Anthropologies of the United States

Jessica R. Cattelino

Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90095;
email: jesscatt@anthro.ucla.edu

Key Words

American cultures, location work, cultural critique, settler colonialism

Abstract

This article reviews recent research in sociocultural anthropology that
has been conducted in and about the United States. I show that an-
thropologists of the United States have been concerned to locate the
anthropological field in three ways: spatial investigations of region, com-
munity, and territory; epistemological and methodological projects of
cultural critique and defamiliarization; and reconsideration of the place
of Native North America in the anthropology of the United States.
Emergent inquiry into settler colonialism and the politics of indigeneity
has the potential to strengthen the anthropology of the United States
by accounting for the ways that being a settler society structures all
American lives.

INTRODUCTION

This article reviews research in sociocultural anthropology that has been conducted in and about the United States since Moffatt's (1992) review. Focusing on the United States risks reinforcing nation-state boundaries, but I take the nation-state and its borders less as givens than as objects of analysis. I show that anthropologists of the United States have been concerned to locate the anthropological field (as discipline, ethnographic site, and theoretical domain) in three ways. First, they have undertaken spatial projects that include regional ethnographies, community studies, and explorations of American power at and beyond U.S. borders. Second, epistemological and methodological projects have located Americanist anthropology in cultural critique and defamiliarization. A third area is emergent: ethnographic research that locates Native North America not as distinct from the anthropology of the United States but rather as critical to it.

Americanist anthropology[1]—the anthropology of the United States—uniquely affords the opportunity to examine the discipline's location work. By "location-work," Gupta & Ferguson (1997) refer to the "idea that anthropology's distinctive trademark might be found not in its commitment to 'the local' but in its attentiveness to epistemological and political issues of location" (p. 39). I undertake location work by outlining the contributions of U.S.-based research to the discipline of anthropology and to critical thinking about American cultures.

The cultural anthropology in and of the United States is long-standing and vast, and omissions are unavoidable. Indeed, exceptionalist discourse about Americanist anthropology's novelty or marginality should be put to rest. In this review, ethnographies are the major sources, supplemented by theoretical

_____

[1]For reasons of interest below, the "Americanist tradition" has referred to the anthropological study of Native North America, with emphasis on its four-field approach (Fogelson 1999).

and methodological writings about Americanist anthropology.

AMERICAN GEOGRAPHIES

Anthropologists often organize studies by space, but this practice does not necessarily lead to the naturalization of cultural boundedness. Instead, scholars in and of the United States have investigated the spatialization of the nation-state and citizenship through migration, the production and ideology of localized community, the racialization of place, the cultural politics of environment and the public/private distinction, and the operation of American power and cultural forms beyond U.S. borders.

Movement and Migration

Migration studies can challenge or reinforce static conceptions of national space. Many recent studies of migration to the United States criticize early work for either reifying the "there" and the "here" or for presuming that individuals migrate across spaces but retain unexamined identities in the course of doing so (Rouse 1995). Recent anthropology has turned away from studying assimilation to show how migrant subjects are produced by law and politics and, conversely, how migration constitutes nation-state borders and citizenship.

Law and citizenship figure centrally. Coutin's (2000) study of Salvadoran "legalizing moves" in the United States points to the importance of law as regulating movement and borders and as carving out the substance of being American. De Genova ties migration to spatialized nationalism and the production of illegality; his study of "Mexican Chicago" (2005) aims to resignify the boundaries of nation in an iconic American city.

None of these authors reduces migration to legal processes. Ong shows that, although flexibility has been a privileged dimension of citizenship and subjectivity for transnational elites (1999), Asian immigrants are institutionally and differentially rendered more black or white within American racial hierarchies

(2003; see also Park 1996). Fader's (2009) study of child socialization and language among Hasidic women and girls analyzes a form of illiberal (and yet sometimes multiculturalist) religiosity that challenges standard American immigration narratives. Pérez's ethnography of Puerto Rican migration to the mainland (2004), like Manalansan's (2003) of Filipino gay men in New York City, shows gender and sexuality to organize migration. Pérez documents women's "kin work" (di Leonardo 1992) that maintains transnational networks.

Peoples and Places

Within U.S. borders, anthropological topics and subjects can become pinned to locations. When associations of people with place become patterned, they distort demographic distributions. More importantly, they (inadvertently) reinforce policy decisions that distribute economic and cultural resources unequally across American spaces. For example, as Morgen & Maskovsky (2003) note, poverty studies are conducted more often in urban than in rural contexts (with the exception of Appalachia; see also Goode & Maskovsky 2001 on poverty). Generally, post–World War II anthropologists have deemphasized rural America (Adams 2007) and have associated it with whiteness [but see Stack (1996) on African Americans returning "home" to the rural South and Kosek (2006) on Hispanos and the politics of nature in northern New Mexico]. By contrast, studies of African American, Asian American, Latino, and ethnicized white communities are most often based in urban neighborhoods.

American Indians are strongly associated with the reservation, even though the majority live in urban areas. Ramirez (2007) counters the dominant scholarly view that urban indigenous people are displaced by celebrating urban "hubs" that connect indigenous peoples and places. Biolsi (2005) and Wagoner (2002) analyze indigenous places in spaces of overlap with non-Indians. Simpson (2003) examines Mohawk nationalism in border crossing between the United States and Canada. Even

reservation-based ethnographies need not take for granted the space of the reservation. Basso's (1996) "ethnography of lived topographies" (p. 111) among Western Apaches shows how speaking about places and with place-names creates moral imperatives, histories, and place itself.

Community studies are an old tradition in the anthropology of the United States, and they cement a disciplinary affinity with qualitative sociology (especially urban studies; see, e.g., Sanjek 1998) that dates at least to Lynd & Lynd's *Middletown* (1929) and Warner's *Yankee City* (1941–1959). Early studies generally overstated the representativeness of their samples for an analysis of American society and culture (for a critique, see Lassiter et al. 2004). Nonetheless, they identified themes in American life that have proven enduring, such as the relationships among religion, individualism, and community (for studies of New Age spirituality, faith-based activism, and ex-gay conversion, respectively, see Brown 1997, Elisha 2008, and Erzen 2006). Over time, clusters form of geographically based studies (a recent example is Silicon Valley: see English-Lueck 2002 on technology and the dilemmas of cultural complexity; Ramirez 2007, Shankar 2008, and Zlolniski 2006).

Some anthropologists undertake community studies in which they examine the relationship between identity and place for racially marked Americans. Working against associations of people of color with bounded place, they analyze the commitments that create and maintain places such as Desi Land in Silicon Valley (Shankar 2008) or Black Corona in Queens, New York (Gregory 1998). Jackson (2001) explores the idea and observational terrain of "Harlemworld": He analyzes how, when, and under which conditions Harlem residents understand race to be performative (see also Kondo 1997), and he (2005) argues for the analytical and descriptive value of racial sincerity relative to racial authenticity. Stoller (2002) globalizes Harlem in an ethnography of West African traders who market to African Americans. Goldschmidt (2006)

argues that African Americans understand difference on the basis of race, and Hasidic Jews on the basis of religion, in their shared neighborhood of Crown Heights, Brooklyn. A tradition follows Stack (1974) in humanizing the agentive residents of poor and racially marked neighborhoods (e.g., Bourgois 1995 on drug dealing; Bourgois & Schonberg 2009 on addiction; Wojcicka Sharff 1998). Newman (1999, 2008) explores strategies of the working poor in Harlem and connects these to shifting federal and local policy. Newton (1993) charts the work of creating a gay and lesbian town.

Some community studies, more than others, go beyond a case-study approach to raise analytical questions of broader interest. Gregory (1998) and Stewart (1996), for example, interrogate space as process and possibility while engaging the legacy of neighborhood and region, respectively, in American scholarship and cultural politics. For Gregory (1998), "community describes not a static, place-based social collective but the power-laden field of social relations whose meanings, structures, and frontiers are continually produced, contested, and reworked in relation to a complex range of sociopolitical attachments and antagonisms" (p. 11). He analyzes how, for example, a neighborhood clean-up "reworked the racialized economy of space" (p. 127). Hartigan (1999) shows how the racial identities of—and racial ascriptions by—whites in Detroit are situated by class and spatial positions (on whiteness see Brodkin Sacks 1998, Frankenberg 1993). Dávila's (2004) study of the "cultural politics of urban space" (p. 2) in gentrifying East Harlem points to a contradiction whereby Puerto Rican culture is commodified as the basis for neighborhood revitalization even while race and ethnicity are delegitimized as bases for political claims to representation and equality. Doukas (2003) locates community in and against the history of U.S. corporate expansion.

Community is a cultural category in the United States. Ortner (1997) moves away from community studies to investigate the "post-community," arguing that "the fate of 'communities' is precisely one of the issues at stake

in contemporary American society" (p. 62). Greenhouse et al. (1994) examine the myth of community and the role of law as an available discourse for Americans to talk about community. Ortner's (2003) ethnography of class and culture among her New Jersey high-school classmates investigates the production and dispersion of community in modern America. As these and other scholars show, anthropological research can retain the benefits of community studies while querying the shifting historical and spatial contours of community in the United States.

The Cultural Politics of American Places

Anthropology has the power to name spatial and cultural units where they might otherwise remain invisible or disconnected. Doing so is political. For example, in a social history of debt, Williams (2004) insists on seeing the connections within a single economy between creditors and debtors and between credit card holders who carry no balance and those whose steep interest rate payments make easy credit possible for the former. Others orient readers to social movements as units: Morgen (2002), for example, argues that the national story of the women's health movement must be told via local groups (see also Durrenberger & Erem 2005 on the labor movement). Valentine (2007) tracks the emergence of transgender as a social category.

Americanist anthropologists increasingly take environment as an object of social analysis. Checker (2005) tracks the relationship between civil rights and environmentalism in environmental justice claims by African American residents of a polluted neighborhood in Georgia (see also Brodkin 2009). Sayre (2002) combines political ecology with ethnography to show how environmentalists in southern Arizona misplaced blame for the decline of masked bobwhite populations on cattle ranching rather than on cattle and real estate speculation (see also Sheridan 2007). Kosek's (2006) study of race, class, nation,

and the political life of forests in New Mexico suggests that, at least in some regions, "nature has been the primary target through which bodies and populations—both human and nonhuman—have been governed, and it has been the primary site through which institutions of governance have been formed and operated" (p. 25). These ethnographies reveal the politics of nature's production in America.

Anthropologists often couple analysis of the domestic sphere with a critique of the public/private distinction, including with regard to labor (Lamphere et al. 1993) and homelessness (Dehavenon 1996). Others analyze the race, class, and gender dimensions of home and its defense, from neighborhood governance (Ruben & Maskovsky 2008) to domestic violence control (Merry 2001) to the growth of gated communities (Low 2003; see also Chesluk 2007 on the redevelopment of New York's Times Square). Rapp & Ginsburg (2001) chart forms of citizenship and kinship produced around the public circulation of representations of disability (on disability see Frank 2000, Landsman 2008; on kinship formations, see Franklin & McKinnon 2001, Gailey 2010, Lewin 1993). Stewart (2007) captures aspects of ordinary life in America that often go overlooked, including attachments and ways of affecting and being "affected" (p. 2) that create "little worlds" (p. 109) of shifting coherence and composition.

The United States beyond Nation-State Borders

An exciting possibility for location work extends Americanist research beyond U.S. borders. I do not refer to globalization generally but rather to analyses that stretch the ethnographic investigation of the United States to American formations elsewhere. Maskovsky (2009) argued that "we must first and foremost take seriously the postcolonial critique of area studies' complicity with imperialism and place U.S. empire at the center of analysis" (p. 6). This charge is important. In addition to empire, however, there is room to analyze other modes by which American cultural forms move beyond nation-state boundaries with, for example, military action, rule of law, U.S.-based nongovernmental organizations, American expatriots, and U.S. corporations abroad.

An obvious starting point is the military. Including Gill's (2004) study of the School of the Americas as an instrument of U.S. imperialism in the spread of an "American way of life" (p. 8) and Lutz's (2001) ethnography of the "homefront" at Fort Bragg, this work reconsiders the relationship between home and abroad, state and community, culture and power. Gusterson's (1996) study of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory articulates national with international culture and politics, as nuclear science exerts "downward pressures" on American culture and as family relations, religion, class, and gender exert "upward pressures" on nuclear practice and policy (p. 223). Masco (2006) argues that Manhattan Project nuclear scientists created not only new technology and changing global-local configurations but also new forms of national consciousness. Price's histories of anthropology in World War II (2008) and the Cold War (2004) show how military engagement produced the area studies institutions that shape the discipline. Americanist scholars are beginning to investigate overseas military bases (Lutz 2009). Vine (2009) tells the story of residents displaced by the legally murky establishment of a U.S. and British military installation on Diego Garcia. Silliman (2008) connects U.S. frontier ideology to overseas warfare through metaphors of American Indians that are deployed by the U.S. military in the Middle East.

Similar work on U.S.-based multinational corporations and business practice focuses less on generalized processes of globalization than on the circulation of particular American cultural forms (see, e.g., Zaloom 2006 on commodities traders in Chicago and London). In line with Susser (1996) and Collins (2003), industrial workers for American-owned companies domiciled outside U.S. borders can be understood as an expansion of the domestic labor force and as potentially altering the cultural logics of work and poverty in America.

Chapters in Maskovsky & Susser (2009) examine the "internal costs of empire." Similarly, Morgen & Maskovsky (2003) urge anthropologists to position U.S. welfare reform policy in relation to global economic processes. Such projects facilitate new analyses of American space, power, and cultural production.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL LOCATIONS

Americanist anthropology can destabilize or reinforce the discipline's epistemological foundations: There is no intrinsic effect of Americanist research on knowledge production. Nonetheless, there are identifiable tendencies. These include cultural critique, concern with the circulation and positioning of anthropological knowledge, and a rethinking of the relationship between theory and data. Before turning to these themes, it is helpful to identify relevant disciplinary traditions.

Disciplinary Traditions

Anthropological research in the United States is widespread and longstanding. Moffatt (1992) explained the growth of Americanist research beginning in the 1980s as the effect of postcolonial critiques of anthropology, interdisciplinarity, and declining funding for international research (p. 205). Additionally, my review of the literature suggests that increasing numbers of women in the discipline contributed to the growth of U.S.-based research, especially second book projects. Yet U.S.-based research is hardly new. Oft-forgotten anthropological research in the United States—by Boasians or urban anthropologists working with the Chicago School of Sociology, at field schools in Indian Country, and in other traditions—was especially prominent prior to World War II. I do not intend to review this history except to cite two imperatives put forth by di Leonardo (1998). She insists on contextualizing anthropology's intellectual history with reference to American political and economic history, and she calls for Americanist anthropologists to undertake interdisciplinary training akin to that of colleagues who work elsewhere.

Anthropological research may or may not theorize America as such. De Genova (2007) follows Marcus (1999) in arguing that anthropology in the United States has not added up to an anthropology of the United States. De Genova pins this absence on American exceptionalism, anthropologists' failure to think of the United States as just another nation-state, and the ongoing existence of blinders to American empire. One might add another view: that scholars have been reluctant to generalize about the United States, perhaps because they are attuned to the dual pitfalls of transferring the anthropological gaze from foreign to "domestic exotics" (di Leonardo 1998) and of allowing white "heartland" communities to stand for America (on identity in America, see Baker 2004). De Genova's solution is to emphasize political economy, but anthropologists of the United States can also take another turn: from reified culture to the study of cultural activism (Ginsburg 2002; see also Checker & Fishman 2004 and Harding 1999) and cultural production. By refusing to oppose structural analysis to cultural critique, an analysis of cultural production can approach questions about capitalism and inequality in domains such as high fashion (Kondo 1997), film making (Ginsburg 2002), rock and roll (Mahon 2004) and country music (Fox 2004), museums (Clifford 1997, Erikson & Wachendorf 2002, Handler & Gable 1997), and magazines (Lutz & Collins 1993). Stewart (1996) presents an arresting account of cultural production and poetics that unsettles realist narratives of Appalachia and America.

Cultural Critique

Along with exploring the production of culture, anthropologists have engaged in cultural critique that defamiliarizes the taken-for-granted in contemporary American life. Marcus & Fischer (1986) contended that anthropologists generally venture afar with "marginal or hidden agendas of critique of their own culture, namely, the bourgeois, middle-class life of mass liberal societies, which industrial capitalism has produced" (p. 111). Written into their analysis

was a (descriptive, but also normalizing) vision of which—and whose—America stood in relation to other places and peoples. Despite that limit, they rightly called for more rigorous cultural analysis of American culture, noting that cross-cultural juxtaposition relies on careful study in both places, and they identified a long tradition of epistemological critique. Marcus & Fischer identified the most promising agents of cultural critique as anthropologists whose previous research was located elsewhere, not in the United States (p. 113). Ginsburg (2006), however, argues that there is a recent trend in American-educated anthropologists who train to work in the United States.

What can anthropologists first trained to conduct research in the United States contribute to epistemological critique and cross-cultural juxtaposition? First, such a project—what one might call first-instance Americanist anthropology—has the potential to produce rigorous analysis of American cultures, political economy, and history that often is presumed rather than developed in cultural critique. If interdisciplinary and ethnographically grounded, first-instance Americanist anthropology should challenge the class and race presumptions prevalent in cultural critique. To put it another way, we must question what constitutes the familiar that is supposedly defamiliarized through cultural critique. Second, first-instance Americanists should bring to interdisciplinary American Studies a comparative engagement with the ethnographic record, not forgoing but rather relying on—and contributing to—the discipline's distinctive modes of empirical research and theorization.

An important example of cultural critique has been the study of gender. Inspired by the women's movement, feminist anthropologists in the 1970s and 1980s spread across the globe to establish an ethnographic record of global gender variation and differently gendered power relations. The resulting record was of great importance to feminist theory and practice. Meanwhile, anthropologists of the United States examined a range of topics that included gender negotiation (Ginsburg & Tsing 1990)

and the transformative potential of theorizing reproduction (Ginsburg & Rapp 1994; see also Ragoné 1994, Rapp 1999). The politics of gender and reproduction in the United States influenced research elsewhere, which in turn shaped their investigation in the United States.

In one mode of cultural critique, anthropologists have located America in the identification of forms of knowledge or naturalized domains of social life—e.g., market economy and neoliberal economic theory—that are associated with the United States. For example, in ethnographies of investment bankers and commodities traders, respectively, Ho (2009) and Zaloom (2006) show that the association of the market with (raced, classed, and gendered) America reinforces U.S. global power and restructures American corporations, ideologies of success, and inequalities (see also Martin 1994 on flexible bodies). In the United States, markets are models for social relations and exchange practices, from garage sales (Herrmann 1997) to alternative forms of currency (Maurer 2005). "American consumer culture," as Chin (2001) argues in her examination of African American youth consumption, is not only an arena for working out social inequality but also a measure of social value (see also Jain 2006 on injury and product safety law). Dávila (2001) shows how marketing to Latinos is implicated in hierarchies of race, culture, and nation. In her analysis of the cultural politics of manic depression, Martin (2007) demonstrates mania's historical affinity with a U.S. neoliberal economic order that privileges flexibility, creativity, and productivity.

Circulation and Position

Americanist research raises questions of broader significance about the force and movement of anthropological ideas (Brettell 1993). di Leonardo 1998 (see also Baker 1998) offers a trenchant critique of how anthropological knowledge circulates in ways that create power inequalities. She cautions against the "anthropological gambit" (1998, p. 57), by which scholars deploy irony, humor, or

sentimentality to imply that "we" really are like "them" (where who counts as "we" reinscribes privilege).

Debates over conducting anthropological research at home went on for decades and seem to have run out of steam with recognition of the field's epistemic and demographic multiplicity. Rather than arguing about subject positions and objectivity, anthropologists are now more likely to discuss specific at-home fieldwork dilemmas. These include pressure to convert or adhere to Christianity (Harding 1999) or Hasidic Judaism (Fader 2009), the politics of desire and subjective instability in interracial fieldwork (Chin 2006), the space of cultural biography alongside autobiography (Frank 2000), or the imperative for public action to accompany theorization of concepts such as racism and antiracism (Mullings 2005). Maurer (2005) takes the epistemological correspondence between anthropological description and everyday theories of money as an opportunity to explore the ethics and politics of anthropological method. Going beyond commonplace reflexivity, Jackson (2005) adopts a superhero avatar ("Anthroman") to engage creatively the positional and performative dimensions of fieldwork while theorizing class and racial performativity.

Theory as Cultural Resource and Practice

Americanist research encounters recursive risks and evidentiary potential when deploying social theory that is produced in American and European academies. Moffatt (1992) noted that "folk forms" of scholarly concepts circulate in American culture and that those concepts are themselves drawn from "the common culture" (p. 222). I raise a different but related question: What if anthropologists attend to theory as part of the cultural repertoire available for social scientific analysis? Is social theory also data for anthropologists of the United States?

Anthropologists have grappled with the status of non-Western theory and with the challenge of deploying culturally inflected Euro-American social theory to analyze other peoples' lives. Americanist anthropology, by contrast, risks deploying theory that is produced within American cultural arenas without attending to the potential for autoreinforcement when concepts are used to explain proximate social lives and imaginaries. What if Americanists considered social theory to be a form of cultural production? Harrison (2008), among others, reminds us that the terrain of theory in the United States is already structured by race and class. Many have examined the cultures of science, technology, and medicine in the United States (e.g., Dumit 2004; Kelty 2008; Martin 1994, 2007; Rapp 1999; Saunders 2009), and a number of researchers (e.g., Helmreich 1998, Masco 2006) have demonstrated the cultural embeddedness and impact of scientific investigation. In addition to undertaking a located cultural analysis of social theory, Americanist anthropologists can build theory at its creative ethnographic edge.

Anthropologies of the United States do not categorically shake the epistemological foundations of a discipline whose dominant modalities have been familiarization and defamiliarization. The contingency of Americanist anthropologies' effects suggests that it is time to set aside the question of what changes with an anthropology of the United States (as if change were inevitable) and instead to ask what anthropologies of the United States can change, and how.

CONDITIONS OF INDIGENEITY AND SETTLER COLONIALISM

Of all location work undertaken by Americanist anthropologists, perhaps none has been so vexed as the relationship to Indian country. Emergent inquiry into settler colonialism and the politics of indigeneity has the potential to strengthen the anthropology of the United States by accounting for the ways that being a settler society structures all American lives. Such an approach can enhance the anthropology of Native North America by identifying the ongoing conditions and limits of settler colonialism while also attending to forms of indigenous political and cultural distinctiveness.

By "conditions of indigeneity," I mean both the everyday conditions of indigenous peoples' lives and also the structures that condition indigeneity in the contemporary world. Anthropologists, in general, wisely resist debates about who is really indigeneous in favor of analyzing claims and practices of indigeneity under changing historical conditions. In recent years, scholarly attention in the Anglophone settler states (especially Australia, New Zealand, and Canada) has turned to settler colonialism as a distinct configuration of citizenship, territory, economy, and cultural politics.

Near, and Yet So Far

The anthropology of the United States and the anthropology of Native North America have been maintained largely as separate anthropological traditions. For example, Moffat defined the scope of his review as follows: "American in this article means 'of the continental United States [excluding native American peoples]'" (Moffatt 1992, p. 205n1, brackets in original). Native America's marginal status in the anthropology of the United States (combined with its ongoing legitimacy as a distinct site of anthropological study) reflected and reinforced the positioning of indigenous peoples as outside the time and space of modern American life. Perhaps for related reasons, Deloria's trenchant critique of "anthros" (1988 [1969]), in combination with efforts by Native communities to gain control over their representation and knowledge production, led to some research restrictions and generated scholarly reflections on the ethics, politics, and subjective positioning of anthropological research in Indian country (e.g., Biolsi & Zimmerman 1997, Field 2008, Medicine 2001, Simpson 2007, Starn 2004, Whiteley 1998).

My goal is neither to revisit these questions of history and method nor to review generally the recent research on indigenous peoples in the United States (for the latter, see Strong 2005; see also Kan & Strong 2006). Nor am I simply criticizing anthropologists of the United States for failing to include Indian country.

Instead, I consider the location work that is accomplished by analyzing the United States and Native North America in terms of settler colonialism and the politics of indigeneity. To analyze the United States as a settler society is not to displace other conceptualizations (e.g., as a former slave state or an ongoing site of migration) but rather to capture the complexity of American political, economic, and cultural formations.

Before turning to this conceptual terrain, it is vital to recognize that a number of anthropologists have treated indigenous communities neither as outside of the time and space of the United States nor as laboratories for the study of acculturation. For example, Blu's (2001 [1980]) study of Lumbee identity and racial formation during the Civil Rights era took Lumbee political activity to be the outcome of combined internal and outsider ideas of who Lumbees are. Sider (2003, updating an earlier study published in 1993) showed Lumbee identity to be inextricably bound up with inequalities produced by the state and capital. A number of anthropologists have examined how American Indian blood reckoning both participates in American racial logics and also is contoured by the specificity of Indian claims to tribal sovereignty and nationhood (Strong & Van Winkle 1996, Sturm 2002; see also Kauanui 2008 for a historical account of Hawaiian blood and sovereignty).

Others have centered Native America in the racial and geopolitical organization of U.S. society and anthropological inquiry. Baker (2010) argues that concepts of culture first developed by anthropologists of Native North America formed the template for anthropological theories of race deployed in subsequent debates over "the Negro problem." De Genova (2006) contends that Native American racialization is the "ideological template" (p. 10) for Latino and Asian racialization. Although powerful, his model relies on an overly restrictive account of indigenous peoples as foreign. Borneman (1995), likewise, centers Native Americans in his history of anthropology as "foreign policy" arguing that the discipline has always been

concerned with the foreign and paradigmatically with the Indian (who subsequently became domesticated, after which anthropology moved overseas). Nonetheless, as Native American Studies scholars have shown (e.g., Deloria 1998), American Indians have long been part of settler American domestic imaginaries (and especially of American exceptionalism): Indigenous peoples can form or threaten the boundaries of citizenship and sovereignty in settler states (see also Biolsi 2005, Simpson 2003). If, as Borneman (1995) argues, "anthropology's unique location from which it makes continued contributions to knowledge" is "[f]ieldwork among the foreign" (p. 669), where does this leave Americanist anthropology? Shifting the anthropological focus to settler colonialism brings into view new ethnographic and analytical questions about politics, sovereignty, economy, and representation in the United States.

Politics

Relatively little research focused on the politics of indigeneity until after the Red Power movement and the indigenous critique of anthropology forced a reorganization of the anthropology of Indian country (but see Blu 2001 [1980]). Some anthropologists have addressed federal Indian law and policy on Indian reservations (e.g., Biolsi 1992, 2001; Miller 2001; Richland 2008). Nesper's (2002) ethnography of the "walleye wars" over Ojibwe treaty rights provides an account not only of political conflict with whites but also of political organizing and internal diversity within Ojibwe communities. Fowler (2002) explores Cheyenne-Arapaho political consciousness and practice in the context of federal self-determination policy (whereby federally recognized tribal governments administered tribal social services). Blu (2001), Cramer (2005), and Miller (2003) have explored the racial, legal, and regional politics of recognition whereby some but not other indigenous groups can gain federal acknowledgment as (semi)sovereigns. Merry's (2000) historical ethnography of law, culture, and colonization in Hawai'i explores the "civilizing process" (p. 8)

whereby Euro-American law became a marker of sovereignty to which Hawaiians appealed as evidence of nationhood. Some of these works point the way toward an analysis of the everyday practices and structures of feeling (see O'Nell 1996 on depression) entailed by the politics of indigeneity. Research on politics among indigenous peoples can contribute to ethnographic and theoretical understandings of citizenship, recognition, and law in settler states.

Sovereignty

American Indian nations retain (limited) sovereignty within the U.S. federalist system and also stake claims to inherent sovereignty outside their relationships to the United States. Increasing attention among anthropologists to indigenous sovereignty dovetails with recent trends in Native American Studies, indigenous political movements, and anthropology outside of Indian country. Relative to others, anthropologists are likely to study sovereignty's local manifestations and limits (Fowler 2002) and attend to the lived dimensions of sovereignty beyond formal political claims. Anthropological investigations of indigenous sovereignty also have the (unrealized) potential to inform theories of sovereignty beyond the indigenous context. Meanwhile, anthropologists working in nonindigenous contexts have increasingly taken sovereignty to be an object of inquiry (see Hansen & Stepputat 2006). Their work aids in theorizing settler-state sovereignties. Indigenous sovereignty, however, is differently configured and, therefore, is essential to any larger project of theorizing sovereignty.

Sovereignty takes a particularly territorialized (and temporalized; see Bruyneel 2007) form for indigenous people in settler states. Nonetheless, Biolsi (2005) observes that American Indian sovereignty is rarely territorially exclusive but rather is shared, to varying degrees, with other sovereigns. Cattelino (2008; see also Spilde 1998) examines Florida Seminole sovereignty in the casino era as constituted through practices of autonomy but also in relations of interdependency with other sovereigns

(including other indigenous peoples; see Jackson 2003 on interindigenous relations). Indigenous forms of sovereignty, when not taken solely to be failed sovereignties, point to the limits of dominant theories of sovereignty as autonomy. Attention to these limits, in turn, has implications for anthropological investigation of U.S. sovereignty.

As Strong & Van Winkle (1993) write, Native American nations "challenge and constrain the boundaries and sovereignty of the United States" (p. 9). Simpson (2003) examines Mohawk narratives of, and embodied practices at, the U.S.-Canadian border to show how indigenous nationalism unsettles settler-state sovereignty. At a historical moment when indigenous claims and practices are increasingly articulated in the terms of sovereignty, anthropologists working in Indian country can investigate aspects of sovereignty that are of critical concern to indigenous lives and social theory alike.

Economy

Anthropological study of indigenous economic action has the potential to upend the settler colonial conflation of indigenous peoples with poverty. Anthropologists have examined American Indian marginalization in wage labor (Littlefield & Knack 1996), capital accumulation (Faiman-Silva 1997, Pickering 2000), economic development (Dombrowski 2001), job training in boarding schools (Lomawaima 1994), and welfare state redistribution (Berman 2003). Tribal government operation of casinos has forced reconsideration in public culture and policy alike of American Indians' place within American economic and political landscapes (Cattelino 2008; Darian-Smith 2002, 2003; Spilde 1998). The task is not simply to offer an empirical corrective (showing that Indians can be rich or capitalists) or a celebration of counter-stereotypes that overlooks exploitative economic relations within Indian country. Instead, rethinking indigenous economy poses a political and theoretical challenge to the cultural logics whereby indigenous people

are perceived to occupy a space of economic difference, pastness, and lack of regulation or lawlessness (Darian-Smith 2002, Erikson 1999, Simpson 2008). Anthropological inquiry may unsettle the "double bind of American Indian need-based sovereignty" (Cattelino 2010), whereby indigenous wealth is taken to be a sign of cultural loss and assimilation to an "American" way of life and thereby to undermine the difference on which tribal sovereignty is based.

Representation

One condition of settler colonialism is that indigenous lives and differences are contested on the terrain of representation (Bodinger de Uriarte 2007, Castile 1996, Ginsburg 2002, Krech 1999, Mithlo 2009, Mullin 2001, Prins 2002, Strong 2004). Struggles over "who owns Native culture," as Brown (2003) puts it, often involve legal disputes over cultural and intellectual property (see also Coombe 1998). Brown rightly identifies cultural activism as key to indigenous claims. That said, his appeal to an open domain of ideas and images downplays the harm of transparency and translation to some indigenous forms of knowledge production (see, e.g., Whiteley 1998 on Hopi cultural representation as instrumental value) and the selective deployment of openness within settler societies. The production and contestation of tradition is explored by Jackson (2003) in Yuchi ceremonial performance and Richland (2008) in language use in Hopi courts (see also Samuels 2004 and Fienup-Riordan 2000). While noting that cultural claims sometimes deploy essentialisms (Mithlo 2009) and that indigenous difference is often figured narrowly as cultural (Mullin 2001), anthropologists can complement the well-established literature on white images of Indians with attention to indigenous cultural activism.

Toward an Anthropology of Settler Colonialism

Scholars in indigenous studies are increasingly writing and thinking in terms of settler colonialism. Wolfe (1999, p. 2) describes settler

colonialism as "a structure not an event," and he differentiates settler colonialism's target of land dispossession from the expropriation of labor in dependent colonies. He, like Fogelson (1999), connects past-oriented anthropological research in Native America to American nationalism. Settler colonialism creates a set of structures, practices, ideological formations, and dilemmas that are open to social scientific analysis. These, I suggest, include but by no means are limited to the dilemmas that indigenous peoples' everyday practices of citizenship pose to settler states, distinctive epistemologies and disciplinary formations, settler quandaries of how to claim national histories and territories when these are laced with traces of invasion, and pressure on the crafting of shared futures.

The anthropology of Native North America cannot be subsumed by the study of the United States. On the other hand, it cannot stand entirely outside of the time and space of the United States. Critical ethnographic engagement with the conditions of indigeneity may illuminate aspects of life in this settler society that too often go unexplored not only in scholarship but also in public culture. If anthropology was built partly on the study of American Indians, then it is time to critically reclaim the discipline's foundations as built in, on, and with Indian country. Along with ongoing investigation of the space of America and the epistemological position of Americanist anthropology, it is this type of location work that will maintain the vitality of the anthropology of the United States.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LITERATURE CITED

Adams J. 2007. Ethnography of rural North America. *N. Am. Dialogue* 10(2):1–6

Baker LD. 1998. *From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Baker LD. 2004. *Life in America: Identity and Everyday Experience*. Malden, MA: Blackwell

Baker LD. 2010. *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Basso KH. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: Univ. N. M. Press

Berman T. 2003. *Circle of Goods: Women, Work, and Welfare in a Reservation Community*. Albany: State Univ. N. Y. Press

Biolsi T. 1992. *Organizing the Lakota: The Political Economy of the New Deal on the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Reservations*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Biolsi T. 2001. *"Deadliest Enemies": Law and the Making of Race Relations On and Off Rosebud Reservation*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Biolsi T. 2005. Imagined geographies: sovereignty, indigenous space, and American Indian struggle. *Am. Ethnol.* 32(2):239–59

Biolsi T, Zimmerman LJ, eds. 1997. *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria, Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Blu KI. 2001 [1980]. *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People*. Lincoln/London: Univ. Nebr. Press

Blu KI, with introduction by RD Fogelson. 2001. Region and recognition: Southern Indians, anthropologists, and presumed biology. In *Anthropologists and Indians in the New South*, ed. RA Bonney, JA Paredes, pp. 27–51. Tuscaloosa: Univ. Ala. Press

Bodinger de Uriarte JJ. 2007. *Casino and Museum: Representing Mashantucket Pequot Identity*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Borneman J. 1995. American anthropology as foreign policy. *Am. Anthropol.* 97(4):663–72

Bourgois PI. 1995. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Bourgois PI, Schonberg J. 2009. *Righteous Dopefiend*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Brettell CB. 1993. Introduction: Fieldwork, text, audience. In *When They Read What We Write: The Politics of Ethnography*, ed. CB Brettell, pp. 163–76. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey

Brodkin K. 1998. *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says About Race in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Brodkin K. 2009. *Power Politics: Environmental Activism in South Los Angeles*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Brown MF. 1997. *The Channeling Zone: American Spirituality in an Anxious Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Brown MF. 2003. *Who Owns Native Culture?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Bruyneel K. 2007. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Castile GP. 1996. The Commodification of Indian Identity. *Am. Anthropol.* 98(4):743–49

Cattelino JR. 2008. *High Stakes: Florida Seminole Gaming and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Cattelino JR. 2010. The double bind of American Indian need-based sovereignty. *Cult. Anthropol.* 25(2):235–62

Checker M. 2005. *Polluted Promises: Environmental Racism and the Search for Justice in a Southern Town*. New York: N. Y. Univ. Press

Checker M, Fishman M, eds. 2004. *Local Actions: Cultural Activism, Power, and Public Life in America*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Chesluk B. 2007. *Money Jungle: Imagining the New Times Square*. New Bruswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Chin EM. 2001. *Purchasing Power: Black Kids and American Consumer Culture*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Chin EM. 2006. Confessions of a Negrophile. *Transform. Anthropol.* 14(1):44–52

Clifford J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Collins JL. 2003. *Threads: Gender, Labor, and Power in the Global Apparel Industry*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Coombe RJ. 1998. *The Cultural Life of Intellectual Properties: Authorship, Appropriation, and the Law*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Coutin SB. 2000. *Legalizing Moves: Salvadoran Immigrants' Struggle for U.S. Residency*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press

Cramer RA. 2005. *Cash, Color, and Colonialism: The Politics of Tribal Acknowledgment*. Norman: Univ. Okla. Press

Darian-Smith E. 2002. Savage capitalists: law and politics surrounding Indian casino operations in California. In *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society*, ed. A Sarat, P Ewick, 26:109–40. Amsterdam: JAI

Darian-Smith E. 2003. *New Capitalists: Law, Politics, and Identity Surrounding Casino Gaming on Native American Land*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learn.

Dávila AM. 2001. *Latinos, Inc.: The Marketing and Making of a People*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Dávila AM. 2004. *Barrio Dreams: Puerto Ricans, Latinos, and the Neoliberal City*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

De Genova N. 2005. *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

De Genova N. 2006. Introduction: Latino and Asian racial formations at the frontiers of U.S. nationalism. In *Racial Transformations: Latinos and Asians Remaking the United States*, ed. N De Genova, pp. 1–20. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

De Genova N. 2007. The stakes of an anthropology of the United States. *CR: The New Centennial Rev.* 7(2):231–77

Dehavenon A. 1996. *There's No Place Like Home: Anthropological Perspectives on Housing and Homelessness in the United States*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey

Deloria PJ. 1998. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press

Deloria VJ. 1988 [1969]. Anthropologists and other friends. In *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, pp. 78–100. Norman: Univ. Okla. Press

Di Leonardo M. 1992. The female world of cards and holidays: women, families, and the work of kinship. In *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, ed. B Thorne, M Yalom, pp. 246–61. Boston: Northeast. Univ. Press

Di Leonardo M. 1998. *Exotics at Home: Anthropologies, Others, American Modernity*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Dombrowski K. 2001. *Against Culture: Development, Politics, and Religion in Indian Alaska*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Doukas D. 2003. *Worked Over: The Corporate Sabotage of an American Community*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press

Dumit J. 2004. *Picturing Personhood: Brain Scans and Biomedical Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Durrenberger EP, Erem S. 2005. *Class Acts: An Anthropology of Service Workers and Their Union*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm

Elisha O. 2008. Moral ambitions of grace: the paradox of compassion and accountability in evangelical faith-based activism. *Cult. Anthropol.* 23(1):154–89

English-Lueck J. 2002. *Cultures@Silicon Valley*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Univ. Press

Erikson PP. 1999. A-whaling we will go: encounters of knowledge and memory at the Makah Cultural and Research Center. *Cult. Anthropol.* 14(4):556–83

Erikson PP, with Ward H, Wachendorf K. 2002. *Voices of a Thousand People: The Makah Cultural and Research Center*. Lincoln/London: Univ. Nebr. Press

Erzen T. 2006. *Straight to Jesus: Sexual and Christian Conversions in the Ex-Gay Movement*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Fader A. 2009. *Mitzvah Girls: Bringing Up the Next Generation of Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Faiman-Silva SL. 1997. *Choctaws at the Crossroads: The Political Economy of Class and Culture in the Oklahoma Timber Region*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Field LW. 2008. *Abalone Tales: Collaborative Explorations of Sovereignty and Identity in Native California*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Fienup-Riordan A. 2000. *Hunting Tradition in a Changing World*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Fogelson RD. 1999. Nationalism and the Americanist tradition. In *Theorizing the Americanist Tradition*, ed. LP Valentine, R Darnell, pp. 75–83. Toronto: Univ. Tor. Press

Fowler L. 2002. *Tribal Sovereignty and the Historical Imagination: Cheyenne-Arapaho Politics*. Lincoln/London: Univ. Nebr. Press

Fox AA. 2004. *Real Country: Music and Language in Working-Class Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Frank G. 2000. *Venus on Wheels: Two Decades of Dialogue on Disability, Biography, and Being Female in America*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Frankenberg R. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Franklin S, McKinnon S. 2001. *Relative Values: Reconfiguring Kinship Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Gailey C. 2010. *Blue-Ribbon Babies and Labors of Love: Race, Class, and Gender in U.S. Adoption Practice*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press

Gill L. 2004. *The School of the Americas*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Ginsburg FD. 2002. Screen memories: resignifying the traditional in Indigenous media. In *Media Worlds: Anthropology on New Terrain*, ed. FD Ginsburg, L Abu-Lughod, B Larkin, pp. 39–57. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Ginsburg FD. 2006. Ethnography and American studies. *Cult. Anthropol.* 21(3):487–95

Ginsburg FD, Rapp R, eds. 1994. *Conceiving the New World Order: The Global Politics of Reproduction*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Ginsburg FD, Tsing AL, eds. 1990. *Uncertain Terms: Negotiating Gender in American Culture*. Boston: Beacon

Goldschmidt H. 2006. *Race and Religion Among the Chosen People of Crown Heights*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Goode J, Maskovsky J, eds. 2001. *New Poverty Studies: The Ethnography of Power, Politics, and Impoverished People in the United States*. New York: N. Y. Univ. Press

Greenhouse CJ, Yngvesson B, Engel DM. 1994. *Law and Community in Three American Towns*. Ithaca/London: Cornell Univ. Press

Gregory S. 1998. *Black Corona: Race and the Politics of Place in an Urban Community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Gupta A, Ferguson J. 1997. Discipline and practice: "the field" as site, method, and location in Anthropology. In *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, ed. A Gupta, J Ferguson, pp. 1–46. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Gusterson H. 1996. *Nuclear Rites: A Weapons Laboratory at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Handler R, Gable E. 1997. *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Hansen TB, Stepputat F. 2006. Sovereignty revisited. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 35(1):295–315

Harding S. 1999. *The Book of Jerry Falwell: Fundamentalist Language and Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Harrison FV. 2008. *Outsider Within: Reworking Anthropology in the Global Age*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press

Hartigan J. 1999. *Racial Situations: Class Predicaments of Whiteness in Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Helmreich S. 1998. *Silicon Second Nature: Culturing Artificial Life in a Digital World*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Herrmann GM. 1997. Gift or commodity: What changes hands in the U.S. garage sale? *Am. Ethnol.* 24(4):910–30

Ho K. 2009. *Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Jackson JB. 2003. *Yuchi Ceremonial Life: Performance, Meaning, and Tradition in a Contemporary American Indian Community*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Jackson JL. 2001. *Harlemworld: Doing Race and Class in Contemporary Black America*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Jackson JL. 2005. *Real Black: Adventures in Racial Sincerity*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Jain SL. 2006. *Injury: The Politics of Product Design and Safety Law in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Kan S, Strong PT, eds. 2006. *New Perspectives on Native North America: Cultures, Histories, and Representations*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Kauanui JK. 2008. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Indigeneity and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Kelty CM. 2008. *Two Bits: The Cultural Significance of Free Software*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Kondo DK. 1997. *About Face: Performing Race in Fashion and Theater*. New York: Routledge

Kosek J. 2006. *Understories: The Political Life of Forests in Northern New Mexico*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Krech S. 1999. *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History*. New York: Norton

Lamphere L, Zavella P, Gonzales F, with Evans PB. 1993. *Sunbelt Working Mothers: Reconciling Family and Factory*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press

Landsman G. 2008. *Reconstructing Motherhood and Disability in the Age of "Perfect" Babies*. New York: Routledge

Lassiter LE, Goodall H, Campbell L, Johnson MN, eds. 2004. *The Other Side of Middletown: Exploring Muncie's African American Community*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira

Lewin E. 1993. *Lesbian Mothers: Accounts of Gender in American Culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press

Littlefield A, Knack MC, eds. 1996. *Native Americans and Wage Labor: Ethnohistorical Perspectives*. Norman/London: Univ. Okla. Press

Lomawaima KT. 1994. *They Called It Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Low SM. 2003. *Behind the Gates: Life, Security, and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*. New York: Routledge

Lutz CA. 2001. *Homefront: A Military City and the American Twentieth Century*. Boston: Beacon

Lutz CA, ed. 2009. *The Bases of Empire*. New York: N. Y. Univ. Press

Lutz CA, Collins JL. 1993. *Reading National Geographic*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Lynd RS, Lynd HM. 1929. *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture*. New York: Harvest Books, Harcourt Brace

Mahon M. 2004. *Right to Rock: The Black Rock Coalition and the Cultural Politics of Race*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Manalansan MFI. 2003. *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Marcus GE. 1999. How anthropological curiosity consumes its own places of origin. *Cult. Anthropol.* 14(3):416–22

Marcus GE, Fischer MMJ. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Martin E. 1994. *Flexible Bodies: Tracking Immunity in American Culture from the Days of Polio to the Age of AIDS*. Boston: Beacon

Martin E. 2007. *Bipolar Expeditions: Mania and Depression in American Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Masco J. 2006. *The Nuclear Borderlands: The Manhattan Project in Post-Cold War New Mexico*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Maskovsky J. 2009. Some new directions in anthropology "at home." *N. Am. Dialogue: Newsl. Soc. Anthropol. N. Am.* 12(1):6–9

Maskovsky J, Susser I. 2009. *Rethinking America: The Imperial Homeland in the 21st Century*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm

Maurer B. 2005. *Mutual Life, Limited: Islamic Banking, Alternative Currencies, Lateral Reason*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Medicine B. 2001. *Learning to Be an Anthropologist and Remaining "Native": Selected Writings*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press

Merry SE. 2000. *Colonizing Hawai'i: The Cultural Power of Law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Merry SE. 2001. Spatial governmentality and the new urban social order: controlling gender violence through law. *Am. Anthropol.* 103(1):16–29

Miller BG. 2001. *The Problem of Justice: Tradition and Law in the Coast Salish World*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Miller BG. 2003. *Invisible Indigenes: The Politics of Nonrecognition*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Mithlo NM. 2009. *Our Indian Princess: Subverting the Stereotype*. Santa Fe, NM: Sch. Adv. Res.

Moffatt M. 1992. Ethnographic writing about American culture. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 21:205–29

Morgen S. 2002. *Into Our Own Hands: The Women's Health Movement in the United States, 1969–1990*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Morgen S, Maskovsky J. 2003. The anthropology of welfare "reform": new perspectives on U.S. urban poverty in the post-welfare era. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 32(1):315–38

Mullin MH. 2001. *Culture in the Marketplace: Gender, Art, and Value in the American Southwest*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Mullings L. 2005. Interrogating racism: toward an antiracist anthropology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 34(1):667–93

Nesper L. 2002. *The Walleye War: The Struggle for Ojibwe Spearfishing and Treaty Rights*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Newman KS. 1999. *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City*. New York: Knopf/Russell Sage Found.

Newman KS. 2008. *Chutes and Ladders: Navigating the Low-Wage Labor Market*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Newton E. 1993. *Cherry Grove, Fire Island: Sixty Years in America's First Gay and Lesbian Town*. Boston: Beacon

O'Nell TD. 1996. *Disciplined Hearts: History, Identity, and Depression in an American Indian Community*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Ong A. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logic of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Ong A. 2003. *Buddha Is Hiding: Refugees, Citizenship, the New America*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Ortner SB. 1997. Fieldwork in the postcommunity. *Anthropol. Humanism* 22(1):61–80

Ortner SB. 2003. *New Jersey Dreaming: Capital, Culture, and the Class of '58*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Park K. 1996. Use and abuse of race and culture: Black-Korean tension in America. *Am. Anthropol.* 98(3):492–99

Pérez GM. 2004. *The Near Northwest Side Story: Migration, Displacement, and Puerto Rican Families*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Pickering KA. 2000. *Lakota Culture, World Economy*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Price DH. 2004. *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Price DH. 2008. *Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of American Anthropology in the Second World War*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Prins HEL. 2002. Visual media and the primitivist perplex: colonial fantasies and indigenous imagination in the decolonization of the fourth world. See Ginsburg 2002, pp. 58–74

Ragoné H. 1994. *Surrogate Motherhood: Conception in the Heart*. Boulder, CO: Westview

Ramirez RK. 2007. *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Rapp R. 1999. *Testing Women, Testing the Fetus: The Social Impact of Amniocentesis in America*. New York: Routledge

Rapp R, Ginsburg F. 2001. Enabling disability: rewriting kinship, reimagining citizenship. *Public Cult.* 13(3):533–56

Richland J. 2008. *Arguing with Tradition: The Language of Law in Hopi Tribal Court*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Rouse R. 1995. Questions of identity: personhood and collectivity in transnational migration to the United States. *Crit. Anthropol.* 15(4):351–80

Ruben M, Maskovsky J. 2008. The homeland archipelago: neoliberal urban governance after September 11. *Crit. Anthropol.* 28(2):199–217

Samuels DW. 2004. *Putting a Song on Top of It: Expression and Identity on the San Carlos Apache Reservation*. Tucson, AZ: Univ. Ariz. Press

Sanjek R. 1998. *The Future of Us All: Race and Neighborhood Politics in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press

Saunders B. 2009. *CT Suite: The Work of Diagnosis in the Age of Noninvasive Cutting*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Sayre NF. 2002. *Ranching, Endangered Species, and Urbanization in the Southwest: Species of Capital*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Shankar S. 2008. *Desi Land: Teen Culture, Class, and Success in Silicon Valley*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Sheridan TE. 2007. Embattled ranchers, endangered species, and urban sprawl: the political ecology of the New American West. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 26(1):121–38

Sider GM. 2003. *Living Indian Histories: Lumbee and Tuscarora People in North Carolina*. Chapel Hill: Univ. N. C. Press

Silliman SW. 2008. The "old west" in the Middle East: U.S. military metaphors in real and imagined Indian country. *Am. Anthropol.* 110(2):237–47

Simpson A. 2003. *To the reserve and back again: Kahnawake Mohawk narratives of self, home and nation*. PhD diss., McGill Univ.

Simpson A. 2007. On ethnographic refusal: indigeneity, 'voice' and colonial citizenship. *Junctures* 9:67–80

Simpson A. 2008. Subjects of sovereignty: indigeneity, the revenue rule, and juridics of failed consent. *Law Contemp. Probl.* 71:191–215

Spilde KA. 1998. *Acts of sovereignty, acts of identity: negotiating interdependence through tribal government gaming on the White Earth Indian Reservation*. PhD diss., Univ. Calif., Santa Cruz

Stack C. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper & Row

Stack CB. 1996. *Call to Home: African Americans Reclaim the Rural South*. New York: BasicBooks

Starn O. 2004. *Ishi's Brain: In Search of America's Last "Wild" Indian*. New York: Norton

Stewart K. 1996. *A Space on the Side of the Road: Cultural Poetics in an "Other" America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Stewart K. 2007. *Ordinary Affects*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Stoller P. 2002. *Money Has No Smell: The Africanization of New York City*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Strong PT. 2004. Representational practices. In *A Companion to the Anthropology of North American Indians*, ed. T Biolsi, pp. 341–59. Malden, MA: Blackwell

Strong PT. 2005. Recent ethnographic research on North American Indigenous peoples. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 34:253–68

Strong PT, Van Winkle B. 1993. Tribe and nation: American Indians and American nationalism. *Soc. Anal.: J. Soc. Cult. Pract.* 33:9–26

Strong PT, Van Winkle B. 1996. "Indian blood": reflections on the reckoning and refiguring of Native North American identity. *Cult. Anthropol.* 11(4):547–76

Sturm C. 2002. *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Susser I. 1996. The construction of poverty and homelessness in US cities. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 25(1):411–35

Valentine D. 2007. *Imagining Transgender: An Ethnography of a Category*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Vine D. 2009. *Island of Shame: The Secret History of the U.S. Military Base on Diego Garcia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Wagoner PL. 2002. *They Treated Us Just Like Indians: The Worlds of Bennett County, South Dakota*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press

Warner WL. 1941–1959. *Yankee City*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press

Whiteley PM. 1998. *Rethinking Hopi Ethnography*. Washington, DC: Smithson. Inst. Press

Williams B. 2004. *Debt for Sale: A Social History of the Credit Trap*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press

Wojcicka Sharff J. 1998. *King Kong on Fourth Street: Families and the Violence of Poverty on the Lower East Side*. Boulder, CO: Westview

Wolfe P. 1999. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London/New York: Cassell

Zaloom C. 2006. *Out of the Pits: Traders and Technology from Chicago to London*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Zlolniski C. 2006. *Janitors, Street Vendors, and Activists: The Lives of Mexican Immigrants in Silicon Valley*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Ⓡ

Contents

Theme I: Modalities of Capitalism

Theme II: The Anthropology of the Senses

Soundscapes: Toward a Sounded Anthropology

Indexes

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Anthropology* articles may be found at http://anthro.annualreviews.org/errata.shtml