

underestimated. While contributing to some of the most prevalent debates in indigenous and colonial studies, the collected work provides multiple points of entry for scholars in the fields of art, media, and geography to begin the deep work of engaging in settler-colonial critiques within their own fields and disciplines. While useful as a survey text, most authors engage with a much longer history of intellectual debate through a sort of intellectual shorthand that requires a shared grounding within the field of indigenous studies and settler-colonial studies, and is thus not well suited as an introductory text.

While collectively the articles make numerous contributions, there are a few absences throughout the book. In short, the collection lacks a nuanced approach to, or engagement with, critiques of gender binaries and the central role of gender in the practices of settler-colonial occupation. While many of the chapters confront the complexities of race in their approach to understanding structures of colonialism, the manner through which colonial violence is not only gendered in its impacts, but gendered in structure, is absent. With the recent work of scholars such as Sarah Deer and Sarah Hunt, it is clear that these important interventions should be engaged from multiple disciplinary and contextual points. Further, Wolfe's introduction could have included a more pointed examination of his own position within the field, as well as the position that the respective authors occupy, as a means of critically demonstrating the very recouping of binarism he advocates at the outset of his work.

Despite these absences, the book is a useful contribution to the field. Collectively, the work can be read as calls to action that offer multiple points of entry and acknowledge the variety of approaches within the field of indigenous studies. However, the chapters share a theoretical commitment to mobilizing the breadth of resources within the field of indigenous studies to critically interrogate particular instantiations of colonial power. For example, Manu Vimalassery argues, "Indigenous critical theory, with its focus on relationality and responsibility to nonhuman animals, plants, and inanimate elements present in Indigenous place, can contribute to a more concrete and thorough critique of political economy grounded in place" (176). As in the best edited collections, the sum of the whole is thus greater than each of the constituent parts.

Kelsey R Wrightson

University of British Columbia

The White Possessive: Property, Power and Indigenous Sovereignty. By Aileen Moreton-Robinson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015. 264 pages. \$94.50 cloth; \$27.00 paper; \$12.49 electronic.

This monograph is a collection of essays that are the result of "a lifetime of experiencing and witnessing racism in its many forms" (xx). Aileen Moreton-Robinson seeks to answer two questions that are largely concerned with Aboriginal people who have been racialized and how their racialization is intimately tied to the "possession of Aboriginal lands and Aboriginal people" (xx). These twelve chapters were written independently of one another, but all work together to explore how white possession disavows

Aboriginal sovereignty through the “possessive logics of patriarchal white sovereignty” (xxi). *The White Possessive* is organized into three parts: “Owning Property,” “Becoming Propertyless,” and “Being Property.” Moreton-Robinson’s work advances whiteness studies and uses race as a category of analysis and explores white possessive logics, or “a mode of rationalization,” which inextricably links white possession and indigenous sovereignty (xii).

Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, Crow Creek Sioux scholar, argues in “First Panel: Reclaiming American Indian Studies” that American Indian studies, or indigenous studies, is grounded in two key concepts: “Indigeness and sovereignty” (*Wicazo Sa Review* 20:1). Cook-Lynn proposes that all aspects of indigenous scholars’ work should “advance and protect” indigeness and sovereignty. Mason Durie, Māori scholar, has similarly articulated that Māori studies should be grounded in Māori philosophies, worldviews, language, and methods. However, Moreton-Robinson states that the development of indigenous studies has been problematic because it has developed alongside other disciplines that continue to marginalize or exclude an indigenous worldview, which “discursively centers the Indigenous world as the object of study” (xv). *The White Possessive* posits that while this body of scholarship is vital to not just indigenous peoples and nations, it has created a discipline that uses “‘culture’ to function discursively as a category of analysis in the process of differentiation” (xv). Other disciplines have used race as a marker of difference while also defining indigenous culture. Moreton-Robinson’s monograph demonstrates that indigenous peoples are not objects to be studied; rather, they should be the center of the analysis by using race as a category of analysis.

The first part in *The White Possessive*, “Owning Property,” examines how a sense of belonging by non-indigenous settlers/migrants in Australia is tied to the ownership of land and the dispossession of indigenous owners. Moreton-Robinson explores British migrancy and the colonization of Australia in which British settlers arrived in 1788 and claimed land under the doctrine of discovery, or *terra nullius*—land belonging to no one. A new national identity emerged with these first British migrants who settled and claimed the land as a valuable resource for the British empire. British belonging was further legitimized with the passage of the Immigration and Restriction Act in 1901 and other legislation that sought to extinguish indigenous title to land. Indigenous peoples could not belong to their own land; instead, the settlers “dispossessed, murdered, raped and incarcerated the original owners on cattle stations, missions, and reserves” (4). Indigenous belonging was very different than British settler belonging in Australia; it was not just about owning land, but a relationship to land that is “through and from them” (12).

In the second part, “Becoming Propertyless,” Moreton-Robinson explores how patriarchal whiteness is about power, power to confer title to land and wealth and used as an organizing principle that subjugated indigenous people. “Race and gender are salient in determining who rules and who accumulates property and wealth” in Australia, which continues to maintain a social structure in which white, settler men remain at the apex of a racial and social hierarchy that was founded on indigenous peoples (66). One of the stronger chapters in this section is “Leesa’s Story: White

Possession in the Workplace.” Moreton-Robinson effectively points out that indigenous sovereignty has been defined and granted by the settler-colonial state. For example, “Native title is not Indigenous sovereignty because it is nothing more than a bundle of rights to hunt, gather, and negotiate as determined by Australian law” (94). In the Australian context, indigenous peoples are not recognized as property-owning subjects; instead, they remain propertyless because indigenous sovereignty is tied to land and recognized by law. She cites Cheryl Harris’s argument in “Whiteness as Property”: “Possession—the act necessary to lay the basis for rights in property—was defined to include only the cultural practices of whites . . . that which whites alone possess—is valuable and is property” (94). White possessiveness is found in the workplace and shapes the ways in which indigenous peoples and white Australians interact with one another. Moreton-Robinson asserts that everyday racism is also an act of white possessiveness. Lees’s story further reveals the gendered nature of white possession in the medical field, which manifested itself as racism. The depiction of Lees as “overly sensitive” was used to mask the blatant racism she experienced as an indigenous woman in the medical field and another way in which white Australians have used their white possessive to dispossess indigenous peoples.

The final section, “Being Property,” examines the various ways in which the logics of possession have been employed. Even though each chapter is meant to stand alone, Moreton-Robinson relies on the same body of literature to craft her argument in four different chapters. For example, she uses Foucault’s concepts of race and “biopower” to ground her discussion of race, racism, and the state in chapters 9 and 11 (129, 156). She also relies on the same citations and phrases to provide the framework for her argument in each chapter and, as a result, it detracts from the larger argument of the entire monograph. The strongest chapter, “Virtuous Racial States,” uses the “United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” to examine how morality and politics were used by Canada, Australia, the United States, and New Zealand to contest four key areas found within the declaration. These four countries used virtue to continue to dispossess indigenous peoples by stating that indigenous peoples did not seek to work with nation-states harmoniously, or within existing systems that are founded on the premise that the indigenous body and lands would never be marked as legal. The declaration was treated as external intervention to recognize and protect the rights of indigenous peoples. The very existence of indigenous peoples undermines and threatens patriarchal, white sovereignty. *The White Possessive* advances the field of indigenous studies and paves the way for whiteness studies and race to be used as a category of analysis, not as a marker of cultural differences. Finally, Moreton-Robinson’s work is useful to examine how race and sovereignty are inextricably linked to one another.

Elise Boxer
University of South Dakota