The Routledge Guides to Using Historical Sources

How does the historian approach primary sources? How do interpretations differ? How can such sources be used to write history?

The *Routledge Guides to Using Historical Sources* series introduces students to different sources and illustrates how historians use them. Titles in the series offer a broad spectrum of primary sources and, using specific examples, examine the historical context of these sources and the different approaches that can be used to interpret them.

Reading Primary Sources
Miriam Dobson and Benjamin Ziemann

History Beyond the Text
Sarah Barber and Corinna Penniston-Bird

History and Material Culture
Karen Harvey

Understanding Medieval Primary Sources
Joel Rosenthal

Memory and History
Understanding Memory as Source and Subject
Joan Tumblety

Understanding Early Modern Primary Sources
Laura Sangha and Jonathan Willis

Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies

Edited by Chris Andersen and Jean M. O'Brien

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

Robert Warrior (Osage) is the author, co-author, or editor of six books, including most recently the edited volume *The World of Indigenous North America* (Routledge). He was the founding president of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association and is the 2016–17 president of the American Studies Association.

Introduction

Indigenous Studies: An appeal for methodological promiscuity

Chris Andersen and Jean M. O'Brien

What *isn't* Indigenous Studies? A question such as this, its grammatical irregularity notwithstanding, tends to bedevil most new or emerging fields, especially those that seek the lofty status of discipline. More than fifty years of thinking, writing, presenting and publishing by committed scholars on Indigenous Studies have tended to focus not so much on what it is or is not, but rather on what it should aspire to be. Emerging from the social and intellectual flux of the 1960s, early Indigenous Studies scholarship initially ruminated on the importance of new theoretical or methodological frameworks and Indigenous Studies' relationship to Indigenous sovereignty. Despite the formulation of journals purporting to speak to Indigenous Studies that began to publish scholarship under its aegis, little sustained effort has been exerted to reflect on the field's origins, boundaries or current trajectories.

Were we to understand Indigenous Studies in all its various iterations – Native American studies, American Indian studies, Native studies, and so forth – as a discipline (by no means a foregone conclusion), what does that mean in practice? That is to say, what elements are important or even central to rendering otherwise diverse fields of interest and knowledge production, well, disciplinary? Much of the literature on disciplines in the academy focuses on them as a constitutive and governing force in producing bodies of knowledge. Bryan Turner (2006: 183) argues, for example, that "[*d*]*isciplina* were instructions to disciples, and hence a branch of instruction or department of knowledge. This religious context provided the modern educational notion of a 'body of knowledge', or a discipline such as sociology or economics."

As bodies of knowledge, disciplines thus possess important epistemological prescriptions. Tony Becher (1981), for example, argues that disciplinary boundaries are based on different intellectual clusters that include debates about distinctive concepts, methods and fundamental aims. More specifically, he suggests that since "research is a rule governed system of inquiry", disciplines produce and govern particular rules for debate and analysis (Bridges 2006). Following Krishnan's (2009) discussion, we might then present a number of defining characteristics of the intellectual aspect of disciplines: they focus on a specific object of research that, over time, produces an accumulated body of specialized knowledge through distinctive theories, concepts, terminologies and,

of particular relevance here, methodologies. We delve into the importance of this volume as a methodological contribution in further detail below. We wish to flag here, however, the fact that as Indigenous Studies continues to emerge, it continues to draw on a huge array of disciplines and methodological debates to inform our perspectives and work, and it has tended to do so in a context with little collective strategy or long-term planning – hence our use of "promiscuity" in the title (referring to its original Latin use, meaning "mixed, indiscriminate, in common, without discussion") to modify "methodology".

Perhaps more than any other national context, US-based Native American or American Indian Studies scholars have reflected on the state of Indigenous Studies as a discipline. For example, a number of "state-of-the-discipline" pieces written under the auspices of a flagship journal of American-based Indigenous Studies – *American Indian Quarterly* – touch on various elements central to this endeavour. We will briefly discuss aspects of these arguments because we believe that the marketplace of ideas at play in an American context possesses significant resonance outside of its geo-political context. In her state-of-the-discipline piece, scholar Clara Sue Kidwell (White Earth Ojibwe and Choctaw) argues for American Indian studies as a "legitimate field of intellectual inquiry" with five central components: the central relationship between Indigenous culture and land (or place); that historical relations between Indigenous societies and settler communities were just that – relational – and as such, have to be told from both sides (which includes according agency to Indigenous history); that sovereignty is an inherent right of Indian nations; that language is the essential key to understanding culture and that therefore requires preservation; and finally, that "contemporary Indian music, dance, art, and literature express long-standing values of tribal cultures while adapting them to modern media" (Kidwell 2009: 4).

Similarly, Indigenous Studies doyen Jace Weaver (2007) argues that debates in Indigenous Studies have tended to produce more heat than light. In this context, he suggests a number of intellectual features to which the discipline should aspire: interdisciplinarity; comparativity; privileging an Indigenous perspective; demonstrating a commitment to Native American community; employing a "borderless" discourse that seeks to link the local with national and international Indigenous issues and peoples. In his state-of-the-discipline piece, Duane Champagne argued that

> American Indian cultural emphasis on retaining culture, identity, self-government, and stewardship of land and resulting contestations with the U.S. government and society forms a body of empirical social action that constitutes the subject matter of American Indian studies as an academic discipline.
>
> (2007: 353)

Champagne notes that American Indian studies can be extended internationally in the form of Indigenous Studies. We note here that Weaver and Champagne are less hopeful than Kidwell. Weaver characterized current American Indigenous Studies as "a mess", while Champagne suggested that "relatively little conceptual progress has been made toward defining American Indian Studies as a discipline and toward developing theory and research that presents a coherent theoretical and methodological approach to the study of indigenous peoples" (2007: 354).

Elizabeth Cook-Lynn argues that part of the mandate of Indigenous Studies (what she terms "Indian Studies") lies in "exposing the lies of the self-serving colonial academic institutions of America, bolster[ing] the rights and obligation to disobedience, and resist[ing] the tyranny of the U.S. fantasies concerning history and justice and morality" (Cook-Lynn 1999: 16) – in other words, the hard work of decolonization. In this context, she suggests the importance of Indian Studies scholars engaging wide and public audiences and doing so in the context of our tribal nations and territories (1999: 20). More specifically, she argues that we work not for our students, our faculties or our universities, but in the interests of creating "a mechanism in defense of the Indigenous principles of sovereignty and nationhood" (1999: 20), and one that is undertaken in an explicitly endogamous fashion (1997: 11).

Despite the sophistication of these scholars' labours, relatively little space has been set aside for exploring the *methodological* prescriptions of Indigenous Studies. We should pause here to note that our understanding of Indigenous Studies methodologies is that, although they might include these, they are not (necessarily) the same as the manner in which Indigenous methodologies have been framed academically, a growing subfield of inquiry arguably most widely associated with Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999). Nor, as we will explain below, is Indigenous Studies necessarily the same thing as Indigenous knowledge – at least, as it is normally conceived. Instead, our understanding underscores the importance of the approach of Innes (2010), who has contributed a chapter to this volume). In his introduction to a special issue of *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, Innes (2010: 3) presents three central intellectual goals for Indigenous Studies: to access, understand and convey Native cultural perspective(s); to conduct research that benefits Native people and/or communities; *and to employ research methods and theories that will achieve these goals*.

Finally, Innes argues that Indigenous Studies must practice methodological diversity. He suggests that Native studies ought to be broadly multi-disciplinary insofar as the issues we examine should dictate the methods and theories used. For Innes, the *ethical* relationship to the community with whom the research problem is being formulated, rather than the specific theories and methods used, is part of what distinguishes Native studies from other disciplines: "Developing an ethical research relationship is more important than how the data is collected" (Innes 2010: 6). The central importance of methodological diversity – or, without putting too fine a point on it, interdisciplinary – has also been pointed to by scholar Jace Weaver, who makes a compelling case for the necessity of interdisciplinarity in both pedagogical and scholarly knowledge generation contexts.

One of the complications that arises from this principle, Innes suggests, is the realization that Native studies is not the same thing as Indigenous knowledge, although in any given instance it may incorporate Indigenous knowledge as part of its explanatory framework. Distinguishing between the two and not losing sight

of their key differences is, we suggest, important to building the legitimacy of Indigenous Studies in the academy *and* in Indigenous communities, both theoretically and, more importantly here, methodologically. Indigenous Studies entered into academic histories under particular conditions and these early conditions have since shaped the kind of training its progenitors undertook and the kind of knowledge it produced. This means that Indigenous Studies is different from – but in certain cases and under the right conditions can be broadly allied with – Indigenous knowledge, particularly as situated and practised outside of the academy. Acknowledging their difference without pronouncing their ontological discreteness is far more effective than swallowing traditional pieties offered by academics with little respect given to the complexity of the social relations that animate them. Nowhere is the successful negotiation of this creative tension more apparent than the recent and overwhelming achievement of NAISA, the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association.

Begun in the spring of 2007, with the first organizing meeting held at the University of Oklahoma, NAISA has grown into the largest Indigenous Studies association in the world, now regularly attracting more than a thousand scholars – most of them Indigenous – to locales across the United States and Canada. A perusal of any of the programmes over its past near-decade of existence evidences the astounding range of methodological approaches employed by scholars who, through their participation in the annual meetings, shore up and build on the intellectual richness of Indigenous Studies. While various scholars have noted the limitations and boundaries of NAISA's knowledge-production tendencies (see TallBear, forthcoming), it nevertheless constitutes a crucial fork in the road of Indigenous Studies' growth as/into a discipline. And its methodological richness and diversity are equally undeniable.

It is within this animus of acknowledging our methodological complexity that this current volume, *Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies*, took shape. We have, through our own long-standing networks, brought together a disciplinarily extensive and geographically expansive group of Indigenous Studies scholars who have, regardless of their formal disciplinary affiliation and training, signalled a commitment to Indigenous Studies as a growing field – perhaps – discipline. Our invitation to participate made clear that participation would not require a "toeing the line" in terms of what we wanted the contribution to look like. Instead, we left the shape of the argument nearly solely up to the authors, limited only by word count (about 4,000 words) and animated by a single question: "What is your methodological approach to the way you undertake research, and how does it differ from past research in your field or discipline?"

As you will see, contributors responded with an astonishing array of sophisticated, subtle and above all *useful* chapters that offer academics at all levels – from Master's-level students to senior scholars – much grist for the mill as they undertake research in their varied fields of inquiry. One of the reasons for this approach is that "literature review" essays – while invaluable – have a quality that fixes them in time and, almost by definition, dates them, given production schedules and the passing of time. Given the vibrancy of Indigenous Studies at this moment, we wanted to capture a hybrid approach that both looks back at important touchstones for the field and looks to the exciting work being undertaken now and aimed for in the future.

The volume has been organized into two major parts ("Emerging from the past" and "Alternative sources and methodological reorientations"), the second of which comprises five main sections: Reframing Indigenous Studies; All in the family; Feminism, gender and sexuality; Indigenous literature and expressive culture; and Indigenous peoples in and beyond the state. Part I, "Emerging from the past", is meant to take on the various ways in which, while engaging with more venerable disciplines, Indigenous Studies scholarship has harnessed its central concepts, but also moved beyond them. White Earth Ojibwe scholar Jean M. O'Brien begins with a discussion of historical sources and methodologies, laying out how American Indian history in particular has fared within those methodological boundaries, then moving to a discussion of what Indigenous Studies' historical methods looks like. Then, Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee Nation) reflects on and explores the intersection of Indigenous Studies with English literature, in particular focusing on the complex rise of "Indigenous literary nationalism" through a consideration of three works considered central to that subfield.

Following Justice's piece, Pauline Turner Strong speaks to the roots of Indigenous Studies in history and anthropology, tracing its genealogy through the emergence, in the postwar period, of ethnohistory, and the interdisciplinary manner in which Indigenous Studies builds upon those complex roots. Finally, Michif (Métis) scholar Chris Andersen and Maori scholar Tahu Kukutai speak to the ways that quantitative information, particularly through official data like the census, has constructed Indigenous communities statistically, the manner in which this has produced simplistic and stereotypical depictions, and how Indigenous Studies scholars have more recently made creative use of official datasets to "speak back" against these conversations.

As mentioned above, Part II contains five sections, the first of which is titled "Reframing Indigenous Studies". This section's first chapter, by Kelly McDonough (White Earth Ojibwe descent), uses a case study of the Nahuas to outline how and why Indigenous intellectualism and alphabetic writing have been obscured and ignored by scholars until relatively recently. It documents current efforts to recover both the memory and textual evidence of nearly 500 years of Nahua knowledge production and dissemination as it relates to the written word. The myriad ways in which Nahuas have engaged the world and the word through a diverse array of written forms and genres are discussed, as are the cultural and linguistic revitalization projects that aim to reconnect Nahuas today with these recovered writings. Following McDonough, Mvskoke/Creek Nation scholar K. Tsianina Lomawaima offers an affective understanding of historical methodology based in Deloria's principle of relativity, asking us to think broadly not only about what historical subjects might have written (or had written about them), but about how they thought, did and felt, and the affective relationship of those elements to archival contents.

Then, Goenpul scholar Aileen Moreton-Robinson's chapter presents *relationality* as an Indigenous research paradigm that can shape Indigenous social research. She explores how this paradigm sits in marked contrast to Western methodologies, which operationalize being disconnected from the world as a presupposition of its application. She illustrates the value and utility of this paradigm through an analysis of the research methodologies literature produced by Indigenous scholars in Canada, the United States, Hawaii, Australia and New Zealand.

Following Moreton-Robinson, Kim TallBear (Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate and Cheyenne & Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma) explores how the reciprocity or "giving back" that forms the basis of critical research communities is actually predicated on a binary between those who inquire and those whose lives are studied. In this chapter and in the specific context of science and technology studies, she instead articulates overlapping intellectual, ethical and institution-building projects – to share goals while staying engaged in critical conversation through which new knowledge and insights are articulated together.

Next, Pohnpeian-Filipino Vicente Diaz's chapter is based around a provocative question of method: "Just how do we smell our histories?" In an invitation to think through what a possible answer to this question might look like, Diaz considers olfaction's ontologies and their epistemological possibilities, that is, olfaction's various states of being in the interest of studying their analytical (and other) possibilities in general, and in the context of Indigenous pasts in particular. Methodologically, Diaz encourages us to embrace total bodily immersion in the most visceral of activities that are central to projects of political and cultural reclamation and nation re-building.

Following Diaz, Osage scholar Robert Warrior argues that intellectual history has played a large role in the development of Indigenous Studies over the past two decades, and he offers two contexts for understanding the relationship between the two: 1) the articulation of traditional Indigenous knowledges in the academic field; and 2) the integration of theorizing and knowledge creation created in antagonistic social and cultural concepts of Euro-American intellectual practices. Warrior explores some of the methodological tensions in writing Indigenous intellectual histories in the midst of these two tensions and offers methodological insights that Indigenous intellectual history makes available in our attempts to grapple with these tensions.

Next, Kanaka Maoli scholar Noenoe K. Silva reviews the advent and development of critical Hawaiian studies from the 1980s to the present day. She focuses mainly on the work of Kanaka scholars who broke the ground (or cleared the path) for Kanaka-centred study, making use of the large and long-standing archives of writing in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi (the Hawaiian language). Finally, Coll Thrush's chapter argues that although urban and Indigenous histories are often framed as though they are mutually exclusive, treating them instead as mutually constitutive offers opportunities for new research and writing at the intersection of those two fields of history. Focusing on the United States, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, Thrush offers three lenses of urban Indigenous history: the presence of local peoples in whose territories settler cities have been built; the migration of diverse Indigenous peoples to urban places; and the use of Indigenous images in the urban imaginary.

The second section of Part II, "All in the family", contains chapters by Indigenous authors who speak to the central importance of family in the construction of their scholarly methodologies. We start with Maori scholar Alice Te Punga Somerville, who explodes our notions of what is – or counts as – an archive, and within that context, makes use of two Pacific texts relating to the interconnectedness across time and space, and makes an appeal to understanding geographical disparity in terms of presence rather than absence. Next, Maori scholar Aroha Harris speaks to the complexity of oral history and its relationship to Maori tellings of their own histories. More specifically, she addresses questions about subjectivity and ethics, and provides an example of oral life histories as illuminating source, well-suited to reading with and against the archives and manuscripts on which historians typically depend.

Following Harris, Cree scholar Robert Innes explores how researchers have begun to employ stories as theoretical frameworks to explain Indigenous peoples' views, thoughts and motivations to gain a better understanding of their historic and contemporary realities. His chapter outlines how traditional stories such as "Elder Brother" can assist in exploring the connection between the beliefs, insights, concepts, ideals, values, attitudes and codes of conduct and the interactions of contemporary members of First Nations. Next, Amy Den Ouden explores ways to understand and engage in histories with communities. Her chapters offers insights into the process of community-based historical production, and discusses examples of Indigenous historical knowledges that illuminate the complexities, and transformational possibilities, of history-making as an intellectual, social and political endeavour.

Following Den Ouden, Sweden-based Sámi scholar May-Britt Öhman presents what she refers to as a "supradisciplinary methodology", through which she addresses her scholarly work in the context of Sámi history and present time from her own perspective, that of a Forest Sámi of the Lule River Valley. Within the (colonial) academic context, she makes personal use of supradisciplinary methodology to assist in recovering her own personal hidden Sámi history, but also, more broadly, to fight the amnesia regarding Sámi history in general, and then more particularly in her work with allies to promote Sámi rights to lands and waters, defending and struggling for the survival of diverse Sámi cultures within an aggressively colonial Sweden.

Finally, William Bauer (Wailacki and Concow of the Round Valley Indian Tribes) explores the complex importance of oral histories to Indigenous Studies. He argues that oral histories are vital for understanding American Indian history because they provide information on the everyday experiences of American Indian people (women in particular), and stitch together a collective memory of the American Indian past. Most importantly, Bauer argues, oral histories allow us to express our sovereignty.

In the third section of Part II, the volume turns to dynamics relating to feminism, gender and sexuality in Indigenous Studies. Jacki Thompson Rand (Choctaw

Nation of Oklahoma) argues that scholars ought to actively reconsider their reliance on the "status" of women as an analytical frame, subject to criticism as inconsistent with Indigenous perspectives, and consider sustainability as a way to capture women's economic, social and political roles in modern tribal communities and the challenges women face from without and from within. Scholars of native women's studies work with limited primary sources, making the collection of oral histories and their careful analysis crucial to the field, conducive to community collaboration, and amenable to public humanities platforms. Then, Chickasaw Nation scholar Shannon Speed explores the issues involved in telling the stories of Indigenous women migrants from Mexico and Central America. She unpacks some of the ethical and practical issues involved in an Indigenous feminist anthropologist retelling of stories marked by extreme violence. She argues that while the dilemmas and contradictions of anthropological representation are never fully resolvable, using Indigenous feminist oral history practice allows both for sustained attention to the avoidance of perpetuating further violence through the representational process, and potentially for representations that challenge hegemonic hierarchies of knowledge and truth in the colonized world.

Following Speed, Tonawanda Band of Seneca scholar Mishuana Goeman's chapter examines feminism and its relationship to colonialism, social justice and Indigenous Studies. The chapter first explores and critiques the historic approach to feminism, then presents an alternative genealogy, breaking down the problems with the three waves of feminism, and presenting Indigenous women's engagement and relationship to mainstream and women-of-color feminism. Indigenous feminism's goals support self-determination, sovereignty, healthy Indigenous communities and a thriving planet. Next, Maori scholar Brendan Hokowhitu explores how, unlike the typical ahistorical treatment of masculinity within the general field, Indigenous masculinity scholarship is linked to the tenets of Indigenous Studies more broadly. That is, a common method that has developed within this nexus has characteristically been "genealogical" in nature in that most scholars have tended to locate the production of contemporary Indigenous male bodies within the broader frames of settler colonialism and colonial history.

Finally, Mark Rifkin explains how, as a concept, "Indigenous" provides a means of challenging settler political and social norms. He goes on to explain, however, that it can also allow certain formulations of indigeneity to become the norm through which the concept implicitly is defined. Rifkin suggests that although similar tension operates within the term *queer*, queer studies' unpacking and tracing of the implicit normalizations enacted through its use can aid Indigenous Studies in thinking about what is at stake in the ways the notion of Indigenous/indigeneity circulates.

Following a discussion of these dynamics, the fourth section of Part II focuses on Indigenous Studies practitioners' engagement with various elements of expressive culture. In K'iche' Maya Emilio del Valle Escalante's chapter, he uses literary text to explore the "poetics of survival" through which displaced Mayan survivors of massacres by the Guatemalan state narrate experiences of violence, pain and chaos not only to disclose the operations of settler colonialism, but also

to "re-member" the Maya social body by confronting the past. In doing so, he rewrites or re-rights history in order to inscribe the historical memory of Maya survivors of the armed conflict. Sherry Farrell Racette (Timiskaming First Nation) then explores material culture considerations of objects as witnesses, archival documents, storytellers and teachers. Beginning with a brief historical context of the relationship between Indigenous peoples and museums, she reflects on twenty years of museum- and community-based research centred on objects, archives and story. She shares a conversation initiated with two fellow scholars, asking the basic question, "Is there something fundamentally different about the way Indigenous scholars engage with material culture?"

Resonating with Farrell Racette's work, Piscataway Gabrielle Tayac's chapter presents a concept for curatorial practice that inscribes the place of museums and exhibits as sites of indigenized three-dimensional authorship. Museum-based sources are situated to overturn colonial legacies. Indigenous Studies students and scholars are encouraged to exercise three-dimensional authorship as a complement to publication. Museum-based scholarship and curation should be elevated to parity with published products across fields beyond fine arts disciplines. The National Museum of the American Indian provides a current example of work that utilizes three-dimensional authorship. Finally, we turn to film, through the chapter of Michelle Raheja (Seneca heritage), which analyzes Indigenous film history through the lens of settler colonialism, arguing that, since film's inception, motion picture companies have participated in a "logic of elimination" (Wolfe 2006) designed to erase Indigenous people visually. The chapter contrasts these desires by demonstrating the success of contemporary Indigenous science fiction filmmakers in drawing from both Indigenous speculative oral narrative as well as colonial literary and visual culture representations of "first contact" to institute new modes of thinking about Indigenous futurity.

The fifth section of Part II is titled "Indigenous peoples in and beyond the state". The section begins with Turtle Mountain Anishinaabe scholar Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, who makes the methodological argument that understanding story as law not only unearths a rich body of Indigenous thought, it also dispels the notion of the inviolability of the law, demonstrating that law is likewise a set of stories. In examining the creation stories of the state, she explores how Western law took form and functions to legitimate the settler nation-state through Indigenous dispossession. The study of Indigenous law, in presenting alternative frameworks for the restoration of Indigenous–state relations, not only contains the potential to produce new methodological approaches, but may also unearth alternate methods for living together differently. Following Stark, Métis scholars Brenda Macdougall and Nicole St-Onge examine how the 49th parallel effectively created a historical myth by attributing American and Canadian national identities to Indigenous populations. They argue, however, that designating Indigenous populations as either Canadian or American has obscured the historical reality that the Northern Plains was an Indigenous space shaped by these populations' diplomatic protocols and internal frameworks for belonging. During this era, the Métis in particular used the borderland to advance their own

sense of rights and ownership as they operationalized networks, connections and webs of exchange via the systems of mobility necessitated by their trade economy.

Next, Margaret Jacobs explores how the study of Indigenous education challenges the progressive narratives of education in American history and adds new dimensions to studies of colonialism worldwide. The sources that scholars use to examine Indigenous education have influenced their approaches and interpretations. Those using government records and the papers of missionary and reform groups have emphasized the oppressive nature of Indigenous education as a weapon of colonialism. Scholars who prioritize the use of Indigenous-authored sources have given more weight to the ambivalent experiences of Indigenous survivors and how Indigenous communities have sought to gain control of education as a key means of asserting sovereignty.

Following Jacobs, Mary Jane Logan McCallum discusses some of the procedures historians undergo when researching modern institutional records pertaining to Indigenous people – in particular, medical records to which public access is restricted because they contain personal health information. After describing the records and some early encounters with them, she discuss the complicated nexus of ethics codes and the research agreement that has come to regulate her research, and she delineates some of the methods used to research Indigenous institutional archives both in the presence and in the absence of such regulations.

Following McCallum, Jeffrey Ostler draws on recent trends in the overlapping fields of settler colonial and genocide studies to propose possibilities for the development of an alternative approach to the study of the history of genocide in North America. Taking examples from recent literature, the chapter discusses new approaches to disease and its intersection with other forces of destruction, patterns of violence, state policy toward Indigenous people, and demography. Throughout, the chapter emphasizes the methodological importance of a sustained analysis of native agency and survival.

Finally, Anishinaabe scholar Sheryl Lightfoot (Lake Superior Band/Keweenaw Bay Indian Community) positions the importance of Indigenous Studies in the context of the recent spate of reconciliation projects engaged in by various nation-states. Such projects are charged with improving relationships between Indigenous peoples and the governments that have caused them harm. This chapter argues that scholarship and political activism can be effectively and ethically bridged through research that engages active Indigenous–state reconciliation projects in three "R" ways: Revealing, Reporting and Reflecting – the "past–present–future" concept of researching social change.

It is our hope that this volume will provide readers with a sense of this particularly dynamic moment in the emergence of Indigenous Studies. Following more than five decades of scholarship tilling new fields and searching for approaches to capture Indigenous perspectives on the long history of settler colonialism globally, Indigenous Studies seems to have arrived at a moment of incredible synergy and unprecedented engagement on a global stage. We hope this volume shines a spotlight on some of the ways in which scholarship is transforming Indigenous Studies in innovative and exciting ways.

References

Becher, Tony. 1981. "Towards a definition of disciplinary cultures". *Studies in Higher Education*, 6(2): 109–122.

Bridges, David. 2006. "The discipline and disciplines of educational research". *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 40(2): 259–272.

Champagne, Duane. 2007. "In search of theory and method in American Indian studies". *American Indian Quarterly*, 31(3): 353–372.

Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. 1991. "The radical conscience in Native American studies". *Wicazo Sa Review*, 7(2): 9–13.

Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. 1997. "Who stole Native American studies?" *Wicazo Sa Review*, 12(1): 9–28.

Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. 1999. "American Indian studies: an overview". *Wicazo Sa Review*, 14(2): 14–24.

Innes, Robert. 2010. "Introduction: Native Studies and Native cultural preservation, revitalization, and persistence". *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 34(2): 1–9.

Kidwell, Clara Sue. 2009. "American Indian Studies: intellectual navel gazing or academic discipline?" *American Indian Quarterly*, 33(1): 1–17.

Krishnan, Armin. 2009. "What are academic disciplines: some observations on the disciplinarity vs. interdisciplinarity debate". *NCRM Working Paper series*. University of Southampton: ESRC National Centre for Research Methods, pp. 1–57.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London and New York: Zed Books.

TallBear, Kim. Forthcoming, 2016. "Dear Indigenous studies, it's not me, it's you: why I left and what needs to change". In Aileen Moreton-Robinson, ed. *Critical Indigenous Studies: Engagements in First World Locations*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Turner, Brian. 2006. "Discipline". *Theory Culture Society*, 23(2–3): 183–197.

Weaver, Jace. 2007. "More heat than light: the current state of Native American studies". *American Indian Quarterly*, 31(2): 233–255.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native". *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4): 387–409.

Part I

Emerging from the past

1 Historical sources and methods in Indigenous Studies

Touching on the past, looking to the future

Jean M. O'Brien

Indigenous histories have always existed. Indigenous notions of the past that connect people to places, events, peoples, and memories help Indigenous peoples define their place in the created world and explain its shape, wonders, and human relations (like other kinds of history). Indigenous peoples have their own ways of reckoning and remembering histories, including over the past several decades incorporating historical methodologies associated with western European traditions (Nabokov 2002). Even though Indigenous peoples have always understood their place within the created world according to narratives (many rooted in oral transmission supplemented with other memory technologies, such as winter counts, wampum belts, memory piles, pictographs, and more), Indigenous voices and agency in producing historical narratives have rarely been accorded a place of legitimacy in the formal discipline of history and have instead been dismissed as "myth," "legend," "folklore," or "saga" (Nabokov 2002; Basso 1996).

Philip Deloria periodizes ways of thinking about the history of American Indian history into four broad approaches: (1) Frontier imaginings, characterized by spatial reckonings of encounters that moved from conflict to conquest (beginning in the "contact" era); (2) Racial/developmental hierarchies as a way of accounting for peoples, encounters, and difference (dating from the late eighteenth century); (3) Modernist approaches that focused on the notion of fixed social boundaries between peoples, but also the possibility of their transcendence (beginning in the late nineteenth century); and (4) Postmodern/postcolonial ways of thinking about Indian history, which focus on "the tension between the liberating discussion of boundaries and the constant reshaping of them as political memories of the colonial past" (roughly World War II to the present) (Deloria 2002).

Deloria's synthesis is remarkable in what it captures, including the easily overlooked fact that certain traces (or even larger elements) of each of these approaches continue to shape narratives about Indigenous peoples. Monographs continue to promote a narrative arc of an epic clash between Euro-American and Indigenous foes, which ends in the defeat of the admirable Indigenous nations, their struggles ultimately futile as they inevitably fade into insignificance, with no acknowledgment of the continuation of their political existence. The historical literature continues its fixation on "mixed bloods" as somehow racially and

culturally "deficient" compared to their supposedly "pure" forebears, frequently purporting to "measure" the degree of "assimilation." In these formulations, "racial" change via "mixing" with other races (via discredited nineteenth-century notions of racial science predicated on "pure," distinct races) or cultural change supposedly diminishes the indigeneity of the person/peoples, and greases the slide into "assimilation." These deeply held and often unconscious assumptions presume that Indigenous peoples can only be the victims of change, never its agents. Indigenous peoples, then, can never be a part of modernity, but instead stand in as modernity's polar opposite, thus robbing them of the possibility of being historical actors and peoples (O'Brien 2010).

Part of the problem for proponents of Indigenous history is that the discipline of history is deeply wedded to national narratives as the infrastructure that channels analysis and interpretation in particular directions to the exclusion of others. The logical outcome is the rise and triumph of the nation-state in the face of internal and external foes. In the case of the United States and its Indigenous peoples, the standard plot line follows the long history of Indigenous displacement (often figured as "territorial expansion" or "territorial acquisition") that secures the land base of the nation, a process that in Indigenous Studies is understood as "settler colonialism." In Patrick Wolfe's classic formulation, "settler colonialism is an inclusive, land-centred project that coordinates a comprehensive range of agencies, from the metropolitan centre to the frontier encampment, with a view to eliminating indigenous societies" (Wolfe 2006).

A standard means of framing the United States as a nation might begin with "pre-contact" Native North America, then proceed through "exploration," "discovery," the claiming of Indigenous lands for European nations, and the contest among European nations for mastery of the hemisphere. As Michael Witgen has shown, claims to imperial mastery of Indigenous peoples existed in their own fantasies rather than in actual power relations throughout the upper Great Lakes region into the nineteenth century, depending on where in Native North America you stood (Witgen 2007, 2012). In Latin America, Patricia Seed has demonstrated convincingly the degree to which Spaniards engaged in mere "ceremonies of possession" rather than claims to conquest that could be plausibly defended (Seed 1995). In the case of the United States, a long period of "colonial" history follows these claims of possession (however illusory), with the American Revolution rendered as *the* "post-colonial" moment of the nation (meaning shedding the shackles of English colonialism for the free development of a democratic republic, the United States). After the American Revolution, the nation fends off internal and external threats to become *the* world power. With these framings, the outcome is predetermined (the triumph of the nation), and plot lines lead to "declension narratives" for Indigenous peoples. Many make the leap from "declension" to the "extinction" of Indigenous peoples.

The fundamental problem in national narratives of the United States is that they cannot possibly account for the existence of more than 560 federally recognized tribal nations engaged in continuing nation-to-nation relationships with the US federal government, and they cannot adequately represent even a fraction of

Indigenous historical and contemporary experiences (which include far more complexity than even the basic fact of federally recognized tribal nations standing in diplomatic relationships to the United States, including state-recognized tribes as well as tribal peoples unrecognized by any external political body) (Wilkins and Stark 2011). Accounts that fail to acknowledge the political dimension of Indigenous nationhood typically elect to reckon Indigenous people as racial or ethnic minorities, which cannot capture the unique status of First Peoples in the United States (and elsewhere). Too often, narratives about Indigenous peoples founder when they train their focus too tightly on Indigenous "culture(s)" without probing, for example, the power and prerogative Indigenous nations possess to defend their cultural practices on the political and legal level. Framing Indigenous histories within the rubric of "multiculturalism" distorts their place within the settler colonial state. Indigenous Studies cannot settle for the idea that Indigenous peoples have *culture* in the absence of *politics*.

Published accounts produced by non-Indigenous people until well into the twentieth century followed two basic trajectories. The first was that which plotted the Wars for the West, the military history that eventually dispossessed Indigenous peoples in the service of casting the United States as a national power. The second concerned the proto-ethnology and then anthropology emerging largely from the mid-nineteenth century onward that purported to create a science of man, including Indigenous North Americans, as part of a racial hierarchy and then as a culturally distinct mosaic of peoples whose ways of life faced constant threats in the face of modernity; this was figured as "salvage anthropology", aimed at producing snapshots of cultures in supposed eclipse.

The tide seemed to turn for Indigenous history at the very end of the 1960s and into the 1970s. No book can claim the massive influence in the United States of Vine Deloria, Jr.'s *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (1969), which boldly called out mainstream America for its treatment of Indian people and Indian history, and signalled a dramatically new direction that many of us trace as the touchstone for the development of Indigenous Studies as a field. This book appeared amidst the Red Power movement, and the emergence of "ethnic studies" units and programs, as well as departments of American Indian Studies. Robert Berkhofer's 1971 call for a New Indian history looked to interdisciplinarity (especially between history and anthropology, or the emergent approach of ethnohistory) to write dynamic Indian histories that imagined Indians as part of the national "present," and took Indians seriously as political actors (Berkhofer 1971). Over time, the "New Indian History" took on the notion of placing Indians themselves at the centre of historical analyses.

Indigenous history methodologies

At one time, many mainstream historians regarded Indigenous history as marginal on the basis that rich and thorough archives were sparse or non-existent: What to do in the absence of "real archives" or "reliable documentation" as typically figured by the discipline? How does one confront the demands of the discipline of

history regarding particular kinds of written documentation, and the continued marginalization of particular kinds of sources – oral histories, for example? Who gets to decide what history matters, and what counts as reliable evidence? How does one narrate histories in the absence of documents historians routinely demand? What makes the sources of Indigenous history different (and what *doesn't* make them different)? What kinds of sources *do* exist that are core to the discipline, as traditionally composed? These are crucial questions for the field, and areas of robust critical engagement for scholars of Indigenous history.

In fact, as recent scholarship has amply demonstrated, Indigenous peoples have been producing written documentation of and about their lives for hundreds of years, even if the standard is writing in European languages (let alone the ancient writing technologies in rich evidence across the Americas that pre-date the presence of Europeans in this hemisphere) (see for example Deloria 2002; Jaskoski 1996; O'Connell 1992; Warrior 2005; Round 2010). Beginning with the first Native scholars in the Indian College at Harvard in the 1660s, Indigenous peoples have been writing and publishing at an accelerating rate into the present (Deloria 2002).

The long-standing marginality of the field has produced a situation of rich possibilities for transforming Indigenous histories, and, if there is the will, national narratives as well. An active embrace of the many and diverse archives of Indigenous history, and openness to the methodologies of Indigenous approaches that have been marginalized or disdained, promise the transformation of the field in fruitful directions (as outlined in this volume). From the perspective of Indigenous histories, a couple of overarching notions are vital to bear in mind: First, there is an abundance of documentation to support the pursuit of Indigenous history. No longer can it be claimed that the sources just don't exist to do justice to that history. There are also "unexpected" archives that have been underutilized and unappreciated, many of them stemming directly from the relationship of tribal peoples within settler colonialism. And second, these archives – those longer known and those now being uncovered – must be appreciated from Indigenous perspectives, which have overturned older understandings in countless instances.

Indigenous Studies, Indigenous history, and, increasingly, a move toward global approaches to Indigenous Studies and Indigenous history subsume an expansive embrace of different perspectives on historical actors and events, imaginative approaches to identifying and using source materials, creativity in developing rigorous analytical frames that can transform Indigenous histories and their interventions, and an almost seamless interdisciplinarity that seeks to illuminate historical experiences that have been kept on the margins. Indigenous Studies as currently practised draws on many scholarly traditions, but no one volume captures the preoccupations, ethics, and fundamentally distinct research methodologies better than Linda Tuhiwai Smith's path-breaking book *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (1999). Indigenous Studies requires the acknowledgment of two fundamental commitments in order to gain legitimacy in the view of other practitioners and of the peoples, communities, and/or nations involved: an acknowledgment of the positionality of the researcher/writer in relation to the peoples, communities, and/or nations involved, and an acknowledgment of the accountability of the research/writer in relation to the peoples, communities, and/or nations. Smith's eloquent study contains a wealth of insights stemming from these ethics and a thorough genealogy of the problem of Western knowledge systems for Indigenous peoples. Indigenous Studies pertains to living, breathing peoples, and what is written carries real consequences for the subjects of the research/writing. These relationships read very differently from the notion of "objectivity" formerly elevated to such heights in the discipline but now understood by most to be a problematic notion at best (Novick 1988).

In the space remaining, I'd like to take account of some of the possible "archives" for Indigenous history (by no means exhaustive), and some of the methodologies already in use in fruitful and promising ways in Indigenous Studies and Indigenous histories.

First and foremost, the obsession (in the case of the United States) of English colonialism with the legalities of land ownership (broadly including the resources on and underneath the land), inherited by the United States, has resulted in the production of massive, complex archives. These archives are far from perfect, and settler colonial claims to "proper" transfer of Indigenous homelands to the colonial state by no means followed the espoused protocols whereby the United States claimed the mantra of "expansion with honour" toward Indigenous peoples. Still, the stated imperative to follow protocols regarding landownership resulted in the accumulation of rich materials for Indigenous history.

The "New Social History" that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s embraced interdisciplinarity as an approach, including quantitative methods. Indigenous Studies has been somewhat slower to take up this approach (but see Chapter 4 in this volume). Yet abundant material is available for particular Indigenous peoples at times. Such documentation is an outgrowth of the apparatus of settler colonialism, with the built-in mandate of surveillance of Indigenous subjects, "assimilationist" programs, and the bureaucracy of Indian affairs. In some cases, the state apparatus provides *more* abundant documentation for Indigenous people than non-Indigenous. For example, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) mandated an *annual* census on many Indian reservations in the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While not unproblematic, they are rich and underutilized sources nonetheless. As well, assimilation mandates resulted in photographic and ethnographic studies of countless reservation communities, also underused and rich for analysis (Parker 2015).

Many tribes maintain their own archives, archivists, and museums, which vary considerably in their composition (Roy et al. 2011; Sleeper-Smith 2009; Lonetree 2012). The movement to organize, maintain, and protect archival material has been a strong one in Indian Country for decades. These are important sites for portraying Indigenous histories and the contemporary world – an important element in exercising sovereignty for tribal nations.

Material culture studies are of deep significance to Indigenous Studies. Understanding the study of objects as a window into the complexity of Indigenous cultural practices and the meanings objects are imbued with constitutes a

methodological approach that deepens Indigenous history. Moving long past nineteenth-century museum practices that fixed objects in cases to signify entire cultures, dynamic approaches to the cultural complexes surrounding objects can provide insights into Indigenous aesthetics, worldviews, technologies, and more (Cruikshank 1998). In the United States, the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1978 and subsequently amended) has provided a way for many tribes to reclaim cultural material and skeletal remains seized from them through dubious means over a long history, though for many the struggles for repatriation remain mired in contention and confrontation.

Family history is central to any reckoning of Indigenous history, and many of the same archives used for non-Indigenous histories and genealogies contain rich materials. Ancestry.com, a boon for professional and amateur genealogists alike, contains a wealth of relatively easily accessible source material for Indigenous history, including BIA annual censuses, land records, allotment records, and military records, in addition to the vital records that are at the heart of genealogical approaches.

Particular Indigenous communities contain their own wealth of stories about their histories, and, in this sense, the communities themselves constitute "archives". Conducting oral histories in communities (through proper protocols) promises to shed light on the longer history of their compositions, the intrusion of the state, and the activism of community members in asserting their nationhood. Indigenous peoples frequently retain deep-seated suspicions about "researchers," which requires building relationships, establishing protocols, and working out how accountability will be assured. Communities themselves frequently create their own boundaries around knowledge to be shared and that to be keep private, including what kinds of historical narratives are appropriate for distribution versus those narratives that ought not to be made public.

Language is a deeply rooted archive of a particular sort, accessible only to those willing to dedicate themselves to the learning of Indigenous languages. Languages contain vital knowledge about worldviews, cultures, and perspectives that lend particular insights into Indigenous communities and their histories. Language preservation and revitalization is a major initiative in a great many Indigenous communities, and language research generally contributes to these efforts in important ways. Language studies have transformed certain areas of Indigenous Studies, such as in Hawaiian studies (see Chapter 11 by Noenoe Silva in this volume). Silva's own work in uncovering rich, deep archives in the language have absolutely transformed our understanding of Native Hawai'i.

As a final example, Indigenous methods of reckoning place – through place names, mapping practices, and oral stories about the characteristics and meanings of physical features of the landscape – are related to language usage and the ways Indigenous people understood and understand their place in the created world (Basso 1996; Cruikshank 2005). Important work has been done to understand the sophistication and precision of Indigenous mapping practices (Barr 2011; Witgen 2007), and even the ways in which Indigenous land usage involved complex understandings of the intricacies of ecosystems (Cronon 1983), and the

manipulation of land usage for geopolitical purposes (Hamalainen 2010). The imposition of Western cartography on Indigenous systems of understanding place has created gross distortions and bolstered false claims to Indigenous landscapes (Barr 2011; Hamalainen 2010; Jortner 2015).

In sum, Indigenous history – in particular because of its attachment to the broader methodologies of Indigenous Studies beyond the discipline of history – is a vibrant and dynamic field that is poised to re-write narratives of all sorts.

References

Barr, Juliana. 2011. "Geographies of power: Mapping Indian borders in the 'borderlands' of the early southwest". *William and Mary Quarterly*, 68: 5–46.

Basso, Keith H. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Berkhofer, Jr., Robert F. 1971. "The political context of a new Indian history". *Pacific Historical Review*, 40: 357–382.

Cronon, William. 1983. *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Cruikshank, Julie. 1998. *The Social Life of Stories: Narrative and Knowledge in the Yukon Territory*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Cruikshank, Julie. 2005. *Do Glaciers Listen? Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, and Social Imagination*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Deloria, Philip J. 2002. "Historiography". In Philip J. Deloria and Neal Salisbury, eds. *A Companion to American Indian History*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 6–24.

Deloria, Jr., Vine. 1969. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.

Hamalainen, Pekka. 2010. "The politics of grass: European expansion, ecological change, and Indigenous power in the southwest borderlands". *William and Mary Quarterly*, 67: 173–208.

Jaskoski, Helen, ed. 1996. *Early Native American Writing: New Critical Essays*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jortner, Adam. 2015. "The empty continent: Cartography, pedagogy, and Native American history". In Susan Sleeper-Smith, Juliana Barr, Jean M. O'Brien, Nancy Shoemaker and Scott Manning Stevens, eds. *Why You Can't Teach United States History Without American Indians*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 71–86.

Lonetree, Amy. 2012. *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Nabokov, Peter. 2002. *A Forest of Time: American Indian Ways of History*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Novick, Peter. 1988. *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the Historical Profession*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

O'Brien, Jean M. 2010. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

O'Connell, Barry, ed. 1992. *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, A Pequot*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Parker, Angela. 2015. "Photographing the Places of Citizenship: The 1922 Crow Industrial Survey". *Native American and Indigenous Studies*, 2: 57–86.

Round, Phillip H. 2010. *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663–1880*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Roy, Loriene, Anjali Bhasin, and Sarah K. Arriaga, eds. 2011. *Tribal Libraries, Archives, Museums: Preserving Our Language, Memory, and Lifeways*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press.
Seed, Patricia. 1995. *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492–1640*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Sleeper-Smith, Susan. 2009. *Contesting Knowledge: Museums and Indigenous Perspectives*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Sleeper-Smith, Susan, Juliana Barr, Jean M. O'Brien, Nancy Shoemaker, and Scott Manning Stevens, eds. 2015. *Why You Can't Teach United States History Without American Indians*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
Warrior, Robert. 2005. *The People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Wilkins, David E., and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark. 2011. *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
Witgen, Michael. 2007. "The rituals of possession: Native identity and the invention of empire in seventeenth-century western North America". *Ethnohistory*, 54: 639–668.
Witgen, Michael. 2012. *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native". *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8: 387–409.

2 Reflections on Indigenous literary nationalism

On home grounds, singing hogs, and cranky critics

Daniel Heath Justice

The year 2014 marked the fifteenth publishing anniversary of Craig Womack's *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism* and its affirmation of Muskogee Creek-specific literary history; 2015 was the twentieth anniversary of "intellectual sovereignty" from Robert Warrior's *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*, with Jace Weaver's *That the People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community* and its notion of "communitism" celebrating its own twentieth anniversary in 2017. Although none of these is the first or last work in the critical mode now known as "Indigenous literary nationalism," they arguably stand as the most prominent in both critical regard and controversy. This brief chapter considers the conversation around literary nationalism between these and other interpretive projects in the field, with attention to their continuing importance to the intellectual and ethical concerns of Indigenous literary studies.

By way of full disclosure, I look to all of these works as central to my own scholarly development, with Womack's *Red on Red* being the most immediately transformative. I read it shortly after its publication, when I was a first-year Ph.D. student at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and it was a revelatory experience, especially Womack's reading of Creek literature through Muskogee political history and cultural expression, not the crossblood criticism or French Continental theory in vogue at the time. Indeed, my coming-of-age as a scholar can quite readily be divided into two chapters, pre- and post-*Red on Red*, and while other works up until that point and after were incredibly significant, including those of Weaver and Warrior noted above, Louis Owens's *Mixedblood Messages*, and Elizabeth Cook-Lynn's varied essays, for me it was Womack's book that had the most electrifying scope of possibility.

Earlier literary criticism of the 1990s focused on hybridity and poststructuralist play, the dynamic trickster mixedbloods and crossbloods of Owens (Choctaw/Cherokee), Gerald Vizenor (Anishinaabe), Diane Glancy (Cherokee), and others. Worthy and important works, but over that decade (and after) the scholarship in response was increasingly distanced from the lands and politics of Indigenous nations and generally more focused on identity, pan-Native urbanity, and movement over rootedness and grounded memory. (As an example, Vizenor's consistent aesthetic and intellectual concerns with land and reimagining of

References

Allen, Chadwick. 2012. *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bauerkemper, Joseph. 2014. "Indigenous trans/nationalism and the ethics of theory in Native literary studies". In James H. Cox and Daniel Heath Justice, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Indigenous American Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brooks, Lisa. 2006. "Afterword: At the gathering place". In Jace Weaver, Craig S. Womack and Robert Warrior. *American Indian Literary Nationalism*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip. 2009. *Inheriting the Past: The Making of Arthur C. Parker and Indigenous Archaeology*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Cox, James. 2006. *Muting White Noise: Native American and European American Novel Traditions*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Huhndorf, Shari M. 2009. *Mapping the Americas: The Transnational Politics of Contemporary Native Culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lincoln, Kenneth. 2007. "Red stick lit crit". *Indian Country Today*, 26(44).

Lyons, Scott Richard. 2010. *X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McKegney, Sam. 2007. *Magic Weapons: Aboriginal Writers Remaking Community after Residential School*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Maddox, Lucy. 2005. *Citizen Indians: Native American Intellectuals, Race, and Reform*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Martin, Keavy. 2012. *Stories in a New Skin: Approaches to Inuit Literature*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Pulitano, Elivira. 2003. *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Te Punga Somerville, Alice. 2012. *Once Were Pacific: Māori Connections to Oceania*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Warrior, Robert Allen. 1995. *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Weaver, Jace, Craig Womack, and Robert Warrior. 2006. *American Indian Literary Nationalism*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Womack, Craig S. 1999. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

3 History, anthropology, Indigenous Studies

Pauline Turner Strong

Introduction

The relationship between history and anthropology is both productive and fraught. Prior to the emergence of Indigenous Studies as a multidisciplinary enterprise, history and anthropology were intertwined in a number of forms, including cultural, social, and oral history; historical anthropology and archaeology; subaltern and colonial studies; and ethnohistory. The last field is most significant for Indigenous Studies: ethnohistory has focused squarely on the experiences of Indigenous peoples (if often through colonial lenses) and there is a direct line of scholarship connecting ethnohistory to Indigenous Studies. While it is tempting to propose that Indigenous Studies may become a "successor discipline" to ethnohistory (Haraway 1988), both of these multidisciplinary formations are currently thriving, with a significant number of scholars actively participating in both.

Ethnohistory is a multidisciplinary approach to Indigenous, colonial, and postcolonial history that developed in North America in the 1950s. Combining the approaches of history, cultural anthropology, and archaeology, ethnohistory centres on the history of non-European peoples, including their experiences of colonization, resistance, and cultural change. Ethnohistory began as an applied field, as historians and anthropologists collaborated on US tribal land claims cases, and soon became institutionalized in the organization now known as the American Society for Ethnohistory (Harkin 2010). The discipline expanded unevenly into other regional contexts, with the Americas remaining at its core. Most ethnohistorians are trained primarily as anthropologists, historians, or archaeologists, making ethnohistory a complex interdisciplinary pursuit.

Over seven decades ethnohistory has both integrated and revealed tensions among historical, anthropological, and Indigenous perspectives on cultural and historical processes (Krech 1991). These tensions have influenced the development of Indigenous Studies, in which Indigenous sources, perspectives, and methodologies are of paramount importance.

A genealogy of Ethnohistory

Following the enactment in the United States of the Indian Claims Commission Act (1946), anthropologists and historians served as expert witnesses in court cases adjudicating tribal claims to territory. This development was influenced by an important Supreme Court decision that defined the basis of Indigenous land claims as evidence of occupancy from "time immemorial" (McMillen 2007). Conducting research for both sides (Indian tribes and the Justice Department), expert witnesses relied on colonial documents, oral histories, and ethnographic research to delineate Indigenous beliefs about territory and resources; Indigenous patterns of land use; Indigenous and colonial understandings of treaty rights; the history of appropriation of land and resources from Indigenous communities; and cultural continuities and changes among Indigenous populations. After 1978, when the Indian Claims Commission issued its final report, anthropologists and historians, by then often identified as ethnohistorians, continued to serve as expert witnesses in other contexts, including tribal recognition cases.

By 1978, however, ethnohistorians were conducting research that went well beyond the testimonial. Ethnohistory consolidated a previously marginalized focus on Indian history within the field of history, while providing a corrective to the synchronic nature of traditional ethnographic research, in which Indigenous peoples were often treated as timeless (Wolf 1982). The neglect of history among anthropologists should not be overemphasized, however, as Mooney's work on the Ghost Dance in the late nineteenth century demonstrates. In the early twentieth century, anthropologists such as Swanton, Speck, Steward, and Fenton used historical methods to reconstruct Indigenous culture. The acculturation studies of Redfield, Herskovits, Lewis, and others in the 1930s also constituted a move toward analyzing cultural change. Meanwhile, Evans-Pritchard moved British anthropology away from the synchronicity of structural-functionalism, describing social anthropology as "a kind of historiography" (1950: 123).

Ethnohistorians have produced numerous collections of primary documents, including documents in Indigenous languages, as well as cultural histories of particular Indigenous peoples. These are important for providing fine-grained, diachronic perspectives on Indigenous experiences. Wallace (1969), for example, drew on archival and ethnographic research to analyze the development of the Handsome Lake religion among the Senecas in the eighteenth century. Wallace has influenced subsequent analyses of cultural revitalization, including Harkin's (2004) collection, which shows the comparative power of Wallace's approach by considering Pacific cargo cults, the Ghost Dance movement on the US Plains, and contemporary social movements. Ethnohistorians have also considered revitalization in the context of Indigenous schools, cultural centres, language programs, and economic development efforts.

Research on the politics, economics, ideologies, and social relations of the "colonial situation" (Cohn 1987) is central to ethnohistorical research. Ethnohistorians have analyzed the political economy of colonial empires, the impact of epidemics on Indigenous populations, the nature of imperial

bureaucracies, the acculturation of Indigenous children in boarding schools, Indigenous strategies of survival and resistance, and Christian evangelization and Indigenous responses, among other topics. Studies of the gendered nature of the colonial situation, and especially changes in gender roles under colonialism and Christianity, led to the development of feminist ethnohistory (Strong 1996). Leacock conducted important early work in this area, researching the impact of the fur trade on gender roles among the Innu. Etienne and Leacock (1980) offer a historical materialist explanation of gender inequality, emphasizing how together the allied forces of capitalism, colonialism, and Christianity led to the degradation of women's status. Studies inspired by Leacock show that the impact of capitalism and Christianity on gender roles is extremely complex, varying according to Indigenous gender relations as well as the way Indigenous economies articulated with capitalist economies. More recently, the ethnohistory of sexuality has emerged in the work of scholars such as Gutierrez (1991), Roscoe (1998), and Stoler (1995), all interested in the dynamics of race, class, and sexuality in colonial systems of inequality.

In political economy and environmental history the research of White has been particularly significant. Beginning with a monograph on the colonial production of dependence among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos, White (1983) developed an ethnohistorical approach that focuses on changing modes of production, social relationships, and environmental relationships. He and others have chronicled the impact of the fur trade, farming, mining, and other European interventions on Indigenous ecologies and economies, analyzing the various forms of dependence and innovation that these interventions engendered. Brooks (2002) offers another approach to political economy, analyzing the transformation of Indigenous Southwestern forms of captivity, servitude, and adoption under colonialism. Subsequently, Miles (2005) presented an intimate portrayal of Cherokee slavery and family life.

White is also known for the influential concept of the "middle ground" (1991), which refers to social and cultural patterns that develop under sustained culture contact. Sahlins (1981) developed a somewhat similar concept, "structures of the conjuncture," in his analysis of the early history of Hawaii. Both scholars offer ways of conceptualizing the hybrid sociocultural forms that develop over the course of intercultural encounters. Sahlins's earlier work on foraging economies has also been influential on ethnohistories like Brightman's (1993) that focus on Indigenous economies and cultural logics.

Relations between Indigenous peoples and the colonizing state have been a recurring concern of ethnohistory. In his scholarship on India, Cohn (1987) developed the concept of "rule by records," which has inspired many important studies of colonial rule as an exercise of knowledge and power (Axel 2002). Dirks (2001), for example, historicizes the notion of "caste," analyzing it as a product of Indigenous culture, colonialism, and resistance. In the North American context, many studies of the colonial state center on treaties and sovereignty issues (Wilkins and Lomawaima 2001).

An especially productive arena of ethnohistorical research is the study of colonial missions and Indigenous responses. Clendinnen (2003) considers missionary work and resistance among sixteenth-century Yucatan Mayans, while Jean Comaroff (1985) analyzes the Church of Zion among the Tshidi of southern Africa as a form of Indigenous agency. Among the many studies of religious change in North America, Spicer's work on the Southwest (1962) stands out for its scope, while works by Axtell (1986), Salisbury (1982), Kan (1989) and others consider other regions.

Ethnohistorians have offered important contributions to the understanding of "ethnogenesis" – the formation of social groups through historical processes of culture contact. Studies of the Métis of Canada, the Seminoles of the US Southeast, the Garifuna of the Caribbean, and the Yoruba of Africa, among others, have employed this concept productively. Hill (1996) considers the development of new cultural identities among Indigenous American and African American groups, tying the emergence of new identities to global processes of domination, resistance, and exchange.

Silverstein (1997) has promoted the ethnohistory of "languages of encounter," which concerns the reciprocal transformation of linguistic forms and linguistic communities. In this vein, Collins (1998) analyzes the relationship between discourses of place and the expropriation of land among the Tolowa.

Notable recent ethnohistorical works abandon "ethnographic authority" or authoritative history (Clifford 1988) for collaborative, polyphonic, and reflexive modes of research and representation. For example, Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh (2006) interweave perspectives of Tohono-O'odham, Hopi, Zuni, and San Carlos Apache collaborators. Reflexive ethnohistorical scholarship critically examines the role of history and anthropology in producing and circulating hegemonic representations of Indigenous people. Wilmsen (1989), for example, examines ideological constructions of the San of southwestern Africa as "primitive" rather than as a displaced and excluded underclass. O'Brien (2010) analyzes the discursive extinction of Indian peoples in New England through the "last of his tribe" trope, while Deloria's works (1988, 2004) offer wide-ranging critiques of historical, ethnographic, and popular representation. Coming full circle to the beginnings of ethnohistory, Campisi (1991) has reflected critically on his experience as an expert witness in the Mashpee tribal recognition case.

Sources and methodologies

A recurrent theme in ethnohistory has been the tension between the methodologies of anthropology and history, tensions aptly captured in Brown's (1991) metaphor of "strange bedfellows, kindred spirits." Historians have relied primarily on the critical analysis of colonial and state documents, while anthropologists have pursued oral history and "upstreaming," as Fenton (2009) called informed speculation about the past based on more recent cultural practices. Anthropologists have also emphasized comparative analysis and Indigenous conceptions of history, leading Fogelson (1989) to advocate for "ethno-ethnohistory."

As Fogelson's ironic term suggests, there has been some debate over the very name of the field. To what does the "ethno" in "ethnohistory" refer? For some it refers substantively to Indigenous and other ethnic groups, making ethnohistory the history of these groups. For others, it has methodological significance, and refers to an ethnological or ethnographic approach to history. For still others, "ethnohistory" refers to ethnic and Indigenous groups' conceptions of their own pasts. All of these endeavours have taken place under the rubric of "ethnohistory", sometimes in the very same works. In light of these difficulties some scholars, especially those conducting research outside of the Americas, avoid the term altogether, referring instead to "historical anthropology" or "anthropological history." Yet the term "ethnohistory" persists, as does the scholarly tradition and community that has grown up around it.

Ethnohistorians typically rely on multiple forms of data, all of which must be utilized with considerable care. These include:

- Colonial and other institutional documents, including travel journals and memoirs; policy statements; and missionary, administrative, judicial, and treaty records. In interpreting primary documents the ethnohistorian attempts to distinguish official categories, prejudices, and misapprehensions from Indigenous beliefs and practices, putting the documents within the larger context of governmentality. The ethnohistorian must also be aware of the selective and contingent nature of archiving (Dirks 2002; Galloway 2006).
- Written records in Indigenous languages. Particularly significant for literate cultures, these may exist for oral cultures in transcriptions. They also may exist in written form for Indigenous peoples like the Cherokee who developed a written form of their language after contact, or those, like the Lakota, who learned to read and write in their native language from missionaries. Regarding his work with Euro-American and Lakota documents, DeMallie writes, "in a fundamental sense they represent conflicting realities, rooted in radically different epistemologies. The challenge of ethnohistory is to bring these two types of historical data together to construct a fuller picture of the past" (1993: 516).
- Archaeological evidence, which offers a significantly lengthier diachronic dimension than historical and ethnographic evidence. Rogers and Wilson (1993: 7) describe ethnohistorical and archaeological sources as "complementary investigative routes" into cultural change, with archaeology particularly valuable for information on demography and geography, settlement and land use patterns, travel routes, and ethnic relationships.
- Collections, including maps, illustrations, photographs, and artifacts. Much ethnohistorical research occurs in museum collections, which must be understood as subject to the same processes of selection, appropriation, misinterpretation, reinterpretation, and loss as historical archives (Galloway 2006).
- Oral traditions, including oral histories, genealogies, folk tales, and place names. Like institutional documents, oral traditions must be contextualized

within contemporary social structures and projects. As Vansina (1985) emphasizes, oral traditions represent the viewpoints of particularly situated actors and often shift over time.

- Ethnographic research, including systematic participant-observation, aimed at finding traces of, or attitudes toward, the past in the present. For some, ethnographic fieldwork is what differentiates the ethnohistorian from the historian; for others, the difference resides in a more general "anthropological orientation" toward culture (Cohn 1968). Regardless, the results of ethnographic research must always be understood as situated within a particular moment and particular ethnographic encounter. Ethnographic research produces its own archive, and ethnohistorians typically rely on the ethnographic research of previous generations as well as their own. Brown's (2009) ethnohistorical works on the Ojibwa, using materials from Hallowell's fieldwork in the 1930s, exemplify work with an ethnographic archive.

Given the range of data, and the different training that historians, anthropologists, and archeologists bring to their research, it is unsurprising that methodological disputes arise frequently in ethnohistory. These concern, for example:

- The contingency and partiality of documentary sources. Galloway (2006) notes the significance of material not noticed by or not available to European observers; material misinterpreted by European observers; and material that has been lost. Ethnohistory requires a methodology of suspicion and convergence, in which documentary sources are viewed as compromised and explanations are strengthened by the convergence of several lines of evidence.
- The role of oral history, tribal history, and living memory as supplements or correctives to written documents, which usually represent colonial perspectives. Vansina (1985) offers a methodology for the interpretation of oral history, including a way of distinguishing among ecological, genealogical, sociological, and extraordinary time. Anthropologists including Cruikshank (1998) have emphasized the importance of prophecy and other Indigenous orientations to time, which contrast sharply with linear time.
- The problem of "mixed epistemologies," with history, cultural anthropology, and archaeology each relying on different modes of explanation and validation. Wilson contrasts an archeological approach focused on long-term and large-scale processes with historical approaches more concerned with small-scale, shorter-term processes. This difference in temporal scale poses "the challenge of integrating macroprocesses and microprocesses of culture change into a coherent analysis" (Rogers and Wilson 1993: 21, 23).
- Differences between Western and Indigenous epistemologies, which dwarf the differences between disciplinary epistemologies highlighted by Wilson. Taking Indigenous epistemologies seriously is a hallmark of Indigenous Studies (Smith 2012; Denzin et al. 2008).
- The ability of ethnohistory to deal adequately with plural interpretations, including tensions between (and within) archaeological, documentary, and oral histories. Hoxie argues for an ethnohistory that aims "to describe community lives in their own terms," producing "stories that allow for an open vision – one that is coherent but attends to several layers of meaning and many co-existing interpretations" (1997: 606, 610). Fogelson (1989: 141) enumerates the difficulties posed to ethnohistorians by "multicultural frames of reference," by "different modes of discourse, by documentation that cannot always be limited to written manuscripts, and by recognition of different conceptions of reality."
- The role of theoretical concepts in the field (e.g., Sahlins's structuralism and Wolf's use of world systems theory). Hoxie (1997), for example, counterpoises the pluralistic ethnohistory he advocates against Wolf's (1982) influential attempt to locate tribal histories within a global system. And Sahlins's (1981, 1995) influential structural history has drawn vigorous opposition as a misinterpretation of Indigenous beliefs and actions (Obeyesekere 1997).

Cohn (1987) mediated wisely between "anthropologyland" and "historyland," noting that history and anthropology have a common subject matter, "otherness"; a common project, translation; and a common interest in studying social transformation. He called for an "anthropological history" in which the colonial situation presents a unified analytic field for the study of the construction and representation of culture – Indigenous, colonial, and postcolonial culture alike. Requiring a working experience of both the field and the archive, this endeavour must be highly reflexive and attuned to the ways in which current scholarly concepts (e.g., "culture," "race," "tribe") are often remnants of colonial forms of rule. Even the division between history and anthropology is a remnant of colonial notions of the timeless "primitive"; in overcoming this disciplinary divide, then, ethnohistory offers a way of moving beyond colonial ideologies.

Ethnohistory and Indigenous Studies

The newer field of Indigenous Studies builds upon, critiques, and reframes ethnohistory. In formative methodological works (Wilson and Yellow Bird 2005; Smith 2012), Indigenous scholars critique colonizing knowledges; articulate Indigenous knowledges and methodologies; foreground Indigenous experience and agency; and argue for activist research agendas. Blackhawk (2006) exemplifies this approach, productively coupling his account of imperial violence during Anglo-American expansion into the Great Basin with an account of Indigenous agency.

Also characteristic of Indigenous Studies is a global comparative perspective, which contrasts with the particularism of much ethnohistorical work. A particularly significant comparative framework for Indigenous Studies is settler colonialism (Wolfe 1999; Veracini 2011), which emphasizes commonalities in the project of eliminating and excluding Indigenous peoples found across settler states. Simpson (2014) illustrates the transformative potential of the framework of settler colonialism, explicitly countering the ethnohistorical tradition of Wallace, Fenton,

and others in emphasizing Iroquois sovereignty and resistance over traditionalism and revitalization.

There are no sharp lines between ethnohistory and Indigenous Studies, however. Blackhawk's book has been acclaimed across history, ethnohistory, and Indigenous Studies. But Indigenous Studies has broadened the meaning of interdisciplinary scholarship, expanded the scope of comparison, and focused productively on Indigenous experience, knowledge, and agency. History, ethnohistory, and Indigenous Studies are together forging productive discussions on how the historical and cultural dimensions of Indigenous experience are related to other dimensions – the philosophical, the textual, the political, the economic, the geographical, the artistic, the psychological – and how these can best be researched and represented.

References

Axel, B., ed. 2002. *From the Margins*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Axtell, J. 1986. *The Invasion Within*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blackhawk, N. 2006. *Violence Over the Land*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brightman, R. 1993. *Grateful Prey*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brooks, J.F. 2002. *Captives and Cousins*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Brown, J.S.H. 1991. "Ethnohistorians: Strange bedfellows, kindred spirits". *Ethnohistory*, 38(2): 113–123.

Brown, J.S.H. 2009. *Memories, Myths, and Dreams of an Ojibwe Leader*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Campisi, J. 1991. *The Mashpee Indians*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Clendinnen, I. 2003. *Ambivalent Conquests*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clifford, J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cohn, B.S. 1968. "Ethnohistory". In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 6: 441–448. New York: Macmillan/Free Press.

Cohn, B.S. 1987. *An Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays*. Delhi and New York: Oxford University Press.

Collins, J. 1998. *Understanding Tolowa Histories*. New York: Routledge.

Comaroff, J. 1985. *Body of Power, Spirits of Resistance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cruikshank J. 1998. *The Social Life of Stories*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Deloria, P.J. 1988. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Deloria, P.J. 2004. *Indians in Unexpected Places*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

DeMallie, R.J. 1993. "'These have no ears': Narrative and the ethnohistorical method". *Ethnohistory*, 40(4): 515–538.

Denzin, N.K., Y.S. Lincoln, and L.T. Smith. 2008. *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Dirks, N.B. 2001. *Castes of Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dirks, N.B. 2002. "Annals of the archive: Ethnographic notes on the sources of history". In B. Axel, ed. *From the Margins*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 47–65.

Etienne, M. and E. Leacock. 1980. *Women and Colonization*. New York: Praeger.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1950. "Social anthropology: Past and present". *Man*, 50(198): 118–174.

Fenton, W. 2009. *William Fenton: Selected Writings*. Ed. W.A. Starna and J. Campisi. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ferguson, T.J. and J.S. Colwell-Chanthaphonh. 2006. *History is in the Land*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Fogelson, R.D. 1989. "The ethnohistory of events and nonevents". *Ethnohistory*, 36(2): 133–147.

Galloway, P. 2006. *Practicing Ethnohistory*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Gutierrez, R. 1991. *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Haraway, D. 1988. "Situated knowledges". *Feminist Studies*, 14(3): 575–599.

Harkin, M.E., ed. 2004. *Reassessing Revitalization Movements*. Norman: University of Nebraska Press.

Harkin, M.E. 2010. "Ethnohistory's ethnohistory: Creating a discipline from the ground up". *Social Science History*, 34(2): 113–128.

Hill, J.E., ed. 1996. *History, Power, and Identity*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Hoxie, F. 1997. "Ethnohistory for a tribal world". *Ethnohistory*, 44(4): 595–615.

Kan, S. 1989. *Memory Eternal*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Krech, Shepard, III. 1991. "The state of ethnohistory". *Annual Reviews in Anthropology*, 20: 345–375.

McMillen, C. 2007. *Making Indian Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Miles, T. 2005. *Ties that Bind*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Obeyesekere, G. 1997. *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook*. 2nd edn. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

O'Brien, J. 2010. *Firsting and Lasting*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rogers, J.D. and S.M. Wilson, eds. 1993. *Ethnohistory and Archaeology*. New York and London: Plenum.

Roscoe, W. 1998. *Changing Ones*. New York: St. Martin's.

Sahlins, M. 1981. *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sahlins, M. 1995. *How "Natives" Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Salisbury, N. 1982. *Manitou and Providence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Silverstein, M. 1997. "Encountering language and languages of encounter in North American ethnohistory". *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 6(2): 126–144.

Simpson, A. 2014. *Mohawk Interruptus*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Smith, L.T. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Spicer, E. 1962. *Cycles of Conquest*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Stoler, A. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Strong, P.T. 1996. "Feminist theory and the invasion of the heart in North America". *Ethnohistory*, 43: 683–712.

Vansina, J. 1985. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Veracini, L. 2011. "Introducing settler colonial studies". *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1(1): 1–12.

Wallace, A.F.C. 1969. *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca*. New York: Knopf.

White, R. 1983. *The Roots of Dependency*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

White, R. 1991. *The Middle Ground*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkins, D.E. and T. Lomawaima. 2001. *Uneven Ground*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Wilmsen, E.N. 1989. *A Political Economy of the Kalahari*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W.A. and M. Yellow Bird. 2005. *For Indigenous Eyes Only*. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.
Wolf, E. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Wolfe, P. 1999. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*. London: Cassell.

4 Reclaiming the statistical "native"

Quantitative historical research beyond the pale

Chris Andersen and Tahu Kukutai

This chapter examines the ways in which quantitative research approaches and statistical sources have constructed Indigenous peoples and Indigenous histories, often to negative effect, and gives voice to the efforts of Indigenous scholars and communities to transform those practices. There are three sections. The first section describes the practice of quantitative history in relation to Indigenous peoples, with a particular focus on demographic history. We identify key critiques of the field and discuss some of the broader methodological challenges of using quantitative methods to tell Indigenous histories. The second section focuses on the statistical sources used to inform historical representations of Indigenous peoples, with an emphasis on the national population census. In the third section we explore changes to the statistical field from one in which Indigenous peoples had no say to one in which it is becoming increasingly difficult to envision large-scale data collection being carried out without the consent and active participation of Indigenous experts and communities. We argue that while there have been changes in terms of statistical coverage that will inform future history-telling, this has yet to translate fully into Indigenous agency in telling of our histories in that quantitative space, and this is where attention remains most needed.

Quantitative history – "in the absence" of

In contrast to an earlier reliance on textual records and archival research, quantitative historical analysis today relies heavily on the use of large (and now digitized) databases of economic and demographic data drawn from statistical sources such as the population census, births, deaths and marriage registers, parish, taxation, military and hospital records, ship logs and voting rolls. These forms of numerical data are typically collated and arranged by researchers into time-series datasets to fit their own analytical purposes, but increasingly, researchers also have recourse to large volumes of digitized historical data centralized in a single repository.

Quantitative approaches to Indigenous histories most often take the form of demographic histories focused on issues of past population change (see, for example, Cook 1976; Cook and Borah 1979; Dobyns 1983; Pool 1991, 2015; Thornton 1987, 2000). Population histories draw heavily on the use of

6 Mind, heart, hands

Thinking, feeling, and doing in Indigenous history methodology

K. Tsianina Lomawaima

In 2013, Thomas King wrote that:

> [i]f there is any methodology in my approach … it draws more on storytelling techniques than historiography. A good historian would have tried to keep biases under control. A good historian would have tried to keep personal anecdotes in check. A good historian would have provided footnotes. I have not.
>
> (2013: xii)

A good historian also tells a good story, but King teases scholarly gravitas. King is funny, and with humour opens up serious questions for Indigenous history. What do we think about in Indigenous history? How do we feel about it? How do we do it? What did our subjects think and feel and do? How do *thinking*, *feeling*, and *doing* interact to produce Indigenous histories? To tackle these questions I hew to Vine Deloria, Jr.'s principle of relativity:

> "We are all relatives" when taken as a methodological tool for obtaining knowledge means that we observe the natural world by looking for relationships between various things in it … This concept is simply the relativity concept as applied to a universe that people experience as alive and not as dead or inert.
>
> (Deloria 1999: 34)

Following Deloria, I search for relationships among *thinking*, *feeling*, and *doing*. Examples from the archive, scholarship, and teaching embody the interpretive and methodological potential of an Indigenous principle of relativity.

Thinking

> Personally, I'd want to hear a creation story, a story that recounts how the world was formed, how things came to be, for contained within creation stories are *relationships* that help to define the nature of the universe and how cultures understand the world in which they exist.
>
> (King 2003: 20, emphasis added)

Creation stories transmit theories explaining the world and its history. The discipline of History debates its relationship with theory but churns out anthologies explaining the worlds of Indigenous history. Scanning edited volumes surveying Native North American history is one way to get at *what we think*, but most readers are likely well-acquainted with the literature. I will sacrifice a literature review to concentrate on thinking, feeling, and doing in other arenas, with an aside – read *Reflections on American Indian History* (Hurtado 2008). Calloway, Edmunds, Hauptman, Iverson, and Child appreciated relativity within Indigenous lives.

Feeling

Emotions connect scholars, subjects, and Indigenous communities through expansive Indigenous theories of kinship, including biological descent, adoption, marriage, and clan affiliation. We rarely experience a cut-and-dried status, though, as insider or outsider. Indigenous identities are complicated and generate a continuum for judging: Insider? Outsider? The cross-examining analytic of relativity contextualizes two impassioned letters from the National Archives, written by Native employees of the Office of Indian Affairs (OIA) in a matrix of insider/outsider identity, emotion, and the work we do.

We may view the OIA as monolithically oppressive, but Indians have always worked there. They valued a steady paycheck; wished to serve Indian communities with their talents and skills learned in school; and aspired to get ahead (Cahill 2011). The OIA was never an easy place for an Indian to work, simultaneously insider and outsider. Carlos Montezuma felt any Indian working for the OIA was a traitor to the race. Employees – Charles Dagenett, Gertrude Bonnin – spiritedly defended their service to Indian communities. Navigating tribal, pan-Indian, and professional OIA identity was tough. The following letters attest to that toughness.

Ruth Muskrat Bronson (Cherokee teacher at Haskell Indian School) wrote the editor of the *Good Housekeeping* magazine on March 7, 1929 to protest articles titled "The Cry of a Broken People." On March 10, 1932 Henry Roe Cloud (Winnebago, OIA Field Representative) wrote to a Native employee at the Rosebud Agency, where Roe Cloud had investigated a complaint. Typed, paginated, and carbon copied, the letters were official and public. Spectacularly long (17+ pages), each is packed with emotion: outrage, self-certainty, wounded pride, grief. Each letter emanated from the writer's job, was intensely personal, and expressed "insider" Native identity. Relativity guides us to examine their content for braided strands of thinking, feeling, and doing.

"As an Indian": Ruth Muskrat Bronson

A folder in the Haskell records is labeled "Charges against Indian Service in 'Good Housekeeping' 1929" (National Archives and Records Administration/ NARA, Kansas City, 1929). Letters from OIA officials and "friends of the Indian" to the magazine's editor protested the "scandalous" attacks on the OIA made by Vera L. Connelly (NARA, Kansas City, 1929). They accused Connelly of

ventriloquizing the "propaganda" of the Indian Defense Association and John Collier. Bronson's letter stands out for its length, its defensiveness, and an emotional argument rooted in a Native employee's pride in her work.

Beginning "As an Indian I am impelled to protest," Bronson repeatedly invoked her identity:

> According to Miss Connelly it would be something unusual for an Indian woman to be so bold as to rise up and speak out in meeting, but I happen to come from a tribe whose women ... selected the tribal rulers. Therefore I dare to speak.
>
> (NARA, Kansas City, 1929)

Bronson also stressed her loyalty to the Service and its employees: "in justice to my own people and in loyalty to those who have served us so nobly and so well I cannot ... remain silent" (NARA, Kansas City, 1929). She responded to Connelly's picture of agents as "brutal, over-bearing, despotic, greedy, [and] indifferent" with her own experience as a teenaged assistant to an agent – also Cherokee – who encouraged her to attend college, counseled her on jobs, and devoted his life to service to his people and to the OIA. Bronson admitted to "blunders – oh yes, a great many" but denied rampant viciousness and abuse (NARA, Kansas City, 1929). Connelly's critique of boarding schools brought the importance of Bronson's *doing* to the foreground.

If Connelly were correct, Bronson wrote, Native teachers at Haskell "would refuse to stay on the pay roll of such an institution. For we are not rascals, any of us ... We have come to the Government Boarding School because we believe it to be the best medium for the thing we wish to do" (NARA, Kansas City, 1929). Given the boarding school abuses and deficiencies documented by the Institute for Government Research one year earlier (Meriam et al. 1928), Bronson's unflagging defense seems unrealistic. *Good Housekeeping*'s editor was amazed that "anyone as intelligent as you are should be so ignorant of the conditions that exist among your people" (NARA, Kansas City, 1929). Bronson was indeed intelligent. I do not read her letter as a knee-jerk defense by a co-opted assimilationist. She wrote from the centre of where she thought, and felt, and worked as a Native woman, dedicated to her people, within a bureaucracy employing others who shared her ideals and commitment to the work, "the thing we wish to do."

"We Who Are Indians": Henry Roe Cloud

Henry Roe Cloud's 1932 letter spoke to similar issues – pride as a government employee, frustration with "unfair" critiques, commitment to "his people" – but Roe Cloud vented his outrage against an agent who fit the image painted by Connelly, not Bronson. Like Bronson, Roe Cloud's outrage was rooted in life experience, in his case the tragic loss of his young son. In 1932, as a Field Representative, Roe Cloud investigated a complaint against the Rosebud Agent; afterward he corresponded with a Native employee who supported the Agent. Roe Cloud excoriated agency personnel for their unfeeling treatment of Indians, especially Clark Little Thunder, who lost his young son to tuberculosis. It was not long after that that three-year-old Henry Roe Cloud, Jr. passed away after a brief illness. Clearly Roe Cloud's grief connected him to Little Thunder, but his outrage also sprang from his work as a Native person to make the OIA bureaucracy more just and humane.

The letter began with accusations of local incompetence, continuing: "[W]hat is worse ... [is your] attack [on] the one friend [Roe Cloud] who came there to assist your administration" (NARA, Seattle, 1932). Roe Cloud, like Bronson, took his job personally. He filled 14 pages with the facts of the case. On page 15 he came to "Little Thunder and his boy Ellis." On his first examination of Ellis the agency doctor reported his emaciation, with "affection of the knee joints of some seven months standing": his knees were locked. "Great Caesar's Ghost!" wrote Roe Cloud. "What was he and the Superintendent doing during these seven long months! Had the father become a ten per center [a complainer]? Does the ten per center lose even the claims of humanity?" (NARA, Seattle, 1932). Roe Cloud recounted the "heart rending" tale of the father who searched unsuccessfully for a job, carrying his son on a pallet in the back of his wagon. When he reached the clinic, the doctor noted Little Thunder gave his son a "multicolored silk handkerchief and some other worthless stuff" (NARA, Seattle, 1932). Roe Cloud's comment devastates:

> We who are Indians have all passed through the "silk handkerchief" stage. There was a time when a silk handkerchief meant more to us than anything in the world. This father found he could not do any more for the body so wracked with disease, but he could do something for the spirit, the immortal part of us, to build up, if he could, in the fast closing days, the morale of his son by giving to him what he knew he most desired. Let me say to you that in like manner, to my own dying little son, I gave a pretty pair of moccasins. He fondled them for a little while for only one day, and left me the next day. What father in this world will not do anything, give all he has of wordly goods if only to save his son?
>
> (NARA, Seattle, 1932)

A few paragraphs later, Roe Cloud closed:

> I have many faults, and these worry me often, but I have not yet proved traitor to the cause of our great government for the amelioration, justice and civilization of our Indian people.
>
> (NARA, Seattle, 1932)

Decades later, Roe Cloud's emotion explodes from the archive. We cannot hope to understand this episode absent the context of grief over his son, but it would be equally impoverishing to lift the "emotional" content of this letter out of the context of Roe Cloud's commitment – among "we who are Indians" – to his work

and the work "of our great government." Roe Cloud's emotion interlaced with commitment to family, community, and Indian peoples; his professional pride; his self-identification as Winnebago; and his loyalty in 1932 to an Indian Office where he believed justice might be possible.

Searching for relationships among thinking, feeling, and doing while reading the two letters together makes more visible the key importance of doing, of day-to-day, year-to-year striving to effect change. Bronson and Roe Cloud believed in what they were *doing*.

Doing

When working from archives, what documents should we leave on the shelf? In a provocatively brief article, Laura Terrance shared two stories of "resistance to colonial education": the anonymous autograph journal of "a young woman who attended a residential boarding school in the early twentieth century" (Terrance 2011: 621), and Zitkala-Ša's published autobiographical account of her schooling (Zitkala-Ša 2003). Terrance refused to use the journal because it was produced within the boarding school, an examplar colonial "state apparatus" that disciplined and denigrated Indian people (Terrance 2011: 622). Terrance admitted the journal's seductions, though:

> I projected my interpretation-as-meaning into each of the entries, gradually coming to feel like I "knew" these students. I came to like them, to respect them, to feel a connectedness to them.
>
> (2011: 622)

Resisting the feeling of "connectedness" and questioning "methodologies of knowledge production," Terrance implemented an archival version of Audra Simpson's ethnographic refusal (2007).

Terrance questioned if archival sources should be used when the author did not make a conscious effort to publish. Her archival refusal resonates through Indigenous Studies; much of our evidence is unpublished, and ethical and moral research issues pervade the field. Archives (like boarding schools) nest like Russian dolls within layers of colonial state apparatuses that have silenced countless Native people who never heard of or negotiated the publishing opportunities pursued by Zitkala-Ša. Hundreds of thousands of archived documents are saturated with Indian voices. They were in some sense "published" – in federal superintendents' annual reports or independent investigative committee transcripts, for example – but not usually with Indian intent or consent. Indian-authored letters to superintendents, field inspectors, commissioners of Indian Affairs, and elected officials were stored without Indian intent or consent.

Do we refuse them all? Is the resultant silence colonial, or anti-colonial, or just a can of worms bouncing down a slippery slope? Archival refusal may not be appropriate for all sources, but it raises demanding questions: What and where are our archives? Whom and what might we refuse, and why? Where do we owe

affection, respect, connectedness, and responsibility for scholarly diligence? How do we conscientiously carry out those responsibilities?

Thinking–feeling–doing: a principle of relativity

"Come home now!" A Yavapai perspective on history

Maurice Crandall (Yavapai-Apache Nation of Clarkdale, Arizona) visited the Newberry Library in Chicago, which holds the papers of Carlos Montezuma, early twentieth-century Yavapai physician and Red Progressive. Crandall thought biographers had done Montezuma justice, but reading the papers convinced him that a Yavapai perspective could yield "an alternate narrative" of Montezuma's life (Crandall 2013: 2). Crandall pushes beyond the trope that Montezuma "reconnected" with Yavapai late in life; Montezuma "actively searched for his family from a young age," and most importantly, his relatives never forgot him (2013: 2). Crandall's story exemplifies the principle of relativity, pursuing relationships among thinking, feeling, and doing: an intellectual's search for new meaning in a well-combed archive, the affections binding families, and the historian's responsibility to represent Montezuma's life enmeshed in horrific violence. The result is a rebalanced narrative. Crandall puts Montezuma's 1871 capture and enslavement at the centre of his life story, and importantly, recognizes what Montezuma *does* for the Yavapai-Apache Nation today:

> Carlos Montezuma connects us to an ephemeral past, one that was full of horror and violence, and one from which a young boy eventually returned, showing us that we can always go home.
>
> (2013: 12)

Hearing voices: relationships with Abalone

Abalone Tales, co-produced by ten authors and the Cultural Committee of the Yurok Tribe, is sub-titled *Collaborative Explorations of Sovereignty and Identity in Native California* (Field et al. 2008). *Tales* respectfully elucidates Native relationships with Abalone herself. Possessed of lustrous beauty, reflecting (fire) light, Abalone also speaks. When regalia enlivened with Abalone is danced in ceremony, movement enables Abalone's voice. Intellect and emotion connect Abalone, regalia, dancers, artists, community, and all who hear Abalone's voice as Native Californians come together to fix the world, the ultimate *doing* for others. Mind, heart, and hands pull together.

> I kind of picture the regalia as children, because it's my responsibility to house them, to make sure they're maintained … And then it's my responsibility to run that regalia all over, wherever the dances are going on … it's my responsibility to make sure it gets to that place … It's a life, it's a spirit, it's a living being, and we don't own other living beings … But in the process of, I

> guess you could say, giving birth to the regalia, all of my emotions, all of my feelings – my essence, in short – is going in to create that piece of regalia. Bradley Marshall.
>
> (Field et al. 2008: 124)

Connections clicked: relativity in the classroom

Fall semester, 2013: Twice a week, 250 students enrolled in *Many Nations of Native America* met for 50 minutes in a big square classroom. We began in late August. On December 2, I tried to represent the genocide of Native Californians in the Gold Rush era. Two days later this email arrived:

> Professor Lomawaima,
>
> After class on Monday, I felt the topic we discussed was still bothering me. I sat and talked with my mom … and we both felt very disturbed by it … Personally, I have had a hard time feeling connected and concerned with the many topics we have discussed … I know they are important, but I have unfortunately found myself asking why does it matter so much, why is it so important to them? After Monday's lesson, I knew. As my mind wandered after class, connections with so many past lessons clicked and I felt like I really cared about what had happened … Just a little feedback, I hope it helps in some way.
>
> Best,
> Student

This student thought things over; talked things over with Mom; made connections; and let me know. The student thought, and felt, and did. The doing made the lesson real. Why did the connections click for this one student? I will never know, but I hope that 14 weeks of effort to attest to relationships helped: among thinking–feeling–doing; among diverse sets of US citizens; among past, present, and future Native experiences; among faculty, TAs, and students. On December 2, 2013, the principle of relativity made a difference and the connections clicked.

Conclusion: What is at stake in doing Indigenous history?

In *Indians in Unexpected Places*, Philip Deloria (2004) roots his work in time spent with his grandparents.

> The memories and emotions contained in those encounters led me to start thinking more seriously about Indian athletes and drivers and about the inclination within American culture to insist on the separation of categories like *Indian*, *sports*, *automobiles*, and *New York*.
>
> (2004: ix)

Memories and emotions are powerful engines, as is the courage of Deloria's choice of his first chapter's title and topic: violence. In 1903 on Lightning Creek, within steps of the gates in the fence marking the Pine Ridge reservation, shots rang out. Deloria tells a powerful story about the violence that enveloped Peter White Elk, Hope Clear, Charlie Smith, and their relatives and friends. Violence has defined too much Indigenous history, taken too many Indigenous lives, and scarred too many survivors.

Terrance refused the archive because of the violence embodied by the boarding school where the journal was written. Connelly criticized the violence done to a people whom she called "broken," while Bronson protested the violence done by Connelly to *her* people (and herself), whom she knew to be alive and kicking, and working for a better chance. Roe Cloud bitterly decried the violence of rampant unemployment, malnutrition, substandard health care, and bureaucratic disregard for the humanity of the so-called ten-percenters in Indian Country. My student grappled to assimilate all that violence students have never heard of that contradicts almost everything they have been taught their entire lives to be true about the United States.

Violence is a noxious miasma that motivates and chokes, inspires and shrouds *doing* Indigenous history. How do we *do* violence justice? What a thought. The keenest writers and thinkers – Will Rogers, Vine Deloria, Jr., Paul Chaat Smith, Thomas King – disembowel the monster of violence with a weapon of fiercely sardonic humor. Humor is not necessarily disrespectful of tragedy; laughter can be a medicinal thread that stitches together thinking, feeling, and doing. Laughter fixes the world, even as we struggle with violence.

References

Cahill, C.D. 2011. *Federal Fathers and Mothers: A Social History of the United States Indian Service, 1869–1933*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Crandall, M. 2013. "Wassaja comes home: A Yavapai perspective on Carlos Montezuma's search for identity". *The Journal of Arizona History*, 54(1): 1–26.

Deloria, P.J. 2004. *Indians in Unexpected Places*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Deloria, V., Jr. 1999. "Relativity, relatedness, and reality". In B. Deloria, K. Foehner, and S. Scinta, eds. *Spirit and Reason: The Vine Deloria, Jr. Reader*. Golden: Fulcrum Publishing, pp. 32–39.

Field, L.W., C. Seidner, J. Lang, R. Cambra, F. Silva, V. Hailstone, D. Marshall, B. Marshall, C. Lara, M. George, Sr., and the Cultural Committee of the Yurok Tribe. 2008. *Abalone Tales: Collaborative Explorations of Sovereignty and Identity in Native California*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hurtado, A.L., ed.. 2008. *Reflections on American Indian History: Honoring the Past, Building a Future*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

King, T. 2003. *The Truth about Stories: A Native Narrative*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

King, T. 2013. *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Meriam, L., R.A. Brown, H.R. Cloud, E.E. Dale, E. Duke, H.R. Edwards, F.A. McKenzie, M.L. Mark, W.C. Ryan, Jr., and W.J. Spillman. 1928. *The Problem of Indian*

Administration. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press for the Institute for Government Research.

National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Kansas City, Kansas. 1929. "Charges against Indian service in 'Good Housekeeping' 1929". Record Group 75. Haskell Indian School Records. Box 32. Decimal Correspondence File, 1917–1959. Folder 3.

National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Seattle, Washington. 1932. March 10, 1932 Henry Roe Cloud to Charles Brooks. Record Group 75. Rosebud Agency Records, Box 14.

Simpson, A. 2007. "On ethnographic refusal: Indigeneity, 'voice,' and colonial citizenship". *Junctures*, 9: 67–80.

Terrance, L.L. 2011. "Resisting colonial education: Zitkala-Sa and Native feminist archival refusal". *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 24(5): 621–626.

Zitkala-Ša. 2003. "The school days of an Indian girl". In her *American Indian Stories, Legends, and other Writings*. New York: Penguin Books, pp. 87–103.

7 Relationality

A key presupposition of an Indigenous social research paradigm

Aileen Moreton-Robinson

As an expression of Indigenous sovereignty most Indigenous researchers adhere to a research agenda informed by our respective cultural knowledges, ethics and protocols. In operationalizing this agenda we are creating a new social research paradigm requiring rigorous and heavy intellectual work. Over the past three decades Indigenous scholars have built this paradigm, and our efforts have drawn attention. Usually this takes the form of a question: If there is an Indigenous social research paradigm, what are its core components? An interesting question given that there are competing definitions of what constitutes a non-Indigenous paradigm, and some argue it is the very nature of a paradigm to avoid the specificities of definition, while others tacitly agree that core components are evidenced by the standards that shape how research is operationalized within the social sciences and humanities. In this chapter I do not define the general laws, standards and methodological principles of an Indigenous social research paradigm. Instead, my aim is to demonstrate a key presupposition of the paradigm: Relationality is the interpretive and epistemic scaffolding shaping and supporting Indigenous social research and its standards are culturally specific and nuanced to the Indigenous researcher's standpoint and the cultural context of the research. This presupposition is revealed through an examination of Indigenous research methodologies literature produced in Canada, the United States, Hawaii, Australia and New Zealand.

I acknowledge that the United Nations has defined 'Indigenous' as including those who self-identify as Indigenous peoples at the individual level and are accepted by the community as its members; have a historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies; have a strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources; have distinct social, economic or political systems; have distinct language, culture and beliefs; form non-dominant groups in society; and resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities (UNPFII 2015). Māori, Métis, First Nations, Native Americans and Aborigines all share these attributes with other Indigenous peoples. However, our lands are occupied by first-world Western states on the basis of an alien form of judicial sovereignty and a shared genealogy of predominantly British colonization. Our legal status, marked respectively by the signifiers Native American, Māori, First Nation, Métis, Native Hawaiian and Aborigine, is not