

**WHO IS AN INDIAN?**  
**Race, Blood, DNA, and the Politics of Indigeneity in the Americas**

**SEMINAR PREPARATION NOTES**

**Dr. Maximilian C. Forte**

Assistant Professor, Anthropology  
Department of Sociology and Anthropology  
CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY  
1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd., W.,  
Montreal, Quebec, H3G 1M8, Canada  
Tel: 514 848-2424 ext.5567 (Home: 514-761-7748)  
Fax: 514-848-4539  
E-Mail: [mforte@alcor.concordia.ca](mailto:mforte@alcor.concordia.ca)

***PRELIMINARIES***

- (1) All participants are asked to send their papers in Word or PDF format, to the email address above, by **June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2007**. They will be reformatted by Max Forte and made available to all participants well in advance. More details about this step and the structure of the seminar will follow below.
- (2) All participants will receive formal letters of invitation at the same time that travel and accommodation arrangements are finalized, which may be particularly useful for those entering and leaving Canada from the U.S.
- (3) The projected dates for the seminar are August 1-5, with participants arriving during the day of the 1<sup>st</sup>, gathering for a reception in the late evening, with full days of activity on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and very early on the 5<sup>th</sup>, with most departures planned for the late afternoon and evening of the 5<sup>th</sup>. This is the maximum duration—depending on how far the received funding can stretch, the number of days may contract. However, for now, at least the meeting facility has already been booked and secured.

**INTRODUCTION**

“But you don’t look Indian”; “I have a Certificate of Degree of Indian Blood”; “My grandmother was a pure Carib”; “Are they real Caribs?”; “My DNA test results show that I am 38 percent Indian”; “The epicanthic folds on my eyelids and my shovel-shaped incisors tell you I am Taino”; “We have no Indians left, we are all *mestizo*”; “When we were small, our parents told us we were ‘Spanish’”; “He’s no Cherokee, he’s of the Wannabe Tribe.”

These and many other similar statements can be commonly heard across the Americas wherever indigenous identities have been discursively rendered into visible, physical categories, where indigenous identities have been reduced to bodily characteristics that can be mapped and indexed, certified and regulated. This project is about the ways that bio-politics shape indigenous identities across the Americas

—whether in terms of racial phenotypes, blood quanta, or, of very late, DNA analysis—and the opportunities for fashioning indigenous identity beyond bio-political constraints. We are collectively concerned about the very real outcomes of biologized indigenous identities, where ultimately “the Indian” is defined out of existence, and we also wish to point to some of the paradoxes that create the opposite effect (vast numbers defined into an “Indian” category thanks to DNA testing) but at the expense of cultural integrity.

### *Context of Analysis*

Racial identity shifts have underscored the mutually reinforcing processes of indigenous demographic and political resurgence in many parts of the Americas. The question of who is a “real Indian” seems to have much more force today, either as a means of validating or disqualifying claimants to indigenous identity, in a context where significant numbers of people in various parts of the Americas are self-identifying as indigenous. According to 2000 US Census data, self-identified American Indians are becoming the US’ fastest-growing minority, growing by more than 400 percent since 1960 (Shoemaker 1999:4; Nagel 1996:114). In Canada, more than twice as many people self-identify as aboriginal than those who are registered as “Status Indians.” Brazil has seen its indigenous population grow by more than 300 percent in 50 years (Warren 1996:11-12). In Central America states have officially recognized indigenous communities in a break with previous narratives of amalgamation (Hooker 2005; Stocker 2005; Tilley 2002). The Caribbean has witnessed the resurgence of people claiming the identities of indigenous nations that were long thought to have been extinct, and some are using DNA testing services to prove their ancestry (Guitar et al. 2006; Martinez Cruzado 2002).

Issues of membership and self-identification are increasingly entangled in the operations of states and indigenous leaderships as they try to manage or contest the influx of “new claimants” to indigenous identities. While indigenous identity was never free of bodily associations, there appears to be a current revitalization, indeed an industrialization, of previous modes for fixing indigenous identity in physical substances (blood, genes, phenotype). With DNA testing creating new maps of indigenous identity we are witnessing the heightening of anxiety with each new opportunity for expanded indigenous self-identification, especially as the map is increasingly becoming the territory. The question of who has a legitimate right to proclaim an indigenous identity is one of the most divisive issues now afflicting Native North America (Churchill 2004:60). Lawrence argues that the “white need for certainty about the parameters of Indian ‘difference’” is the root of casting Natives as racially Other (2004:4). Similarly, Sissons argues, “indigenous racial impurity has been regarded as...threatening to the natural order and a cause for colonial and post-colonial concern” (2005:38). Others note that long-established norms of racialization are now under fire, and that many lives stand to be affected in material ways from both the maintenance and resistance to these norms, in ways that can affect the whole society (Garrouette 2003).

### *Focus and Objectives*

The proposed project brings together both leading and promising scholars to compare and theorize contemporary policies, ideologies, and technologies for regulating, certifying, and administering indigenous identifications, and the alternatives for indigeneity beyond biologized determinants. The project has three main aims, presented here in ascending order of importance. The first involves the participants’ recognition of the need to move beyond the telling of local stories of calculations of indigenous identity, toward a more comprehensive analytical methodology embracing the Americas, thereby promising fertile ground for conceptualizations of what are often striking similarities coupled

with theoretically fruitful analysis of differences. Thus one aim is to produce a transnational way of talking about race and indigeneity in the Americas. The second aim is the theoretical development of a unified, Americas-wide, problematic which can be termed the bio-politics of indigeneity, focused on race (phenotype), blood, and DNA. The third aim involves theorizing the current practices and future possibilities of indigeneity beyond the restrictions of bodily markers, and even beyond Indianness.

We collectively seek to reconnoiter histories and concepts of race and blood, and the impact of the new genetics, in a comparative transnational perspective in order to create a terrain for common understanding and collective theorizing, on the way to perceiving indigeneities beyond bio-politics. Our primary focus is on the bio-politics of indigeneity and their inversions, reformulations of hegemonic ideas of race and blood, transgressions against these ideas, and alternate conceptualizations of indigeneity.

### **WHAT THE PROJECT PROMISES TO ACHIEVE**

This project will advance the theoretical study of indigeneity by bringing issues of power and citizenship into a meeting with “embodied” ways of knowing and narrating indigenous identity. A further contribution to knowledge will come from our exploring the question of whether indigeneity is simply a question of identity. We will also consider how in the absence of a strong basis in visible racial difference, some indigenes go about articulating alternative routes to indigeneity. We proceed to discuss a more diffuse indigeneity as an evolving epistemology and ontology that cannot easily be tied to particular places or specific bodies. We also intend to evaluate how indigenous philosophies of identity and community might allow us to reframe the questions we ask about “Indianness” and “indigeneity,” even as we debate the contents and applicability of these terms.

The contributors develop a comprehensive framework for understanding and explaining racial approaches to indigenous identity at the intersections of colonialism, state governance, and indigenous political resurgence, by way of a cross-cultural and comparative analysis of indigenous cases from across the Americas. The second aim of the project is to explore the theoretical and conceptual bases for conceiving a unified problematic—the bio-politics of indigeneity—which has at least three manifestations: “race” at the broadest level but also involving culturally specific valuations of particular phenotypical traits in accordance with local norms of racialization; blood quantum measurements and the calculus of identity; and, DNA testing. The third goal of the collection is to examine the social possibilities and cultural contours for an indigeneity that exceeds or transcends the criteria of bodily markers, and for disciplinary reformulations.

The first topical objective is concerned with finding common empirical, theoretical and conceptual ground for a comprehensive understanding of race and indigenous identity in the Americas. Our objectives here include:

- analyzing diverse histories and conceptualizations of “purity” and “mixed-blood” indigenous identities in different parts of the Americas, and the reasons for those differences; and,
- to reveal the extent to which concepts of the “real Indian” are of universal concern across the Americas, and whether such concepts are equivalent in their meanings and social deployments.

The second topical objective is to examine the bio-politics of indigenous identification, where bodies are

seized upon as conduits for a number of projects. Our focus here is on:

- attempts by indigenous communities to build internal unity and external exclusivity;
- governmental attempts to reduce the numbers of institutionally recognized “Indians”;
- or, a means of achieving status as indigenous;
- indigenous notions of blood and their possible differences in meaning from Western notions of blood;
- the roles (competing, contrasting, mutually reinforcing) between science, kinship, law, and custom in determining membership in indigenous communities; and,
- the extent to which acts of quantification and certification help make visible previously “invisible indigenes” or are instead conceptual weapons in an armory designed to displace and deny indigenous presences.

The third topical objective will engage us in discerning the potential for re-centering indigeneity on culture and process, rather than biological fixity. We will consider how millions of indigenous persons who are described by others as “half-castes,” “mixed-bloods,” “non-traditional,” and “Westernized”—usually the majority of self-identified indigenous persons—are regulated by regimes of what Jeffrey Sissons called “oppressive authenticity” and sometimes find new ways of fostering an indigeneity that is not necessarily tied to “Indian-ness.” We are thus interested in exploring the potential for alternative indigeneities.

### Questions & aims

The central questions to be addressed throughout the project include the following, in no particular order:

- ◆ Is the “real Indian” a construct of universal concern across the Americas?
- ◆ Do racial characterizations of indigenous identity, especially in terms of phenotypical appearance, prevail in places where “indigenous” has not been defined under the law?
- ◆ Are there diverse conceptualizations, both dominant and indigenous, of “race” and how do these confront one another in practice?
- ◆ Is the concern with mapping identities a by-product of the resurgence of indigenous identity politics?
- ◆ What are the issues of power and citizenship that are tied up with ways of narrating indigenous identity in terms of the body?
- ◆ What are the historical contexts and political economic frameworks that work to secure, reproduce or transform these modes of identifying the indigenous?
- ◆ What options are there for new ways of being/becoming indigenous under current regimes of certification, classification and surveillance?
- ◆ In the absence of a strong basis in visible racial difference, how do some indigenes go about articulating their own identities?
- ◆ Is indigeneity only or even primarily a question of identity?
- ◆ Is the emphasis on the *gene* in the indigene an inescapable feature for representing indigeneity in Western society? Is it inescapably Western?
- ◆ While blood, DNA, and race are biologized forms of identifying indigenes, do other discourses and representational possibilities lurk within such constructs?

- ◆ Are there any paradoxes that emerge from attempted exclusion via DNA testing/race/blood quantum?
- ◆ Is it wise for anthropology to wash its hands of the messy business of judging Indianness by allowing communities to make the decision-making?
- ◆ If indigeneity escapes the confines of the biological body, does this mean that we need to drastically undo conceptions of “new Indians,” “born again Indians,” “hobby Indians,” and “wannabe Indians”?
- ◆ Does the “post-traditional condition” effectively mean that “anything goes” where self-identification and recognition are concerned?

## STRUCTURE OF THE SEMINAR & PAPERS

One month prior to the workshop, electronic copies of first drafts of papers will be circulated to all of the participants (most likely on a password protected website), possibly followed up by hard copies distributed at the workshop.

Papers should be approximately 7,500 words in length, not exceeding 30 pages, typed double-spaced, 1-inch margins, on 8.5 by 11-inch paper. Please keep in mind that you should not reach this maximum in your drafts, as the post-seminar revisions, and post-external review revisions will almost certainly require you to add some material without exceeding the limit above.

Each participant will be required to read all of the papers in advance of the sessions listed above, either before coming to the seminar (if possible), or on each of the nights of the seminar. Spoken contributions will present a summary of the papers, the key questions that are raised, and will address the perspectives and concerns offered by the surrounding participants. Participants should feel encouraged to engage with each of the papers presented, to raise questions, offer constructive criticisms, make suggestions, or to debate.

Two contributors in each session will each be allotted 20 minutes to present a summary and explain the structure and focus of their written contributions. The remaining 110 minutes will be occupied by a discussion of the papers involving all of the contributors, and perhaps, select invited guests from the anthropology departments at Concordia University, Université de Montréal, and McGill University.

Coffee breaks and a common lunch each day are meant to facilitate more informal interactions and exchanges of ideas. Housing all of the contributors (minus the organizer) within the same hotel should also permit for more frequent interaction and the possible formation of collaborative sub-networks within the workshop.

The move toward an edited volume thus occurs in three stages. First, individual contributors will produce their papers, to be circulated by the organizer. Second, at the workshop, contributors will: (a) present a synthesis of their contribution, explaining the importance of the issues they selected and the way they framed them; (b) they will address how their work addresses the larger themes of the workshop; and, (c) they will discuss and propose the key questions and issues that we should all be addressing. Third, contributors will present revised drafts of their papers to better match common themes and issues to be addressed in the published version of each paper.

Within a three-month period after the workshop (by November of 2007), contributors will present new drafts, revised to match the key themes and questions to be outlined in the concluding summary of the workshop (produced by the organizer) and in follow-up discussions between the organizer/editor and individual contributors.

The intended aim is to produce a coherent framework, allowing for theoretical diversity, as a means of structuring an edited volume intended for publication by an academic press. A prospectus for the proposed volume has been sent to 10 publishers (and at the time this document was prepared, the prospectus was turned down by Berg, with interest expressed by the University of Toronto Press). A

companion website for the workshop and the intended volume will also be developed, featuring paper abstracts, contributor biographies, and links to relevant resources.

## PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

**Wednesday, 01 August: 8:30–10:00pm**

Reception (introductions, distribution of printed copies of papers and other workshop materials)



**Thursday, 02 August:**

Morning Session (9:00am–11:30am, with a 15 minute coffee break)

*Introduction by Maximilian Forte*

1. Presentation, discussion and debate of the preliminary outline of the project, common themes, key questions, towards building a framework for comparative analysis

*Comparative Analysis*

2. Phil Bellfy, “How Much Indian are You? A Cross-border Perspective”

-Lunch Break-

Afternoon Session (1:00pm–3:30pm)

*Sighting, Placing, and Displacing Indigeneity*

3. Karen Stocker, “Locating Identity: The Role of Place in Chorotega Identity”
4. José Antonio Lucero, “Encountering Indigeneity: International Funding of Indigenous Organizations in Peru”

-Coffee Break-

Roundtable Discussion (4:15pm–5:30pm)

[during the final group discussion of each day we will try to do a “rewind,” look for areas of common agreement, discuss questions of common concern, and address any unresolved issues of the day]





**Friday, 03 August:**

Morning Session (9:00am–11:30am, with a 15 minute coffee break)

*DNA Debates in Canada and the United States*

1. Dennis and Alice Bartels, “Beothuk and/or Mi’gmaq?”
2. Kimberly Tallbear, “DNA.coms: Genetics and (Native American) Race On-line”

~Lunch Break~

Afternoon Session (1:00pm–3:30pm)

*Debating Blood in the Calculus of Indian Identity*

1. Julia Coates, “Law, Nationality, Blood and the Cherokee Resurgence”
2. Melissa Meyer, “Blood Makes a Navajo, not Culture’: American Indian Beliefs about Blood”

~Coffee Break~

Roundtable Discussion (4:15–5:30pm)



**Saturday, 04 August:**

Morning Session (9:00am–11:30am, with a 15 minute coffee break)

*Caribbean Resurgent Indigeneities: Beyond Race*

1. Maximilian Forte, “A Heritage Beyond Race: Positioning Carib Indigeneity in Contemporary Trinidad”
2. José Barreiro, “Taíno Revival and the Question of Blackness”

~Lunch Break~

Afternoon Session (1:00pm–3:30pm)

*Debating “Indianness”*

3. Bonita Lawrence, “Is ‘Indianness’ Even Necessary? The Nationhood Struggles of Federally Unrecognized Algonquins in Eastern Ontario”
4. Eva Marie Garrouette, “The Canary in the Coal Mine: What Sociology Can Learn from American Indians”

~Coffee Break~

Roundtable Discussion (4:15–5:30pm)



**Sunday, 05 August:**

Morning Session (8:30am–11:15am)

1. Jonathan W. Warren, “Does Identity Make an Indian? The Retreat of Anthropology”
2. Circe Sturm, “Anthropology, Power, and Indigeneity”

~Coffee Break~

Closing Session (11:30am–12:15pm)

*Summary of arguments and perspectives* (Maximilian Forte)



**LIST OF PAPERS**

1. **Introduction: Sighting and Certifying Indigeneity in the Americas and the Prospects for Moving Beyond Race**  
*Maximilian C. Forte*
2. **“Blood Makes a Navajo, not Culture”: American Indian Beliefs about Blood**  
*Melissa L. Meyer*
3. **Law, Nationality, Blood and the Cherokee Resurgence**  
*Julia M. Coates*
4. **Beothuk and/or Mi'gmaq?**  
*Dennis A. Bartels and Alice L. Bartels*
5. **DNA.coms: Genetics and (Native American) Race On-line**  
*Kimberly Tallbear*
6. **“How Much Indian are You?” A Cross-border Perspective**  
*Philip C. Bellfy*
7. **Taíno Revival and the Question of Blackness**  
*José Barreiro*
8. **A Heritage Beyond Race: Positioning Carib Indigeneity in Contemporary Trinidad and Tobago**  
*Maximilian C. Forte*
9. **Locating Identity: The Role of Place in Chorotega Identity in Costa Rica**  
*Karen Stocker*
10. **Encountering Indigeneity: International Funding of Indigenous Organizations in Peru**  
*José Antonio Lucero*
11. **Is “Indianness” Even Necessary? The Nationhood Struggles of Federally Unrecognized Algonquins in Eastern Ontario**  
*Bonita Lawrence*
12. **The Canary in the Coal Mine: What Sociology Can Learn from American Indians**  
*Eva Marie Garroutte*
13. **Does Identity Make an Indian? The Retreat of Anthropology**  
*Jonathan W. Warren*
14. **Anthropology, Power, and Indigeneity**  
*Circe Sturm*

**ABSTRACTS (in the order set out in the list of papers)**

**Introduction: Sighting and Certifying Indigeneity in the Americas and the Prospects for Moving Beyond Race**

*Maximilian C. Forte*

The introductory chapter aims to outline the panorama for comparison of cases from across the Americas, the central concepts of the project, its primary objectives and key questions, the positions adopted by the authors with respect to the key questions, and the main theoretical conclusions derived from the collection of papers. This is followed by a synthesis of the chapters that follow.

**“Blood Makes a Navajo, not Culture”: American Indian Beliefs about Blood**

*Melissa L. Meyer*

To help make my case that blood discourses in the U. S. were more complicated than hegemonic imposition by the dominant culture allows, this essay will survey a number of Native North American customs, beliefs, and rituals centering on blood. It will become quite clear that Native beliefs about blood, kinship, and peoplehood were spiritual and extremely deeply-held. Some matrilineal groups today predicate membership on having an enrolled mother. The power of mothers’ blood to determine family and clan relations is central to these groups. When we return to an informant’s comment that blood makes a Navajo, not culture, we will see how he drew on Navajo cosmological beliefs to elaborate exactly what he meant. He clearly retained Navajo beliefs about human physiology and spirituality. If he maintained these beliefs, why not other Navajos – even people who made enrollment decisions? This is the dimension we are currently lacking.

**Law, Nationality, Blood and the Cherokee Resurgence**

*Julia M. Coates*

“Legal” definitions are often overlooked in discussions of indigeneity, while race and culture demand greater attention. Yet many tribal governments in the United States regard legal definitions not as artificially imposed from external colonizing institutions, but as internally achieved definitions of “nationality” and their sovereign statuses. While its lack of quantum standards or cultural requirements are frequently not understood by non-Indians and derided by other tribal nations, the Cherokee Nation has continued to assert that nationality derived from their specific history of tribal citizenship is a more inclusive category for contemporary times than race or cultural markers. Based on interviews from a particularly challenging group of Cherokee nationals, the 60% of the citizenry living outside the tribal core in northeastern Oklahoma, this paper examines the potential of “nationality” as a basis of self-identification for those Cherokees in diaspora, and the role the concept of “citizen” plays in contemporary Cherokee resurgence.

**Beothuk and/or Mi’gmaq?**

*Dennis A. Bartels and Alice L. Bartels*

It is widely believed that the last Newfoundland Beothuk perished in 1829. But recent research suggests that the genetic material of the Beothuk is indistinguishable from that of contemporary Newfoundland Mi’gmaq and from that of the Innu of Labrador. This discovery has implications for the issue of genetic versus social construction of aboriginality and indigeneity. It also has implications for the current attempt by Mi’gmaq in the Federation of Newfoundland Indians to gain Status under the Indian Act.

### **DNA.coms: Genetics and (Native American) Race On-line**

*Kimberly Tallbear*

Roughly 15 companies market “Native American DNA” tests to the public. Two companies market the “paternity test” directly to US tribes and Canadian First Nations. I focus on five companies that target the “Native American identity market”. I examine their scientific-cultural claims in marketing texts and imagery that tie Native American racial/tribal identity to DNA. I analyze how each company wields one of two overlapping categories, “race” or “tribe”, as objects of science, when they are primarily historical, political, and cultural categories. Finally, I look at how several companies target the political arena of tribal/First Nation enrollment and rights.

### **“How Much Indian are You?” A Cross-border Perspective**

*Philip C. Bellfy*

Beginning with the legal “definitions” of “race” as it is applied in modern, Western society, this paper will explore the question of indigenous identity as it relates to blood-quantum, tribal membership, self-identification, and other markers, especially as these markers are defined differentially in the United States and Canada. As the author is a low-blood-quantum tribal member in the US, the paper will explore these definitions of the “Indian” through the author’s personal experience as well as from examples drawn from the writings of several other Aboriginal People –from both within and outside the academy.

### **Taino Revival and the Question of Blackness**

*José Barreiro*

This paper will explore the apparent accusations of anti-Black sentiment made against the contemporary Taino movement by several scholars in the field of Puerto Rican Studies, many of who see the claim to Taino identity as a negation or attempted escape from Blackness. The material for this paper is based on interviews presenting a range of opinions by leaders and members of different organizations that constitute this movement. In addition, I will consider the political impact of recent mitochondrial DNA surveys conducted in Puerto Rico that claim to show that 61% of contemporary residents of the island possess Pre-Columbian indigenous ancestry. The paper will also present evidence of past or historical uses of “indio” identities to obscure Black Caribbean identities—in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico.

### **A Heritage Beyond Race: Positioning Carib Indigeneity in Contemporary Trinidad and Tobago**

*Maximilian C. Forte*

Racializations of identities in Trinidad were institutionalized and regulated in conjunction with broader political economic processes shaping the British colony from the 1800s onwards. Indigenous identity was strictly governed given the economic status associated with Mission Indians. Miscegenation was a formal basis for excluding individuals from the rights and status obtaining to mission residence. Purity of blood, however measured, became the norm for assigning or claiming indigenous identity. Over a century later, while racial notions of identity persist, current Carib self-identifications stress indigeneity as a cultural heritage, a body of practices, and recognition of ancestral ties that circumvent racial ideologies.

### **Locating Identity: The Role of Place in Chorotega Identity in Costa Rica**

*Karen Stocker*

In the absence of a legal definition of “indigenous” in Costa Rica, the implicit definition in the North

Western province of the country has become “one who resides in a reservation.” However, various other interpretations of the label exist both within and outside of the Chorotega reservation. Social class and approximation to stereotypical views of what an indigenous person looks like also play a role in individuals’ working definitions of indigenous identity as does the social location and relative power of the person providing the definition. This chapter will address how various residents of the Chorotega reservation, those who live just outside the reservation, scholars, legal discourse, historical discourse, and those who have inhabited or studied other Costa Rican reservations have defined indigenous identity in contradictory ways, and in manners that have had varying consequences for those labeled as Chorotega in Costa Rica.

### **Encountering Indigeneity: International Funding of Indigenous Organizations in Peru**

*José Antonio Lucero*

This paper seeks to understand how international non-governmental organizations select indigenous development partners and what effects they have on the construction of Indianness. Building on prior field research on indigenous social movements in Ecuador and Bolivia, the paper examines the interaction between Oxfam America and two indigenous political organizations in Peru. Comparing two different experiences, one which resulted in the consolidation of a strong Andean organization, and another which led to organizational fragmentation, this paper examines the ways in which international funds and actors become both targets and terrains of cultural political activity. In an interactive process of legitimation, actors on both sides of the development encounter shape discourses over the role of foreign aid and the content of indigeneity. Indigenous actors, in the strategic plans of development agencies, are distinguished in terms of representativity and political effectiveness. The contestation and negotiation over “development” and “indigeneity” reveal the need to understand how both are constructed across local and global scales.

### **Is “Indianness” Even Necessary? The Nationhood Struggles of Federally Unrecognized Algonquins in Eastern Ontario**

*Bonita Lawrence*

With the development of the Ottawa Valley land claim since the 1990s, federally unrecognized Algonquins, after a century of being swamped by settlers and facing extreme assimilation pressures, have been forced to negotiate nationhood in conjunction with the one existing Ontario Algonquin reserve. The resultant reshaping of contemporary Algonquin identity has highlighted divisions between the one Algonquin community which lives under the Indian Act and the far greater numbers of Algonquins who are federally unrecognized, or “non-status.” The Algonquins of Pikwakanagan, whose primary identity for many years has been “Indian”, see Algonquin identity entirely through the legal regime governing Indianness in Canada. However, non-status Algonquins, for whom Indianness has been a submerged and silenced identity, are experiencing a resurgence of identity, not as “Indians”, but as Algonquins. Conflicting views of Algonquin identity, of the importance of the Indian Act—and indeed, of Indianness, are rife among the different communities.

### **The Canary in the Coal Mine: What Sociology Can Learn from American Indians**

*Eva Marie Garroutte*

I will focus on three case studies involving claims for recognition as American Indian. The selected case studies highlight controversies involving (1) the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe of Massachusetts, (2) Kennewick Man, and (3) organizations marketing DNA testing services to establish racial ancestry. In

each instance, I examine claims to ethnic authenticity, followed by counter-claims and subsequent disputes; I will show how participants may invoke a range of strategies for identity construction and deconstruction. These case studies illustrate how ambiguous ethnic boundaries can be at the margins and especially when there are reasons, such as economic resources, to justify claims and counter-claims about group membership. The experiences of American Indians may represent the “canary in the coal mine” that predicts experiences that other Americans, particularly mixed-race individuals, may increasingly confront.

### **Does Identity Make an Indian? The Retreat of Anthropology**

*Jonathan W. Warren*

In studying Indian resurgence in Brazil I found that one of the primary reasons for the upsurge in the Indian population was a shift in anthropological thought. The Brazilian constitution mandates that an anthropologist produce an official report ruling on the legitimacy of a given community’s claims to Indianness and this report usually determines the judiciary’s opinion. In the past few decades, Brazilian anthropologists have moved away from a definition of Indianness that required biological and cultural purity to a Barthian position in which self-identity is sufficient. Consequently this has helped to produce an upsurge in the number of federally recognized Indian communities in Brazil. Given the stakes—land, social services and most importantly the legitimacy of the Indigenous movement—is it wise for anthropology to wash its hands of the messy business of judging Indianness by allowing communities to make the decision-making? Is Indianness simply a question of identity? What will the likely consequences be of anthropology’s retreat?

### **Anthropology, Power, and Indigeneity**

*Circe Sturm*

According to demographers, the number of self-identified Cherokee continues to grow and cannot be explained in terms of birth and death rates. Instead, this population is comprised primarily of “racial shifters,” individuals who have shifted their racial self-identification from white to Native American in recent years. This chapter explores the racial, cultural and political implications of such kinship claims, including why former whites would want to shift out of whiteness into Indianness. Of particular interest are the ways in which anthropological understandings of difference continue to shape public perception of who is “authentically” Cherokee or not. How do ideas about, race, culture, blood, ethnicity, and nation intersect with one another and what are their political implications for Indian country? How have current anthropological understandings of difference joined with neoliberal policies to create an environment in which claims of racial difference can be made without being questioned and can be used to both grab and deny power at the same time?

## ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

**Dr. José Barreiro** (Taíno Nation of the Antilles) is currently the Assistant Director for Research, National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, D.C. He was the former Senior Editor of *Indian Country Today*, also Associate Director of the American Indian Studies Program at Cornell University and former Editor in Chief, Akwe:kon Press Communications. His recent publications include: “Taíno Survivals: Cacique Panchito, Caridad de los Indios, Cuba.” In Maximilian C. Forte, ed., *Indigenous Resurgence in the Contemporary Caribbean: Amerindian Survival and Revival*, pp. 21-40. New York: Peter Lang, 2006; “A Bridge for the Journey: Trajectory of the Indigenous Legacies of the Caribbean Encounters, 1997–2003.” In Maximilian C. Forte, ed., *Indigenous Resurgence in the Contemporary Caribbean: Amerindian Survival and Revival*, pp. 253-270. New York: Peter Lang, 2006; and, *America is Indian Country: Opinion and Perspectives from Indian Country Today*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishers, 2005.

**Dr. Dennis A. Bartels** is a recently retired Professor of Anthropology of Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada. His recent publications, authored with Alice L. Bartels, include: “Indigenous Peoples of the Russian North and Cold War Ideology.” Forthcoming in *Anthropologica*, 2006; “Mi’gmau Lives: Aboriginal Identity in Newfoundland.” In David McNab and Ute Lischke, eds., *Walking a Tightrope, Aboriginal People and Their Representations*, pp. 249-280. Waterloo, ON: Sir Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2005; and, *When the North was Red, Aboriginal Education in Soviet Siberia*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995.

**Alice L. Bartels** was recently a Visiting Scholar at the Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge; an Exchange Scholar at the Institute of National Schools, Moscow, Faculty of Far North Peoples of the Herzen State Pedagogical Institute, Leningrad; and, a Field Associate, Department of Ethnology, Royal Ontario Museum. She has co-authored numerous works with Dennis A. Bartels.

**Dr. Philip C. Bellfy** (Member of the White Earth Band of Minnesota Chippewa) is an Associate Professor in the Departments of History and American Studies at Michigan State University, East Lansing. His recent publications include: “Permission and Possession: The Identity Tightrope.” In David T. McNab and Ute Lischke, eds., *Walking a Tightrope: Aboriginal People and Their Representations*, pp 29-44. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2005; *Three Fires Unity: The Anishnaabeg of the Lake Huron Borderlands*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003 (winner of the UNP “American Indian Prose Award” for 2003); and, *Indians and Other Misnomers*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Press, 2001.

**Dr. Julia M. Coates** (Cherokee Nation) is an Assistant Professor in the Native American Studies Department at the University of California at Davis. Her recent works include: “New Echota Historic Site: Early Cherokee Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century.” In Frances Kennedy, ed., *American Indian Places*, Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, in press; and, “None of Us Are Supposed to Be Here: Ethnicity, Nationality, and the Production of Cherokee Histories.” Dissertation in the American Studies Department, University of New Mexico, UMI Dissertation Services, 2002

**Dr. Maximilian C. Forte** is an Assistant Professor in Anthropology at Concordia University in Montreal, Canada. He has lived and studied in Trinidad for over six years, with most of those years spent in Arima researching the Santa Rosa Carib Community. He has also conducted limited field research in



Dominica. He obtained a PhD in Anthropology from the University of Adelaide in 2002. He has published aspects of his research in *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, *Indigenous Affairs* and *The Indigenous World*. He is the founding editor of the Caribbean Amerindian Centrelink ([www.centrelink.org](http://www.centrelink.org)) and the current senior editor of *Kacike: The Journal of Caribbean Amerindian History and Anthropology* ([www.kacike.org](http://www.kacike.org)). Forte also serves as the web master for the Santa Rosa Carib Community and has posted numerous research essays online. A book, based on his research in Trinidad, titled *Ruins of Absence, Presence of Caribs: (Post) Colonial Representations of Aboriginality in Trinidad and Tobago* was published by the University Press of Florida in 2005. He is also the editor of *Indigenous Resurgence in the Contemporary Caribbean: Amerindian Survival and Revival*, published by Peter Lang in 2006. His research has also been awarded grants by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council in Canada in 2006 and 2007.

**Dr. Eva Marie Garrouette** (Cherokee Nation) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at Boston College. Her recent publications include: *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America*. Berkeley, CA: University California, 2003; "Art and authenticity: American Indian Creativity and Identity." In Heather Fryer, ed., *Cowboys Indians and the Big Picture*, pp. 45-49. Chestnut Hill, MA: McMullen Museum of Art, 2002; and, "The Racial Formation of American Indians: Negotiating Legitimate Identities within Tribal and Federal Law." *American Indian Quarterly* 25 (2) 2001: 224-39.

**Dr. Bonita Lawrence** (Mi'kmaw) is an Assistant Professor in the School of Social Sciences of the Atkinson Faculty of Liberal and Professional Studies at York University in Toronto, Canada. Her recent publications include: "Real" *Indians and Others: Mixed-Blood Urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004; with Kim Anderson, editor: *Strong Women Stories: Native Vision and Community Survival*. Toronto: Sumach Press, 2003; and, "Rewriting Histories of the Land: Colonization and Indigenous Resistance in Eastern Canada." In Sherene Razack, ed., *Race, Space and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*, pp. 21-46. Toronto: Sumach Press, 2002.

**Dr. José Antonio Lucero** is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Temple University. His recent works include: *Struggles of Voice, Voices of Struggle: The Politics of Indigenous Representation in Bolivia and Ecuador*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, in press; "Representing 'Real Indians': The Challenges of Indigenous Authenticity and Strategic Constructivism in Ecuador and Bolivia," *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 41, No. 2, June, 2006, pp. 31-56; and, with Maria Elena Garcia, "Un País Sin Indígenas: Rethinking Indigenous Politics in Peru." In Nancy Postero and Leon Zamosc, eds., *The Struggle for Indian Rights in Latin America*. Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press.

**Dr. Melissa L. Meyer** is a Full Professor in the Department of History and in the Graduate Program in American Indian Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her recent works include: "You Know They Will Come if You Say So': White Earth Women and Social Welfare." In R. David Edmunds, ed., *Enduring Nations: Essays on the History of Native Americans in the Midwest*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, in press; *Thicker than Water: The Origins of Blood as Symbol and Ritual*. New York: Routledge Press, 2005; and, "American Indian Blood Quantum Requirements: Blood is Thicker than Family," In Valerie Matsumoto and Blake Allmendinger, eds. *Over the Edge: Mapping Western Experiences*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

**Dr. Karen Stocker** is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology at California State University, Bakersfield. Her recent works include: *"I Won't Stay Indian, I'll Keep Studying": The Effects of Schooling on Ethnic Identity in a Rural Costa Rican High School*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 2005; "Citizenship, Wealth, and Whiteness in a Costa Rican High School," *International Journal of Educational Research, Policy, and Practice (IJEPRP)* 5(4) 2005: 119-146; and, "No somos nada: Ethnicity and Three Dominant and Contradictory Indigenist Discourses in Costa Rica," *University of New Mexico Latin American Institute Research Paper Series No. 35*, June, 2000.

**Dr. Circe Sturm** (Choctaw) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology and in the Native American Studies Program at the University of Oklahoma at Norman. Her recent works include: "States of Sovereignty: Race Shifting, Recognition and Rights in Cherokee Country." In Daniel M. Cobb and Loretta Fowler, eds., *Beyond Red Power: New Perspectives on Twentieth-Century American Indian Political History*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, in press; *Blood Politics: Race, Culture and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002; and, "Blood Politics, Racial Classification and Cherokee National Identity: The Trials and Tribulations of the Cherokee Freedmen." *American Indian Quarterly* 22 (1 & 2) 1998: 230-258.

**Dr. Kimberly Tallbear** (Enrolled, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate, Old Agency, South Dakota) is an Assistant Professor of American Indian Studies at Arizona State University, Tempe. Her recent publications include: co-edited with Craig Howe, *This Stretch of the River: Lakota, Dakota and Nakota Responses to the Lewis and Clark Expedition and Bicentennial*. Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Pine Hill Press, 2006; "DNA, Blood and Racializing the Tribe." In Jayne O. Ifekwunige, ed., 'Mixed Race' Studies: A Reader. London: Routledge, 2004; and, "Racializing Tribal Identity and the Implications for Political and Institutional Development." In Martin Nakata, ed., *Indigenous Peoples, Racism and the United Nations*, pp. 163-174. Sydney, Australia: Common Ground Publishing, 2001.

**Dr. Jonathan W. Warren** is an Associate Professor of Latin American and International Studies and Chair and Director of Latin American Studies at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies at the University of Washington, Seattle. His recent publications include: co-authored with France Winddance Twine, "Critical Race Studies in Latin America: Recent Advances, Recurrent Weaknesses." In John Solomos & David Theo Goldberg, eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, pp. 538-560. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002; *Racial Revolutions: Antiracism and Indian Resurgence in Brazil*. Duke University Press, 2001; and, "Indians and Antiracism in Brazil: Racial Identities, Racial Justice," *Human Rights Review*, 2 (3) 2001: 27-50.

## REFERENCES

- ALCOFF, LINDA. 1995. "Mestizo identity," in *America mixed race: The culture of microdiversity*. Edited by N. Zack, pp. 257-278. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- APPELBAUM, NANCY P. 2005. Post-revisionist scholarship on race. *Latin American Research Review* 40: 206-217.
- . 2003. *Muddied waters: Race, region, and local history in Colombia, 1846-1948*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- APPELBAUM, N., A.S. MACPHERSON AND K.A. ROSENBLATT. Editors. 2003. *Race and nation in modern Latin America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- BRODWIN, PAUL. 2002. Genetics, identity and the anthropology of essentialism. *Anthropological Quarterly* 75:323-330.
- BROOKS, J.F. Editor. 2002. *Confounding the color line*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- CHAMBERS, SARAH C. 2003. "Little middle ground: The instability of a mestizo identity in the Andes, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," in *Race and nation in modern Latin America*. Edited by N. Appelbaum, A. Macpherson, and K. Rosenblatt, pp. 32-55. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- CHURCHILL, WARD. 2004. "A question of identity," in *A will to survive: Indigenous essays on the politics of culture, language and identity*. Edited by S. Greymorning, pp. 59-94. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- DE LA CADENA, MARISOL. 2000. *Indigenous mestizos: The politics of race and culture in Cuzco, Peru, 1919-1991*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- ESGUERRA, JORGE CANIZARES. 1999. New world, new stars: patriotic astrology and the invention of Indian and Creole bodies in colonial Spanish America, 1600-1650. *The American Historical Review* 104: 33-68.
- FORBES, Jack D. 1993. *Africans and Native Americans: The language of race and the evolution of Red-Black peoples*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- FORTE, M.C. Editor. 2006. *Indigenous resurgence in the contemporary Caribbean: Amerindian survival and revival*. New York: Peter Lang.
- FRANKLIN, SARAH. 2003. Re-thinking nature-culture: Anthropology and the new genetics. *Anthropological Theory* 3:65-85.
- GARCÍA, MARÍA ELENA AND JOSÉ ANTONIO LUCERO. 2004. "Un país sin indígenas: Rethinking indigenous politics in Peru," in *The struggle for Indian rights in Latin America*. Edited by N.G. Postero and L. Zamosc, pp. 158-188. Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press.
- GARROUTTE, EVA MARIE. 2003. *Real Indians: Identity and the survival of Native America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- GOULD, JEFFREY L. 1998. *To die in this way: Nicaraguan Indians and the myth of mestizaje, 1880-1965*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- GOW, PETER. 1991. *Of mixed blood: Kinship and history in Peruvian Amazonia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- GRAHAM, R. Editor. *The idea of race in Latin America, 1870-1940*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- GUITAR, LYNNE, PEDRO FERBEL, AND JORGE ESTEVEZ. 2006. "Ocama-daca Taíno (hear me, I am Taíno): Taíno survival on Hispaniola, focusing on the Dominican Republic," in *Indigenous resurgence in the contemporary Caribbean: Amerindian survival and revival*. Edited by M.C. Forte, pp. 41-67. New York: Peter Lang.
- HALE, CHARLES R. 1999. Travel warning: Elite appropriations of hybridity, mestizaje, antiracism,

- equality, and other progressive-sounding discourses in highland Guatemala. *The Journal of American Folklore* 112:297-315.
- . 1997. Cultural politics of identity in Latin America. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 567-590.
- HALLIBURTON, R., JR. 1977. *Red over Black: Black slavery among the Cherokee Indians*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- HARMON, ALEXANDRA. 1998. *Indians in the making*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- HARRIS, MARVIN. 1964. *Patterns of race in the Americas*. New York: Walker.
- HARRISON, FAYE V. 1995. The persistent power of 'race' in the cultural and political economy of racism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 47-74.
- HOOKER, JULIET. 2005. "Beloved enemies": Race and official mestizo nationalism in Nicaragua. *Latin American Research Review* 40:14-39.
- HOWARD, ROSALYN. 2002. *Black Seminoles in the Bahamas*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- JACKSON, ROBERT H. 1999. *Race, caste, and status: Indians in colonial Spanish America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- JAMES, M. ANNETTE. 1995. "Some kind of Indian," in *America mixed race: The culture of microdiversity*. Edited by N. Zack, pp. 133-154. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- KATZ, WILLIAM LOREN. 1986. *Black Indians: A hidden heritage*. New York: Simon Pulse.
- LAWRENCE, BONITA. 2004. "Real" Indians and others: Mixed-blood urban Native people and indigenous nationhood. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- LUCERO, JOSÉ ANTONIO. 2006. Representing 'real Indians': The challenges of indigenous authenticity and strategic constructivism in Ecuador and Bolivia. *Latin American Research Review* 41:31-56.
- MARTINEZ CRUZADO, JUAN C. 2002. The use of mitochondrial DNA to discover pre-Columbian migrations to the Caribbean: Results for Puerto Rico and expectations for the Dominican Republic. *Kacike: The Journal of Caribbean Amerindian History and Anthropology*, <http://www.kacike.org/MartinezEnglish.html>
- MENCHACA, MARTHA. 2001. *Recovering history, constructing race: The Indian, Black, and White roots of Mexican Americans*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- MEYER, MELISSA. 2005. *Thicker than water: The origins of blood as symbol and ritual*. New York: Routledge.
- MILLER, MARILYN GRACE. 2004. *Rise and fall of the cosmic race: The cult of mestizaje in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- MORNER, MAGNUS. 1967. *Race mixture in the history of Latin America*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- NAGEL, JOANE. 1996. *American Indian ethnic renewal: Red power and the resurgence of identity and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'NEILL, THERESA D. 1994. Telling about Whites, talking about Indians: Oppression, resistance, and contemporary American Indian identity. *Cultural Anthropology* 9: 94-126.
- PERDUE, THEDA. 2003. "Mixed blood" Indians: Racial construction in the early South. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- . 1979. *Slavery and the evolution of Cherokee society, 1540-1866*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- REARDON, JENNY. 2004. *Race to the finish: Identity and governance in the age of genomics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- RESTALL, M. Editor. 2005. *Beyond Black and Red: African-Native relations in colonial Latin America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- SANDERS, JAMES. 2003. "Belonging to the great Granadan family: Partisan struggle and the construction of indigenous identity and politics in southwestern Colombia, 1849-1890," in *Race and nation in modern Latin America*. Edited by N. Appelbaum, A. Macpherson, and K. Rosenblatt, pp. 56-86. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- SAUNT, CLAUDIO. 2005. *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the unmaking of an American family*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- SHOEMAKER, NANCY. 1999. *American Indian population recovery in the twentieth century*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- SHUKLA, S. AND H. TINSMAN. Editors. 2006. *Imagining our Americas: Toward a transnational frame*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- SIDER, GERALD M. 1993. *Lumbee Indian histories: Race, ethnicity, and Indian identity in the southern United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SISSONS, JEFFREY. 2005. *First peoples: Indigenous cultures and their futures*. London: Reaktion Books.
- SKIDMORE, THOMAS. 1993. Bi-racial USA vs. multi-racial Brazil: Is the contrast still valid? *Journal of Latin American Studies* 25:373-386.
- SMITH, CAROL A. 1997. The symbolics of blood: Mestizaje in the Americas. *Identities* 3:495-522.
- SNIPP, C. MATTHEW. 1986. Who are American Indians? Some observations about the perils and pitfalls of data for race and ethnicity. *Population Research and Policy Review* 5: 237-252.
- STERN, ALEXANDRA MINNA. 2003. "From mestizophilia to biotypology: racialization and science in Mexico, 1920-1960," in *Race and nation in modern Latin America*. Edited by N. Appelbaum, A. Macpherson, and K. Rosenblatt, pp. 187-210. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- STOCKER, KAREN. 2005. "I won't stay Indian, I'll keep studying": Race, place, and discrimination in a Costa Rican high school. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- STRONG, PAULINE TURNER AND BARRIK VAN WINKLE. 1996. 'Indian blood': Reflections on the reckoning and refiguring of Native North American identity. *Cultural Anthropology* 11: 547-576.
- STURM, CIRCE. 2002. *Blood politics: Race, culture, and identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1998. Blood politics, racial classification, and Cherokee national identity: The trials and tribulations of the Cherokee Freedmen. *American Indian Quarterly* 22: 230-258.
- TALLBEAR, KIMBERLY. 2004. "DNA, blood and racializing the tribe," in 'Mixed Race' Studies. Edited by J.O. Ifekwunigwe, pp. 123-120. London: Routledge.
- TELLES, EDWARD E. 2006. *Race in another America: The significance of skin color in Brazil*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- TILLEY, VIRGINIA Q. 2002. New help or new hegemony? The transnational indigenous peoples' movement and 'being Indian' in El Salvador. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34:525-544.
- TWINE, FRANCE WINDDANCE AND JONATHAN W. WARREN, JONATHAN. 2002. "Critical race studies in Latin America: Recent advances, recurrent weaknesses," in *The Blackwell companion to racial and ethnic studies*. Edited by J. Solomos and D.T. Goldberg, pp. 538-560. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Editors. 2000. *Racing research/researching race: Methodological dilemmas in critical race studies*. New York: New York University Press.
- WADE, PETER. 2004. Human nature and race. *Anthropological Theory* 4:157-172.
- 2003. "Race and nation in modern Latin America: An anthropological view," in *Race and nation in modern Latin America*. Edited by N. Appelbaum, A. Macpherson, and K. Rosenblatt, pp. 263-282. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- . 1997. *Race and ethnicity in Latin America*. London: Pluto Press.
- WARREN, JONATHAN W. 2001. Indians and antiracism in Brazil: Racial identities, racial justice. *Human Rights Review* 2: 27-50.
- . 2001. *Racial revolutions: Antiracism and Indian resurgence in Brazil*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- WEISMANTEL, MARY. 2001. *Cholas and pishtacos: Stories of race and sex in the Andes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . AND STEPHEN F. EISENMAN. 1998. Race in the Andes: Global movements and popular ontologies. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 17: 121-142.
- WHITEHEAD, NEIL L. 2005. “Black read as Red: Ethnic transgression and hybridity in northeastern South America and the Caribbean,” in *Beyond Black and Red*. Edited by M. Restall, pp. 245-268. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.