In her introduction Hoover delineates one of the most important of these traditional ideas: that the bodies of Mohawk women—and the *health* of those bodies—are intimately bound to the health of the nation through its children, yes, but also through its food. This goes back to the Creation narrative. Thus, this is also ultimately a story about fish and vegetables, mainstays of traditional subsistence at Ahkwesáhsne, severely threatened by the racialized negligence of Alcoa-Reynolds and General Motors. But fish and farming are not only vital elements of traditional subsistence. Hoover shows that they are vital expressions, embodiments, of traditional relationship and the traditional core value of living life with thanks-giving. And now, thanks to this community's determination and resilience, they are returning to Mohawk bodies.

Third, Hoover uses medical anthropologists Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Margaret Lock's articulation of three bodies—the individual body, the social body, and the body politic—to bind these accounts together. This makes sense given the intimate inseparability of these dimensions in Mohawk thought and action, but as Hoover herself indicates, the image is deeper and wider. The Mohawk social body includes not only human kin and community, but also our other-than-human kin of the natural world, and indeed, the waters and earth and air that sustain us all. All of these come together in the bodies of Ahkwesahsnehró:non.

This is not a story of complete victory. Legal and environmental battles are still being fought. There have been losses as well as successes. The land and rivers are slowly improving but may never be as they were. Neither may the people. Divisions and rancor and ill health persist. But this is a story of a people who refused to give up, and who pulled strength and intelligence and determination from their roots to work together, however imperfectly, to fight for an indigenous future for their children. That future may not be perfect, but will have been enlivened and improved by what these living ancestors have attempted.

Christopher Ronwanièn:te' Jocks
Northern Arizona University

The Settler Complex: Recuperating Binarism in Colonial Studies. Edited by Patrick Wolfe. Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Centre, 2017. 247 pages. $35.00 paper.

Each chapter in this collection provides a pointed intervention into a complex debate in the field of settler-colonial and colonial studies, and the subjectivities that complicate the binary between "Native" and "settler." Patrick Wolfe's arguably most influential analysis of settler colonialism—that settler colonialism is a structure, not an event—serves as a common point that many of the authors return to throughout the book. In Wolfe's formulation, he asserts that "the existence of major differentiations within settler (and, for that matter, within Native) societies does not alter the binary nature of the Native/settler divide. . . . The opposition between Native and settler is a structural relationship rather than an effect of the will" (2). In this provocation, and by returning to the structural differentiation between settler and Native, he denies absolution to settlers who seek these "moves to innocence" (citing Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, 3) to pardon responsibility for upholding the structure of colonialism. While this collection offers a nuanced appreciation of how settler-colonial oppression manifests differently for different bodies and in different spaces, Wolfe is making a political point that is later taken up by Dean Saranillio in 2013: "Power does not simply target historically oppressed communities but also operates *through* their practices, ambitions, narratives, and silences" ("Why Asian Settler Colonialism Matters: A Thought Piece on Critiques, Debates, and Indigenous Difference," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, 288). The critical contribution of this text is found in recovering the possibility of a binarism between settler and Native, where Wolfe offers an intervention to combat the settler assimilation of indigenous collectivities. He further links questions of belonging to the very possibility of indigenous sovereignty, arguing, "the blurring of the lines between settlers and Natives is not an individual matter. If it were an individual matter, then the recurrent phenomenon of non-Natives claiming Native status might be seen to counter programs of Native assimilation by adding to the number of Indians. But sovereignty is not a head count. . . . The undermining of tribal authority is the core aim of assimilation" (9).

Oriented towards the shared theme of recouping the binarism, each chapter offers a fine-grained and unique approach to key debates in the field of indigenous studies. The works are thus exemplary of the methodological necessity for particular and intimate approaches to the field, where broad theoretical debates are applied directly to a particular site or method of colonial encounter. However, the chapters also speak to the utility of comparative analysis, where interventions in one space/place resonate across the book and offer readers different points of access. For example, Tracey Mar's work speaks to the memorialization of colonial histories as a means to refigure the present, stating, "they are memories of erasure but their lack of solidity empties them of responsibility in the present" (33). Taken from the Australian context, much can be learned from Mar's analysis of the role of landscape and memory in preserving the structures of the settler-colonial present in other places. Thus, space is created for critical interventions into how colonialism manifests in different ways, across different spaces and times.

The majority of these chapters have been published elsewhere, and thus, the real strength of the book is in bringing them together. Wolfe managed to create a conversation between scholars who speak to colonial experiences from vastly different vantage points, though with a clear shared political commitment to positioning their analyses in the field. While this is a particular kind of intellectual vulnerability, it offers readers new spaces for their own interjections and an approach to understanding colonialism that allows for an examination of multiple scales and sites/cites of violence. The final chapter, a work by Maya Mikadashi, perhaps best illustrates the global implications of colonial violence, and the particular and peculiar ways in which it is lived.

Authors of this work deftly navigate between the realms of the political and artistic to illuminate the interrelation between the often-disparate arenas. As has been made clear in the recent movements towards decolonization and resurgence, the role of arts in both reproducing and combating colonial violence cannot be 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 is 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