

Audra Simpson

The Sovereignty of Critique

Born from dissatisfaction and alienation from the disciplines, Native Studies in what is now North America sought to teach people in the 1970s to serve Indigenous communities and defend treaty rights and, in doing so, lands and waters. From its beginning, the field was a critique of knowledge and disciplinary formations that had imagined indigenous peoples as either dying or dead, or subjects of continual capture. The emergent field emphasized both *sovereignty* (the historical agreements that “tribes” or nations had entered into to protect their lands) and the necessity to engage materials about Native people, evaluating and analyzing not only its truth claims but its constitution—a practice of *critique*. These two crucial activities in Native and indigenous studies (sovereignty and critique) are in tension with one another. In what follows I offer an account of the theoretical and political impetus for this focus in the field on sovereignty, while giving an account of its formation. I divide the analysis into constituent parts that reveal the tension between commitments to an inherently constraining and delimiting formulation—sovereignty—and to interrogative practices like critique, looking specifically at the ways in which sovereignty and

The South Atlantic Quarterly 119:4, October 2020

DOI 10.1215/00382876-8663591 © 2020 Duke University Press

critique co-constitute each other. This tension or relationship has germinated critical strands within the field that address the domination of the settler state as well as the production of knowledge and the formation of the disciplines. As such, Native Studies developed in service to community, with critical commitments to protection of territory and decolonization that extend to institutional and academic commitments and politics.¹

“Sovereignty” may now be viewed as a dated political idea premised on an exceptionalism that, some might say, has a specious claim to contemporary imaginings of justice. Its genealogy resides in a Western European, monarchic right to kill—in a desire to secure jurisdiction over territory that appears to no longer matter in the world of today. This is (presumably, perhaps ideally) a world that is punctuated by flows of capital and people, where “belonging” is sorted not by clans, crests, and names but by twitter handles in deterritorialized, de-raced, and blooded spaces beyond the material world. Yet in spite of this admittedly abbreviated account of the “hyper-real” world in which we live, theorists from the Pacific² have taught us that the radical Indigenous commitments to place- and water-centered lives persist, not as stasis but in a dialectical tension between these core commitments to life, land, and waters. Sovereignty, in this sense, matters. But only critique can help us distinguish between sovereignty as western exceptionalism and dominance, and sovereignty as Indigenous belonging, dignity, and justice.

Constituent Parts 1

Let first let me speak more of the title of this piece and its constituent parts. “Sovereignty”—the notion of jurisdiction over territory and people, of a monarchical power to kill, in Schmittian terms to possess such an increase of power and have absolute arbitrariness at one’s disposal, is summarized blithely as a power defined as the one who may make the decision. Why speak of such arbitrary power as virtue or “sovereignty” at all when its power is derived from potential lethality? Why do so when it is both an artifact of Western geopolitical and now biopolitical effort, when it is invested clearly and unambiguously in the deep histories of Western governance that required force, violence, exclusionary practices in the carving of territory? “Carving out territory” is not a project without bodily effects. A certain innocence attaches itself to such language, yet in so doing it galls the record of lives and land lost in the project of “carving.” And “carving” what? Territory, at once material and metaphysical, to which Indigenous peoples globally belong. So why speak of sovereignty when it has been used to justify the seizure of those territories as “just” (in the form of divine power and right) and

the ongoing life of foreign and sometimes settler and *settling* governance in Indigenous lands? Why talk about sovereignty in the context of critique?

In indigenous studies it is a strange need seemingly at odds with the philosophical systems that animate claims to and for justice, land, water, life, and dignity, yet sovereignty plays the shorthand game of protecting territory from incursion and, one would think, protecting from harm. “Sovereignty” is a political form that held hands with the first instances of global capital, mercantilism, that authorized the travel of foreigners to Indigenous territories and the massive, forcible detachment of people in search of more land, more labor, and more capital. Indigenous lands and bodies were Western sovereignty’s (supposed) *terra nullius* and *tabula rasa*—their lands, their bodies and then minds, were to be cleared, like a forest for planting and emplacing others here. Jesuits called their work in “New France,” a “harvest of souls”—for the Lockean logic of property formation informed retrospectively the efforts of missionaries as they worked their minds and souls into something extractable and convertible: spirits as property, land as possession. As such, “sovereignty” is fraught. It is shot through with these hidden and not so hidden experiences of force, displacement, and containment. Yet Indigenous peoples now “govern” presumably, with this political form, or aspire to, or are conscripted via (settler) law to use this language of sovereignty and aspire to control of territory, memberships, and jurisdiction. Simultaneously—and this is my key point throughout—Native and Indigenous studies has made “sovereignty” an intellectual and scholarly focus that also served a political project of justice and service for communities.

There is a political and collective sense of self that now must be addressed in the move to sovereignty. The Iroquois Confederacy, Lewis Henry Morgan’s so-called “Romans of the New World”—or as they know themselves “Haudenosaunee” (people of the Longhouse)—have acted as nations and as sovereign, sovereign because they confederated, because they have their own governance system, their own “citizenship” or clan system, their own land—what is left of it. They even tried in the late 1920s to acquire recognition at the League of Nations as a nation-state in order to rid themselves of the burdensome yoke of Canadian settler colonialism. The bid for recognition was not successful, but was crucial for furthering an understanding of North American Indigenous sovereignty globally and thus qualifies what we might think of as “success.”³ Either way, the appeal for international recognition was argued not with the language of racial redress or rights, but with the language of sovereignty. So this term is more than merely an ancestor to white, western political ordering confined only to Europe but is a language game that historically been played under conditions of imperial settler coloniality.

The historical record is replete with Indigenous peoples making these arguments that pivot around the claims of sovereignty.⁴ They have made them to other Indigenous nations, governments of various forms, to international tribunals regarding the centrality of their own inherent capacity to govern and the need for that capacity to be respected (see Deloria Jr. and Wilkins 1999; Bruyneel 2007; Stark 2016). These arguments and episodes of assertion were felt most recently when what is now the United States linked opposition to the Dakota Access Pipeline to a specific violation of Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868⁵—treaties that, in defining the boundaries of Sioux protect one of the largest water tables in the world. These are treaties that are law, and as such are laws that have been abrogated. They are arguments predicated upon relationships between people (as co-signatories to agreements). As it stands, these laws now protect the water table and provide critical resistance to the danger posed by the transport of fossil fuels across those territories and to the toxicity to land, water, and people that follows this form of incursion. The Geonpul cultural analyst and theorist Aileen Moreton-Robinson has argued that Indigenous relationships to land—the bundle of relationalities to land, water, and peoples (what is translated in what is now Indigenous Australia as “country”)—is an ontological position that *requires* sovereignty (see Moreton-Robinson 2008, 2015). The significance of “sovereignty” to protect land and relationships is not limited to territory, but to bodily integrity and safety as well. The Muscogee legal scholar Sarah Deer has argued that Indigenous sovereignty in a legal sense protects Indigenous women from sexual violence because it is the diminishment of tribal sovereignty in the first place that allows for racial impunity and the extreme forms of violence that are inflicted upon Indian women in their territories (Deer 2015).

Wherever there is dispossession, wherever there are people who manage to survive such theft in liberal democracies, sovereignty will just as surely appear.⁶ In Anglo-liberal democracies *settler* sovereignty is at work as jurisdiction, maintaining and protecting territory, but it tries to conceal its power and its history in a variety of ways. To be sure, this history is managed or contained in the conciliatory language of public apologies (see Simpson 2011),⁹ which attempt to repair prior wrongs and tend to an injured but restored demos. But more virulently, “sovereignty” animates the directives that issue from presidential mouths on matters of immigration, of the “border” and who shall cross it, and more generally on questions of what kind of exclusions are needed to protect, presumably, territory, place, and populace—who shall pass, who shall not pass, who shall die, who shall (let) live.

It's an ongoing ruse, this question of whose state and land this is, because it is premised on other violences that are animated by racial hierarchies and fears. The violences that first took land from Indigenous peoples, violence of war and of law, attend differently to other people of colour, for they, as well, remain vulnerable to force when imagined as out of place; they, as well, are rendered subjects of fear rather than recognized as fellow citizens worthy of protection (Maynard 2017; Camp and Heatherton 2016). They still cannot move too fast, or too erratically to white eyes lest they incite a panic and themselves be murdered, for appearing as bodily matter out of place (see Yamahtta-Taylor 2016; Ransby 2018). This danger to Black lives is as pervasive as it is atmospheric—animated by an antiblackness that is, as Christina Sharpe (2016: 104) argued, “as pervasive as climate.” This atmospheric requires *reminders* that black bodies be *resignified* as human—that they *matter*, that they are subjects of care and love, not danger, violence, and disposability. Likewise, the two-faced Janus of sovereignty, of presumed jurisdiction over territory, shows one face to Indigenous peoples as they hold on to these imperatives of life, but there are similar atmospherics (see Simmons 2017) at work here in which the other face of Janus emerges—that of dispossession and broken treaties (as in 1868). In other words, the same jurisdictional plea for protection animates Indigenous calls for upholding treaties, because the provisions of treaties can protect land and waters from violence. Sovereignty matters in these different ways, is embedded within ideologies of exclusion, fear and violence in the maintenance of a settler state and protection from encroachment and violence when deployed by others. Is sovereignty the right thing, then, for us to think with?⁷

Sovereignty is more than a problem of the violence to exclude, to maim, to kill in the name of jurisdiction, or a reminder of past agreements. It can be a useful analytic, if not practice. However, this idea requires a repositioning, a reclarification of purpose that can be unsettling because of its very rootedness in place and in history. Indigenous peoples define themselves through relatedness to each other as families, as clans and nations, in relationship to territory. The Oka Crisis (1990), Idle No More (2012), #NoDAPL (2016), and the Unis'tot'en Camp (2010–present) teach again and again that resistance and refusal to dispossession and encroachment are practices of care in addition to pronouncements of trespass and theft.⁸ This fact renders sovereignty as a form of relationality rather than a violent claim of property, exclusion, and a right to kill. So I think my own point further: what does sovereignty mean to people who are conditioned to think of themselves in responsible relation to land, to history, and to each other in this way?

Constituent Parts 2

Let me tell the same story differently now. When white people of various forms, various specificities, came here they thought that they “found” (presumably) savage people who were at times seriously jarring to them. Those whom they encountered, who are now defined by this encounter—if we can use such benign language for the longitudinal process of dispossession that this inaugurates—were, in the case of the Haudenosaunee,⁹ led by women. But even this mode of “leadership” was shared with men. As to be expected, British and Dutch traders and politicians found these gendered arrangements to be unusual. They noted repeatedly that the women had to be dealt with, that they had their own councils, their own positions of significance or influence (“Clan Mothers”); that they were responsible for the transmission of chiefly names or titles, and that they “owned” or cared for land. Settlers thus recognized these Indigenous political orders as classically *political*, realizing that Indigenous protocols should be observed for diplomatic relations. That there were such political frameworks of considerable richness and variety only increases the sense that there was deep intentionality to the “settling” of so-called New Worlds, because murderous rampages required the breaking of diplomatic relations.¹⁰ Settlers, after all, came for souls. They came for land. They came for themselves. And Indigenous peoples were in the way.¹¹ In whatever negotiated, subtle, harsh form that took, they were in the way. And the project of getting us out of the way, off our own land, out of ourselves, away from our families, the project of removing people from land, family, and culture in order to alienate them, is dispossession, which is the ongoing project of settler colonialism. Settler colonialism—the project, analytic, and form of governance—is not the event that it has been imagined as, an event of “Conquest,” a singular “genocide” (in the singular, as if it is finished). Rather, it forms a material and semiotic structure and force to disappear those who cannot be used to the ends of land and capital accumulation.

Because sovereignty is inherent, unceded, and situated in a contested territory, it constitutes more than the right to kill. For the Standing Rock Sioux in 2016, sovereignty was invoked as a prayerful duty¹²: it was the duty to protect their land and water from toxicity. Similarly, the ongoing manifestations at Mauna Kea by Kanaka Maoli and allies sought to *block* the construction of a thirty-meter telescope. The construction of such a telescope—the largest one in the world—required that the Kanaka Maoli rescind their responsibility to that mountain as a living plane, as a site of ongoing ancestral life. They refused the understanding of the mountain as simply “the

most scientifically beneficial vantage point to view the stars,” and in doing so, refused to forget, abandon, and revoke their responsibilities and relationship to that territory as anything other than a life form that matters to them. “Sovereignty,” then, moves through these different contexts as a philosophical and governing system that is carried in the languages and experiences of people who had and *still* have political codes and commitments for life that predate settlement.

If this desire to move people out, to take from them, is a force and a simultaneous failure then we might ask why a state like apparatus such as sovereignty persists in argumentation, law, and practice? “Sovereignty” remains as an active antagonist as long as there is a state that is predicated upon dispossession. This active relationship to land, water, and responsibilities returns us to the activity of critique. “Critique” attaches itself to these claims and iterations of sovereignty because, in practice, it is to stand in active relation towards knowledge. As Foucault said, it is to “know knowledge”—to try to get as full a grasp over what is before you and know how it operates, examine its effects, and see what it does. “Knowledge” in a formal disciplinary sense has been an object of concern for Indigenous peoples who use it to govern in every way. Such “critique” has been nothing if not central for the Native Studies project from its inception.

Constituent Parts 3

The defining moment for the institutionalization of Native Studies took place at, of all perhaps surprising places, Princeton University at “The First Convocation of Native American Scholars” in March, 1970. It was there, as Crow Creek Sioux Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (1997: 9) recounts, that there was a proclamation for the development of “Native American Studies as an Academic Discipline” whose major thrust would be the defense of land and indigenous rights. She summarized the sentiments of speakers at the convocation: “we cannot defend our languages and cultures if we cannot defend land.” Her decades’ long work not only contributed to the planning and implementation of this vision at places like the University of Arizona, but a steady output of articles and books that hammered at this point, expressing the *need* for intellectual infrastructures within and beyond universities that would contribute to the well-being of native nations and peoples. These infrastructures were to be based on an approach that was “endogenous” (inward looking) rather than materialist or scientific—what she called “exogenous” (or anthropological, scientific).¹³

Her account, and the formulation of the discipline pronounced at Princeton, required working from within tribal or Indigenous worldviews and frameworks *and* refuting “the exogenous seeking of truth through isolation” (re: “the ivory tower”) (Cook-Lynn 1997: 11). This discipline was to be generated from within indigenous or “tribal” frameworks but also was to be in an active, critical relationship—one predicated upon “refutation” or critique—with the systems of thought that come to know and name and entrap Indigenous peoples and knowledge systems. This was in an especially charged and critical relationship to anthropology, which at that time, imagined indigenous peoples to be cultural remnants and at other moments, as scientific subjects, but not so much as authorizers of their own knowledge histories, futures, and destinies. Vine Deloria Jr. (1970) characterized the inequality of this relationship as parasitic, and the scholarship as producing “conceptual prison[s] into which Indians have been thrown.”

The terrain of justice, then, moved between calls for institutional, disciplinary, and curricular transformation and political action on land and water. The aspirations of the Princeton Convocation were put into effect when Awkesasne Mohawk Richard Oakes, a San Francisco State student, took stock of the inadequate Native studies offerings at his university and planned to agitate, with then faculty member, Standing Rock Sioux anthropologist Beatrice Medicine, for curricular offerings that mattered to Native nations. As a result of this planning and action, Native Studies programs began at San Francisco State as well at Trent University in Peterborough Ontario in 1969. Within no time there was also the nineteen-month Indigenous occupation of Alcatraz in 1970,¹⁴ which demanded that out-of-use federal lands be returned to Indigenous peoples. Those actions, those arguments for intellectual independence, were preconditioned by the refusal of epistemic domination, what Deloria called a “conceptual prison.”¹⁵

Anthropology of that moment—1969, 1970 and 71—responded to these critiques and activisms. Deloria’s parodic and biting critique of anthropology in *Custer Died for Your Sins* highlighted the inequities of power exacerbated by anthropologists in the field, as well as the ways in which their research was largely useless to Indigenous communities. Other works of the time highlighted the global condition of colonization and imperialism that enabled the field itself; Talal Asad’s *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (1973) and Dell Hymes’s *Reinventing Anthropology* (1972) put anthropology into global, imperial circuits of knowledge and practice. Not long after the Princeton Convocation, the formation of Native and Indigenous Studies at San Francisco State, and the occupation of Alcatraz, some of the very same

scholars attended the American Anthropological Association meetings in 1970 and, prompted by Deloria's scathing critique along with the concerns of others, successfully pressed for a research code of ethics—a code that the AAA never had before.¹⁶

In spite of this dialectic between the field of anthropology and Native American studies—one which may be read as negative but then quite generative and productive—the practice of each field remained strained, to say the least. In Haudenosaunee research, for example, there was a small group of anthropologists that maintained a kind of textual domination over representations of the Iroquois.¹⁷ They blocked Haudenosaunee versions of history around NY State curriculum changes in the eighties, prevented the return of wampum belts, and betrayed promises to elders regarding the publication and circulation of images of sacred masks. This small group of anthropologists operated outside of these ethical and transformative discussions within a field that was itself grappling with its colonial legacy and was responding very directly to anti-colonial and in particular Indigenous critiques of its method and practice.

What then became of the literature in response to critical projects on the ground? What of the projects that refused historical injustice and ethnographic entrapment as well as the gaze and practices of the containment or disappearance of Indigenous peoples? The answer requires more than a push for representation. As noted above, critiques of the late 1960s mobilized into political actions as well as institution- and curriculum building, bearing in mind all along those commitments to land and sovereignty. At times, Cook-Lynn's "endogenous" approach operated at the center. These actions would fan out in different ways, and they often aligned with ambitions of language and Freedom Schools as well as clinics in communities and cities.¹⁸ The result may be now a wide range of educational options that center Indigenous thought, culture, and politics in the service of communities. Above all, there is a commitment to community but at the same time there is the practice of critique, an implicit "refutation", to once more borrow Deloria's language, of conceptual prisons.

Recent scholarship has built upon and elaborated the central role of critique in the field. Jodi Byrd's *Transit of Empire* argues that the theoretical nesting ground of what is considered critical thought—in classic western theory—has required the figure of the indigenous to be a *site* through which the claims of theory "transit." Here critical theory hollows out Indigeneity, rendering it inert in order to build useful explanatory frameworks that nonetheless remove, ignore, and elide Indigeneity, completely *transiting* through

it. In that transit there is a near-constant deferral of the actuality of Indigenous frameworks, liveliness, lands, and waters. Byrd establishes this idea through a reading of theorists like Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, who speak of “Indians without ancestry,” which helpfully challenges European Enlightenment thought but which, more crucially, misses the kinship their own ideas have with Indigenous figures within and beyond their texts (see Byrd 2011). Her study made critical theory her primary object, in social scientific terms, but she also opened up her analysis to the reading of maps, of missionary voyages across the world, and of John Woo’s torture memos on Guantanamo—memos that reach back to the archive of killing Modocs in the 19th Century in order to justify the form of violence inflicted upon rightless, and not yet charged but presumed to be, terrorists. As Byrd shows time and again, the grounds of justification for these European projects are found in Indigeneity, but the latter is deferred; it not only does not speak for itself, but it is a linchpin only for imagining, justifying, and asserting in this case, a form of sovereignty.

It is in this deferring, and occluding context that histories also get rewritten for the political desires and needs of the day. The most celebrated book in Canada that both Indians and Canadians embraced in the last decade is *Orenda* (Boyden 2013),¹⁹ a fictionalized and savagizing retelling of the past “encounter” with the especially savage Haudenosaunee. This *Avatar*-like narrative of life in what was “New France” was written by a now-legendary imposter to the field of literature, a faux-Indigenous author, Joseph Boyden.²⁰ His fictionalized account was an award-winning best seller. Among its many problems, it used the *Jesuit Relations*, a global chronicle of missionary activity among Indigenous peoples in North America (as well as those-to-be-converted-globally), to create a new past for Canada in the present. This new past was to accord “equal agency to all participants,” the possibility of malevolence or virtue to all protagonists, as a modality of literary if not historical reconciliation. In this “fictionalized” encounter text, there is a complication: we are not told where moral weight lays, who the “bad guy” is—is it the Jesuits? the Huron? Each protagonist appears in a complex form, except it seems, the Haudenosaunee. They (we) are the bad ones. Perhaps, true to Byrd’s analysis, we see a transit in every way, a barreling through Indigenous polities, stories, knowledges, and politics to stop short at a Haudenosaunee monster. Canada may need a monster, or the literary *imagination per se* needs one. Either way, “Indigenous” disappears in a strange, conciliatory, retrospective sleight of hand: one group is (still) the “bad guy.” Indigenous peoples in this reconciliation text were not actually needed except perhaps for inspirational fodder—an

absence deemed acceptable because the author was (then, supposedly) Indigenous himself! So the “transit” was complete, with its own indigenous driver who was not, in fact, Indigenous.

Constituent Parts: Coda

The arc of critique runs through a field of ideas that are tied to actions. Coloniality, however, shapes so much of this field. And there the specter of the state, of dealing with and perhaps thinking like a state, lurks: it is here, then, that sovereignty intersects the arc of critique. I have offered an account of this term, sovereignty, and its imbrications with the practice of critique, the Foucaultian interrogation of knowledge, which was tied to inequalities and to a refusal of that power over Indigenous life. This refusal created the life form of Native and Indigenous Studies, but perhaps most dialectically this refusal protects the grounds and waters that Natives peoples themselves protect and care for.

Notes

- 1 This piece has had a long life in its journey to publication. I am grateful to Jennifer Denetdale and the *Indigenous Book Festival* (IFAIR) at University of New Mexico (2014) for inviting me to keynote their conference and in doing so, to write new work. Theresa McCarthy is owed big thanks for the invitation to keynote a cornerstone of Haudenosaunee scholarly life, “Storytellers Conference,” at University at Buffalo in New York (2015), as is Carole McGranahan and the graduate students who honored me with the invitation to keynote “The Ethnographic Turn: On Theory, Method and Practice in Anthropology” (2016). These public versions of the work were germinated in deep, conversational reflection for the past ten years. Graduate students in my “Critical Native and Indigenous Studies” seminar have worked through the texts that are found in this piece and I thank them for thinking through this work with me. Sandy Grande was a colleague without peer for offering clarifying edits at the 11th hour. Thanks to Andrew Cole for the invitation to distill this material into article form and his careful edits on the final version. All mistakes are my own.
- 2 Paradigmatically, Epeli Hau’ofa (1994) “Our Sea of Islands.” See also Vincente Diaz and J. Kehaulani Kaunani’s (2001) introduction to the special volume “Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge.”
- 3 See Monture (2015) for a thorough account of Deskaheh (Levi General) bid for international recognition on behalf of Haudenosaunee in the 1920s. Deskaheh’s (1923) twenty point appeal to the League of Nations, “The Red Man’s Appeal to Justice.”
- 4 For an excellent summary see Joanne Barker’s (2006) introduction “For Whom Sovereignty Matters.”
- 5 *Treaty of Fort Laramie* (1868). There is an earlier treaty of the same name from 1851. Both demarcate the boundaries of the Great Sioux Nation and describe the terms of non-interference of said territory.

- 6 See, for example, Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2015). For a history of dispossession as theft in anarchist thought and critical theory see Nichols (2019).
- 7 I point as well to Six Nations' own Rick Monture's (2015) aforementioned literary history and analysis of Six Nations of the Grand River, *We Share Our Matters* that demonstrates the life of sovereignty through entangled imperatives of Haudenosaunee notions of 'the good mind' and colonial governance.
- 8 Respectively, these are responses to state incursions into Indigenous territory to: extend a golf course nine more holes through a Mohawk burial ground (Oka Crisis, 1990), remove protections to land and water through revisions to the "Indian Act" (Idle No More, 2012), violate two treaties in order to extend a pipeline that will transport fossil fuels atop the largest water table in the world (#NoDAPL 2016), reoccupation of territory by allies and Wet'suwet'an nationals in opposition to the extension of gas and shale pipelines through Wet'suwet'an territory (ongoing). These are all violations of Indigenous jurisdiction.
- 9 The most thorough (and necessarily revisionary) account of the historiography of Haudenosaunee women may be found in Hill (2017). See especially Chapter 2, "Konti-nohsyonni-The Women Who Make the House."
- 10 See Reséndez (2017) for extensive accounting of the genocidal and enslaving after-effects of these encounters.
- 11 For an extensive "non-consensual" account of this history see Dunbar Ortiz (2015).
- 12 See Estes (2019) for a comprehensive and historicized account and analysis of this action, as well Estes and Dhillon (2019) for a range of writings on the action in *Standing Rock: Voices From the #NoDAPL Movement*. The spiritual dimension of the action is all over LaDonna Braveheart Bull Allard's (2019) account, which embeds the sacredness of the site with an earlier Whitestone massacre that wiped out 2000 dogs (carrying babies), countless people—her grandmother was a survivor. It happened on the very site where the pipes were to run through the Cannon Ball River. For work on the sacred-ness of Mauna Kea see Caumbal-Salazar (2017), Hobart (2019) and Maile (2019).
- 13 See "Who Stole Native American Studies?" where Cook-Lynn (1997: 11) summarizes this "endogenous" method: "This approach has been seen as an immediate departure from the anthropological, ethnological approach that has focused from the outside on cultural materialism and 'the other' and the so-called scientific method. This departure has been a major part of the struggle toward autonomy as a discipline." Yazzie and Estes (2006) have an excellent review of Cook-Lynn's scholarship and significance to Native Studies in "Guest Editor's Introduction: Essentializing Elizabeth Cook-Lynn."
- 14 This was led by the same Richard Oakes that started organizing for a comprehensive Native Studies program at SF State and LaNada Means. See Kent Blansett's (2018) recent biography of Oakes.
- 15 See Cook-Lynn's (1997: 22) assessment of those fields as "disfiguring and deforming Native peoples, communities and nations."
- 16 See Biolsi and Larry Zimmerman Jr. (2007) for an account of this Bureau of Indian Affairs funded panel within the AAA in 1970 and the crucial after-effects within the field. Most crucially was the development of the first statement of ethics for the professional member organization of the field.
- 17 For conceptual framework and history of this representational practice, see Simpson (2014). Theresa McCarthy (2016) and Gail Landsman (2006) characterized the anthropologists of the Iroquois as particular "holdouts" well after all of this change in the field.

- 18 For a Haudenosaunee example, see White (2015).
 19 Note: “Orenda” is a Mohawk word that translates to “spiritual power.”
 20 The story of his contrived identity was first reported by the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN) by Jorge Barrera (2016). It created a storm of further work on the inconsistencies in his narrativization of not only himself but also the work he appropriated from others. See Eric Andrew-Gee (2017) for a more recent account of not only the story that Boyden told about himself but his relationships with communities in the North that he then wrote about under his assumed and shifting identity. In his very critical review of the novel, the Anishnabe scholar Hayden King (2013) identified how Boyden disproportionately attributed violence to the Haudenosaunee, which in turn imputes a certain inevitability and virtue to colonialism.

References

- Andrew-Gee, Eric. 2017. “The Making of Joseph Boyden.” *Globe and Mail*, November 12. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/joseph-boyden/article35881215/>.
- Asad, Talal. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London, UK: Ithaca Press.
- Barker, Joanne. 2006. “For Whom Sovereignty Matters.” In *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination*, 1–32. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Barrera, Jorge. 2016. “Author Joseph Boyden’s Shape-shifting Indigenous Identity.” *aptnnews.ca*, December 23. <https://aptnnews.ca/2016/12/23/author-joseph-boydens-shape-shifting-indigenous-identity>.
- Biolsi, Tom, and Larry Zimmerman Jr. 2007. “Introduction: What’s Changed, What Hasn’t.” In *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr and the Critique of Anthropology*, 3–23. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Blansett, Kent. 2018. *A Journey to Freedom: Richard Oakes, Alcatraz, and the Red Power Movement*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Boyden, Joseph. 2013. *The Orenda*. Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Braveheart Bull Allard, LaDonna. 2019. “They Took Our Footprint Out of the Ground.” In *Standing Rock: Voices From the #NODAPL Movement*, edited by Nick Estes and Jaskiran Dhillon, 43–55. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. 2007. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Byrd, Jodi. 2011. *Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Camp, Jordan, and Christina Heatherton, eds. 2016. *Policing the Planet: Why the Policing Crisis Led to Black Lives Matter*. London: Verso.
- Caumbal-Salazar, Iokepa. 2017. “A Fictive Kinship: Making ‘Modernity,’ ‘Ancient Hawaiians,’ and the Telescopes on Mauna Kea.” *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 4, no. 2: 1–30.
- Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. 1997. “Who Stole Native American Studies?” *Wicazo Sa Review* 12: 9–28.
- Deer, Sarah. 2015. *The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Deloria Jr., Vine. [1970] 1988. *Custer Died for Your Sins; An Indian Manifesto*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Deloria Jr., Vine, and David Wilkins. 1999. *Tribes, Treaties & Constitutional Tribulations*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Deskaheh. 1923. "The Red Man's Appeal to Justice." <https://law.lib.buffalo.edu/pdf/Red-manappeal.pdf> 1/13/2020
- Diaz, Vincente, and J. Kehaulani Kaunani. 2001. "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge." *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2: 315–42.
- Dunbar Ortiz, Roxanne. 2015. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Boston: Beacon.
- Estes, Nick. 2019. *Our History is the Future*. New York: Verso.
- Estes, Nick, and Jaskiran Dhillon, eds. 2019. *Standing Rock: Voices From the #NoDAPL Movement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hau'ofa, Epeli. 1994. "Our Sea of Islands." *The Contemporary Pacific* 6, no. 1: 148–61.
- Hill, Susan. 2017. "Kontinonhsyonni: The Women Who Make the House." In *The Clay We are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River*, 53–76. Winnipeg, University of Manitoba Press.
- Hobart, Hi'ilei. 2019. "At Home on the Mountain: Ecological Violence and the Violence of Terra Nullius." *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 6, no. 2: 30–50.
- Hynes, Dell. 1973. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- King, Hayden. 2013. "Critical Review of 'The Orenda': a Timeless, Classic Colonial Alibi." *Muskrat Magazine*, September 23. <http://muskratmagazine.com/critical-review-of-joseph-boydens-the-orenda-a-timeless-classic-colonial-alibi/>.
- Landsman, Gail. 2006. "Anthropology, Theory, and Research in Iroquois Studies, 1980–1990: Reflections from a Disability Perspective." *Histories of Anthropology Annual* 2: 242–63.
- Maynard, Robin. 2017. *Policing Black Lives: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present*. Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood.
- McCarthy, Theresa. 2016. In *Divided Unity: Haudenosaunee Reclamation at Grand River*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Monture, Rick. 2015. *We Share our Matters*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. 2008. "Introduction." In *Sovereign Subjects: Indigenous Sovereignty Matters*, 1–15. St. Leonard's, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. 2015. *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nichols, Robert. 2019. *Theft is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ransby, Barbara. 2018. *Making All Black Lives Matter: Reimagining Freedom in the 21st Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Reséndez, Andrés. 2017. *The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Sharpe, Christina. 2016. In *the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Simmons, Kristen. 2017. "Settler Atmospheric." *Cultural Anthropology: Fieldsights*, November 0. <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/settler-atmospherics>.
- Simpson, Audra. 2011. "Settlement's Secret." *Cultural Anthropology* 26, no. 2: 205–17.
- Simpson, Audra. 2014. "Constructing Kahnawà:ke as an 'Out-of-the-Way-Place': Ely S. Parker, Lewis Henry Morgan and the Writing of the Iroquois Confederacy." In *Mohawk Interruptions: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stark, Heidi. 2016. "Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land." *Theory and Event* 19, no. 6. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/633282>.

- Treaty of Fort Laramie, U.S.-Sioux Nation, Apr. 29, 1868.* 1868. United States National Archives. <https://ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=42&page=transcript>.
- Maile, David Uahikeaikalei'ohu. 2019. "Threats of Violence: Refusing the Thirty Meter Telescope and the Dakota Access Pipeline" In *Standing Rock: Voices From the #NODAPL Movement*, edited by Nick Estes and Jaskiran Dhillon, 328–43. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- White, Louellen. 2015. *Free to Be Mohawk: Indigenous Education at the Akwesasne Freedom School*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Yamahtta-Taylor, Keeanga. 2016. *From #blacklivesmatter to Black Liberation: The Movement for Black Lives*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Yazzie, Melanie and Nick Estes. 2016. "Guest Editor's Introduction: Essentializing Elizabeth Cook-Lynn." *Wicazo Sa Review* 31, no. 1: 9–26.