persons. Upsetting how we define these terminologies, as well as how we use the English language, this collection will be of interest to readers and scholars actively seeking a collection of poetry that forges new modes of understanding and expression and that relentlessly and unapologetically builds towards an indigenous future. These are poems of affirmation, resilience, and resistance.

Francisco Delgado, University of New Haven

Esther G. Belin. *Of Cartography*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2017. 88 pp. ISBN 9780816536023.

<https://uapress.arizona.edu/book/of-cartography>

Esther G. Belin's newest collection of poetry, *Of Cartography*, is a moving and innovative work, bringing together poetry and indigenous experiences and knowledge of space. Indeed, Belin mobilizes poetry to articulate what can be understood as a new form of cartographic practice, informed by her family's experiences of relocation and migration. As her poems travel throughout California and her Diné homelands in the Southwest, we come to see a deep relationship between stories and the land to which they belong, coupled with an assertion of sovereignty in healing and identity in the wake of colonial relocation policy, and the ways in which Belin writes such navigations of belonging serve as a guide for readers to reflect upon poetry as a form of cartography. Indeed, Belin crafts text and poetic structure in a way that requires us to examine how meaning is inscribed to space—both on the page and on the land.

Belin's upbringing in Los Angeles, and her relationship to her homeland, are a central theme of this collection. These stories function as the building blocks of a new cartographic practice, one that reflects indigenous epistemologies and experiences. Indeed, her treatment of the intergenerational effects of relocation and navigation of an urban Indian identity give insights into how a strategic cartography may be implemented by indigenous people surviving and resisting the complexities of off-reservation life. For example, Belin writes of the sense of home that is created by the sound of Navajo language, even in the midst of an urban environment, and describes these urban Navajo speakers as mapping an imagination of homeland on the landscape—"In the middle of busy intersections/and energy-efficient street lights/they see a cornfield and canyon walls" (48). However, in the same poem, Belin also writes of walking past these Navajo speakers, and uttering bits of other indigenous or foreign languages, leaving them in confusion as to her origin. This may be representative of the inter-tribal/cultural knowledge that urban indigenous people attain while living in a mixed cultural space, as well as the nature of being Indian in a place where Indians are not imagined to exist, constantly being mistaken for a different ethnicity. More largely, I view it as a signifier that these cartographies are not a given or automatic, predicated upon indigeneity; rather, they are solely seen by those who draw and choose to navigate within them. Access to them, therefore, to some degree depends on an individual's knowledge of language or culture.

The role colonial education played in these experiences is also a recurring theme in Belin's poems. Belin's parents participated in the Special Navajo Five-Year Program at Sherman Institute in southern California, as part of federal relocation efforts that led to large urban Indian populations in cities like Los Angeles. These relocation policies and boarding schools are repeatedly referenced throughout the collection, spanning back to the 1895 incarceration of Hopi men at Alcatraz Island, for refusing to send their children to boarding schools. In contrast, Belin opens the collection with references to Navajo education, locating it on the Navajo Nation, and describing it as a home that still stands, where her mother once hid her prized belongings.

This sense of home and familiarity with place further highlights urban indigenous experiences of geography. Belin writes beautifully descriptive poems not just of her homeland, but of the spaces between homeland and home; her family's travels on the route between the Navajo Nation and Los Angeles is a powerful example. In this poem, Belin maps the journey using significant place-markers like the Grand Canyon and Gallup, peppered within a narrative of her family's experience of the drive—noting the turnout to Crownpoint, rez cars, and HUD housing. In so doing, Belin stresses the use of alternative landmarks, using place-markers that would be of significance to a Navajo or indigenous driver but may melt into the landscape for anyone who lacks the cultural context to notice or appreciate them. Moreover, she insists on indigenous cultural survival where others may not see it—describing her daughter's car seat as “a modern cradleboard that meets car and airplane safety requirements” (37). This may be seen as another element to the cartographic practice this collection offers.

Perhaps the most striking demonstration of this cartographic practice, however, is in the architecture of the text itself. The poems are organized according to Diné cardinal points, and are graphically organized in such a way that they require readers to sit and learn to read them, examining the directionality of the text and the spatial relationships between points. These poems are visually challenging and rich, and reading them becomes an exercise similar to poring over a detailed map. These poems ask readers experiment with different directions in which to read the text (5), plot coordinates of locations and items (39), relocate points (73), and use relocated points as an “entryway” to weaving together a new bundling ceremony (74). In this way, Belin not only theorizes and demonstrates a new cartographic practice, but asks readers to learn this practice and become literate in it themselves.

This is where the beauty of *Of Cartography* shines its brightest. Its engagement with readers requires us to embark on reclamation of spatial agency alongside Belin, and the teachings within it function as literary cartography lessons. *Of Cartography* is a beautiful application of a new cartographic practice, where poetry written to reflect Navajo epistemologies and language is mobilized as mapping technology. This collection is of importance to anyone interested in indigenous cartography and geography, expression and navigation of urban indigenous identity, and Navajo literary interventions.

Annita Lucchesi, University of Lethbridge

Kathy Jetnil-Kijiner. *Iep Jāltok: Poems from a Marshallese Daughter*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2017. 81 pp. ISBN: 9780816534029.

<https://uapress.arizona.edu/book/iep-jaltok>

Climate change; sea level rise; nuclear detonations; these are the topics commonly affiliated with the Marshall Islands in western popular media. But it is with the image of a basket that Kathy Jetnil-Kijiner weaves her personal and ancestral history of the Marshall Islands and asserts a textured narrative of grief but also resilience, empowerment, and hope. The Marshall Islands are an island nation in Micronesia that gained independence in 1979. With a long history of their islands being co-opted by foreign nations for different military purposes (military supply bases, airfields, bomb testing sites, etc.), the Marshallese live daily with the effects of colonialism. However, *Iep Jāltok*, the first book of poetry by a Marshallese writer to be printed by a United States press, powerfully charts a new course of Marshallese history *and* futurity. Indeed, the printing of the collection itself is now part of Marshallese survivance, as it gains a wider audience for the experiences that Jetnil-Kijiner documents. Readers of *Transmotion*, a journal inspired by the work of Gerald Vizenor who first gave scholars the important term “survivance,” may be assured that the spirit of that term pulses powerfully through this book.

This collection has four sections: *Iep Jāltok*, History Project, Lessons from Hawai‘i, and Tell Them. *Iep Jāltok* takes its name from a reference to Marshallese matrilineal society. The epigraph, which quotes the only Marshallese-English dictionary in print, explains that *iep jāltok* is “a basket whose opening is facing the speaker. Said of female children. She represents a basket whose contents are made available to her relatives.” Two concrete poems entitled “Basket” bookend the collection, while doubles are a theme in the first section. After the first “Basket” poem, the collection begins with two origin stories: those of Lōktanūr, a mother figure from Marshallese cosmology who introduced the Marshallese to the sail; and the sisters Liwātuonmour and Lidepdepju, who are viewed as the mothers of the chiefly lineage and represented as two sacred stones. Focusing on pairings, Jetnil-Kijiner asks her readers to question binaries so often associated with colonialism—modern/timeless, progressive/past, oppressor/oppressed, civilized/uncivilized, and colonizer/colonized. This first set of poems tell two histories: Lōktanūr—which is told in two parts, then Liwātuonmour and Lidepdepju—about two sacred stones; by using duality, she explores the defining characteristics of Marshallese society and values over time, giving Marshallese cosmologies due space against the influences of religious colonialism. In one of the poems, Jetnil-Kijiner retells the desecration of Lidepdepju (her stone was thrown into the sea by a western missionary); the form of these poems is striking, visually resembling a dictionary entry. Through form and content, each delineation of the terms reveals a fraught relationship over the place of origin stories in contemporary society—after independence, but also after the onset of colonialism.

The section History Project outlines the Marshallese interactions with and effects of western militarization. In the poem “Hooked,” Jetnil-Kijiner presents the story of a man who ultimately loses his limbs to diabetes after becoming addicted to fatty canned foods—foods that had only become introduced because the west’s use of the islands for warfare had decimated the local food supply and the islanders were forced to accept western preserved foods. Her critique of these subtle but destructive western influences continues in “The Letter B is For” which explains

the etymology of the Marshallese word “baam”—“as in / Kombaam ke? / Are you contaminated / with radioactive fallout?” (19). This chilling example of western militarism’s effects is a found poem, as the content of the verse is adopted from the Marshallese-English Dictionary’s sample sentences of the word. The effects of the bombs leave irrevocable traces on both language and body, and the corporeal influences continue in “Fishbone Hair” which tells of the loss of her niece from cancer. In this section’s central poem, “History Project,” Jetnil-Kijiñer integrates these personal and national histories, reminding the reader not only how the personal is politically powerful, but how the political is always personally felt. The poem explores Jetnil-Kijiñer’s childhood, when she explored the Marshallese history with western nuclear testing while completing a school history project competition. Through the inclusion of primary source quotations in italics, the poem mixes her personal experience of learning the history alongside the atrocities of western military negligence and the horrors of Marshallese familial destruction. The speaker’s project on nuclear detonations in the Marshall Islands “For the Good of Mankind” repeats the foreboding words of the United States military officer who, without a translator, convinced the chief of Bikini atoll to allow the testing of atomic weapons on the island, promising that their sacrifice would lead to “the end of all wars” (Keju-Johnson 15). By the end of the poem, when her project has been reviewed by the judges and is misunderstood, these detrimental miscommunications in which the Marshallese lose are repeated once again.

Perhaps best known from this collection is her poem “Dear Matafele Peinam,” which she performed in 2014 at the Opening Ceremony of the United Nations Secretary-General’s Climate Summit. This poem, in an apostrophe to her infant daughter, promises that she will fight to protect her from the foreboding messages about the threats that climate change and rising sea levels bring to their islands, asserting: “no one’s moving / no one’s losing / their homeland / no one’s gonna become / a climate change refugee” (71) But in the next stanza with a turn to the history project of the rest of her collection, she explains, “or should i say / no one else” (71). Once again Jetnil-Kijiñer instructs her audience on the history of the Pacific over the last two centuries—one of desecration, development, and displacement. She then switches her address to her fellow peoples of the Pacific: “to the Carteret Islanders of Papua New Guinea / and to the Taro Islanders of the Solomon Islands / I take this moment / to apologize to you / we are drawing the line / here” (71) In a turn to indigenous solidarity, she acknowledges that the threats of climate change expand beyond her family, beyond the Marshall Islands, and beyond the Pacific. In this rousing call to action, Jetnil-Kijiñer leaves her reader with images of resistance and protest, of solidarity and organizing: “and there are thousands / out on the street / marching with signs / hand in hand / chanting for change NOW / and they’re marching for you, baby / they’re marching for us” (72-73). It is no surprise that after Jetnil-Kijiñer’s performance of this poem at the United Nations, she was described as “the poet [who] brings world leaders to tears.”

This moving debut should be admired, relished, and read in classrooms far and wide. It provides a rich and detailed survey of Marshallese pasts, presents, and futures told through one insightful activist’s study of history, linked with her personal experiences. Through its intimate portraits of her own journeys and those of Pacific peoples, *Iep Jāltok* intertwines vulnerability with empowerment for an inspiring message of survivance. As Jetnil-Kijiñer expresses triumphantly in “Dear Matafele Peinam:”

we deserve
to do more

than just
survive
we deserve
to thrive. (73)

Rebecca Hogue, University of California, Davis

Keju-Johnson, Darlene. "For the Good of Mankind." *Pacific Women Speak Out for Independence and Denuclearisation*. Zohl de Ishtar, Ed. Christchurch, NZ: The Raven Press, 1988.

Carter Meland. *Stories for a Lost Child*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2017. (American Indian Studies Series.) 157 pages. ISBN: 9781611862447

<http://msupress.org/books/book/?id=50-1D0-3FCD#.WtiyPWT5mKY>

Readers of Carter Meland's novel *Stories for a Lost Child* will find themselves in a dilemma similar to the protagonist's: how to understand the relationship among the various stories being told. Those stories include sermon-like lessons for humanity delivered by Bigfoot, the outer space adventures of two American Indian astronauts trying to return to Earth, and descriptions of some down-and-out native people in or around Minneapolis. These are connected by third-person narration from the point of view of Fiona, a teenager who has received a package of stories written by the grandfather she never knew. A letter in the package states they were written before she was born, and that they are being delivered years after his death. As she reads them, she looks for clues about the experiences and character of her grandfather, and she looks for how these sometimes strange stories can be useful in her own life and to understanding why her mother refused to tell Fiona much at all about her grandfather. This includes her search for information about her Anishinaabe heritage, which she feels was denied to her by her grandfather's absence and her mother's silence. This absence is described as a hole in her life: "... but there was a hole there, too, in her life, one her mom refused to fill and only ever barely acknowledged. Her grandpa. The Indian" (5).

Among the stories written by Fiona's grandfather are monologues by Bigfoot. In chapters with titles including "Swampbreath" and "Feathertruth," Bigfoot, in his peculiar diction, preaches to humanity to be humble and connected to the land, to remain in touch with the immediacy of experience and greater truths embodied in the earth, plants, and animals but not in representations of them. Having found a bird feather on the ground, he instructs humans on how to experience it properly – and how not to experience it.

You say it smells like that angel you find in them words of men? Men, that one soaring in the warm sun, rising from the words of men and away from the earth? Men. I shake my head. I bare my teeth and knock fallen branch against sturdy tree. And knock again. And again I holler at the treeline. No, men, no!

Listen, men!

Smell that feather as it is, not as you wish it were. Don't mistake the words of men for that feather truth. Draw deep, men. (59)

Bigfoot may initially puzzle Fiona, but he is given the last words of the grandfather's package to her, and those words seem directed at her instead of humans in general.

Listen, little one, listen!

Little one, touch dreams, don't measure them. Walk with them. Leave inches to men, leave beaten ground, leave men to scratch their chin.

Come! Step long, little one, step far.

Leave men, live tall. (101)

Other stories involve two astronauts, a Dakota man and an Anishinaabe man, as they explore outer space and then return to Earth. Their return does not go as planned, and they discover they have traveled back in time to an Earth before Turtle Island had emerged from the ocean; this does not alarm them much, as they plan to simply retrace their path and get back to where they were before. Perhaps echoing our recent emphasis on “water is life,” they load their ship’s tanks with this “first water” to take with them to the future – their present – because it is “Powerful medicine” (67).

Still other stories are less fanciful and involve contemporary native people, whom Fiona deduces include her grandfather and other relatives, and people from the distant past, including a French priest who may be her ancestor. Some of the stories require her to determine whether they are fact or fiction, whether the protagonists are her grandfather, someone her grandfather knew, or a fictional character. Initially Fiona is frustrated by the stories. She had hoped for her grandfather’s life story more directly, for clear indications of how his life led to hers, and for how his life could provide answers to her questions: “Sure, they were good enough, if you liked weird nightmare sorts of things, but they didn’t really tell her anything about him.” She had hoped for “some little half-hidden suggestion about her grandma or mom, some notion of what her Grandpa did after he left them – or why he left” (35). As she progresses through the package from her grandfather she gets better at deciphering the stories and their lessons; the stories become more satisfying. She looks up information on the Anishinaabeg online, information her mother has never shared, but that is not impactful as her grandfather’s stories, including those from Bigfoot, also known as Misaabe: “Misaabe’s words told her more about where she came from than any facts, way more than her mom every shared, too” (80).

Eventually the stories overlap – but how they do that is best to not reveal here so readers can discover the connections on their own. Some readers will enjoy the novel’s loose structure, while others may not be satisfied with the degree of closure the novel offers; how the stories help Fiona better understand herself or her dilemmas is not always clear. For instance, the longest unit of the novel ends with a sense of satisfaction for Fiona, but it involves friends of hers who see much more loss than she does. But to describe the stories more would risk giving away surprises or denying readers their own satisfaction in putting the pieces together alongside Fiona.

Two of Meland’s narrative choices present a valuable implication for readers: Bigfoot and the astronauts of NASA (Native American Space Adventuring). When Fiona’s grandfather creates stories about these characters for her, he is reaching simultaneously into an indigenous past and into an indigenous future. He is evoking a very old body of indigenous narratives and indigenizing a body of contemporary narratives. With his native astronauts, the grandfather imagines a future that includes native people. These are valuable images for a young woman trying to understand her native past and dream of a native future.

Manipulations of time and space are important elements for Indigenous Futurism, according to Lindsey Catherine Cornum. The native astronauts in *Stories for a Lost Child* provide this, as they travel through space and time – from the future, into the distant past, into the grandfather’s present, etc. Cornum explains, “We are always going back to the origin, our creation stories, as a starting point for moving forward, or up, or sideways. This mode of thinking can motivate us not only to consider how our actions will reverberate into the future, but also how they build on -- or,

as is all too often disregarded, erased or disrespected -- the historical past.” Meland does this through the grandfather’s stories that weave the historical past, the recent past, and the future into Fiona’s present.

Scott Andrews, California State University, Northridge

Cornum, Mary Catherine. “The Creation Story is a Spaceship: Indigenous Futurism and Decolonial Deep Space.” *Voz-à-Voz*.
<http://www.vozavoz.ca/feature/lindsay-catherine-cornum>

Greg Sarris. *How a Mountain was Made: Stories*. Berkeley: Heyday, 2017. 303 pp. ISBN: 978-1-59714-414-8.

<https://heydaybooks.com/book/how-a-mountain-was-made/>

Greg Sarris's new collection, comprised of pieces originally published in the tribal newsletter of the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (of which he has been the long-time chairman), is a somewhat difficult volume to categorize. The book brings together a series of retellings of Miwok stories about their traditional homeland on and around Sonoma Mountain in Northern California. Each of its sixteen chapters is framed and introduced by conversations between Question Woman and Answer Woman, twin crows and daughters of Coyote, who engage in the on-going work of co-creation through their deeply reciprocal relationship. Question Woman can remember nothing, and thus finds herself compelled to constantly interrogate her companion. Answer Woman knows everything but is unable to call that knowledge to mind without being asked. Together, then, these twins engage in the ongoing work of co-creation, jointly recalling and reproducing the place-specific knowledge of the coastal Miwok. They do so in a book that, stylistically and structurally, initially presents itself as a work targeted toward young adults. Beneath its relatively simple façade, however, *How a Mountain was Made* explores the complexities and depth of the Miwok episteme in a manner that will reward multiple readings on a number of levels. Sarris's book resists conventional marketing categories, then, but it does so precisely because of how effectively it translates the power of traditional storytelling into a contemporary idiom. Not unlike his earlier non-fiction work, *Mabel McKay: Weaving the Dream*, this work challenges preconceptions about where knowledge lives and how it becomes, and remains, active in the world.

The very first story in the collection, "The Pretty Woman and the Necklace," offers an excellent example of the subtleties of Sarris's work in his retellings. On the one hand, this is a simple didactic tale about vanity, the story of a Miwok woman who, in search of a way to stand out to a potential suitor, recruits the help of Bear, Cooper's Hawk, and Fly to craft a necklace of colored stones taken from the slopes of Sonoma Mountain. As one might expect, this project proves to be her undoing, alienating her from her own people and herself as she becomes increasingly obsessed with adornment, regardless of the cost to her relations or to the land. But as is generally the case with traditional stories, Sarris's tale contains a number of other elements within it—elements echoed by the brilliant stones embedded on the mountain side in the narrative itself. (This type of symbolic reinforcement of theme appears throughout the collection, reminding us of Sarris' literary training and background as a wonderful novelist and short story writer; when Question Woman and Answer woman sit on a fence to talk, in other words, we are generally aware that this is both a literal and a metaphorical space.) In the story of "The Pretty Woman," readers will encounter implicit lessons regarding the appropriate and respectful manner of asking for help in need, as opposed to the use of manipulation and flattery to achieve self-serving ends. Sarris's characters directly model appropriate and inappropriate behavior in other words. Sarris also incorporates numerous songs into the tale, reminding readers that each being of creation has its own power that should be respected and understood (in non-appropriative ways). He offers a compelling narrative account, as well, of how the relatively benign self-centeredness of youth (a

phase through which all people pass) can transform into an ethos of domination. And he engages in the vital work of place-making, tying all these narrative elements to their discrete localities. Sarris's writing is littered with place names, and in this respect his book invites readers to develop an awareness of how closely Miwok identity is connected to the geography of Northern California.

It is noteworthy too, considering the contemporary political context in which tribal communities operate and Sarris' own experiences as tribal chairman, that *How a Mountain Was Made* includes several stories that deal explicitly with the nature and challenges of leadership. Coyote is a central figure in a number of tales, and one of the most striking aspects of his appearance in those contexts is his imperfection--as well as his ability to grow through experience to compensate for those imperfections. In "Coyote Creates a Costume Fit for a Chief," our protagonist's insecurity and egotism cause him to turn away from the centering wisdom offered by his wife, Frog Woman, a Dreamer whose visions guide the people in such vital pursuits as the gathering of food and recognition of when and where to hunt. Misunderstanding the importance for all members of the community to play their particular roles for the collective good, Coyote grows unhappy at what he sees as the people's lack of appreciation for him. This propels him in his misguided desire for an elaborate costume that will draw attention back to himself. Of particular note in this story, however, is the fact that while those members of the community he enlists to help him in his quest recognize his folly and disapprove, they allow him to make his own missteps and learn from those mistakes. By the end of the tale, Coyote's actions have inadvertently changed the world (transforming Lizard, Rattlesnake, Quail, and Dragonfly into their present forms). He has also learned that that all he truly needed to be an effective leader was his "Chief's Song." But while it initially appears that Coyote's folly has led to the loss of that song, what his nephew Chicken Hawk and wife Frog Woman reveal is that his actions have merely served to disperse it into all of the "secret objects" he requested for his costume. In this respect, we realize, Coyote's folly and subsequent growth ushers in new forms of ceremony, while also serving to reinforce the idea that the wise leadership diffuses throughout the people rather than residing with a single dominant figure. If Coyote still howls in shame at night in remembering his errors, then, that memory has no negative impact on the community's overall safety and happiness. Indeed, Sarris ends this story by noting that "the ceremony turned out beautifully" (118).

It has been almost twenty years since we've had a new book from Greg Sarris. *How A Mountain Was Made* is, perhaps, not what readers might have expected from him in his return to print. However, long-time readers of his work will easily discern in the book the narrative gifts and the careful depiction of key themes (particularly regarding the relationship between song, power, place and being) that run throughout his work. And new readers should appreciate his skillful ventriloquism of Question Woman and Answer Woman and the great care he has taken to highlight the profundity that resides in the stories that continue to create and map the Miwok homeland.

David J. Carlson, California State University, San Bernardino

Diane Glancy and Linda Rodriguez, eds. *The World Is One Place: Native American Poets Visit the Middle East*. University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2016. 128 pp. ISBN 978-1-943491-07-0.

<http://www.newletters.org/bkmk-books/the-world-is-one-place>

Editor Diane Glancy commences her Foreword by stating “The earth is language. The land essentially is story” (11). Glancy’s statements provide a road map for the collection. Language, land, and story intertwine and permeate the assorted poems. Indigenous poets of diverse tribal affiliations embark on individual projects exploring questions of language, land, story, and indigeneity within a global context. The realm of the poetic allows for the exploration of cultural and linguistic boundaries and how they function on individual and collective levels. The collection expresses the journeys of the diverse poets who visited different regions of the Middle East. The collection is thus itself a journey across the pages, transferring readers (and poets) through time and space to Turkey, Syria, Jordan, and other places. The collection will prove useful in a number of contexts and learning environments: in particular I would highly recommend it be taught in American Indian studies classes, Middle Eastern classes, and comparative and world literature classes.

Three sections comprise the text: “Place,” “People,” and “Spirit.” This division might be misleading, as the three concepts pervade the collection. One of the unique aspects of this text is the inclusion of work notes by the poets, preceding their poems. The work notes contextualize the creative pieces and act as road maps for how properly to read and absorb the words. Mvskoke Creek poet and musician Joy Harjo opens the first section, “Place,” with her piece *Refugee*. The poem is set in the Palestinian city of Bethlehem, a city famous as the birthplace of Jesus, and indeed the speaker provides a brief summary of the Nativity. Harjo mentions that “Jesus became a healer. Walked far to help others, and to show that we, too, are healers” (19). We move from the historic and religious past to the harsh contemporary reality of Palestinians living in refugee camps. Harjo ends up staying with the Palestinian students “in a home that could have been my grandparents’ house...” (20). The speaker laments the violence against the people and the land, forging connections with her tribal land in the United States, thereby affirming the oneness between all peoples and lands.

Navajo poet Bojan Louis connects the Armenian genocide with the Navajo Long Walk through his depiction of an ethnically Armenian band in “System of a Down.” He attempts to reconcile these connections during his time in Turkey and the Turkish regime’s adamant refusal to acknowledge the genocide. While in Turkey, Louis states “Every town I visit beyond the city, I’m tempted to ask, What’s with Armenia? Everyone’s forgotten, yeah?” (27). Silence blankets Turkey in regard to the Armenians who were massacred. The wordplay in “everyone’s forgotten” connotes the people who have forgotten, as well as the forgotten, murdered Armenians. His mind transports him to Philadelphia, where the same propensity to forget the atrocities committed against Native peoples also lingers. The speaker gives advice on the suitable ways to bury

genocides and become complicit: “Help snip the thread of sewn-shut lips... Don’t forget to say, thank you, always” (28). Silence, complicity, and forgetfulness plague both Turkey and the United States, rendering the people accessory to the crimes.

In the section entitled “People,” Mohawk writer James Thomas Stevens tells the story of an ill-fated trip to Jordan which witnessed the cancelling of an all-Natives poetry festival. He and other poets decide to salvage the trip. His poem, *We Are*, captures the hospitality of Jordanians and the beauty of the country. Stevens speaks of attempts by Jordanians to identify him and Native poets of other tribal affiliations:

Where from? Who?
Yes. America, but no.
 The only way to signify--a feather
 at the back of the head.
Sauvagi!
 We register
 displeasure-- *a yes, but no.*
 A third offers, *Al honood al humr.*
 Explains, Red Indians (56)

The efforts to identify their origins convey the power and dominance of mainstream Western cultural exports of Native peoples. The Jordanians they are speaking with recognize them as “savages” and “Red Indians.” Stevens and his group manage to enjoy the people and the place despite this earlier misstep. The speaker says they “[read] poems in people’s homes, in deserts, in cafés... *You have no family here, so we are your family*” (57). Words bring people together, salvaging the failed conference, and allowing Stevens to convey his fascination and connection with Jordan.

The final section of the book, “Spirit,” includes an imagined poetic experience of Afghanistan. Fort Mojave writer and language activist Natalie Diaz creates fictional experiences of a made-up version of her brother who served in the U.S. military. She labels the poem *The Elephants* in reference to the Quranic *surah* (section) named *Al-Fil* (The Elephant), and as a metaphor for the army tanks. Diaz’s fictional brother remains haunted by the horrific war experiences he encountered. The speaker begins the poem “My brother still hears the tanks when he is angry-- they rumble like a herd of hot green elephants...” (94). The poem addresses the fluidity of time and space. The brother cannot escape the war, internalizing the landscape with all the events he witnessed. Both countries bleed into each other as a manifestation of her brother’s PTSD. The speaker comments “The heat from guns he’ll never let go-rises up from his fists like a desert mirage...” (95). The speaker employs imagery from the Afghani desert to convey her brother’s trauma. It serves as further proof of the interrelation between the disparate landscapes and their convergence in her brother’s psyche.

As someone from Egypt, I consider the Arab world (and by extension) the Middle East to be my home. In light of this, my only qualms with this collection are the unfortunate Orientalizing and fetishizing tendencies. The same stereotypical images reproduced in literatures in the West on the Middle East are recurrent here. Some of these examples include “veiled” and “unveiled” women, “the call to prayer,” references to wars, terrorists, Scheherazade, and other images and motifs. The “Othering” perpetuated by Western intellectuals and writers is reproduced in the collection.

Editor Linda Rodriguez closes the collection with an article titled “Are Our Hands Clean? A Meditation on the Middle East and the United States.” Rodriguez addresses American interference in the Middle East, including policy-making, land exploitation, invading Middle Eastern countries, and other forms of interference. The essay reads as a confessional and an attempt to acknowledge the vicarious guilt felt by Americans who disagree with U.S. foreign policy. She writes “As a person of indigenous heritage and an American citizen and taxpayer, I weep at what is being done in my name and with my money” (107). She acknowledges the wrongs committed by the United States against Middle Easterners. I do think there are generalizing and stereotyping tendencies here as well. People from the Middle East are never given names or faces. Rodriguez mentions specific countries by name, however, the region is still regarded as a monolithic entity (an unfortunate trend in Western discourse). Rodriguez raises a call to action against injustices everywhere and to change the world for the better. She posits that in the face of overwhelming helplessness, the only recourse is to “sing,” referring to the present collection as “our song” (108). “Singing” might be the only resort, but in response to Rodriguez’s question of whether “our hands can be clean,” the unfortunate answer is “no.”

Dalia Ebeid, University of Arizona / Cairo University

Contributor Biographies

SCOTT ANDREWS teaches American and American Indian literatures at California State University, Northridge. He has published reviews, essays, poetry, and fiction in various journals. He is a citizen of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma.

BRIAN BURKHART is Associate Professor of Philosophy at California State University Northridge. He grew up on the Navajo nation in Arizona and is also from the Cherokee tribe of Oklahoma, where he still has a lot of family. He wrote his doctoral dissertation at Indiana University on environmental ethics and indigenous philosophy, and is in the process of having a book published by SUNY Press entitled *Respect for Kinship: Toward an Indigenous Environmental Ethics*.

HEID E. ERDRICH is the author of five collections of poetry, most recently the Minnesota Book Award-winning *Curator of Ephemera at the New Museum for Archaic Media* from Michigan State University Press. Her recent non-fiction work is *Original Local: Indigenous Foods, Stories and Recipes*. She is editor of two anthologies of literature by Native writers including the forthcoming NEW POETS OF NATIVE NATIONS from Graywolf Press. Heid's writing has won numerous awards as have her collaborative poem films, which you can see on her [Vimeo channel](#). Heid grew up in Wahpeton, North Dakota and is Ojibwe enrolled at Turtle Mountain. She teaches in the low-residency MFA Creative Writing program of Augsburg College.

BECCA GERCKEN is an Associate Professor of English and American Indian Studies at the University of Minnesota, Morris. She has published in the areas of identity and representation, masculinities, and pedagogy. Her most recent work appears in *Leslie Marmon Silko: Ceremony, Almanac of the Dead, Gardens in the Dunes* and *Gambling on Authenticity: Gaming, the Noble Savage, and the Not-So-New Indian*.

TIFFANY MIDGE's poetry collection "The Woman Who Married a Bear" (University of New Mexico Press) won the *Kenyon Review* Earthworks Indigenous Poetry Prize, and a Western Heritage award. Her work's been featured in *McSweeney's*, *Okey-Pankey*, *The Butter*, *Waxwing*, and *Moss*. She is Hunkpapa Lakota and allergic to horses.

MARGARET NOODIN is the author of *Weweni* (Wayne State University Press, 2015), a collection of bilingual poems in Anishinaabemowin and English, and *Bawaajimo: A Dialect of Dreams in Anishinaabe Language and Literature* (Michigan State University Press, 2014). She currently works as an associate professor at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, where she also serves as director of the Electa Quinney Institute for American Indian Education.

TOMMY ORANGE's much-anticipated novel, *There There*, will be published in June of 2018. He was born and raised in Oakland, California. He is an enrolled member of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma. He currently teaches in the MFA program at the Institute of American Indian Arts.

KENNETH M. ROEMER (B.A., Harvard; M.A., Ph. D., Univ. of Pennsylvania), a Piper Professor of 2011, Distinguished Teaching Professor, and Distinguished Scholar Professor at the University of Texas at Arlington, has received four NEH grants to direct Summer Seminars and has been a Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Fellow and a Visiting Professor in Japan. He has been a guest lecturer at Harvard and has lectured at twelve universities in Japan and in Vienna, Lisbon, Hong Kong, Montpellier, Dresden, and several cities in Italy, Brazil, Ireland, Canada, and Turkey. He was one of only three Americans selected to co-chair a seminar at the 2008 European Alpbach Forum in Austria. He is past President of the Society for Utopian Studies, founding Editor of *Utopus Discovered*, past Vice President and founding member of the Association for the Study of American Indian Literatures (ASAIL), and past Chair of the American Indian Literatures and Late 19th- Early 20th-Century Divisions of the Modern Language Association (MLA). He has been Managing Editor of *American Literary Realism* (ALR) and Assistant Editor of *American Quarterly*. He serves on the Editorial Boards of *Utopian Studies*, *SAIL*, and *ALR*. He has served on the Advisory Board of *PMLA* and the Editorial Board of *American Literature*. His website *Covers, Titles, and Tables: The Formations of American Literary Canons in Anthologies*, <www.library.uta/ctt> is the first website discussed in Martha L. Brogan's *A Kaleidoscope of Digital American Literature*.

ANDREA L. ROGERS describes herself as a writer, member of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma, teacher of Middle School art, mom.

SHAWAANO CHAD URAN is a Visiting Assistant Professor in Cornell's Department of Anthropology. Dr. Uran is White Earth Anishinaabe and teaches courses such as Critical Approaches in American Indian and Indigenous Studies.