INTRODUCTION

Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee Nation), Mark Rifkin, and Bethany Schneider

Over the past decade, U.S. law and public policy have increasingly sought to define, and in most cases to diminish, the access of same-sex couples to forms of legal recognition, most dramatically in terms of marriage and adoption.[1] At the same time, the contours and content of Native peoples' sovereignty have been steadily curtailed, especially along the lines of taxation and land claims.[2] These patterns may not initially appear related, although Native nations' infamous status as "domestic" and "dependent" resonates eerily with state investments in curtailing and containing queer capacities to form state-sanctioned "domestic" contracts or have "dependents."[3] And in 2004 the Cherokee Nation passed a law banning same-sex marriage, which soon was followed in April of the next year by a similar statute in the Navajo Nation, a measure that passed despite a veto by the Nation's president and public objections by traditionalist elders.[4] What do these decisions suggest about the ways heteronormativity contributes to the construction of dominant ideological understandings of political legitimacy? What might these efforts to affirm Cherokee and Navajo straightness tell us about the role of discourses of sexuality in Indian policy? What does this policy reveal about the complex matrix of racial, imperial, and sexual privilege? How does this change in policy, and the intranational contentions over it, affect how we think about the running invocation by mainstream politicians of the centrality of heteromarriage in the history of "civilized nations"?[5]

These examples suggest the kinds of intellectual and political analyses made possible by bringing together many of the questions being asked in Native American studies and queer studies. We thought that the time was ripe for a special issue that considers how putting these two areas of study in dialogue can contribute to our understanding of the U.S. nation-state, Native polities and peoplehood, and the complex role of culture(s) in political expression and identification. Native and queer studies have, together and separately, worked to theorize

GLQ 16:1–2
DOI 10.1215/10642684-2009-011
© 2010 by Duke University Press

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

and defend various kinds of diversity as well as individual and collective self-representation in the face of totalizing state legalities and ideologies, and this special issue is devoted to the intersections of those sometimes consonant, sometimes dissonant, interventions. Efforts within queer studies to critique the presumptive whiteness of much queer work and to address histories and ongoing dynamics of racialization have tended to efface issues of indigeneity and settlement, and as Native feminists have argued, articulations of Native nationhood can normalize the heteropatriarchal dynamics of settler governance.[6] Additionally, at a moment when scholars are scrambling to move beyond "Queer Nation" to "Queer Planet," adopting a transnational hermeneutics in response to the dynamics of globalization, we feel that it is important to remember the radically *inter*national status of Native America: there are 194 countries in the world, give or take a few, but there are 562 federally recognized American Indian nations in the United States alone, and many more unrecognized.[7]

There is a great deal of exciting work being done that seeks to think across and between Native studies and queer studies, and we conceive of this special issue as a forum for such emerging scholarship.[8] The essays and creative pieces here offer a range of approaches and perspectives, and in choosing them, we used a very broad and malleable question to guide the selection: how can Native American and queer studies, especially as informed by each other, complicate, challenge, and reconfigure available ways to conceptualize the state, national identity, and their multivalent social influences in the United States and among Native peoples? Topics of interest for us included the following, all of which appear in some way in the contributions: the usefulness and place of queer theories in Native American studies and vice versa; efforts to recognize or reorganize Native kinship systems; the role of internationalism in queer and Indigenous critique of the nation-state; the status of LGBT, queer, two-spirit identified Indians in their communities; the role of notions of civilization in defining "normal" sexual behavior; the ways public discourse around nonnormative sexuality (for and against) deploys whiteness, monogamy, and the nuclear family; and the reliance on notions of citizenship and the coherence of U.S. national space in non-Native LGBT forms of identification. Eschewing simple parallelism, the issue addresses how the concerns that have occupied these two scholarly fields are linked, sometimes explicitly, sometimes in painful disavowal, and the pieces here explore how acknowledging this enmeshment can produce different and richer understandings of the internal logics and broader cultural dynamics of U.S. and Native governance and of the ongoing challenges facing queer people and Indigenous peoples.

We have decided, though, to approach the introduction in a somewhat

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

unusual manner. Rather than coauthor it, we have decided that each of us would share our particular perspective on the issue and our role in its creation. Instead of creating the sense of a single critical narrative that frames the pieces, we wanted to indicate at the outset the diversity and difficulties at the intersection the issue explores, also graphically illustrating in print form what the issue always was in process and hopefully will provoke now that it has reached fruition — a critical conversation.

Daniel's Take

Kweh. Se:ko. Ahnee.

It's mid-April in southern Ontario. Rain has been falling outside for the past two days, and dark, heavy clouds to the east and west alike threaten further drenching. I write these words at a massive desk made of a single plank of stained and salvaged pine, lovingly crafted by a local woodworker of extraordinary talent and generosity, a man who has, we fear, lost his short battle with cancer, or his longer struggle with alcoholism — or both, as we've heard nothing from or about him for a year. But the desk is still burnished with his signature stain, a rich golden red that has deepened and become even more beautiful in the last two years, and it still radiates with his kindness and the loving attention that distinguishes the work of a true artist from a dabbler.

Our house sits comfortably among windswept pines and stark paper birches, nestled between the base of a steep escarpment and the shores of what is now known as Georgian Bay. The home I share with my husband, his mother, and our two dogs is built of both log and board-and-batten, built on lands known by previous inhabitants as Wendake (later Huronia), not far from the historical site of the community of Wenrio in the traditional homelands of the Attignawantan, or Bear People, the most powerful nation of the Huron-Wendat alliance. These are lands with a long, beautiful, and terrible history. The Hurons as a people are gone now, having fled or been driven into exile by the Five Nations of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy in the seventeenth century, after a devastating conflict that implicated Jesuit missionaries, Huron converts, Huron traditionalists, and Iroquoian expansionists and culminated in this area in the destruction of the Jesuit mission Sainte-Marie Among the Hurons in March 1649. The majority in the region now are English Canadians, though there is a substantial Franco-Ontarian community, many of whom consider themselves Métis, being descended from Anishinaabe women and French *voyageurs* in the region during the early Canadian fur trade that followed the devastation of Wendake.[9]

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

Just across the waters from our home stands Christian Island, named for the Jesuit and Christianized Huron refugees who sought brief sanctuary there after the destruction of the Sainte-Marie mission by the Iroquois and their traditionalist Huron allies. The island's name in Huron-Wendat is Ganoendoe; although a defensible space, it turned out to be nearly impossible to farm and thus made a poor refuge, famine and further Five Nation attacks rendering it only a temporary respite before the full Huron diaspora.[10] Yet Ganoendoe has another Indigenous name, Chimnissing ("Big Island"), so called by the Anishinaabe of Beausoleil First Nation, for whom it's now a much more amenable place to live than it was for their Huron refugee predecessors. (It's also a popular site among non-Native summer vacationers, who lease beach cottages from the Beausoleil Lands Management Office.)

About 170 kilometers away from my home in Wendake sits the city of Toronto, where I teach Aboriginal literatures and Aboriginal studies, and where I lived when Kent and I first started dating, nearly four years ago. To the Huron-Wendat peoples, that place is *toronton*, "the place of meetings," or, to the Kanienkehaka, the Mohawks, it is *tkaronto*, "the place where the trees stand in the water," named so for the fishing weirs that were prominent along the edge of Lake Ontario. Historically, that land and its environs have been a shared space of significance to the Huron-Wendat alliance, the nations of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy (especially the Mohawks and Senecas), the Iroquoian Tionontati and Atiwendaron peoples, and various Anishinaabe communities, and it remains so today, even while for the vast majority of its inhabitants it is known only as Toronto, the capital city of the province of Ontario, in the territorial boundaries of the Dominion of Canada, a Commonwealth Realm within the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Kweh. Se:ko. Ahnee. 'siyo. These are greetings — in Wendat, Mohawk, Anishinaabe, and Cherokee — that affirm a different kind of peopling and placing than that asserted by the various nation-states in this hemisphere. They are offerings of generosity, of welcoming, that recognize a different kind of relationship between peoples, and between peoples and places. To speak of these different relationships and understandings is, necessarily, to acknowledge not just the comings- and gatherings-together but also the mixed and many complications of our relationships, the breakings and divisions, shatterings and woundings that divide us from our histories, our pleasures, our embodied experiences.

Not too long ago I reviewed a novel for an academic journal, a novel supposedly about two-spirited/queer Native people, cowritten by a gay anthropologist who was a problematic but groundbreaking leader in the scholarly study of variant gender

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

and sexuality in Native communities in the 1980s, and a gay New Age–inflected novelist whose highly didactic work advocates a primal, sacred wisdom essential to gay male experience. Not surprisingly, the novel — a hackneyed story of a gay white man who comes to Navajo territory in the aftermath of the U.S. Civil War to discover his inner "two spirit" through frequent and enlightened sex with a range of queers of color — was a troubling text on numerous stylistic, narrative, and ethical grounds. Neither should it be a surprise in the paracolonial context of the Americas that, in 2006, a novel written by highly educated, ostensibly intelligent, and apparently very earnest "Indian lovers" was, at the end, a predictably frustrating lesson in the long and demeaning history of cultural appropriation, ethnocentrism, and colonialist sexual objectification.

Until relatively recently, the only widely available resources queer Native folks could access in understanding their sexual/gendered selves *as tribal peoples* were either soulless anthropological treatises or paperback anthro-porn. The absence was (and sometimes continues to be) particularly acute if those with knowledge of diverse gender or sexual cultural practices, understandings, or ceremonies were reticent to share publicly that information. Beginning in the early 1980s, and emboldened in part by the ongoing liberation struggles by people of color, women, and gays and lesbians, a number of openly gay, lesbian, bisexual, and, more rarely, transgendered Native activists in urban areas began to articulate their tribal sexualities and gendered identities in ways that brought together the varied threads of their embodied experience around an Indigenous center. This issue of *GLQ* was made possible largely because of this important genealogy.

Native and queer subjectivities have a long and quite vexed history of interconnectedness within the early modern context of colonialism and imperialism. In 1513 Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, a failed Spanish entrepreneur-turned-conquistador and explorer, led his soldiers against the village of Quarequa. After slaughtering and dismembering the chief, Porque, and over six hundred of his warriors, Balboa turned his attention to the "house of this kynge," which was "infested with most abhominable and unnaturall lechery." There he found "the kynges brother and many other younge men in womens apparell, smoth & effeminately decked, which by the report of such as dwelte abowte hym, he abused with preposterous venus."[11] Balboa ordered that the men, who numbered around forty, be fed alive to his hunger-maddened war-dogs.

"Infested." "Abhominable and unnaturall lechery." Disease, deviance, and death — this is the measure of queerness in the "conflict zone" between the Indigenous people of Quarequa and the Spanish raiders. The response is dismemberment, obliteration. In 1583 the Third Provincial Council of Lima, the colonial

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

administration in what is now Peru, declared through its published *Tercero Cathecismo y Exposición de la Doctrina Christiana* that

> above all these sins [of fornication] is the sin we call nefarious and sodomy. . . . If there is anyone among you who commits sodomy, whether with another man, or with a boy, or a beast, let . . . [it] be known that they carry the death penalty under the just laws of our Spanish kings. Let it be known that because of this the Holy Scriptures say that God destroys kingdoms and nations. Let it be known that the reason why God has allowed that you, the Indians, should be so afflicted and vexed by other nations is because of this vice that your ancestors had, and many of you still have. And let it be known that I tell you from God's command that if you do not reform all your nations will perish, and God will finish you, and will eradicate you from the earth.[12]

By this missionary rhetoric, genocide is justified by the supposedly unnatural desires of the Indigenous population, just as the rape of Indigenous women is justified by colonialist rhetoric that both hypersexualizes them and inextricably links their physical bodies with the God-ordained penetration and "taming" of the "savage wilderness" by Christian patriarchy enriched by resource and bodily exploitation. There are numerous other examples we could draw on to argue for some sense of historical empathy between the oppression of Native peoples and the persecution of sexual minorities, and a number of fine scholars have explored in detail the sexual and gendered history of colonization (including Rayna Green, Andrea Smith, and Jonathan Goldberg, among others).[13] Yet an important (and more recent) point of connection is a geographic one, and one that deserves more scholarly attention.

Much of the grassroots theorization and activism for Native rights emerged from disenfranchised, politicized, and sometimes detribalized young Indians in major urban areas throughout the United States and in Canada. One particular site of energetic activism was San Francisco. Though the American Indian Movement (AIM) was founded in Minneapolis, its leaders were highly visible in San Francisco — most notably, through their occupation of Alcatraz Island, with significant support from many in the Bay urban Indian community — and this helped mark the city as a center of Native resurgence. Yet many AIM leaders (as well as members of other ethnopolitical movements, such as the Black Panthers and the Brown Berets) shared the mutual influence and adoption of a sexist, "macho-warrior" pose that drew far more from white stereotypes of Native masculinity than from decidedly more complex and often less hyperaggressive tribal models,

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

with the result that, as the Lakota anthropologist Beatrice Medicine wryly notes, "militant men often say they are fostering Indian unity by having girl friends in each tribe and by fathering as many children as possible."[14] Compromised in part by its homophobia and sexism, AIM offered at least as many problems as possibilities for LGBTQ Native people, so Gay American Indians (GAI) was founded in San Francisco in 1975 by Barbara Cameron (Lakota) and Randy Burns (Paiute) in part to counter both the racism of the gay and lesbian rights movement and the homophobia of other Indian activists.[15] Offering social, political, familial, and educational support and resources to its members, GAI was an important early model for subsequent politics in the then-emergent two-spirit movement (a term coined at a conference in Winnipeg in 1990 to replace the offensive anthro-fetish of "berdache"), which now includes thousands of active members in dozens of two-spirit organizations across North America, as well as the annual international Two-Spirit Gatherings.

As evidenced by this brief and admittedly scattershot history, there are and have been many continuities and connections between the tribal and the sexual in the paracolonial Americas, but such history also demonstrates the challenges inherent in acknowledging those links. In an era of polarized politics and increasing inequity in economic, political, and geographic access, the challenges are likely to increase rather than diminish.

Like the words of welcome that open my introductory remarks, this issue of *GLQ* is an invitation to address those challenges directly. It's an invitation for readers and contributors to gather together to engage the aesthetic, intellectual, experiential, and theoretical sexual subjectivities of Indigenous North America. We hope it will help prompt further such conversations and collaborations.

Certainly it has already served these purposes for the three of us. As Mark's comments note, I was a latecomer to this project as coeditor, but not as a contributor; the call for papers that he and Bethany crafted was eloquent, incisive, and challenging, and I was excited to send along a proposal, which (after many revisions and permutations) became the essay included elsewhere in this issue. What impressed me then, and continues to impress me now, is how this project has excited so many scholars — Native and non-Native alike — to push their ideas, talents, and perspectives farther than they expected, to abandon the comfort of trite and predictable arguments for the more troubling but important currents beneath the analytic surface.

The interpretive provocations and interventions herein function as a critical gifting that honors the diversity, efforts, and lived realities of generations of lovers, activists, artists, and scholars. From Scott Lauria Morgensen's critique of

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

the colonial interplay between heteronormativity and settler politics, to Andrea Smith's insistence that queer studies can offer valuable insights to Native studies with regard to decolonization and escape from the normative structures of "ethnographic entrapment," from Craig Womack's argument for the necessity and pragmatic values inherent in the *naming* of queer desire in queer Native texts to Qwo-Li Driskill's community-based narrative recovery of Cherokee traditions of sexual diversity, and Lisa Tatonetti's compelling discussion of the instability of the queer Native subject in contemporary films like *Johnny Greyeyes* and *The Business of Fancydancing*, the numerous contributions to this issue offer no single politic, no monolithic argument or shared critical perspective. Instead, these essays reflect the rich complexity of Indigenous and queer experience.

Bethany, Mark, and I worked with neither the expectation of nor the desire for unanimity; indeed, our personalities, like our scholarly and editorial emphases, are so different as to render any such possibility decidedly unlikely. What we *did* and *do* share with one another and the issue's varied contributors, however, is a commitment to intellectual rigor, honesty, and respect — qualities that the essays in this issue demonstrate both individually and in dynamic conversation. It's been a wonderful experience; Bethany and Mark deserve enormous credit for having envisioned and committed themselves to seeing this project realized — they're the true visionaries behind its clear success, and, to be quite frank, they've done far more of the difficult editorial work than I have, and for much longer. Yet I'm honored to have been asked to participate as a coeditor, and thankful that I accepted the invitation, as both the process and the result have been enriching beyond anything I could have anticipated. Best of all, I've come to know these two fine scholars and the other contributors so much better as a result, and my own work is the richer (and, I hope, better) for the experience. It's been a pleasure to bring my own ideas to this shared vision and to see it become something that promises to make a real contribution to this important critical conversation.

Native peoples of all sexualities and sexual dissidents of all ethnicities, genders, and orientations have much in common that merits study, but our differences offer important insight into both the limits and possibilities of solidarity across those commonalities. Cross-disciplinary conversations — like cross-cultural interactions — are fraught with difficulties and inevitable conflicts. At their best, however, the analyses and methodological explorations made possible through these conversations also provide some of the most tender, generous, and delightful reminders of what it is to be shamelessly, beautifully, and fabulously human in thoughtful relation to each other and to those who inhabit the other-than-human world.

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

Bethany's Take

These essays' authors are writing out of the scholarly conviction that responsible work in Native studies must move beyond the endless documentation and analysis of racism and stereotypes, beyond work that grows out of and returns to a fascination with non-Native histories, philosophies, and structures of feeling. Instead, as these authors model, we must study and theorize Native American art, culture, philosophy, and politics from Native intellectual, cultural, and national perspectives. If this sounds like a tautology, it isn't. The amount of scholarship about Native subjects that takes little or no account of scholarship based in Native history and culture is astounding. Perhaps Native studies should be considered a methodology (a shift queer studies has managed to make), rather than a subject. Indeed, as Andrea Smith asks in this issue, why can't Native studies be brought to bear on something other than Native topics? Thus, for most scholars in this issue, the question of "how and if queer theory" is a question of how and if queer theory can work with or alongside this fundamental call—that scholars engaged in Native studies, whether they themselves are Native American, are ultimately responsible first and foremost to Native Americans and Native America.

Fair enough. But why is "how and if queer studies" even a question? Surely Native studies can have its disciplinary foci and still engage queer studies. On the most simplistic of levels, there are gay Indians. Getting a touch more complicated, gay Indians make culture, engage in politics, have history, make history, are variously and shiftingly gendered and sexed. And of course, given that "gay people" are not especially what queer studies is even about—given, in other words, that queer studies *has* managed to become a methodology—Native America in general, its genders and sexualities, as it were, should be just as open to the analytic lenses of queer studies as anything and anybody else. What's the issue here?

The answer to that—or rather, the answers—are complicated and contradictory and are tossed back and forth in this collection of essays. But to begin to give you a sense of their scale and scope, I am going to do what I've just said Native studies is moving away from and provide a potted history of nineteenth-century United States Indian policy, which is in and of itself a history of racism and prejudice.[16] If you are unfamiliar with Native studies and unfamiliar with American Indian history, you will need a bare-bones understanding of United States Indian policy and its shifting but constant investment in controlling Native genders and sexualities to chart the larger arc of this collection. A basic understanding of how deeply and for how long Native sexualities have been interdicted by the state will help, if these subjects are new to you, explain the complexity of the

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

questions the authors of these essays are engaging, and will begin to suggest how powerful a *methodology* state control of Native genders and sexualities has been for the United States. Just as Native studies is trying to extend its reach beyond the constant analysis of white racism, so queer studies has expanded far past the study of homophobia and its effects. But *because* violent interventions by the state into Native genders and sexuality has been so central to U.S. Indian policy for so long, because Native genders and sexualities have been ground up and redefined through the machine of state control and cannot be — as is often attempted — rescued or redeemed as the original radical "queer," the meeting of queer and Native studies is neither new nor clean. It is not and cannot be a carefree, joyous meeting and greeting, caring and sharing. In other words, we do have to go back, at least briefly, to the things both fields want to move beyond — the analysis of structures of homophobia and racism. We need to have in our heads at least an outline of the history of the forced and violent union by the state of Indian and queer.[17] The project of thinking these fields together has to acknowledge this "dirty history" and then still be able to talk about comradeship. Having done that, we must not fall into imagining that the happy solution is to "bring" queer to bear on Native studies. The real challenge lies in the vice versa, in thinking in the other direction. What would it mean to think immediately about Native issues in the marriage debate? Can we fully understand that we are talking about Native rights whenever we talk of gay adoption? The aim here is not to mindlessly resuture the subjectivities and politics that have suffered state yolkings for the purposes of repression and genocide, but to reroute our thinking — to see the connections that might allow us to say that Native studies and queer studies challenge and nurture each other *from within*. This journal, and these scholars working on Native and queer work, are not working via fantasies of contact between the fields. We do not have to "bring" anyone to anything; we are already entangled at the roots. We do not have to rescue any one "other" with our own presumptively redemptive subjectivity or methodology or political affiliation.

Of course the history of the European assertion of state control through the queering of colonized populations, and the punishment and violent redirection of Native genders and sexualities not conforming to European ideologies, is much longer and much larger than the history of the United States as a political and geographic entity. But one must begin somewhere, and through both choice and chance this special issue, for better or worse, is focused on the Native populations of the continental United States. I am going to tell an abbreviated story of indigeneity, states, and unions by sending a plumb line down through a series of

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

speeches notable for their nearly overwhelming vapidity, combined with their towering symbolic and ideological importance: presidential inaugural addresses.

For the first eleven decades of U.S. history, presidents mentioned American Indians fairly regularly in their inaugural speeches. Fourteen speeches given by ten different presidents dedicate at least a clause and sometimes a whole paragraph to the perplexing problem of how to claim nationhood on stolen land. With the exception of James Madison's frenzied saber-rattling 1813 address in which Indians are the "savage" counterpart of the invading English, the presidents choose benevolence as their general temperament. The early speeches describe Native people as "nations" and "neighbors," giving lip service to sovereignties that were separate from the United States both politically and geographically. But if sovereignty is dimly recognized in these speeches, the speakers also make it clear that it has a shelf life. The early speeches look forward to a time when Indians will be "civilized." Essays in this collection by Andrea Smith and Scott Lauria Morgensen show that the "civilization" imposed by settler ideologies on Native cultures is explicitly bound up in heteronormative structures of family and labor. 'Twas ever thus: Thomas Jefferson makes the equation between reproductive, propertied straightness and so-called civilization quite clear in his 1805 inaugural address: "Humanity enjoins us to teach them agriculture and the domestic arts; to encourage them to that industry which alone can enable them to maintain their place in existence and to prepare them in time for that state of society which to bodily comforts adds the improvement of the mind and morals."[18] Jefferson makes it sound as if "maintaining their place in existence" is a simple matter of learning and performing "agriculture and the domestic arts." These are jobs that were sharply gendered male and female in Anglo-American culture, and those very gender formations flew in the face of most Native gender constructions. That agricultural labor was the provenance of women and formed the core of women's cultural power in most Native cultures helped make the fact that Native people farmed at all conveniently invisible to Anglo observers.[19] Men giving up hunting and taking over farming from women disrupted Native formations of masculinity and aimed to dismantle the cultural status and power of Native women. The threat of cultural "gendercide," a term Deborah Miranda uses in her essay in this collection, is thus palmed in Jefferson's seemingly gentle and even "comfortable" invitation to "a state of society" in which private property replaces Native cultural practices and displaces Native people.

But across the early decades of the nineteenth century, the tenet that Native people, gently and slowly surrounded by white immigrants, would "assimilate,"

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

giving up their communal land as they awoke to the mature pleasures of capitalist accumulation, faded. It was replaced by the idea, and eventually the government policy, of Indian Removal. Native nations east of the Mississippi would be "offered" equivalent land west of the river, an "Indian Territory" would be created in what is now the state of Oklahoma, where Native nations would be contained within an expanding United States. Native nations stopped being hailed as external and sovereign, and in their inaugural addresses presidents began describing them as internal to the state. They became "the tribes within our limits," no longer encouraged to become properly gendered adult practitioners of "agriculture and domestic arts." Rather, the presidents began describing Indians as eternally childlike, playing round the knees of a colonizing state. James Monroe, under whose presidency the attack on the sovereignty of southeastern Native nations turned fierce, took a lot of time in his 1821 second inaugural address to make paternal the relationship of the United States to a concomitantly infantilized Indian population.

> We have treated them as independent nations, without their having any substantial pretensions to that rank. The distinction has flattered their pride, retarded their improvement, and in many instances paved the way to their destruction. . . .We should become their real benefactors; we should perform the office of their Great Father, the endearing title which they emphatically give to the Chief Magistrate of our Union. Their sovereignty over vast territories should cease, in lieu of which the right of soil should be secured to each individual and his posterity in competent portions; and for the territory thus ceded by each tribe some reasonable equivalent should be granted, to be vested in permanent funds for the support of civil government over them and for the education of their children, for their instruction in the arts of husbandry, and to provide sustenance for them until they could provide it for themselves.[20]

The speaker, who *is* the chief magistrate in question, takes real pleasure in imagining that Native people are begging him to be Daddy and that he is "performing the office of their Great Father" by, essentially, taking the T-bird away. Native nations are painted here as uppity teenagers who have been given responsibility (independent nationhood) too early and who must therefore, as punishment, lose that privilege (sovereignty and land). Monroe explains here that the United States will divide the still infantile Indians' land into individual portions. Native people, as individuals, will be allowed to stay on bits of it and leave those bits to "posterity" (the imposition of heteronormative patriarchal inheritance on Native people

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

used as "gendercide" yet again). But once property is made private and inheritable, it is also made alienable, out of Native control altogether.

Monroe is clearly pleased with the image of federal reorganization of Native land as the benevolent punishment of wastrel youth by a stern but loving father. But if the president is Father, are Indians sons, exactly? At the risk of sounding flippant (though I am actually quite serious), Monroe is planning the dispossession of Native people by subsuming their land into the United States, cutting it up into portions, and then allowing them to remain on tiny segments while "Father" pays their expenses for them. The metaphor is much more resonant of another kind of Daddy—the kind who supports a succession of eternally youthful rent boys.

This 1821 speech precedes the 1831 Supreme Court decision of *Cherokee Nation vs. Georgia*, in which John Marshall ruled that the Cherokee Nation was, yes, a distinct political society but a peculiar one. Native nations, the court ruled, are "domestic dependent nations" and "in a state of pupilage." Their relationship to the United States "resembles that of a ward to a guardian."[21] This definition, which still stands, has had long and complicated implications for Native Americans, some positive and much negative. Marshall's definition allowed for a limited definition of sovereignty for Native nations, but it also insisted on the eternal infantilization of those same nations, "wards" to the federal government's "guardian." As the nineteenth century progressed, the implications of this infantilization became clear. In debates over the Fourteenth Amendment in 1866, Senator Jacob Howard of Michigan voiced an opinion that was at the core of the exclusion of Native Americans from the franchise: "I am not yet prepared to pass a sweeping act of naturalization by which all the Indian savages, wild or tame, belonging to a tribal relation, are to become my fellow-citizens and go to the polls and vote with me."[22] The Civil Rights Act of 1866 states "that all persons born in the United States, and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States."[23] "Belonging to a tribal relation" distressed white America *because* the kinship structures of that tribal relation stood directly against the heteronormative structures of private property ownership and inheritance necessary to the very foundations of what it meant to be a "fellow-citizen."

"Tribal relation" is, as Mark Rifkin has argued in an article in an earlier issue of this journal, and as several of our contributors explore, a queer relation vis-à-vis the liberal state.[24] But if the kinship structures of tribal relations can be, shall we say, generatively "queer" within specific Native cultures, the Indian of white fantasy, in all his dime-store musculature and eternal infantilized dependence is also, in the racist discourse of the state, violently and insistently queered.

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

In the example above, the exclusion of Indians from adult participation in the state is summed up by the Fourteenth Amendment as "Indians not taxed." The phrase is also in the Constitution, where it indicates that the census, for the purposes of calculating the allocation of legislators in the House of Representatives, should not include Indians living on Native land. But by the mid-nineteenth century the implication of "not taxed" has shifted. Now, the Daddy-state pays the rent of Native nations contained within the United States as infantile sovereignties in an eternal "state of pupilage." This paying of the rent allows the state to insist on the youth and concomitant disfranchisement and dependency of Indian people. And until 1924 when Native people gained the vote regardless of tribal affiliation, "adulthood" was only conferred with the dismantling of the "tribal relation" that the state understood as already queer and used to queer Native populations.[25] To produce Indians as individuated, property owning, tacitly "straight" adults, the "tribal relation" and tribally held land became the target of U.S. Indian policy. The Dawes Act of 1887 shattered tribally held land into allotments, forcibly turning communal land into private property and opening up "excess" land to purchase by white settlers.[26] Across the next forty-seven years, until the allotment process ended in 1934, Native Americans lost two-thirds of their land base, an estimated ninety million acres. The incursion of white settlers into Indian land broke up hunting grounds and insisted on nuclear-family-based farming practices, thus directly attacking traditional male and female gender roles. A large part of the goal was to force Indian men into women's work and Indian families into nuclear models, to destroy the core of matrilineal societies based on women's central role in agriculture and to forcibly reorient Native cultures to patriarchal, property-based models. Needless to say, the heteronormative "gendercidal" policies of the Dawes Act were also aimed against genders other than male or female, and against cross-gendered affiliations. Meanwhile, Native children were shipped by the thousands to boarding schools where they were trained in the gender roles considered appropriate to white society, and where sexual abuse was so common and indeed, institutionalized, as to almost form a core part of the curriculum.[27] The dubious carrot of citizenship in the United States was made dependent on Indians eschewing the "tribal relation," an eschewal violently enforced at the level of gender and sexuality.

Which brings us to the very last time a president discussed Native Americans in an inaugural speech. It was 116 years ago, on March 4, 1893. Two and a half years earlier, the violent suppression of the Ghost Dance by the U.S. army had culminated in the massacre of three hundred Lakota at Wounded Knee, marking the end, for many decades at least, of armed resistance by Native Americans. In

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

Chicago, the World's Fair was in full swing, celebrating the four-hundredth anniversary of Columbus's arrival in the so-called New World. In a few more months, Frederick Jackson Turner would speak at that same World's Fair and announce that the frontier was closed and the Indian chapter of white American history was over. Grover Cleveland, who, in his first term as president from 1885–1889 had presided over the passing of the Dawes Act, was returning to the presidency after a four-year hiatus. Here, in its final iteration as a subject worthy of an inaugural address, the smug narrative of paternal benevolence that obscures the preceding century of displacement and genocidal warfare—described by Ulysses S. Grant in his 1873 second inaugural address as "wars of extermination"[28]—is in full flower:

> Our relations with the Indians located within our border impose upon us responsibilities we cannot escape. Humanity and consistency require us to treat them with forbearance and in our dealings with them to honestly and considerately regard their rights and interests. Every effort should be made to lead them, through the paths of civilization and education, to self-supporting and independent citizenship. In the meantime, as the nation's wards, they should be promptly defended against the cupidity of designing men and shielded from every influence or temptation that retards their advancement.[29]

Monroe before him had claimed that independence "retarded" Indian development. Here, Cleveland claims that it is the "cupidity of designing men" that "retards" it. So which is it? Indian pretences to sovereignty or predatory white men? Both are pedophilic fantasies: the first fantasy is of an infantile Indian who poses *as* a full-grown man, the second is a fantasy of an infantile Indian posed *by* full-grown men. Both are greasy with greed and excessive, inappropriate desires—*cupid* is nestled within Cleveland's choice term *cupidity*. The presumed desirous goal? "Advancement"—salvation from backwardness, arrested development, and no future.

Queer studies has recently had plenty to say about the presumed cultural goal of futurity and grown-up-ness.[30] Some think queers should want none of it, some think queers skew it, some think that the infantile (and, indeed, the "retarded") is always queer. Any which way, this work has helped us recognize that distasteful political ground is repeatedly sought in the name of future generations. Queer futures are certainly complicated in the case of Native America, and an understanding of the pasts and futures of American Indian sexualities can—if encountered as dangerous rather than as a happily sequestered chapter

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

in the multicultural anthology of global queerness—do much to reframe standard histories of sexuality that look to the nineteenth century as a moment when "gay" came into modern being. The violence of the state against Indians was brought to bear on kinship relations and tribal affiliations in a state-driven attempt to force Indians into a heteronormative futurity defined by private property, inheritance, and the nuclear family. But that very insistence on a heteronormative futurity, aimed against Native land first and foremost but partly effected through the violent reordering of Native genders and sexualities, was denied Indians by the same state apparatus that insisted on it. Native people, forced from their traditional genders and sexualities, were requeered as children, eternally stunted, the sexualized wards of the state. Forced into future-driven, property-oriented genders and sexualities, Indians were also consigned to a terrible "no future" predicated precisely on the state's definition of "straightened" Indians as nevertheless queerly childish, or childishly queer. The state's tacit definition of Indians as gay, in other words, is caught up in both drives—toward an anti-Native future in which Native genders and sexuality are violently reoriented toward private property and nuclear families, and at the same time toward a "no future" Nativeness, the insistent and reiterative requeering of Native Americans as stunted, eternal children and as depressive, death-driven suicides.

But rather than turn here to Lee Edelman's *No Future*, with its problems for queer of color critique generally and Native studies in particular (tackled in this issue by Smith), I want to turn to Native studies and argue that the critical possibilities of "survivance" are thrilling for queer Native studies.[31] The obsessive and reiterative depiction of Native people as doomed has been answered by Gerald Vizenor's neologism *survivance*. A queer spin on this word understands that it is not about "survival" in a necessarily reproductive, future-driven mode. In the face of a slathering, constantly reiterated, pornotropic desire for Native absence, suffering, and disappearance, "survivance" turns away from a dialectical response that would simply answer death with birth, disappearance with expansion. It is a word about place and presence rather than futures and pasts, and it allows for forgetting and remembering, dying and living, making and destroying, repetition and reiteration. As Vizenor puts it, "Native survivance is an active sense of presence over absence, deracination, and oblivion; survivance is the continuance of stories, not a mere reaction, however pertinent. Survivance is greater than the right of a survivable name."[32] That "greater than the right of a survivable name" is the key for queer critique. The essays in this issue cumulatively make an argument for queer Native survivance, for the possibility and excitement of two-spirit, gay, les-

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

bian, bisexual, and transgender Indian lives, and of resisting state-sanctioned or academy-sanctioned or politically sanctioned lures to sell each other out.

All of this was in my head as I watched the presidential inauguration ceremonies this past January. I did not expect President Obama, who reached out with unprecedented regularity to Native people during his campaign, to talk about Indians in his speech, and anyway, the distinction of being talked about in an inaugural address is dubious, at best.[33] Rick Warren, a conservative celebrity evangelist, gave the invocation at Obama's inauguration. I understood that he was invited *as* an opponent of gay marriage to appease the religious Right (though he has since claimed that, despite encouraging his congregation of thousands to vote for Proposition 8—the restriction of marriage to a man and a woman in the California Constitution—he was never an "activist" against gay marriage). I understood, without conceding, that queer listeners were meant to accept Warren's inclusion as a strategic move. We were meant to yet again "take one for the team." What did knock me back on my heels was the end of the Reverend Joseph E. Lowery's concluding benediction. Lowery is a civil rights activist and a supporter of gay equality before the law, though not of gay marriage. He ended his prayer in a way that he has often ended his prayers over the years. He altered a rhyme that the blues singer Big Bill Broonzy used in "Black, Brown and White," a rhyme that is a much older invocation of the rules of "pigmentocracy" in the United States: "If you're black, get back. If you're brown, stick around. If you're white, you're alright." Lowery said: "Lord, in the memory of all the saints who from their labors rest, and in the joy of a new beginning, we ask you to help us work for that day when black will not be asked to get [in] back, when brown can stick around, when yellow will be mellow, when the red man can get ahead, man; and when white will embrace what is right."[34] Many people (including myself) found this retooling of a lesson in racialized subjugation charming—a light touch at the conclusion of a ceremony inaugurating the first person of color into the office of the president of the United States. This was an event almost unbearably freighted with Meaning, and there was something wonderfully effervescent in the reworking of that ugly rhyme into a sing-song fantasy of togetherness, capped by a pointed invitation for "white" to change and to "embrace" that togetherness. Others felt differently, and the debate over whether Lowery was racist or racializing went back and forth on the Internet for a little while.

But these judgments aside, the minute the rhyme was spoken, it seemed inevitable to me that, in a ceremony in which gay civil rights were explicitly repudiated by the inclusion of Warren as the religious voice of America, Indians made their appearance, for the first time in over a century, as the culmination in a list

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

of "colors" signaling American racial diversity. Lowery's rhyme was deceptively simple; in fact, it carefully took the millions of listeners around the globe through a series of stages. As the rhyme began, "black and brown" still seemed to invoke the painful divisions between African Americans inherited from centuries of a slavocracy perpetuated partly through sexual violence. The introduction of "yellow" taught listeners retrospectively that Lowery's "brown" invoked Latino/a and Chicano/a Americans. The introduction of "yellow will be mellow" also taught listeners that this list was meant to be slightly outrageous and funny, an effect that was helped along by the rhyme's hokey use of 1960s slang. By the time Lowery got to the layered anachronisms of "the red man can get ahead, man," the crowd in Washington was already laughing. Then, the rhyme tipped from its self-knowing extremes of jokey racial designations to the deadly serious conclusion: "and white will embrace what is right."

There was no "And gay will be OK," in Lowery's list. But somehow his prayer did stand in stark contradistinction to Warren's, and somehow it did speak against the fact that Warren was there to repudiate queers. To my mind the connection was a sideways one, and it happened through the inclusion of "red" in Lowery's list. The Indian didn't fit neatly into Lowery's rhyme and its color lineup of black, brown, yellow, white. Why didn't Lowery just say "and red will get ahead?" Why that strange use of "red man?" Lowery had to say "red *man*" because "red" on its own means "commie." But the very fact that Lowery had to make this little dodge, disassociating the Indian from the commie, reminds us of the peculiar relationship of Native Americans to the state, and to state control, reminds us that "tribal affiliation" has been attacked *to create property from Indian land*, and that gender and sexuality has been hotly contested in that attack. Here, in the first mention of Indians at an inauguration in anyone's living memory, the threat of the Indian's commieness (which is not so different from the threat of Native "tribal affiliation") is (yet again) contained by sexing him: "man."

My "take," then, is not an analysis of the essays in the collection but a primer. It's fun to use Native American history to show how Lowery's prayer about racial diversity (that didn't mention sexuality) might answer the ugly antigay implications of Warren's prayer (that also didn't mention sexuality). Lowery extended the logic of multiculturalism to catch whiteness up in the flicking tail of his joke. But this collection is *not* an extension of those logics. A rudimentary understanding of the nineteenth-century history of American Indian policy and its pointed attack on Native sexualities will hopefully enable you to read this collection as a challenge. Is it possible that queer studies needs Native studies more than the other way around?

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

Mark's Take

Origin Story I

In providing a kind of genealogy for how I come to this issue, both in professional and intellectual terms, I want to tell two stories. At the Modern Language Association (MLA) annual conference in 2002, I attended the business meeting for the Association for the Study of American Indian Literature (ASAIL). It was my first time at the meeting, and only my second MLA, and I didn't really know what to expect, nor did I really know anyone there (or at least that's my somewhat spotty recollection). Part of the meeting involved brainstorming ideas for panels sponsored by the committee for the next year's meeting. As a newcomer to the group, and a non-Native one at that, I thought I might as well offer my suggestion, which if unpalatable to everybody else simply would be voted down or left aside in the final determination. I somewhat loosely proposed a panel addressing queer issues, without much more definition than that, and there seemed to be a good deal of support for the general idea. Once the votes were tallied, I found that the queer studies panel had been chosen to be one of the ones sponsored by ASAIL, and much to my surprise, I was asked if I would chair it. Given my position as a non-Native, newcomer, and graduate student, I really was not sure about the appropriateness or wisdom of this decision. I never had done anything of the kind before, and I wasn't sure that I had the knowledge or experience necessary to choose papers, never mind to lay out the parameters of the intellectual intersection that I just was beginning to conceptualize, at least for the purposes of writing the call for papers and assembling the panel. The dissertation on which I was toiling was not in queer studies, but I had felt incredibly invested in queer theory and politics as an undergraduate and early in my graduate career and was hoping to turn back to it in my second project. Already committed to Native studies, I had begun to consider what it would mean to reinterpret some of the texts I was teaching through a queer frame, having already begun work in this vein on an essay about Zitkala-Ša that would be published several years later.[35]

At the end of the MLA meeting, someone suggested to me that I might want to contact Craig Womack to see if he would be interested in participating. I believe by that point I already had read his novel *Drowning in Fire*, but if nothing else, I certainly was familiar with his seminal scholarly work in *Red on Red*, which given its focus on the need for Native people to narrate Native histories made me all the more apprehensive about being the one putting together this panel.[36] He agreed to serve as a commentator, for which I was incredibly grateful. I called the panel "Intersections of Native American Studies and Queer Studies," and in the call for papers I tried to focus on how the two might "complement, critique, and/or compli-

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

cate each other" as ways to produce knowledge.[37] I was particularly interested in exploring the extent to which the methodologies of each critical tradition were intelligible within the terms of the other and how bringing them together might reveal unexamined assumptions about what constitutes sexuality, heteronormativity, collective identity, and politics. More specifically, my two primary areas of concern were examining how ideologies of straightness informed settler understandings of Native family formation, homemaking, and residency in ways that occluded their role in Indigenous governance and how non-Native modes of queer critique left little to no room for addressing Native sovereignty and self-determination, instead tending to focus on breaking intergenerational ties and deterritorialization.[38] Not only was I not explicitly looking for papers that addressed self-representations by lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and two-spirit Native people, I actually was a bit wary of them, worried that the cross-disciplinary intersection the panel was supposed to investigate would become circumscribed around personal identity, the study of writers who were both queer and Native.[39]

I chose what seemed to me the strongest proposals, but in retrospect, I cannot discount the fact that my sense of each abstract's intellectual promise was influenced (to what degree I'm not sure) by my preexisting commitment to certain kinds of inquiry and my hesitation with respect to others. When I received the papers and passed them along to Craig, he immediately asked about the relative lack of focus on queer Native writers among them. In response to what he considered to be a glaring absence, he asked if he could forego commentary per se and instead offer discussion of several very out Native lesbian writers. I agreed, acknowledging his concerns about Native queer writers ending up marginalized at the very intersection where they should be most visible. At the panel itself, Craig read from three writers (Beth Brant, Chrystos, and Janice Gould) and provided interpretations of their work, without directly offering a critique of the panel or the choice of papers on my part. Picking up on what Craig was implying, much of which he had said to me in our e-mail conversations prior to the panel, folks in the audience asked questions about the reasoning behind the choices I had made. What I said in response was that a Native queer studies that occluded the experiences of queer Native people was unacceptable but that one which understood itself as exclusively shaped around an account of those experiences, and representations of them, also was problematic. I was alluding to a similar set of issues to those at stake in the movement from "gay and lesbian" to "queer" studies, in that case tracking the contours and force of heteronormativity rather than concentrating on excavating and interpreting the lives and cultural production of persons who belong to sexual and gender minorities.[40]

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

In this vein, one person said that she had come expecting to hear papers about "Native dykes." I know nothing about her background and her aims in articulating that desire, but what I heard in her comment was either a wish to see her own experience as a Native dyke reflected and recognized or a wish as a non-Native to see and embrace the Native version of her sense of herself. Put in fairly reductive terms, I think Craig was invested in making possible the former against racist and homophobic erasures and violence on all sides, and I was worried about the potentially imperial dimensions of the latter, the false solidarity of non-Native queers who want to identify with things Native while not seriously interrogating settler privilege and remaining willfully ignorant of Indigenous struggles for self-determination for their peoples.[41] Admittedly, this impression has very little to do with the woman whose comment occasioned it, about whom I was and am entirely ignorant, but this moment seemed, and seems still, to me to crystallize an intellectual and political tension that first was made manifest to me by the experiences surrounding the panel, a tension that has shaped my thinking on the intersection of queer and Native studies and that is represented in the pieces for this issue. The friction toward which I am gesturing might be described as that between *identitarian* and *nonidentitarian* methodologies, by which I mean forms of knowledge-production and critique whose mappings are centered on the social positions occupied by queer Native people versus those mappings that use other kinds of coordinates (such as my own focus on Native kinship systems).[42] Rather than argue that these two kinds of approaches bear an antagonistic relation to each other or that the potential disjunction between them generates a conceptual crisis in need of resolution, I suggest that they mark two distinct trajectories through the intersection of Native and queer studies, potentially overlapping and mutually illuminating but neither reducible to nor more primary than the other.[43]

The pieces in this issue indicate analytic possibilities opened by both trajectories; discrepancies between their formulations, differences, and disagreements within each category; and the value of reading them alongside and against each other. One might categorize the pieces by Qwo-Li Driskill, Deborah Miranda, Lisa Tatonetti, and Craig Womack as working within an identitarian methodology; those by Louis Cruz, Janice Gould, Scott Morgensen, Andrea Smith, and James Thomas Stevens as offering nonidentitarian perspectives; while the essays by Sarah Dowling and Daniel Heath Justice can be thought of as transecting, and more directly problematizing, the distinction between approaches that I am sketching. In "Doubleweaving Two-Spirit Critiques: Building Alliances between Native and Queer Studies," Driskill suggests that attending to the particularities of two-spirit identities can allow for a productive *disidentification* with existing

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

intellectual strategies in queer of color critique, arguing that the latter offers a sustained analysis of how heteronormativity is braided with structures of racialization but in ways that tend to background or erase Indigenous modes of collectivity and the dynamics of settler imperialism. Drawing on the Cherokee technique of doubleweaving, s/he develops a conceptual framework in which the relation of two-spirit identity to Native histories and traditions provides a distinct approach that is continuous with the aims of queer of color analysis but that attends to the presence and politics of indigeneity. If Driskill takes up aspects of tradition as a lens for contemporary cultural analysis, Miranda uses the cultural work and concerns of contemporary queer and two-spirit Natives as a framework for registering the assault on non-Euro-normative modes of gendered identification in Indigenous California. In "Extermination of the *Joyas*: Gendercide in Spanish California," she traces the fragments in existing historiography that point to how the violent imposition of normative European sex/gender orders was a key technology for asserting control over Indigenous places and peoples. Considering how a focus on the imperial disciplining and attempted decimation of the *joyas* reveals underexamined dimensions of the ongoing legacy of settler invasion, she tracks the persistence of *joya* identity in varied forms, indexing the survivance of Native traditions and forms of individual and collective self-representation largely assumed lost. Looking at portrayals of Native queerness in contemporary film, Tatonetti's "Visible Sexualities or Invisible Nations: Forced to Choose in *Big Eden*, *Johnny Greyeyes*, and *The Business of Fancydancing*" examines the ways homoeroticism is cast as necessarily separate from the space of the reservation. She explores how despite the varied conceptions of Indigenous identity offered by the films, from almost totally separated from any discernible Native community to deeply embedded in Native family formations, they all explicitly or implicitly align the reservation with normative straightness in ways that suggest the need for two-spirit people to choose between their sexual/gender identity and their commitments to peoples and homelands. Centering the experiences and intuitions of Native queers as a mode of intellectual inquiry, Womack addresses how "suspicioning" can provide a way to bridge the intimately subjective and the critical, drawing on one's longings, inchoate understandings, and perhaps academically unfashionable feelings to forge readings that speak to a desire for public recognition and community. In "Suspicioning: Imagining a Debate between Those Who Get Confused, and Those Who Don't, When They Read Critical Responses to the Poems of Joy Harjo, or What's an Old-Timey Gay Boy Like Me to Do?" he argues for the value of an assertive foundationalism that privileges making visible Native homoerotic possibilities and queer identities as a way to challenge their erasure, also avoiding the

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

potentially slippery slope of a critical ambiguity that does not necessarily reflect the self-conceptions and collective needs of LGBT/queer/two-spirit Native people.

The essays I'm characterizing as nonidentitarian also address issues of identity and identification in sustained ways, but they do not take the social position of two-spirit or queer Native people as a necessary starting point for generating analysis and critique. They emphasize the potential pitfalls of highlighting Indigenous difference and use queerness — as a set of social experiences and methodologies — as a lens through which to highlight the encompassing dynamics of settler-state authority as it provides a structuring context that shapes the lives, subjectivities, and social formations of all those who inhabit the sphere over which it asserts sovereignty. The series of images by Louis Cruz links the revaluation of same-sex desire and the gender possibilities available within Native tradition to the broader project of reclaiming aspects of Indigenous life lost or suppressed because of the history of settler imposition and violence. Gould's autobiographical piece, "My Father, Cynthia Conroy," addresses her relationship with her transvestite and then transsexual white father. While acknowledging her positionality as a Native lesbian, her account chronicles the lives of the people in her family in ways that indicate how the state frames their experiences and expectations. The choices of everyone in her life appear powerfully shaped by state-sanctioned racializing, gendering, and heteronormative ideologies that mesh with each other to support nuclear-family homemaking, which constrains their life options and possibilities for envisioning a more whole sense of self. Morgensen's essay further explores how non-Natives participate in a social system founded on settler violence, showing how non-Native forms of sexual identity are predicated on ongoing histories of colonial terror. In "Settler Homonationalism," he refigures Jasbir K. Puar's work on the relation between current discourses of terrorism and "homonationalism," in which (white) queers seek access to the privileges of citizenship by accepting inclusion into the U.S.'s racializing and imperial narrative of its own exceptionalism; Morgensen argues that current non-Native articulations of queer identity claim cultural citizenship by simultaneously appropriating indigeneity and erasing the contemporary existence of Native peoples, taking settlement as axiomatic even in the process of offering an oppositional vision of the nation. Smith's "Queer Theory and Native Studies: The Heteronormativity of Settler Colonialism" takes up a different thread in queer studies, arguing that its development of a notion of *subjectless critique* can aid in decentering the ethnographic imperative she suggests often dominates Native studies. Instead of trying to represent Native people, creating an image of otherness consumable by non-Natives, she suggests taking the charting of the dimensions and dynamics of (hetero)normativity by queer stud-

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

ies as a guide for how Native studies might shift to engage more fully the system of settler colonialism in all its facets, but reciprocally, she indicates the ways that a number of prominent queer theorists efface their own status as settlers, and abject indigeneity, even as they critique the state, illustrating the need for a more sustained and substantive engagement with subjectivities of settlement within queer studies. In contrast to the call for a two-spirit mode of critique, Stevens suggests that such a position does not reflect his self-understanding and that it potentially caters to a non-Native desire for the performance of Native spirituality. In "Poetry and Sexuality: Running Twin Rails," he indicates how his experience of his own sexual identity does not fit the Twin-Spirit model, instead addressing how his poetry explores the effects of settler colonialism on all modes of intimacy and eroticism in the United States.

The pieces by Dowling and Justice most directly challenge the schematic I have been using. They in some sense make LGBT Native identity their focus, taking the effort to affirm its presence as a key critical goal, but, in different ways, both also refuse to privilege that intersectional space as a site of knowledge-production, decentering the process of recognition even as it remains a key element of the essays' intellectual aims. In "'And through its naming become owner': Translation in James Thomas Stevens's *Tokinish*," Dowling offers a reading of Stevens's work that highlights how it weaves homoeroticism into the history of conquest, particularly through incorporating and reworking Roger Williams's *Key into the Language of America*. Instead of seeking to mark the specificity of queer identity in the present, however, Dowling argues that the text queers temporality in ways that highlight how the quotidian metaphorics of possession that circulate in romantic discourse are expressive of contemporary social subjects' enmeshment in the ongoing history of settlement, and in this way, queerness provides less an alternative to, or way out of, entrenched imperial dynamics than a trace of their persistence as a condition of intelligibility for all forms of desire. Starting from the standpoint of the Cherokee Nation's passage of a law defining marriage as between one man and one woman, Justice's "Notes toward a Theory of Anomaly" sets out to find precedent for recognizing such same-sex relationships. Yet rather than look for evidence of a two-spirit status within Cherokee tradition, he suggests that the cosmovision of Mississippian peoples, those who prior to the early nineteenth century inhabited what has come to be known as the U.S. Southeast, honors *anomaly* as a necessary feature of social life. From this perspective, the institutionalization of a normative ideal organized around heteroconjugal domesticity violates traditional philosophies (contesting the justifications offered by Cherokee officials that they were upholding such principles), but the marriage law does so less by effacing

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

roles that had gender or erotic components deemed perverse than by a fetishization of dichotomy that profoundly skews modes of thought that acknowledge hybridity and incongruity as valued features of existence. Additionally, Sharon Holland's "Afterword" suggests the ways that a kind of identitarian commitment may subtend all of the essays, inasmuch as the particular ways they center Native histories is a strength that also can lead them away from a more sustained engagement with the critical possibilities opened by other extant queer and feminist modes of analysis, such as those developed within women of color feminism and black queer studies.

In suggesting a distinction between identitarian and nonidentitarian kinds of analyses, I seek less to mark mutually exclusive or competing modes of inquiry than to designate the presence of distinct kinds of intellectual and political concerns that appear within contributors' efforts to think across, between, and among Native American and queer studies. These potentially discrepant aims may generate tensions, but the attempt definitively to privilege one approach over another would seem to me to short-circuit the possibilities for productive dialogue among them. The pieces here indicate quite powerfully the stakes and losses that would attend disregarding the subjectivities, experiences, and knowledges of queer Native people or failing to address the relation between available identity formations and the ongoing history and violence of settler colonialism.

Origin Story II

In the summer of 2006 Bethany and I raised the idea of working on a project together. We knew it would involve some mesh of Native studies and queer studies, since we both had been moving in and across that particular interdisciplinary crossroads in one form or other for some time, and we wanted to do a collection of some sort, coediting rather than coauthoring. We began considering venues, deciding on *GLQ* because of its commitment to expanding the boundaries of what constitutes "queer" analysis. Also, I know that, at least for me, that choice had much to do with my status as non-Native and the attendant fact that I imagined my intervention as getting more queer studies folks to attend to Native peoples, politics, and histories and the dimensions and dynamics of settler imperialism.

At that time, as well as afterward, Bethany and I discussed whether we, as non-Natives, should be the ones editing such a project. We went back and forth on this question, coming to the conclusion (at least as I remember it) that we would be open if other people expressed concern on this front but that since we both are deeply invested in Native studies and queer studies (as intersecting fields and independent of each other) and we were planning to have Native scholars predomi-

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

nate in the special issue itself, that perhaps not having Native representation in the editorship positions themselves was not a major issue. We collaborated on the proposal and sent it to Ann Cvetkovich and Annamarie Jagose. When they also raised the question about editorial representation, we offered a version of the reasoning sketched above, which seemed to address their concerns and to reaffirm for us that our perception on this particular issue made sense. Bethany and I brainstormed with each other, and with Ann and Annamarie, about whom to invite, and we came up with a list of contributors that we felt would make for a compelling issue. We knew we wanted to include creative work, gesturing toward important cultural expressions and interventions made in other genres than the academic essay as well as the significance of storytelling as a mode of knowledge-production for Native peoples (as suggested by the pieces by Gould, Stevens, and Cruz). In the weeks preceding the first meeting of what would become the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA), we contacted people, trying to gauge their interest. I made a point of indicating to everyone that neither Bethany nor I were Native, and the people to whom I spoke did not express concern about this fact at that time.

Picking up the narrative at the 2007 meeting of the American Studies Association (ASA) in mid-October, at that point I was hoping to check in with the contributors who were there about the possibility of doing a panel to advertise the issue at the next year's ASA. When I went up to chat with one of them, that person told me that there was something about which we had to talk; this person had received an e-mail indicating word was being spread to avoid participating in the issue because of the lack of Native editorial representation, and this person seriously was considering pulling out of it. I had not heard anything of the sort, and so was shocked and felt terrible that I had done something to provoke such a response. The person who had received the e-mail suggested that I contact the people involved in the issue to see if they had heard anything, if they shared the concerns about representation, and where they thought we should go from here.

After telling Bethany, who was equally surprised and horrified, about the situation, we did precisely what our contributor suggested. While no one else had heard anything of the sort, the responses with respect to representation were a bit more mixed: some people thought Bethany and I had acted respectfully and responsibility and no change was necessary; some thought we should see if an appropriate Native scholar were interested in joining us in editing but need not worry if no one was available; some thought we really needed at least one Native coeditor. Given how far along the project was at that point—the issue's general shape and aims were configured, most of the contributors had been solicited, and

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

the call for papers, although not yet posted, had been drafted — Bethany and I were very worried about inviting someone into a process well under way, thereby offering only a tokenistic inclusion. Our solution was to ask Daniel, who already was a contributor and therefore had been part of the process for some time (having himself suggested at least one of the other contributors), if he would be interested in joining us as a coeditor. Bethany and I suggested that depending on his perspective on the issue's existing structure we could do anything from revise the call for papers to start again from scratch, reconceptualizing the issue and the contributors. Daniel graciously agreed to take up editorial duties and indicated that he had no problem with the shape and articulation of the issue thus far. This way to address concerns about representation, obviously, is not optimal, and while I cannot and will not try to speak for Daniel, I do not think his agreement with our previous choices actually resolves the issues at play in this story.

While these kinds of background details usually are not mentioned in an editorial introduction, I offer them because I hope they can help illuminate the sort of negotiations surrounding this kind of intellectual project (which often go unaddressed) and the complex, layered, and sometimes painful politics of solidarity at stake in such negotiations. More than simply providing background for the issue, retelling this story in print functions as a way to index the institutional matrix in which the intellectual work of the essays occurs. If we are concerned with the issue of nationality and the complex ways legal and political discourses at various scales operate to shape Native and settler notions of sovereignty, we also need to address the ways knowledge-production within the academy takes part in these broader patterns. Returning to the methodological role of identity discussed in the first story above, the kinds of questions raised about choosing a standpoint from which to begin analysis — particularly the need for critical mappings that center queer Native experiences, self-understandings, and social locations whether or not the critic hirself is Native — apply with greater force when considering the question of which scholars' perspectives will be privileged in shaping the emergent field of Native/queer studies. Certain material benefits within the academy accrue to those chosen to edit or appear in scholarly projects like special issues and book collections. As we all know, there is a hierarchy of publication for the purposes of tenure, and decisions about inclusion ramify as lines on a curriculum vitae, as well as relative notoriety within one's discipline, that can have significant consequences when one is being evaluated for tenure or promotion. Also, given the emphasis on newness within scholarly publication and the fact that certain areas of analysis tend to be seen as more readily covered than others (a Native author's work would be far more likely to be seen as critically exhausted after a few essays

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

than would, say, the writing of John Milton), being the first one to publish on a subject—as editor or author—means that one's work not only can open up an area of study but also, paradoxically, can close off possibilities for others to publish in what is taken to be the "same" area. If Native scholars are competing for a limited number of slots with non-Native ones, and the numbers for the latter are significantly higher, the former structurally will be disadvantaged with respect to publication, and in ways just outlined, Native intellectuals can be crowded out of the less-than-capacious marketplace of ideas created by the actual dynamics of academic publishing. Taking Craig's critique of my choices for the MLA panel as a guide, wouldn't the problems raised by an emergent Native/queer criticism that leaves aside queer Native writers be magnified by an emergent Native/queer criticism that leaves aside queer Native critics?

I do accept the anti-essentialist (and perhaps just commonsensical) argument that a person being Native does not guarantee that hir work or editorship inherently will be more insightful, careful, or attentive to concerns raised by Native peoples than that of a non-Native. Yet I think back to the claims made by the white, wannabe scholar from Sherman Alexie's *Indian Killer*, who asserts, "Every good story that belongs to Indians belongs to non-Indians too."[44] Such a sentiment functions as an extension of larger settler logics of preemption and of claims to indigeneity, explicit and implicit, that bracket the violence of settlement and the ongoing struggle for self-determination by Native peoples, a dynamic Morgensen theorizes in his contribution to this issue. If I as a non-Native critic were to take up Driskill's doubleweaving as a way to conceptualize my own intellectual project or to adopt Womack's "suspicioning" as a methodology, to what extent does that engagement with their work, the acceptance of their intellectual and rhetorical sovereignty, still function as an appropriation, a claiming of Indigenous precedent as a way to legitimize my own settler position as an authority on indigeneity?[45] Conversely, following the implications of Smith's analysis of "ethnographic entrapment" in her essay, doesn't a shift away from chronicling Native difference to foregrounding the ongoing history of settler colonialism place responsibility on non-Native scholars, including in queer studies, to address the complex dynamics and dimensions of settler rule? If there's a real danger that non-Natives will use Native stories to accrue cultural capital, and institutional authority, for themselves within the academy in ways that parallel and interface with the persistent legal appropriation and management of Indigenous resources, isn't there also the danger of marginalizing settlement as purely of concern to those who *are* Indigenous, creating greater space for Native people in Native(/queer) studies but at the expense of expanding the base of people critiquing settler colonialism? If a Native/

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

queer studies without Native scholars creates a false solidarity, replicating a larger dynamic in which Native peoples are "overrun by the ignorance of the mistaken, misdirected efforts of those who would help them," a Native/queer studies without non-Native scholars can foreclose possible lines of solidarity, in terms of generating a movement—or at least securing institutional nodes like programs, centers, and hiring lines—within the academy that can direct additional resources to anti-imperial knowledge-production.[46]

Where is the line between solidarity and expropriation, between non-Natives helping advance a critique of the settler imperialism in which they are enmeshed (and from which they benefit) and reinforcing it through the implicit, and largely well-meaning, exertion of control over knowledge-production and the institutional resources that go along with it? I do not have a good answer, or at least I have no easy, definitive one, but instead offer a series of situation-specific tactical strategies, such as those described above. Perhaps like the relationship between intellectual approaches addressed in my first story, this question also involves less a single choice, the possibility of determining a clear boundary, than a vexed, continuing negotiation, except this one extends beyond methodology to how people in the academy understand their own personal, direct implication in histories and current systems of state-sponsored intervention, invasion, displacement, regulation, translation, and erasure targeting Indigenous peoples. How does recognizing such implications affect the quotidian dynamics of our participation in institutions of higher learning? Might a Native/queer studies play a role in theorizing such dynamics? What would it mean to *queer* understandings of those dynamics, or does such a project function as an evasion?

At this stage, to ask what work remains undone is fairly premature, since in many ways the effort to think Native American studies and queer studies together is in its nascency. A few broad questions might include the following, however: to what extent do available strategies of queering provide a way to open up the study of indigeneity and settlement, and to what extent do they end up replicating the logics of settlement? What would it mean to indigenize queer studies? In what ways has Native studies been complicit with heteronormativity? How does engaging with queer critique suggest ways to rethink Native sovereignty and nationality? How do existing articulations of Native self-determination challenge queer studies approaches to nationalism? How does centering the history of Native peoples and the continuing process of settlement substantively alter how we write the history of sexuality? What constitutes "tradition," and how might (the critique of) heteronormativity (re)shape how tradition is cited and circulated? How might the

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

increased visibility of queer Native people affect the ways sovereignty and peoplehood are conceptualized and lived? The essays here address these questions from different critical angles and to varied methodological, theoretical, and disciplinary ends and effects, and these certainly do not exhaust the issues raised by the contributions here, instead merely suggesting some of the launching points they offer. These pieces offer a sustained analysis of the intertwining of settler colonialism with discourses of sexuality, the enactment and naturalization of state power through heteronormalization, the importance for queer scholarship and politics of engaging with the ongoing dynamics of settlement and foregrounding the self-representations of Indigenous peoples, the presence of the history of conquest in quotidian aspects of social life, the possibilities and problems of articulating Native eroticisms and genders within a vocabulary of public visibility as sexual minorities, and the multifaceted relationship between "sexuality" and available ways of imagining and performing peoplehood. I hope, then, that these "origin" stories ultimately function less as origin than provocation, offering not a secure place of purity from which to begin but, like the pieces collected here, an exploration of how efforts like this special issue begin in medias res amid, in Vizenor's terms, the "ruins of representation" created and maintained by settler colonialism.[47]

Notes

1. See George Chauncey, *Why Marriage? The History Shaping Today's Debate over Gay Marriage* (New York: Basic Books, 2005).
2. Some notable court cases include *Carcieri v. Salazar* 129 S. Ct. 1058 (2009); *Plains Commerce Bank v. Long Family Land* (2008); and *Sherill v. Oneida* 125 S. Ct. 1478 (2005). For an overview of contemporary federal Indian law, see David E. Wilkins and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001).
3. Native peoples were declared to be "domestic dependent nations" in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831). See Jill Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases: The Confrontation of Law and Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996).
4. See Jennifer Denetdale, "Carving Navajo National Boundaries: Patriotism, Tradition, and the Diné Marriage Act of 2005," *American Quarterly* 60 (2008): 289–94; Jeffrey S. Jacobi, "Two Spirits, Two Eras, Same Sex: For a Traditionalist Perspective on Native American Tribal Same-Sex Marriage Policy," *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 39 (Summer 2006): 823–50; and Christopher L. Kannady, "The State, Cherokee Nation, and Same-Sex Unions: In Re: Marriage License of McKinley and Reynolds," *American Indian Law Review* 29 (2004–5): 363–81. See also Daniel Heath Justice's essay in this issue.

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

5. For a prominent example, see Senator Rick Santorum's appearance on "Fox News Sunday" in August 2003, www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,93646,00.html (accessed April 25, 2009).
6. As Sharon Holland notes in her afterword, the essays tend not to address black queer studies per se, but the critique they offer also can be extended to the givenness of the settler-state in that scholarship. For a stunning collection of this work, see E. Patrick Johnson and Mae G. Henderson, *Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005). For examples of Native feminist critique of hetero-patriarchal configurations of nationhood, see Joanne Barker, "Gender, Sovereignty, and the Discourse of Rights in Native Women's Activism," *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 7 (2006): 127–61; Reyna K. Ramirez, *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); and Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End, 2005).
7. For examples of the shift to transnationalism in queer studies, see Arnaldo Cruz-Malavé and Martin F. Manalansan IV, eds., *Queer Globalizations: Citizenship and the Afterlife of Colonialism* (New York: New York University Press, 2002); Gayatri Gopinath, *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Martin F. Manalansan IV, *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); and Jasbir K. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007). On the vexed process of federal recognition, see Renée Ann Cramer, *Cash, Color, and Colonialism: The Politics of Tribal Acknowledgment* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005); Eva Garroutte, *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native North America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); and Allogan Slagle, "Unfinished Justice: Completing the Restoration and Acknowledgement of California Indian Tribes," *American Indian Quarterly* 13 (1989): 325–45.
8. For examples, see "Queering Native Literature, Indigenizing Queer Theory" in *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 20 (2008): 1–75.
9. The term *Métis* is a vexed one in Canada, as there are different and sometimes conflicting definitions depending on the contexts and relevant authorities. (The lowercase *métis* is sometimes applied in the case of those with mixed Native and non-Native ancestry, but not always, thus adding to the confusion.) The Métis National Council (MNC)—which represents those Métis with the strongest cultural, linguistic, and geographic distinctiveness—insists on a very narrow definition, applying only to those people descended from ancestors granted land or scrip under the Manitoba Act of 1870 or subsequent Dominion Land Acts. (The MNC also acknowledges those with documented historical community recognition, primarily from those in the Red River settlement of contemporary Manitoba.) More broadly, the Native Council of

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

Canada and Congress of Aboriginal Peoples recognize those with cultural and historical Métis roots, although they need not necessarily be from the prairie provinces or necessarily reflect Red River cultural practices. (This would be the definition used by most Métis in Ontario.) Adding to the confusion are various legal definitions of the Canadian nation-state, such as those Indians who missed signing treaties and didn't officially gain status and some who were enfranchised by getting a university degree (and thus lost status) or, with women, marrying out, losing status and becoming, to the Canadian government, Métis. (Bill C-31 reversed this situation for some Métis, who then became status Indians.)

10. The Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Confederacy, commonly known today as the Six Nations, was originally composed of five linguistically and culturally connected peoples: Mohawks, Senecas, Oneidas, Onondagas, and Cayugas. The Tuscaroras joined the Confederacy in 1722.
11. Peter Martyr, quoted in Jonathan Goldberg, "Sodomy in the New World: Anthropologies Old and New," in *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*, ed. Michael Warner (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 4.
12. Quoted in Peter Herman Sigal, *Infamous Desire: Male Homosexuality in Colonial Latin America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 144–45.
13. Rayna Green, "The Pocahontas Perplex: The Image of American Indian Women in American Culture," *Massachusetts Review* 27 (1975): 698–714; Smith, *Conquest*; and Jonathan Goldberg, "Sodomy in the New World: Anthropologies Old and New," in Warner, *Fear of a Queer Planet*, 3–18.
14. Beatrice Medicine, "Changing Native American Roles in an Urban Context *and* Changing Native American Sex Roles in an Urban Context," in *Two-Spirit People: Native American Gender Identity, Sexuality, and Spirituality*, ed. Sue-Ellen Jacobs, Wesley Thomas, and Sabine Lang (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 153.
15. Brian Joseph Gilley, *Becoming Two-Spirit: Gay Identity and Social Acceptance in Indian Country* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 27–28.
16. This is hardly an undocumented history, and interested readers will find many books to choose from in pursuing it. Good overviews include Wilkins and Lomawaima, *Uneven Ground*; Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986); and following, as I do not, into the twentieth century, Vine Deloria, *American Indian Policy in the Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992).
17. Of course non-Native queers have been implicated in the process of settlement, and radical queers have been invested in romanticized notions of Indianness to assist utopian community building. See, for example, Scott Morgensen, "Arrival at Home: Radical Faerie Configurations of Sexuality and Place," *GLQ* 15 (2008): 67–96.
18. Edwin Williams, *The Addresses and Messages of the Presidents of the United States, Inaugural, Annual and Special, from 1789 to 1846* (New York: Walker, 1846), 174.

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

19. This general principle played itself out differently in different nations, and with different implications for women's cultural power. For a Cherokee example, see Theda Perdue, "Women, Men, and American Indian Policy: The Cherokee Response to 'Civilization,'" in *Negotiators of Change: Historical Perspectives on Native American Women*, ed. Nancy Shoemaker (New York: Routledge, 1995), 90–114.
20. Williams, *Addresses and Messages of the Presidents*, 431.
21. "*Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1830)," in *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, ed. Francis Paul Prucha (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), 59.
22. Quoted in Daniel McCool, Susan M. Olson, and Jennifer L. Robinson, *Native Vote: American Indians, the Voting Rights Act, and the Right to Vote* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 4.
23. Quoted in McCool, Olson, and Robinson, *Native Vote*, 3.
24. See Mark Rifkin, "Romancing Kinship: A Queer Reading of Indian Education and Zitkala-Sa's *American Indian Stories*," *GLQ* 12 (2006): 27–59.
25. The Fifteenth Amendment did not go down easily everywhere. Several states, including New Mexico and Arizona, still continued to deny Indians the right to vote, and court cases need to be filed in order to extend the amendment to them. See Donald Fixico, *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy, 1945–1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986); and Kenneth R. Philp, *Termination Revisited: American Indians on the Trail to Self-Determination, 1933–1953* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).
26. The Dawes Act exempted most of the tribes in Indian Territory, including the Five Civilized Tribes, from allotment; they were included under the Curtis Act (1898).
27. See Smith, *Conquest*; and Tim Giago, *Children Left Behind: The Dark Legacy of Indian Mission Boarding Schools* (Santa Fe: Clear Light, 2006).
28. Ulysses S. Grant, "Second Inaugural Address," in *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789–1897*, 10 vols., edited by James Daniel Richardson (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1896–99), 7:222.
29. Grover Cleveland, "Inaugural Address," in *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789–1897*, 10 vols., edited by James Daniel Richardson (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1896–99), 9:391–92.
30. See, for example, Lee Edelman, *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004); Kathryn Bond Stockton, "Growing Sideways, or Versions of the Queer Child: The Ghost, the Homosexual, the Freudian, the Innocent, and the Interval of Animal," in *Curiouser: On the Queerness of Children*, ed. Steven Bruhm and Natasha Hurley (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004); and Elizabeth Freeman, "Packing History, Count(er)ing Generations," *New Literary History* 31 (2000): 727–34.
31. See, for example, José Esteban Muñoz, "Cruising the Toilet: LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka, Radical Black Traditions, and Queer Futurity," *GLQ* 13 (2007): 353–67.

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

32. Gerald Vizenor, “Aesthetics of Survivance: Literary Theory and Practice,” in *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence*, ed. Gerald Vizenor (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008), 1.
33. Where Indians have not been mentioned, they have been implied in the century and more since Cleveland’s speech. As usual, you can find Native people in their conspicuous absence from narratives about national origin. From Robert Frost’s remarkable sleight of hand in his reading of the “The Gift Outright” at John F. Kennedy’s inauguration, in which he claims that “the land was ours before we were the land,” to Obama’s comfortable statement that “we settled the West” (and I don’t think he was referring to his own Native ancestry here), a pretty and Indianless vision of the expansion of the United States is often evoked at these events.
34. Joseph P. Lowery, Inaugural Prayer, voices.washingtonpost.com/inauguration-watch/2009/01/transcript_of_rev_lowerys_inau.html (accessed March 15, 2009).
35. Rifkin, “Romancing Kinship.”
36. See Craig Womack, *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); and Womack, *Drowning in Fire* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001).
37. See cfp.english.upenn.edu/archive/2003-03/0167.html (accessed January 4, 2009).
38. For examples of the ways non-Native queer theoretical work seems to found itself on displacing intergenerationality, see Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner, “Sex in Public,” *Critical Inquiry* 24 (1998): 547–66; Edelman, *No Future*; and Judith Halberstam, *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives* (New York: New York University Press, 2005). For more capacious accounts of queer temporality, see Elizabeth Freeman, *The Wedding Complex: Forms of Belonging in Modern American Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002); Heather Love, *Feeling Backward: Loss and the Politics of Queer History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); and Christopher Nealon, *Foundlings: Lesbian and Gay Historical Emotion before Stonewall* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001). For an effort to think queer and Native temporalities together, through the work of Craig Womack, see Bethany Schneider, “Oklahobo: Following Craig Womack’s American Indian and Queer Studies,” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 106 (2007): 599–613. For accounts of queer diaspora that seem to have little place for indigeneity, see Gopinath, *Impossible Desires*; Eithne Luibhéid, “Sexuality, Migration, and the Shifting Line between Legal and Illegal Status,” *GLQ* 14 (2008): 289–315; Martin F. Manalansan IV, “Race, Violence, and Neoliberal Spatial Politics in the Global City,” *Social Text*, nos. 84–85 (2005): 141–55; and Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*. For further discussion of that particular dynamic, see Smith, this issue.
39. I’m using *queer* here as a catchall for the longer list noted above, for the sake of brevity. I am not suggesting that the term is either merely neutral or necessarily accepted as relevant by the writers and persons loosely included under the rubric here. In this special issue alone, for instance, Driskill proposes *Two-Spirit* as an alternative to *queer* for Native people, but that gesture is equally contested by Justice and Stevens.

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

40. For varied articulations of this difference, see Scott Bravmann, *Queer Fictions of the Past: History, Culture, and Difference* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Cathy J. Cohen, "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?" *GLQ* 3 (1997): 437–65; Lisa Duggan, "The New Homonormativity: The Sexual Politics of Neoliberalism," in *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics*, ed. Russ Castronovo and Dana D. Nelson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 175–94; Linda Garber, *Identity Poetics: Race, Class, and the Lesbian-Feminist Roots of Queer Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001); and Michael Warner, *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life* (New York: Free Press, 1999).
41. See also Beth Brant, *Writing as Witness: Essay and Talk* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1994); Qwo-Li Driskill, "Stolen from Our Bodies: First Nations Two-Spirits/Queers and the Journey to a Sovereign Erotic," *SAIL* 16 (2004): 50–64; Brian Joseph Gilley, *Becoming Two-Spirit: Gay Identity and Social Acceptance in Indian Country* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006); Sue-Ellen Jacobs, Wesley Thomas, and Sabine Lang, *Two-Spirit People: Native American Gender Identity, Sexuality, and Spirituality* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997); and Deborah Miranda, "Dildos, Hummingbirds, and Driving Her Crazy," *Frontiers* 23 (2002): 135–49.
42. As should become clear from my description below, my choice of terms should not suggest that I am defining one approach as more linked to "identity politics" than the other, nor am I suggesting that a politics organized around identity is necessarily more naive, limited in scope, or exclusionary than other formulations or formations.
43. In fact, I feel that my thinking about how the settler state employs heteronormativity to limit and regulate the possibilities for Native sovereignty has been shaped in immeasurable ways by reading Womack's novel *Drowning in Fire*. See Mark Rifkin, "Native Nationality and the Contemporary Queer: Tradition, Sexuality, and History in *Drowning in Fire*," *American Indian Quarterly* 32 (2008): 443–70.
44. Sherman Alexie, *Indian Killer* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1996), 60.
45. On intellectual and rhetorical sovereignty, see Scott Richard Lyons, "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?" *College Composition and Communication* 51 (2000): 447–68; Malea Powell, "Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians *Use* Writing," *College Composition and Communication* 53 (2002): 396–434; and Robert Allen Warrior, *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995).
46. Vine Deloria Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (1969; Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988), xiii.
47. Gerald Vizenor, *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1994).

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024

Downloaded from http://read.dukeupress.edu/glq/article-pdf/16/1-2/5/414313/GLQ161-2_02_Intro.pdf by guest on 14 April 2024