

to share these pieces with the institutions that housed them in the interlude. In addition, Clifford discusses Native Alutiiq/Sugpiag groups who contemporaneously reconcile, redefine, and reinterpret their Alaskan identities in the era after the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA)—an act that created for-profit corporations to settle the largest indigenous land claims in US history. Clifford focuses on the newly defined concept of heritage projects, which, given that corporations like Exxon Mobil and Wells Fargo sponsor these heritage projects, are aligned with hegemonic forces of globalization. However, Clifford contends that such projects can never be fully encapsulated by, or reduced to, these dominant forms of power. Clifford places this complex condition of “within and against” in conversation with twin theoretical structures of interpellation and articulation. Clifford argues that the interpellative power of officially sanctioned multiculturalism flattens and spatially fixes indigenous histories, and manages indigenous political agency. Alternatively, articulation “keeps us attuned to historical processes of connection and disconnection, making space for a performative politics. Tactical, relational forms of agency are emphasized” (303). For Clifford, therefore, ANCSA forms an important and significant part of Alaska Native identity, but nonetheless only one part.

While Clifford acknowledges the historical agency of Alaska Native groups, his discussion portrays ANCSA as less ominous, powerful, and influential than perhaps “historically real” (86). Clifford’s unwavering focus on the rearticulation of indigenous identities and quasi-utopian collaborative heritage projects tends to obscure violent colonial histories and capitalistic forces that shape indigenous politics. A more thorough examination of the totalizing capacity of ANCSA would have bolstered his discussion of interpellation and articulation in the case of Alaska Native experience. The overwhelming attention devoted to articulation theory averts needed consideration of the inequities that stem from ANCSA, such as class stratification, corporate embezzlement, and ecological degradation. Nonetheless, Clifford’s collection offers new and repeated interventions into examining the contemporary politics of indigeneity. His self-reflexive engagement offers a generative example of acknowledging and reconciling the positionality of the researcher and the researched. Furthermore, Clifford’s reflection on the cultural renewal through performance and translation in post-ANCSA moments, along with his privileging of the geopolitical Native Pacific, offer meaningful insight into an under-investigated part of an important and relevant history.

*Jennifer R. Smith*

University of California, Berkeley

**Seasons of Change: Labor, Treaty Rights, and Ojibwe Nationhood.** By Chantal Norrgard. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014. 216 pages. \$29.95 paper; \$28.99 electronic.

The seasonal pattern of resource use among the Ojibwe or Anishinaabeg of the western Great Lakes is a cherished set of traditions bound up with their cultural existence. The great value of Chantal Norrgard’s fine new work is that it looks through the lens of labor

history to provide the continuing story of change within these important traditional activities. The Ojibwe people were crucial to the development of the European fur trade, which relied on a reciprocal process of exchange that owed a great deal to Ojibwe beliefs and practices. Ojibwe people participated in many ways, not just in producing furs to be traded for European merchandise, but in supplying traders with food such as game, fish, berries, maple sugar, and wild rice, as well as canoes and containers of bark and skin. Without them the fur trade would never have thrived in the Great Lakes. That history has been examined in many works from many economic points of view, but what happened after the fur trade has yet to be considered fully. This book helps to fill the gap.

This process changed with the onset of American colonization in the western Great Lakes, through treaty-making, lumbering, and settlement. In a series of treaties beginning mainly after the War of 1812, Ojibwe people began to receive cash for their land, and were soon engaged in transactions with storekeepers and others who bought their produce and sold them trade goods. Thus traditional hunting, fishing, and gathering were now connected to new trade or cash business with new economic agents. Among other activities, Ojibwes supplied food for loggers, and worked for logging companies as guides, hunters, and drivers of logs, work that made use of the traditional Ojibwe skills in surviving and navigating the woods, lakes, and rivers of their native country. The activities of lumber companies were facilitated by the continuing presence of the Ojibwe people in the region. The Ojibwe people retained particular rights in a series of treaties signed in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota territories—such as the St. Peters treaty of 1837, and La Pointe treaties of 1842 and 1854. US government treaty negotiators, who found Ojibwe people unwilling to leave their homelands, agreed to what Ojibwe leaders demanded: the reservation of usufructuary rights for the continuing subsistence of the people in the ceded territories.

As increasing numbers of Europeans moved into the new states of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, Ojibwes and other Native peoples supplied game, fish, wild rice, maple sugar, and berries to the food markets of new central towns like Detroit, Milwaukee, and St. Paul, as well as many smaller regional centers. In some cases companies began to export these Native-harvested foods beyond local markets to larger cities in the East and South via steamboats and new railroad lines. In these early years of European colonization and settlement, continuation of Native usufructuary activities was seen as compatible with the presence of white settlers.

This changed when settlers and a new breed of white hunters and fishers known as “sportsmen” began to see themselves as competitors for the seasonal wild foods, particularly game and fish. The ethic of sportsmanship cultivated by upper and middle-class whites saw hunting and fishing strictly as sport; pursuing game and fish for food was to be avoided. While the first efforts to regulate hunting and fishing focused on commercial hunting and fishing—especially the shipping of game and fish to metropolitan centers in the East—later laws targeted anyone who hunted for their own subsistence. The ethic of sportsmanship lay behind increasing efforts on the part of Midwestern state legislatures in the late-nineteenth century to limit the actions of Native hunters and fishers, as well as some European immigrants such as Finns and Italians, who also were perceived as “pot-hunters.”

Norrgard points out that this regulation of hunting and fishing represents an early example of the government interventions in the economy which characterized the progressive era of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. This intervention also corresponds with the beginning of tourism on northern lakes. In their oral traditions Ojibwe peoples retained knowledge of the hunting and fishing rights they had reserved in the ceded territory decades before; government officials, on the other hand, retained little knowledge of those treaties, if they ever had any, and refused to admit such treaty rights could remain. As the author recounts, the willful ignorance or amnesia of state and federal officials about Ojibwe treaty rights at the time provides a backdrop to effective advocacy for treaty rights in the late-twentieth century—also a time when, like their ancestors, many whites did not know, could not remember, or refused to believe that any reserved treaty rights existed. Finally court rulings supporting the continuing existence of treaty rights provided a definitive response to these objections, as in the *Voigt* case in Wisconsin and the *Mille Lacs* case in Minnesota, though they did nothing to repair the earlier damage to Native peoples who were prosecuted for carrying out their traditional seasonal round.

In the end, treaty rights to hunt, fish, and gather—defined first in the Ojibwe traditions, reserved in a series of treaties, and later attacked by settlers and settler governments—have helped to illustrate, define, and motivate Ojibwe sovereignty in the Great Lakes region. As Norrgard puts it, “Hunting, fishing, and to a lesser extent, gathering, were the primary means through which Ojibwes articulated and exercised their sovereignty in defiance of state laws” (134). In carrying out traditional seasonal activities, Ojibwe people challenge colonization, asserting the power of their own culture over the disintegrating effect of an otherwise devastating process. Norrgard concludes, “It was through their struggles to challenge colonialism on their own economic terms that Ojibwes have become the resilient and vibrant people that they are today” (135). That the Ojibwe people so stubbornly maintained the usufructuary rights that were ultimately recognized by federal courts means the importance that these seasonal activities carry—helping to define the relationships of the Ojibwe people to their own traditions, to each other, and to the settler world that sought to colonize or destroy them—can only continue.

*Bruce White*

Turnstone Historical Research, St. Paul, Minnesota

**Secrecy and Insurgency: Socialities and Knowledge Practices in Guatemala.** By Silvia Posocco. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2014. 272 pages. \$49.95 cloth; \$49.95 electronic.

Given the plethora of scholarship on Guatemala’s civil war (1960–1996) from anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, historians, and other scholars, few aspects of it remain unstudied. Yet while the military has received much scholarly attention, we know little about the inner workings, perceptions, or day-to-day lives of the