

SETTLER HOMONATIONALISM

Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities

Scott Lauria Morgensen

In *Terrorist Assemblages* Jasbir Puar argues that the U.S. war on terror engenders among U.S. queer subjects a homonormative nationalism, or “homonationalism.” Puar examines how, by appealing to or being embraced by the antiterrorist state, U.S. queers appear as a form of “U.S. exceptionalism.” Their protection or promotion by U.S. imperialism then supports and extends, in Rey Chow’s terms, “the ascendancy of whiteness.”¹ Puar adapts Foucauldian theory of biopolitics to argue that a key effect of the war on terror is the production of white heteronormative national subjects of life. In turn, terrorists and all who are linked to them are framed as racial and sexual populations marked for death, in a parallel process Achille Mbembe terms “necropolitics.”² Puar has extended these arguments in other writing with Amit Rai, by arguing that both these life- and death-enhancing projects frame the terrorist as a monster who can be read as queer. This is so especially if colonial discourses conflate racialized terrorists with sexual perversion or uphold the heteronormativity of white citizens as in need of enhancement or defense. But as Puar and Rai note, the war on terror creates white heteronormative nationalism as not a target but the agent of terrorizing brutality. Terror in fact is the function of the biopolitics that purports to oppose it.³ This is the context in which U.S. queer subjects become homonationalist: when they try to join an imperial biopolitics as liberal subjects of life, they become what Puar calls “queer as regulatory” over other, queered populations in relation to which they also exert terrorizing control.⁴

I am compelled by Puar’s analysis, which I extend at the intersections of queer studies and Native studies. Puar presents the term *homonationalism* to explain how racialized sexuality and national terror interact today. I interpret homonationalism as an effect of U.S. queer modernities forming amid the conquest of Native peoples and the settling of Native land. The terrorizing sexual coloniza-

tion of Native peoples was a historical root of the biopolitics of modern sexuality in the United States. Colonists interpreted diverse practices of gender and sexuality as signs of a general primitivity among Native peoples. Over time, they produced a colonial necropolitics that framed Native peoples as queer populations marked for death. Colonization produced the biopolitics of modern sexuality that I call “settler sexuality”: a white national heteronormativity that regulates Indigenous sexuality and gender by supplanting them with the sexual modernity of settler subjects. Despite having formed in the United States to serve Anglo-American landowning classes and the Euro-ethnics they absorbed, settler definitions of modern sexuality became hegemonic for all non-Natives, as well as for Native people who sought ties to sexual modernity. Settler colonialism thus conditioned the formation of modern sexuality in the United States, including modern queer subjects and politics. By the mid-twentieth century U.S. sexual minority movements had formed on normatively white and national terms, which could include reversing the discourses marking them as primitive and embracing a primitive or specifically Native sexual nature. Non-Native queers of color long remained marginal to such projects or critiqued them, as their participants or as the organizers of queer of color coalitions. But over time non-Natives were able to form shared identities and movements to claim modern sexual citizenship in the settler state. Under such conditions, queer movements can naturalize settlement and assume a homonormative and national form that may be read specifically as settler homonationalism.

My reading of settler homonationalism extends a larger project in which I am centering settler colonialism as a condition of the formation of modern queer subjects, cultures, and politics in the United States.⁵ Narrating Native histories of sexuality and gender while absencing Native people from sexual modernity produces U.S. queer projects as settler formations. Such projects remain distant from Native queer activism that challenge the colonial formation of modern sexuality, by denaturalizing settlement, reimagining subjugated Native knowledges, and fostering Native survivance within broader work for decolonization. Inspired by Native queer activism and Indigenous feminist and queer critiques, my historical and ethnographic work traces the processes that made settler definitions of sexual modernity normative in U.S. queer projects. I conduct this work as a non-Native and white participant in the multiracial U.S. queer cultures and politics I critically engage, and from within allied and dialogic relationships with Native queer activism and Indigenous queer and feminist work in Native studies. My work invites new conversation among queer of color, queer diasporic, and Indigenous queer critiques and all critical queer projects in the United States that

would disrupt homonationalism, by calling all to mark and challenge its settler formation.

My argument engages Puar's to pursue calls for queer studies to engage Native studies and center settler colonialism and indigeneity when theorizing the racial or national formation of sexual modernity.⁶ I extend Puar's argument by studying the conditions under which U.S. queer projects produce a *settler* homonationalism, which greatly expands the historical frame in which we might trace queer complicities in U.S. imperial biopolitics. In turn, I am led by Puar's claims to ask how U.S. queer projects produce settler *homonationalism*, a question that then centers for analysis the terrorizing methods that create queer subjects as agents of the violence of the settler state. My adaptations of Puar's work also call scholars in Native studies to engage Foucauldian theory of biopolitics, both by embedding feminist and queer criticism in Native studies and by investing in race and sexuality in colonial studies. Current debates in Native studies over the uses of post-structuralism are answered by turning critical theory of biopolitics into a Native-focused and decolonizing bridge between theory in queer and Native studies.

This essay explains settler homonationalism as the product of a biopolitical relationship between the sexual colonization of Native peoples and the normative settler formation of modern queer projects in the United States. My conclusions invite further questions for theorizing homonationalism and settlement today. What might "terrorists," figured as foreign, have to do with "savages," figured as domestic, when the state identifies objects of colonial or imperial control? How has the closure of colonial frontiers informed the biopolitics of modern sexuality, or its imperial projections in the war on terror? How do U.S. queer claims on sexual nature or rights cite Indigenous roots to project their global scope? How is homonationalism part of the settler formation of U.S. queer projects, and how can their historical and contemporary complicities in terror be addressed? My answer to these questions is that settlement must be denaturalized in all its forms, including within U.S. queer projects. Scholars must study the past and present activity of settler colonialism as a contradictory and contested process, which even now produces and fractures homonationalism, exposing it to possibilities for critique.

The Colonial Biopolitics of Modern Sexuality

While I argue that homonationalism arises whenever settler colonialism is naturalized in U.S. queer projects, tracing this process demands more than simply adding the word "settler" to the term. Puar examines homonationalism as a formation of national sexuality linked to war and terror, and both must inform a theory of

settler homonationalism. Puar argues that in the biopolitics of U.S. empire, homonationalism makes the subjects of queer modernities “regulatory” over queered and “terrorist” populations that are placed under terrorizing state control. In kind, a theory of settler homonationalism must ask how in the United States, the terrorizing sexual colonization of Native peoples produced the colonial biopolitics of modern sexuality that conditioned queer formations past and present. My essay reinterprets historical writing on sexual colonization and on modern queer formations to explain how these processes relationally positioned varied non-Native and Native people within a colonial biopolitics. But this account rests, first, on linking insights in Native studies on gender and sexuality to feminist scholarship on biopolitics in colonial studies.

Feminist and queer criticism in Native studies already explains terror as key to the sexual colonization of Native peoples.⁷ Andrea Smith argues that “it has been through sexual violence and through the imposition of European gender relationships on Native communities that Europeans were able to colonize Native peoples,” in a process that included marking Native people “by their sexual perversity” as queer to colonial regimes.⁸ Bethany Schneider affirms that “Indian hating and queer hating form a powerful pair of pistons in the history of white colonization of the Americas.”⁹ In part, Native peoples were marked as queer by projecting fears of sodomy on them that justified terrorizing violence.¹⁰ At the same time, diverse modes of embodiment and desire in Native societies challenged colonial beliefs about sexual nature and were targeted for control. As Smith argues, given that “U.S. empire has always been reified by enforced heterosexuality and binary gender systems” while many Native societies “had multiple genders and people did not fit rigidly into particular gender categories . . . it is not surprising that the first peoples targeted for destruction in Native communities were those who did not neatly fit into western gender categories.”¹¹ And, as Schneider concludes, “the tendency or tactic of Europeans to see sodomy everywhere in the so-called New World enabled a devastating two-fisted excuse for murderous violence and a complicated homoerotics of genocide.”¹² Such readings of histories of terrorizing violence in Native studies are joined by arguments about how forms of violence acted as modes of social control in the new colonial moral order. Schneider notes that Mark Rifkin’s work shows how “policies aimed at assimilating Indians through the destruction of kinship structures figured Indian cultures as other than heteronormative in order to reinvent and assimilate them as straight, private-property-owning, married citizens.”¹³ Rifkin pursues this claim by arguing that scholars investigate

(1) how a sustained engagement with American Indian histories and forms of self-representation as part of a history of sexuality in the United States can aid in rethinking what constitutes heteronormativity and (2) how queer critique of federal Indian policy as compulsory heterosexuality can contribute to an understanding of its organizing ideological and institutional structure as well as strategies of native opposition to it.¹⁴

Queer and feminist readings in Native studies thus explain how terrorizing violence became normalized in colonial sexual regimes. Such work offers a productive basis for asking how terrorizing methods produce the colonial biopolitics of modern sexuality.

Theories of biopolitics and colonization are indebted to Ann Stoler's efforts to locate Foucauldian theories of sexuality within colonial studies. Many scholars have critiqued Michel Foucault's omission of colonialism from his work on sexuality. Stoler challenged this limit in Foucault's work by asking if the power relations he traced in Europe related to the histories of imperial metropolises and colonial societies. She argued that they did, by marking how Foucault addressed sexuality and race in his theories of biopower—or, in the form of government, biopolitics.¹⁵ Stoler displaced a more common reading of Foucault's history of sexuality in queer theory, which tended to frame European societies and their normative whiteness as roots of modern sexuality, and to pay secondary if any attention to racial differences or colonialism. In particular, early queer theory did not emphasize Foucault's reading of modern sexuality as a biopolitics, by which he marked modern regimes that produce subjects of life by deploying state racism to define them apart from populations marked for death. Foucault argued that modern sexuality acts as a biopolitics when national institutions enhance normative sexuality as life while regulating racial and sexual populations marked for death. Stoler argued that linking a theory of biopolitics to colonialism shifted trajectories of queer theory that read Foucault's history of sexuality as "a history of western desire."¹⁶ In light of colonial histories, Europe is Western only to the extent that it is metropolitan—a center of colonial empires—which means neither Europe nor Western cultural legacies will be understood before studying their formation in colonial and settler societies. Stoler and other scholars in colonial studies examined how racial and national formations of sexuality and gender produced the biopolitics of colonial regimes.¹⁷ As Stoler notes, a focus in such work on modes of reproduction accounted poorly for nonheteronormative sexualities and genders, and still requires critically queer readings. Yet this work already shows—in concert with

Foucault's work, but against limits he put on it—that modern sexuality may have arisen first *in* the colonies, if not in their relation to the metropolises, rather than within the boundaries of Europe. In light of this, by “modern sexuality” I refer to the discourses, procedures, and institutions in metropolitan and colonial societies that distinguish and link primitive and civilized sexuality and gender, and define racial, national, gendered, and sexual subjects and populations in biopolitical relationship.

Colonial studies of biopolitics importantly historicize sexuality in relation to Foucault's theories of modern disciplinary power. Scholars of colonialism noted the historical transition that Foucault proposed for the history of European modes of punishment in *Discipline and Punish*.¹⁸ In eighteenth-century Europe, a pre-modern right of the sovereign to mete out death in punishment, notably as public spectacle, was complemented or superseded by modern modes of punishment based on producing populations for surveillance. Foucault presented the panopticon in Jeremy Bentham's modern prison as an institutional image of disciplinary power. But he argued that discipline became the normative logic of modern institutions even more broadly and educated all modern subjects in their senses of self. In this context, Stoler explains the sexual and gendered regimes of metropolitan and colonial societies as being based on a colonial “education of desire.” Stoler's phrase marks how colonial power historically deployed a sovereign right of death, which over time became complementary to a disciplinary education of desire separating normative subjects of life from subject populations. Stoler's work presents colonial biopolitics as what Foucault called a “society of normalization” — “a society where the norm of discipline and the norm of regularization intersect” — and shows that it formed subjects of life and populations marked for deadly regulation by educating them in their interdependent locations in colonial regimes.¹⁹

Stoler's reading of colonial biopolitics helps illuminate how in the United States the sexual colonization of Native peoples relates to the settler sexuality that arose to control and supplant them. While Stoler focused on historical colonies rather than settler societies, feminist and queer work in Native studies more directly inspires study of the biopolitics of settler colonialism. Modern sexuality arose in the United States amid the colonial conditions of a settler society. Terrorizing violence marked Native peoples as sexually deviant populations to be subjected to a colonial education of desire, while agents and beneficiaries of sexual colonization became subjects of settler sexuality. Settlement and its naturalization then conditioned the emergence of modern queer formations, including their inheritance and sustaining of colonial biopolitics in the form of settler homonationalism.

But what historical dynamics produced Native peoples as queered populations marked for death, and settlers as subjects of life—including, at times, as homonationalists? Detailed accounts have yet to be written. Yet signs appear already in histories of the sexual colonization of Native peoples that mark the trajectory suggested by Foucault, in which the spectacular violence of a sovereign right of death was incorporated into the deadly logic of disciplinary regulation. Colonial brutality always targeted sexual transgressions to control Native communities. But the growth of modern biopolitics linked the discipline of individuals to that of communities and defined Native people as racial and sexual populations for regulation. I now reread such histories in the United States as contexts in relation to which non-Native queer formations could arise as modern inheritors of the discipline of Native communities in a settler state.

Terror and Resistance in Sexual Colonization

Scholars in Native and queer studies are familiar with accounts of early colonists exacting a terrorizing right of death to educate Native people in the new colonial moral order. While interpreting Peter Martyr's account of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa's 1513 expedition in Panama, Jonathan Goldberg notes that Balboa's victorious arrival after battle at the house of the indigenous king was framed by his condemnation and elimination of what he perceived to be gender and sexual transgression. On reportedly finding the king's brother and about forty other men dressed in women's apparel or living in sexual relationships, Balboa threw them to be eaten alive by his dogs. Goldberg argues that this act "retrospectively justifies" the conqueror's earlier slaughters in battle—in which accounts stated that Spanish soldiers killed Indians "as animals"—or to quote Martyr, "hewed . . . in pieces as the butchers doo fleshe." For Goldberg, "post-facto, the body of the sodomite takes on an originary status, as the cause for what was done to the Indians in the first place."²⁰ Linking ascriptions of savagery to transgressions of sexual nature defined European rule as sexual colonization and justified its violences. This account of Balboa's expedition evokes qualities that also inflect other early Spanish, French, and British encounters with Native peoples narrated by the category *berdache*. This orientalist term arose to condemn Middle Eastern and Muslim men as racial enemies of Christian civilization, by linking them to the creation of *berdache* (in translation) as "kept boys" or "boy-slaves" whose sex was said to have been altered by immoral male desire. Like the category *berdache*, the transgressions Balboa described did not just mark gender or sexual transgressions

but the acts of powerful men that turned them or others against nature, resulting in an immoral and effeminized male leadership that invited and justified conquest. Earlier generations of feminist scholars argued that a bias in colonial tales of *berdache* erased female embodiment from accounts of Native gender and sexual diversity. But feminist critiques in the wake of Stoler and Smith will note that the central condemnation of Native male embodiment in colonial accounts of *berdache* established the masculinist and heteropatriarchal terms of colonial power.²¹ Colonial discourses of race and sexuality then came to mark transgressive individuals and entire communities when they meted out spectacular death to educate Native peoples in the moral order of colonization.

Yet subsequent histories of colonial control of indigenous male sexuality support Foucault's claim that a sovereign right of death joined the rationalizing management of populations to produce modern disciplinary power. Zeb Tortorici examined a 1604 case of sodomy accusations in Valladolid, Michoacán, Mexico, that illuminates this shift. After the capture of two indigenous Purépecha men "committing the *pecado nefando*—the nefarious sin of sodomy," a regional investigation resulted in sodomy charges against thirteen indigenous and mestizo men, some of whom were relatives or in long-term relationships.²² For two months, legal and religious authorities exacted confessions and implications that tried to determine the degree of interest or culpability in the alleged acts for each accused while threatening torture or public execution as punishments. Yet the investigation deferred its threatened outcomes to serve as a fact-finding exercise, which newly mapped social networks along which the church and government began to chart new routes for their authority in indigenous communities. Given that only six of the thirteen accused men were tried for sodomy, with four of them executed, and others who evaded capture never pursued, Tortorici suggests that in this era the intimation of sodomy among indigenous men remained deadly but no longer drew an absolute response.²³ Public execution now appeared as a threatened end to a broader process of surveillance and population management that sought more minute control over sexual transgressions and indigenous communities. Tortorici historicizes this shift in managing sexuality within "the secularization of colonial Mexican society," so that "while in 1604 four of the Purépecha men accused of sodomy were executed for their crimes, in the eighteenth century men found guilty of sodomy were never executed for their crimes."²⁴ Yet amid these changes, study of "sodomitical subcultures" (as Tortorici calls them) was sustained as a method for colonial authorities to study and control sexuality among Native peoples.

Scholars of anglophone and francophone North America also mark how gender and sexuality shaped colonial expansion and its formation of disciplinary

regimes of modern sexuality. Historians note that the settlement of French and British Canada and of colonial and post-Revolutionary New England produced strongly gendered modes of control over Native peoples, as war, containment on reserves, and colonial law, economy, and religion redefined roles for Native women and men in work, marriage, and community leadership.²⁵ While such histories invite more accounts of sexual and gender diversity, these appear clearly when British, French, and U.S. explorers, traders, and researchers traveled the fur trade or colonial expansion and met Native people whom they called *berdache*, “warrior women,” or other terms of fascination or contempt. In the mid-nineteenth century when most such accounts appear, persons so marked were less often singled out for violence than subjected with their communities to military attack, containment, or removal. But they did gain note in colonial institutions established during settlement, such as Indian agencies, missionary churches, and boarding schools. Without needing to exact brute violence, these institutions used disciplinary education to try to break Native communities, languages, and cultural knowledges—as in the work of Richard Pratt at the Carlisle Indian School and his famous motto, “Kill the Indian, and save the man.”²⁶ Scholars of Native studies argue that Native people made such institutions sites for defying the erasure of Native identity or community, including at times by adopting colonial languages or educational methods within new forms of resistance.²⁷ But both colonial control and Native resistance were shaped by struggle over gender and sexuality, in the establishment on the colonial frontier of modern methods for the colonial education of desire.

The grounding of U.S. colonization in sexual regulation and discipline is demonstrated by the history of the Crow Agency and the life of Osh-Tisch (Finds-Them-and-Kills-Them). Osh-Tisch was born in 1854 and was raised and recognized in Crow society as *boté* (or *badé*), a Crow role in which she lived consistently on Crow land to the age of seventy-five.²⁸ I use the pronoun *she* in line with the English usage attributed to Pretty Shield, a member of Osh-Tisch’s village, who later recalled Osh-Tisch as “a Crow woman” who was also “neither a man nor a woman.” Will Roscoe reports from oral histories of Osh-Tisch’s life that her community included many *botés*, and at least one “woman who had no man of her own,” The Other Magpie, whom Osh-Tisch accompanied in sharing exploits in battle.²⁹ Roscoe says that after the establishment of the agency and other colonial institutions, Crow people were “subjected to ongoing interference by representatives of the U.S. government,” including in contests over *botés*, among whom Osh-Tisch was prominent. Robert Lowie said of Osh-Tisch that “former agents have repeatedly tried to make him [*sic*] don male clothes, but the other Indians themselves

protested against this, saying that it was against his nature.”³⁰ Walter Williams interviewed the Crow tribal historian Joe Medicine Crow about his memories of Osh-Tisch, who died in 1929 when Medicine Crow was seven years old. Williams says that “when I asked about the controversy over Osh-Tisch’s clothing, he did not answer but told me to meet him the following day on the grounds of the Bureau of Indian Affairs offices. I arrived the next day and observed that the BIA building was surrounded by huge oak trees.” Medicine Crow then reflected that

one agent in the late 1890s . . . tried to interfere with Osh-Tisch, who was the most respected *badé*. The agent incarcerated the *badés*, cut off their hair, made them wear men’s clothing. He forced them to do manual labor, planting these trees that you see here on the BIA grounds. The people were so upset with this that Chief Pretty Eagle came into Crow Agency, and told [the agent] to leave the reservation. It was a tragedy, trying to change them.³¹

Both Lowie and Medicine Crow tell that the agency established its rule by targeting *botés* for gendered and sexual reeducation, which sparked resistance by Crow leaders and their community. Yet even as pressure for gendered and sexual conformity increased in schools and churches, resistance to it did not end. Roscoe describes how

children were required to attend government-run boarding schools in which any expression or use of native language and customs was severely punished, boys and girls were segregated, and girls were not allowed to leave the school until husbands had been found for them. In such an environment, children with *boté* tendencies were quickly identified. According to Holder, when a Crow boy was found secretly dressing in female clothes in the late 1880s, “He was punished, but finally escaped from school and became a *boté*, which vocation he has since followed.”³²

Historical records indicate that Osh-Tisch lived as a *boté* for the rest of her life. In 1891 she took in “a three-year-old child” who was listed on a census as her “adopted son,” but who four years later was recorded as a girl—suggesting that Osh-Tisch was fulfilling a role in Crow community of passing the life of *boté* to a next generation.³³ Yet by her late age, it appeared to colonial authorities that no other Crow people were living a traditional *boté* identity. Williams quotes Thomas Yellowtail saying, “When the Baptist missionary Peltotz arrived in 1903, he condemned our traditions, including the *badé*. He told congregation members to stay

away from Osh-Tisch and the other *badés*. He continued to condemn Osh-Tisch until his death in the late 1920s. That may be the reason why no others took up the *badé* role after Osh-Tisch died.”³⁴

Death thus still shaped sexual colonization in the era of containment and assimilation, but in new ways. Under colonial rule, Native people faced constant condemnation of gender and sexual transgression, which at times took shape as a violent education in a new life. But if public punishment—which now did not end in murder—failed to quell resistance, the deadly logics of regulation kicked in. After the passing of old resisters like Osh-Tisch, colonial education prevented a new generation being raised, so an entire way of life could appear to have passed. But the violence of this erasure persists in Native people’s memories of these changes. Williams presents oral histories of Lakota traditionalists who recalled the effects of colonial education. As one tells,

By the 1940s, after more Indians had been educated in white schools, or had been taken away in the army, they lost the traditions of respect for *winktes*. The missionaries condemned *winktes*, telling families that if something bad happened, it was because of their associating with a *winkte*. They would not accept *winkte* into the cemetery, saying “their souls are lost.” Missionaries had a lot of power on the reservation, so the *winktes* were ostracized by many of the Christianized Indians.³⁵

Williams quotes another telling “of the pressures put on *winktes* in the 1920s and 1930s”: “The missionaries and agents said *winktes* were no good, and tried to get them to change their ways. Some did, and put on men’s clothing. But others, rather than change, went out and hanged themselves. I remember the sad stories that were told about this.”³⁶

Williams also recounts a Navajo woman who had narrated her own story of being taken with her relatives as a child to the Carlisle Indian School:

Her cousin, a *nadle*, was also taken there. Since he was dressed as a girl, school officials assumed he was female and placed him in the girl’s dormitory. The Navajo students protected him, and he went undiscovered. Later, however, there was a lice infestation. The white teachers personally scrubbed all the girls, and were shocked when they found out that the *nadle* was male. The Navajo woman said, “They were very upset. They would not tell us what happened to him, and we never saw him again. We were very sad that our cousin was gone.” The family still does not know if the boy was sent to another school, or to prison, or was killed.³⁷

In these stories from the late nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth, multiple images of death frame Native people's memories of the erasure of gendered and sexual possibility: as exile from the community's spiritual continuity; in so restricting life as to force persons to "choose" to die; and in being "disappeared" by the traceless authority of the bureaucratic state. These are some of the results of shifting colonial authority from a brutal right of public execution to the normalization of death in regulatory regimes based on discipline. But disciplinary methods were no less terrorizing. They required internalizing a possibility that life as *nádleeh*, *winkte*, *boté*, or a "woman who had no man" was impossible, in this life or in the next. And they suggest that the sustained resistance of relatives and communities ultimately faced a colonial power to make loved ones literally disappear, beyond knowledge of life or death. These are the terrorizing acts of a society of normalization, as Foucault and Stoler theorized, and they formed on the frontier of the settler state by controlling Native peoples as populations for the colonial education of modern sexuality.

Yet if sexual colonization targeted particular persons, both oppression and resistance remained collective experiences. My account revises colonial accounts of violence against *berdache* by noting that the lives the term marked were not the singular experiences of a sexual minority but of Native peoples claiming relationship and collective identities. Here I affirm Jace Weaver's argument that Native resistance to colonization has pursued a "communitism" linking community survival to activism for justice.³⁸ Forcing *botés* into masculine dress and parading them as labor announced colonial power over the entire Crow community and its values. But Chief Pretty Eagle's defiance of the agent reaffirmed those values, by marking gender and sexuality as front lines in Crow people's experiences of colonization while demanding freedom for the *botés* as a condition of the community's collective sovereignty. In turn, the girls at the Carlisle School who protected the *nádleeh* youth defended the truth of their loved one's life, even as they recognized that a colonial intent to erase that life also sought to erase their interdependence. Neither their inability to protect their cousin nor the loss that this sustained for the survivors overwrites how the situation portrays Native people dignifying identities and sustaining collective ties amid colonial education. Finally, Chief Pretty Eagle's defense of *botés* in the 1890s suggests, under different conditions, encounters Brian Joseph Gilley describes at Two-Spirit gatherings in the 1990s, when Two-Spirit men and women began receiving recognition from traditionalist elders for embodying the very traditions that elders defended and that they now could choose to defend together.³⁹ Such moments can be read in relation to the earliest encounters of Native peoples with attempted conquest. They indicate that Native

gender and sexual diversity persistently troubled the boundaries of sexual colonization and, in its survivance, continues to inspire collective work for decolonization today.

Settler Colonialism and Queer Modernities

Modern sexuality arose in the United States as crucial to a colonial society of normalization. The violent sexual regulation of Native peoples became a proving ground for forming settler subjects as agents and beneficiaries of modern sexuality. Their subject positions arose relationally within the colonial biopolitics of modern sexuality and call for broad analysis in queer, American, and Native studies.⁴⁰ I now ask how colonial histories made settlement a primary condition of the formation of modern queer subjects and politics in the United States. I reexamine scholarship in queer studies that suggests this claim, and I mark how future queer scholarship can center the study of settler colonialism, including as a condition of homonationalism.

Settler colonialism is the open secret in most historical work in U.S. sexuality studies and queer studies. Settler colonialism conditioned every aspect of the history of sexuality in the United States, but only rarely has it been made a focus of study. My account has suggested a convergence between the sexual colonization of Native peoples and the growth in the United States of techniques of modern sexuality. These proliferated in the decades following the frontier's "closure," a time that in fact represented a heyday of state and religious efforts to institute a colonial education of desire, as in the events at the Crow Agency or during the 1879–1918 tenure of the Carlisle Indian School. Far from reflecting finality, this period witnessed tense negotiations of active and contested settlement. In such a time, any iteration of modern sexuality that placed Native people in the past knew itself to be a contingent claim that remained open to challenge. Thus scholars must recognize that modern sexuality is not a *product* of settler colonialism, as if it came into being in the United States after settlement transpired. Modern sexuality arose in the United States as a method to *produce* settler colonialism, and settler subjects, by facilitating ongoing conquest and naturalizing its effects. The normative function of settlement is to appear inevitable and final. It is naturalized again whenever sexuality or queer studies scholars inscribe it as an unexamined backdrop to the historical formation of modern U.S. sexual cultures and politics.

Scholars in Native and American studies have theorized settler colonialism as the social processes and narratives that displace Native people while granting settlers belonging to Native land and settler society. With Renée Bergland and

James Cox, I examine how this displacement is enabled by settler narratives of Native absence or disappearance.⁴¹ Both terms share a quality of invoking the very thing being argued as not present. Stories of Native absence or disappearance thus precisely do not erase Native people but produce particular forms of knowledge about Native people, as already or inevitably gone. Cox argues that tales of Native disappearance should also be read as narratives of settlement. The very absence of Native people in a story is telling us a story about qualities of settler subjects, cultures, and social life.

Queer scholarship on race and sexuality has been effective at marking colonial relations and discourses and inviting the study of settlement. Scholars reveal that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, sexual sciences and civil institutions distinguished primitive from civilized sexuality in order to define queer margins for sexual normality. Eithne Luibhéid and Roderick Ferguson explain how Asian immigrants and conquered Mexicans after the mid-nineteenth century, and African Americans during slavery and the Jim Crow society, were produced as racial and sexual populations for national regulation.⁴² Queers of color in such contexts were targeted for control, but as emblems of entire racial populations to be queered as the primitive margins of national whiteness and its civilizational sexuality.⁴³ In turn, Jennifer Terry and George Chauncey, among others, explain how sexual sciences classified perversions by documenting white subjects as degenerates who had regressed to prior stages of racial evolution.⁴⁴ In early activism, white sexual minorities reversed discourse on sexual primitivity in order to embrace it as a nature deserving recognition by modern citizenship. In the United States, Harry Hay organized the Mattachine Society by referencing stories of *berdache* as the primitive nature of sexual minorities and as a primitive model of acceptance that modern societies could emulate—themes that were sustained in homophile and gay and lesbian civil rights activism.⁴⁵

Each such moment is illuminated by its relation to settlement. As Luibhéid's remarkable historical research suggests, the structural locations of non-Native people of color within the biopolitics of modern sexuality in the colonial and imperial United States align with those assigned to Native peoples by sexual colonization.⁴⁶ Their distinctive encounters with racial and sexual power thus may be examined as interrelated effects of the United States forming as a colonial power through processes of settlement. Yet studying their ties also will mark the many nonidentical locations occupied by non-Natives, including queers of color, in relation to Native people under colonial conditions of settlement. In turn, white U.S. sexual minorities who defended their sexual primitivity articulated normative practices of settler citizenship. Philip Deloria and Amy Kaplan have examined

settler citizenship as based on the conquest *and* incorporation of primitivity, so that primitivity becomes a resource to be drawn on when asserting the unique strengths of a settler civilization.⁴⁷ Modern sexuality discourses also taught white U.S. American men to tap and control their primitive roots, as when G. Stanley Hall's recapitulation theory of play or youth health movements in the YMCA invited white youth to explore primitive developmental stages so as to become civilized adults with virile sex and sexuality.⁴⁸ White U.S. sexual minorities thus organized in a political culture that already validated a journey to personhood and citizenship that translated primitive roots into settler modernity. Defending primitive sexual nature, which could include appropriating Native American culture as part of their history, translated their queer marginality into a normative assertion of settler citizenship.

Focusing on settlement also marks the way that theories of degeneration assigned to modern queers in the early-twentieth-century United States presumed Native disappearance. As degenerates, modern queers appeared as failed subjects, incapable of representing either white civilization or authentic primitivity. Yet this framing also naturalized them across racial differences as non-Native, in that it presumed that authentic Native people had already disappeared from the modern and settled spaces where queer degenerates would be found. If living Native people ever did appear in those spaces, they tended to present as out of place. For instance, Nayan Shah's compelling history of sexuality and migration cites a California police report from 1918, which criminalized a relationship between a South Asian migrant man and an American Indian youth by narrating it as sexual predation. This regulatory moment occurred amid recent histories of scalp bounties and massacres targeting Native peoples across Northern California, including only two years after the death of Ishi, famed survivor of the Yahi tribe. How might popular narratives of lost Native authenticity have shaped the police description of the youth only by his town of origin (Truckee) and his assimilation into a multiracial underclass? How, still, might tales of sexual primitivity persist, as his framing as the passive object of his racialized partner's desire suggests (without naming) the logic of *berdache*?⁴⁹

In turn, Siobhan Somerville and Kevin Mumford have shown how popular stories and social practices in the early twentieth century linked homosexuality to miscegenation, including representing it as emblematic of white "slumming" for sexual adventure in African American districts of New York City and Chicago.⁵⁰ Yet in the Northeast, blackness already connoted historical miscegenation with Indianness. Amy den Ouden has explained how in the wake of normative associations of Native people with blackness in New England, Native communities with

black family lines could be marked by white authorities as racially inauthentic, thereby delegitimizing their Native identities and land claims. In light of this, by the early twentieth century, how did discourses on sexual perversion tie Indianness *and* blackness to homosexuality, and how did they interlink? Did the histories of black-Indian communities and of their regulation shape modern racial theories of homosexuality? What would a queer history of homosexuality and miscegenation look like if Indianness — as an identity, or an object of colonial discourse — were crucial to analysis?⁵¹

Queer studies must center settler colonialism and processes of settlement in order to pursue these directions in scholarship. Settler colonialism appears in the relational of colonial and modern sexual regimes; in narratives of sexuality and gender based on Native absence and disappearance, despite evidence of Native survival and resistance; and in the normative formation of settler sexual subjects, cultures, and politics. I argue that queer accounts of settler colonialism will be supported by studying the colonial biopolitics of modern sexuality. The frame of colonial biopolitics makes the discursive and institutional relationality of Native and settler subject positions relevant to any account of modern sexuality in the United States. While such accounts have tended to exclude Native people, biopolitics marks erasure as meaningful to narrating settlement, even as that move can be investigated for evidence of the irruption of Native people amid stories of their demise. The frame of colonial biopolitics will also mark how the power relations structuring “Native” and “settler” articulate diverse people, cultures, and politics across differences of race, nation, class, disability, gender, and sexuality that exceed these two terms and their opposition. Yet the normativity of the terms within colonial biopolitics will still inform every U.S. formation of modern sexuality. Studying their relationality can recall that the locations they define for Native people always are exceeded by the discrepant histories and epistemologies of Native people’s interdependent and resistant lives. In turn, the term *non-Native* can help mark how subjects outside Native communities incompletely fit the term *settler* — whether excluded from it categorically or asked to pass through or appeal to it — as they negotiate varied non-Native lives in a settler society. Differences among non-Native people of color, or between them and white people, thus will not be erased by marking their shared inheritance of settler colonialism; indeed, doing so will *mark* those differences, even as their distinctive relationships to settler colonialism and its naturalization become relevant to study.⁵² In the process, analyzing the colonial biopolitics of modern sexuality will focus queer studies on the work of denaturalizing settlement. I mean here not just that settler colonialism will be marked as a condition of all modern sexual power in the United States

but also that the meaningfulness of its naturalization will become a major area of study. We need many more, and more detailed accounts of the subjects, institutions, and power relations that form whenever settler colonialism is naturalized within modern queer projects in the United States.

My argument invites scholars to return to homonationalism and explain it as one crucial effect of the settler histories of modern sexuality in the United States. We will see that if non-Native queers become sexual subjects of life, they will do so by joining a colonial biopolitics of modern sexuality that functions to produce modern queers as settler subjects in relation to Native peoples. Normatively white and national queer politics will arise here by naturalizing settler colonialism, notably when appeals to the settler state fail to trouble its colonial relation to Native peoples and its enforcement of a settler society.⁵³ To invoke Puar, the settler formation of U.S. queer projects will make them “queer as regulatory” over Native peoples, whose social lives will appear distant in time and space despite the continued existence of collective and allied Native activisms for decolonization and calls to non-Natives to join. Homonationalism will arise here, where the historical and contemporary activity of settler colonialism conditions queer modernities in the United States.⁵⁴

Destabilizing Settler Homonationalism

What would it mean for U.S. queers to confront their settler formation? What would resistance to settler homonationalism look like? While I cannot foresee an end to these questions, I begin with the deceptively simple argument that queers must denaturalize settler colonialism in all its forms. Queers naturalize settler colonialism whenever conquest and the displacement of Native peoples are ignored or appear inevitable. They also do so whenever they produce sexuality and gender from the desires of settler subjects for a home on Native land and relationship to Native histories and culture. Settler colonialism thus must be challenged not only in social and political spaces but also in the definition or experience of subjectivity. For instance, non-Natives may think that as queer subjects, they inherit ties to Native histories of gender or sexual diversity that grant them a kind of kinship with Native peoples. Identifying this way, non-Native queers may think that the terrors of sexual colonization visited on Native peoples were caused by persons unrelated to them or that those same violences were visited on themselves, either of which may obscure their specific non-Native relation to Native peoples and settler colonialism. At its extreme, non-Native queer longing for Native histories of sexuality or gender can seem to invite alliance when it performs a racial or national “pass-

ing” that appropriates Native culture in order to indigenize non-Native queers. Native queer and Two-Spirit activists critique such practices, including offers of alliance that try to absorb them or Native histories into non-Native politics. While Two-Spirit activists have sought recognition in U.S. queer spaces, they have done so less to join them than to hold them responsible to the distinctions of Native histories, which remind non-Natives that colonization continues to shape contemporary life.

Non-Native queers can learn from Native activists how to focus their identities and politics on challenging settler colonialism. What does it mean for non-Natives, located differently as they are by race and nationality, to study their formation in a settler society: knowing one’s home is not one’s own; knowing one feels at home only to the degree that others remain dispossessed; being accountable to histories of Native displacement by questioning one’s sense of place? One site where these questions have been asked has been in queer of color coalitions that form intimately with Native queer activism. Such projects have noted that non-Native queers of color can inherit the power of settlers despite their antiracism or anticolonialism, and they have theorized the varied colonial histories that shape non-Native queers of color and Native queers from within new and decolonial queer theories and activism.⁵⁵ How can non-Native queers of color in the United States continue to theorize histories of forced migration, slavery, occupation, and globalized labor as effects of white supremacist colonization, and the ancestral histories notably linking Chicana/o, Latina/o, and African American communities to Native Americans, while still vigilantly challenging wherever they may sustain or benefit from settler colonialism? Such critical reckonings with settler colonialism rarely have arisen in normatively white U.S. queer spaces, where the need for them is dire. White queers still must recognize race and nation as intrinsic to their formation by sexuality and gender. How then can they mark settler colonialism as a primary context of their racial and national formation? How can they then trace the histories that sought to merge Anglo colonists, Euro-ethnic immigrants, and hosts of persons marked by whiteness into the normative status of settler subjects—a persistent status, like whiteness, that cannot be dismissed but must be perpetually interrogated?

Denaturalizing settler colonialism will mark it as not a fait accompli but a process open to change. While settlement suggests the appropriation of land, that history was never fixed: even the violence of allotment failed to erase collective Native land claims, just as land expropriation is being countered by tribal governments reacquiring sovereign land. In turn, as Thomas King and Paul Carter suggest, settlement narrates the land, and, as storytelling, it remains open to debate,

such as in Native activisms that sustain Indigenous narratives of land or tell new stories to denaturalize settler landscapes.⁵⁶ The processes of settler colonialism produce contradictions, as settlers try to contain or erase Native difference in order that they may inhabit Native land as if it were their own. Doing so produces the contortions described by Deloria, as settler subjects argue that Native people or their land claims never existed, no longer exist, or if they do are trumped by the priority of settler claims. Yet at the same time settler subjects study Native history so that they may absorb it as their own and legitimate their place on stolen land.⁵⁷ These contradictions are informed by the knowledge, constantly displaced, of the genocidal histories of occupation. Working to stabilize settler subjectivity produces the bizarre result of people admitting to histories of terrorizing violence while basing their moral systems on continuing to benefit from them. The difference between conservative and liberal positions on settlement often breaks between whether non-Natives feel morally justified or conscionably implicated in a society based on violence. But while the first position embraces the status quo, the second does nothing necessarily to change it. As Smith pointedly argues, “It is a consistent practice among progressives to bemoan the genocide of Native peoples, but in the interest of political expediency, implicitly sanction it by refusing to question the illegitimacy of the settler nation responsible for this genocide.”⁵⁸ In writing with Kehaulani Kauanui, Smith argues that this complicity continues, as progressives

have critiqued the seeming erosion of civil liberties and democracy under the Bush regime. How is this critique affected if we understand the Bush regime not as the erosion of U.S. democracy but as its fulfillment? If we understand American democracy as predicated on the genocide of indigenous people? . . . Even scholars critical of the nation-state often tend to presume that the United States will always exist, and thus they overlook indigenous feminist articulations of alternative forms of governance beyond the United States in particular and the nation-state in general.⁵⁹

Smith and Kauanui remind us here that Indigenous feminists crucially theorize life beyond settler colonialism, including by fostering terms for national community that exceed the heteropatriarchal nation-state form.⁶⁰ Non-Natives who seek accountable alliance with Native people may align themselves with these stakes if they wish to commit to denaturalizing settler colonialism. But as noted, their more frequent effort to stabilize their identities follows less from a belief that settlement *is* natural than from a compulsion to foreclose the Pandora’s box of contradictions

they know will open by calling it into question. In U.S. queer politics, this includes the implications of my essay: queers will invoke and repeat the terrorizing histories of settler colonialism if these remain obscured behind normatively white and national desires for Native roots and settler citizenship. A first step for non-Native queers thus can be to examine critically and challenge how settler colonialism conditions their lives, as a step toward imagining new and decolonial sexual subjectivities, cultures, and politics. This work can be inspired by historical coalition politics formed by queers of color in accountable relationship to Native queer activists. Yet this work invites even more forms, particularly when Native queers choose to organize apart. White queers challenging racism and colonialism can join queers of color to create new queer politics marked explicitly as non-Native, in that they will form by answering Native queer critiques. As part of that work, non-Native queers can study the colonial histories they differently yet mutually inherit, and can trouble the colonial institutions in which they have sought their freedom, as steps toward shifting non-Native queer politics in decolonizing directions.

With these intentions, I end by returning to the contemporary moment of Puar's work to invite further reflection on a settler analysis of homonationalism. After 9/11, patriotic narratives of national vulnerability led to the U.S. projecting overwhelming power against Afghani and Iraqi people who had no role in the destruction of the World Trade Center. How did historical calls for military mobilization compare, for instance, in the wake of Little Big Horn and in the subsequent massacre at Wounded Knee? We can ask how narratives of protecting U.S. citizens motivated or justified projecting military power for the wholesale containment of subject populations and their land for U.S. economic and political control. In turn, scholars can join Puar and Rai and Indigenous feminists by investigating how "terrorists" are imagined in relation to "savages," as dangerously mobile or uncontained objects of U.S. colonial and imperial control. The imagining of savages and terrorists as monstrously raced and sexed produces counterparts for imagining U.S. military manhood as conquering and U.S. settler womanhood as civilizing in both settler and imperial projects of sexual normalization.

Puar argues that U.S. queers become complicit with putatively protective state violence through homonationalist participation in the war on terror, as they are promised citizenship for supporting homeland defense, military service, or educating subject populations at home or abroad in new national values. Homonationalism aligns queers with the biopolitical work of containing "terrorist" populations, which works to impose qualities of a new moral order of national gender and sexuality in Afghanistan and Iraq through disciplinary education. How does

this relationship compare with the colonial education of desire institutionalized in the frontier society that first consolidated the United States as an imperial power? How does that history currently contextualize homonationalist politics in the United States, the sexual politics of Native Nations today, and their relationship? These lines of comparison also can lead to considering how homonationalism in global contexts of human rights and movement activism projects settler histories of sexuality along global scales. Inderpal Grewal examines the complicities of women's movements in U.S. promotions of international human rights, including when they justified war in Afghanistan as a battle for gender justice.⁶¹ Puar in kind explains how homonationalist demonization of Islam as a promulgator of homophobia could justify U.S. or allied military intervention as a defense of sexual rights. How have efforts in U.S. queer politics to define sexual rights promoted the United States as arbiter of a global human rights regime? How, then, do U.S. queers imagine their work rests on embracing traditional sexualities worldwide as their prehistory, and when is such work informed by tales of kinship with Native Americans? The global aspirations of U.S. queers can be situated and challenged by marking where they derive from or project queer forms of settler sexuality, as is occurring in Native queer activism today.

Theorizing settler homonationalism indicates how U.S. queer claims on national belonging stabilize settlement and participate in reinventing its lessons within new imperial projects. The sexual terror of colonial discipline that conditioned Native people and settler subjects within a settler society remains an absented history within U.S. queer modernities. Yet the protean context of settlement remains, as its contradictions continue to open its integrity to question while requiring constant recuperation by settler nationalism. Centering scholarship on how settlement shapes queer formations and the state will create spaces where the powers of sexuality and settlement together can be interrogated and transformed.

Notes

1. Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), 2, 24.
2. Achille Mbembe quoted in Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*, 33.
3. Jasbir Puar and Amit Rai, "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots," *Social Text*, no. 72 (2002): 117–48.
4. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*, 11, 24.

5. Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Welcome Home: Settler Sexuality and the Politics of Indigeneity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010). See also Morgensen, "Activist Media in Native AIDS Organizing: Theorizing the Colonial Conditions of AIDS," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35 (2008): 35–56; Morgensen, "Back and Forth to the Land: Negotiating Rural and Urban Sexuality among the Radical Faeries," in *Out in Public: Reinventing Lesbian/Gay Anthropology in a Globalizing World*, ed. Ellen Lewin and William Leap (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2009), 143–63; Morgensen, "Arrival at Home: Radical Faerie Configurations of Sexuality and Place," *GLQ* 15 (2008): 67–96.
6. Daniel Heath Justice and James H. Cox, "Queering Indigenous Literature, Indigenizing Queer Theory," *Studies in American Indian Literature* 20 (2008); Elizabeth Povinelli, *The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); Mark Rifkin, "Romancing Kinship: A Queer Reading of Indian Education and Zitkala-Sa's *American Indian Stories*," *GLQ* 12 (2006): 27–59; Bethany Schneider, "Oklahobo: Following Craig Womack's American Indian and Queer Studies," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 106 (2007): 599–613.
7. Indigenous feminist scholars lead the historical documentation and critical theorizing of gender, sexuality, and colonization that condition Native peoples and settler societies. See, for example, Jennifer Denetdale, *Reclaiming Navajo History: The Legacies of Navajo Chief Manuelito and Juanita* (Tempe: University of Arizona Press, 2008); Luana Ross, *Inventing the Savage: The Social Construction of Native American Criminality* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998); Andrea Smith and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, "Native Feminisms Engage American Studies," *American Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (2008): 241–49.
8. Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End, 2005), 139, 10.
9. Schneider, "Oklahobo," 606–7.
10. Schneider, "Oklahobo," 607.
11. Smith, *Conquest*, 178.
12. Schneider, "Oklahobo," 606–7.
13. Schneider, "Oklahobo," 606–7.
14. Rifkin, "Romancing Kinship," 30.
15. Michel Foucault, *An Introduction*, vol. 1 of *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1978); Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 144.
16. Stoler attributes this phrase to Judith Butler. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*, 156; Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), 190.

17. See, for example, Philippa Levine, *Prostitution, Race, and Politics: Policing Vene-
real Disease in the British Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2003); Vicente Rafael,
White Love and Other Events in Filipino History (Durham, NC: Duke University
Press, 2000); Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*; Eileen Suarez, *Impos-
ing Decency: The Politics of Sexuality and Race in Puerto Rico, 1870–1920* (Dur-
ham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999). The introductory chapter to Stoler’s *Carnal
Knowledge and Imperial Power* provides a useful review.
18. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheri-
dan (New York: Vintage, 1977).
19. Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*, 83.
20. Jonathan Goldberg, “Sodomy in the New World: Anthropologies Old and New,” in
Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory, ed. Michael Warner (Min-
neapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 4, 6–7.
21. For early critiques of the absenting of female embodiment from colonial accounts of
Native gender and sexual diversity, see Patricia C. Albers, “From Illusion to Illumi-
nation: Anthropological Studies of American Indian Women,” in *Gender and Anthro-
pology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching*, ed. Sandra Morgen (Washington,
DC: American Anthropological Association, 1989), 132–70; Paula Gunn Allen, *The
Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions* (Boston: Bea-
con, 1986).
22. Zeb Tortorici, “‘Heran Todos Putos’: Sodomitical Subcultures and Disordered Desire
in Early Colonial Mexico,” *Ethnohistory* 54 (2007): 35, 41.
23. Tortorici, “‘Heran Todos Putos,’” 5.
24. Tortorici, “‘Heran Todos Putos,’” 67n77, 57.
25. See, for example, Ann Little, *Abraham in Arms: War and Gender in Colonial New
England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Jean O’Brien,
*Dispossession by Degrees: Indian Land and Identity in Natick, Massachusetts,
1650–1790* (Oxford: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Ann Marie Plane, *Colonial
Intimacies: Indian Marriage in Early New England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University
Press, 2002).
26. Elaine Goodale Eastman, *Pratt, the Red Man’s Moses* (Norman: University of Okla-
homa Press, 1935).
27. See, for example, Brenda Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families,
1900–1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); K. Tsianina Lomawaima,
“Domesticity in the Federal Indian Schools,” in *Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspective
on Difference in Science and Popular Culture*, ed. Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urla
(Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 197–218; Robert Allen Warrior, *The
People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction* (Minneapolis: University of Minne-
sota Press, 2005).
28. Will Roscoe, *Changing Ones: Third and Fourth Genders in Native North America*
(New York: St. Martin’s, 1998), 31.

29. Roscoe, *Changing Ones*, 30–32.
30. Roscoe, *Changing Ones*, 29.
31. Walter Williams, *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Beacon, 1986), 179.
32. Roscoe, *Changing Ones*, 35.
33. Roscoe, *Changing Ones*, 36.
34. Williams, *Spirit and the Flesh*, 183.
35. Williams, *Spirit and the Flesh*, 182–83.
36. Williams, *Spirit and the Flesh*, 182.
37. Williams, *Spirit and the Flesh*, 180.
38. Jace Weaver, *That the People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).
39. Brian Joseph Gilley, *Becoming Two-Spirit: Gay Identity and Social Acceptance in Indian Country* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 90, 95, 98–100.
40. In Native studies, the work of Jennifer Denetdale and Mark Rifkin is contributing to this history; see Jennifer Denetdale, *The Long Walk: The Forced Navajo Exile* (New York: Chelsea House, 2007); and Rifkin, “Romancing Kinship.”
41. Renée L. Bergland, *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2000); James H. Cox, *Muting White Noise: Native American and European American Novel Traditions* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006).
42. See, for example, David Eng, *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001); Roderick Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004); Ferguson, “Of Our Normative Strivings: African American Studies and the History of Sexuality,” in “What’s Queer about Queer Studies Now?” special issue, ed. David L. Eng, Judith Halberstam, José Esteban Muñoz, *Social Text*, nos. 84–85 (2005): 85–100; Eithne Luibhéid, *Entry Denied: Controlling Sexuality at the Border* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Eithne Luibhéid and Lionel Cantú Jr., *Queer Migrations: Sexuality, U.S. Citizenship, and Border Crossings* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).
43. See also Cathy Cohen, “Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?” in *Sexual Identities, Queer Politics*, ed. Mark Blasius (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 200–27; Ferguson, “Of Our Normative Strivings.”
44. Julian Carter, “Normality, Whiteness, Authorship: Evolutionary Sexology and the Primitive Pervert,” in *Science and Homosexualities*, ed. V. A. Rosario (New York: Routledge, 1997), 155–76; George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940* (New York: Basic Books,

- 1994); Jennifer Terry, *An American Obsession: Science, Medicine, and Homosexuality in Modern Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).
45. Such claims shaped early-twentieth-century European activism by Magnus Hirschfeld and Edward Carpenter, but Hay's initial reiterations of them (and, in later political moments) through *berdache* specifically articulated non-Native sexual minorities' relation to primitivity through Native American indigeneity. See, for example, Harry Hay, *Radically Gay: Gay Liberation in the Words of Its Founder*, ed. Will Roscoe (Boston: Beacon, 1996); Jonathan Katz, *Gay American History: Lesbians and Gay Men in the USA* (New York: Crowell, 1976); Dorr Legg, "The Berdache and Theories of Sexual Inversion," *One Institute Quarterly* 2 (1959): 59–60, 66.
 46. Luibhéid, *Entry Denied*. See also Eithne Luibhéid, "Introduction: Queering Migration and Citizenship," in Luibhéid and Cantú, *Queer Migrations*; Luibhéid, "Queer/Migration: An Unruly Body of Scholarship," in "Queer/Migration," special issue, ed. Eithne Luibhéid, *GLQ* 14 (2008): 169–90.
 47. Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).
 48. Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880–1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); John Donald Gustav-Wrathall, *Take the Young Stranger by the Hand: Same-Sex Relations and the YMCA* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Benjamin Rader, "The Recapitulation Theory of Play," in *Manliness and Morality*, ed. J. A. Mangan and J. Walvin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), 123–34.
 49. Nayan Shah, "Between 'Oriental Depravity' and 'Natural Degenerates': Spatial Borderlands and the Making of Ordinary Americans," *American Quarterly* 57 (2005): 711–12.
 50. Siobhan Somerville, *Queering the Color Line: Race and the Invention of Homosexuality in American Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000); Kevin Mumford, *Interzones: Black/White Sex Districts in Chicago and New York in the Early Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).
 51. Amy den Ouden, *Beyond Conquest: Native Peoples and the Struggle for History in New England* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005).
 52. Research will show the boundaries among non-Native people of color and Native people blur from anticolonial alliances to adoption by Native communities of settler forms, including slavery. Removal also forced Native people to encroach on one another's lands so that right of origin and right of settlement can be argued in debates over federal recognition of Native sovereignty. All such contradictions and their effects are elucidated in Native studies scholarship. (See, e.g., Valerie Lambert, *Choctaw Nation: A Story of American Indian Resurgence* [Lincoln: University of Nebraska

- Press, 2007]; Celia Naylor, *African Cherokees in Indian Territory: From Chattel to Citizens* [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008]; Circe Sturm, *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002].) But contradictions in the terms *Native* and *settler* only make it more important to study their complex function as a key opposition in colonial society, and specifically in the colonial biopolitics of modern sexuality.
53. Such work will note that all engagements with the settler state are not identical. Appeals to rights in the state redressed histories of racism and state violence against people of color, Jews, poor people, and people with disabilities, even as Native people negotiate treaty and trust responsibilities and U.S. citizenship while asserting sovereignty in relation to state power. Studying homonationalism as a settler formation permits asking whether queer participation in the state questions its settler formation or adapts its power to broader work for decolonization.
 54. Many routes can be imagined for further analysis of sexual colonization, settler sexuality, and Native resistance: amid battles Native communities faced over removal, reservations, or colonial education; in the imagining or practice of U.S. sexology; in the policing of U.S. sexual subcultures; in early narratives of sexual minority emancipationism; or, indeed, in past or present homonationalist mobilizations of U.S. sexual minority politics. I write this essay to invite many more accounts of settler homonationalism.
 55. A key historical example was the formation in New York City of the Cairos Collective (1992), publisher of *ColorLife!* magazine, and the Audre Lorde Project (1994) in association with historical members of the New York Native Two-Spirit organization WeWah and BarCheeAmpe, as documented in their newsletter *Buffalo Hide* and in *ColorLife!* See, for example, Cairos Collective, "Founding Matrons & Patrons," *ColorLife!* June 28, 1992, 32; Mariana Romo-Carmona, Lidell Jackson, and Curtis Harris, "Activists Respond to the Quincentennial: Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Two-Spirit in 1992," *ColorLife!* June 28, 1992, 11–12; WeWah and BarCheeAmpe, "500 Years of Survival and Resistance," *Buffalo Hide*, Spring 1992; WeWah and BarCheeAmpe, "What Are Two Spirits?" *ColorLife!* June 28, 1992, 4.
 56. Thomas King, *The Truth about Stories: A Native Narrative* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); Paul Carter, *The Road to Botany Bay: An Exploration of Landscape and History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); Valerie Kuletz, *The Tainted Desert: Environmental Ruin in the American West* (New York: Routledge, 1998); Winona LaDuke, *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life* (Boston: South End, 1999).
 57. Deloria, *Playing Indian*.
 58. Smith, *Conquest*, 185.
 59. Andrea Smith and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, "Introduction: Native Feminisms Engage American Studies," *American Quarterly* 60 (2008): 244–45.

60. See, for example, Joanne Barker, "For Whom Sovereignty Matters," in *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination*, ed. Joanne Barker (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 1–32; LaDuke, *All Our Relations*; Smith, *Conquest*.
61. Inderpal Grewal, *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005).

Copyright of GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian & Gay Studies is the property of Duke University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.