

Silva's treatment of Hawaiian language sources, however, deepens the kind of engagement required and suggests a vast store of unexamined and/or untranslated archival materials in need of study. Like many of Alfred's writings (as well as the overall guidance long provided by Deloria), Silva's book bravely and joyfully dives deep into the intellectual ethics of indigeneity. I would just suggest two additional comparisons. This work sits comfortably alongside Leanne Betasamosake Simpson's *What We Have Always Done* (2017) and Robin Kimmerer's *Braiding Sweetgrass* (2014). As with these authors, Silva seamlessly infuses research engagements with methodologies rooted in traditional indigenous knowledge and knowledge production in order to foster intellectual recovery and to embody modes of reempowerment. More of such bold and culturally directed scholarship is always a welcome development in indigenous studies.

While *The Power of the Steel-Tipped Pen* stays admirably focused on Kānepu'u and Poepoe and the principle of putting past Kanaka intellectuals in conversation, Silva also generously creates some openings for other scholarship in need of attention. She observes, as one example, how early 1900s Hawaiian-language newspapers actively addressed and even printed protests against anti-Hawaiian racism in politics (141). How the community publicly discussed and strategized around issues like racism and women's suffrage remain enticing topics, and supply precisely the kind of encouragement intended to extend study of Hawaiian intellectual histories and use of Hawaiian language sources. Her brief but exciting attention to how Kānepu'u's and Poepoe's writings engaged with indigenous geographies should likewise generate new scholarship on Kanaka space and attention to current and past spatial reclamation projects.

Lastly, it appears that this text implicitly requests that all its audiences slow down. Those less familiar with Hawaiian history, culture, and language will find that the text's advanced knowledge base and extensive terminology slows down reader's engagement out of a need for effective comprehension. Move too quickly and one can easily lose the nuance and power of this analysis. Yet those with greater familiarity and knowledge are also asked to slow down, in this case, in order to more deeply engage with the layered content and vocabulary that Silva signals and can only partially explain (in the embedded *koana*/hidden meanings, for example). In either case, any reader with an interest in indigenous studies will find this text offering several valuable methodological lessons as well as a wonderful example of a community-centered scholarship of practice.

*Natchee Blu Barnd*

Oregon State University

### **Prairie Rising: Indigenous Youth, Decolonization, and the Politics of Intervention.**

By Jaskiran Dhillon. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017. 320 pages. \$80.00 cloth; \$34.95 paper.

Multicultural scholars have vigorously argued for inclusion of marginalized knowledges and cultures into education. Likewise, non-governmental organizations and academics are increasingly turning toward indigenous knowledge, arguing that it offers

ways to address environmental degradation, among other issues. These calls to recognize “cultural difference” are often made through appeals to “work together” with the goal of healing the nation, if not the entire Earth.

Jaskiran Dhillon’s *Prairie Rising* contributes a timely and poignant critique of the proposal that state “collaboration” with indigenous communities is about national “inclusion” and “healing,” and proposes it is instead a “changing face of settler colonialism” (8). Her study, situated in what is currently known as Treaty Six Territory in Canada, and inspired by the indigenous youth who live in the “margins of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan’s largest city” (8), delineates how state power works through everyday social mediations that purport that the “youth crisis” is an issue of individual “choice” that can be ameliorated with collaborative social reform efforts. Contributing to the critique of “recognition” made by critical indigenous studies scholars, Dhillon argues that participatory alliances, rather than being about “recognition,” are “state attempts to quell Indigenous political difference” and complete the process of settlement (140).

For example, Dhillon observed and learned through her position as a youth worker, especially with young women experiencing sexual exploitation, that even though the state recognizes indigenous youth’s experiences of poverty, abuse, and violence, it “distances itself from the roots of this deprivation” (6) and fails to acknowledge how indigenous youth’s life choices are overdetermined by the historical and social reality of settler colonialism, thereby denying indigenous young people’s rights to stolen land or the possibility of indigenous resurgence (85). In the words of one of her coworkers, it’s ultimately the decision of youth to stay on the streets (81). Interventions that target youth for personal empowerment, in short, ultimately leave them to blame for their individual marginalization and depoliticize their suffering. Dhillon contends that since settler colonial power relations inform what is normal and can be imagined for both non-Natives and Natives, participation uncritical of settler colonialism can serve colonial state interests. She cautions that the “potentialities for the state to reinvent itself through the auspices of Indigenous community organizing while simultaneously depoliticizing the lived realities of urban Indigenous youth” (23) make it imperative to address the ongoing legacy of colonial violence within neoliberal participatory governance, which is predicated on, and leaves intact, settler colonialism.

Drawing on settler-colonial studies, complicating the supposed tension between agency and structure, and practicing an ethnographic dissection of participation, the author’s writing remains clear and engaging, reaching across indigenous studies, sociology, and anthropology to interrogate the violence experienced by Native lands and, by extension, Native peoples. The introduction provides a historical sketch and situates the author and her analytic frame, while the remainder of the book is organized into three parts of two chapters each and a concluding chapter that articulates Dhillon’s vision. Part 1 maps “the possibilities for social life that are claimed to exist against those that actually do exist” (78) for indigenous people who have been “(re)constituted by the state as racialized citizen subjects in desperate need of saving” (85) and to clarify these dynamics by “moving closer to the lived realities on the ground” (78). Here she interrogates current social reform measures by placing them against the backdrop of the sociohistorical realities. In part 2, through participatory

observation with a state-community alliance, Dhillon highlights how endorsement of state-community intervention and misrecognition “elevates the goodwill of the settler state while downplaying colonial relations of domination” (154). Part 3 takes the more pragmatic issues of social and educational programming and reveals how culturalization, liberal attention to cultural recognition through centering conceptions of indigeneity like powwows and sweetgrass, signal state accommodation as the end goal.

Her methodological approach will be important to faculty and burgeoning scholars thinking through how to do work *with* marginalized communities and not “on them.” Dhillon’s work, I believe, takes Audra Simpson’s “ethnographic refusal” to heart and effectively turns away from showcasing sad vignettes of indigenous youths’ lives and instead practices an “ethnographic dissection” of the “ruse of ‘participation’ and ‘choice’” that function within settler society (xi). While Dhillon focuses analytically on the politics of participation, she situates the youth she works with and for at the heart of her project, and they inform the construction of the story about the navigation of colonial institutional systems. The approach works to problematize the simplification of discussions on agency and brings our attention back to the way that state power is enacted and reproduced through our everyday encounters.

While I appreciate Dhillon’s intention in stating that “Indigenous nations have always resisted—without the aid of settlers” (238), it also remains true that the “contact line” between “sides” has always been a moving one, if not a construction in service of coloniality. In fact, much of her book disrupts ideals of the simplified colonizer/colonized binary by forcefully but eloquently pointing out that “Human interactions . . . are dynamic and multifaceted—we do not always follow a script” (23). Further research might attempt to deal with the fine lines, if any, between participatory governance and collaborative research. That is, as academics are increasingly heralding state-community collaborations in the form of “participatory research,” researchers, like other state-community agents, might benefit from a critical reflection of our work with *or from within* indigenous communities. How would a critique of the politics of recognition in participatory research put to task academics who claim their research is “community-driven”?

*Prairie Rising* provides a much-needed resource to articulate the ways state power works through different bodies at different moments to reproduce itself as a normal, suitable, and even a necessary intervention in the lives of indigenous youth. Refusing to utilize the experience of indigenous youth as shock-and-awe, *Prairie Rising* brilliantly “moves away from this trend” by conducting an ethnography of participatory governance to unpack “the metrics of regulatory social projects intended to alter their lives” (39). More than saying that the state works on the bodies of government officials, community actors, and youth, Dhillon precisely exposes how colonial statecraft “seeks to target Indigenous youth for the end goal of reproducing and maintaining the settler colonial state” (xi) and these inclusionary and seemingly responsive interventions enact a power/knowledge nexus that attracts the interest of community actors themselves in reproducing state institutions, like education and law, as appropriate corrective mechanisms in indigenous youths’ lives. Dhillon politicizes community collaboration

to showcase the changing form of settler colonialism that shapes the way in which our communities think about themselves, their locations, and their possibilities—including resistance.

Yvonne P. Sherwood  
University of California, Santa Cruz

**Report of an Inquiry into an Injustice: Begade Shutagot'ine and the Sahtu Treaty.** By Peter Kulchyski. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2018. 176 pages. \$24.95 paper; \$20.00 electronic.

Having published extensively on Northern Aboriginal politics and hunting rights in *Like the Sound of a Drum: Aboriginal Cultural Politics in Denendeh and Nunavut*, (2005), as well as on Inuit histories and rights struggles (*Kiumajut [Talking Back]: Game Management and Inuit Rights 1900–70*, 2007), Peter Kulchyski's latest book focuses specifically on the Begade Shutagot'ine, a small community of Dene with whom Kulchyski has been personally and academically involved for decades. Originally an inquiry into "the intersections between two kinds of ethics" entitled "talking about the land: speech and environmental ethics among Begade Shutagot'ine" (83), Kulchyski reveals the book's current form was a "second best" option (86). *Report of an Inquiry into an Injustice* can still meditate on the ethical nexus of speech and the environment, however (124). *Report* is at once a legal treatise (opening and concluding briefs frame four depositions "that I, Peter Kulchyski, inscribe as witness to Begade Shutagot'ine land rights struggles over the past two decades" (2), a novelistic recounting of Dene hunting trips, and an intimate reflection on major themes of the author's career.

Throughout, Kulchyski wrestles with his status as settler academic ally: what is his role as scholar, political actor, friend? An answer: "Witness, I thought then, and still at times think now" (30). At times preferring the role of "secretary" (29) and at other times "documentarian, as recorder" (73), he offers fascinating reflections on the nature of testimony (37), the difference between the witness, the historian, and the advocate, and how their "boundaries are less rigid, more porous" when performed "on that other stage, the stage of history" (32).

As witness to the historical trauma of "the purported extinguishment of Aboriginal title of Begade Shutagot'ine through the mechanism of the Sahtu Treaty," Kulchyski testifies: "I was not an innocent bystander. I deliberately responded to the call of Begade Shutagot'ine for help" (31). The four depositions are, in fact, testimony regarding their unextinguished Aboriginal title and ownership of land, given that he asserts that Canadian "facts of law" (6) mean that they "are in position to negotiate a modern treaty that is acceptable to them if at some point they so desire." Kulchyski's hunting stories thus also serve as "depositions" that speak directly to this legal context.

Kulchyski's conclusion argues that his relationship with Begade Shutagot'ine provides "an insight into the 'certainty' policy of the federal government respecting modern treaties" (129). If the federal government's older approaches were to extinguish