

bureaucrats, work that addresses this topic head-on is important. Kessler-Mata's work not only addresses the current understanding of sovereignty, but also provides an alternate framework to consider and discuss moving forward. While anyone interested in the subject of tribal sovereignty will benefit from reading this book, those that are frustrated with the current state and progress of tribal sovereignty and freedom will find this book especially interesting.

Christopher M. Page  
Portland State University

**As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance.** By Leanne Betasamosake Simpson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017. 312 pages. \$24.95 cloth; electronic editions also available.

I first read the work of Nishnaabeg scholar, activist, and artist Leanne Betasamosake Simpson about a decade ago. I felt as though she had written to me in the same way that Simpson describes reading Lee Maracle's *I Am Woman* (2003): "She just spoke her truth, without apologies" (33). Throughout the years I have continued to seek her work for insight, solace, and strength. Her latest book, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*, feels like a good long visit in which Simpson has generously shared her honesty, fortitude, and love.

The opening scene captures much of the brilliance woven throughout the book. Simpson is home, in Nishnaabeg territory, in an area now commonly known as the settler town of Peterborough, Ontario. Her children are there, and Nishnaabeg Elder Doug Williams is there in spirit as Simpson recalls something he once told her. All at once, this first passage is full of the spatiotemporality, everydayness, and intimate relations that are indigenous intelligence and radical resurgence. Her relationship with Williams, she later shares, has taught her more than any other about what it means to be a Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg.

While Simpson has long theorized about indigenous resurgence, she deliberately uses *radical* resurgence in this book to differentiate between the kind of resurgence that settler colonialism creates and the thorough and comprehensive resurgence that indigenous peoples have always lived. She contends that in a reconciliatory era, resurgence has been co-opted by recovery-based narratives in which colonialism is relegated to past wrongs and trauma from which indigenous peoples themselves become individually responsible to heal. Meanwhile, as the settler state and citizens embrace depoliticized forms of cultural revitalization in a celebration of indigenous culture, indigenous lands and peoples continue to be subjected to colonial violence and dispossession. Simpson juxtaposes this settler-colonial version of resurgence—which becomes part of the very fabric of securing settler-colonial hegemony—to what she calls "The Radical Resurgence Project" (34). Simpson is deploying *radical* "to mean root, to channel the vitality of my Ancestors to create a present that is recognizable to them because it is fundamentally different than the one settler colonialism creates"

(48). Radical resurgence is the multiple and comprehensive aspects that make up indigenous life, as it has always been lived and renewed. It is a way of life that is grounded in indigenous intelligence.

Simpson eloquently centers indigenous intelligence, specifically Nishnaabeg intelligence, as she recounts a story, also shared in previous writings, about the time she learned from Anishinaabeg elders from the reserve community of Long Lake #58 in northern Ontario. In this book she returns to this story in order to elucidate the process-oriented nature of Nishnaabeg intelligence, as she reflects on the practice, time, and self-reflection that it took for her to truly see and understand the Nishnaabeg theory she began to learn while being on the land with these brilliant elders. Drawing on the work of Dene scholar Glen Coulthard, Simpson reflects on how her time in Long Lake #58 was her first substantive experience of grounded normativity, which is the process of learning indigenous intelligence by being present in a web of human and non-human relations, and learning and growing from these relations in a reciprocal and accountable way.

As Simpson shares, within her own nation grounded normativity is perhaps best conveyed through the term *Nishnaabewin*, which is “all of the associated practices, knowledge, and ethics that make us Nishnaabeg and construct the Nishnaabeg world” (23). Grounded normativity is intelligence that is literally “generated from the ground up” (28) through land-based practices that bring indigenous peoples into ethical relations with each other and with our non-human relatives. Indigenous peoples embody their intelligence systems by being practitioners of indigenous intelligence. It is these intelligence systems, Simpson says, that make up the radical resurgence that has always existed across diverse and interconnected indigenous landscapes.

Throughout the book, Simpson continues to revisit stories and theories she has once written about with expanded understandings that come with the flux of time, growth, and experience. In this way, the cyclical, ever-growing, and process-oriented nature of Nishnaabeg intelligence is not simply written about, but also becomes part of Simpson’s method. We are not simply told that indigenous intelligence is always in flux and changing. Rather, readers witness this through Simpson’s reflexive practice, even further evoked as this particular book is situated within the span of Simpson’s theoretical and creative works.

More than this, Simpson’s method is firmly grounded in Nishnaabeg intelligence—grounded normativity—as it is lived and felt as *kwe* (a Nishnaabeg woman). She states: “My body and my life are part of my research, and I use this knowledge to critique and analyze” (31). It is from “*kwe* as method generating *kwe* as theorist” (30) that Simpson ruptures the ostensible divide between indigenous lands/waters and indigenous peoples/bodies/lives as she examines how both the dispossession and liberation of indigenous lands/waters is inseparable from bodily sovereignty. It is from “*kwe* as method” that Simpson asserts that radical resurgence cannot exist without the eradication of gendered violence: “Radical resurgence is then about the destruction of the colonial hierarchy that heteropatriarchy embeds in us, our communities, and our nations, and restoring all Indigenous bodies as political orders within our political systems and nationhood” (134).

In chapters 6, 7, and 8, Simpson examines how settler colonialism is a gendered structure of dispossession and violence which disproportionately impacts indigenous women, youth and 2SQ people (she uses the latter as an umbrella term to refer to “all Indigenous Two Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual, transgender, transsexual, queer, questioning, intersex, asexual, and gender-nonconforming people”) (255). She analyzes how gendered hierarchies have been reproduced within indigenous communities through the surveillance and criminalization of gender variance and intimacies, as well as the internalized impacts of this dispossession and violence. Drawing on the work of scholar Alex Wilson (Cree), she then reflects on the gender variance and queerness embedded in indigenous landscapes and languages, and urges readers to critically reflect on how radical resurgence depends not only on the dismantling of heteropatriarchy, but on centering the intelligence and political leadership of indigenous 2SQ peoples which has always been present despite colonial interventions.

Simpson ends the book with a compelling discussion on constellations of co-resistance. She begins by centering Kwagiulth (Kwakwaka’wakw) scholar Sarah Hunt’s theorizing on everyday acts of resurgence and brings this into conversation with Cree scholar Jarrett Martineau’s work on affirmative refusal, fugitivity, and resistant constellations. In addition to Nishnaabeg cosmologies and her own experiences in indigenous community organizing and mobilizing, Simpson draws on this scholarship to reflect on constellations of co-resistance that are/can be lived through collectivizing everyday acts of resurgence within grounded normativity. When she states, “Constellations exist only in the context of relationships; otherwise they are just individual stars” (215), she emphasizes the relationality of constellations at various interconnected scales, ranging from the intimate, to local, to international indigenous relationship-building. Constellations of co-resistance, Simpson states, are relational networks within the larger project of radical resurgence which provide a fugitivity or flight “out of settler colonial realities into Indigeneity” (217). She ends by asking: “Who should we be in constellation with?” (228) to reflect on the constellations of co-resistance that are/can be built across indigenous, black, and other racialized communities.

In a way, the book itself is the result of Simpson’s own constellational framework, as she draws from the brilliance of indigenous elders, youth, women, 2SQ, and artists, some whom are family, mentors, and friends. In addition to the aforementioned intellectuals, readers encounter the brilliance of Nishnaabeg elder Edna Maniowabi, Nishnaabeg artist Rebecca Belmore, Cree scholar and poet Billy-Ray Belcourt, and Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson, as well as a number of black scholars theorizing on radical traditions of liberation and freedom, such as Dionne Brand, Katherine McKittrick, Fred Moten, and her former professor Clarence Mumford. She draws on these individuals’ works by thinking with them (she oftentimes refers to ongoing conversations that influence her), and by simultaneously reflecting on how she comes into relationship with their brilliance based on her own knowledge as a Nishnaabeg woman. In doing so, she encourages indigenous readers (for whom she writes first and foremost) to ground what she is sharing as *kwe*, and to pose questions and build on this dialogue from within our own intelligence systems as they are grounded in our

ancestral lands/waters, bodies and relations. For this, *meegwetch*, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, and for doing as *you* have always done; for generously sharing your brilliance and light, and for inspiring indigenous peoples to live our radical resurgent presents, now and always.

Michelle Daigle

University of British Columbia

**Back to the Blanket: Recovered Rhetorics and Literacies in American Indian Studies.** By Kimberly G. Wieser. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2017. 277 pages. \$39.95 cloth, \$21.95 paper.

In *Back to the Blanket: Recovered Rhetorics and Literacies in American Indian Studies*, Kimberly G. Wieser calls for “Intertribalism as a way to approach American Indian studies from a lens of relatedness” (17). Wieser’s main goal in this book is to point to the various relationships she, readers, and authors have with each other as a way to create readings of Native texts that generate intertribal survivance. In contrast to a Western tradition of “exegesis,” or objective analysis of texts, Wieser proposes a strategy by which such intertribal relationships can be developed: she proposes a Native “eisegesis,” or interpretation of texts from knowledge the reader might already possess and that mirrors oral traditions (xiii). By positioning herself in relationship to the various texts she reads and actively highlighting these relationships throughout the book, Wieser calls for a type of intertribalism that creates a paracolonial state of relating that emphasizes “the condition of the culturally distinctive tribal nations and people who persist alongside mainstream culture despite ongoing colonialism” (197).

By centering intertribal relationships, Wieser points to the ways that “incorporat[ing] Native notions of relatedness, offers us rich possibilities as scholars of Native studies for developing knowledge and arguments grounded in Indigenous structures tied to Indigenous perspective, allowing us to see relatedness and commonality while maintaining tribal specificity and sovereignty” (xii). Wieser thus does not position intertribalism as a means to create a pan-indigenous cohesive grouping or lens by which to analyze all forms of indigenous literature, but rather in various discussions of Native literature demonstrates that textual analyses can approach texts with cultural specificity as well as through an intertribal lens that offers readers a different form of understanding grounded on relatedness, and through intertribal survivance has the potential to advance liberation and decoloniality.

More importantly, the author’s investment in survivance and intertribalism and her call for a different type of reading of Native literature and Native studies texts takes an approach that mirrors the structures of oral traditions and the role of the listener as a cocreator of stories. Here the author is countering author-creators of individualized stories who hold all the power in knowledge-making; Wieser’s discussion of eisegesis specifically names a form of knowledge production that acknowledges and includes the listener/reader into the text. She is calling for a more complex understanding of how