Introduction

Exploring Indigeneity

Introductory Remarks on a Contested Concept

Nasir Uddin, Eva Gerharz, and Pradeep Chakkarath

While popular images tend to depict indigenous people as having lived a "simple" and unspoiled lifestyle before they became threatened by the "evils" of modernity and (neo)colonial exploitation, there is evidence for the argument that, in many parts of the world, indigenous people were neither "locally locked" in the deep forest or remote hills, nor socioculturally "isolated," dissociated from others and the outside world. Historians, political scientists, and anthropologists have shown that trade networks reached not only over great distances but also to remote places, and that, even though they may have been able to elude the power of state societies (Scott 2009), people living in those places were never completely isolated. This makes it even more astonishing that the notion of indigeneity has become a universalist concept that has gained global recognition for representing exactly this: a population that is economically "backward," due to a lack of modern technology, and politically "independent," due to the freedom from external forces and global capitalism, and therefore in need of protection. Such images tend to ignore the fact that it was colonialism itself that produced the well-known image of the noble or dangerous savage: simple, innocent, even childish, yet untamed and therefore threatening people, who lived in harmony with nature. But while colonial and postcolonial imaginations rested upon the idea that human progress is inevitably connected with a clearly defined path towards modernization, today's discourse on indigeneity considers the indigenous "way of life" as being endangered by the latter, and therefore as requiring protection. Both approaches disregard the fact that their universalist claims do not necessarily match the self-images of the populations usually la-

beled "indigenous." They also tend to ignore that, like other people all over the world, these populations are extensively connected to, and deeply influenced by, transformative global socioeconomic and political rhetoric and realities (for more detail, see Cadena and Starn 2007; Clifford 2013). Mobility is a feature of the modern world as people, goods, and ideas move rapidly from one place to another. This fosters the emergence of new visions and aspirations for development that are embedded in the dynamics of local and global statecraft. While one should refrain from constructing indigenous people as clearly demarcated "groups" who exist "out there," and even when one accepts that in general the world's population struggles with the impact of neoliberal notions of economic formation and governmentality, it is also important to recognize that the label "indigenous" has recently become a powerful category that continues to inspire identity politics, emancipatory projects, and protectionist measures worldwide.

Even today, indigenous activists across the world to some extent tend to reproduce images of locally locked, culturally confined, socially egalitarian, economically self-sufficient, and politically independent "peoples" in international forums and indigenous peoples' rights discourses in order to pursue particular claims. These images are particularly plausible and illustrative because they constitute a counter-narrative to modernization—a discourse frequently pursued by activists' main opponent, the nation-state. Modernization, globalization, industrialization, and other forms of what we call "neoliberalism" are not projects "out there" that hang over people's heads like a phantom, but strategies that are being pursued, and quite often actively protected and promoted, by the nation-state. Accordingly, indigenous activism mostly addresses state actors who are regarded as complicit in "selling out" indigenous rights to lands and natural resources without recognizing their way of life as being different to that of the majority population. This explanation, however, does not tell the entire story. It ignores the fact that the national imagination of many postcolonial states rests upon the ideal of a culturally homogenous society, for which minorities constitute a potential threat (Appadurai 2006). It also ignores the fact that within nation-states it is not only the so-called indigenous people who have been marginalized, but also often other segments of society who have not been able to gain recognition and influence. In contrast to explanations that tend to ignore the complexity of historical processes—that is, those acted out by a variety of protagonists at various global and local scales—this volume addresses the question of how indigeneity has manifested itself as a global discourse, feeding into very concrete poli-

cies and politics at different moments in time. It highlights that the concept itself is not a new invention, with a clearly defined meaning and scope, and related to a well-crafted set of rights, but rather that it has been used in many different ways by various actors. Accordingly, it has been used as an ascriptive and self-ascriptive category, as it is strategically employed by activists in order to pursue a particular set of claims, and by governments to defeat said claims or to make strategic concessions. Indigeneity has been appropriated by states and organizations exactly because it carries a particular meaning that is loaded with essentialist sentiments. However, it is not the validity of these sentiments over which activists continue to fight, but rather access to resources, rights, and dignity. This volume presents empirically grounded case studies from different parts of the world, which show that indigeneity is a contested concept and manifests itself in various ways.

Being concerned with "indigeneity on the move" indicates a keen interest in the question of how far, and under what conditions, the concept of indigeneity, which can be considered one of the key concepts of current social sciences, has the potential to change, alongside the rapidly changing lives and lifestyles of indigenous peoples across the world. And by extension, how these changes might reshape or at least modify our perspectives on established theories about social, economic, and political dynamics and their underlying factors. The concept of "indigeneity" and the various understandings of its meaning have had an impact not only on how social scientists think about the interconnections of identity, space, language, history, and culture, but also on how they describe the increasingly complex interplay of diverse players and agents within dynamic global socioeconomic, and political realities, and the rhetoric that accompanies it.

Indigeneity has become a resource in identity politics, a matter of "deep belonging," desired more than discouraged, and proclaimed more than hidden as one's attachment to a particular place, culture, and nation. It is woven together in an intricate web of concepts such as ethnicity, identity, hybridity, authenticity, autochthony, diaspora, nation, and homeland, and the ways in which these ideas are formed, developed, and "owned." In so far as territoriality and ancestral rights over land are inscribed into the notion of indigeneity, the imagination of place, space, and time are central analytical dimensions that are highly relevant, particularly with regard to questions concerning the redistributive power of states and political (e.g., democratic) processes. Although indigeneity is primarily expressed as an attachment to land, locale, and nation, the relationship between indigeneity and belonging

is reworked and modified in translocal and transnational communicative and interactive processes. Consequently, these concepts intersect with local, national, and global sociopolitical debates and are confronted with the challenges posed to indigenous aspirations by the neoliberal agenda of nation-states and their concerns with sovereignty. Therefore, apart from being of academic interest, the politics of indigeneity are significant in the context of nation-building, the accommodation of minority rights, neoliberal policy reforms, and political debates in growing rights activism at a global scale. Given these contexts, how should we address indigeneity on the move in its various manifestations at different levels? What are the challenges that indigenous peoples across the world face in the interface between local, nationalist rhetoric and global, political dynamics? How are these challenges crucial for indigenous people living in different regions across the globe? These are the leading questions, in relation to national and transnational indigenous activism, that this book seeks to address, with the aim of shaping a potential framework to better understand the various manifestations of indigeneity.

Apart from some very good ethnographies on indigenous issues published across the world, there exist various edited volumes on indigeneity, on the indigenous dynamics of translocal politics, and on indigenous cosmopolitanism (see, e.g., Cadena and Starn 2007; Dev, Kelkar, and Walter 2004; Forte 2010; Karlsson and Subba 2006; Rycroft and Dasgupta 2011; Venkateswar and Hughes 2011), which focus mainly on the present discourse on indigeneity and the struggles of indigenous people with the diverse issues they experience, in the context of a recurrent and rapidly transforming socioeconomic and political reality. These collections portray the present situation as a consequence of the past, where indigenous people were thought of as a "backward human race," this category being produced in colonial scholarship on civilization in the mid nineteenth century. However, the situation has now considerably—though not completely—changed; indigenous peoples receive global attention, and their rights are acknowledged in different international forums. Indigenous people represent themselves at every level of society—locally, nationally, regionally, and globally—which gives birth to potentially new, as well as problematic, dimensions of the concept of both indigeneity itself and concurrent identity politics. This book focuses on "indigeneity on the move" with a critical assessment of local, translocal, and transnational figurations, and their relevance to the notions of indigeneity and indigenous activism, based on empirically informed analyses of past experiences and present challenges.

Indigeneity, Identity Politics, and Nation-States

The idea of indigeneity as a political resource in identity politics, referring to individual and collective attachment to a particular place, culture, and nation, is not a new phenomenon. It intersects with local, national, and global sociopolitical debates following the framework of "us" versus "them" in various contexts. The politics of nationalism, and that of naming and categorizing in postcolonial states, along with developmental interventions and displacements and, more recently, certain states' neoliberal agendas, have seen indigenous activists and those sympathetic to indigenous claims fight for legal and constitutional recognition within the political space of particular nation-states. Such recognition is usually framed in the language of rights (Cowan 2001; Gellner 2011) and relates to ideals of justice, equity, development, and democracy.

Ethnographies from all over the world have shown that the negotiations between indigenous activists and governments are framed within very different discourses, which differ from region to region and from one country to another. For instance, in the Americas, the discourse has been determined by images of indigenous people as the victims of settler colonialism, while in postcolonial states in South and Southeast Asia it involves cultural politics and the exclusionary policies of nation-building and state formation. In many countries, development programs directed towards economic growth at the cost of indigenous people and their habitats have given activists grounds to criticize development both as a discourse and as a set of practices (Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1994; Ziai 2013). Economic, political, and social marginalization have fostered the emergence of new, pioneering indigenous movements, which have been (partly) successful in introducing policy reforms and formulating alternative visions of society (e.g., Esteva and Prakash 1998; Laurie, Andolina, and Radcliffe 2005). Taking up a notion of indigeneity that is strongly linked with environmentalism and that line of activism, some movements have produced new visions for development, and new concrete versions thereof, such as the Buen Vivir initiative (see Ruttenberg 2013; Villalba 2013). Some of these activist movements have become particularly successful in claiming access to state resources, as the cases of Bolivia and Ecuador show (see Molyneux and Thomson 2011).

Whereas definitions of indigenous people in the Americas have been largely undisputed, activists in many parts of Africa and Asia, in contrast, have faced more difficulties because of different historical backgrounds or ethnic settings. Many Asian and African states refrain from acknowledging indigenous people as a category of citizens who are

eligible for special rights and benefits on the basis of being oppressed (Gerharz 2014; Hodgson 2011; Pelican 2009). The arguments employed by these governments often rely on an interpretation of the notion of indigenous people that relates to specifics of the American populations—for example, the exposure to a colonialist force and its repercussions. At the same time, activists draw upon globalized notions of indigeneity to legitimize their claims. Paradoxically, both of these strategies can be interpreted as being directly related to globalization, in the sense of deterritorialization, which has opened up new avenues for denationalization and the permeability of boundaries, and therefore paves the way for universalist claims, such as human rights or collective rights pertaining to the specific conditions assigned to the indigenous "way of life." In this sense, the emergence of indigenous activism can be regarded as a challenge to the modernization efforts of nation-states (Clifford 2013). However, the rising number of incidents of collective violence can also be traced back to growing pressure from globalizing forces, which threatens nationalist ideals of cultural purity within nation-states and leads to the reassertion of us/them constructions in ethnic terms (Appadurai 2006). Minorities with cultural differences thus become a problem because they challenge, from the statist perspective, the national narratives of social cohesion, solidarity, and homogeneity. In stark contrast to the universalist claims that unfold in transnational social spaces, we witness the recurrence of nationalist claims to social and cultural homogeneity.

Indigeneity as a Subject of Global Policy

Whereas indigeneity remains a highly contested concept in many countries with respect to the ideas of modern nation-states, a global discourse with more or less transnationally standardized meanings and connotations has emerged, especially following the support of international organizations with measures such as the International Labour Organization (ILO) conventions, the definition by the World Bank, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). These imply the right to self-identification and self-definition, for example, but also offer guarantees such as freedom from oppression, as well as enshrining a special relationship between indigenous people and their land, and seeing mobility as a way of life. Debates on indigeneity and indigenous activism have shown a remarkable continuity throughout recent decades and have led to "place-making" at the level of the United Nations (Muehlebach 2001). In the early 1980s, the United

Nations had already started to respond to the claims of indigenous activists, who highlighted the marginalization of so-called indigenous peoples. With the formation of the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP), in 1982, struggles for equality that had been taking place in several nation-states around the world gained global recognition, and regular meetings within the UN also encouraged local civil society groups and rights organizations to expand their networks beyond the national space by building connections with transnational indigenous activism. These alternate, global institutionalizations were accompanied by an increasing interest from the ILO, which adopted the first international legal mechanism for the protection of indigenous peoples in 1989, in the form of the ILO Convention 169.

Due to the continuous efforts of the WGIP to raise the concerns of indigenous people, the UN Human Rights Council proposed to the General Assembly that 1993 should be named as the "International Year of the World's Indigenous People."[1] This was followed by the first "International Decade of the World's Indigenous People" (1995–2004). Indigenous activists made use of these ten years to initiate a variety of activities, including resolving problems related to the rights to lands, the preservation of nature and protection of habitats, health and education issues, and the constitutional recognition of identity—in all parts of the world. The Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues was formed in 2000, and a UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous People was appointed in 2001, although the impact of these measures on UN policies was limited.[2] Consequently, the UN declared 2005–14 as a second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People, making the "integrity and dignity" of indigenous peoples across the world a goal, which was in turn crucial for growing indigenous activism at both the global and local level, refueling as it did the rights movement of indigenous peoples working for cooperation, dignity, and integrity. Amidst this mounting indigenous activism, indigeneity became "a global ethnoscape" (Appadurai 1996), which now serves as a powerful tool for political negotiations because the international recognition of indigeneity has created a political space for indigenous people across the world to press their claims and demands (see Gerharz 2012; Ghosh 2006).

These international developments in creating and developing legal instruments were supplemented by the rights-based and promotional activities of transnationally organized initiatives such as the Environmental Defense Fund, the Forest People's Movement, Survival International, Cultural Survival, and Rainforest Action Network, among others.[3] Much of this transnational activism relates to global debates

on environmentalism, both in the 1980s when the Green Movement gained momentum and, more recently, in relation to the climate change discourse. At the same time, the relative success of indigenous activists in lobbying for their goals by relating them to environmental issues has convinced other activists that it is a strategy worth following (Baviskar 2006). Such a strategy therefore holds enormous potential for claims articulated in various political domains. While some scholars are skeptical about an essential affinity between the environment and indigenous people (e.g., Linkenbach 2004), others strongly favor the idea that indigenous people are the best caretakers of environmental and natural resources (see Laungaramsri 2002). Moreover, Shalini Randeria (2003) demonstrates that the focus on environmentalism might lead to new strategic alliances with other civil society actors.

Indigeneity as an Academic Concept

Among activists, indigeneity is commonly defined by referring to collectives of people who believe that they share specific historical roots and experiences that are closely tied to certain territories, specific ethnic traits and linguistic autonomy, as well as specific customs, institutions, worldviews, and a characteristic way of life. Researchers seeking to document the project of indigenous identity politics have supported these activist claims with their academic analyses. With a tendency to embark on ethnographic naturalism, however, these perspectives have dismissed the essentialist connotations entailed in the notion of "indigenous peoples." Adam Kuper's much-cited article "The Return of the Native" (2003) strongly criticizes the entire idea of indigeneity as a postcolonial reproduction of what Andre Béteille calls "the re-emergence of primitivity" (see also Béteille 1998). These critical voices have reminded us that research on indigenous peoples entails several ethical and analytical dilemmas that need to be explicitly addressed. According to Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012: 1), "The word itself, 'research,' is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary. When mentioned in many indigenous contexts, it stirs up silence, it conjures up bad memories, it raises a smile that is knowing and distrustful." However, ethnographers undertaking intensive research on indigenous peoples during the last couple of decades have been more sensitive to the colonial past in dealing with indigeneity and formerly colonized peoples, and also more politically conscious about the politics of representation (see Bal 2007; Hodgson 2011; Shah 2010).

A different path out of the impasse has been chosen by Kay Warren and Jean Jackson (2003). Based on their observation that, in order to represent indigeneity to make their claims, activists have adopted the notion of culture as a concept to depict commonality among particular groups and thus embarked on strategic essentialism, Warren and Jackson draw a sharp distinction between the culture concept applied by activists and the perspective of the researcher. Their task is not to reproduce the essentializing view of culture by isolating cultural practices that are used as markers of identity, but to examine "the ways essences are constructed in practice and disputed in political rhetoric" (ibid.: 9). Acknowledging that indigeneity has become a powerful tool in identity politics thus opens an analytical perspective academics have from the very beginning been trying to find a "middle point" between the perspectives of activists and an essentialist framework of categorical approaches in understanding the concept of indigeneity (see Barnard 2006; Merlan 2009).

One should, however, also be aware that for some decades now, "indigeneity" has been discussed in various academic disciplines, under varying perspectives, and sometimes detached from identity politics and the sociopolitical framework that has come to dominate the social scientific discussions of the concept in many research fields. In the field of psychology, for example, so-called "indigenous psychology" has taken the form of a sub-discipline with a growing number of representative and influential scholars worldwide. Although this academic movement's beginnings and goals can quite easily be traced back to the beginnings of postcolonial studies, psychological research is less interested in the potential political nature of the sub-discipline's origins; rather, its interest focuses on the question of whether there are psychological traits, pathologies, intervention strategies, therapies, and other psychologically relevant phenomena, including theories and methods, that—for good reasons—can be understood as indigenous features of very specific groups with very specific histories and their very own ways of experiencing, thinking, feeling, and behaving (Chakkarath 2012, 2013). Similar questions have been raised and investigated in other fields, such as the educational sciences (Snively and Corsiglia 2001; Verran 2001), sociology (Khoury and Khoury 2013; Morgan 1997), within the discourse on postcolonialism (Baber 2002), or archaeology (Bruchac, Hart, and Wobst 2010), to name just a few. One of the main queries that resonates from all of these concerns with the human psyche and so-called indigenous science approaches is the crucial academic question of whether our scientific theories can claim universal validity

unless they have successfully met the challenges embedded in and conveyed by the concept of indigeneity.

Since questions like these are fundamental questions within the general philosophy of science, we should be cautious when merely treating these issues as simple offshoots of the postcolonial discourse, identity politics, and their sociohistorical background. This is another important reason why the contributions to this book attempt to understand indigeneity as an academic perspective beyond political and cultural binaries, while paying particular attention to the context that has been shaped in relation to manifold discourses and their various manifestations.

From Rights to Dignity

The last four decades of indigenous activism can be summarized as the era of movements, struggles for international recognition of identity, and campaigns for rights to lands, forest, natural resources, and habitats—on both local and global scales. Following the two International Decades of the World's Indigenous People (1995–2004 and 2005–14), and the continuing annual International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples (9 August), indigenous peoples have gained the support of the international community and human rights bodies, as well as national-level civil society organizations. In this process, the rights of indigenous peoples have been established by international legal protections; however, at the country level, many indigenous peoples are still waiting for official recognition. Currently, the futures of indigenous people lie with the state of dignity they look to gain at both local and global levels. In contrast to those who have made attempts to minimize the existing diversities of indigenous people, by formulating standard frames to ensure the rights and dignity of all indigenous people, Kuper (2003) concludes that there is no global solution for this diversity worldwide. One of the main focuses of this book is to present how indigenous peoples in various parts of the world are simultaneously involved with movements for indigenous peoples' rights, as well as the struggle to improve their socioeconomic and political positioning in the national space, in order to gain dignity. Identity politics also feature in the indigenous movements in some nation-states, precisely because they are categorically excluded from the process of homogenous nation-building and the majoritarian policies of state formation. Therefore, indigenous peoples try to build relationships with the state that involve a dialectical engagement, in the tradition of Justin Kenrick and Jerome Lewis (2004), who present indigeneity as a sort of relationship—to culture, to

land, and to ethnic historiography, or to put it another way, "indigeneity as a cultural concept." Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and Gérard Toffin (2011) have taken a similar view in favor of culturalist groups, explaining that indigeneity involves multiple attachments and senses of belonging, which constitute their social and cultural bases. However, many scholars, like Dipesh Chakrabarty (2002), argue that the idea of indigeneity is broadly a political concept, and has nothing to do with culture. Putting aside these debates over whether the idea of indigeneity is a political concept or a cultural one, it becomes important to determine the particular rights for indigenous peoples that ensure a certain level of dignity both as human beings and indigenous people on global and local scales.

Indigeneity, Land, and Resources

Struggles for land resources are one of the major challenges indigenous people face in all parts of the world. This has to do with the common view that land constitutes a core issue of indigeneity. In Chapter 1, Erik de Maaker explores the relationship between modes of land ownership, conceptualizations of land and nature, and notions of indigeneity. He states that the portrayal of upland communities of Northeast India as "indigenous" depends to a large extent on a presumably inextricable relationship between people and land (Karlsson 2011; Li 2010). Upland people are believed to "belong" to their land, and its forests, in the sense that it is considered sacred to them. One way in which this essential bond to the land is expressed is in joint land ownership. In the Garo Hills of Meghalaya, collective ownership was legally secured in the colonial period. Although its original aim was to avoid villagers losing their land, it has been unable to counteract the disparities in power and wealth that have always been prevalent within village communities. Moreover, in much of the Garo Hills there is a tendency towards the privatization of land use, as well as ownership. This commodification of land is unavoidable for the modernization of agriculture, and yet it challenges Garo notions of indigeneity, as well as related perceptions of land and nature. De Maaker, in this chapter, analyzes the transformation of land relationships, the legalities in which these are founded, and the consequences they have for Garo notions of indigeneity.

In another case from Southeast Asia, Ian Baird in Chapter 2 discusses how indigeneity functions as a strong political resource, using the case of land management in Cambodia, Thailand, and Laos. He brings out the political rhetoric of indigenous people, explaining that

over the last couple of decades the concept of "indigenous peoples" has gained increasing traction in Asia, with some countries—such as the Philippines, Japan, Taiwan, and Cambodia—having adopted legislation that recognizes indigenous peoples. Still, other national governments in Asia continue to resist, with many following the "saltwater theory," which specifies that the concept of indigenous peoples is only applicable in places where there has been considerable European settler colonization (such as the Americas, Australia, and New Zealand). Elsewhere, the concept is seen as irrelevant, since everyone is considered to be indigenous. Still, even in these countries the movement has made some inroads, albeit unevenly, due to varying political and historical circumstances. Much of the increased attention on the concept of indigenous peoples is linked to advocacy associated with attempts to gain increased access and control over land and other natural resources. In this chapter, Baird considers the links between the indigenous peoples' movement and land and resource tenure issues in three countries in mainland Southeast Asia where the concept of indigeneity is variously recognized.

Becoming 'Indigenous'

Indigeneity is also challenged by various local, regional, and international political dynamics of identity and locally embedded public and political discourse. Therefore, a deeper understanding of the dynamics of indigeneity depends on how local political rhetoric negotiates with international indigenous activism. In Chapter 3, Gabriele Herzog-Schröder draws our attention to the Yanomami of Venezuela and Brazil, who are often represented as an "isolated," indigenous, ethnic group of the South American lowlands, prototypically as Amerindian societies of Amazonia. In the Brazilian part of their territory they have, over the last three decades, been invaded and abused as part of a disgraceful gold rush. However, anthropologists, too, became notorious for inappropriate projections of the Yanomami in Venezuela. Due to this history of invasion and worldwide media attention, the Yanomami have been subject to representation as the stereotypical "exotic" within both anthropological academia and beyond. This widespread publicity has obscured the fact that presently, growing contact with the "outside" world is taking place in quite heterogeneous ways among the Yanomami. While some Yanomami personalities are well informed about city life and symptoms of globalization—for example, the famous Davi Kopenawa from Brazil—the majority of Yanomami have not

yet traveled outside their traditional territories. The misrepresentation of indigeneity, and the processes of approximation of an isolated area in southern Venezuela, demonstrate how a gradual understanding of the "outside world" goes hand in hand with the Yanomami's own understanding of being "indigenous." At the same time, this new indigenous identity situates the actors as members of a nation, and makes them appear as belonging to a particular indigenous group within a choir of other indigenous people within these newly conceived national complexes. These freshly acquainted forms of identity—being "Yanomami" (as an indigenous group), being indigenous, and being Venezuelan or Brazilian—are contested by a traditional cosmological worldview, in short by being determined as "shamanic." New forms of "knowledge," as well as spatial imaginaries—novel to the traditional worldview—are discussed in this chapter, focusing particularly on schooling as an interface between indigeneity and modernity.

The increasing pace of connectivity and networking is helping indigenous activism reach translocal and transnational spaces, which in turn provide transnational incentives to local and national activism. In Chapter 4, Eva Gerharz argues that indigeneity is made use of by activists as a crucial category, one that signifies belonging in various ways, and more or less successfully. Using the case of Bangladesh's indigenous activist movement and its demands for the recognition of diversity as an example, the article identifies three different domains in which indigenous activism is at work, and locates these within translocal space. In particular, Gerharz shows how international claims to indigenous rights are translated into the national legal framework and how these attempts are being negotiated between actors who draw on globalized concepts and discourses in different ways. A second domain is development, one of the classical fields of international and transnational interaction in Bangladesh, in which indigenous issues have been taken up only recently. These initiatives, however, have provoked quite controversial debates, especially from those actors who seek to preserve indigeneity as a distinct way of life. The third dimension is concerned with the ambiguities emerging from the representation of indigenous people, their culture, and way of life in the public space of the Bengali-dominated national society. These three dimensions, Gerharz argues, rest upon activist configurations that are marked by dynamic boundary-making processes, which are enacted in multiethnic settings and not only allow the inclusion of non-indigenous activists but also foster the exclusion of indigenous people who do not support the political claims and demands of the movement. Gerharz argues that understanding the constellations of belonging from a translocal per-

spective helps us to move beyond essentializing concepts of indigeneity that run the risk of reproducing stereotypical images.

In Chapter 5, Nasir Uddin also focuses on indigenous people in Bangladesh, but from a different angle. His interest is in the various forms of identity politics, cultural politics, and the politics of nationalism that are produced locally, but that also compete with global notions of indigeneity, and which therefore also deserve attention, critical discussion, and analysis from academics. He particularly focuses on the complex networks of the politics of indigeneity, in which the identity of a particular group of people becomes a conflict between local articulations of selfhood, national politics of "otherness," and transnational discourses of indigeneity. His discussion critically engages with recurrent debates on indigeneity, identity politics, and the politics of nationalism in local, national, and transnational spheres, using the case of the Khumi people who live in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT), in southeastern Bangladesh. The Khumi, culturally different from the majority Bengali population and from other ethnic minorities in Bangladesh, confront multiple identities—Khumi, Pahari, *upajatee* (sub-nation), tribe, *jumma* (shifting cultivators), *adivasi* or indigenous people, *khudra-nrigoshti* (ethnic minority), and so on—amid the local and global politics of indigeneity. The state's politics of nationalism, transnational politics of indigeneity, and postcolonial practice of colonial discourse in the South Asian subcontinent place the Khumi in an identity crisis, and demonstrates the problems with subscribing to the idea of indigeneity as an international category. Consequently, the Khumi are now in the position of losing their "self" in "others" who themselves claim to be indigenous people. With the case of the Khumi, Uddin examines the idea of indigeneity, politics of identity, and belonging, as well as the notions of nationalism in Bangladesh, against the wider background of the relation of the CHT to the state, which has been shaped over time and through regimes, from the colonial (British), through the semi-colonial (Pakistan), to the post/neocolonial (Bangladesh) era.

Indigeneity as a Political Resource

The emergence of the idea of indigeneity was strongly motivated by indigenous activism across the world, which resulted in the international endorsement of various legal frameworks for the rights of indigenous people. Since then, indigeneity has become a political resource.

In Africa, "indigeneity" has been a highly contested concept. Michaela Pelican explains in Chapter 6 that during the past twenty years, many ethnic and minority groups in Africa have laid claim to "indigeneity,"

in their country or region of residence, on the basis of their political marginalization and cultural difference. They have drawn inspiration from the UN definition of "indigenous peoples" as a legal category with collective entitlements, and have linked up with the global indigenous rights movement. Concurrently, there has been an extensive debate within Africanist anthropology on the concept's analytical usefulness. Moreover, several African governments have questioned its applicability to the African continent, arguing that all population groups may count as "indigenous." However, with the adoption of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007, conceptual criticism has abated, and many African governments have made attempts to integrate the indigenous rights discourse in their policies and development programs—with varied outcomes. Pelican outlines the different trajectories of the indigenous rights movement in Africa and discusses the factors that may contribute to its success or decline. In particular, she compares two case studies. The first is the Mbororo of Cameroon, a pastoralist group that in 2005 became internationally recognized as an indigenous people, and whose socioeconomic and political trajectory she has followed since the 1990s. The second is the Maasai of Tanzania, whose involvement in the indigenous rights movement dates back to the late 1980s.

Apart from Asia and Africa, Latin America is also an important geographical region with its own ethno-historical background where indigeneity has taken a very significant position in the political sphere. In Chapter 7, Olaf Kaltmeier argues that the Indian question lies at the heart of the political-cultural definition of the Americas, in the process of colonization. The identitarian concept of "Indian" is a colonial intervention and an exercise of epistemological power, subsuming different peoples and empires under a single signifier. Thereby, this classification has been used since colonial times to design ethnic policies of domination. Nevertheless, in order to frame their protests, subaltern actors have frequently made use of this concept, which finds its ultimate expression in the politicization of the indigenous question in the 1990s. Kaltmeier analyzes the different conjunctures of the political use of indigeneity in modern Latin America, from the beginning of the twentieth century to the present. Relying on Latin American postcolonial and cultural studies, the chapter unravels the conjunctures of state-driven inter-American *indigenismo, indianismo,* and indigenous autonomy and pluri-nationality. Finally, Kaltmeier discusses whether the pluri-national redefinition of Andean societies marks a turning point towards the end of coloniality, or whether we face a new conjuncture of colonization based on the closure of the Indian mobilization cycle and the emergence of a regime of accumulation based on appropriation.

In Chapter 8, Gilberto Rescher shows that self-representation is also an important means of indigenous representation that can be considered an alternative approach to the politics of representation adopted by the unitary nation-state. Based on his empirical investigation into public discourses on indigenous people in Mexico, he shows that these frequently emphasize their supposed backwardness, and consequently conceptualize indigenous groups as marginalized and trapped in clientelist relations. However, indigenous villages are localities where local and translocal processes intersect, facilitating social, economic, and political transformations. In Mexico, Rescher argues, indigenous villages normally present themselves as indigenous communities, and these can be seen as an important basis of the political system, because they are conceived as a unit of potential political mobilization in favor of specific political actors. This allegiance was classically thought to be secured in the manner of a clientelist exchange of (state) resources for political loyalty. Though local political actors seldom employ the term indigenous, the communities' representatives allude to relevant imaginaries and views, strategically employing suitable representations in political negotiations through a variety of means. The underlying relative unity of the communities is achieved by social cohesion based as much on several forms of pressure as on a belonging resulting from inter alia day-to-day interactions. The (often prejudiced) views of indigenous communities are embodied by their members and the affiliation is both internally and externally displayed. Indigeneity and representation as consolidated communities are important political resources, even though these groups, far from being homogeneous, are often affected by internal conflicts and power relations. Thus, the social positioning of these indigenous groups initially stays the same. Nevertheless, indigenous communities may use this (self-)representation to promote a transformation of (local) political relations. Party affine organizations that seek to transnationally re-establish networks of political co-optation are also frequently ethnically framed, employing discourses that emphasize a pretended shared ethnic identity. Thus, indigeneity can be both part of practices that enhance political transformations, and a discursive instrument to revive clientelist modes of political interaction.

Indigeneity and the State

Around the world, states always constitute a major stakeholder in the realm of indigeneity, either as promoters of indigenous people or as forces against them. In fact, people who claim (or are claimed) to be

indigenous continuously negotiate their local identity with translocal politics, and their cultural identity with political entanglement. Recognition of indigeneity is therefore said to have challenged the idea of a unitary nation-state that upholds the notions of nation through the minority-exclusionary politics of majority inclusion, which excludes cultural "others" through the spheres of rights and entitlements (see Uddin 2014). Uday Chandra in Chapter 9 discusses the case of Maoists in Jharkhand, India, to illustrate relations between indigeneity and the state. He argues that the Communist Party of India (Maoist), in both its own words and those of its critics, is fighting a revolutionary guerrilla war to overthrow the bourgeois state in India. Yet everyday local realities in their tribal bases show Maoist cadres making claims on the state to raise minimum wages, implement new forest laws, and ensure the timely payment of rural employment guarantee funds. Since 2009, Maoist factions and splinter groups have also routinely campaigned for *adivasi* political parties, such as the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha (JMM), and have even begun contesting state and panchayat elections in scheduled tribe constituencies. By participating in the electoral arena, are Maoist rebels abandoning their radical political project in favor of indigenous politics? Or does the agenda for radical social change spill over into "revisionist" avenues such as elections? To explain this apparently anomalous state of affairs, Chandra proposes the notion of "radical revisionism," encompassing political practices that work within existing democratic structures but push them to the hilt and seek to transform them from below, in the hope of radical democratic futures. He draws on extensive ethnographic fieldwork in central and southern Jharkhand to shed light on the everyday tactics and maneuvers of *adivasi* youth, who, as radical revisionists in Khunti and West Singhbhum districts, abandon the party line and, paradoxically, accentuate the modern state-making process in the tribal margins of modern India. In particular, Chandra focuses on how new political subjectivities, as well as new notions of democratic citizenship, community, and leadership, emerge on the ground.

Within the framework of state–indigeneity relations, Wolfgang Gabbert discusses in Chapter 10 how, since the 1980s, constitutions in several Latin American countries have been reformed to acknowledge the multicultural and ethnically diverse character of the nations and to recognize existing indigenous legal and political practices. Thus, a first step in creating a more accessible and more adequate legal system has been taken. However, these legal reforms touch on a number of practical and theoretical issues related to such fundamentals of social anthropology as the reification of culture and tradition. Gabbert discusses

four of these topics: the political fragmentation of the indigenous populations; their cultural heterogeneity; the relationship between law and social structure; and the incidence of power relations in customary law. He argues that much of the current debate on the recognition of so-called indigenous customary law applies to an earlier model of the nation-state, thereby running the risk of fostering new forms of cultural homogenization and sustaining the current domination by the state over indigenous groups.

Philipp Zehmisch discusses the issue of state and non-state relations in Chapter 11 in relation to the idea of indigeneity, by arguing that discourses, definitions, and practices relating to indigeneity have shifted across time, spaces, and contexts. He understands the term as contingent upon the relationship between the state and non-state actors. Zehmisch captures indigeneity as a dialectical process between essentialist classifications of indigenous groups by authorities, and creative appropriations of such categories by indigenous people themselves. His ethnographic example, the Andaman Islands, serves to demonstrate the trajectory of the notion of indigeneity. Here, popular definitions, representations, and discourses of the British Empire, the Indian nation-state, and the global sphere intersect. The shifting notions are scrutinized by looking at state policies and indigenous–settler dynamics. He highlights how specific spatial arrangements and contact scenarios were interpreted, explained, and described through references to indigeneity. In the Andamans, colonial notions of "savagery" were indicative of indigenous warfare and co-optation at the frontier; they justified the taming and civilizing of "primitive" islanders and their forests through the settling of convicts and "criminal tribes" from the Indian subcontinent. The transformation of ecological "wilderness" into ordered settler colony spaces was executed by "aboriginal" forest laborers: *adivasi* migrants from Chota Nagpur, the Ranchis, and the Karen, a Burmese "hill tribe." After independence, anthropologically informed "tribal" governance led to protection acts, reserve zones, and welfare policies. Parallel to that, forestry, infrastructure development, and migrations degraded indigenous resources and led to violence. More recently, transnational, national, and local civil society actors have appropriated the notion of indigeneity. Conservationists and indigenous activists have promoted their own "ecologically noble savage" agenda when involved in conflicts with the government about the isolation of indigenous peoples; in contrast, local politicians advocate the "mainstreaming" of backward "*junglees*." Beyond that, Ranchi elites are fighting for official recognition of their indigenous status, while the majority of *adivasi* peoples are threatened by eviction due to environ-

mental governance. Such conflicting and fluid characteristics appear to be essential elements of indigenous futures.

Indigenous Knowledge and Its Futures

The idea of indigeneity is quite often discussed within the paradigm of indigenous knowledge, as indigenous peoples have for generations been effectively practicing a particular type of knowledge system that is now recognized as eco-friendlier, more sustainable, and more productive than the modern Westernized developmentalist paradigm (see Sillitoe 1998). Therefore, a deeper understanding of the significance of indigenous knowledge is important to comprehend indigeneity on the move. As part of this debate, the ideas and roles of indigenous medicines have appeared as substitutes for biomedicine because of their effective, lasting, and significant capacity for healing diseases. Therefore, the futures of indigeneity demand a serious discussion on the futures of indigenous medicine, which William Sax addresses with empirically based information and analysis in the postscriptum. It has been argued that although biomedicine (also called "modern medicine," "cosmopolitan medicine," or "allopathy") began as a form of indigenous or local knowledge in Europe, it then transcended its origins and became universal or "cosmopolitan." It is therefore often regarded as a timeless and culture-free form of universal (as opposed to indigenous) knowledge that can be transplanted from place to place without undergoing fundamental change, much like chemistry, physics, or mathematics. Sax argues that, on the contrary, although there may be some heuristic value in describing it as an abstract system divorced from its context, knowledge is in fact always "done": acquired, owned, disputed, implemented, or, as the positivists would have it, "discovered." Knowledge has no ontological status outside the human practices that produce and reproduce it, and such practices are always historical and contextual. Thus, argues Sax, all medicine, including modern cosmopolitan medicine, is "indigenous" at the point of application. Although it is true that in our times, biomedicine is epistemologically, institutionally, and politically dominant, this has to do less with universal and context-free truths than with the circumstances of its dissemination. When we compare what are called "indigenous medicines" (e.g., tribal medicines, traditional healing) with modern biomedicine, we are not comparing a context-bound with a context-free system, because there are no forms of knowledge that are free of context. Rather, we are dealing with what Bruno Latour would call "networks" of different sizes. Sax discusses

and compares several of these networks, focusing on various forms of "traditional" and "religious" healing from Asia, in an attempt to show that their growth in recent decades has much to do with their context dependency.

Conclusion

The book brings together the findings of empirically grounded research from different parts of the world, particularly in the "Global South." Based on various transdisciplinary contexts—anthropology, sociology, political science, psychology, geography, and history—it critically engages with debates on indigeneity and its historical and ideological trajectory, in order to determine its theoretical and political destination. The scholars who have contributed to this book examine the current state of indigeneity as an active force, the potential space of identity in a deterritorialized world, and highlight the scalar and temporal dimensions of indigeneity's sources, contents, and connectedness with related concepts and ideas. When taken together, the book explores the ways in which indigeneity becomes relevant with regard to knowledge, representation, and individually and collectively negotiated "ways of being." With a focus on the politics of identity and belonging, it attempts to offer new frames through which one may understand the relationships of such politics with many contemporary nation-states, and seeks to provide a critical overview of current research on indigeneity. It also identifies the issues that must be addressed in future research and discussions, in order to investigate indigeneity and its role within changing political and economic environments with greater refinement. For this purpose, the contributors to this book reflect upon their research to engage critically in debates on indigeneity, and thus provide solid theoretical and empirical examinations into indigeneity in the globalized world. Much of this revolves around the observation that the recurrent indigenous activism occurring around the world could lend an honorable dignity to struggles to establish rights. This diverse collection attempts to help readers to acquire comprehensive knowledge about contemporary research that has shaped scholarship on indigeneity and indigenous mobility, and to show promising directions for future research.

Nasir Uddin (PhD, Kyoto) is a cultural anthropologist based in Bangladesh, and Professor of Anthropology at Chittagong University. He studied and carried out research at the University of Dhaka, the Uni-

versity of Chittagong, Kyoto University, the University of Hull, Delhi School of Economics, Ruhr-University Bochum, VU University Amsterdam, Heidelberg University, and the London School of Economics (LSE). His research interests include indigeneity and identity politics; dialectics between colonialism and postcolonialism; refugee, statelessness, and citizenship; notions of power and the state in everyday life; the Chittagong Hill Tracts; and South Asia. His latest book is *Life in Peace and Conflict: Indigeneity and State in the Chittagong Hill Tracts* (Orient BlackSwan, 2017).

Eva Gerharz (Dr.phil., Bielefeld) is Junior Professor for Sociology of Development and Internationalization at Ruhr-University Bochum, and Interim Professor of Development Sociology at Bayreuth University from 2017 to 2018. Until 2010, she was a researcher in the Department of Social Anthropology, Faculty of Sociology at Bielefeld University, Germany, and also Associate Scientist at the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), Kathmandu. With a major focus on South Asia (Bangladesh and Sri Lanka), her research deals with indigeneity, ethnicity and conflict, development and reconstruction, political activism, and transnationalism. Eva has published in several academic journals, including *Mobilities, Conflict and Society, Asian Ethnicity*, and *Indigenous Policy Journal*. As well as her monograph, *The Politics of Reconstruction and Development in Sri Lanka* (Routledge, 2014), she has co-edited *Governance, Development and Conflict in South Asia* (Sage, 2015, with Siri Hettige) and *Land, Development and Security in South Asia* (SAMAJ, 2016, with Katy Gardner).

Pradeep Chakkarath (Dr.phil., Konstanz) is a cultural psychologist at Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany, and (together with Jürgen Straub) co-director of the Hans Kilian and Lotte Köhler Centre (KKC) for Cultural Psychology and Historical Anthropology. He is a lecturer at universities in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, Editor in Chief of the German journal *psychosozial*, and a fellow alumnus of the Center of Excellence at the University of Konstanz, Germany. He was a visiting professor at the Université Evangélique du Cameroun. After having completed his Master's degree in philosophy and history and his PhD in psychology, he conducted cross-cultural research on children's development and parent–child relationships with an emphasis on Asian–European comparisons. Currently, his main interests are in human development from an interdisciplinary perspective, the history and methodology of the social sciences, and the indigenous psychology approach.

Notes

1. See http://www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f04e10.html (accessed 16 March 2017).
2. See http://www.culturalsurvival.org/news/none/un-tracks-progress-second-international-decade-world-s-indigenous-people (accessed 16 March 2017).
3. Beth Conklin and Laura Graham explain that continuous media reporting on global warming, declining biodiversity, and deforestation brought, for example, the plight of local Amazon Indians and their conflict over natural resources to the attention of a broader international audience (see Conklin and Graham 1995).

Bibliography

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* Minneapolis, MN and London: Minnesota University Press.

———. 2006. *Fear of Small Numbers: An Essay on the Geography of Anger.* Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Baber, Zaheer. 2002. "Orientalism, Occidentalism, Nativism: The Culturalist Quest for Indigenous Science and Knowledge." *The European Legacy* 7: 747–58.

Bal, Ellen. 2007. *They Ask if We Eat Frog: Garo Ethnicity in Bangladesh.* Leiden: International Institute for Asian Studies.

Barnard, Alan. 2006. "Kalahari Revisionism, Vienna and the Indigenous Poeples Debate." *Social Anthropology* 14(1): 1–16.

Baviskar, Amita. 2006. "The Politics of Being 'Indigenous'." In *Indigeneity in India,* ed. Bengt G. Karlsson and Tanka B. Subba, 33–50. London: Kegan Paul.

Béteille, André. 1998. "The Idea of Indigenous People." *Current Anthropology* 39(2): 187–92.

Boyer, Dominic. 2009. "Making (Sense of) News in the Era of Digital Information." In *The Anthropology of News and Journalism: Global Perspectives,* ed. S. Elizabeth Bird, 241–256. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Boyer, Dominic. 2012. "From Media Anthropology to the Anthropology of Mediation." In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology,* ed. Richard Fardon, Oliva Harris, Trevor Marchand, Cris Shore, Veronica Strang, Richard Wilson, Mark Nuttall, 383–392. London et al.: Sage.

Bruchac, Margaret, Siobhan Hart, and H. Martin Wobst (eds). 2010. *Indigenous Archaeologies: A Reader on Decolonization.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast.

Cadena, Marisol de la, and Orin Starn (eds). 2007. *Indigenous Experience Today.* New York: Berg.

Chakkarath, Pradeep. 2012. "The Role of Indigenous Psychologies in the Building of Basic Cultural Psychology." In *The Oxford Handbook of Culture and Psychology,* ed. J. Valsiner, 71–95. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chakkarath, Pradeep. 2013. "Indian Thoughts on Psychological Human Development." In *Psychology and Psychoanalysis* (Vol. XIII, Part 3, of *History of Sci-*

ence, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilization), ed. G. Misra, 167–190. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.
Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2002. *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Clifford, James. 2013. *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-First Century.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Conklin, Beth A., and Laura A. Graham. 1995. "The Shifting Middle Ground: Amazonian Indians and Eco-Politics." *American Anthropologist* 97(4): 695–710.
Cowan, Jane K. 2001. "Ambiguities of an Emancipatory Discourse: The Making of a Macedonian Minority in Greece." In *Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives,* ed. Jane K. Cowan, Marie-Bénédicte Dembour, and Richard Wilson, 172–176. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
Dev, Nathan, Govind Kelkar, and Pierre Walter (eds). 2004. *Globalization and Indigenous People in Asia: Changing the Local-Global Interface.* Thousand Oaks, CA and London: Sage.
Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Esteva, Gustavo and Prakash, Madhu. 1998. *Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures.* London and New York: Zed Books.
Ferguson, James. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development" Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho.* Minneapolis, MN and London: University of Minnesota Press.
Forte, Maximilian C. 2010. *Indigenous Cosmopolitans: Transnational and Transcultural Indigeneity in the Twenty-First Century.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
Gellner, David. 2011. "Belonging, Indigeneity, Rites, and Rights: The Newar Case." In *The Politics of Belonging in the Himalayas,* ed. Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and Gérard Toffin, 45–76. Delhi: Sage.
Gerharz, Eva. 2012. "Approaching Indigenous Activism from the Ground Up: Experiences from Bangladesh." In *Beyond Methodological Nationalism: Research Methodologies for Cross-Border Studies,* ed. Anna Amelina et al., 129–154. London: Routledge.
Gerharz, Eva. 2014. "Recognising Indigenous People, the Bangladeshi Way: The United Nations Declaration for Indigenous People's Rights, Transnational Activism and the Constitutional Amendment Affair of 2011." *Indigenous Policy Journal* 24(4): 64–79.
Ghosh, Kaushik. 2006. "Between Global Flows and Local Dams: Indigenousness, Locality and the Transnational Sphere in Jharkhand, India." *Cultural Anthropology* 21(4): 501–34.
Hodgson, Dorothy. 2011. *Being Maasai, Becoming Indigenous: Postcolonial Politics in a Neoliberal World.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Karlsson, Bengt. 2011. *Unruly Hills: A Political Ecology of India's Northeast.* New York: Berghahn Books.
Karlsson, Bengt, and Tanka B. Subba (eds). 2006. *Indigeneity in India.* London: Kegan Paul.
Kenrick, Justin, and Jerome Lewis. 2004. "Indigenous Peoples' Rights and the Politics of the Term 'Indigenous'." *Anthropology Today* 20(2): 4–9.

Khoury, Seif Da'Na, and Laura Khoury. 2013. "Geopolitics of Knowledge: Constructing an Indigenous Sociology from the South." *International Review of Modern Sociology* 39: 1–28.

Kuper, Adam. 2003. "The Return of the Native." *Current Anthropology* 44(3): 389–402.

Laungaramsri, Pinkaew. 2002. *Redefining Nature: Karen Ecological Knowledge and the Challenge to the Modern Conservation Paradigm.* Chennai: Earthworm Books.

Laurie, Nina, Robert Andolina, and Sarah Radcliffe. 2005. "Ethnodevelopment: Social Movements, Creating Experts and Professionalising Indigenous Knowledge in Ecuador." *Antipode* 37(3): 470–96.

Li, Tania Murray. 2010. "Indigeneity, Capitalism, and the Management of Dispossession." *Current Anthropology* 51(3): 385–414.

Linkenbach, Antje. 2004. "Lokales Wissen im Entwicklungsdiskurs: Abwertung, Aneignung oder Anerkennung des Anderen?" In *Lokales Wissen: Sozialwissenschaftliche Perspektiven,* ed. Nikolaus Schareika and Thomas Bierschenk, 233–57. Münster: Lit.

Merlan, Francesca. 2009. "Indigeneity: Global and Local." *Current Anthropology* 50(3): 303–33.

Miller, Daniel. 2011. *Tales from Facebook.* Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.

Molyneux, Maxine, and Marilyn Thomson. 2011. "Cash Transfers, Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia." *Gender & Development* 19(2): 195–212.

Morgan, Gordon. 1997. *Toward an American Sociology: Questioning the European Construct.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Muehlebach, Andrea. 2001. "'Making Place' at the United Nations: Indigenous Cultural Politics at the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations." *Cultural Anthropology* 16(3): 415–48.

Pelican, Michaela. 2009. "Complexities of Indigeneity and Autochthony: An African Example." *American Ethnologist* 36(1): 149–62.

Pfaff-Czarnecka, Joanna, and Gérard Toffin. 2011. "Introduction: Belonging and Multiple Attachments in Contemporary Himalayan Societies." In *The Politics of Belonging in the Himalayas: Local Attachments and Boundary Dynamics,* ed. Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and Gérard Toffin, xi–xxxviii. New Delhi: Sage.

Randeria, Shalini. 2003. "Cunning States and Unaccountable International Institutions: Legal Plurality, Social Movements and Rights of Local Communities to Common Property Resources." *European Journal of Sociology* 44(1): 27–60.

Ruttenberg, Tara. 2013. "Wellbeing Economics and Buen Vivir: Development Alternatives for Inclusive Human Security." *PRAXIS: The Fletcher Journal of Human Security* 68(28): 68–92.

Rycroft, Daniel J., and Sangeeta Dasgupta (eds). 2011. *The Politics of Belonging in India: Becoming Adivasi.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Schüttpelz, Erhard. 2007. "Ein absoluter Begriff. Zur Genealogie und Karriere des Netzwerkbegriffs." In *Vernetzte Steuerung: Soziale Prozesse im Zeitalter technischer Netzwerke*, ed. Stefan Kaufmann, 25–46. Zürich: Chronos.

Scott, James. 2009. *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shah, Alpa. 2010. *In the Shadows of the State: Indigenous Politics, Environmentalism, and Insurgency in Jharkhand, India.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Sillitoe, Paul. 1998. "The Development of Indigenous Knowledge: A New Applied Anthropology." *Current Anthropology* 39(2): 223–52.
Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples,* 2nd ed. London and New York: Zed Books.
Snively, Gloria, and John Corsiglia. 2001. "Discovering Indigenous Science: Implications for Science Education." *Science Education* 85: 6–34.
Uddin, Nasir. 2014. "Paradigm of 'Better Life': 'Development' among the Khumi in the Chittagong Hill Tracts." *Asian Ethnicity* 15(1): 62–77.
Venkateswar, Sita, and Emma Hughes. 2011. *The Politics of Indigeneity: Dialogues and Reflections on Indigenous Activism.* London and New York: Zed Books.
Verran, Helen. 2001. *Science and an African Logic.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Villalba, Unai. 2013. "Buen Vivir vs. Development: A Paradigm Shift in the Andes?" *Third World Quarterly* 34(8): 1,427–42.
Warren, Kay B., and Jean E. Jackson. 2003. *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
Ziai, Aram. 2013. "The Discourse of 'Development' and Why the Concept Should Be Abandoned." *Development in Practice* 23(1): 123–36.