UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Against Extraction: Indigenous Modernism in the Twin Cities

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7j72g8sm

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 49(1)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Makhdoumian, Helen

Publication Date
2026-04-02

DOI
10.17953/A3.64276

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

10.17953/A3.64276

Against Extraction: Indigenous Modernism in the Twin Cities. By Matt Hooley. Durham: Duke University Press, 2024. 232 pages. $102.95 cloth; $26.95 paper.

The year 1830 saw the passing of the Indian Removal Act. A cornerstone of federal Indian policy, this decree signed by then president Andrew Jackson had substantial ramifications. Succeeding removal acts modeled language of this first one. In *Against Extraction: Indigenous Modernisms in the Twin Cities*, Matt Hooley reads against the grain of removal as a one-time act. He does not do so to trace the cross-referencing of language across distinct removal policies. Rather, he frames removal as a recurrent practice of colonial political domination. The elasticity of the word "extraction" proves the strength of this recent book-length monograph in Indigenous literary studies.

Specifically, Hooley begins with the premise that "removal is an inaugurating gesture of extraction, which is itself a condition for the production of the political and narrative structures through which colonial history is articulated" (34). With this foundational view of territorial displacement managed through the legal policy of removal, Hooley goes on to proffer two interlocking and overarching conceptual frames for the book: "extraction history" and "distributions of interiority" (11). The former organizational concept attends to environmental history but exceeds that point to encompass four different colonial forms that result from land seizure: removal, the domestic, ruin, and rights. The latter organizational framework draws on several veins of critical thought—from Karl Marx to Stuart Mills—and institutional manifestations—such as the operational logic of the US Department of Interior—to ultimately describe the material underpinnings and consequences of colonialism. Throughout, Hooley refers to the synthesis of these two ideas as "US cultures of extraction."

The book's title references the book's third organizational framework: "Indigenous modernism." Broadly, Indigenous modernism "refers to practices of critical and creative attention that Indigenous texts turn toward situated social and material histories shaped by US colonialism" (16). That definition itself does not do justice to Hooley's intervention. Scholars of Indigenous literatures have previously demonstrated just that: Indigenous authors' insightful harnessing of the written word to illuminate and critique the mechanisms of settler colonialism. Hooley, however, has a bone to pick with the study of modernism as instantiated in historical epoch-making, cultural theory, and literary analysis. In short, Indigenous modernism, as Hooley sees it, is not a "subaltern or minor modernism, or even among an array of modernisms" (19). Rather, Hooley reveals how a group of creative producers—Ojibwe authors and writers displaced to a city borne out of Indigenous dispossession and removal, the Twin Cities—make perceptible that the political and economic forces of modernism themselves derived from the five forms of extraction histories he delineates.

Inspired by structural analysis of settler colonialism undertaken by Glen Coulthard (Yellowknives Dene), Jean M. O'Brien (White Earth Ojibwe), and Patrick Wolfe, Hooley attends to the following authors: William Whipple Warren (Ojibwe descent), Louise Erdrich (Turtle Mountain Ojibwe), David Treuer (Leech Lake Ojibwe), and Gerald Vizenor (White Earth Ojibwe). To organize the introduction and epilogue, Hooley turns to the artwork of George Morrison (Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa). In them, Hooley offers biography at times while making interventions in critical assessment and reception of Morrison's oeuvre.

In *Against Extraction*, Hooley joins other literary critics who have likewise made removal policy and its aftereffects a focus of their book-length publications in Indigenous literary studies. Here, texts include *Reading Territory: Indigenous and Black Freedom, Removal, and the Nineteenth-Century State* (2023) by Kathryn Walkiewicz (Cherokee) and *Native Removal Writing: Narratives of Peoplehood, Politics, and Law* by Sabine N. Meyer (2022). Other recent scholars, such as Sarah Hernandez (Sicangu Lakota) in *We Are the Stars: Colonizing and Decolonizing the Oceti Sakowin Literary Tradition* (2023), have made removal part and parcel of larger tribal national approaches to the study of Indigenous literatures. The latter proves especially complementary, as Hooley points out that the authors he takes up arrived in not just the Twin Cities but Dakota homelands.

From a pedagogical standpoint, Hooley's *Against Extraction* has utility insofar as he pays attention to questions of genre and literary form. Chapter one, for instance, explicates William Warren's *The History of the Ojibway People* (written between 1846 and 1853) in the context of the survey genre which, Hooley contends, facilitated removal policies. Warren "employed ethnographic stylistic postures" of the ethnographic survey to reveal the genre's "fallacy of its objectivity" and "illusion of transparency" (36). Elsewhere, in chapter two, Hooley revisits arguments on the genre of the domestic novel and reorients genre criticism by recourse to Louise Erdrich's *Tracks* (1988) and *Four Souls* (2004). Hooley refers to these as "allotment novels" (69) and focuses on the theme of the "recovery of relations" (69) to then position them as "theory" regarding "material practices of Indigenous remaining and return" (92). In body chapters, attention to federal Indian policy in the form of discussion of distinct eras of policy to specific court cases subtends close readings of primary texts. From that same pedagogical standpoint, the book's conceptually driven approach—and, more specifically, the laudable theoretical ambitiousness of the project—proves its limitation. To be clear, the ideas themselves are not problematic. The abundance of them, however, may prove hard for readers to digest.

The book is organized around three tiers of conceptual interventions. The first I outlined at the beginning of this review. The second tier of theoretical frameworks encompasses those which anchor each chapter: "US power as a structure of aid" (chapter one); "social vacancy" (chapter two); "climate ruin" and "practice of location" (chapter three); "colonial politics of protection" and "aformality" (chapter four); and "against" (introduction and epilogue). The third tier covers a wealth of topics ripe for further thought-provoking analysis in the study of Indigenous modernism: "jurisdictional form of the settler city" (introduction); "cooperative projects of text- and

territory-making" (chapter one); "affective dimension of settler violence" (chapter two); "modalities of infrapolitics" (chapter three); "diaspora" (chapter three and epilogue); and "memory" (chapter four and epilogue). Breadth—or a panoramic take on the colonial dismemberment of bodies, lands, systems of governance, and modes of relating to human and nonhuman others—also results in another organizational element some readers may find distracting. Many chapters are anchored around a paragraph of questions Hooley seeks to answer in ensuing pages. To Hooley's credit, this latter structuring of chapters may very well have been a product of editor or peer reviewer feedback.

These rhetorical decisions need not diminish Hooley's contributions. What we need, and what Hooley ultimately models, are examples of reading structure (form) in Indigenous literatures to understand how Indigenous authors theorize colonial structures (forms).

Helen Makhdoumian
Vanderbilt University