

Introduction

Nationalism and Nation Re-building in Native North America

Simone Poliandri

Nationhood and nationalism have recently emerged as some of the leading expressions of tribal belonging and community self-determination among Native North American peoples.¹ They have become increasingly connected with issues of political and economic sovereignty, sense of peoplehood, identity, territoriality, citizenship, and the development and maintenance of cultural capital. This collection of essays offers a broad range of perspectives on the role of Indigenous nation building in the lives of Native American peoples and communities. The contributors argue for the centrality of nationhood and nationalism in molding and, concurrently, blending the recent political, social, economic, and cultural strategies that Native American peoples have adopted toward self-definitions and self-determination.

Concurrently, Native American nationalism and nation building have been the topic of several academic and nonacademic studies that have addressed these issues from a multitude of angles, including (but not limited to) political, legal, geographic, epistemological, ethical, historical, and cultural.² Thomas Biolsi (2005) discussed the Native peoples' recasting of Indigenous geographies stating that in the United States "Native nationhood is a critical site of identity and political struggle for Indian peoples" (254). Asserting sovereignty over reservation territories as only one of the many perceptions of geopolitical space that Native Americans possess and employ in social and political struggles, Biolsi observed that a "national

indigenous space” extending beyond reservation boundaries represents a further context where American Indians can “assert and exercise their Indianness” (249). Pushing the argument forward, Larry Nesper (2007) illustrated the creation of tribal codes and tribal courts among the Lac-du-Flambeau Ojibwe of Wisconsin as a testimony to the recent appearance of “tribal states” among Native Americans in the United States. Centering his analysis on several court cases dealt with by an Ojibwe Tribal Court, Nesper observed, “Especially with the emergence and development of courts in reservation societies, it seems appropriate to speak of ‘tribal states’” (675; quotes in original), and “Reservation governments . . . are becoming statelike. . . . The process entails the codification of law and the development of courts” (676).

Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred (2009) offered an opposite perspective regarding the ongoing formation of an Indigenous national sentiment. In discussing the current formation of Indigenous political identity in Canada, Alfred underscored the relations of Indigenous nationhood with traditional Indigenous philosophies and values as the appropriate archetype, on the one hand, and the Euro-Canadian concepts of citizenship and state institutions as the inappropriate colonially based models, on the other. Building on the works of Holm et al. (2003) and Corntassel (2003) that offer “peoplehood” as the basis of Indigenous nationalism in place of tribe or band, Alfred addressed the impasse between the Indigenous people’s need to (re)define and implement their own forms of governance and the unfitting political terminology (including citizenship, state, courts, and so forth) available to First Nations leaders as a result of a long history of institutional colonialism. He discussed the issue in these terms:

The concept of Indigenous nations conceptualized along the state formation spectrum is itself a European derived concept and a reframing of traditional Indigenous nationhood and identities. . . . It promotes a governing principle that replicates the state in categorizing and organizing of people by government institutions on the basis of rights that are generated by legal and judicial processes. This form of nationhood and citizenship is an assimilative approach to Indigenous identity. (2009, 12)

More than a decade earlier, Alfred (1995) had already underscored the importance of Native North American communities’ reassertion of their tribal nationhood, thus defying the collective or pan-Indian efforts that characterized Native political action in the 1960s and 1970s. In this,

he laid the ground for other scholars who gave preferred treatment to the tribal sovereignty over the Indian sovereignty discourse. Wilkinson (2005), for instance, was among the most successful authors tackling the issue of nationhood from a tribal perspective; yet, departing somewhat from Alfred's position, Wilkinson attributed the rise of sovereignty as a political goal to the concurrent and coordinated tribal responses to the common challenge posed by the Termination policy of the 1950s and the subsequent successful pan-Indian quest for self-determination of the late 1960s and 1970s.

Attention to tribal claims to nationhood has continued to characterize more recent analyses. While discussing Navajo cultural identity and self-rule, Diné scholar Lloyd Lee observed that "American Indian identity is interwoven with nation building and access to resources," and as a consequence, "American Indian identity studies are advancing the discussion on how each Native nation should develop and maintain self-rule" (2006, 79). In a follow-up essay titled "The Future of Navajo Nationalism," Lee reiterated the concept of tribally unique nation building and called for the development of a "serious discussion" about Navajo nationalism or national independence among Navajo people. To this goal, Lee highlighted that Navajo people "need to set objectives that reflect their cultural identity" (2007, 54). Lee defined nationalism as "the devotion to the interests or culture of one's nation [and] to have aspirations for national independence in a country under foreign domination" (2007, 54). Already in 1991, sociologist Anthony Smith wrote in his work titled *National Identity* that "today national identity is the main form of collective identification" (170); furthermore, Smith argued that "nationalism is an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining the autonomy, unity, and identity of a nation" (74; italics in original); finally, and most important, Smith underscored that "nationalism is about 'land,' both in terms of possession and (literally) rebuilding, and of belonging where forefathers lived and where history demarcates a 'homeland'" (70; quotes and parentheses in original). Most recently, Brian Hosmer and Larry Nesper engaged a group of scholars from different disciplines in a conversation on both historical and contemporary "definitions and manifestations of Native nationhoods" (2013, 4). This work aimed at (and successfully managed) sampling the eclectic evolution of tribal nationhood in North America as well as shedding light on how nationhood matters differently to different Native actors, as a result of processes of colonization, decolonization, and the evolution of Native cultural practices of belonging. Finally, Mohawk anthropologist Audra Simpson (2014) has recently offered an

alternative and refreshing perspective on the recent developments of tribal nationhood and sovereignty, focusing on the case of the Mohawk people of Kahnawà:ke. While calling out and exposing the still-active colonial agenda of the U.S. and Canadian settler states, disguised under the conciliatory politics of multiculturalism and juridical recognition, Simpson illustrated the alternative “politics of refusal” that the Mohawk are in the process of exercising to define and actualize their own notion of nationhood—a notion, she claims, to be “driven by their refusal of recognition, their refusal to be enfolded into state logics, and their refusal, simply, to disappear” (2014, 185). Refusing then becomes, in the context of nation building, a strategy toward exercising sovereignty—precisely, “nested sovereignty,” which Simpson identifies as indigenous sovereignty existing within the larger state sovereignty—to design and implement an alternative idea of nation, one that has yet to overcome the challenges of the settler states’ historical territorial expropriations and their imposition of the legal terms of tribal-nation belonging.

All these perspectives highlight several key motifs that have characterized the development of Native nationalism and nationhood in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Although not exhaustive (and it could not be otherwise given the wide breadth and ever-evolving makeup of nationalism and nationhood), the array of themes that these authors highlight is noteworthy because it includes the connection of tribal nationhood with tribal identity, the resiliency of tribal nation-building efforts in the face of centennial colonial pressure, the link between historical and contemporary nation-building efforts, and the importance of tribal cultures in the definition of tribal nationalism and shaping of nation-building paths.

These themes, and others linked to them, sparked a discussion that I started with Hosmer and Nesper during the 2009 Native American/Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA) meeting in Minneapolis and, eventually, led to the publication of this volume in their co-edited *Tribal Worlds* series. This conversation was extended to a wider group of scholars, some of whom participated in a themed session at the 2010 NAISA conference in Tucson and ended up contributing to this volume. The purpose of this collection is to present some of the ideas on indigenous nationalism and nationhood that emerged from those exchanges, as well as ground them in case studies that link our scholarship with the tangible nation-building efforts of indigenous communities in North America. The contributing authors echo and, at the same time, build on these themes in order to move the discussion of Indigenous nationhood further and

offer additional evidence of the variety of their manifestations. This volume provides a variety of perspectives on Native American/First Nations nationalism and nation-building from different disciplinary backgrounds and sample cases throughout North America. A common theme interlacing all contributions is the broad consideration of nationalism and nationhood, not just as political and institution-building issues, but as processes including social, cultural, legal, economic, and historical factors.

Nation Building as Nation *Re*-building

Although the phrase “nation building” identifies one of the key aspects of recent and contemporary life of most Native American tribes and First Nations, it is more accurate to talk about nation *re*-building (hence the title of this volume), as many, if not most, tribal nations in the United States and Canada already went through a nation-building (or, actually, *re*-building) process in the 1800s and early 1900s, when colonial imposition forced them to recast their role in the history of the continent. It can be argued, in fact, that the European and American nation-building era of the nineteenth century was characterized by and partially grounded in the concurrent colonial process of destruction and subsequent reconstruction (albeit in crippled or profoundly changed forms in many cases) of Indigenous nations (Hobsbawm 1992). Therefore, I agree with Oren Lyons, Haudenosaunee Faithkeeper of the Onondaga and Seneca Nations, that we should really be talking about nation *re*-building rather than nation building, because Native peoples have always been here and are not newly built (2007, viii).

Several Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars share this vision. Taiaiake Alfred (2005) spoke of resurgence and regeneration of Indigenous peoples, where the prefix *re*- clearly refers to an Indigenous-driven process of change or inversion from the long history of dominance and dispossession in the North American and, more broadly, global contexts. Along these lines, Jeff Corntassel highlighted the importance for Indigenous peoples to achieve *sustainable self-determination*, namely a process guaranteeing creating permanent self-determination opportunities that are culturally, economically, and environmentally viable besides the recognition of the necessary, but not sufficient, political and legal rights. This, Corntassel maintained, will lead toward “a more holistic and dynamic approach to *regenerating* indigenous nations” (2008, 105; emphasis added). Indigenous sustainable self-determination, Corntassel and Songhees

First Nation member Cheryl Bryce added (2012), must be asserted rather than negotiated with the governments, as in the case of Bryce's efforts to stir up community action toward reclaiming ancestral homelands in order to revitalize distinct cultural practices, such as traditional food systems, in Lekwungen (Victoria and the greater Victoria area in contemporary British Columbia).

Native American nationalism and nation *re*-building at the beginning of the twenty-first century are necessarily different from what tribal nationhood and nation *re*-building were in the past, albeit many of the similarities relate to the challenges posed by Euroamerican colonialism and postcolonialism.³ Tribal nations such as the Choctaw and the Cherokee were targets of the U.S. relocation (and subsequent misappropriation) policy of the 1830s and undertook a rebuilding of their nations in Oklahoma that was all but a smooth process. The nation rebuilding that has taken place since the late twentieth century has many aspects in common, as well as many differences with the process that developed one hundred and fifty years earlier (Lambert 2007; Sturm 2002).

What certainly changed are the social, economic, and political idiosyncratic goals that tribal nations have identified as best for the reconstruction, maintenance, or flourishing of their own communities. Among the major improvements in such a process is the fact that, over the last four decades, North American tribal nations have acquired (for the most part) the right and capacity to select their own nation-building paths rather than being bestowed one, as, for instance, during the mildly successful U.S. Indian Reorganization Act era of the 1930s and 1940s. In the United States, such a leap toward self-determination was made possible by a shift in federal Indian policy and the implementation of game-changing federal legislation. The reference is, of course, to the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 95-698), which propelled a series of policies and subsequent regulations aiming at increasing indigenous communities' control over tribal affairs in several areas, spanning from education to economic development (Cornell and Kalt 2010).

Today, the establishment of tribal citizenship, economic success in several fields of enterprise, territorial reconstitution or expansion, institutional development (including the restoring of traditional values and practices), and, often, a combination thereof characterize the nation *re*-building efforts of tribes and First Nations all over Turtle Island/North America. Whether debating tribal membership—as among the Anishinabek of Ontario, Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq, and Oklahoma Cherokee⁴—or pur-

suings financial success—like the Seminole, Lakota, Mississippi Choctaw, and Mashantucket Pequot have done⁵—or applying traditional principles to the creation of tribal courts—like the Navajo and the Lac-du-Flambeau Ojibwe, among hundreds, have done⁶—or focusing on the restoration of traditional clan systems, as well as the access to traditional lands and natural resources—as among the Haudenosaunee, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, the Apsáalooke, and the Mi'kmaq⁷—it is undoubted that such efforts have recently soared at the forefront of tribes' and First Nations' nation *re*-building agendas.

This neither implies that Native nation-building efforts have appeared only recently nor that such efforts must be purely considered a response to colonial invasions and impositions. Native American nation building is a process that started in precontact times—albeit based on premises and ideas of nation different from the Euro-American ones—and continued during the early period of European colonialism. In fact, it made no sense to talk about “Native Americans” before Euro-Americans achieved military and political dominance on the continent, as pan-Indianism developed as both a reaction to colonial aggression and a Euro-American intellectual construction, another of those “fantasies of the master race” that contested author Ward Churchill (1998) contributed to expose.

The links to the precontact and postcontact pasts are evident and, at the same time, necessary to understand today's tribal expressions of nationhood and nationalism. In a seminal work discussing Native American sovereignty, Vine Deloria and Clifford Lytle stated, “[Since pre-contact times] Indians had a good idea of nationhood” (1984, 9), which embodied the concern for the preservation of people and land, a key concept to understand the current Native American perceptions of the world. Lakota scholar Hilary Weaver, also known as Ga no was'het, might very well hint at this idea of people-based nationhood in saying that Indigenous identity is “connected to a sense of Peoplehood” (2001, 245). A decade later, such a statement is ever more true, as Native American identity, in so far as it is constructed and managed in relation to governments and other peoples, relies on nationhood as one of its pillars. Deloria and Lytle pushed their political analysis forward underscoring that Native movements toward self-determination have recast their goal from the achievement of *self-government*—which implies that the people are ready to assume decision-making responsibilities, yet under the recognition and monitoring by a superior political power (i.e., the U.S. and Canadian federal governments), and thus inadequate—to the establishment of *nationhood*—which implies free and unrestricted decision making within the tribal community (1984,

13–15; emphasis in original). The pivotal differences in this transition are, on the one hand, the change in the level and scope of Native peoples' aspirations—which are limited in the case of self-government and much broader in the case of nationhood—and, on the other hand, the nature of the status to be achieved—where self-government is not a Native idea (although a useful one to set up the base from which to undertake negotiations) while Indigenous nationhood can be when grounded on traditional Indigenous philosophies (to paraphrase Taiaiake Alfred, 2009).

Yet it is undoubtedly true that recent developments of Indigenous nationhood have more often than not implied the adoption of Western models of nationhood as well as the identification and pursuit of institutional goals that stem from such dominant models. This point surfaces in scholarly perspectives such as Paul Treanor's (1997).⁸ Treanor presents nationalism as a "world order" that allows different expressions and number of states and nations as variants of one world order, but does not allow other entities (other than nations, that is) from achieving state status. In other words, he contends, "nationalism is a blocking world order [that] excludes other worlds" (6.1). In fact, this structural model is not threatened by either global or local forces: on the one hand, as a "world order," nationalism cannot be eroded by extra-national or global forces, as it is already "100% global [and, thus, it] cannot logically be further globalized" (4.1). On the other hand, the emergence of alternative nations and states to the existing ones does not imply the deterioration or dissolution of the "world order," but rather the conformation of the new entities to the existing model and their transformation into new expressions of the force they once opposed. This particular perspective compels minorities, including Indigenous and Native American peoples, to conform to the national model in order to achieve self-determination. Such a model, in Treanor's words, is based on a strong resistance to change and it is "past-based," where "the purpose of the nation [is] to project the past (as collectively remembered) into the future, as little changed as possible" (6.4). This resonates well with many Native American peoples' attempts to maintain unspoiled perspectives of their pasts as guide for the present and future. In this sense, Native peoples are well equipped to recast themselves into "modern" national entities within the existing "world order."

Still, this also implies that they have to play another people's game—that is, the necessity to adopt Western concepts of nation and nation building in full or in part—albeit adding their own idiosyncratic elements and values in order to assert their sovereignty. Coulthard (2007) drew on Fanon in analyzing the reproduction of colonial structures to warn against

such a pitfall in the Canadian Indigenous peoples' contemporary quest for political recognition of rights to self-government, treaty rights and, more broadly, cultural distinctiveness. Rather than liberating, Coulthard maintained, contemporary Indigenous politics of recognition:

. . . promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonial power that Indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend. More specifically, . . . the reproduction of a colonial structure of dominance like Canada's rests on its ability to entice Indigenous peoples to come to identify, either implicitly or explicitly, with the profoundly asymmetrical and non-reciprocal forms of recognition either imposed on or granted to them by the colonial-state and society. (2007, 439)

Pushing forward this analysis—or, better, exposure—of the fallacies of state recognition and reconciliation as misguided mechanisms that promise (but do not intend) to actualize Indigenous peoples' claims of sovereignty, Coulthard (2014) recently called for a *resurgent politics of recognition*, allowing Indigenous peoples to empower themselves through revived cultural practices as radical alternatives to the structural dimensions of colonial power. In Canada, Coulthard maintains, the means by which the colonial relations of power are negotiated and reproduced are no longer violence and coercion, but rather accommodation (of sanitized, or acceptable, Indigenous claims) and reconciliation (which ideologically places the abuses of settler colonialism in the past).

This view resonates and aligns with the painstaking work of exposing discursive domination—that is, the subtle maintenance of colonial state hegemony through the constraining of Indigenous sovereign efforts and paths toward empowerment within the limits of Euroamerican legal terminology and institutional procedures—that Alfred (2005) and Nadasdy (2005, 2012), among others, have undertaken in the service of unmasking false decolonization processes. Presented in these terms, the road toward nationhood appears as a corralled path that tribal communities and leaders must follow inescapably in an alleged ever-losing (or compromising) battle with the dominant culture. A rather discouraging perspective, indeed.

Yet I think otherwise. First, speaking of nation *re*-building implies that Native peoples exercised self-government as nations since precontact times. Three decades ago, Boldt and Long offered this picture when they

wrote of “*nations* of people [that] regulated their internal and external relations” (1984, 545; emphasis in original). Second, I believe that tribal nations’ selective adoption of nation-building traits and strategies entails agency and creativity, something akin to the process that James Clifford called “Indigenous articulation” (2001), rather than forced compromise to greater forces and foreign models. In fact, the actual practice of sovereignty, rather than the unexpressed and unpracticed potential of it, requires Native peoples to develop their own governing institutions that are stable, effective, and matching tribal cultural ideas (traditional or not) of governance. Cultural match also does and will guarantee a higher degree of community support (Cornell and Kalt 1998). This necessarily means that there must be different paths and strategies, with different degrees of similarities and differences, toward pursuing and achieving tribally customized expressions of nationhood. Conceived as such, an idiosyncratic statement of tribal cultural values based on traditional philosophy, nationhood can be considered a synonym of peoplehood without running the risk of representing the transformation into a new idea “derived primarily from the old European heritage, and with a singular focus distinct from the old Indian culture and traditions” (Deloria and Lytle 1984, 12).

Cherokee/Creek scholar Tom Holm, Diane Pearson, and Ben Chavis presented the analogy between the concepts of nationhood and peoplehood when discussing Native American group identity and its connection to sovereignty, which is “inherent in being a distinct people” (2003, 17). Building on the earlier thoughts on Indigenous group identity by Edward H. Spicer (who introduced the concept of “enduring people”) and Cherokee anthropologist Robert K. Thomas,⁹ Holm, Pearson, and Chavis presented a model of peoplehood in which four equally important pillars interlock to provide a group’s sense of identity and place in the natural and spiritual environments: language, sacred history (which includes oral traditions, kinship structures, and customs), territory, and ceremonial cycle. These elements make peoplehood a holistic reality that embodies nationhood more accurately than band or tribe. The inclusion of language, territory, ceremonies, and sacred stories in the peoplehood model elevate nationhood from a mere expression of sociopolitical organization to a denominator of indigenous and, specifically, tribal identity.

In this sense, peoplehood is a different kind of nationhood than that included in the common Western academic hierarchical definitions of forms of political organization which identify bands and tribes as the lowest and the nation-state as the most developed. Such definitions rely on criteria that highlight the distinction between pre-state or unsophisticated

political units with relatively small-size populations where relations are mainly determined by ancestry and clanship versus the “modern” expression of political aggregation where centralized governments regulate the individual and group lives of large populations, whose main aggregative principle is bureaucratic citizenship rather than common ancestry. Yet gauging Native nationhood based on such a hierarchical model runs the risk of repeating the Darwinian perspectives employed in colonial times that placed Native peoples in a pre-state or nonstate stage, which were consequently utilized to justify assimilation in the name of Western superior institutions. These ideas also gave sense to expressions such as “domestic dependent nations,” which Supreme Court Justice John Marshall used in his landmark ruling in the *Cherokee Nations v. Georgia* case of 1831, thus creating both a standard and a precedent that would be instrumental in the erosion of tribal nationhood in times to come (Holm, Pearson, and Chavis 2003).

Corntassel (2003) recognized the four-pillar model of peoplehood as a promising solution to overcome the host states’ monopolies on the policies of identification of Indigenous peoples and, concurrently, to refocus on the Indigenous peoples’ goals of political, social, economic, and cultural autonomy. At the same time, Native nations’ rebuilding of nationhood reflects a rebuilding of tribal identities that have also taken forms often departing from models featuring the much-expected “traditional” elements—this being a stereotype in itself: Native peoples always/only look backward to walk forward. For instance, although only a minority of Native North American communities own or run casinos and gambling facilities, this is one of the many available roads that some tribal nations have chosen to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The way that the so-called “casino tribes” have chosen to do so—for instance, by employing pan-Indian symbols, such as the statue of an unidentified Indian archer shooting into the sky at a central meeting point in the Mashantucket Pequot’s Foxwoods complex, to highlight tribalism—can also be considered an expression of sovereignty (Cattelino 2008). Choosing how to be and how to self-represent are privileges of sovereign people. “Perhaps the preponderance at Foxwoods of stereotypical signs of Indianness embodies the constructedness of modern Pequot identity—or, rather, the modernity of the Pequots’ reconstructed identity” (Anthes 2008, 208). Pequot identity and nationhood are not reducible to a core of essential elements preserved (or survived) from a turbulent colonial past and strategically selected in the last forty years. Rather, they embody a national core that has been shaped through processes of

displacement, diaspora, and rebuilding that are still in the making and challenge claims of cultural continuity as the foundation of tribal nation building. As traditional symbols of nationhood have been all but obliterated, Pequot cultural identity and nationhood have necessarily departed from a process of continuity (Anthes 2008, 215).¹⁰

In this process, several Native North American tribal nations have acquired elements of the Western concept of nation-state, albeit utilized in different degrees and forms. One recent example of such adoption is the creation of tribal passports by the Haudenosaunee people in an effort to assert their sovereign right to define their citizenship and nationhood. In July 2010, this national right was put to test when the Iroquois national lacrosse team attempted to use them for international travelling to the World Lacrosse Championships in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom refused to grant entry to the team under such documents, which Britain, Canada, the United States, and the international community do not recognize as valid travel documents issued by a country, meeting the strict security requirements in a post-September 11 world. The team refused to relinquish their documents in exchange for U.S. and Canadian equivalent passports. The incident sparked a political dispute on the extent of tribal nation sovereignty.¹¹

It is evident that many, if not most, of these adoptions have occurred as response mechanisms to the encroachments onto tribal and First Nations' political sovereignty by the U.S. and Canadian federal, state, and provincial governments. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that although "[t]ribes now commonly refer to themselves as 'nations,' [t]his does not signify status as nation-states" (Cornell and Kalt 2010, 5; quotes in original). On the one hand, such a notion highlights the power deficiencies of tribal nations, which lack the prerogatives (such as maintaining a standing army, printing currency, and so forth) of their hosting nation-states, the United States and Canada. On the other hand, the very concept of tribal nationhood possesses an idiosyncratic cultural history and nature, thus transcending the sole administrative and bureaucratic nature of Western statehood. As Mohawk anthropologist Audra Simpson insightfully contended, the notion of Indigenous nationhood expresses a political reality "inextricably joined to culture" and, therefore, "demarcates identity and seizes tradition in ways that may be antagonistic to the encompassing frame of the state" (2000, 114). Simpson (2014) developed this argument further in her ethnographic-based discussion of the Mohawk's politics of refusal to let go of the notion that they are a nation other than the United State and Canada. In this sense, the Haudenosaunee passport incident

as well as the quests for tribal citizenship of the Kahnawà:ke Mohawk (Simpson 2000, 2014) and the Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq (Poliandri 2011, as well as Chapter 3 in this volume), for instance, embody the actualization of cultural difference in a leveled political arena rather than attempts to close (or reduce) the bureaucratic gap between Indigenous and dominant expressions of governance and sovereignty. This reflects the convergence of new, “modern” aspirations—be they financial success and self-sufficiency or an increase in education (more and more toward secondary and postsecondary) (Brayboy et al. 2012)—and the proper, culturally determined form of nationhood necessary to achieve such goals. The palatable aspect of this shift, one that offers Native peoples a much greater chance to attain actual success, is the fact that tribal nations are now more and more in control over their choice of nation form, once a responsibility (or imposition) of the Euroamerican governments.

In this regard, Duane Champagne (2002) discussed the political, cultural, and economic challenges that twenty-first century globalization poses to the Native American nations. Champagne called for a strategy of survival and thriving based on traditionally oriented values and cultural ideas. Yet, as Champagne reminded us, this process need not strive to rebuild or replicate the social and political tribal structures of the past, which are unfit to the contemporary world. Rather, values and cultural orientations—such as a holistic perception of life (one that does not compartmentalize social, political, religious, economic, and family life) and a political approach based on negotiation, accommodation, and respect for autonomy of individual and groups (thus different from the Western and U.S. self-maximizing and individualistic experience)—must serve as guidelines for sustainable structures that can meet the challenges of a globalizing world. *Tribal capitalism*—the economic model that aims at collective tribal accumulation rather than individual accumulation and makes reinvestment of profit into the tribal community its cornerstone—embodies this structural solution and has been recognized as such by most contemporary tribal nations (Miller 2013).

Stephen Cornell and Joseph Kalt, co-directors of the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, illustrated in clear terms the shift in tribal economic success since the 1975 change in U.S. federal Indian policy aimed at granting self-determination to tribal nations. Despite a rocky start due to a lack of business experience, education capital, and governmental decision-making capacity, U.S.-based tribes shifted gear rapidly in the following decade and many attained economic success, albeit most tribal communities still face enduring social problems.

By the second half of the 1980s, however, self-determination had become a widespread and systematic restructuring of tribal governments and their relations with the federal government. This restructuring has acquired a name as the “nation building” movement. It is being manifested by wholesale changes in tribal institutions and policies as the Indian nations themselves rewrite their constitutions, generate increasing shares of their revenues through their own taxes and business enterprises, establish their own courts and law enforcement systems, remake school curricula, and so on, across the panoply of functions commonly associated in the United States with state governments. (Cornell and Kalt 2010, 12; quotes in original)

Cornell and Kalt (1998) had already laid down the foundation of this perspective in the previous decade when they published the results of the Harvard Project in many papers, all pointing at the combination of sovereignty and nation building as the formula for the success of Native economic development. “Sovereignty, nation-building, and economic development go hand in hand,” they wrote. “Without sovereignty and nation-building, economic development is likely to remain a frustratingly elusive dream” (1998, 188–189). According to this perspective, which the authors of this volume share, nation building and the implementation of sovereignty have been instrumental in turning things around for tribal nations and continue to fuel the political and economic renaissance of many tribes.

In the United States, economic development has gained momentum in Indian Country since the late 1980s, partially as a result of policies of self-determination that allowed tribal nations to acquire greater control over their own affairs. However, although economic growth is promising, results are still tenuous. Social indicators, such as levels of poverty, health, substance abuse, and education rates, to name a few, still offer a grim or negative picture (HPAIED 2008). Corntassel and Witmer (2008) have attributed the curtailing of the economic and political development of U.S.-based American Indian tribal nations, as well as their capacity to self-represent on their own terms, to the increased encroachment of state governments in tribal affairs since the passage of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) in 1988. The introduction of IGRA, Corntassel and Witmer maintain, marked the beginning of the current “forced federalism” Indigenous policy era in which the transfer of federal powers to state governments compelled tribal nations into “dangerous political and

legal relationships with state governments that challenge their cultures and nationhood status” (2008, 5). Such a shift has implied the necessity of Indigenous nations to enter compacts on taxation, gaming, harvesting rights, and other areas of tribal enterprise with state governments that have historically been hostile to them. These relationships have become particularly antagonistic “when economic development issues such as gaming are being negotiated” (2008, 23). Yet Corn tassel and Witmer are keen to remark that the sole focus on economic and political issues runs the risk of addressing challenges to the development of Native nationhood that require also cultural and spiritual solutions, in line with the four-pillar model offered by Holm, Pearson, and Chavis (2003).

A Multifaceted Approach to the Understanding of Native Nationalism and Nation *Re*-building

Contemporary Indigenous nation *re*-building must be understood and discussed for what it is: a multifaceted dynamic process that includes cultural resurgence, social development, regaining control over historical representation, economic development and self-sufficiency, political self-determination, and legal autonomy. This volume strives to survey this eclectic reality—or, more accurately, realities, as every tribal/First Nation has been walking an idiosyncratic path made up of a unique, localized combination of the aforementioned elements—by presenting cases that speak to the economic facet of Native American nation building (Braun), the cultural and political aspects of nation building (Poliandri), the historical representation of nationhood (Shepherd), and the historical and legal affirmation of nationhood (Wetzel and Grey).

In his provocative and visionary Chapter 1, Sebastian Braun argues that the nation represents the most appropriate context in which American Indian peoples can attain successful economic development in the United States. In particular, economic and political participation are key stepping stones toward the exercise of “true sovereignty” which, Braun contends, American Indians are being prevented from regaining in the present system. Thus the central question that Braun asks and attempts to answer is, “How can existent sovereignty (based on membership) be enhanced to achieve and practice true sovereignty (based on citizenship)?” The question then becomes one of structure rather than one of efficacy under the current conditions. “To achieve true sovereignty the system needs to be broken,” Braun states. In this perspective, empowering the communities

entails a holistic solution granting political control, the legitimacy of a cultural interpretation of the world, and economic self-sufficiency that will allow American Indian communities to define their own relationships with their social, natural, and spiritual environments. By pointing to a solution that addresses the nation as a whole rather than any of its parts and by approaching the problem from an economic and political angle, Braun builds on the work of scholars such as Mohawk economist Dean Howard Smith, who discussed the compatibility of economic development with cultural integrity and, in fact, argued for the centrality of the former to guarantee the maintenance of the latter (1994; 2000).

Reservation lands are necessary but not sufficient to the exercise of sovereignty by Native nations, because such territories are located at the economic and social periphery of the United States. In fact, Braun contends, these are usually linked to or, more often, even economically dependent on the rural areas they are adjacent to, which in turn are peripheral to the social, political, and economic centers of the country, located in the cities. Thus, Native lands can be seen as “the periphery of the periphery,” a reality that has been known and, unfortunately, has not changed much over the last one hundred and more years.

Braun argues that failed solutions to the problem have included ethnification (the strategy aimed at making American Indians simply another ethnic group in the American mosaic, thus ignoring their legal diversity, while “allowing” the retention of their cultural diversity, thus celebrating the politically “harmless” components of such diversity), de-nationalization (which implied stripping Native Americans of their tribal nationhood and re-nationalizing them as Americans under the overt goal of integration and participation in a progressive society yet pursued through the, more or less, covert strategies of forced assimilation and sociocultural debilitation), and de-territorialization (which since the establishment of the reservation system and the allotment policy has meant dispossession, on the one hand, and making the remaining Native-controlled territories “the periphery of the periphery”).

The alternative, or real, solution that Braun explores lies in the context of tribal citizenship, whose control the American Indian nations have legally and politically enjoyed already for several decades. This, Braun envisions and discusses in detail, is where true sovereign efforts must be invested in order to break the system of control and dependency. Although aware of the high degree of improbability that such a vision will come true in the short term as well as the myriad of challenges to such a development, Braun nevertheless invites the reader to seriously engage in

the exercise of “re-imagining realities outside of the boxes we are delivered by hegemonic forces and practices.” After all, colonialism can be portrayed as a series of enduring boxes—in the form of social and cultural values, economic and political systems, military dominance, and legal and administrative control—that were built around once-sovereign peoples and have prevented (or hindered) their full development as autonomous nations. Given that much has been unsuccessfully attempted to break such constraints, it might be very well worth to consider alternative approaches.

In Chapter 2, Jackie Grey traces the political assertions of the Aquinnah Wampanoag nation of Noëpe (today’s Martha’s Vineyard) by looking at how anticipation of dispossession, resistance, and territorial struggles developed in juridical documents and Indigenous political discourse over the last three hundred years of colonial history. Specifically, anticipation has been mostly expressed in legal form and lies at the core of the Aquinnah Wampanoags’ claims to self-government in the critical period of Aquinnah history stretching between the early 1970s and today. At the same time, Grey contends, anticipation has worked as a force fueling, diverting, and often opposing tribal and nontribal efforts to secure and maintain power over land on Noëpe, the ancestral land for the Wampanoag Indigenous population, or Martha’s Vineyard, a territorial symbol of wealth and prestige for the non-Native population for the last two centuries.

Looking at the nation-building process undergone by the Wampanoag of Noëpe, Grey examines the development of the struggle for land control as a series of moves and responses on the part of two factions of the Aquinnah Wampanoags and the non-Native residents of the island based on anticipating events and consequences as well as on anticipating the opponents’ responses and subsequent moves. It was in the midst of legislative threats to declare indigenous coastal lands “forever wild” (an enduring colonial fantasy, some might say) that the Aquinnah Wampanoag revamped their nation-building efforts by chartering the Wampanoag Tribal Council of Gay Head in 1972. Adding the status of legal entity to their nationhood allowed the Wampanoag to gain leverage to defend their collective interests, most notably the control over their “common lands” symbolized by their annual harvesting ceremony locale, the cranberry bogs.

In her analysis, Grey highlights a three-hundred-year trajectory connecting a seventeenth-century written declaration with which an Aquinnah Wampanoag sachem reaffirmed the Indigenous people’s perennial link with and right to the territory; a lawsuit initiated in 1974 in which the

Aquinnah Wampanoag searched for the return of unoccupied, communal lands; the resulting controversial 1983 settlement agreement between part of the Wampanoags (led by the tribal council) and the town of Gay Head, the state of Massachusetts, and a non-Native citizens' group; the subsequent U.S. Senate hearings to discuss the opportunity of the settlement's Congressional ratification into law; and the still unfolding developments of the Noëpe Wampanoags' struggle for sovereignty and nation building in the twenty-first century. The litigation ended with the ratification of a settlement whose settler-law language aimed at anticipating future conflict but, at the same time, troubled the Aquinnah Wampanoag self-rule. The close reading of the testimonies before the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs at a 1986 hearing attended by several Aquinnah tribal members, retrieved from written and oral accounts, reveals a complex web of anticipated moves and consequences, unanticipated developments, and contrasting visions that pitted tribal members against tribal members and tribal members against non-Native residents of Noëpe in trying to secure control over the representation of historical reality and present opportunities.

In the end, Grey's chapter highlights once again how Indigenous nationhood is rooted in territory as well as the social, cultural, and emotional ties to these tribal lands. "What will endure," Grey states, "is Aquinnah land." Yet such ties are not crystallized in time but, rather, remain fluid and changing. The deep connections to tribal land allow the tribal nation's past to remain anchored to its present and the future as both assets of developing identities and tangible resources for decolonized survival and success.

In Chapter 3, Simone Poliandri discusses the recent nation-building process in the First Nations of Eastern Canada and highlights some of the ways in which nationhood and nationalism have developed in the social and political arenas among the Mi'kmaw people of Nova Scotia. Poliandri introduces the phrases "First Nationhood" and "First Nationalism" to indicate the idiosyncratic character of Native North American peoples' expressions of nationhood and nationalism.

As in the other cases discussed in this volume, Poliandri underscores that Mi'kmaw nation building and national sentiments also possess a strong territorial component, which for the Mi'kmaw people entails connections to their entire traditional territory, Mi'kma'ki (which includes the Maritime provinces of Canada, part of Quebec, part of Newfoundland, and part of northern Maine), to the space of the reserves, and to the areas under land claims. Grounding his arguments on ethnographic,

administrative, juridical, and secondary evidence, Poliandri identifies three dimensions of Mi'kmaw nation building and the contexts in which they have developed in recent years: First Nationhood as tribal sentiment, thus expressed by people from the entire Mi'kma'ki; First Nationhood expressed by single Mi'kmaw bands (or communities); and First Nationhood and nationalism expressed by Mi'kmaw people from single Canadian provinces (Poliandri 2011).

Analyses of the highly controversial Marshall case, which culminated in the landmark 1999 Supreme Court case ruling on First Nations resource access in the Maritimes, the experiences of several generation of Mi'kmaw children in the infamous Shubenacadie Indian Residential School, and sociocultural events such as the Mi'kmaw powwow trail and the summer celebration of the Mi'kmaw patron saint, St. Anne, elucidate how the Mi'kmaw nation-building process takes place at the tribal dimension. Concurrently, the recent phenomenon of single Mi'kmaw bands introducing themselves and acting as national entities highlights a newly developed form of nation building and national sentiment played at the local level. Furthermore, Mi'kmaw nationhood and nationalism have most recently emerged in the provincial dimension, where bands from single provinces act as units in dealing more effectively with the provincial and federal governments. Both the analysis of the Made in Nova Scotia Process, the umbrella agreement placing the Nova Scotia Mi'kmaw bands and the provincial and federal governments at the table of negotiations, and the 2008 *Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia Nationhood Proclamation* by the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs are evidence of this new context in which Mi'kmaw nation building has recently been developed. Finally, the essay contemplates the formulation and implementation of a viable definition of "Mi'kmaw citizenship," which represent the most recent challenges in the nation-building efforts of the Mi'kmaw people. In sum, the multicontext development of First Nationhood and nationalism among the Mi'kmaq highlights a complex and multifarious process that speaks volumes about dynamic concepts of nation and nationhood that are concurrently tied to traditional visions, historical developments, and current social, political, and economic strategies.

In Chapter 4, Jeffrey Shepherd discusses the historical forces and events that led to the formation of modern Hualapai nation and national sentiment. Shepherd situates the formative core of modern Hualapai nationhood and nationalism at the intersection of a precolonial sense of peoplehood, ties to ancestral land, and a shared set of family, band, and tribal memories with the process of development that these underwent

in facing and dealing with the unfolding of the U.S. colonial enterprise. Conquest, dispossession, and confinement met processes of resistance, recasting, and creation of the modern Hualapai political discourse. Survival entailed challenging the dominant historical vision with collective memories and alternative ideas of territorial belonging.

Shepherd discusses the effects that a changed cultural geography and spatial distribution of peoples had on Pai bands' redefined identities as "bands negotiated new relationships with each other as they faced a common set of experiences" and as Pai headmen demanded the establishment of a common reservation in the early 1880s, which Shepherd deems "a turning point in the Hualapai history because it signaled the preservation of a piece of their homelands," despite the immense problems associated with the image and reality of reservation life, and set the basis for their modern sovereignty. He argues that this spatially meaningful event, the bureaucratization and racialization of independent Pai bands into a single group (the Hualapai), and the common experiences of internment and escape that marked the history of non-native colonial settlement of northwestern Arizona in the second half of the nineteenth century forged a new collective identity and became focal points for the development of the Hualapai national identity.

Shepherd identifies the creation of centralized Hualapai political institutions representing the rights of all Pai bands as evidence of the development of a nationalist sentiment (or, at the very least, a collective political strategy) among the Pai band members, who progressively absorbed the Hualapai group identity. Hualapai nationalism became grounded in land claims and resource access struggles that united Pai bands in the challenge against common threats and, in the process, saw the emergence of a Hualapai nationalist rhetoric based on a mixture of tradition, history, and progress discourse, which was amply used in U.S. courts.

Shepherd highlights how the fight against the railroad development through their territory (a common experience by many western tribes over many decades since the 1850s), the return migration to the reservation by many off-reservation Hualapai residents, the creation of a highly contested Indian Reorganization Act government in the 1930s, and the contentions sparked by the U.S. termination policy spearheaded by the Indian Claims Commission in the 1950s were key elements in shaping the Hualapai nation-building process in one way or the other in the twentieth century. This is when Hualapai nationhood established itself unequivocally as a further identity layer alongside family and band identities.