

ceramic evidence from an archaeological site in Utah, this chapter presents compelling proof of the presence of ancestral Ute people far to the north of their conventionally defined territory. These findings indicate that mobile hunter-gatherers were raiding and trading with Puebloan populations to the south during the early fourteenth century—well before the arrival of the Spanish to the region. Alternatively, Robert J. Stokes and Joanne C. Tactikos's chapter, "A Protohistoric to Historic Yavapai Persistent Place on the Landscape of Central Arizona: An Example from the Lake Pleasant Rockshelt Site" presents evidence for the continued use of rock shelters by the Yavapai people from the protohistoric period into the twentieth century.

While the volume's format allows readers to engage with different types of data and modes of argumentation, many of the chapters provide only a brief glimpse into the material record, leaving one longing for a more detailed discussion of the evidence. In addition to the varying levels of depth across the book, the ambitious range of this volume often results in the absence of an obvious connection between chapters. Weaving back and forth between temporal periods and region, the reader often loses track of the central intellectual mission of the volume. Furthermore, some of the contributions seem out of place in a book dedicated to mobile people. For example, chapter 8 discusses evidence for the use of chipped-stone technology by Hispano communities in New Mexico during the nineteenth century. While an interesting contribution, this chapter neither fits within the protohistoric period as described in the book's title, nor focuses on a mobile group as typically conceived by anthropologists.

Overall, *Fierce and Indomitable* offers an important set of case studies that challenge various engrained orthodoxies in Southwest scholarship, including the separation of the non-Pueblo and Pueblo worlds, the comparatively late appearance of mobile groups in the region, and the abandonment of particular areas of the Southwest during the protohistoric period. Although the reader is at times overwhelmed by the multiplicity of interventions that the authors in this volume make, Seymour and her contributors have produced an important volume that provides valuable new evidence of mobile lifeways in the Southwest.

Lindsay M. Montgomery
University of Arizona

Navajo Sovereignty: Understandings and Visions of the Diné People. Edited by Lloyd L. Lee. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2017. 206 pages. \$28.95 paper; \$16.17 electronic.

Self-governance or self-determination has been an essential issue for American Indian communities since first contact with Europeans, if not far earlier. All Native communities had complex systems of governance that combined leadership, moral decision-making, and the sacred in intricate ways—even if settler-colonial powers refused to recognize this as governance. The godfather of American Indian studies, Vine Deloria Jr., began to describe the authority and collective rights of American

Indians to self-governance using the word *sovereignty*. While the term still holds significant sway, it is not used without controversy, much of it stemming from the extent to which sovereignty is a European term/concept and whether it aligns with Indigenous values. Ultimately, I would contend that sovereignty is a useful placeholder for an idea that combats settler logic in general, but as a catchall term, it should always require contextual specificity when talking about how it relates to a given Indigenous community.

The latter view is expressed exceptionally well in *Navajo Sovereignty: Understanding the Vision of the Diné People*, edited by Lloyd L. Lee and published as part of the University of Arizona Press's "Critical Issues in Indigenous Studies" series. A series of essays from a variety of authors, in some ways *Navajo Sovereignty* can be considered a sequel to Lee's excellent earlier edited volume, *Diné Perspectives: Revitalizing and Reclaiming Navajo Thought*. Lee is a prolific scholar on many important aspects of his home community, and a leading voice decolonizing what in the late twentieth century had come to be known as "Navajo studies." This expertise and experience helped him draw together a fantastic group of Navajo scholars, thinkers, and leaders to provide various forms of commentary on the historic, contemporary, and future state of Navajo self-governance. All the essays do an excellent job of combining a Euro-American academic nation-building approach with Diné values and notions of leadership. One thing the book does particularly well is use the Diné language. All contributors appear to have an exceptional grasp of the language, know how to identify relevant concepts inherent to it, and how to translate these concepts to an English-speaking audience.

Contemporary anthropologists and cultural studies thinkers have critiqued the concept of "sovereignty" for the way in which it promotes exceptionalism in neoliberal states and thereby acts to rationalize empowering some communities at the expense of others, most notably in the work of Giorgio Agamben and Aihwa Ong. Some American Indian political and legal scholars have responded to this critique by reasserting the value of sovereignty for Indigenous peoples suffering the consequences of settler colonialism. Here the argument is that sovereignty is inherent to Indigenous communities because of their relationships to land and self-government prior to colonialism (e.g., Barker, Tsossie, Aleinikoff, Bruyneel). While these scholars recognize that the term *sovereignty* may come out of a European Enlightenment tradition, it has value for the political, juridical, and economic rights of American Indian communities (I would argue that it is also the notion of self-governance most frequently promoted by elected tribal officials). Conversely, there is also a movement in American Indian scholarship rejecting the notion of sovereignty in favor of what is seen as more traditional or localized Indigenous concepts of self-determination and self-governance. This comes from a radical decolonizing perspective arguing that relying on colonizers' terminology and concepts will never free one from settler-colonial relationships (i.e., Alfred).

Authors in *Navajo Sovereignty* seem to have opted to steer between these two Indian country notions of self-governance, recognizing the value of the term *sovereignty* for a tribal community's relationships with states, the federal government, and non-Native US citizens, as well as the importance of locating self-governance within Indigenous traditions and concepts. This tactic, and indeed perhaps the greatest strength of the collection,

allows for both decolonizing gestures and legal and political articulations that have a greater likelihood of being respected and honored by the political systems and settler state that subsume tribal communities in the United States. It should be no surprise to scholars of American Indian governance and politics that such a book could be written about the Navajo Nation, a tribal government with perhaps the most intricate systems of local and overlapping jurisdictions, highest number of public/civic agencies, and a community long characterized for its adaptiveness and ability to blend the historic and traditional with the contemporary and foreign. Whether or not this “adaptability” is merely a trope created by non-Navajo observers is implicitly critiqued in *Navajo Sovereignty*: many contributors make a case for the Indigenous roots of Navajo self-governance and the traditional Diné values that undergird Navajo-style self-determination.

The book is divided into four sections with two essays each (“Law,” “Education,” “Research,” and “Vision and Creativity”). This approach ensures that Navajo self-determination is explored from several different perspectives. The “Law” section draws upon the theoretical and practical knowledge of a former Navajo Nation Supreme Court justice and a current Navajo attorney. These authors contextualize Navajo legal sovereignty within the larger United States legal context that has sought to delimit tribal sovereignty and jurisdiction. Additionally, they examine how Diné notions of law construct a relationship between individuals and the collective community. The “Education” section focuses on how Navajo teachings help people develop harmony in their life in order to be productive members of society and the role that family and institutions such as government and schools play in developing contemporary Navajo citizens. In a relatively short space, this section does a stellar job of presenting a highly nuanced interpretation of the Diné concept of harmony. This is done in a way that goes far beyond a cursory treatment of the term *hózhó* only, which unfortunately is where many other scholars stop.

The third section is “Research.” The first essay in this section is on principled notions of good governance and perhaps most thoroughly combines Western logic and political science with Navajo principles, employing charts, diagrams, and a large dose of Diné language. The companion article focuses more on local-level governance, the Navajo Chapter House system, and explains how this system can be used as the level to plan and implement the principles of good governance. The volume concludes with “Vision and Creativity.” This section contains articles that are based more on the practical implications and activist strategies for decolonizing the structure of Navajo governance and maintaining cultural values at the heart of Navajo sovereignty.

Navajo Sovereignty is important for anyone interested in American Indian self-governance and the debates surrounding how sovereignty should be enacted in Indian country, and whether the concept itself should be the basis for self-determination in Indigenous communities. The editor and authors of this book deserve much praise for the deft way in which Indigenous principles are connected to political science. Perhaps most importantly, *Navajo Sovereignty* is a clear and enjoyable read.

David Kamper
San Diego State University