

the context of dominant societies and political systems that, in most cases, range from hostility to indifference to the idea of Native American nationalism, at best.

The last sentence of the overview appearing on the back cover (cloth edition) of *Native American Nationalism and Nation Re-Building* states, “In all cases, the political effectiveness of nationhood in promoting and sustaining sovereignty presupposes Native full participation in and control over economic development, the formation of historical narrative and memory, the definition of legality, and governance.” If indigenous nationhood and tribal sovereignty is, in fact, defined as the inherent and supreme authority by indigenous tribes to govern themselves within the borders of the United States or Canada, then this is a presupposition that will never achieve realization.

All of which brings me back to Vine Deloria Jr.’s seemingly pessimistic view of the future status of indigenous peoples in the United States: an alternative and optimistic read of his vision of the future is that future efforts to fully assimilate indigenous people will fail and Native Americans will be around and living in well-defined Indian communities one hundred or two hundred years from now. And in all likelihood, those Native communities will continue to uphold unique national identities and indigenous claims to sovereignty, and will still be doggedly pursuing nation-rebuilding efforts. With this book, the editor and contributors to *Native American Nationalism and Nation Re-Building: Past and Present Cases* have produced an important and lasting scholarly contribution to the enduring pursuit of indigenous nationhood.

*Nicholas C. Peroff*

University of Missouri–Kansas City

**Native Space: Geographic Strategies to Unsettle Settler Colonialism.** By Natchee Blu Barnd. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2017. 232 pages. \$24.95 paper.

*Native Space: Geographic Strategies to Unsettle Settler Colonialism* is a lucid examination of routine examples of subtle Native territorial claims. As a project, *Native Space* is abstract, focusing on what the author methodologically describes as “mundane” productions of space and how these figure into decolonization efforts. The result is a unique blend of topics, ranging from the ways that Native communities deploy street signs to insist on presence, to how the use of street signs in non-Native, mainly white neighborhoods ironically bolsters a sense of Eurocentric hegemony. Natchee Blu Barnd’s reach is tremendous in this book, from the politics of legibility to the politics of art. In juxtaposing these accounts, he creates a unique understanding of the production of Native geographies that shows how they are messy, mundane, and unequal.

The book’s organization begins at the scale of the tribe—using sovereignty to name streets in their language as a form of claims-making—and ends at the scale of the individual, focusing on specific artists and their attempt to disrupt colonial narratives of conquest through strategic deployment of sculptures. Neither linear nor fixed in a place, the book moves around the United States but spends most of its time with the Kiowa on the border of Kansas and Oklahoma, where complicated iterations of place-making

exist around a mythologized binary of the settler and the colonized. The contribution of this book is to highlight the dual process by which Native peoples make and unmake ideas and power relations of space, what Barnd describes as “inhabiting” (5–7). Drawing on spatial understandings from human geographers Henri Lefebvre, John Allen, and Doreen Massey, Barnd uses examples of street signs, public events, and strategic deployment of art to demonstrate strategies by which Native peoples produce new spaces and challenge existing and uneven spatial relations.

For example, in the first chapter about Native street signs, Barnd writes, “street names and signs materially resist the colonial grammar that still textually marks many tribal landscapes, either by replacing or operating in coexistence with tribal grammars of place” (37); or, “Contemporary Native space continues to defy the spatial absoluteness, certainty, and singularity, that colonization intends to generate” (97). Or, when discussing the importance of Native monuments, in the form of sculptures, at the US-controlled site of Little Big Horn, “A public installation piece is a three-dimensional map that . . . can work as a representation of spatiality while physically occupying a site-specific space” (131). In sum, examples like these demonstrate a “mundane” production of space against the narrative of the colonial state. The first and second chapters compare the use of Native names in street signs for both tribal communities and non-Native, mainly white communities. Where the Native communities use street names as forms of place-making, non-Native communities use Native names on their streets to appropriate Indianness and to shore up senses of conquest.

Chapter 3 is perhaps the most grounded to a place and provides the most nuance. It weaves together two examples of communities in the historic Kiowa lands of Kansas and Oklahoma who celebrate one of the Kiowa’s most famous leaders, Set-tainte, but from opposite ends of colonial history. The mainly white community in Satanta, Kansas hosts an annual celebration during which they crown a town “chief” and “princess” while dressed in Native regalia. From a distance this would smack of racism, but Barnd tells us that the Kiowa descendants of Set-tainte and town residences maintain a “mutually productive if at times uneasy relationship.” He compares how white and Native communities remember Set-tainte to support his point that Native space “maintains layered geographies, and provides for coexisting partialities” (97).

This chapter 3 is central, flanked by considerations of street names on one side and Native art on the other. Although rarely (if ever) are these topics considered side-by-side, *Native Space* draws them together and suggests that their implications are part of a banal production of Native spatial claims. Barnd employs a dialectical method of presenting one thing and then its inverse. For Barnd, street signs are “material expressions” that “reinforce . . . what it means to practice tribal sovereignty and produce Native geographies” (28). On the other hand, “Street signs and names can signal . . . settlement without directing attention to the histories or official structures of colonialization, thereby routinely and simultaneously possessing Indianness and dismissing indigeneity” (59). Chapter 4 does the most to show the complication of overlapping geographies, both colonial and Native. In this chapter, Barnd focuses on the work of Native artists who rework colonial productions of space into Native imaginations. Chapter 5 picks up on the desire of Native peoples to “unmake” colonial

space and focuses on examples of art that disrupt that narrative of the colonial state with reminders of Native histories and presence.

What is unique about Barnd's approach in the larger field of settler-colonial studies is his appreciation for nuance. Although his organization often relies on binaries (i.e., first the Natives' story, then the colonists'), his analyses are consistently focused on the coproduction of space and what Anna Tsing calls "friction." The street signs in chapter 1 sometimes coexist alongside colonial names; this is a form of speaking to and against the structures of colonialism in how geography is defined and presented. In chapter 2, Barnd reminds us that "Indianness" and "playing Indian" is a critical infrastructure of the settler-colonial project and that white communities reify their colonial heritage in the use of tribal names. In examining streets named after Indians throughout the country, he finds that these street names become synonymous with the spatial production of white neighborhoods. In order to authenticate their claims to lands stolen from indigenous peoples, white residences inhabit Indianness in the use of tribal names to call their streets (59–66).

The author makes good points about the difference between indigeneity, Indianness, and "inhabiting," but these ideas need to be brought closer together into better conversation. Sometimes the text loses inhabiting, for example. The book also could have benefited from a longer conclusion with more discussion on the significance of these examples and how they relate to Native space. Nonetheless, the book is very readable and Barnd efficiently presents complex ideas without burdening the reader with difficult sentences. It is a book I will use in future instruction.

*Andrew Curley*

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Perishing Heathens: Stories of Protestant Missionaries and Christian Indians in Antebellum America.** By Julius H. Rubin. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2017. 276 pages. \$50.00 cloth; \$55 electronic.

In *Perishing Heathens*, Julius Rubin examines the interactions of Protestant missionaries, Indian converts, and would-be converts from the first years of the nineteenth century to the 1830s. This era coincided with the attempts of the federal government to impose upon Native people—or entice them to accept—a "civilization program." This period also saw an evangelical movement known as the Second Great Awakening, and the passing and implementation of the 1830 Indian Removal Act. These contexts tie together neatly in Rubin's book since Protestant missionaries, with the backing of the federal government, served as the "agents" of the civilization program.

Rubin organizes his volume into six chapters that mostly focus on different missions, missionaries, and Native converts. The exception is a chapter dealing with what Rubin defines as the "chain of religious intelligence." Although the chapters read as discrete essays, they are connected by the themes of religious fervor and the desire to convert peoples who have not been exposed to Christianity. A key commonality is the admiration that the missionaries (and would-be missionaries) had for the eighteenth century