INTRODUCTION

Per Axelsson and Peter Sköld

This volume examines the historical and contemporary construction of indigenous peoples in a number of fascinating geographical contexts around the world. Colonisation, political policies and cultural processes have often excluded or devalued representations of indigenous peoples in official statistics. Researchers are dependent on the highly variable way in which states or territories enumerate, categorise and differentiate indigenous peoples. In a long-term perspective, ethnic markers in censuses or other demographic records have shown great differences between nations, regions and parishes, and other administrative units.

In the autumn of 2006, thirty researchers gathered in Umeå in northern Sweden to attend a workshop entitled 'Indigenous Identity in Demographical Sources'. This event revealed the need for international collaboration on these issues. Generally, the situation varies substantially across countries. We need to study and understand why, for instance, Sweden does not register the indigenous population residing within its national borders, while countries such as New Zealand, Canada and Australia do. There is great significance related to the study of statistical constructions of 'indigenous people'. The scholars represented in this book highlight different aspects of indigenous demography: the creation and validity of categories for enumerating indigenous populations, the use and misuse of ethnic markers, micro-demographic investigations, demographic databases, and indigenous identities.

Anthropologists, historians, demographers and sociologists analysing historical and contemporary evidence from Canada, the U.S.A., Australia, New Zealand, Colombia, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Latvia and the U.K. are gathered together in the present volume to explore the statistical construction of 'indigenous peoples'. The approach adopted here is to a great extent historical, thereby providing the necessary long-term perspective for the understanding of the processes that have led to the present situation where statistical categorisation misses much of the cultural and indigenous perception of people and its varying representations. Moreover, there is a strong link between history and indigeneity. Indigenous peoples have used their lands for thousands of years, and their contemporary situ-

ation is to a great extent related to their ancient presence in the land.

Indigenous Peoples and Demography examines the differences between genealogical and cultural markers, groups and individuals, and subjective and objective perspectives on indigenous identity. How have different social and institutional systems defined indigenous groups in terms of inclusion and exclusion? What were the reasons for these decisions and how are they mirrored in the demographic sources? The book also discusses how a set of ethno-demographic tools can be developed to categorise how households are constructed within complex ethnic and economic environments, along with how these factors can be read into statistical data.

New Approaches to Population Studies

A complex situation is always faced when quantifications of individual behaviour are performed using traditional demographic tools. Individuals can belong to several collectives or have several identities. A person can change identity over time, but it is also possible to experience and be associated with different identities at the same time. Moreover, these identities often have varying degrees of status. These complex circumstances highlight the striking differences that can occur within groups that at first seem homogeneous. Thus, it is a problem that adequate data are often missing for factors other than imprecise definitions based on regions and nations. In order to understand demographic changes, in which social action with an impact on demographic behaviour is closely connected to such collective identities that are recognised and experienced, researchers have developed the concept of culture as an indicator (Fricke 1997; Kertzer 1997).

Population studies have long analysed changes in individual and family behaviour. Political and administrative borders have defined collectives of people. Originating from national surveys, international comparisons have provided evidence of both differences and similarities, and time trends have been observed. The general idea has been that national identities exist, and that they have an impact on demographic features. National identities have occupied demographic statistics for a long period of time. Added to the national level of investigating demography, a further macro perspective has presented more general transitional schemes in which great parts of, and sometimes entire, continents are included. They too are supposed to represent common values and aims. Based on the wholly positive acceptance of Western development, often described as the perpetual evolution of societies, a scientific demographic consensus has been shaped. Arland Thornton (2001) called this the developmental paradigm, and argued convincingly that it has largely led conclusions in the wrong directions. He suggested that demographers have reached a broader understanding of family change when they have gone beyond social and economic explanations. A key component of this extended agenda is culture. There is strong evidence that neither nations nor continents, nor

probably even regions or local societies, are the most satisfactory formations for a coherent contextualisation of cultural identity. And whatever definition of culture we prefer, it can be stated that certain types of societies are disfavoured by the developmental paradigm.

The development of the modern state urged leaders to simplify the reality of cultural complexity through a series of typifications (Scott 1998: 2–3, 76–81). However, an objective statistical realism is close to the primordialist notion of timeless identities, much discredited in recent social science, particularly among anthropologists (Kertzer and Arel 2002: 19).

Demography has been criticised for its strong dependence on modernisation theories and its exclusively quantitative foundation. The lack of social perspectives has created the need for a more reflexive science better suited to the complexity of historical and present-day societies (Greenhalgh 1996). Robin Wright (2002), for example, states that it is particularly difficult for analysts to conceptualize indigenous societies in terms of Western definitions of cultural identity, and that there is a tendency to characterise them as lacking in social structure, not least regarding the anthropological emphasis on the structure of a jural domain.

Even so, ethnographic, anthropological and other qualitative challenges to quantitative demography are dependent on the possibility of measuring and describing populations. While most of the demographic categories have developed during a long historical process, the current cultural variables are largely the result of political and ideological constructions. Simon Szreter, Hania Sholkamy and A. Dharmalingam underlined the importance of reflective and critical examination (Szreter, Sholkamy and Dharmalingam 2004: 4–8). This should preferably result in a dialogue between demography, history and anthropology, to mention only some of the academic disciplines involved. Hermeneutic methods with an emphasis on contextualisation and description will join a more hypothetical deductionism aimed at the construction of categories for analysis. Szreter, Sholkamy and Dharmalingam argued for context-based categories, unencumbered by any claims of universality or eternalness. This approach offers an opportunity for historical methods, which are indifferent to cultural contexts, to be combined with anthropological perspectives.

Culture and identity are given shape from a number of disparate perspectives. We find here the outcomes of national and colonial administrative institutions, census takers' ambitions to create a logical system, scientific experiments, different ethnic or religious ambitions of being recognised, and the ambitions of authorities connected to these collectives. The cultural variations in and modifications of these ideological codes, to use Kreager's terminology, are complications of the outcomes of traditional methods. Demographic thinking has shifted to considering ways in which we can extend and redevelop the concept of culture as identifier. Kreager argued that it is not a grand theory of culture that population studies is seeking, but 'a more limited comparative framework that would

enable specific demographic changes to be understood as a dimension of specific cultural differentials and changing relationships between groups. More particularly, the hope has remained that such an approach would allow formalisation, in which identity could serve as a proxy for complex patterns of cultural change' (Kreager 1997: 142).

The demographic sources are often representations of processes in which individuals are turned into objects. As Melissa Nobles and others have argued, race is not an objective category; censuses help shape racial discourses, which in turn affect public policies (Nobles 2002). Ian Hacking, in an analysis drawing on Foucault, argued that what we have experienced is moral categorisation with the purpose of control (Hacking 1986: 226). One far-reaching consequence of this is that the truths emanating from this categorisation have been adopted by the subjects themselves, and have thus had a major impact on indigenous identity processes. Certainly, states have a great responsibility for this. In her chapter, Tahu Kukutai (this volume) concludes that identity categories and the groups they seek to describe are political and social constructions that often reflect prevailing race logics and state imperatives, at odds with the criteria that groups use to define themselves. Similarly, Linda Tuhiwai Smith wrote that it is difficult to speak of 'indigenous peoples' and 'research' simultaneously without acknowledging and understanding the impact of imperialism and colonialism on the creation of knowledge (Tuhiwai Smith 1999: 2). She argued that 'methodologies and methods of research, the theories that inform them, the questions which they generate and the writing styles they employ, all become significant acts which need to be considered carefully and critically before being applied. In other words, they need to be 'decolonised'' (ibid.: 39).

There is a range of notions concerning indigenous peoples that include understandings of their number, of their geographical area, of their societal structure, of limitations and definitions, and of the basis of identity that do not represent the indigenous reality. The result is sometimes exclusion, and sometimes alienation from the indigenous culture. Acknowledging the negative effects that can be associated with ethnocentric perspectives, there is an overwhelming need for inside perspectives when demographic categories are discussed. This qualitative dimension represents not only the prospect of more culturally correct understandings and descriptions, but it also has the ability to bring changes into related contexts. This book scrutinises the historical and contemporary context of indigenous demographic categorisation, and it aims to improve the possibilities for comparison, revision and development.

The present volume addresses three critical challenges. One is the complicated meeting between quantitative and qualitative methods, representing widely different research traditions. Efforts on both sides have resulted in innovative and complex research design where mutual strengths are promoted and disciplinary limitations have been reduced (Bernardi

and Hutter 2007). Another is the relation between the historical and the contemporary context, with geographical variation an additional complicating factor. It follows that attention must be given to all the divergences involved, but equally that favourable opportunities are acknowledged. There are excellent examples of studies that have combined comparisons of deviating contexts of time and space, investigating risk factors for measles mortality, survival of mothers and their offspring, the impact of nutrition, and social inequalities in child mortality in nineteenth-century Europe and countries in the contemporary Third World (Burström 1996; Andersson 2000; Scott and Duncan 2002; Macassa 2004).

A third challenge is the inside and outside understanding of complex indigenous societies. Externally produced censuses, surveys and administrative data are too often inaccurate when it comes to representing indigenous social structures. Nevertheless, our ambition is to foster a better use of historical sources, with our ultimate ambition being to elucidate mechanisms within demographic changes of indigenous populations that will improve the possibilities of positive developments in health. Indigenous poor health is historical, cultural and political in character. In the contemporary era, where political distinctions are frequently drawn between 'symbolic' and 'practical' reconciliation, historical records can provide a powerful contrast to this, illustrating the inextricable links between bodily health, social values and systems of colonial power (Birch 2007; Mitchell 2007; Taylor 2009). The providing of adequate indicators of health and living conditions among indigenous peoples is related to our understanding of the historical process that has led us up to where we are today (Andersen and Poppel 2002; Anderson 2007; Parkinson 2007).

Indigenous Perspectives: Definitions and Contextualisation

The definition of 'indigenous peoples' remains an open issue, and here we will not offer a definite solution to the problem of definition. Earlier works have stressed historical continuity, the experience of colonisation and self-identifications as being universal features of indigenous peoples worldwide. The time, extent and impact of colonisation varies across continents. The most used and cited definition has long been that of José Martinez Cobo – an Ecuadorian diplomat and at the time a UN special rapporteur – who coined a 'working definition' of indigenous peoples:

> Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral

territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems. (Martinez Cobo 1987).

Though a good starting point, Martinez Cobo's definition may be a too simplistic definition of 'indigenous peoples'.

The United Nations, national governments and academic institutions have different perspectives on defining or characterising indigenous peoples. Even if indigenous groups themselves have their own concept of how they wish to be viewed and identified (Bartlett et al. 2007), self-identification has practical, and sometimes ideological, limits (Kertzer and Arel 2002: 34). Ken Coates argued that although colonial status is clearly a central element in the history of most indigenous peoples, colonising powers are not the key determinants of indigeneity (Coates 2004: 13–14). Coates presented a more extensive definition, focusing on historical processes and relationships, the aim being to remain sensitive to the circumstances of local indigenous societies. Coates exemplified this by highlighting such central characteristics as: their 'small size, attachment to the land, value system and culture rooted in the environment, commitment to a sustainable lifestyle, mobility and cultural conservatism. With the inevitable regional and historical variations, they also share several key historical circumstances: economic and political domination by outsiders, selected integration/participation with non-indigenous societies, limited or non-existent power within the nation state, emerging involvement in a local or international process of decolonisation' (ibid.: 14).

Taylor and Bell provided a series of arguments for a separate analysis of indigenous peoples. They presented arguments relating to location, social justice, social science, and context. They underlined the importance of the considerable degree of regional diversity among indigenous groups within a given country. Policy makers are committed to achieving social justice for their indigenous peoples, and to do so an understanding of demographic patterns is essential. Traditional demographic studies of fertility, mortality and migration also need to be carried out in relation to indigenous peoples. The field also needs to develop methods and measures that take into account the characteristics of indigenous cultures (Taylor and Bell 2004: 5). Historical contexts of colonisation influence the indigenous peoples of today (Snipp 1997). In many respects, the scientific and political community still lacks an understanding of how colonisation, as a demographic process, has influenced the colonised as well as the colonisers.

Censuses play a key role in the construction of social reality, especially when they employ identity categories, such as ethnicity. This has been displayed as the most basic of powers, a power to name, to categorise and thereby to create social reality. Censuses set their goal as that of objectively assessing the state of subjective identities (Kertzer and Arel 2002: 20, 36; Urla 1993: 837). Anderson has argued that statistical records are important devices employed by the colonial state to impose a totalising, classificatory grid on its territory, permitting claims of total control (Anderson 1991: 184).

Clearly one of the major problems when it comes to indigenous demography is that the sources are constructed by non-indigenous members of society. The futile attempts of colonisers to reduce ethnicity to a single criterion, such as origin or language, greatly distort complex and changing identities. Indigenous groups have been denied an existence in the records, and thus in society. However, not all groups or individuals have wished to be included and labelled. Extensive resistance towards ethnic or indigenous categorisation has been a response to the marginalisation effect of national policies, and the neglect of indigenous aims and their perceptions of identity.(Kertzer and Arel 2002: 22–30). In an Australian context, Gardner and Bourke (2000) argued that the truly fluid variable is the history of white definitions of Aboriginal identity. That is why there is a continuous need for historical approaches uncovering how, why and for what purpose data on indigenous peoples have been collected, as well as a need for studies of why colonial powers enumerated everyone but the native populations.

Organisation of the Book

When we put this volume together we were faced with several alternative ways of structuring the book. One way could have been to organise the chapters after the different administrative systems that have produced demographic definitions of indigenous peoples, while others might have been to choose analytical approaches or a chronological order. Nevertheless, we found a geographical organisation most appropriate, thereby illustrating the global perspective as well as the differences in chronology, policies and experiences. The complexity of indigenous demography and our efforts to deal with this scientifically is further developed in the epilogue, which pulls together the various findings of the chapters.

In their chapter, Smith, McCalman, Anderson, Smith, Evans, McCarthy and Beer scrutinise the early development of indigenous statistics in Australia. Established as a British colony in 1835, the state of Victoria was considered the leader in Australian indigenous administration, being the first colony to legislate for the 'protection' of Aborigines, and the first to collect statistical data on their decline and anticipated disappearance. The Victorian Aborigines Protection Act of 1886 – 'the half-caste act' – sought to accelerate the process of assimilation of the Aboriginal population. People were divided into full-bloods and 'half-castes', with the latter group consisting of people with any degree of mixed blood. Half-castes were not accepted by whites or by Aborigines until eighty years after the act was passed. A painstaking investigation combining family histories – using birth, death and marriage registries – and census and archival records provides this information. One startling finding is that the surviving Aboriginal population is descended almost entirely from those who were under the protection of the colonial state. The population reconstitution of Smith

et al. resolves longstanding uncertainties about the fate of Aboriginal people in Victoria in the colonial and postcolonial era. The reconstitution confirms that the resurgence of Aboriginal Victoria during the late twentieth century resulted from the rejection of fractional identity and invisibility by the Aboriginal people themselves. They had never disappeared; they had merely been rendered invisible by legislative fiat.

Tahu Kukutai shows in her chapter how the state of New Zealand has defined and circumscribed Maori identity, and the potential consequences of this from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. The Maori were enumerated separately from the rest of the population until 1951, and a system based on blood quantum was designed. But in contrast to South Africa or the United States, the statistical deployment of blood quantum in New Zealand reflected its usage in legal definitions of Maori, but was not tied to an explicit system of discrimination. From 1916 to 1951, the term 'race alien' was used in censuses, for the purpose of enumerating those with non-European blood. This was not used to discriminate against the Maori, but rather to identify and restrict the entry of 'coloured' migrants, such as Chinese people. In modern censuses, Maori identities are more flexible and inclusive, and multiple criteria are used to define the term, including self-identification. Nevertheless, the discourse on defining the Maori is still contested, and today it represents the subjective outcomes of political consciousness and choice, the 'objective' reality of biological and cultural origin, and structural constraints that condition opportunities to access and express identity.

A global perspective is important for the advancement of indigenous studies. This book contains no contributions from Africa or Asia, and only one chapter concerns the vast region of Latin America, and thus it does not present a worldwide coverage. These continents are increasingly involved in indigenous research and there are obvious reasons for supporting this trend. The notion of indigenous peoples has been highly controversial in Africa and Asia, and a number of groups became more actively engaged in the international indigenous movement during the 1990s (Karlsson 2003; Saugestad 2008).

Steinar Saether provides an overview of the ethnic categories used during the period from 1750 to 1850 in Latin America, especially in the Caribbean provinces of Colombia, and why they changed over the years. He identifies five distinct periods from 1725 until today that have been crucial to the use and design of categories of race and ethnicity in censuses. Several changes occurred during the late colonial and early republican eras. During Spanish rule, there was a close relationship between census categories, tribute obligations and access to land. Inhabitants' resistance to being registered is also noted in some areas. In the new republics, the census categories changed mainly because the new elite constructed categories to reflect their notions of the ideal society.

David Hacker and Michael Haines use census data to investigate life expectancy and age-specific mortality among the American Indian population. They find that when life tables are created they are difficult to interpret, low in accuracy, and suffer from various types of bias. Especially when using a two-census method linking people between the 1900 and 1910 census, they find that people who were designated, for example, 'Indian' in the first census might have 'migrated' out of that category by the next. The period of investigation is also situated in the midst of a time of great change for the American Indian population, owing to coercive federal assimilation policies. The demographic evidence suggests that the indigenous population faced substantial difficulties, with higher mortality rates and lower life expectancy than the white and black populations of America.

The chapter by Michelle Hamilton and Kris Inwood considers the geographic and cultural factors that affected the enumeration of the Aboriginal population in the Canadian census of 1891. Hamilton and Inwood clearly illustrate the challenges of census taking: geography (travel of the enumerators), difficulties with language, and some of the cross-cultural differences that were manifest between Aboriginal peoples and state-employed enumerators. On top of these factors, there was sometimes a conflict concerning how to interpret the 'real' intentions of the enumerator, and the enumerators were at times met with suspicion and resistance. Hamilton and Inwood argue that during the late nineteenth century, Canadian census authorities attempted to understand Aboriginal communities better, and the Aboriginal communities learned more about the ways in which the state wanted to gather census information.

Sweden has extensive demographic registers, which in the past also included ethnic identity. Thus, Per Axelsson's chapter shows that categories intended to cover Sami ethnicity varied greatly, and that the strategies underlying classification have changed considerably between those used in 1750 and the twentieth century. The last census with information on ethnicity was carried out in 1945, after which Sweden abandoned the practice, which is currently seen as a problem. It is impossible to estimate the total Sami population, and there is no option to link ethnic information to other register data.

Norway has a national research-funding policy that guarantees a substantial amount of research on indigenous groups. From this foundation, extensive efforts have been made to address the issues of Sami identity and society. Lars Ivar Hansen's chapter on the usefulness of early modern sources for the reconstruction of population development shows that mid eighteenth-century Norwegian registers include an increasing proportion of Sami among the settled population. The records illustrate the complexity of Sami society, where large non-nomadic groups lived by the sea or on farmsteads. The settled Sami became a substantial part of the population in northern Norway, in some areas representing a third of the total settled inhabitants.

In her chapter on the Sami of Norway, Hilde L. Jåstad views ethnicity from the perspectives of the individual and households and finds that the census instructions restricted the definition of ethnicity. Nevertheless, there was some regional variation between parishes. Ancestry seems to have been the most important criterion. Some parishes had few representations of mixed households, while others had considerably more, which indicates that there was variation in the interpretation of ethnicity criteria. The increase in mixed marriages may be interpreted as a consequence of the Norweganisation process. The vast majority of Sami households included no other ethnic marker. Their marriage market was thereby rather ethnically homogeneous.

Bjørg Evjen concludes that the definition of ethnic categories had a great impact on the population structure of late nineteenth-century Norway. The instructions that were given to census takers, and how they were interpreted, need careful analysis when studying the indigenous population. What might seem to be demographic changes due to migration or fluctuating birth rates can instead largely be explained by changing official strategies of ethnic classification.

In Gunnar Thorvaldsen's chapter, three sometimes contradictory criteria of ethnicity are discussed: individual/group, ancestral/cultural (language) and subjective/objective. Individual representations were more important than those of the group, and he shows that there was not as much confusion among census takers as is sometimes argued. Thorvaldsen concludes that Sami ethnicity was an influential contextual variable.

Torunn Pettersen raises the fundamental question of who is entitled to represent the Sami people of today. The derogatory opinions of the majority population of Norway about the Sami are part of the explanation for why not all Sami actually choose to register themselves as a member of this indigenous group. This leads to shortcomings in the accuracy of contemporary indigenous demographic data, and these shortcomings have negative implications in several societal contexts. Demands for change must come from the Sami, Pettersen argues. She argues that ethnic self-identification must be the basic principle, but that the state also has a responsibility.

Using the highly informative 1926/7 polar census records, David Anderson investigates the hunting and herding Essei Iakuts living in the Evenki region of eastern Russia. By linking people's household structures to the herd structures of the reindeer supporting these households, he reconstructs novel relational patterns. The census taker lived in the region for a year and created household cards detailing age, name, occupation, income, and so on, but more surprisingly also recorded information using questionnaires concerning the formation of local reindeer-herding families. The author uncovers a complex picture of interaction between wealthy and poor families, within and outside households. The study establishes, for instance, that the Essei Iakuts had a system of social solidarity called *posobka* to help during difficult times. Anderson also offers

theoretical insights into how the dual analysis of the demography of people and the demography of reindeer can strengthen our understanding of indigenous societies.

John Ziker looks at the central Taimyr lowlands region of Siberia, using both the historical polar census of 1926/7 and his own ethnographic research. He shows that the historical data together with focused observational analysis increases the possibility of studying the effects of politics and policies. Demographic data coupled with household socio-economic information provides a complex picture of land and resource use, social organisation and identity for the central Taimyr lowlands in the 1920s, where generosity was a cultural keyword. Furthermore, people of today are studied using demographic records. A striking demographic feature is the concentration of non-natural deaths in the younger age groups. The collapse of a planned economy in the 1990s affected the region, and long periods of inactivity led to vast drinking problems.

In Russia, the term 'indigenous' is not only a qualitative characteristic of certain populations or individuals as it also has a quantitative dimension, and a disputed threshold has been established according to which ethnic groups cannot amount to more than 50,000 persons. Sergey V. Sokolovskiy's chapter traces the conceptual construction of this threshold, and the influence of the legal status of identity politics. Questions of historical succession (who came first and who came later) have often served as a battleground for competing claimants. In a special decree passed during the early Soviet era, the 'small peoples of the North' were guaranteed equal rights to social advancement, and they were to be continuously enumerated. Since then, diverse statistical sources have been based on the rigid idea of primordial ethnicity and bounded and unchangeable cultural units. However, the post-Soviet era has experienced fluctuations in the numbers of indigenous peoples based on changes in state policy, legal status and identity politics, as well as changes in official linguistic and cultural classifications. Recently, urban and modernised groups have been added to the official list of indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian north that was previously dominated by groups with a traditional economy.

Notions of identity are untheorised in demography, and identity is often confused with identification (Gardner and Bourke 2000). Definitions should focus on what actually characterises an indigenous people, rather than on what does not. The borderline between an ethnic minority and an indigenous people has sometimes been difficult to draw. In this context, the chapters by Andrejs Plakans and John MacInnes are illustrative. Plakans's study of Latvia illustrates the relation between nationalistic motives and the concept of indigenousness. He suggests that there is a marked contrast between census categories and identities in the demographic sources of the eastern Baltic littoral during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Censuses have a very difficult task in that their aim is to describe the pop-

ulation using a number of constructed categories. The census is rarely a representation of the current situation. Changes are a necessity, and work with censuses can be characterised as Sisyphean. When constructing national and ethnic categories, there is a risk that religious, social, economic and other parameters will be either neglected or over-emphasised.

John MacInnes provides an interesting perspective when he concludes that few groups in the U.K. claim to be indigenous. One exception is the British National Party (BNP), which portrays twentieth and twenty-first-century immigration as different from its historic antecedents. He asks who the British are, and finds that identity categories are discursively constructed and do not have an external, standard referent. They are therefore much more difficult to handle using the classification systems of official censuses. The problem is that it is impossible to give them a fixed meaning. Scientists and census makers have a responsibility to be more conscious of what they are doing. MacInnes argues that despite the fact that censuses can never give a clear picture of a society in terms of nationality or ethnicity, we must be cautious not to reproduce identity categories that are irrelevant.

The present volume demonstrates strong parallels between the history and contemporary situation of indigenous peoples in different parts of the world. Furthermore, the book adds valuable knowledge to the complex relation between demographic classification, state policies, indigenous response and indigenous identity. We hope that the volume proves to be a stimulus to future research collaboration, where extended comparisons between countries and continents will play an important role.

References

Andersen, T., and B. Poppel. 2002. 'Living Conditions in the Arctic', *Social Indicators Research* 58(1–3): 191–216.

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Anderson, I. 2007. 'Understanding the Process', in B. Carson, T. Dunbar, R.D. Chenhall and R. Bailie (eds), *Social Determinants of Indigenous Health*. Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin, pp. 21–40.

Andersson, T. 2000. *Survival of Mothers and Their Offspring in Nineteenth-century Sweden and Contemporary Ethiopia*. Umeå: Umeå University.

Bartlett, J.G., L. Madariaga-Vignudo, J.D. O'Neill and H. Kuhnlein. 2007. 'Identifying Indigenous Peoples for Health Research in a Global Context: A Review of Perspectives and Challenges', *International Journal of Circumpolar Health* 66(4): 287–307.

Bernardi, L., and I. Hutter. 2007. 'The Anthropological Demography of Europe', *Demographic Research* 17(18): 541–66.

Birch, T. 2007. 'The Invisible Fire: Indigenous Sovereignty, History and Responsibility', in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.), *Sovereign Subjects: Indigenous Sovereignty Matters*. Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin, pp.105–17.

Burström, B. 1996. *Risk Factors For Measles Mortality: Studies From Kenya and Nineteenth-century Stockholm*. Stockholm: Kavolinska Institutet.

Coates, K.S. 2004. *A Global History of Indigenous Peoples: Struggle and Survival*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.Fricke, T. 1997. 'Culture Theory and Demographic Process: Toward a Thicker Demography', in D.I. Kertzer and T. Fricke (eds), *Anthropological Demography: Toward a New Synthesis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 248–77.

Gardner, G., and E.A. Bourke. 2000. 'Indigenous Populations, "Mixed" Discourses and Identities', *People and Place* 8(2): 43–52.

Greenhalgh, S. 1996. 'The Social Construction of Population Science: An Intellectual, Institutional and Political History of Twentieth-century Demography', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 38: 26–66.

Hacking, I. 1986. 'Making up People', in T. Heller, M. Sosna and D. Wellberry (eds), *Reconstructing Individualism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 222–36.

Karlsson, B.G. 2003. 'Anthropology and the "Indigenous Slot": Claims to and Debates about Indigenous Peoples' Status in India'. *Critique of Anthropology* 23(4): 403–23.

Kertzer, D.I. 1997. 'The Proper Role of Culture in Demographic Explanation', in G.W. Jones, R.M. Douglas, J.C. Caldwell and R.M. D'Souza (eds), *The Continuing Demographic Transition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 137–57.

Kertzer. D.I., and D. Arel. 2002. 'Censuses, Identity Formation, and the Struggle for Political Power', in D.I. Kertzer and D. Arel (eds), *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–42.

Kreager, P. 1997. 'Population and Identity', in D.I. Kertzer and T. Fricke (eds), *Anthropological Demography: Toward a New Synthesis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 135–74.

Macassa, G. 2004. *Poverty and Health in Different Contexts: Social Inequalities in Child Mortality in Mozambique and Nineteenth-century Stockholm*. Stockholm: Kavolinska Institutet.

Martinez Cobo, J.R. 1987. *Study of the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations, vol. 5: conclusions, proposals and recommendation*. New York: United Nations.

Mitchell, J. 2007. 'History', in B. Carson, T. Dunbar, R.D. Chenhall and R. Bailie (eds), *Social Determinants of Indigenous Health*. Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin, pp. 41–64.

Nobles, M. 2002. 'Racial Categorisation and Censuses', in D.I. Kertzer and D. Arel (eds), *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 43–70.

Parkinson, A. 2007. 'The International Polar Year 2007–2008: The Arctic Human Health Legacy', *Alaska Medicine* 49(2): 43–45.

Saugestad, S. 2008. 'Beyond the "Colombus Context": New Chellenges as the Indigenous Discourse is Applied to Africa', in H. Minde (ed.), *Indigenous Peoples: Self–determination, Knowledge, Indigeniety*. Delft: Eburon Delft, pp. 157–73.

Scott, J. C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Conditions Have Failed*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Scott, S., and C.J. Duncan. 2002. *Demography and Nutrition: Evidence from Historical and Contemporary Populations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sköld, P. 1992. *Samisk bosättning i Gällivare 1550–1750*. Umeå: Centre for Arctic Research.

Snipp, C.M. 1997. 'The Size and Distribution of the American Indian Population: Fertility, Mortality, Migration, and Residence', *Population Research and Policy Review* 16: 61–93.

Szreter, S., H. Sholkamy and A. Dharmalingam. 2004. 'Contextualising Categories: Towards a Critical Reflexive Demography', in S. Szreter, H. Sholkamy and A. Dharmalingam (eds), *Categories and Contexts: Anthropological and Historical Studies in Critical Demography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–56.

Taylor, J. 2009. 'Indigenous Demography and Public Policy in Australia: Population or Peoples?' *Journal of Population Research* 26: 115–30.

Taylor, J., and M. Bell. 2004. 'Introduction: New World Demography', in J. Taylor and M. Bell (eds), *Population Mobility and Indigenous Peoples in Australasia and North America*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–10.

Thornton, A. 2001.'The Developmental Paradigm, Reading History Sideways, and Family Change'. *Demography* 38(4): 2001, 449–65.

Thornton, R. 1997. 'Aboriginal North American Population and Rates of Decline, ca. A.D. 1500–1900', *Current Anthropology* 38(2): 310–15.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. 1999. *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Urla, J. 1993. 'Cultural Politics in an Age of Statistics: Numbers, Nations, and the Making of Basque Identity', *American Ethnologist* 20: 818–43.

Wright, R. 2002. 'Historical and Anthropological Perspectives on the Formation of Cultural Identity', *Ethnohistory* 49(3): 703–14.