INTRODUCTION | Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith

It is ironic that at a time when there seems to be a turn against theory within the field of Native Studies, this volume proposes to center the importance of theory. Native studies, with its distinct intellectual and political genealogies, arrives at the question of theory from a different perspective than other fields. While there may be a backlash against theory in other fields (as seen in the publication of volumes such as *Against Theory, Theory's Empire,* and so on), Native studies has made an explicit turn toward theory. The more recent focus in Native studies on theory could suggest that the discipline is simply following the intellectual trajectory of mainstream scholarship. In this volume, however, we propose that distinct engagement of Native studies with theory usefully intervenes not only in Native studies but also in the larger debate around the usefulness of theory in general. In particular, theory is often positioned as the opposite of other concepts considered more important, such as theory versus practice, theory versus community-based scholarship, theory versus truth, and theory versus political engagement. Suspicion about the turn toward theory in Native studies also remains. It is not uncommon to hear the complaint within venues in Native studies that theoretical projects are inherently "Western," are nonindigenous, and spoil the possibility of scholarly production outside the confines of intellectual traditions that have been used to uphold and contextualize forms of defining difference and thus dominating that which was and still is defined as different. As such, theoretical projects are often accused of being insufficiently grounded in the needs of Native communities. Rather than dismissing these critiques, however, we argue that these critiques actually provide a helpful *theoretical* foundation for a politically grounded and analytically charged form of Native studies. This volume proposes that the project of theorizing Native studies troubles these sim-

plistic and ultimately divisive theory-versus-practice dichotomies, reconceptualizes what theory is, and provides a critical framework for decolonizing political and intellectual praxis.

The Truth of Theory

In mainstream academic discourse, theory is often conflated with the specifically European tradition of postmodern or poststructuralist theory. Rooted in a critique of the binary that governs structure or the organization of grammar in linguistics, poststructuralist theory (as seen in the works of Foucault, Derrida, and so on) sought to move beyond the presumed universality of this structure and organization of knowledge. Poststructuralist theory made this move through deconstructive method and took knowledge itself to be subject to inquiry, and in turn poststructuralist theory is equated with destabilizing all truth claims. Thus, theory, in this admittedly abbreviated but popularly held sense, is often posited as antithetical to truth. For example, in *Theory's Empire* the editors complain that the turn toward theory has inhibited the ability to discern the differences between "true and false, right and wrong," leaving us mired in a muddy world in which extreme forms of relativism dominate our apprehension of reality.[1] These debates have also been present within Native studies. Elvira Pulitano, Craig Womack, Jace Weaver, and Robert Warrior have debated to what extent truth claims based on indigenous identity are essentialist. That is, are such claims to indigenous identity not subject to the very fundaments of the construction of reality and hence not subject to critique or skepticism?[2] Other scholars, such as Sean Teuton, have posited a "postpositivist realist" approach to Native studies as a corrective to the problems of poststructuralism, which Teuton claims is a "rejection of our human capacity to make normative claims to knowledge."[3] Unlike the editors of *Theory's Empire,* however, Teuton recognizes that not all theory is poststructuralist, and he advocates for a postpositivist theoretical engagement with Native studies that "allows for genuine debate and exchange across cultures, while still respecting how social location may grant special access to knowledge."[4]

However, as poststructuralist thinkers have noted, "the fact that all knowledge . . . is socially situated and interested . . . does not mean that valid knowledge is impossible."[5] The argument that truth is relative under postmodern thought is simply the flip side of universalist notions of truth. That is, claims to universalism and objectivity rest on the notion that individuals can transcend their historicity to decide what is true cross tem-

porally and cross-culturally. Similarly, relativism rests on the notion that one can escape the grid of intelligibility one lives in and see multiple truths. In our view, poststructuralism contends that all individuals live within a regime of truth that has its own logic, and consequently there is truth *and* the ability to adjudicate between truth claims. If that regime of truth were to become destabilized, it would mean that the individual is simply living under another regime of truth. Because we know that our regime of truth is historically conditioned, we also know that it is not stable, that it is flexible and changing; but we are not capable of not believing what we think is true under the regime we live in—and it is true, as long as we are living in it. That truth is historically conditioned does not make it less true for us. As Stanley Fish argues, postmodern analysis does not preclude the making of truth claims:

> While relativism is a position one can entertain, it is not a position one can occupy. No one can *be* a relativist, because no one can achieve the distance from his own beliefs and assumptions which would result in their being no more authoritative *for him* than the beliefs and assumptions held by others. . . . When his beliefs change, the norms and values to which he once gave unthinking assent will have been demoted to the status of opinions and become the objects of an analytical and critical attention; but that attention will itself be enabled by a new set of norms and values that are, for the time being, as unexamined and undoubted as those they displace. The point is that there is never a moment when one believes nothing.[6]

Native studies concerns itself with more than the obvious misreading of poststructuralist thought and its relationship to truth. Native studies since its inception has steadfastly engaged the historical and political context that defines truth. Vine Deloria Jr.'s germinal texts, particularly *God Is Red,* argue that Native studies poses not just a political challenge to the transcendent and simultaneously universally held barometers of truth, but an epistemological challenge to the institutionalization of that truth—namely, the academy. He argued that Western imperialism and colonialism flowed from a Western epistemology that was premised on either-or logic systems based on Christian precepts. *God Is Red* argues that Native traditions are spatial in that they articulate to particular land bases, whereas Christianity and other traditions are temporal in that they seek converts from any land base and rest on an eschatological framework that envisions and requires an end to history. Of course, this dichotomy proposed by

Deloria was later critiqued by other Native studies scholars, such as Scott Lyons, for its simplicity. Nonetheless, while it is important to nuance the Delorian argument, the significance of his intervention is that epistemologies have material consequences. In particular, Deloria argues that Christianity, because it is a temporally rather than spatially based tradition, is necessarily a religion tied to imperialism because it will never be content to remain within a particular place or community. Rather, adherents of temporal-based religions will try to convince other people of the veracity of these religious truth claims: "Once religion becomes specific to a group, its nature also appears to change, being directed to the internal mechanics of the group, not to grandiose schemes of world conquest."[7] In his critique of liberation theology, Deloria contends that liberationist thought is entrapped by Western logic systems and hence is doomed to replicate the tenets of domination and, thus, fail:

> If we are then to talk seriously about the necessity of liberation, we are talking about the destruction of the whole complex of Western theories of knowledge and the construction of a new and more comprehensive synthesis of human knowledge and experience. This is no easy task and it cannot be accomplished by people who are encompassed within the traditional Western logic and the resulting analyses of such logic provides. If we change the very way that Western peoples think, the way they collect data, which data they gather, and how they arrange that information, then we are speaking truly of liberation.[8]

While he often focuses on Christianity in particular, Deloria argues that Western secular thought is essentially Christian in its foundations: "Christian religion and the Western idea of history are inseparable and mutually self-supporting. . . . Where did Westerners get their ideas of divine right to conquest, of manifest destiny, of themselves as the vanguard of true civilization, if not from Christianity?"[9] It therefore follows that the pathway to decolonization requires a fundamental epistemological shift away from Western theory. Indigenous epistemologies, he concludes, will provide the foundation for indigenous liberation.

Native studies in the 1970s had to struggle to articulate itself as an independent field where Native peoples would no longer be captured by the so-called truth of particular intellectual traditions and disciplinary formations—anthropology in particular. As Philip Deloria and many others contend, Native studies scholars resist the colonial imperative within early anthropology to situate Native peoples as dying cultures to be as-

sessed, memorialized, and classified.[10] Through the panic-driven mode of "salvage ethnography," presumably vanishing Native bodies, cultures, and communities were rendered objects to be studied, advancing the careers of white anthropological "experts" as well as the institutionalization and disciplinary notion that Native people were, in fact, disappearing.[11] The understandings of Native peoples of their own communities and cultures were interlocuted through the anthropologist, who was considered the expert in court cases and other sites of intellectual representation.[12] As a recent example, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Peoples held an expert seminar in February 2013 that addressed this very issue.[13] Many panelists argued that when indigenous peoples seek legal recognition for culture or land claims, courts dismiss them if indigenous communities do not appear to be living by paradigms prescribed the anthropologists who have studied these communities. The theory produced out of these anthropological modes of inquiry served to displace not only intellectual agency but also political agency, with deeply damaging consequences. Ned Blackhawk demonstrates the damaging effects of Julian Steward's taxonomic "cultural ecology" framework with "Great Basin Indians" in their designation as too loosely structured (albeit timeless and primeval) to receive federal recognition. This was their rendering in the classificatory report written by Steward to the federal government.[14] Vine Deloria Jr.'s foundational text, *Custer Died for Your Sins,* contained the seminal chapter "Anthropologists among Other Friends" that ridiculed anthropology's ethnographic obsession with Native peoples, but the chapter was more than a humorously inflected lambasting; it was a critique of the structuring suppositions of the field. In this, the conceptual and material containment of Native peoples into ethnographic sites required anthropological translation.[15] Similarly, Elizabeth Cook-Lynn's account of Native studies argues that the field should wrest itself from the grasp of anthropology through a focus on the political liberation of indigenous peoples.[16]

Thus, even the earlier works of Native studies, and more recent analyses such as Blackhawk's, have pointed to the importance of theoretical interventions in the colonial constructions of truth. This intellectual history demonstrates that the theorization of Native studies points to the centrality of the historical method and critique to the field as a project that responds to forms of ethnographic entrapment and its relationship to settler colonialism as not only a material practice of dispossession but as a representational practice of social scientific discourse.

Who Owns Theory

North America was brought into being as a nation-state under conditions of Native elimination, African enslavement, and an ongoing structure of capitalist accumulation that seems unaware of its bodily and ecological consequences.[17] As indigenous studies scholars argue, these conditions manifest themselves materially as well as epistemologically. The state is not only repressive; it is also educative—shaping common sense through ideological state apparatuses (such as the academy) that normalize the rule of settler colonialism.[18] It is perhaps not a surprise then that a suspicion of theory developed within Native studies, as Native studies developed in response to the ethnographic possessivism and entrapment of those fields that were closest to settler colonialism.[19] As Linda Tuhiwai Smith contends, any engagement with theory must take seriously the manner in which theory has been used against Native communities.[20] In this, Native peoples have been subjected to a variety of theories throughout the centuries about, for example, why their ways of life are "primitive," about why they should not possess title to their land, and about why they should not be allowed to raise their own children.[21] In taking this history seriously, however, some scholars in Native studies reject theory altogether as inescapably Western, but more critically than just a geographic and historical designation as Western—this theory is also tied with histories of taxonomic practice, of designating some people as "savage," as in the case of Steward cited above, and thus legal harm. Theory then can become exclusively associated with Western elites. Barbara Christian raises such concerns in her famous critique of the "race for theory."[22] Speaking to black literary criticism in particular, she asserts that the academic emphasis on "high" theory crowds out the voices of those who actually write literature. It was becoming more important to read literary critiques of literature than to read the literature itself. Nevertheless, Christian does not necessarily argue against theory per se, as she notes that black women have always produced theory. Rather, she contends that the theory produced by black artists and literary writers was not regarded as theory.

This argument has also been forcefully made within Native literary studies; the literary scholar and fiction writer Craig Womack's argument elaborating Cook-Lynn's position pronounces a mode of "separatism" whereby criticism would be generated from *within* communities, by thinkers and writers who emanate from those spaces. Womack and others who agree with him have not rejected theory as such but have called for the prioritization of theory produced within Native communities.[23]

Thus, the problem with dismissing the importance of theory on any grounds, no matter how understandable, is that this dismissal does not credit the intellectual work done within Native communities as critical or of theoretical importance. In this respect, the critique of theory can unwittingly recapitulate colonial and capitalist assumptions about who is able to produce theory. As many scholars have noted, racialized and colonial Others become marked as those who can be theorized about, but not those who can theorize. Denise da Silva in particular traces how Western philosophy marks the Western subject as self-determining and hence able to categorize and mark those deemed not self-determining (the "affectable" Others of Western modernity).[24] But if we demystify theory to understand it as the thinking behind why we think and do things, it is clear that all peoples, of course, "do" theory. Theoretical production is not always captured by the academy, however. In turning away from theory, Native studies risks isolating itself from the important theoretical production occurring within Native communities, past, present, and future, and from important analytical and critical possibilities for work. Perhaps the important intervention is not to reject theory per se, but to question the perceived ownership of theory.

In this respect, this book does not promote theory in opposition to community but actually foregrounds the fact that important theorizing is happening in Native communities, and that different forms of theorization can produce forms of analysis that take up political issues in ways that have important consequences for communities of every sort. For instance, the Taala Hooghan Infoshop in Flagstaff, Arizona, creates a variety of intellectual spaces for community members to theorize the conditions of settler colonialism and possible forms of resistance to it.[25] The Native Youth Sexual Health Network in Toronto is engaged in intellectual production in a number of forums where they theorize the relationships between indigeneity, colonialism, gender, and sexuality.[26] Countless groups in Native communities are not just engaging in activism but are critically theorizing about what forms of activism are most effective. Thus, one cannot avoid theory in the interest of being more community centered without dismissing the theory being produced within communities. The real question on the table is not whether we should theorize. Rather, we need to ask how we can critically and intelligently theorize current conditions in diverse spaces inside and outside the academy, and how we can theorize our responses to these conditions. When we take account of the historical and political conditions that structure theory as a thing that appears through theory's relationships to capital, or in relation to discourses of civilization and savagery,

we may ask how a heightened awareness about the history of ideas, and the practice of ideas, will not only allow us to theorize and critique robustly but also help us to build a more just set of relations between people.[27]

The Practice of Theory

When we demystify what theory is, then it is clear that theory is not antagonistic to practice. People who theorize are stereotypically depicted as divorced from practical realities. This argument presumes that there is such a thing as practice uninformed by theory. For instance, in their rather confused diatribe against theory, Steven Knapp and Walter Benn Michaels argue: "It is the name for all the ways people have tried to stand outside practice in order to govern practice from without. Our thesis has been that no one can reach a position outside practice, that theorists should stop trying, and that the theoretical enterprise should therefore come to an end."[28] This argument makes little sense; if practice and theory are inseparable, as Knapp and Michaels rightfully point out, then it is impossible to end the theoretical enterprise. If we understand theory more simply as an overall rationale for why we engage in the practices we engage in, then obviously all practice is informed by a theoretical rationale.

Therefore, the question is not whether we should engage in theory *or* practice, but, rather, what is the context in which theory and practice became separated within Native studies? Elizabeth Cook-Lynn recounts the development of Native American studies, which she traces to the First Convocation of American Indian Scholars at Princeton University in March 1970. Native studies was envisioned as a project that would break away from an anthropological focus on Native peoples as "exotics" and instead develop as an independent discipline concerned with "the defense of the land and indigenous rights."[29] The defense of Native peoples and lands has remained a priority in much of Native studies, but debate has arisen as to how academic practices can further these goals.[30] Cook-Lynn contends that education should focus on changing U.S. policies as they apply to Native peoples. Because the intellectual concerns of Native studies were supposed to focus on the practical realities faced by tribal nations, theory was seen as a luxury at best, or at worst a distraction from developing projects with more immediate political effects.

As Native studies developed, the field diversified and some subfields turned toward theoretical interventions deemed critical for advancing the goals of Native studies. A turn toward theory may seem antithetical to the more so-called practical focuses that would benefit Native communities.

Yet this divide between theory and practice became troubled as Native studies scholars increasingly identified the larger capitalist, white supremacist, and settler-colonial logics that were shaping Native policies. These scholars argued that many practical strategies for changing Native policies were ineffectual because they often furthered rather than challenged these larger governing logics of rule.[31] Consequently, a turn toward theory has become important in developing intellectual and political projects for indigenous aspirations for justice.

In addition, with the growing attacks against Native studies and ethnic studies in the United States, many Native and ethnic studies scholars are seeking to develop alternatives to what some understand as "the academic industrial complex" as the primary site for Native studies and ethnic studies.[32] Many of these models are informed by indigenous models of education in Latin America that eschew binaries between theory and practice. These spaces are challenging the current models of schooling by refusing to divorce theoretical knowledge from practical skills. They are not rejecting theory. To the contrary, they recognize the importance of theory in developing critical consciousness as people cooperatively work to build another world.

Theoretical Promiscuity

In addition to the debate over whether or not to engage theory, there is also debate about what constitutes the proper contours of theoretical work in Native studies. In particular, how should Native studies engage with other fields? Given the previously described logics shaped by history and politics that undergird academic disciplines, does it make sense for Native studies to engage these fields? If so, is it possible to remain committed to an intellectual project of theorized political critique if Native studies continues to inhabit the colonial logics of other disciplines? Even in the case of seemingly compatible ethnic studies projects, if the goals of Native studies are fundamentally different, then it would follow that the field's intellectual presuppositions may also be fundamentally different. If Native studies is going to question the means by which truth has been articulated, generally at the expense of indigenous peoples, would the discipline then have to develop an autonomous intellectual framework—what Robert Warrior described as "intellectual sovereignty?"[33] If so, does intellectual sovereignty require intellectual isolationism? In this volume, we suggest that intellectual sovereignty requires not isolationism but intellectual promiscuity.

In "Who Stole Native American Studies?" Cook-Lynn argues that Na-

tive studies was "stolen" by other academic disciplines. She warns against Native studies engaging with other fields, even those that might seem beneficial, such as ethnic studies and postcolonial studies. But why would Native studies be endangered by intellectual engagement with other fields? Cook-Lynn and others reason that the intellectual project of Native studies is fundamentally different from that of other fields. In her rendering, while Native studies is located in the academy, its primary aim is not the advancement of knowledge within the academy but the defense of Native communities. Cook-Lynn contends that other projects that do not share this concern could unwittingly domesticate Native studies into a multiculturalist project of representation (and entrapment) within the academy instead of a project that defends Native nations' claims to sovereignty.

When one considers the distinct political commitments of Native studies as well as its distinct epistemological foundations, it is understandable that many people in Native studies are suspicious of intellectual engagement with other fields that might seem to reify colonial epistemological and political presuppositions. These fears are certainly well founded given the genocidal logics that disappear Native peoples into intellectual and political projects that assume the continuation rather than the end of settler colonialism. At the same time, however, the logics of settler colonialism and genocide are not disconnected from the logics of imperialism, capitalism, heteropatriarchy, and white supremacy. As Glen Coulthard's foundational essay "Subjects of Empire" (2007) notes, Native nations often claim that they are fighting for self-determination when they are in fact fighting for recognition.[34] Their work is not geared toward fundamentally calling into question the legitimacy of the settler state, or dismantling the settler state; rather their work is geared toward gaining recognition from the settler state and perpetuating its life, interpreting the small token of recognition as justice. The politics of recognition entails a different approach to coalition-building than the politics of decolonization. The politics of recognition entails a claim to uniqueness that justifies recognition by the state. For example, those indigenous peoples seeking recognition from the state invariably find themselves in competition with others who are also seeking recognition. This forces an adversarial argument that one's own claims to cultural distinctiveness and political integrity, for example, are more worthy than the claims of others.[35] By contrast, the politics of decolonization requires the building of mass movements capable of dismantling settler colonialism, white supremacy, and capitalism. The intellectual project of decolonization would necessarily be broad based as anyone and everyone

who can help think of and imagine ways out of the moral and political impasse of recognition and into different modes of possibility would have to be enjoined to this intellectual and political process.[36] A politics based on recognition can be simpler in many ways. It does not require coalition politics. It does not require a serious engagement with broad-based ideas that can fundamentally change social and political relations as well as relationships with the natural world. And one can gain some helpful concessions through recognition, at least in the short-term. The negative impact of such a strategy is that it presupposes the permanent continuation of the conditions that oppress Native peoples. Because the settler state remains in full force, it has the ability to retract whatever limited forms of recognition it grants and never actually has to question itself or even consider its own history very deeply.[37] And because those seeking recognition do not build sufficient political power through coalitions, they are not in a position to successfully resist the settler state when these concessions are withdrawn.

If, however, the goal becomes a different political form, perhaps under the sign of decolonization and an end to genocide and settler colonialism, it is necessary to build forms of political power to make that happen. This would require a shift away from seeking recognition from those in power, focusing instead on those interested in changing power relationships. Because the conditions of Native peoples are inextricably linked to the conditions facing other oppressed groups, a different political imaginary would require an engagement with intellectual work from these other sites of struggle in order to build stronger intellectual and political solidarities. Similarly, other fields of thought dedicated to social transformation will be strengthened if they more critically engage with Native studies and its investments in ending settler colonialism. If the goal is no longer recognition, then Native studies has less to fear if it engages in coalitional work because it will no longer pursue recognition claims that could be overshadowed by the claims of others. Instead, Native studies should focus on dismantling the system that requires Native peoples to disappear in the first place. Then Native studies would be based not on intellectual isolationism but on intellectual promiscuity, sympathy, and solidarity.

The works of Kimberly Robertson, Myla Vicenti Carpio, and Renya Ramirez on urban Native communities also help reframe some of these debates around intellectual engagement.[38] Their work challenges the dichotomous categories of urban versus reservation, which rest on the premise that Native peoples are immobilized outside the frame of the reservation and cannot circulate meaningfully or on their own terms. Hence, the

movement of Native peoples from reservations to urban areas is seen as a one-way journey to assimilation and despair, if not disappearance from meaningful life and political community. These scholars question many of the prevailing assumptions about urban Native peoples—that they are less authentic, more assimilated, and more culturally alienated from their home communities. Carpio in particular challenges the notion that Native urbanization is a recent phenomenon. She argues that this presupposition elides the complex civilizations that existed in Native America prior to colonization. Building on Jack Forbes, Carpio argues that Native communities clustered around "urban" areas that became trade centers and places of dense interactions among large numbers of people. Essentially, Carpio suggests, the urbanization of Native peoples marks less a one-way journey to assimilation and more a reclamation of lands that are as equally indigenous as reservations. We could even say that this notion of Native peoples who never move, travel, or talk to anyone else is less a demonstration of self-determination and more a colonial trap in which Native peoples are placed in an anterior relationship to the rest of society. However, as Carpio and Ramirez demonstrate, prior to colonization Native peoples had a broad engagement with the world; they traveled and learned from other peoples without losing their governance systems or philosophical frameworks.[39]

In countering the call for intellectual isolationism, it is therefore important to engage rather than reject conversation with schools of thought that may have compatible intellectual and political goals, in particular Marxist theory, feminist theory, ethnic studies, and postcolonial theory. Native studies has often focused on incompatibility and conflicts with these fields. And while these critiques are essential, they should not be used to inhibit engagement with aspects of these fields that might be beneficial for Native studies projects.

Ethnic Studies

Winona Stevenson argues in her essay "'Ethnic' Assimilates 'Indigenous'" that the problem with ethnic studies is that it relegates Native peoples to the classification of "racial minority" rather than as sovereign peoples seeking decolonization.[40] While her important critique of the traditional ethnic studies model is correct, it also presumes that this current model serves all groups well *except* Native peoples. As ethnic studies has generally developed along identity lines (Asian American studies, Native studies, and so on), it has done critical work that provides the foundation for looking at intersections of racism, colonialism, immigration, and slavery in

the U.S. context. However, ethnic studies models constructed solely on an identity-based approach are limiting for all peoples, not just Native peoples. As Elizabeth Povinelli and Rey Chow have demonstrated, liberal multiculturalism relies on a politics of identity representation that is domesticated by nation-state and capitalist imperatives.[41] Today we see the emergence of a critical ethnic studies that does not necessarily dismiss identity, but the discipline structures inquiry around the logics of race, colonialism, capitalism, gender, and sexuality in order to expand its scope. Such a shift in focus is essential to providing a space for all scholars to be part of an engagement with critical ethnic studies since these as well as other logics structure society in its entirety, not just those who are racialized or colonized. A critical ethnic studies is not a melting pot for diverse racialized identity-based groups; it is a coalitional intellectual project that seeks to assess the intersecting logics of white supremacy, settler colonialism, and capitalism. A critical ethnic studies does not erase the need for an autonomous Native studies field, but it provides the space for indigenous studies to expand its impact through diverse academic formations. In particular, a critical ethnic studies provides a space to insist on the primacy of settler colonialism as a logic that structures the world for everyone, not just for Native peoples. Increasingly, Native studies scholars such as Brian Klopotek, Tiya Miles, and Melinda Maynor Lowery are writing in conversation with ethnic studies by focusing on the centrality of the analytics of settler colonialism within history and critical ethnic studies.[42]

Postcolonial Theory

Postcolonial theory is typically met with this dismissal: "Postcolonial? Have they left yet?" Cook-Lynn has critiqued postcolonial theory's disservice to the central aims of indigenous peoples in North America with the theoretician's keywords of *cosmopolitanism, hybridity,* and *postcolonialism.* Cook-Lynn has argued that this languaging detracts from rather than enhances Native communities and interest in their material and discursive territories.[43] Of course, much of the work within postcolonial theory invites this critique. For example, in their introduction to *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory,* Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman describe postcolonial theory as emerging from the "uncontentious" fact that "the era of formal colonial control is over."[44] They go on to describe the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand as *former* white colonies, thus erasing the reality of ongoing colonial rule over indigenous peoples in these countries. This erasure is all the more startling considering that Williams

and Chrisman include a chapter by Anne McClintock that takes postcolonial theory to task precisely for this reason: "By what fiat of historical amnesia can the United States of America, in particular, qualify as 'postcolonial'—a term which can only be a monumental affront to the Native American peoples currently opposing the confetti triumphalism of 1992."[45]

But, as Emma LaRocque notes, postcolonial theory should not be understood as signifying the end of colonialism or even formal colonialism.[46] Rather the *post* suggests the radical rupture in history created by the colonial moment. In this sense, a postcolonial analysis would be central to the development of Native studies because it speaks to the (im)possibilities of preserving tradition (or even articulating tradition) after the radical transformation in Native communities and Native peoples created by the colonial moment. Perhaps for this reason, many Native studies scholars are engaging Frantz Fanon, who articulates this radical rupture in history and its implications for decolonization.[47] And Native feminist and queer theorists are analyzing the costs of how tradition is articulated when it disavows the impact of colonialism in shaping what we remember tradition to be.

Some Native studies scholars have engaged postcolonial theory. For instance, Kevin Bruyneel articulates indigenous political relationships in the United States within a conceptual framework of a "third space of sovereignty." Bruyneel describes the tensions within Native law and policy that places Native peoples both inside and outside the U.S. polity. He argues that most legal scholars try to address this tension by eradicating this boundary, either by making Native nations more "inside" or more "outside" the United States. Rather than attempt to resolve this tension, Bruyneel asks us to understand this tension as a third space of sovereignty. He takes the term *third space* from Homi Bhabha,[48] although he defines it differently. According to Bruyneel, the third space of sovereignty "resides neither simply inside nor outside the American political system but rather exists on these very boundaries, exposing both the practices and contingencies of American colonial rule."[49] Bruyneel provides a rich analysis of some of the central conflicts between Native peoples and the federal and state governments. He takes care to demonstrate that there are not simply "two sides" in these conflicts, but that there is a complex interplay of wide-ranging and conflicting interests that determine the terrain of struggle. Bruyneel asserts that the third space of sovereignty is "not an unqualified or unproblematic ideal" but instead tends to uphold the third space as an alternative to two "false choices": independence and assimilation.[50] In addressing these false choices, Bruyneel provides space to voice the logics of

those who support Native assimilation, as well as demonstrating that those policymakers who support assimilation are themselves not singular in their purpose and effect.

Bruyneel and other postcolonial scholars such as Philip Deloria address the complex reality faced by Native nations today, but they do not necessarily call for complete decolonization and independence. Others, such as Scott Lyons, attempt to bridge a postcolonial analysis with a politics of decolonization. In his book *X-Marks,* Scott Lyons argues that Native peoples who historically collaborated in treaty making or other governmental processes did so within conditions that were not entirely of their making, that were deeply imperfect, and that deployed sign systems that were not entirely their own. As such, their signatures, on treaties for example, were an assent of sorts and should not be read retroactively as treachery or a commitment to assimilation.[51] Under the conditions Native peoples faced, they made the best choices available in order to preserve the well-being of Native peoples in the future. But Lyons proffers a vision of a political future that is not premised on the continuation of capitalism and the nation-state. He contends that the project of imagining this future begins with working with the apparatuses at one's disposal. However, he does not presume that the settler state will necessarily continue. Whereas some postcolonial scholars tend to presume the permanency of settler colonialism, others, such as Lyons, call for a politics of decolonization mindful of settler-colonial realities.

Probably the most extensive treatment of postcolonial theory can be found in the work of Jodi Byrd. In *Transit of Empire* (2011), Byrd takes seriously and theorizes from the critiques indigenous scholars have made about postcolonial theory. She argues that a stronger engagement rather than disengagement with postcolonial studies is helpful to the project of indigenous studies. On the one hand, she advocates for a stronger engagement with theory in general as a means to more fully ascertain how the (presumed) disappearance of indigeneity actually structures critical theory to achieve certain ends—more disappearance. At the same time, this engagement facilitates the development of indigenous theory, which she nuances as "critical indigenous theory" that does not rest on static and fixed notions of indigeneity: "Bringing indigenous and tribal voices to the fore within postcolonial theory may help us elucidate how liberal colonialist discourses depend upon sublimating indigenous cultures and histories into fictive hybridities and social constructions as they simultaneously trap indigenous peoples within the dialectics of genocide, where the only

conditions of possibility imagined are either that indigenous peoples will die through genocidal policies of colonial settler states (thus making room for more open and liberatory societies) or that they will commit heinous genocides in the defense of lands and nations."[52] Byrd demonstrates that contextualizing and closely reading postcolonial theory can provide a helpful intellectual apparatus to ascertain how it is that indigeneity disappears within postcolonial theory itself.

Feminist and Queer Theory

Until more recently, feminist and queer theory was often regarded as unnecessary for the development of Native studies because, so the rationale goes, homophobia and sexism did not exist in many Native communities prior to colonization. Consequently, feminist and queer theory was read as inherently "white," with no meaning for Native communities. This work was essential in pointing to the settler-colonial logics embedded in (white) feminisms.[53] However, these critiques were often made with essentializing claims that Native women cannot be feminists, thus erasing the diversity of thought that exists within both scholarly and activist circles.[54] Also, to the extent that Native women's writings on feminism are cited, their use is often limited to demonstrating the racism of first- and second-wave white feminism. Such rhetorical strategies limit Native women to a politics of inclusion; in vernacular terms the phrasing would be, "Let us *include* Native women in feminist theory (or if we do not think that they can be included, let us reject feminist theory completely)." This politics of inclusion inevitably presumes that feminism is defined by white women to whom indigenous women should or should not respond.

However, many works have recently emerged that rearticulate the terms of engagement within feminist and queer theory. Some work helpfully focuses on the status of Native women and Native peoples who are LGBTQ.[55] Other works note that Native feminist and queer theory is not limited by the objects of its analysis.[56] Rather, these theories shed light on the intersecting logics of settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy: gender violence and heteropatriarchy fundamentally structure the conditions of possibility for settler colonialism.[57] Again, these projects do not dismiss identity, but they do not necessarily presume to know characteristics essential to indigenous womanhood or, in particular, essential characteristics that are graspable to the analyst. Rather, the projects help support a revolutionary politic emerging from the praxis of indigenous communities (both past and present) as well as the material conditions of heteropatriarchy, colonialism, and

white supremacy under which indigenous women live. Indigenous feminist theory, contrary to what even some Native scholars argue, is not simply a multicultural add-on to white feminist theory (which itself is varied and complex). The theorizing produced by Native women scholars and activists make critical and transformative interventions into not only feminist theory but also a wide variety of theoretical formations.[58] Their work has challenged many of the settler-colonialist assumptions within postcolonial theory, ethnic studies, Marxist theory, and other theoretical formations. Similarly, queer theory brings our attention to the manner in which settler states impose heteronormativity on Native communities as a strategy to further colonization. The result is the reification of the heteronormative settler state that not only colonizes Native peoples but also structures the world of possibility for all peoples.

Marxism

Many scholars in Native studies have rightfully critiqued engagement with Marxist thought under the rationale that Marxist theory necessarily presupposes a Western development model that seeks to liberate indigenous peoples from their land bases and move them into the capitalist work economy. A central text, *Marxism and Native Americans* by Ward Churchill, argues that Marxism and Native sovereignty are fundamentally incompatible.[59] This text was written when splits developed within the American Indian Movement over the capital contra wars in Nicaragua. As detailed in Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz's *Blood on the Border,* some American Indian Movement activists supported the U.S. counterinsurgency war against the Nicaraguan Revolution by arguing that Sandinistas were oppressing the Miskito peoples.[60] Others argued that while Sandinista policies may have been problematic, they were certainly preferable to the U.S.-backed Somoza regime that the Sandinista government replaced. This debate created a larger disagreement over whether Marxist-based movements were supportive or antithetical to indigenous liberation. Some have argued that Marxism is not helpful for Native studies because of its investment in economic developmentalism, its Eurocentrism, and its emphasis on labor exploitation rather than land appropriation.[61] As María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo's recent work demonstrates, these critiques are well founded. She details some of the tensions between Marxist-based movements and indigenous struggles.[62] In her analysis of the problems with Sandinista policies as they pertained to indigenous peoples, she contends that the Sandinistas, as well as many revolutionary Marxist movements, fundamentally pre-

supposed the same developmentalist model as the capitalists they claim to resist. Consequently, like their capitalist counterparts, these allegedly revolutionary subjects often frame Native peoples as primitive precursors to the revolutionary subject. Saldaña-Portillo does not call for a rejection of Marxist analysis as did *Marxism and Native Americans*; she seeks a deeper interrogation and exchange between these strands of thought that can speak to a nondevelopmentalist model for economic liberation.

However, as Paula Rojas notes, the reconfiguration of revolutionary movements in Latin America, in places such as Chiapas, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Brazil, has contributed to a new framework for movement building that is democratic rather than authoritarian, inclusive rather than elitist, and that centers indigenous peoples.[63] As a result, they have been able to shut down entire countries and achieve the mass-scale change that is absent in the United States. Native peoples, as well as everyone who wishes to challenge the U.S. empire, would benefit from learning from the success of these struggles. These mass-based movements, which are completely changing the landscape of Latin America, have been informed by indigenous critiques of previous revolutionary movements. Nevertheless, Marxism does make important contributions to the "how" of revolutionary struggle that indigenous peoples will find helpful. That is, exactly how can visions of new political orders in North America join larger struggles against capitalist accumulation? How can struggles against land appropriation be tied to struggles over labor exploitation? Marxist theory provides a helpful lens for addressing these questions. Consequently, some Native studies scholars have called for more engagement with Marxist theory. Roberto Mendoza argues: "Traditionals do not really address the question of power. How can small communities tied in a thousand ways to the capitalist market system break out without a thorough social, economic and political revolution within the whole country?"[64] He also labels those traditionalists who refuse to consider any Marxist analyses as "fundamentalists," and he states: "I feel that dialogue and struggle with Left forces are necessary rather than rejection and isolation."[65] Similarly, Lee Maracle has critiqued the anti-Marxist strands within Native activists, contending that without a Marxist analysis, Native activism does not "challenge the basic character or the legitimacy of the institutions or even the political and economic organizations of America."[66] Scott Lyons calls for a stronger conversation between Native studies and the Left given the current context in which "the world's richest 2 percent . . . control half of humanity's assets . . . as the bottom half—more than three billion people—struggles over a scant 1 percent in order to survive."[67]

Book Overview

In this book we seek to demonstrate the variety of ways that scholars within Native studies operationalize multiple forms of theory to get analysis done and to enact forms of history and theorization that make for that analysis. Teresia Teaiwa's and Dian Million's reflections frame debates about theory in Native studies in terms of how the discipline is both internally and externally policed. In "There Is a River in Me," Million details the manner in which theory has been used as a weapon against Native studies. In particular, she is interested in the manner in which Native peoples are situated as those who can be theorized about, but not those who can theorize. In particular, she challenges the dichotomy between theory and experience by demonstrating how the experiences of indigenous peoples become an important source of theory. Rather than presuming that claims to identity and experience are necessarily essentialist, Million demonstrates how an open-ended articulation of experience and identity can be the foundation for the development of critical indigenous theory. Thus Native studies' engagement with theory requires questioning what we perceive theory to be. Teaiwa, by contrast, focuses on the internal policing within Native studies. Against those who would say that you can't cite Marx, Foucault, and so on because they are not indigenous, Teaiwa explores the benefits that result from engaging with such thinkers, even those from the majority culture. She contends that this engagement is itself an act of sovereignty rather than a sign of assimilation, since it represents Native peoples choosing their intellectual genealogies.

Several of the authors in this volume bring Native studies into conversation with other fields of thought that are interested in challenging relationships of domination. Glen Coulthard reads Marxist theory through the lens of indigenous struggle. In his detailed analysis, he points to the limitations of Marxist theory for indigenous struggle, and he builds on the previously mentioned critiques by other indigenous scholars. However, Coulthard also identifies important contributions within Native studies that he argues can be helpful for indigenous struggle. In particular, he looks at how Marx's notion of primitive accumulation can be a starting point for injecting a stronger analysis of settler colonialism into Marxist theory. This exchange is also helpful for articulating why struggles against settler colonialism also need to be anticapitalist.

Robert Nichols brings critical race theory into conversation with Native studies to articulate his reworking of the framework of the "settler con-

tract." In conversation with Carol Pateman's "sexual contract," and Charles Mills's "racial contact," Nichols contends that settler society is founded on the principles of the settler contract that erase the founding genocide that enables it.[68] Furthermore, argues Nichols, Mills attempts to "close the gap" between the ideal of the social contract and the reality of the racial contract serves to reinstantiate settler colonialism in the name of antiracist critique.

Scott Lauria Morgensen and Mark Rikfin both engage the intersections of queer theory and indigenous studies. Using a Foucauldian analysis of biopolitics, Rifkin assesses the shifting colonial strategy of categorizing Native peoples, from members of distinct nations to the racial category of "Indian." Rifkin demonstrates that this tactic is based on heteronormativity. That is, in order to break up indigenous political orders (Native nations) that pose a threat to the legitimacy of colonial-governance order, these collectivities are diluted into individual family units that can be absorbed into the colonial state. With national collectivities then disavowed, Native peoples become racialized Indians who are managed through the politics of biopower. As racialized subjects, argues Rifkin, they still constitute a threat to the well-being of the colonial state and hence are never properly heterosexual or heteronormative. But this racializing logic masks the even greater threat that Native nations present. Indianization, as it were, allows colonialism to become a population problem rather than a political problem.

The strategy of domesticating Native peoples into populations is further evidenced in global health policy, as Morgensen's chapter demonstrates. In response to the global AIDS crisis, while some regions of the world, particularly Africa, get marked as permanently diseased within the current biopolitical regime, Native peoples are seen as already disappeared and beyond the concern of AIDS health activism. Within this context, Morgensen explores how indigenous AIDS activists counter biopolitical regimes by organizing under the framework of decolonization.

Several contributors use theory to question the academic representational practice in which Native studies finds itself. Andrea Smith builds on Audra Simpson's call for an ethnographic refusal to articulate how Native peoples are situated within the academy in a position of ethnographic entrapment.[69] Building on the work of Rey Chow and Elizabeth Povinelli, Smith questions the politics of Native representation within the academy.[70] It is often presumed that greater visibility of Native cultures within the academy facilitates a politics of political transformation and decolonization. Smith, however, suggests that this quest to prove the worth of Native

cultures facilitates rather than challenges colonization by rendering Native peoples as another cultural group to be incorporated within the multicultural classificatory schemes of the academy.

Christopher Bracken explores the presumed unitary Native self within academic representation as he investigates the vexed relationship between Native identities and Christianity in his textual readings of the works of Samson Occom and Joseph Johnson. Many Native studies scholars have argued that Native Christians cannot historically be understood to be simple apologists for U.S. Christian supremacy, but in fact they have often used Christianity as a means to counter settler colonialism. Bracken, however, builds on this work by rearticulating this relationship, starting from the premise that the Native self is not understood to be a transparent and unified whole. Consequently, the Native self that adopts Christianity is neither singularly resistant nor complicit but is a noncorresponding self that refracts multiple and conflicting desires. In this sense, Bracken's work can be put into conversation with Antonio Viego's *Dead Subjects,* in which he calls for a new representational politics that takes into account "how racism depends on a certain representational capture of the ethnic-racialized subject—rendered as transparent to the signifier, potentially whole and unified—in order to manage this subject more masterfully in discourse."[71]

If Bracken questions the notion of a singular Native self, Mishuana R. Goeman questions the colonial logics by which these singular selves are attached to land. Goeman uses the theory produced in Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie's artwork to resist the biopolitics of population management in which Native bodies are attached to small, manageable, and bounded land bases, what Goeman identifies as a colonial understanding of land and space. Goeman contends that all of the United States is Indian land. Consequently, a different political future requires not simply recognition of the land bases currently occupied by Native peoples but a dismantling of the settler state and a complete rearticulation of the relationship between peoples and land. Land is not a commodity owned by Native peoples; land is part of an active relationship with Native peoples in multiple and complex ways. In addition, Goeman's work methodologically serves to underscore the importance of artistic and literary production as sites of theoretical production. That is, as compared to others who might separate those who do art and literature from those who theorize it, Goeman seeks to resituate Native artists as theorists.

Similarly, Vera B. Palmer challenges the dichotomy between Native traditions and theory by describing the theory implicit within Native spiritual

and cultural traditions. In her reading of Kateri Tekakwitha (Mohawk), who was recently canonized by the Catholic Church in 2012, Palmer explores how the indigenous epistemologies inherent in Tekakwitha's praxis disappear within her Christian veneration. Palmer contends that writings on Tekakwitha should be properly understood within the context of Mohawk epistemologies and cosmologies. In doing so, Palmer demonstrates how indigenous methodologies can provide alternative theoretical frameworks for such interpretive analysis.

Conclusion

The works in this collection share a political commitment to Native communities beyond representation within the academy. This book also affirms that Native studies is capable of developing its own analytic and methodological frameworks outside those determined by traditional disciplines or the Western academy. This volume builds on previous scholarship that has focused on developing an autonomous Native studies by arguing that an explicit turn toward theory can assist in these endeavors. By demystifying theory, we can look at the theoretical production that currently exists within Native communities. And by engaging in the theoretical production occurring in diverse intellectual streams and traditions, Native studies is in a position to build intellectual coalitions and the political power necessary to seriously destabilize the conceits of settler colonialism. In addition, these coalitions can then enable Native studies to have a broad impact on diverse intellectual and political formations.

Notes

1. Daphne Patai and Will H. Corral, eds., *Theory's Empire: An Anthology of Dissent* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 23.
2. See Elvira Pulitano, *Toward a Native American Critical Theory* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003); and Jace Weaver, Craig S. Womack, and Robert Allen Warrior, *American Indian Literary Nationalism* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006). Ours is a gloss that still sustains more nuance than even Pulitano's depiction of the field or her allegations of essentialism wages. Here we want to make clear that in taking up the problem of disagreement, theorists since Socrates have attempted to align differing views through the process of debate and so have engaged in a process that *produces* something—knowledge, substance, logical alignment, or misalignment. It might be argued that this is truly a transhistorical and human and intellectual imperative that takes many forms. The leverage of *essentialist* is to assert that knowledge production occurs outside the terms of engagement

and is a free-floating signifier itself (something strangely outside the scene of its articulation, outside politics, and outside history). We understand this to be impossible and think that even the claim of essentialism removes itself from the political context of the assertion or the argument, which may take a nondialectical form (say of an assertion) but is occurring in political and historical contexts that may require that form.

3. Sean Kicummah Teuton, *Red Land, Red Power: Grounding Knowledge in the American Indian Novel* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), xvi.
4. Teuton, *Red Land, Red Power,* xvi.
5. Steven Seidman, *Contested Knowledges: Social Theory in the Postmodern Era,* 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), 325.
6. Stanley Fish, *Is There a Text in the Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 309.
7. Vine Deloria Jr., *God Is Red: A Native View of Religion* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 1992), 297.
8. Vine Deloria Jr. and James Treat, *For This Land: Writings on Religion in America* (New York: Routledge Chapman and Hall, 1999), 106.
9. Deloria and Treat, *For This Land,* 113.
10. Philip Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998). See also Tom Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman, eds., *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr., and the Critique of Anthropology* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997); Elizabeth Povinelli, *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002); Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999); and Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London: Cassell, 1999).
11. This is not to ignore or to deny the contributions of indigenous anthropologists and scholars such as the Seneca and Tuscarora scholars Arthur Parker and J. N. B. Hewitt—who enjoyed a very narrow but significant degree of institutional security and anthropological influence in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One might also consider the deeply fraught career of the Sac and Fox Columbia University-trained anthropologist William Jones, whose very framework may have contributed to his death by Ilongot "headhunters" in the Philippines in 1909. However, this significance accorded to some Native anthropologists (archaeologists and linguists) may have a gendered *and* raced cast as the lives and careers of scholars such as Ella Deloria (the Yankton Sioux who worked for and with Franz Boas and Ruth Benedict at Columbia University) were very different. Her book, written first in Sioux, was not translated and published into English until the 1970s. She struggled for funding for much of her career and never held an institutional appointment. Her grandnephew, the cultural historian Phil Deloria, writes of her: "Deloria found working for Boas intellectually challenging, but she

constantly teetered on the brink of economic disaster, frequently having to plead for more work and better compensation. She had skill and practical experience equal to that of any of Boas's famous protégés, but she barely received a research assistant's wage." Phil Deloria, "Ella Deloria (Anpetu Waste)," in *Encyclopedia of North American Indians,* ed. Frederick Hoxie (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1996), 359–361. This is much like Zora Neale Hurston, the African American folklorist who also worked for and with Boas at Columbia and wrote monographs that are considered contemporary classics of African American ethnography and literature. For biographical and literary analysis of both Deloria and Hurston, see Maria Cotera, *Native Speakers: Ella Deloria, Zora Neale Hurston, Jovita González, and the Poetics of Culture* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008).

12. See, for example, the federal-recognition requirements of the United States, which requires the documentation of an anthropologist, historian, archaeologist, or other "expert" on the precontact status of native claimants. See Jack Campisi, *The Mashpee Indians: Tribe on Trial* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1991); James Clifford, "Identity in Mashpee," in *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); and Renée Ann Cramer, *Cash, Color and Colonialism: The Politics of Tribal Acknowledgement* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005). And see Bruce Miller, *Invisible Indigenes: The Politics of Non-recognition* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003), for North American and global cases. For the most recent contemplation of this burden of proof from multiple cases in the United States, see Jean O'Brien and Amy den Ouden, eds., *Recognition, Sovereignty Struggles and Indigenous Rights in the United States: State and Federal Recognition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).
13. This seminar for experts was held at Columbia University and was hosted by the Institute for Human Rights and convened by the faculty member Elsa Stamatopoulou.
14. Ned Blackhawk, "Julian Steward and the Politics of Representation: A Critique of the Anthropologist Julian Steward's Portrayals of the American Indians of the Great Basin," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 2, no. 122 (1997): 75–77. Blackhawk details the manner in which the Shoshone, constructed in a taxonomic schemata by Steward, were rendered as diffuse, landless, placed outside of time, and in need, not of a land base and federal recognition but total assimilation into U.S. society because of a conceptually flawed anthropological account of their lives and livelihood. Steward's 1938 report was commissioned by the commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, who sought scholarly opinions on the political and cultural status of these "tribes" as he tried to implement the Indian Reorganization Act, an act that was to reverse the legacy of the dispossessive Dawes Act (1887) and now allow for electorally based tribal governments. See Blackhawk, "Julian Steward and the Politics of Representation," 80, fn. 36, for reference to the report.

Steward recommended against recognition for these "loose" bands, and consequently against federal recognition, a land base, and the Indian Reorganization Act, but his report was countered most vigorously by Alida Bowler of the Carson Indian Agency, who confidentially wrote to Collier and said that based on what she had heard about his work with the Shoshone, she was "unshakably skeptical" of his findings and had reason to "doubt anything he has published in the field." Quoted in Blackhawk, "Julian Steward and the Politics of Representation," 76. Steward's advice was rejected in 1937 and the Western Shoshone were granted reservation lands and recognition.

15. See the critical chapter "Anthropologists and Other Friends," in Vine Deloria Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969). This book was of such import to the field that it prompted a conversation at the American Anthropological Association annual meeting the following year on Native anthropological relations and the first ethics policy adopted by the field. For the legacy of this book to the field, see Biolsi and Zimmerman, *Indians and Anthropologists.*
16. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, "Who Stole Native American Studies?," *Wicazo Sa Review* 12, no. 1 (1997).
17. See Jared Sexton, *Amalgamation Schemes: Antiblackness and the Critique of Multiracialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008); Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology;* and Sylvia Wynter, "Columbus, the Ocean Blue, and Fables That Stir the Mind: To Reinvent the Study of Letters," in *Poetics of the Americas: Race, Founding, and Textuality,* ed. Bainard Cowan and Jefferson Humphries (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997).
18. On the educative role of the state, see Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks,* 12th ed., trans. and ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971); and Stuart Hall et al., *Policing the Crisis* (New York: Homes and Meier Publishers, 1978). On the academy as ideological state apparatus, see Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972).
19. See Cook-Lynn, "Who Stole Native American Studies?"; and Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies.*
20. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies.*
21. See, for example, Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Elizabeth Povinelli, *The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); and Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies.*
22. Barbara Christian, "The Race for Theory," *Cultural Critique* 6 (1987).
23. One need only look to Craig S. Womack's paradigmatic *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999) for the model of this form of criticism, and to Robert Allen Warrior's *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions* (Minneap-

olis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994) for an anteceding, interdisciplinary historicization of the argument and the model. Subsequent works in the subfield of literary studies have largely reworked this premise of culture, in a materialist and also a methodological sense in that their modes of analysis and have engaged most forcefully with the critiques of Elvira Pulitano's charges of analytical myopia in *Toward a Native American Literary Theory.*

24. Denise Ferreira da Silva, *Toward a Global Idea of Race* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007). See also Rey Chow, *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002); María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); and Smith, this volume.
25. See the Taala Hooghan Infoshop's website at http://www.taalahooghan.org/ (accessed 10/07/2013).
26. See the Native Youth Sexual Health Network's website at http://www.nativeyouthsexualhealth.com/ (accessed 10/08/2013).
27. One need not look for evidence of theory's relationship to capital or to its instrumentality in the service of capital accumulation and colonization. See, for example, John Locke's *Of Property* for a seminal, "new world" example in *Two Treatises of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. Ian Shapiro (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 111–21. Subsequent works that then interpret the imperial context and uses of his work include Barbara Arneil, *John Locke in America: The Defense of English Colonialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Uday Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); and James Tully, *An Approach to Political Philosophy: Locke in Contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). For a cognate, historicizing reading of liberal theory in Canada, see Dale A. Turner's *This Is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006). For a reading of social contract theory and its imperial context (and occlusions), see Nichols, this volume.
28. Steven Knapp and Walter Benn Michaels, "Against Theory," *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 4 (Summer 1982): 742.
29. Cook-Lynn, "Who Stole Native American Studies?," 9.
30. See, for example, Waziyatawin, *What Does Justice Look Like? The Struggle for Liberation in Dakota Homeland* (St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press, 2008); and Waziyatawin and Eli Taylor, *Remember This! Dakota Decolonization and the Eli Taylor Narratives* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005).
31. See, for example, Glen Coulthard, "Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada," *Contemporary Political Theory* 6, no. 4 (2007); Jennifer Denetdale, "Chairmen, Presidents, and Princesses: The Navajo Nation, Gender, and the Politics of Tradition," *Wicazo Sa Review* 21, no. 1 (2006); Emma LaRocque and National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, *Violence in Aboriginal Communities* (Ottawa: National Clearinghouse

on Family Violence, Family Violence Prevention Division, Health Programs and Services Branch, Health Canada, 1994); Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights* (Phoenix: University of Arizona Press, 2013); Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014); and Andrea Smith, *The Christian Right and Race Reconciliation* (New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1997).

32. Andrea Smith, "Native Studies and Critical Pedagogy: Beyond the Academic Industrial Complex," in *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism, and Social Change,* ed. Julia Sudbury and Margo Okasawa-Rey (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Press, 2009). For an example of these attacks, see the hostility to ethnic studies in "anti-immigration" states such as Arizona, which has banned the teaching of ethnic studies in public schools, as well as the defunding of ethnic studies programs in the university itself. See Noliwe Rooks, *White Money/Black Power: The Surprising History of African American Studies and the Crisis of Race and Higher Education* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006).
33. Warrior, *Tribal Secrets.*
34. Coulthard, "Subjects of Empire."
35. See, for example, the Aboriginal land-claim cases brought into being and adjudicated by the Wik decision in Australia, which makes determinations between groups of people based on their distinctiveness against each other, never questioning the fundamental right of the state to make such determinations in a scene of dispossession. See, for example, Aileen Moreton-Robinson, ed., *Sovereign Subjects: Indigenous Sovereignty Matters* (Crows Nest, Australia: Allen and Unwin Academic, 2007); and Povinelli, *The Cunning of Recognition.*
36. For an attempt at this sort, see Taiaiake Alfred's *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom* (Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Press, 2005).
37. Consider the reparative gesture of the public (and not so public, in the case of the United States) apologies by the United States, Canada, and Australia that took a form of responsibility for indigenous suffering and injustice but also sealed, semiotically, all further public discussions of these matters. Please see Audra Simpson, "Settlement's Secret," *Cultural Anthropology* 26, no. 2 (2011), for a discussion of the political efficacy of these public spectacles for ongoing projects of settlement.
38. Myla Vicente Carpio, *Indigenous Albuquerque* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2011); Renya Ramirez, *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); and Kimberly Dawn Robertson, "Un-settling Questions: The Construction of Indigeneity and Violence against Women," PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2012.
39. For a cognate study as it obtains to the specificity of the Iroquois (who were imagined as immobilized, sedentary, and even dwelling in "slums in the Wilderness" in various disciplines), see Jon Parmenter's groundbreaking history of mobility, *The Edge of the Woods: Iroquoia, 1534–1701* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2010).

40. Winona Stevenson, "'Ethnic' Assimilates 'Indigenous': A Study in Intellectual Neocolonialism," *Wicazo Sa Rview* 13, no. 1 (1998). Stevenson now publishes under the name Winona Wheeler.
41. Chow, *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism;* and Povinelli, *The Cunning of Recognition.*
42. See Brian Klopotek, *Recognition Odysseys: Indigeneity, Race, and Federal Tribal Recognition Policy in Three Louisiana Indian Communities* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); Melinda Maynor Lowery, *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); and Tiya Miles, *Ties That Bind: The Story of an Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and in Freedom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).
43. Cook-Lynn, "Who Stole Native American Studies?"
44. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, eds., *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory Theory: A Reader, 1850–1990* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 3.
45. McClintock, *Imperial Leather,* 294.
46. Emma LaRocque, *When the Other Is Me: Native Resistance Discourse, 1850–1990* (Manitoba, Canada: University of Manitoba Press, 2010).
47. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin: White Masks,* trans. Richard Philcox (Boston: Grove Press, 1998 [1967]); *Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Richard Philcox (Boston: Grove Press, 2005 [1963]).
48. More specifically, see Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2004 [1994]). For further clarification on his conceptualization, see "The Third Space: Interview with Homi Bhabha," in *Identity: Culture, Community, and Difference*, ed. John Rutherford (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990), 207–21, esp. 208–12.
49. Kevin Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), xvii.
50. Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty,* 1–25.
51. Scott Lyons, *X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).
52. Jodi Byrd, *Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), xxxvi–xxxvii.
53. See Sandy Grande, *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004); and M. Annette Jaimes and Theresa Halsey, "American Indian Women: At the Center of Indigenous Resistance in North America," in *State of Native American: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance,* ed. M. Annette Jaimes (Boston: South End Press, 1992).
54. Andrea Smith, *Native Americans and the Christian Right: The Gendered Politics of Unlikely Alliances* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008).
55. Sue-Ellen Jacobs, Wesley Thomas, and Sabine Lang, eds., *Two-Spirit People: Native American Gender Identity, Sexuality, and Spirituality* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997).

56. See Chris Finley, "Decolonizing the Queer Native Body (and Recovering the Native Bull-Dyke): Bringing 'Sexy Back' and out of the Native Studies Closet," in *Queer Indigenous Studies,* ed. Qwo-Li Driskill, Chris Finley, Brian Gilley, Scott Morgensen, et al. (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2011); Mark Rifkin, *When Did Indians Become Straight? Kinship, The History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); and Andrea Smith, "Queer Theory and Native Studies: The Heteronormativity of Settler Colonialism," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 61, no. 1–2 (2010).
57. See Finley, "Decolonizing the Queer Native Body"; LaRocque and National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, *Violence in Aboriginal Communities;* and Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005).
58. See, for example, Andrea Smith and J. Kehaulani Kaunaui's edited issue of *American Quarterly* and their introduction, "Forum: Native Feminisms without Apology," *American Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (2008). Also see the articles introduced by Mishuana Goeman and Jennifer Denetdale in "Native Feminisms: Legacies, Interventions, and Sovereignties," *Wicazo Sa Review* 24, no. 9 (2009). And see Mishuana Goeman's literary analysis *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013); and Joyce Green's *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism* (London: Zed Books, 2007).
59. Ward Churchill, *Marxism and Native Americans* (Boston: South End Press, 1983).
60. Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *Blood on the Border: A Memoir of the Contra War* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005).
61. See Churchill, *Marxism and Native Americans;* Russell Means and Marvin J. Wolf, *Where White Men Fear to Tread: The Autobiography of Russell Means* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1995); and George Tinker, *Spirit and Resistance: Political Theology and American Indian Liberation* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004).
62. Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development.*
63. Paula Rojas, "Are the Cops in Our Heads and Our Hearts?," in *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-profit Industrial Complex,* ed. Incite! Women of Color against Violence (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2007).
64. "Traditionals" in this quote may be taken to mean those who are self-consciously living as so-called traditional people in the context of a settler society; they are mindfully living according to their indigenous political and philosophical traditions. Roberto Mendoza, *Look! A Nation Is Coming!* (Philadelphia: National Organization for an American Revolution, 1984), 8.
65. Mendoza, *Look!,* 39.
66. Lee Maracle, *I Am Woman: A Native Perspective on Sociology and Feminism* (North Vancouver: Write-On Press Publishers, 1988), 100.

67. Lyons, *X-Marks,* 162.
68. Pateman first theorized the "settler contract," but Nichols works it over most robustly.
69. Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus.*
70. Chow, *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism;* and Povinelli, *The Cunning of Recognition.*
71. Antonio Viego, *Dead Subjects: Toward a Politics of Loss in Latino Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).