

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Plural Sovereignties and Contemporary Indigenous Literature. By Stuart Christie.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0gx648hz>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 35(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Gercken, Becca

**Publication Date**

2011-06-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

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

that omit the biases of the past. Inclusion of the Anishinaabe language in the discussion opens avenues for viewing the importance of the people, diminishes the colonizing power, and should be incorporated into future research methodology.

Geniusz gives an example of how the decolonization of the *anishinaabe-gikendaasowin* could look, by describing the uses and ceremonies of the white cedar, paper birch, and bearberry. The obvious care with which she treats both sides of her perspective as Anishinaabe and scientist creates a complete view that is at once exact while stimulating what we geographers would call a sense of place. A people create that sense of place with the very fabric of their culture, and in this Geniusz is guiding her own people to delve into and decolonize *anishinaabe-gikendaasowin* at a very personal level.

*Our Knowledge* is an important book, for it not only teases out the subtleties of colonization from a unique perspective but also engages the reader in the larger discourse of how we interpret cultural landscapes once the culture has been colonized. Further still, it challenges researchers to move forward in a way that retains the movement within both cultures while involving all in equal respect, and invites us to view Biskaabiiyang as a co-methodology with the scientific method to widen not only our research view but also our worldview.

Lisa B. Chaddock

San Diego City College/Cuyamaca College

**Plural Sovereignties and Contemporary Indigenous Literature.** By Stuart Christie. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009. 296 pages. \$95.00 cloth.

Sovereignty has been the watchword in indigenous criticism for more than a decade, with “nationalist” critics such as Robert Warrior, Jace Weaver, and Craig Womack calling for a methodology grounded in the local, contending that “literary separatism”—criticism situated in tribally specific cosmologies and epistemologies—produces readings that work in support of indigenous sovereignty. In *Plural Sovereignties and Contemporary Indigenous Literature*, Stuart Christie argues that “contemporary indigenous sovereignty [Canadian and American] has become effectively pluralized” and that contemporary indigenous literature “documents” this plural sovereignty (1). With this claim, Christie expands the critical conversation beyond nation-based readings and creates a theoretical construct that allows room for the local and the national, for pre- and postcolonial constructs of Native sovereignty. Christie is careful to situate himself in the ongoing critical debate through a clear articulation of his terms and methodology, no easy task given his nuanced and multivalent

rendering of sovereignty. More important—and more useful to scholars frustrated by the divisive schools of criticism that have of late dominated Native literary studies—is his persuasive claim that a methodology grounded in plural sovereignties offers readers a bridge between materialist and constructivist readings, between nationalist and hybrid understandings of texts. In his recognition of “a multilateral sovereignty read across disparate national narratives” and the “increasing plurality of sovereign experiences within individual tribes and bands” (5–6), Christie generally succeeds in his hope of creating a “third road” between materialist and constructivist understandings of indigenous sovereignty (5). This book, appropriate for advanced indigenous literature courses, offers a useful overview of and a valuable counterpoint to the current state of indigenous literary criticism.

The book is comprised of close readings of novels by now canonical authors including James Welch, Louise Erdrich, Leslie Marmon Silko, and Thomas King, as well as lesser-known authors such as A. A. Carr and Jeannette Armstrong. Christie begins with an astute analysis of the Jay Treaty of 1794 and the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, establishing his definition of plural sovereignties through these legislative acts that, he argues, imposed a foreign notion of sovereignty on Native communities while marking the legal initiation of plural sovereignties as indigenous people freely crossed the literal boundary of the 49th parallel and the imaginary boundary of tribal/band citizenship and national citizenship. Each chapter focuses on a specific aspect of real and imagined (literary) sovereignties—blood identity, captivity narratives, gaming, and capitalism—as it is represented in contemporary Native fiction.

Christie’s strongest arguments can be found in his analysis of Welch’s *The Heartsong of Charging Elk* (2001) and Silko’s *Gardens in the Dunes* (2000), which he characterizes as “indigenous captivity narratives,” as well as Armstrong’s *Slash* (2007), which in its play of language—English and Okanagan—documents plural sovereignties through a resistance to settler-colonial narratives (73). It is Christie’s range of analysis that is especially impressive here as he details the literary movements, languages, and histories—indigenous and settler-colonial—that construct the plural sovereignties of these texts. Christie’s treatments of King’s *Medicine River* (2006) and *Green Grass, Running Water* (1994) are equally persuasive, as is Christie’s assertion that King’s writing, in its critique of existing representations of indigenous and Anglo-European nationalized subjects, exemplifies the definition of plural sovereignties. By focusing on King’s constant play with boundaries, literal and metaphoric, as well as his use of real and mythic time, Christie aptly demonstrates that King’s novels bridge the polarizing impulses of essentialist versus constructivist renderings of Native peoples and their sovereignties.

Christie's readings of Erdrich's *The Bingo Palace* (2006) and Louis Owen's *Dark River* (2000), while engaging, do not offer the compelling interpretation of plural sovereignties found in other chapters. The analysis often seems removed from the notion of plural sovereignties, a term that, in these readings, also lacks the focus and definition found in Christie's study of Silko, Welch, Armstrong, and King. Christie's readings are at their best when they provide a clear and consistent understanding of plural sovereignties and a balance between the literary and the real, the local and the national.

Although Christie's text generally adheres to his self-proclaimed desire for a theoretical middle ground, there are moments when his close readings, most notably those of Sherman Alexie's *Indian Killer* (2008) and Gerald Vizenor's *The Heirs of Columbus* (1991), move from literary critique to political criticism. Christie is so invested in the idea that plural sovereignties are a solution to literary and actual indigenous ills that he faults texts that do not offer a positive or locally informed rendering of plural sovereignty. He decries the postmodern schizophrenia of Alexie's text and his protagonist as rendering plural sovereignty "monstrous" and claims that Vizenor's text, in its lack of overt reference to the Lummi Point Roberts struggle that inspired *The Heirs of Columbus'* Point Assinika, "unwittingly silence[s] . . . indigenous survivance" (42, 114). Both critiques privilege the local and the real and thus undermine the theoretical premise of plural sovereignties, which Christie insists makes space for the local and the national, imagined sovereignty and real sovereignty. In short, with these readings, he argues for the same limitations of indigenous expression that a plural sovereignties reading strategy is designed to eliminate.

Overall, however, *Plural Sovereignties* provides insightful and innovative readings and is thus a valuable resource for understanding Native literature and the sovereignties they embody and create. Christie begins and ends his book with a statement about his place as a "nonsovereign sovereigntist," and with his humble remarks about his "status" in the nation of literary scholars, he invites readers to create a more inclusive scholarly community that allows for a plurality of texts, theoretical paradigms, and identities. With *Plural Sovereignties and Contemporary Indigenous Literature*, Christie offers scholars of Native literatures a fruitful and compelling middle ground in the understanding of sovereignty—literary and real—and, most importantly, literary as real.

Becca Gercken

University of Minnesota–Morris