

could be more like the throat singing with which Stevenson opens her book: two women call and respond to one another with the guttural sound of their voices – *ham me, ham ma, ma, ham ma, ham ma, ham ma*. Such singing, Stevenson argues, is a calling out, “less concerned with what is said than that something is said, that a gesture is made” (165). It parallels the structure of narration that reveals the meaning of something or someone without seeking to define it. Such insights are useful across many contexts of activism and writing, providing us with an ethical imperative for listening anew, but also how we might sing our own narratives in ways that are more adequate to the lives they emerge from.

Some may wonder, as I initially did, about the complete lack of discussion of indigenous sovereignty or nationhood in these pages, but I came to realize that this was one of the book’s strengths. As Stevenson takes us painstakingly through the numerous ways that the Canadian state tries to force Inuit into a form of life that privileges the biological body, we see how this is part of Canada’s attempt to make itself strong and healthy. This focus on biopolitics also permits Stevenson to further locate new sites of resistance and refusal against the state that demands cooperation in its interpellation of individuals as anonymous subjects. The youth, especially, refuse to abide this form of recognition that requires them to be suffering victim-subjects.

Suicide is, as Stevenson boldly but graciously puts it, a form of imagination. It will take the work of activists, community members, and indigenous studies scholars to work out how this ethical reorientation can inform political change. What remains important about Stevenson’s work is the ways it helps us imagine beyond the colonial abstractions and reductions of populations and biological bodies, to understand the importance of the excessive realities of life that are central to all communal forms, which hints towards new ways that indigenous futures can be imagined. Perhaps sovereignty and nationhood will be able to encompass these futures; perhaps new forms of political collectivity entirely will emerge. It will certainly require risk and a reorientation in the ways we listen to those voices within our communities who are saying something, but which dominant forms of recognition cannot hear.

*Leslie Sabiston*  
Columbia University

**People of the Saltwater: An Ethnography of Git lax m’oon.** By Charles R. Menzies. University of Nebraska Press, 2016. 192 pages. \$45.00 cloth and electronic.

“I open my house to you, Reader. Come sit down at the table and take your place. I have a story to tell” (9). With these words Charles Menzies disrupts a number of assumptions readers might make about him and the captivating ethnography he has written. Charles Menzies is a well-known anthropologist, a Canadian citizen, and a faculty member at the University of British Columbia. He is known particularly for his Northwest Coast-centered research on indigenous traditional environmental knowledge. At the same time, as readers of his book will come to understand in their own

ways, Menzies is also Gitxaała, born and raised in his ancestral *laxyuup* (traditional territories) along the northern British Columbia coast. Menzies begins at the edges where territorial waters and lands merge. What he has created here is a complicated weave of disruption and continuity and, ultimately, a story of survivance.

Menzies centers his ethnographic narrative in the dialogic spaces where the Gitxaała, a Tsimshianic people, have shaped and managed their natural resources for millennia, and in turn been shaped by these same processes. In doing so, he self-consciously adopts a decolonizing approach to his research agenda, which is community-based and collaborative. The author begins the first half of the book by elaborating how “the social and political relations that constitute Gitxaała society” (governance, names, history) are the foundation for being Gitxaała (7). In the second half he focuses specifically on the “enactment of cultural practices” in three Gitxaała fisheries. By focusing on the ways in which colonialism has transformed relationships between humans and herring, abalone, and Pacific salmon, Menzies also affirms the ways that Gitxaała people have adapted and persisted.

Menzies presents Gitxaała history in a way that is carefully linked to their unique cultural authority and present worldview. History is contextualized in order to clarify the central point: Gitxaała people are still here because they have for millennia relied on the knowledge and resilience of their ancestors and the authority vested in their chiefs. Historical disruptions like the influx of foreign traders, the introduction of epidemic diseases, the integration into global capitalism, and the intrusion of the Canadian state reverberate into the present and challenge indigenous communities to adapt. As Menzies illustrates powerfully, a core set of values and practices is closely associated with Gitxaała identity: knowing one’s place in a clan or community, making a living in a territory defined through knowledge and use, and engaging purposefully with both humans and nonhumans all persist. The Gitxaała are, to paraphrase an important distinction the leaders of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma have made, a living people *with* a history rather than people living *in* history.

An intriguing aspect of this book is that it is structured through the logic and language of Gitxaała social organization, leadership, territory, and resource practices. Menzies’s in depth knowledge as an anthropologist and community member along with his use of culturally appropriate concepts and terms make this text particularly useful as a model for accomplishing engaged and collaborative scholarly research. The book’s manageable length, accessible and elegant prose, and clear exposition of Gitxaała worldview also make it an exceptional choice for use in university classrooms. Certainly all of these features identify it as an important text for provincial and federal policymakers as well.

It is important to note that the author is not reconstructing “an abstract model of what may have been” (7). Rather, he is exploring how Gitxaała social institutions and resource practices have changed and persisted in light of colonial disruption and the rise of industrial capitalism and yet remain linked in significant ways. He establishes lines of historical evidence and familial-based knowledge systems that imbue contemporary Gitxaała leaders to speak authoritatively about resource management issues. He makes a case for contemporary indigenous management of natural resources, as opposed to

granting that authority to non-Native governmental entities and “expert” researchers. His argument is rooted in the resonance between twenty-first-century science and more ancient and local solutions in solving the problem of sustainably managing resources, although in the twenty-first century, even the best resource managers must account for global problems like industrial pollution and climate change. Arguably, the author clarifies these issues are significant as he makes a case that including indigenous stakeholders are a necessary part of addressing larger issues since they are primary and experienced managers of their natural resources.

I was disappointed with the paucity of images and their overall quality, the beautiful cover photograph notwithstanding. The captions on the photographs required more annotation for context and the maps were inadequate. One of the two maps, according to the author, is based on inaccurate hunting data, so its inclusion seemed unnecessary. Since the author provided rich descriptions of indigenous fishing technologies like stone fish traps and “creekscaping,” photographs or schematics of these would be especially helpful to anyone new to this subject (138–141).

Overall, Menzies’s book presents cultural change as an enduring fact that transcends any boundary imposed to delineate “pre” from “post” contact. It is not a profound insight that cultures change with time. More significant, perhaps, are the specific ways in which humans and their unique cultures endure and adapt to the seismic changes associated with colonialism. In this analysis, what matters more is that Gitxaała people inhabit the twenty-first century in ways that uniquely reflect who they are as they continue to dwell, as their ancestors did, in a “world of wonder and change” (9).

Cailín E. Murray  
Ball State University

**Place Names of Wisconsin.** By Edward Callary. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2016. 360 pages. \$21.95 paper.

This book is a labor of love, but one with limited value for readers of the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*. In one volume, Edward Callary has compiled and organized alphabetically more than 2,300 place-names in Wisconsin. He says he did this as a frequent summer vacationer in Wisconsin who marveled that he could travel to places named after Paris, Rome, and Sevastopol; in effect, a European West. Of course, he knew that there were other names as well. He divides his toponyms into four categories: Native names, French names, “transfer” names (e.g., Sevastopol), and “commemorative” names (e.g., Madison). Callary includes “seven fields”: spelling and pronunciation; present-day county; civil division; date of incorporation; discussion of the name; and references.

This reviewer feels that the entries on commemorative names are the strongest, particularly the many Wisconsin villages and hamlets eponymously named by the first postmaster. Callary has made good use of his study of local historical society