

Introduction

Globalizing the Word

SCOTT RICHARD LYONS

The occasion for this book's production was a symposium held in May 2013 at the University of Michigan entitled *Globalizing the Word: Transnationalism and the Making of Native American Literature*. The essays that resulted from that event—the chapters in this book—examine Native American texts, authors, movements, images, theories, and critical debates in global or transnational, as opposed to tribal or national, contexts. More precisely, they assume that tribal/national contexts are themselves always already “global” in character, that there is no real possibility of a separate textual or critical sphere divorced from global forces (cultural, economic, political), no possibility of a practice purely disassociated from global networks of production, circulation, and consumption. These essays try to make visible some of the ways in which global forces influence—and, in turn, are influenced by—Native American literature, to do this in a critical vein, and perhaps to promote movement in the field of Native American literary studies *through* (which is not the same thing as *away from*) a “separatist,” tribal-nationalist critical paradigm that has influenced the field for over two decades. Paying attention to the global dimensions of Native American literature is important for many reasons, but chief among them is the fact, too rarely acknowledged, that this literature has been globalized from its inception.

What in the World Do You Mean by “Global”?

Globalization is the process by which a single world system is consolidated; it refers to the great interlinking of economies, institutions, cultures, and even peoples that has been underway since 1492. While that year has a particular reputation in the field of Native American studies, there can be no serious dispute regarding its vital importance to human history. In 1491 there really were different “worlds” on Earth, but since 1492 there has been only one. Writers have long debated questions regarding globalization’s historical origins, some considering it a new phenomenon linked to the expansion of electronic media and the Internet, the rise of globalized financial institutions and corporations, the creation of international political bodies, and the proliferation of entertainment cultures that are apparently able to leap all national borders in a single bound. Key historical moments according to this school of thought would include the Bretton Woods Conference of 1944, which resulted in the creation of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), the drawing of the United Nations Charter in 1945, and geopolitical events and treaties after the end of the Cold War in 1989, particularly the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). For David Harvey, who clocks the transformation as recently as 1972, the forces primarily responsible for globalization are “more flexible modes of capitalist accumulation” (i.e., “free trade” and weakened rights for workers) and “time-space compression” (or capitalism’s new ability to conduct its worldwide business faster than you can say “PayPal”).¹ In his estimation, globalization is basically synonymous with postmodernity.

Yet while the twentieth century seems to have been a period of accelerating globalization, this book privileges 1492 and the sixteenth century for getting things going, in part to enhance a Native American perspective. Roland Robertson divides the history of globalization into five periods: “germinal” (1400–1750), “incipient” (1750–1875), “take-off” (1875–1925), “struggle for hegemony” (1925–1969), and, in the case of our own era, “uncertainty” (1969–present).² The key historical developments according to Robertson’s periodization would include, as Paul Jay summarizes them,

the collapse of Christendom; the development of maps and maritime travel; the rise of the nation-state, global exploration, colonialism, the creation of citizenship, passports, diplomacy and the entire paraphernalia of international relations; the

rise of international communication and mass migration; the founding of organizations such as the League of Nations and the United Nations; the outbreak of world wars; and the exploration of space and a developing sense that communities based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual preference, and so on, cut across national and state boundaries.³

On this view, globalization contains the histories of imperialism, settler colonialism, decolonization, and postcolonialism, the latter two in a dialectical relationship with globalization rather than apart from it.

As an example of this dialectical relationship, consider the remarkable history and passage, in 2007, of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, arguably the most significant political development to affect Native Americans since the granting of U.S. citizenship in 1924. As Ronald Niezen has convincingly shown, Native activists walked a long road to the Declaration, starting in 1923 when a Cayuga leader, Levi General/Deskaheh, attempted to gain a hearing at the League of Nations regarding a dispute between the Six Nations and Canada regarding tribal sovereignty.⁴ In those days tribal people were widely considered to be marginal, “vanishing” minorities with “primitive” cultures, although Deskaheh’s example demonstrates how that particular attitude was not exactly shared by most natives. To argue for sovereignty is by definition to engage in nationalism, but rather than attempt to organize hundreds if not thousands of native nationalisms worldwide, tribal communities instead produced a new, ultimately more effective global-political subject: “indigenous peoples.” It was not so very long ago that the word *indigenous* referred to flora and geological specimens; its present ubiquity in Native American discourse testifies to the success of what Niezen calls “indigenism.” As he explains, “use of the term ‘indigenous’ in reference to the original inhabitants of a given territory was popularized in international conferences and conventions, and hastened by the necessity of groups to identify themselves as indigenous, in order to benefit from the protection and rights of ‘indigenous peoples.’”⁵ Organizing at the international level in established global institutions like the United Nations, and employing communication technologies generally associated with globalization such as the Internet, tribes pursued their local objectives—which were, once again, generally nationalist in ambition, as terms like *sovereignty* and *self-determination* suggest—by speaking and securing recognition as global indigenous subjects.

What this amounts to is worth reflection: namely, if you think of yourself as an indigenous person today, it is not in spite of globalization

but rather because of it. Further, as a term of self-description, *indigenous* is decidedly impure. One of the first records of a social organization using that expression to describe people is the 1957 International Labour Organization's Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention and Recommendation; when the ILO revised their work in 1989, as Niezen observes, "few, if any, had developed a self-referential 'indigenous' identity."⁶ Those who have one today do not owe a debt to the ILO for their identities, but they do have the ILO as part of their identity's history and makeup. Put more accurately, their indigenous identity is a result of the dialectic between natives and globalization, a relationship mediated, at least in part, by nontribal groups, associations, and forces.

In keeping with our long view of globalization's history, we can find a similar dynamic with all—let me now say it—indigenous terms of self-description. *Indian*, for example, is a misnomer having nothing to do with tribal peoples encountered by European explorers (nor for that matter with India) and everything to do with that great, world-historic navigational error of Columbus's. Nevertheless, this term was applied en masse to the natives with the ambiguous result of constructing a singular identity out of what had previously been a diversity of tribes and cultures. Yet here too we find both European and native fingerprints at the scene of the sign. In *A Key into the Language of America* (1643), Roger Williams describes how natives "asked me, why we call them Indians, natives, etc. And understanding the reason, they will call themselves Indians, in opposition to English, etc."⁷ The reason that was given—and apparently understood—whatever it was, was a product of globalization during its germinal phase, and when Williams's interlocutors started using the term *Indian* themselves, they too were participating in its development. They were entering the world system as Indians—not only as that, it seems right to assume, nor under fair, just, and equitable conditions—but dialectically and through an exercise of agency.

What about tribal names in heritage languages: aren't those more authentic, existing "outside" of the global system? Not even those. To take my own many tribal signifiers as an example, writers in the nineteenth century, natives and whites alike (George Copway, William Warren, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, Lewis Henry Morgan, to name only a few) spent fairly copious amounts of ink trying to explain what "Ojibwe," "Chippewa," and "Anishinaabe" meant, and their definitions, however different they were, resound yet today, although they now compete with newer definitions. In my lifetime I have seen these various names shift in both meaning and usage, always in response to political, legal, or other social contingencies.⁸ My grandfather, who was born in 1913, was "Chippewa"; my

father, born in 1941, was “Ojibwe” or “Ojibway” (spelling shifts as well); and I, born and raised in the civil rights era, used to refer to myself as a “mixedblood”! When it comes to identities, authenticity is not something existing in a natural state outside of history; authenticity is a discourse conducted in the midst of many voices, not all of them tribal, and none getting the last word.

Now, it might be reasonably objected that I am a bit too focused on the minor issue of nomenclature, from “indigenous” to “Indian” to particular tribal names, as if there weren’t bigger fish to fry in a discussion about globalization and (get ready for another new expression) “indigenity.” My point is that names, identities, and other sources of meaning—all sources of meaning—are now constructed in a global context, that these constructions are made by more than simply Indian hands, and therefore claims to separatism or purity are strategic essentialisms, or what Arjun Appadurai has called culturalism: “the process of naturalizing a subset of differences that have been mobilized to articulate group identity.”⁹ Culturalism, which can take the shape of transnational identity politics, like indigenism at the UN, can be read not only as an activist tactic but also perhaps as evidence of the weakening of nation-states, as Appadurai suggests in *Modernity at Large* (1996):

The wave of debates about multiculturalism that has spread through the United States and Europe is surely testimony to the incapacity of states to prevent their minority populations from linking themselves to wider constituencies of religious or ethnic affiliation. These examples, and others, suggest that the era in which we could assume that viable public spheres were typically, exclusively, or necessarily national could be at an end.¹⁰

Appadurai’s prediction of a “postnational political order” may well have been a bit premature, as nation-states have proven themselves to be rather resilient since the 1990s, but his point about the end of “typically, exclusively, or necessarily national” *public spheres* is well taken. American Indians are not just for “America” anymore.

What is the endgame of global Native American and indigenous activism? It’s not literally nationalism, if by that term we mean a separatist aspiration for a state, nor is it equality, if by that we mean something approximating cultural sameness or political integration, that is, “assimilation.” Ronald Niezen’s groundbreaking study *The Origins of Indigenism* (2003) provides the best summary statement of indigenism’s political objectives:

For most indigenous people, liberation means an honorable relationship with states in which their rights to land are affirmed and compensation for their losses and suffering is honorably provided. Liberation means the ability to exercise self-determination, to develop culturally distinct forms of education, spirituality, economic development, justice, and governance. The most common goals of indigenous peoples are not so much individual-oriented racial equality and liberation within a national framework as the affirmation of their collective rights, recognition of their sovereignty, and emancipation through the exercise of power.¹¹

I want to make two observations about this statement. First, in contradistinction to predictions regarding the nation-state's allegedly immanent disappearance, note how these objectives are geared toward improved tribal relations with their states, not secession from them nor fantasies about their vanishment. If I may simplify, this statement is a pretty accurate characterization of the spirit of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and it exemplifies the possibilities of globalization as a means of enhancing tribal power vis-à-vis nation-states. Second, note Niezen's careful use of qualifying terms, speaking not universally but of "most indigenous people," "most common goals," and "not so much" this, that, or the other thing. Why all these qualifications? The answer speaks of the possibilities of globalization too, namely, at the community level, which of course never achieves consensus about the world it wants to come into existence. Practitioners of the centuries-old tradition of native Christianity, as only one example, may have a very different interpretation of "culturally distinct . . . spirituality" than some fellow tribal members, and of course the same can be said about the meaning of "culturally distinct" education and economic development, and so on. Local tribal cultures are "multicultural" too—the products of long histories of globalization and its transnational institutions and signifying structures, like Catholicism or the English language—and these interior community differences will provide some grist for the mills of our new, global, indigenous public spheres.

Meanwhile, globalization will continue to expand its reach into the most far-flung corners of the world, including the "Fourth World," and will subsequently pay witness to the emergence of more transnational culturalisms and activist agendas. Even so-called "uncontacted" tribes of South America have been contacted, and they have responded—largely by characterizing themselves (with the aid of global NGOs like Survival

International and global indigenous groups) as “uncontacted”—which is, of course, contact. Such are the dialectics of global indigeneity in the twenty-first century. The point that I am trying to make is that if you do not look at the native situated in a global context—a context that includes the tribe as well as the nation-state (among other things) but is not reducible to them—then you could miss out on a story that deserves to be told, and the story you do tell could very well be incomplete.

What Does This Have to Do with Native American Literary Studies?

Stories, to state the obvious, provide much of the raw material of our work in literary and cultural studies, and as everyone knows they have been of great interest to social theorists and activists for their ability to produce ideologies, subjectivities, and, for lack of a better term, “worldviews.” Perhaps it is in recognition of this rather impressive transformational power that the fields of literary and cultural studies are often embroiled in yet another by-product of accelerated globalization: the “culture wars.” At any rate, literature departments, curricula, and scholarship have all been significantly transformed of late—not only by globalization—and the expression we use to characterize these changes is “transnationalism.” What do we mean by it? As Paul Jay writes in *Global Matters: The Transnational Turn in Literary Studies* (2010),

Since the rise of critical theory in the 1970s, nothing has reshaped literary and cultural studies more than its embrace of transnationalism. It has productively complicated the nationalist paradigm in these fields, transformed the nature of the locations we study, and focused our attention on forms of cultural production that take place in the liminal spaces between real and imagined borders. This transformation has exploded under the forces of globalization, but it has its roots in political movements outside of the academy and theoretical developments within it that run back to the early 1960s.¹²

Those outside political movements include the civil rights movement, feminism, the gay and lesbian rights movement, the antiwar movement, and, accompanying these, dramatic demographic transformations in the faculties and student bodies of higher education. These developments and

social movements appeared to have something to say to an academy that seemed culturally ethnocentric and socially disengaged, and they pressured literature departments to reflect on what they do and why.

Yet it was later developments inside that same academy, notably the rise of critical theory, especially poststructuralism, that may have done the most to shift the scholarly gaze away from sameness and toward difference. While structuralism taught that meanings were made not through inherent connections between signs and referents but rather through differences established in elaborate but arbitrary systems of signification, Derridean deconstruction showed how those systems were also unstable and relentlessly deferring of any ultimate meanings. There were gaps between signifiers and signifieds, preventing concepts like nature, culture, and truth from arriving at stable, definitional endpoints. Naturally, this placed articles of faith that had been guiding literary study—such as Matthew Arnold’s “best that has been thought or said”—into a bit of crisis, with one result being a great rethinking of most everything literary studies had previously thought it was about: canons, the universality of experience, the human condition, beauty and the sublime, and paradigms focused on the nation. The traditional, Arnoldian model of literary studies, which was always about sameness, had been challenged by a new and theoretically informed emphasis on difference: differences of identity and subjectivity (including hybrid identities), differences of space (including migration, life in the borderlands, contact zones, and the “nations within”), differences of time (including new approaches to history), and above all differences in meaning (understood as contingent and open to future acts of interpretation and the making of more meanings). Perhaps the most obvious sign of this paradigm shift was its transformation of national literatures, with one happy result being the inclusion—that is, the invention—of Native American literature as a viable category. Simply put, this field did not exist before the transnational turn of literary studies—which means critical theory has not been a “Western” imposition, as is sometimes charged, so much as a birth canal for Native American studies.

The history of Native American literature—which I will now define (not at all unproblematically) as Indian-authored writing addressing Indian issues that enters a public print culture—predates the American Revolution. It begins with Samson Occom’s *A Short Narrative of My Life*, composed in English in 1768 and held in the Dartmouth College library until republication in 1982. Occom’s text was only the first of what became a fairly consistent Indian practice of publishing nonfiction in the nineteenth century, from Christian hymnbooks and sermons, to “traditionary”

tribal histories, autobiographies, and memoirs; to political speeches and pamphlets, to a startling number of tribal newspaper initiatives (over two hundred started in the nineteenth century alone). Most but not all of this work was produced with the support of non-Indian collaborators. The first tribal newspaper, the bilingual *Cherokee Phoenix*, published in both alphabetic English and the Cherokee syllabary invented by Sequoyah, began its run in 1826, edited by Elias Boudinot. It had subscribers as far away as present-day Germany. The first Native American novelist was John Rollin Ridge, a Cherokee journalist in California who as a boy saw his father, John Ridge, murdered by other Cherokees shortly after their nation's removal to Oklahoma Indian territory. Elias Boudinot, another member, along with the elder Ridge, of the "Treaty Party" who signed after much futile resistance (evident in the pages of the *Cherokee Phoenix*) a treaty authorizing the Cherokee removal, was killed on the same day. Ridge's novel, *The Life and Adventures of Joaquin Murieta* (1854), was a violent, mythmaking story about Mexican bandits, racial oppression, and revenge. It was revisited many times over the years, including being written as a 1972 play by Pablo Neruda, and its lead character was an inspiration for Zorro. Ridge romanticized his Mexican bandits, but his depictions of savage, dirty, and backward California Indians are demeaning.

The first Native American woman novelist was S. Alice Callahan, whose novel *Wynema: A Child of the Forest* was published in 1891. Jane Johnston Schoolcraft, the Ojibwe wife of Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, had written a respectable amount of fiction and poetry, much of it high quality, decades before Callahan. Her husband drew on Jane's Ojibwe connections, language, and knowledge for his own work, including the writing that later inspired Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's *The Song of Hiawatha* (1855), although he did not credit her for it. Jane's work was rediscovered and published by Robert Dale Parker in *The Sounds the Stars Make Rushing Through the Sky* (2007). In 1883 a Paiute writer and activist, Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins, published *Life Among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims*, the first Indian autobiography written by a woman. Hopkins lectured in the east, met the sisters Elizabeth Peabody and Mary Peabody Mann (who was married to Horace Mann), and with their assistance published her book and established the Peabody Indian School in Lovelock, Nevada. Among the many "Red Progressives" of the early twentieth century, perhaps the most noteworthy (out of many noteworthy figures in this group) was Gertrude Simmons Bonnin, who wrote under the moniker "Zitkala-Ša." Publishing in major venues like *The Atlantic* monthly, Bonnin was also a leader in the Society of American Indians,

the first pan-Indian advocacy organization (or public sphere), established at Ohio State University in 1913. Bonnin's three-part serial autobiography, reissued as a book entitled *American Indian Stories* in 1921, is clearly her most famous work; but she was also the librettist of *The Sun Dance Opera* (1913), cowritten with a Brigham Young music teacher, William F. Hanson. Based on romantic versions of Sioux legends and religious lore, *The Sun Dance Opera* was first produced at Orpheus Hall in Vernal, Utah; it featured local Ute tribal members in its cast. In 1938, the year of Bonnin's death, the New York Light Opera Guild produced *The Sun Dance Opera* at the Broadway Theatre, listing only Hanson as its author.

The best-selling Native American literary text of all time is *Black Elk Speaks* (1932), produced collaboratively by Nicholas Black Elk and a poet, John G. Neihardt, who interviewed Black Elk at the Pine Ridge Reservation. Black Elk primarily spoke Lakota, so the two men's adult children, Ben Black Elk and Hilda Neihardt, served as translators. The book chronicles Black Elk's remarkable life and includes memories of the Battle of Little Bighorn, Wounded Knee, Black Elk's tour of Europe as part of Buffalo Bill's "Wild West" performances, and his unforgettable religious visions. The inspirational power of this book, which has influenced generations of young Native American activists as well as seekers of alternative religions from all walks of life, seems matched only by its ability to generate controversies, the two most lasting of which have been: 1) How much of this book is authentically Black Elk as opposed to John G. Neihardt? and 2) What do we make of the uncomfortable fact that Black Elk was Catholic, even a catechist responsible for converting other Lakotas to his faith? Both the text and its contexts are rich at the site of *Black Elk Speaks*. In *The Black Elk Reader* (2000), editor Clyde Holler writes that "a proper understanding of Black Elk is essential to the study of (1) American religion, (2) Lakota religion and culture, (3) the worldwide resilience and revitalization of traditional religion and culture, (4) religious change and adaptation, and (5) ethnic American literatures and indigenous autobiography."¹³ Other contributors to that volume seem to suggest that *Black Elk Speaks* is better understood when approached from a proper understanding of other traditions and discourses. Ruth J. Heflin reads the book as a modernist text. R. Todd Wise compares it to the Latin American *testimonio* genre (for example, *I, Rigoberta Menchú*). Amanda Porterfield characterizes Black Elk's thought as a "maturation" of American Transcendentalism. Dale Stover reconstructs Black Elk as a "postcolonial Indian." Frances W. Kaye compares *Black Elk Speaks* to Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*. Michael F. Steltenkamp emphasizes Black Elk's ability to

mix different religious and linguistic practices with ease—singing in both Lakota and Latin, praying the rosary to chase away a thunderstorm—or, in other terms, his hybridity. *Black Elk Speaks* is a perennial favorite among students in my Native American literature classes.

Many of my Native American literature students are surprised to see so many authors and texts from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries on my syllabus, but nearly all of them are at least somewhat aware of writers from the late 1960s forward. N. Scott Momaday's *House Made of Dawn* (1968) won the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction in 1969, thereby inaugurating what critic Kenneth Lincoln called the Native American Renaissance. Momaday studied under Yvor Winters at Stanford. Another leading figure in the Native American Renaissance is James Welch, who studied with Richard Hugo in the creative writing program at the University of Montana. Works by these two men share themes that became important to the Renaissance writers; namely, they featured mixedblood protagonists living disillusioned lives in modern, often racist American society who reexamine their historical and cultural pasts in an effort to improve or even survive their lives. Other writers central to this movement are Leslie Marmon Silko, Louise Erdrich, and Gerald Vizenor, all of whom devoted at least some portion of their works to similar themes. The term "renaissance" used in connection to this period and group of writers is appropriate, and not only because it connects Native American literature to African American literature and its earlier Harlem Renaissance. As the great anthropologist Jack Goody argues in *Renaissances: The One or the Many?* (2009), all renaissances in world history have a "looking back" and an "efflorescence" to them, and this combination certainly captures what was happening in Indian country during the civil rights period and its aftermath.¹⁴ I am not suggesting that Native American Renaissance writers were somehow directly connected with Red Power groups like the American Indian Movement (AIM); that is by no means the case (and some writers, like Vizenor, who followed AIM and other groups as a journalist and essayist, were presciently critical of Red Power's mistakes and excesses). What I am saying is that the civil rights years witnessed a renaissance in Indian country—from the development of tribal colleges and strengthened tribal institutions, to the revitalization of heritage languages and traditional religions, to the explosion of hybrid, "pan-Indian" cultural practices like powwows and the sweat lodge, to the rise of new sovereignty economies (i.e., gaming, smoke shops, and other comparatively advantageous economic pursuits enabled by sovereignty)—of which the literary renaissance was a significant part. In all cultural cases, however, the "looking back" was

done in the spirit of revivifying elements from the past, not seamlessly continuing them as if they hadn't been dead or neglected for some time. In the case of literature, *les revenants* were resuscitated through things like literary modernism, making the cultural parentages of books such as *House Made of Dawn* rather mixed themselves.

Today it is not so uncommon to catch writers like David Treuer talking about native language revitalization on NPR's *Fresh Air* with Terry Gross, Sherman Alexie ranting against e-books on Comedy Central's *The Colbert Report*, or Joy Harjo reading poetry or playing reggae-inflected music at venues around the world. Nor should we find ourselves surprised at the relative but growing success of native cultural producers elsewhere: the 1491s, a young comedy troupe whose short satirical productions go viral on the electronic moccasin telegraphs of Facebook and Twitter; A Tribe Called Red, an electronic music group that has attained a fan base in the dance and hip-hop scenes that far exceeds the native community; and other examples. We should also mention the accompanying rise of a critical discourse community, including the academic field of Native American studies, born during the late 1960s in places like Berkeley and the University of Minnesota. Some early books of criticism were Geary Hobson's 1979 anthology *The Remembered Earth*; Dell Hymes's pioneering study of "oral literature," *In Vain I Tried to Tell You': Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics* (1981); Dennis Tedlock's similarly orality-focused *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation* (1983); Alan Velie's *Four American Indian Literary Masters* (1982); Lincoln's aforementioned *Native American Renaissance* (1983); Andrew Wiget's *Native American Literature* (1985); and Arnold Krupat's *For Those Who Come After* (1985). Critical studies were published even more frequently after the year 1986, as chronicled in a lengthy essay by Craig Womack.¹⁵ Annual conferences are held by academic associations like the Native American Literary Symposium and the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, the latter founded in 2009, as well as the occasional symposium like Michigan's Globalizing the Word in 2013. We could also mention an array of indigenous writers' conferences and literary meetings and associations in countries around the world.

What do transnationalism and globalization have to do with this history? For starters, it seems important that we can actually narrate this sort of history without endless recourse to American literary and cultural history, and we can do it from its very beginning in 1768 right up to our own present era. That is transnationalism. It is just as important to observe, however, that this history is by no means "separate" from non-

tribal influences, forces, cultures, and people; it is, in a word, “inside.” That is globalization. Another observation to make concerns the cultural source of Native American literature; as seen in all of these examples, that source is typically more than one: collaboration with outsiders, insertion into extraneous social networks like the global publishing industry or Christian missionary circuits, or simply the use of a newly appropriated communication technology or aesthetic style. It is not a local “tribal culture” itself that produces Native American literature, although tribal culture is frequently constructed within it. That is transnationalism and globalization. Fourth, if there is one overarching concern that links the tremendous diversity of Native American or all indigenous writers in this history, it is the globalized image of the Indian that has been with us since 1492. Whether critiquing it, escaping it, or—just as often as not—conforming to it, that image of the Indian, which has taken different forms over time (as savage, as biological race, as degraded, as noble, as vanishing, as eco-warrior, as alternative subjectivity against “the West,” etc.), has been the overriding theme that native writers have always had to contend with; it is the most “global” thing of them all. Finally, I would emphasize the difference, not sameness, within the categories of tribe, nation, or Indian, evident in this short history I have presented. The Cherokee story is clearly the most dramatic example, but in less dramatic ways differences are found within every tribal nation, and the examples of women writers show that they have had to deal with different issues than men do (for instance, not receiving credit for their work). Tribal differences result from globalization, and when they compel individuals to connect to interests beyond their tribal nation—for example, Indian Christians with the church, or gay teens with gay culture—that is transnationalism.

From global networks of production, circulation, and patronage that enabled Native American writers to emerge over two centuries ago, to the close involvement of cosmopolitan educational societies and universities, and finally to the importance of cross-cultural collaboration, transatlantic travel, and aesthetics (e.g., modernism) that respect no one’s imagined borders, Native American literature has always been, as stated at the beginning of this introduction, a global enterprise. It deals with the world, not simply the tribe or nation. The purpose of this book is to unpack some of the difficult issues involved with that complex fact. We begin with essays by two of our leading intellectuals in the history of Native American literary studies. Gerald Vizenor’s “Empire Treasons: White Earth and the Great War” concerns Ojibwe men who fought in Europe during World War I—a very unstudied field at present—and it can

(and should) be read as a companion text to his powerful 2014 historical novel, *Blue Ravens*. Arnold Krupat's "Native American Literary Criticism in Global Context" unravels the tangled web of ostensibly competing critical theories—that is, nationalism, indigenism, cosmopolitanism, and transnationalism—and finds them working more or less in complementary, rather than combative, political and ideological ways. The rest of the book chapters proceed more or less historically. Matt Cohen and Phillip H. Round address the challenges of locating the local, global, and critical in early Native American archives. My chapter on George Copway's understudied 1851 travel book reads it—and Copway himself—in the contexts of travel, globalization, and "modernity." My research on Copway's travels was indebted to Kate Flint's study *The Transatlantic Indian, 1776–1930* (2009), so I am pleased to include a new essay by her in this book. Flint provides photographic evidence of how Indians became "ordinary" in not only European or American society but also global culture before and after the turn of the twentieth century. Eric Cheyfitz brings us into the post-civil rights era and raises the crucial issues of labor exploitation and Indians as workers in capitalist globalization; class is important to start addressing in Native American and indigenous studies. In his chapter, Chadwick Allen, a leader in comparative indigenous studies, considers similarities and differences between "transnational" and "transindigenous," finding the tensions therein to be productive. Elvira Pulitano's concluding chapter reads the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a globalized, even cosmopolitan text, with great potential for local decolonization. An afterword by one of the first scholars in our field to think globally, Shari Huhndorf, reflects on this collection especially as it pertains to the vital issue of gender. Finally, I am indebted to Jace Weaver for writing a foreword and publishing this book in SUNY Press's fine Native Traces series.

The title of this book, *The World, the Text, and the Indian*, is, of course, a play on the title of an Edward Said essay, "The World, the Text, and the Critic," published in a book by the same name in 1983, in which the term "worldliness" referred not to the planet or globalization (although both were of great interest to Said) but rather to "circumstantial reality"—that is, the "real world." Said was writing against American deconstructionists who said that since all readings were misreadings, interpretative possibilities were infinite, and no single interpretation could claim to be better than any other. Said disagreed completely, arguing that "texts have ways of existing that even in their most rarefied form are always enmeshed in circumstance, time, place, and society—in short, they are in the world,

and hence worldly.”¹⁶ Texts don’t only “mean” things, they do things in the world; they are worldly, and we as readers and critics should not try to colonize, silence, ignore, or rewrite them. We are, after all, as responsible to texts as we are to our own worldly circumstances. That was not a call to revisionism or activism so much as to historicism. It remains a call worth heeding.

Notes

1. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, MA, and Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1990), vii.
2. Roland Robertson, *Globalization* (London: Sage, 1992).
3. Paul Jay, *Global Matters: The Transnational Turn in Literary Studies* (Ithaca, NY, and London, UK: Cornell UP, 2010), 36.
4. See Ronald Niezen, “Recognizing Indigenism: Canadian Unity and the International Movement of Indigenous Peoples,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42.1 (January 2000), 119–148. This article was expanded into an influential book, *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: U of California P, 2003).
5. Niezen, “Recognizing,” 120.
6. Niezen, “Recognizing,” 120.
7. Roger Williams, *A Key into the Language of America*, in *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, 7th ed., vol. A, ed. Nina Baym et al. (New York: Norton, 2007), 175.
8. Theresa Schenck has tracked some of this history of defining “Ojibwe.” See “The Meaning of ‘Ojibwe,’” Appendix A in William W. Warren, *History of the Ojibway People* (Minneapolis: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2009), 287–288.
9. Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1996), 15.
10. Appadurai, *Modernity*, 22.
11. Ronald Niezen, *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: U of California P, 2003), 17–18.
12. Jay, *Global Matters*, 1.
13. Clyde Holler, “Introduction,” in *The Black Elk Reader*, ed. Clyde Holler (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2000), xv.
14. Jack Goody, *Renaissances: The One or the Many?* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2009), 7.
15. Craig Womack, “A Single Decade: Book-Length Native Literary Criticism between 1986 and 1997,” in the Native Critics Collective, *Reasoning Together* (Norman: Oklahoma UP, 2008), 3–104.
16. Edward Said, *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983), 34–35.

Bibliography

- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1996.
- Goody, Jack. *Renaissances: The One or the Many?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2009.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, MA, and Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1990.
- Holler, Clyde. "Introduction." In *The Black Elk Reader*, ed. Clyde Holler, xiii–xxvi. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2000.
- Jay, Paul. *Global Matters: The Transnational Turn in Literary Studies*. Ithaca, NY, and London, UK: Cornell UP, 2010.
- Niezen, Ronald. *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2003.
- Niezen, Ronald. "Recognizing Indigenism: Canadian Unity and the International Movement of Indigenous Peoples." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42.1 (January 2000), 119–148.
- Robertson, Roland. *Globalization*. London: Sage, 1992.
- Said, Edward. *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.
- Williams, Roger. *A Key into the Language of America*. In *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, 8th ed., vol. A, ed. Nina Baym and Robert S. Levine, 194–205. New York: Norton, 2007.
- Womack, Craig. "A Single Decade: Book-Length Native Literary Criticism between 1986 and 1997." In the Native Critics Collective, *Reasoning Together*, 3–104. Norman: Oklahoma UP, 2008.