UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations. By Kevin Bruyneel.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/003449gn

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 33(2)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Martinez, David

Publication Date
2009-03-01

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

without a working familiarity with Native American contemporary and traditional literatures may find the accretive structure of his argument, coupled with the broad range of material being navigated, to be daunting.

The strength of the critical apparatus that shapes this volume is in some ways at odds with the theoretical position set out in the opening chapter, "Native Dialectics." In introducing his own methods, Lincoln takes the opportunity to revisit his criticisms of Craig Womack's *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism* (1999) and, more broadly, the approach taken by critics in the school of American Indian literary nationalism, who seek to position tribal literatures in terms of the political and cultural work that they perform for their specific tribal nations (bands, tribes, groups). Lincoln reads this quite narrowly, focusing on several early examples and extrapolating from that small sample. In so doing, his argument reduces "nationalism" to "separatism" and, by extension, essentialism. I am entirely sympathetic with Lincoln's argument that isolationist and exclusionist practices are not only impractical, but also harmful to both self and other. Despite the separatism alluded to in the (editorially suggested) subtitle of *Red on Red*, my understanding of American Indian literary nationalism is that it offers a viable and necessary approach, not the definitive approach. Likewise, it appears to me that Lincoln's attention to historical and cultural specificity as well as his emphasis on the poet as someone who shapes rather than simply reflects his or her given traditions, provides *a*—not *the*—most useful way to approach these classics of Native American literature.

Laura Adams Weaver
University of Georgia

The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations. By Kevin Bruyneel. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. 313 pages. $67.50 cloth; $22.50 paper.

In addition to historical efforts at fending off colonial expansionism, American Indians have fought against racism, segregation, assimilation, and an oppressive reservation system run by an authoritarian Indian Bureau. Bruyneel states in his introduction that "the claim of *The Third Space of Sovereignty* is that the imposition of American colonial rule and the indigenous struggle against it constitute a conflict over boundaries, a conflict that has defined U.S.-indigenous relations since the time of the American Civil War" (xvii). These are not only physical boundaries demarcating territories but also political boundaries, as indigenous nations have wrestled with the implications of Chief Justice John Marshall defining them as "domestic dependent nations" in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831), and temporal boundaries, as indigenous peoples have been hampered with assumptions that they are only a part of the past and that who they "really are" is limited to romanticized historical images.

When indigenous people challenge the limits of these boundaries, either individually by defying stereotypes or collectively as organizations and activists

groups demanding their rights, they are often met with outrage and hostility from incredulous non-Indians who cannot understand why these Indians simply will not "stay in their place." "This resistance," Bruyneel explains, "engenders what I call a 'third space of sovereignty' that resides neither simply inside nor outside the American political system but rather exists on these very boundaries, exposing both the practices and the contingencies of American colonial rule. This is a supplemental space, inassimilable to the institutions and discourse of the modern liberal democratic settler-state and nation" (xvii).

Although Bruyneel resists the temptation of labeling indigenous nations and the Indian situation as *liminal*—a favorite term in postmodernist analyses—he instead uses the curious alternative of *postcolonial* to describe what he is talking about. How can Indian nations be colonized and postcolonial at the same time? Bruyneel explains that there two reasons for making this designation: "First, it historically demarcates and defines the beginning of the modern era in U.S.-indigenous relations," as established by Grant's Peace Policy, which worked on the premise that indigenous nations were no longer a "military" problem per se but a domestic or internal affairs issue (xvii). Conquest was presumed to be by and large complete, and in its place would be the process of assimilating the conquered into a nonthreatening segment of the settler community, namely, the reservation system. The process of assimilation, however, neither went smoothly nor did it ever accomplish its goal of completely breaking up the tribal mass and sweeping the fragments of tribal society into the American mainstream. Between bureaucratic incompetence and corruption on the part of the Indian Bureau, on the one hand, and Native resistance, on the other, indigenous nations remained as irrepressible parts of the American settler nation. Reservations ironically became enclaves of cultural resistance against assimilation. As such, as Bruyneel writes, "The second reason for my emphasis on postcoloniality is that work in the field of postcolonial criticism is very helpful, and uniquely so, in the effort to uncover and theorize the active cultural and political life occurring in the interstitial, in-between, neither-nor locations that we commonly refer to as boundaries" (xviii).

The Third Space of Sovereignty treads through familiar but necessary historical territory, beginning with the Cherokee struggle against forced removal and the Marshall decisions that resulted from it during the early 1830s. Following is an analysis of the 1871 decision to end treaty making, thereby ushering in a completely new stage of westward expansion and colonialism. The era that the 1871 decision inaugurated then culminates, in Bruyneel's analysis, with the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924, conferring universal, albeit not universally desired, citizenship on all Indians residing within the continental United States. In turn, after World War II, Indian activism begins to shape the discourse on sovereignty, as assimilation, despite John Collier, turns into termination, and figures such as Vine Deloria Jr. begin an intellectually aggressive campaign for self-determination for indigenous nations. As self-determination turned into cultural revitalization, a renewed demand for treaty rights, and economic development, indigenous nations

were compelled to deal with the ramifications of a new stereotype, the "casino Indian" or "casino tribe."

In an era defined by multiculturalism and political correctness, part of the backlash that erupted during the "culture wars" included white society—white males in particular—portraying themselves as "victims," especially of reverse racism. Thus, when Arnold Schwarzenegger ran for California governor in 2003, he successfully exploited a popular notion that the state's casino tribes had become a threat to the political and economic well-being of the most populated state in the union. "By 2003," Bruyneel observes, "indigenous tribes had come to be seen by many Californians as having gone too far. By this time, tribes were portrayed as the unfair colonizers of the state because they had gone so far, so fast, as to outpace the historical bounds of their sovereignty, thereby transforming themselves into special interests instead of sovereign entities" (179). Schwarzenegger convinced Californians of the notion that the casino tribes ought to pay their fair share, meaning a deep cut into tribal revenue, irrespective of their status as sovereign nations. Bruyneel then concludes with a brief but important look at the political consequences of the Oneida Nation's gaming operations in upstate New York.

In the end, Bruyneel does an excellent job at articulating the complexities behind political entities, that is, indigenous nations, which simultaneously describe themselves as "colonized," yet are also building upon the self-determination won after more than a generation of Indian activism, which covered a gamut of issues, everything from fishing rights and education to child welfare, religious freedom, and Vegas-style gaming. What I appreciate most about *The Third Space of Sovereignty* is the manner in which he honors the American Indian intellectual tradition by citing several authors and community leaders, giving them credit for generating their own ideas and opinions. The latter was particularly evident in chapters 4 and 5, in which Progressive Era thinkers such as Charles Eastman, Carlos Montezuma, and Clinton Rickard were featured, not to mention Red Power activists such as Vine Deloria Jr. Bruyneel also makes a compelling argument for rethinking the sovereignty of indigenous nations in light of the legal and political developments of the past four decades, which, although they may still be haunted by nineteenth-century federal Indian law and policy, have nonetheless reaped many benefits from generations of activism and reform.

At the same time, it is doubtful—Bruyneel's references to decolonization thinkers like Taiaiake Alfred notwithstanding—that *postcolonial* will be adopted by others in American Indian studies as the term defining either the current era or the era since the American Civil War. Bruyneel needs to find a term more appropriate to how indigenous nations describe their ongoing relationship with the US federal government, which, when one looks at the literature on indigenous cultures, histories, and politics, consistently speaks of "colonialism." Having said this, an unexpected result of Bruyneel's analysis is the realization that, although decolonization has only been a part of indigenous academic circles since *Decolonizing Methodologies* by Linda Tuhiwai Smith and *Peace, Power, Righteousness* by Taiaiake Alfred came out in 1999, decolonization as an idea has been around since the end of World War II, when European empires, including

the British, began to crumble, as so-called Third World nations from South America to Africa and Asia fought for their independence.

What indigenous thinkers from Deloria to Smith and Alfred have made clear is that there are different levels to decolonization. Although nation-states around the world from Peru to India may be liberated from the European powers that once dominated them, in each of these nation-states are smaller tribal groups, which are in a colonial relationship between themselves and the respective nation-states that engulf them. Certainly, indigenous nations throughout the United States and Canada are in such a relationship with the American and Canadian federal governments. So the question now is how do indigenous nations decolonize themselves from their respective nation-states? Obviously, there is no clear and easy answer to this question. In which case, perhaps, it is already time to ask another question: What lies beyond decolonization? Bruyneel adds something to this burgeoning discussion.

David Martínez
Arizona State University

From Warriors to Soldiers: The History of Native American Service in the United States Military. By Gary Robinson and Phil Lucas. 144 pages. New York: iUniverse, 2008. $24.95 cloth; $14.95 paper.

The material for this work was originally researched in the 1990s as a prelude to creating a television documentary, but funding to produce the film series could not be obtained at the time. Upon the death of his coauthor in 2007, Gary Robinson decided to publish the research in book format. This research provides an abbreviated and chronological representation of American military service from early British/American conflicts through Operation Enduring Freedom. The book is divided into four sections and includes supplementary information in the appendices. Unfortunately, the work is far too ambitious to cover the history of Native warfare in any detail, and, as such, it promises more than it delivers. That said, however, its primary weakness is in its attempted scope, not in its goal to provide a summary of Native military involvement; the authors have been successful in this effort. The material simply would better serve as a film documentary, and it is a shame that it was not funded in its original format.

An important theme of the book is the continuity of commitment of the Native warrior (and later, serviceman) in the face of conflict. As Robinson notes, the reasons that Native men and women chose to serve are complex. Early on, they chose to fight in order to protect their land, families, and sovereignty, but such motivation is not so far removed even in contemporary wars. Motivation for military service is not always linked to patriotism; some veterans interviewed by Robinson and Lucas state that they were drawn to service because it was their "turn" to serve. This sentiment agrees with that found by other researchers. Although many Native veterans of World War II cite patriotism as a reason of service, in general, most Indian veterans will