

SPECIAL FORUM

Charting Transnational Native American Studies

HSINYA HUANG, PHILIP DELORIA,
LAURA FURLAN, AND JOHN GAMBER

The issue of root and route, indigeneity and transnational migration, seems poised to take center stage in contemporary transnational studies analysis. The figure of the Native is frequently invoked to articulate critical perspectives on the complexities of transnational racial/ethnic performance.¹ Meanwhile, as a signature legacy of colonialism, the Native is invariably appropriated as an icon for racial and ethnic alienation and mastery. There is a productive body of scholarship centering on the ways the Indigenous can be theorized under the colonial gaze. And yet much of this work also fails to recognize the particular historical and political statuses of many Indigenous peoples in the US and worldwide. On the one hand, the Native is used as a convenient tool for articulating the problematics, or rather, the discontents of the contemporary global culture.² On the other hand, the Native can also be an absent presence in the burgeoning discussion of transnationalism. In her 2004 presidential address to the American Studies Association, for example, Shelley Fisher Fishkin put forth the study of America as a transnational cultural production by asking, “What would the field of American studies look like if the *transnational* rather than the national were at its center?”³ While Fishkin’s powerful discourse helps define the spirit of American Studies as a field, it has also been critiqued by a number of Native American Studies scholars for not sufficiently acknowledging the political status of Native nations within the confines of what is today the US and Canada. From a Native American perspective, the US has always been transnational, due to its relationships with sovereign Native nations within its borders. In what way is transnationalism as a significant analytical category useful in providing a deeper understanding of contemporary Native American Studies and larger constellations of ethnic studies: how will the field of Native American Studies change or expand?

This Special Forum emerges out of our desire to provide intellectual space for representing Native American and Indigenous cultures and histories in the transnational context. Nationalistic approaches, which have come to the fore in a number of areas of Native American Studies, have clear pragmatic importance for American Indian people and nations. Intellectually productive as well, such approaches nonetheless run the risk of oversimplifying complex tribal identities, erasing broad networks of interaction and community, and smoothing Indigenous histories that have always included transnational elements. How might we think about the relation between nation and sovereignty, and how do we consider those concepts in relation to “post-sovereignty” arguments that position them within a colonizing Western frame? What are the critical genealogies of Indigenous nationhood? More importantly, what does it mean to put such questions in a transnational frame—not only in terms of the global flow of people, ideas, and capital, but also in relation to the political and aesthetic situations defined by particular tribal nations? In what ways have Indigenous conceptions of nationhood—and the movements between nations—challenged and complicated European and other colonial understandings of the nation? What kinds of advantages and disadvantages inhere in comparative global approaches to indigeneity, particularly in relation to tribal and national narratives that have been central to much of American Indian Studies? How do Indigenous American artistic expressions establish, reshape, challenge, and/or complement the formation of communities and collective cultural and literary entities? How, in these processes, do longstanding notions of homeland and nation interact with new modes of community formation and literary expression, drawn across spatial and temporal borderlines? Insofar as we recognize that Indigenous experiences may make much more sense if understood with less focus on national boundaries, the transnational turn describes the reality of what we often seek in reaching across borders and oceans for consonance or, more importantly, perspective. But how much more complicated ought that discourse be in relation to transnational Indigenous realities?

The essays included in this Special Forum highlight the significance of perceiving the Native as an active agent and of conceptualizing a comparative/trans-Indigenous paradigm for crossing over national, regional, and international boundaries to imagine a shared Indigenous world. We are less interested in the exchanges and contact between Indigenous peoples and mainstream settlers. Rather these essays push against the binary, hierarchical relationship between the major and the minor, the center and the periphery, to articulate, recognize, and/or theorize alternative transborder and transcultural experiences of Indigenous peoples in the Americas and across the Pacific. Such research celebrates the networking and coalition of Indigenous peoples as well as the circulation of Indigenous ideas and cultures, which we believe is crucial to contemporary transnational and American Studies scholarship; it offers inputs based on Indigenous specificities, experiences, and realities to supplement or challenge transnational approaches to imperialism,

diaspora, postcoloniality, and globalization. By restructuring “transnationalism” in terms of Indigenous experiences and realities, these essays further provide an alternative rubric of the “trans-Indigenous,” to borrow Chadwick Allen’s words in this forum as well as from his forthcoming monograph, for future work in Native American and global Indigenous Studies.⁴ Whereas recent work in transnational and American Studies focuses on problematizing the hierarchical demarcation of the center and the margin, the major and the minor,⁵ the intellectual endeavors in this Special Forum put forth multiple juxtapositions to formulate Indigenous-to-Indigenous relationships and connections, which significantly make up for the lack in contemporary transnational and American Studies scholarship.

Indeed, recent study of America has stressed a transnational turn, which requires alternative geographies and histories that go beyond the US and “America,” the continent. And yet Native American and Indigenous peoples, ideas, cultures, histories, and economic-political conditions have seldom emerged as sites of contact and contestation. In her introduction to *Shades of the Planet: American Literature as World Literature*, Wai Chee Dimock brilliantly puts forth that the field of American Studies is “fluid and amorphous, shaped and reshaped by emerging forces, by ‘intricate interdependencies’ between ‘the near and afar, the local and the distant.’”⁶ This venture is not unlike Shelley Fisher Fishkin’s call for an American Studies that takes “the transnational at its center,” and which would require that we see both “the inside and outside, domestic and foreign, national and international, as interpenetrating.”⁷ What roles, Fishkin asks, “might comparative, collaborative, border-crossing research play in this reconfigured field” (21)? By the same token, Jonathan Arac confesses that he writes “as an Americanist who has always hoped to think as a comparatist.”⁸ The comparative paradigm of American Studies sees one important road that runs in two directions: a north–south or south–north movement and contesting east–west directionality. Two axes conflate to delineate a large-scale geography in which “the *prenational* emerg[es], along with the *post-national*.”⁹ As Dimock argues, it is crucial to go beyond an arbitrarily restricted national archive to encompass an “alternative geography—a span of five continents, no less—a world atlas of which the national map is inextricably a part” (8). This geographical spread must, in turn, be complemented by a long history, “cradled by the history of the world” (8). The transnational turn dissolves the field’s “autonomized chronology, meshing it with a continuum still evolving, and stretching as indefinitely into the past as it does into the future” (7). To deterritorialize and reterritorialize the field of American Studies in general, Dimock privileges a planetary reach with a widening circle of associations between the near and the far, inside and outside, human and nonhuman. As Philip Curtin insightfully claims, we must try even harder to balance the depth of our own specializations against a wider span of knowledge.¹⁰ In all this, however, the Native is an absent other.

Apparently, transnationalism in American Studies contains a politics—it is antiexceptionalist, to be sure—but it has also maintained a curious distance from

Native American and Indigenous agenda, dancing in its many meanings and uses with words like “international” and “global,” both of which have a tendency to abstract or attenuate the often disastrous workings of power on the ground.¹¹ On the other hand, it is also worth asking why many Native American scholars in literary and cultural studies have “steered clear of the discourse on the transnational” as well as other recent trends in diaspora, trauma, and postcolonial scholarship.¹² Can we imagine a knowledge system that functions on inclusive principles rather than exclusive ones while at the same time not subsuming material practices, specific experiences, realities, and histories to abstract theorization? Fruitful as are critical inquiries that bridge the differences and foster reciprocity, may we create intellectual space where transnationality and indigeneity intersect and become mutually illuminating by not only articulating and recognizing but theorizing Indigenous experiences and inspiring a paradigmatic shift in how we engage in the world and the contemporary scholarship?

In terms of American Studies as a transnational cultural practice, Native Americans’ indigeneity transcends the US border to embrace the entire western hemisphere as the locus of their cultures and traditions. Recognizing the Americas (rather than any single America) invokes the concept of place as homeland shared by the “first,” “Indigenous,” and “original” people of the continent. In fact, the idea of a shared Indigenous world has been articulated by some in Native American Studies since its beginning in the academy in the 1960s and 1970s, as Robert Warrior points out in his essay on “Organizing Native American and Indigenous Studies.”¹³ This is especially true of the idea of Native Studies as a trans-American/transhemispheric enterprise. Nevertheless, the range and scope of submissions to this Special Forum indicate that there is not a clear idea about what Indigenous transnationalism looks like. To that end, this introduction serves to trace some of the critical thoughts that help conceptualize “the contours of a shared Indigenous Studies project across national, regional and international boundaries,”¹⁴ followed by overviews of the essays in this Special Forum, to map and remap the trajectory of inter- and/or un-locking transnationality and indigeneity.

Four essays by Robert Warrior, spanning from 2003 to 2009, reflect early efforts to chart the uneasy and yet ultimately productive terrain of Native American engagement in a range of academic discourses, including transnationalism.¹⁵ As Native American scholars reach extensively toward a sense of the field that encompasses not only Native America but the broad Indigenous world across nations, lands, and waters, Warrior contends, Native writing and Indigenous scholarship continue to unsettle a history that in the minds of many dominant intellectuals is “already complete.”¹⁶ In “Native American Scholarship and the Transnational Turn,” he calls the relevance of transnationalism to Native American Studies into question, arguing that “many Native people, including Native scholars, rely on the language of nationalism, the language in which the political struggle for their actual social world is being waged” (807), and thus remain wary of an idea like transnationality. From

“Indigenous provocations” at the American Studies Association to the organizing of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, Warrior’s tactics of subversion feature double directionality, both from within and from without, to challenge the grids of our profession and push open the borders of our field. Investigating a similar vein of indigeneity across borders, Robin Maria DeLugan merges indigeneity and cosmopolitanism by tracking the ways “new patterns of hemispheric migration expand the Urban Indian population in San Francisco.”¹⁷ Warrior formulates an intellectual home for Native American scholars in mainstream professional institutions while DeLugan deploys the physical home for the diasporic Indigenous from Latin America in an urban setting of the US. Despite disparity in their agenda and approaches, both nevertheless demonstrate continuous intellectual participation in the cultivation of indigeneity around values of being and belonging in the world.

Recent intellectual endeavors toward indigeneity across borders have culminated in a special issue of *American Quarterly*, published in 2010. Paul Lai and Lindsey Claire Smith coedited the special issue “Alternative Contact: Indigeneity, Globalism, and American Studies,” which suggested “alternative contact,” a concept “apart from narratives of ‘first contact’ between Native Americans and Europeans (including Euro-Americans)—among Indigenous Americans and other populations in the United States and around the world.”¹⁸ Organized into three thematic sections—“Spaces of the Pacific,” “Unexpected Indigenous Modernity,” and “Nation and Nation-State”—the fifteen essays in the volume engage in trans- and cross-national discussion of indigeneity; “alternative theorizations of links among U.S. imperial projects, sovereignty, and racial formation that supplement and challenge recent American studies work on imperialism, globalization, diasporic and hemispheric frameworks” (408); and transnational and cross-ethnic exchanges among Indigenous peoples of the Americas, including encounters with the Caribbean and Pacific Islanders. Whereas “Alternative Contact: Indigeneity, Globalism, and American Studies” touches on indigeneity across *waters*, it does this by diverging from the *land/continent* as the center of transnational Indigenous encounters. Almost a decade prior to the appearance of the “Alternative Contact” issue, the special issue on “Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge” of *The Contemporary Pacific* (2001) examined and theorized the Indigenous in the transnational context by navigating uncharted spaces of the Pacific Islands. Historicizing the ways in which Indigenous discourses of landfall have mitigated and contested productions of transoceanic diaspora, the articles “explore notions of Pacific indigeneity as they circulate through geographical, cultural, political, and historical flows of people(s), things, knowledge, power—between islands and continents.”¹⁹ The oceanic perspectives put forth by Pacific Islanders complement the continental ways of thinking about indigeneity and transnationality. If the US in effect incorporates a geographical space that is constantly bumping up against and expanding into Latin America and the Pacific Rim, the message from the Native Pacific can be inspiring: Neighboring communities have

always exchanged ideas and products, often across vast ocean distances. Along these routes of interconnection was a large world in which indigenes mingled, unhindered by boundaries erected much later by imperial powers.

The recent wave of research and scholarship in perceiving Indigenous Studies in the transnational context also involves book/monograph publications. As if echoing the theme of “Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge,” Elizabeth M. DeLoughrey’s *Routes and Roots: Navigating Caribbean and Pacific Island Literatures* (2010) moves beyond restrictive national, colonial, and regional frameworks to foreground how island histories are shaped by oceanic geography.²⁰ Engaging Indigenous and diaspora literary studies in a sustained dialogue, *Routes and Roots* expands work on the vibrating resonance of Caribbean and Pacific Island literatures. DeLoughrey uses Kamau Brathwaite’s idea of “tidalectic” between land and sea as a dynamic starting point to identify a nexus of historical process and seascape, intertwining geography and history in her exploration of how island writers inscribe the complex relation between routes and roots.²¹ Whereas Shari Huhndorf deploys land experiences, her *Mapping the Americas* likewise partakes in the emerging field of transnational Indigenous cultural studies, noting that “although nationalism is an essential anti-colonial strategy in indigenous setting, nationalist scholarship neglects the historical forces (such as imperialism) that increasingly draw indigenous communities into global contexts.”²² Huhndorf approaches Leslie Marmon Silko’s *Almanac of the Dead* as an anchor text, which “revises indigenous politics by positioning transnational alliances—what the novel, reprising Marx, labels ‘tribal transnationalism’—as the most powerful (but nevertheless contradictory) form of anticolonial resistance,” and in so doing exemplifies “a transnational turn in indigenous cultural production.”²³

Transnationalism and other related processes and experiences of social and cultural mobility do not call an end to being or becoming Indigenous. Instead indigeneity is reengaged with wider fields, identifying alternative ways of being established and projected. Moving beyond one’s original place does not mean that indigeneity vanishes. Maximilian C. Forte’s *Indigenous Cosmopolitans* investigates how indigeneity is experienced and practiced along translocal pathways by conceptualizing indigeneity and cosmopolitanism as different ways of accenting a broad field of transnational (inter)action though ostensibly they seem in constitutive tension with each other.²⁴ Similarly, Renya Ramirez’s *Native Hubs* investigates how urban Native Americans negotiate what she argues is, in effect, a transnational existence.²⁵ To maintain a sense of community without a land base in the modern world poses a substantial problem to Indigenous peoples and Native nationalism. Revolving around cultural and social practices of urban Indians, Ramirez formulates an important understanding of diaspora, transnationalism, identity, belonging, and community and reinforces bonds of social belonging and intertribal alliances.

Our interest in transnational Native Studies calls for conversations and dialogues across national and cultural borders. The transnational engagement in the

ongoing debate over the comparative value of nationalism versus transnationalism is evident in Deborah Madsen's collection *Native Authenticity*.²⁶ Within the created intellectual space, the edited volume examines diverse critical approaches to the idea of "Indian-ness" by integrating contributions from transatlantic scholars of Native Studies in North America and Europe. The complex politics of authenticity is investigated with references to a wide range of materials from Native Hawaiian and Canadian First Nations writing to Chicano/a poetics, politics, and aesthetics of an Indigenous heritage as a claim to "American" authenticity. In another vein, the authors in Elvira Pulitano's edited *Transatlantic Voices: Interpretations of Native North American Literatures* incorporate transnational and transcultural methodologies to probe specific themes of trauma and memory.²⁷ Inputs from Germany, France, Bulgaria, Switzerland, Italy, the United Kingdom, and Finland exemplify Paul Gilroy's paradigm of "the inescapable hybridity and intermixture of ideas."²⁸ Whereas the study of (Native) America and ethnicities can no longer be confined to the borders of the United States, not even to the transatlantic world, an essay collection to be published by one of the major university presses in Taiwan, *Aspects of Transnational and Indigenous Cultures*, shows the timeliness of discussions around the transnational and the Indigenous.²⁹ The forthcoming collection addresses the issues of place and mobility, aesthetics and politics, as well as identity and community, which have emerged in the framework of global/transnational Indigenous Studies. Specifically, one of its trajectories is the vexed question of what distinguishes Indigenous literatures. What are the consequences of transnationalism for both Indigenous Studies and for the field of literary and cultural criticism in general? Philip Deloria, Birgit Däwes, Robert Lee, Joni Adamson, and Chadwick Allen, among others, reorient understandings of transnationality and indigeneity from diverse angles, providing significant impulses especially in the fields of American Indian and comparative Indigenous Studies, ethnic studies, and global cultural studies, which will impact the practice and the transformation of intellectual work in global American Studies.

It is crucial that we embrace a broader scope to see how the critical paradigm of Native American Studies can change and expand by taking part in a broader world of theoretical insights. With critical attention to the problematics of the transnational in relation to indigeneity, we seek to reshape, challenge, and/or supplement "transnationalism" as a significant analytical category in relation to Indigenous scholarship. This critical enterprise largely depends on comparative/trans-Indigenous frameworks, through which to continue the never-ending work of interpretive engagements with examples of contemporary Indigenous literatures and scholarship from the US, Canada, Mexico-US borders, the Pacific Islands, the transatlantic world, and from Austronesian and Aotearoa/New Zealand contexts. This is an ambition that demands audacious spirits and rigorous engagements to put Native America and "multicultural-transnational" Indigenous communities across waters and borders in productive dialogue and, in so doing, to decenter the United States in relation to the rest of the Indigenous world.

Our purpose is twofold. Whereas we emphasize the global/transnational flows of Indigenous ideas and values, to amend the lack of contemporary scholarship on transnationalism, it is equally crucial to recognize and articulate “internal transnationalism,” a story that was not concerned with global gaps and movements but with the “nations within.”³⁰ Missing from much of the conversation have been American Indian “national” spaces existing inside the geography of the United States, populated by people with claims to a past that preceded that “national” geography, and rich with new and emergent tribal nationalisms that disrupt the American national story from unfamiliar directions. Indian people with federal recognition are multinational subjects, and tribal collectives have a surprisingly long history of making international human rights appeals to the United Nations. Global Indigenous organizing puts multiple forms of national possibility into an international—and a borderless and transnational—context. In short, while the dominant idea concepts concerning the transnational weight our thinking toward the global, there are internal national communities—not simply aspirational or cultural but actual and political—that point in more complex directions.³¹

There are four articles in this Special Forum, each offering sophisticated analysis of transnationality vis-à-vis indigeneity. Chadwick Allen’s “A Transnational Native American Studies? Why Not Studies That Are Trans-Indigenous?” challenges us to think beyond “the national borders of contemporary (settler) nation-states” and to instead foreground Indigenous-to-Indigenous relationships. He reminds us that conventional theories of the transnational, usually grounded in American Studies, operate on a “vertical binary” that subordinates Indigenous peoples. As we work toward a new model, which Allen is calling the trans-Indigenous, we need to “to see [Indigenous texts] on their own complex and evolving terms.” Allen reads a wide range of texts through this lens, including an art exhibit catalogue, *Mini-Masterworks III*, from a gallery in Vancouver, to Irvin Morris’s novel *From the Glittering World*, to *Two Cars, One Night*, a short film by Taika Waititi, a Maori filmmaker. He persuasively encourages scholars to “Think Indigenous” as they think about the “afterlives” of Indigenous signs and cultural productions.

Jessica Horton’s piece, “Alone on the Snow, Alone on the Beach: ‘A Global Sense of Place’ in *Atanarjuat* and *Fountain*,” considers both the role of “emplacement and displacement” in Inuit filmmaker Zacharias Kunuk’s well-known film and Anishinaabe artist Rebecca Belmore’s video art, as well as the “transnational lives” of the works as objects. As she theorizes the relationship between the transnational and the Indigenous, Horton poses an important question: “can Native subjects simultaneously participate in transnational processes, remain critical of their colonial dimensions, and continue to form and maintain deep local attachments?” Her reading of *Atanarjuat* focuses on the film’s “sequences of travel” and thinks through its role of place, which she describes as “socially shaped, spiritually personified, and layered with meanings.” She argues that the film’s narrative and imagery demand that audiences imagine Nunavut within a “network of global relations.” *Fountain*

visualizes the body of the artist against the landscape of Iona Beach, Vancouver, a site filled with logging and industrial waste in Musqueam territory. Horton reads *Fountain* as an enactment of “the dangers of displacement and the possibilities for emplacement through a struggle in a marginal place.” Her pairing of these two cinematic texts yields an interesting discourse about bodies and space, the local and the global, and the claiming of Indigenous images and intellectual property.

In “‘¡Todos Somos Indios!’ Revolutionary Imagination, Alternative Modernity, and Transnational Organizing in the Work of Silko, Tamez, and Anzaldúa,” Joni Adamson investigates the ways in which “global indigenous organizing” gets deployed by these three authors and how “coalition politics” provides a way of rethinking Indigenous authenticity in Native literature. Adamson reads *Almanac of the Dead* as a reflection of the effects of NAFTA and the protests of the Zapatistas, whose chant “¡Todos somos indios!” recognizes the unifying power of a global indigeneity. Silko, Adamson writes, “is not just calling attention to a growing ‘tribal internationalism’ but also to the ways in which indigenous groups are working for an ‘alternative modernity’ by entering into alliances with nonindigenous groups that facilitate equitable democratic participation of indigenous, working-class, minoritized, and economically disadvantaged peoples in regional, national, and global societies.” Adamson points to poet Margo Tamez as an example of an Indigenous writer who falls outside the category of recognized national boundaries; instead Tamez operates within the border region of the transnational. As Native border writing, Tamez’s work, specifically the collections *Naked Wanting* and *Raven Eye*, “lyrically map[s] the uprising of multiethnic indigenous and borderland women battling forces of racism, toxicity, and sexual and state violence.” As Adamson demonstrates, Tamez’s poetry connects the personal with the political in meaningful ways. With her mother, Tamez established the Lipan Apache Women Defense to fight for “recognition, self-determination, and human rights” for people in the Lower Rio Grande region. Adamson turns to Anzaldúa’s *Borderlands/La Frontera* in her conclusion to reclaim it as Native border writing; though Anzaldúa’s claims to indigeneity in the text are tentative and timid, Adamson demonstrates how Anzaldúa historicizes and politicizes the experiences of Indigenous peoples in nearly the same region that Tamez portrays in her work. Both authors, Adamson writes, document “the human costs of diaspora and detribalization in terms of the sexual and gender violence and literal contact with toxins.”

In “The Trans/National Terrain of Anishinaabe Law and Diplomacy,” Joseph Bauerkemper and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesik Stark interpret the Anishinaabe story of Maudjee-kawiss, as told by Basil Johnston, as an early example of Indigenous transnationalism. As a result of a mishap during Maudjee-kawiss’s patrol of the Anishinaabe borders, he is adopted by the Bear Nation, although this new relationship does not end his “responsibilities and obligations to his own nation.” Bauerkemper and Stark propose that this border-crossing might yield a new way to theorize Indigenous transnationalism that can be reconciled with contemporary

concerns about sovereignty and commitments to nationhood within Native Studies. The authors' theory of the transnational "intentionally and self-consciously underscores the sophisticated boundaries that differentiate Indigenous nations as discrete polities while also emphasizing the transnational flows of intellectual, cultural, economic, social, and political traditions between and across these boundaries." The authors seek to define an Indigenous transnationalism that "locates the transnational in the connections and interactions among various Native nations." In other words, like Chadwick Allen, they are less interested in the relationship between Indigenous nations and settler-states than they are in Indigenous nation-to-Indigenous nation dynamics and crossings. They are particularly interested in the "kinship-based and diplomacy-oriented mode of restorative justice" that gets proposed by the Bear Nation, as a treaty that occurs between two nations, and suggest that settler-indigenous law would benefit from a transnational dialectic.

In the context of an increasingly transnational globe, the master narratives of time and place have been open to various rethinkings. In hemispheric American Indigenous cultures, central coordinates for the construction of individual and collective identity have emerged around spatial notions of homeland, territory, migrancy, diaspora, and removal. Equally critical have been complex understandings of layered, recurrent, multidimensional, and sacred time. These ways of thinking about space and time have originated from multiple contexts, including tribal, cross-tribal, hemispheric, and global exchange. They demonstrate multiple and longstanding forms of both tribal-national and transnational orientation. At the same time, methodological borderlines between inquiries into cultural impact, identity, and politics, on the one hand, and analyses of literary, aesthetic, and stylistic qualities, on the other, are also being redrawn, diversifying and complicating a discussion concerning the current place of Native Studies at large. These conversations are themselves explicitly transnational in nature—though perhaps not always visible in that form.

This forum seeks not only to present work in transnational Native American Studies and investigate the transnational dimensions of the field itself but also to invite further discussions on how the question of the transnational is entwined with those of representation, culture, ethnicity, academic power/knowledge relations, emergent disciplines, discursive formation, and fieldwork. No one interpretation holds the whole truth. Finally, we contend that in order for trans-Indigenous literature and scholarship to be nested in our academic inquiry, we need to create aggregates that rest on a platform broader and more robustly empirical than the relatively arbitrary and demonstrably ephemeral borders of the nation. These aggregates require alternative geography and alternative histories, which are to be examined, transformed, and translated from trans-Indigenous experiences and realities. The transnational axis of Native American and Indigenous Studies bespeaks

“a continuum still evolving, and stretching as indefinitely into the past as it does into the future.”³²

Notes

Special thanks go to Shirley Geok-lin Lim for initiating the idea of a Special Forum on transnational Native American Studies, to Caroline Kyungah Hong for copyediting the forum, and to Nhu Le for administrative assistance.

¹ See, for example, Rey Chow’s seminal essay, “Where Have All the Natives Gone?” in *Writing Diaspora: Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*, by Chow (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 27–54.

² In Arif Dirlik’s essay, “Globalization, Indigenism, and the Politics of Place,” in “Globalization and Indigenous Cultures,” ed. Fengzhen Wang and Shaobo Xie, special issue, *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature* 34, no. 1 (2003): 15–29, Dirlik identifies “two indigenous situations.” One refers to the resistance of third world countries against globalization from the West by celebrating their traditions and values; in this sense, indigeneity is akin to locality/localism as in the dyad of the global and the local. The other describes aboriginal peoples struggling to preserve their cultures, histories, and rituals in face of colonial erasure. While recognizing the validity of the term “indigenous” in each situation, Dirlik contends that “indigeneity in the age of globalization” is “more of an imagined reality, a desire, a politically consequent projected goal for identity politics, than a really existing cultural, social, and economic mode of production.” Fengzhen Wang and Shaobo Xie, “Introductory Notes: Dialogues on Globalization and Indigenous Cultures,” in “Globalization and Indigenous Cultures,” ed. Fengzhen Wang and Shaobo Xie, special issue, *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature* 34, no. 1 (2003): 9.

³ Shelley Fisher Fishkin, “Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies—Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004,” *American Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2005): 21.

⁴ Chadwick Allen, *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, forthcoming, September 2012).

⁵ Françoise Lionnet and Shu-mei Shih, eds., *Minor Transnationalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005) is a distinct example. In their introduction, “Thinking through the Minor, Transnationally,” the coeditors Lionnet and Shih conceptualize an alternative methodology in the transnational framework that recognizes “relationships among different margins” (2). Whereas they attempt to demonstrate a methodology for highlighting relations of margin to margin rather than margin to center, like Fishkin and Chow, among others, they bypass any Indigenous experiences and realities. For a critique

in this regard, see Chadwick Allen's essay, "A Transnational Native American Studies? Why Not Studies That Are Trans-Indigenous?" in this Special Forum.

⁶ Wai Chee Dimock, "Introduction: Planet and America, Set and Subset," in *Shades of the Planet: American Literature as World Literature*, ed. Wai Chee Dimock and Lawrence Buell (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), 3.

⁷ Fishkin, "Crossroads of Cultures," 21.

⁸ Jonathan Arac, "Global and Babel: Language and Planet in American Literature," in Dimock and Buell, *Shades of the Planet*, 20.

⁹ Dimock, "Introduction," 7.

¹⁰ Philip D. Curtin, "Depth, Span, and Relevance," *American Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (1984): 9.

¹¹ For a list of recent works on "the study of America as a transnational cultural production and the study of transnationalism itself," see Yanoula K. Athanassakis and Eric Lars Martinsen, "Transnational American Studies in the Digital Age," *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 2, no. 1 (2010): 7n7, <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/46j322bc>.

¹² See Robert Warrior, "Native American Scholarship and the Transnational Turn," *Cultural Studies Review* 15, no. 2 (2009): 119–30, in which he reworks related academic conversations among Native American scholars to bring "Native American perspectives into a discussion of transnationality" (119).

¹³ Robert Warrior, "Organizing Native American and Indigenous Studies," *PMLA* 123, no. 5 (2008): 1683–91.

¹⁴ Warrior, "Native American Scholarship," 119.

¹⁵ See Robert Warrior, "A Room of One's Own at the ASA: An Indigenous Provocation," *American Quarterly* 55, no. 4 (2003): 681–87; Robert Warrior, "Native American Critical Responses to Transnational Discourse," *PMLA* 122, no. 3 (2007): 807–8; Warrior, "Organizing Native American and Indigenous Studies"; and Warrior, "Native American Scholarship."

¹⁶ Warrior, "Native American Scholarship," 127.

¹⁷ Robin Maria DeLugan, "Indigeneity across Borders: Hemispheric Migrations and Cosmopolitan Encounters," *American Ethnologist* 37, no. 1 (2010): 84.

¹⁸ Paul Lai and Lindsey Claire Smith, introduction to "Alternative Contact: Indigeneity, Globalism, and American Studies," ed. Paul Lai and Lindsey Claire Smith, special issue, *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2010): 407–8.

¹⁹ Vicente M. Diaz and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, “Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge,” *Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2001): 315.

²⁰ Elizabeth M. DeLoughrey, *Routes and Roots: Navigating Caribbean and Pacific Island Literatures* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2007).

²¹ See Kamau Brathwaite, “The Search for a Caribbean Aesthetic,” *Sunday Express*, November 8, 1992, 29–36.

²² Shari M. Huhndorf, *Mapping the Americas: The Transnational Politics of Contemporary Native Culture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009), 3.

²³ *Ibid.*, 141, 171. On “tribal transnationalism,” see also Joni Adamson’s essay, “‘¡Todos Somos Indios!’ Revolutionary Imagination, Alternative Modernity, and Transnational Organizing in the Work of Silko, Tamez, and Anzaldúa,” in this Special Forum.

²⁴ Maximilian C. Forte, *Indigenous Cosmopolitans: Transnational and Transcultural Indigeneity in the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Peter Lang, 2010).

²⁵ Renya K. Ramirez, *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).

²⁶ Deborah L. Madsen, ed., *Native Authenticity: Transnational Perspectives on Native American Literary Studies* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010).

²⁷ Elvira Pulitano, ed., *Transatlantic Voices: Interpretations of Native North American Literatures* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007).

²⁸ Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), xi, quoted in Pulitano, *Transatlantic Voices*, xxix.

²⁹ Hsinya Huang, ed., *Aspects of Transnational and Indigenous Cultures* (Kaohsiung, TW: National Sun Yat-sen University Press, forthcoming).

³⁰ See Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford Lytle, *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty* (New York: Pantheon, 1984), quoted in Philip J. Deloria, “Conquest Histories and Narratives of Displacement: Thoughts on Civil Rights, Diaspora, and Transnationalism in Ethnic Studies and United States History,” in Huang, *Aspects of Transnational and Indigenous Cultures*, forthcoming.

³¹ See Deloria, “Conquest Histories,” forthcoming. For reference, see also Kevin Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.–Indigenous Relations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007); Mark Rifkin, *Manifesting America: The Imperial Construction of U.S. National Space* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Ronald Niezen, *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); quoted in Deloria, “Conquest Histories,” forthcoming.

³² Dimock, “Introduction,” 7.

Selected Bibliography

- Allen, Chadwick. *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, forthcoming, September 2012.
- Athanassakis, Yanoula K., and Eric Lars Martinsen. "Transnational American Studies in the Digital Age." *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 2, no. 1 (2010): 1–8. <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/46j322bc>.
- Brathwaite, Kamau. "The Search for a Caribbean Aesthetic." *Sunday Express*, November 8, 1992, 29–36.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.–Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Chow, Rey. "Where Have All the Natives Gone?" In *Writing Diaspora: Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*, by Rey Chow, 27–54. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Curtin, Philip D. "Depth, Span, and Relevance." *American Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (1984): 1–9.
- Deloria, Philip J. "Conquest Histories and Narratives of Displacement: Thoughts on Civil Rights, Diaspora, and Transnationalism in Ethnic Studies and United States History." In *Aspects of Transnational and Indigenous Cultures*, ed. Hsinya Huang. Kaohsiung, TW: National Sun Yat-sen University Press, forthcoming.
- Deloria Jr., Vine, and Clifford Lytle. *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*. New York: Pantheon, 1984.
- DeLoughrey, Elizabeth M. *Routes and Roots: Navigating Caribbean and Pacific Island Literatures*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.
- DeLugan, Robin Maria. "Indigeneity across Borders: Hemispheric Migrations and Cosmopolitan Encounters." *American Ethnologist* 37, no. 1 (2010): 83–97.
- Diaz, Vicente M., and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, eds. "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge." Special issue, *Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2001).
- Dimock, Wai Chee, and Lawrence Buell, eds. *Shades of the Planet: American Literature as World Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Dirlik, Arif. "Globalization, Indigenism, and the Politics of Place." In "Globalization and Indigenous Cultures," ed. Fengzhen Wang and Shaobo Xie. Special issue, *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature* 34, no. 1 (2003): 15–29.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies—Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004." *American Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2005): 17–57.

- Forte, Maximilian C. *Indigenous Cosmopolitans: Transnational and Transcultural Indigeneity in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Huang, Hsinya, ed. *Aspects of Transnational and Indigenous Cultures*. Kaohsiung, TW: National Sun Yat-sen University Press, forthcoming.
- Huhndorf, Shari M. *Mapping the Americas: The Transnational Politics of Contemporary Native Culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- Lai, Paul, and Lindsey Claire Smith, eds. "Alternative Contact: Indigeneity, Globalism, and American Studies." Special issue, *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2010).
- Lionnet, Françoise, and Shu-mei Shih, eds. *Minor Transnationalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Madsen, Deborah L., ed. *Native Authenticity: Transnational Perspectives on Native American Literary Studies*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010.
- Niezen, Ronald. *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Pulitano, Elvira, ed. *Transatlantic Voices: Interpretations of Native North American Literatures*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.
- Ramirez, Renya K. *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Rifkin, Mark. *Manifesting America: The Imperial Construction of U.S. National Space*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Warrior, Robert. "Native American Critical Responses to Transnational Discourse." *PMLA* 122, no. 3 (2007): 807–8.
- . "Native American Scholarship and the Transnational Turn." *Cultural Studies Review* 15, no. 2 (2009): 119–30.
- . "Organizing Native American and Indigenous Studies." *PMLA* 123, no. 5 (2008): 1683–91.
- . "A Room of One's Own at the ASA: An Indigenous Provocation." *American Quarterly* 55, no. 4 (2003): 681–87.