INDIGENEITY AND INDIGENOUS MEDIA
ON THE GLOBAL STAGE

Pamela Wilson and Michelle Stewart

In the dry, adobe-baking heat of a New Mexico summer, eighteen eager Native American writers, directors, and actors converged on the campus of the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA) in Santa Fe in 2004 to participate in what was promoted as a route to "Hollywood's fast track": the Summer Television and Film Workshop, a groundbreaking collaboration between the tribal arts college, ABC Television, and ABC's parent, the Walt Disney Company, to "raise the technical and creative skills of Native American filmmakers, screenwriters, producers, and actors, and to help them become more competitive in today's demanding marketplace." IAIA President Della Warrior proclaimed it an honor for Native American students to learn from "the decision makers who define excellence in the entertainment industry." Seven Workshop participants have subsequently received a yearlong apprenticeship with an ABC-Disney executive and full access to the corporation's extensive film production resources.[1]

The Sundance Film Festival has also provided major institutional support to Indigenous independent filmmaking by, according to Sundance promotions, "providing a world stage for their compelling and innovative stories" through the festival's Native American Initiative to "build connections between Native Cinema [and] the marketplace of independent film" as part of a "global filmmaking community." The 2006 Native Forum included panel discussions, such as "Native Cinema and the Marketplace" and "Investing in Indigenous Cinema," that emphasized the logistics of creating, funding, and marketing Native American and Indigenous films, while a grant from the Ford Foundation made possible a workshop for four Indigenous filmmakers to meet one-on-one with "es-

tablished filmmaker and industry leaders . . . to strengthen the projects and help bring them to fruition." Sundance Festival Director Geoffrey Gilmore sees the project as "living proof of the dramatic evolution of indigenous filmmaking and filmmakers."[2]

Achieving this kind of "success" in the global media marketplace—with much emphasis in all public relations discourse on the terms *global* and *marketplace*—demonstrates the stakes of globalization for Indigenous cultural expression, both individual and collective. Young Indigenous media artists—considered "raw Native talent" by the Hollywood studios, according to the filmmaker and scholar Beverly Singer (personal communication, 2005)—navigate between their desires for major commercial industry support and their own artistic and cultural expression. At the same time, however, a good deal of Indigenous media is being produced for noncommercial purposes and beyond the reach of the mainstream media industries. Indeed, the major executives of the hegemonic media do not always define the terms of "excellence" for Indigenous media makers. Indigenous artists and activists are using new technologies to craft culturally distinct forms of communication and artistic production that speak to local aesthetics and local needs while anticipating larger audiences.

In recent years, Indigenous media—which we loosely define as forms of media expression conceptualized, produced, and / or created by Indigenous peoples across the globe—have emerged from geographically scattered, locally based production centers to become part of globally linked media networks with increased effectiveness and reach. Simultaneously, Indigenous media have begun to receive greater attention from scholars, critics, and global activists. These developments have called into question many previously held definitions and assumptions about Indigenous media and now call for a reexamination of how we think and talk about Indigenous media in an environment of globalization. Indigenous media now occupy a significant place not only in local cultures and communities but also in national and global media discourses, policies, industries, and funding structures. The need for a collection of essays representing a global, interdisciplinary perspective—as well as a mix of insights from both producers and scholars—has never been as urgent. This collection, by interdisciplinary scholars and media producers, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, was born of a desire to address the changing environments in which Indigenous media are today being produced, shaped, and consumed.

Indigenous peoples have long had an ambivalent relationship with the mass media. Even though Indigenous groups and artists have produced their own expressive media for generations, the industrialized, mass-produced messages and images—and accompanying technologies—in most cases have represented the perspectives, values, and institutional structures of empire. "Mass media [have] long been a weapon of mass destruction for Native American people," explains the Pawnee / Yakama artist Bunky Echo-Hawk on his Web site. "[They were] used early on in American history to garner widespread public support for, and to justify the violent occupation of this land and policies encouraging the exter-mination of Native American people and culture. Currently, [they are] used to romanticize the culture, promote negative stereotypes, and main-tain the fallacy that Native Americans are a people of the past."[3] As Faye Ginsburg notes in her contribution to this book, Indigenous peoples have, until recently, been the object of other peoples' image-making practices in ways that have often been damaging to their lives.

Many studies exist of representations and stereotypes *of* Indigenous peoples by the dominant media;[4] this book's focus, however, is on the shift in the past few decades to the command of mass media technologies *by* Indigenous peoples as they have appropriated the technologies of the dominant society and transformed them to their own uses in order to meet their own cultural and political needs—what the visual anthropolo-gist Harald Prins (2004: 516) would call the Indigenization of visual media. A number of political, social, legal, and technological developments con-tributed to this shift. As we will discuss below, a burgeoning human rights discourse following World War II convinced many Indigenous activists of the need for a variety of forms of self-representation. In this context, the media became an important tool for bringing land claims and cultural histories to an international forum. Some Indigenous groups enlisted the aid of sympathetic anthropologists as both Indigenous peoples and an-thropology as a discipline began to question the ethnographer's role and responsibility in relation to Indigenous peoples. By the 1960s, civil rights movements in the United States and in Canada fueled significant calls for self-determination and a language of nationalism that insisted on the distinctness of Indigenous claims (beyond those of the demands for equal rights made by minority groups) (Fleras and Elliot 1992).

Concomitantly, the invention of a lightweight and portable film cam-era with synchronous sound took filmmaking into the street and the field. This gave rise both to the *cinéma vérité* movement (also known as

direct or observational cinema; see Mamber 1976; O'Connell 1992; and Rouch and Feld 2003) and to a parallel ethnographic film movement among anthropologists (see Heider 1976; Loizos 1993; and MacDougall 1998). Some ethnographic filmmakers considered observational cinema to be the antidote to the crisis of representation: if the written monograph would inevitably betray the ethnocentric and subjective framework of the ethnographer, perhaps the camera could circumvent this bias. Thus, by setting up a camera and allowing the film to roll, some ethnographic filmmakers sought to document Indigenous cultural practices objectively. The excesses and absurdity of the worst of these practices led ethnographers and Indigenous groups to develop an ethos and practice of dialogic filmmaking and anthropological advocacy and convinced many of the necessity for self-representation (Weinberger 1994).[5] As Prins (2004: 518) explains of this turn that began in the 1970s, "In an intervention that paralleled the postcolonial move to 'write back' against colonial masters, Indian activists began to 'shoot back,' reversing the colonial gaze by constructing their own visual media, telling their stories on their own terms."

In Canada and Australia, the launching of satellites that stood to bring non-Indigenous media to the Arctic and the Outback for the first time spurred Indigenous groups to demand dedicated air time for the preservation and promotion of Indigenous languages and cultures (Michaels 1986; Roth and Ginsburg 2003). States made dispensations for "indigenous content" and, increasingly, national broadcasting offered grants and training to Indigenous producers. In this context, radio, television, and video all offered new means to connect communities and revitalize cultures.

In the 1970s and 1980s, a number of organizations, institutes, and foundations developed to provide support to this growing movement and to showcase Indigenous works in festivals and other venues.[6] Heralded by Paul Hocking's 1975 collection of seminal essays, the subfield of visual anthropology became an early academic locus for work on Indigenous media. Scholars in this interdisciplinary field began to address these new forms of cultural expression and turned their focus from ethnographic film produced by outsiders to the cultural politics of Indigenous media as produced by insiders—what Ginsburg calls the anthropology of media (see Michaels and Kelly 1984; Turner 1990; and Ginsburg 1991, 1994).[7] Scholars in other fields also began to give more attention to aspects of Indigenous media production such as community broadcasting and its

cultural power and political efficacy. At the same time, the growth of community broadcasting organizations, government agencies, and scholarly journals reflected a broader interest in "community-based, citizen's and 'third sector' media and culture."[8] With this increased attention, the study of Indigenous media spread throughout the academy into many disciplines: from anthropology, communications, media studies, and cultural studies to such fields as literature, art, geography, linguistics, information technology, education, sociology, history, and political science.

Contemporary Indigenous media demonstrate the extent to which the hallmarks of an earlier regime of empire—colonization, forced assimilation, genocide, and diaspora—are being challenged and displaced by new constellations of global power. Indigenous media often directly address the politics of identity and representation by engaging and challenging the dominant political forms at both the national and international level. In this landscape, control of media representation and of cultural self-definition asserts and signifies cultural and political sovereignty itself. As such, Indigenous media are the first line of negotiation of sovereignty issues as well as a discursive locus for issues of control over land and territory, subjugation and dispossession under colonization, cultural distinctiveness and the question of ethnicity and minority status, questions of local and traditional knowledge, self-identification and recognition by others, and notions of Indigeneity and Indigenism themselves.

THE PROBLEM OF DEFINING INDIGENEITY IN THE ERA OF GLOBALIZATION

In today's economic environment, marketing and selling "the Indigenous" through media, tourism, art, crafts, music, and the appropriation of traditional knowledges and Indigenous images has become a profitable enterprise that Indigenous peoples worldwide feel the need to monitor and protect. Indigenous styles and causes are now chic in the dominant cultures, especially in the West. This has led to new types of commercial market niches in the developed Western world for products marketed as Indigenous, ranging from import boutiques featuring tribal crafts (e.g., Ten Thousand Villages) to CDs of "world music" (e.g., those of Putumayo) and socially conscious charitable gift giving to "alleviate hunger and poverty" and promote "strong communities, sustainability, environmental protection, and peace" (e.g., Heifer International). As Nigel Parbury has noted, "The 'Indigenous Industry' is a global phenomenon that

is worth billions and billions of dollars annually. In this context, it becomes an imperative to examine fundamental assumptions about what actually constitutes Indigeneity on the international stage, because that's where the major players . . . are conducting their business" (quoted in Onsman 2004: xv). Parbury's statement underscores the complexity and irony of the contemporary reality: not only are nation-states "putting up" with the presence of Indigenous peoples, but they may—under the auspices of "official" diversity—be competing not just for Indigenous land and resources, but also for the international "brand recognition" afforded by Indigenous cultural property. Thus, the question of Indigeneity as a distinct and significant category in today's global cultural politics is a complex one requiring careful analysis.

These considerations foreground the problem of defining Indigenous media—and Indigeneity itself—in this postmodern, globalized era, where the status of national identity and its relation to global institutions is itself being debated. When discussing Indigeneity, we encounter an intersection of many discursive paradigms in academia and also in cultural politics at all levels. In editing this collection, we have realized the lack of clarity that exists as to what does and does not constitute "Indigenous media," and this intellectual argument has shaped the collection itself. Should a collection on Indigenous media include articles on Welsh television? Or filmmakers of Indigenous ancestry who make Hollywood films? Or media that address Indigenous themes and issues but are produced by non-Indigenous artists? Is it important to distinguish Indigenous groups from other ethnic minorities in theorizing these issues? Indeed, is the question of Indigeneity a distinct and significant category in today's global cultural politics? Although we have come to understand that these questions do not have clear answers, we believe that an exploration of the paradigms that have defined the concept of Indigeneity will help frame the larger question of what constitutes "indigenous media." We and our contributors explore how these definitional questions bear on Indigenous activism and media activity on local, national, state, and global stages.

As we noted earlier, in the years following the Second World War, Indigenous groups began to lobby the newly formed United Nations and to form NGOS in order to advance land claims and secure sovereignty. The legal scholar S. James Anaya (2004) acknowledges that international law, once an instrument of colonialism, has continued to develop, "however grudgingly or imperfectly," to support the rights and demands of Indigenous peoples in their local and national struggles. He points out at least

two distinct sets of Indigenous discourses in international law today: first, the rhetoric of international human rights principles and the subsequent rise of an international Indigenous rights movement in the late twentieth century, and, second, the political rhetoric of nation, focused on sovereignty issues of Indigenous nations in the context of the nation-states that now envelop and subordinate them.

The concept of the Fourth World (and, later, Fourth Cinema: see Jennifer Gauthier's essay in this collection) emerged in this context, both in response to the Third World liberation rhetoric of the 1970s and with a growing appeal (pursued by groups such as the American Indian Movement [AIM]'s International Indian Treaty Council and the World Council of Indigenous Peoples) to international political bodies as a way to stress prevailing rights to self-determination under treaty relations. In 1974 George Manuel and Michael Posluns were the first to use the term *Fourth World* in connection with Indigenous activism to indicate this growing international consciousness among "people who have special nontechnical, nonmodern exploitative relations to the lands which they still inhabit and who are disenfranchised by the nations within which they live" (Dyck 1985: 21). Today international Indigenous movements have widened their purview, emphasizing the realities of internal colonialism for Native peoples and strategizing cultural survival in the face of urbanization, relocation, and diaspora.

In late December 2006, for example, a number of news headlines from independent media sources announced the "First Encounter of the Zapatista Communities with the Peoples of the World." Held in Oventic, Mexico, this four-day series of workshops and intercultural sharing was facilitated by Zapatista Comandanta Sandra and Comandante Moisés, who hosted about two thousand participants from forty-four countries (see Encounter 2007). According to one report, the group was united by a desire to "construct a better world, where all worlds fit" and (quoting Comandante Moisés) "to get to know each other and share the experiences of how we are organizing and pushing forward the struggles of each group, each movement, each sector and each person" (Bellinghausen 2007).

This type of movement is at once both nationalist and antinationalist, in that it advocates for nationalism as well as a collaborative, collective global Indigenist appeal that takes the issues beyond those of the nation-state and earlier contexts of empire. It politically redefines the contours of Indigenous nationalism by fostering a coalition politics that is both local

and international. Facilitated by globalization and the increasing transnational linkage of peoples, societies, economies, and governments worldwide, this international "pan-Indigenous" movement has brought together representatives of Indigenous nations and supportive NGOs (either particular to one Indigenous group, translocal, or transnational). At the same time, perhaps paradoxically, this type of international movement is also decidedly localist, respecting the autonomy and distinctiveness of disparate Indigenous groups.

International Indigenism—a term that, like *Indigeneity*, is used in various ways to fit diverse agendas—may at times appear to be strategically essentialist in its international appeals, identifying Indigenism as a philosophical and cultural attitude toward the world that is shared by all Indigenous peoples, a model for global conduct in its resistance to colonialism, imperialism, environmental destruction, and now, globalization. As Ravi de Costa (n.d.: para. 5) explains, "It is the fact that all Indigenous peoples can draw on their traditions as a mode of resistance that allows much broader identification to be made." In Ward Churchill's (1996: 512) formulation: "Indigenism offers . . . a vision of how things might be that is based on how things have been since time immemorial, and how things must be once again if the human species, and perhaps the planet itself, is to survive much longer. Predicated in a synthesis of the wisdom attained over thousands of years by Indigenous, land-based peoples around the globe—the Fourth World, or, as Winona LaDuke puts it, 'The Host World on which the first, second, and third worlds all sit at the present time'—Indigenism stands in diametrical opposition to the totality of what might be termed 'Eurocentric business as usual.' " In every regard, Churchill and others see Indigenous self-determination—sociopolitical, cultural, and economic autonomy (or sovereignty)—as the necessary response to the legacy of colonization and the only means to ensure the survival of Indigenous peoples.

Indigenous groups have become actively involved in the definition and assertion of the rights of Indigenous nations in international law. Many players are now addressing Indigenous issues on the world stage in transnational and international networks of advocacy and alliance: government agencies of the states in which Indigenous peoples are contained, as well as national, supranational, intergovernmental, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), foundations, and agencies. These groups are also in close dialogue with transnational corporations and funding agencies

such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, all of which have deep stakes in questions of the futures of Indigenous peoples, lands, and their resources—though not all have the same agenda.

Two of the major institutions in which the internationalization of Indigenous rights advocacy issues has taken place are the United Nations (primarily housed in the Commission on Human Rights and its various subcommissions until 2006) and the International Labour Organisation (ILO). As Anaya (2004: 7) explains, the principles on which this U.N.-based Indigenous rights movement has been based are distinct from the movements for national or tribal sovereignty:

> International law's embrace of human rights, however, engenders a discourse that is an alternative to the state-centered, historical sovereignty one, a discourse that has yielded results in the international system for Indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples have seized on the institutional and normative regime of human rights that was brought in the fold of international law in the aftermath of World War II and the adoption of the United Nations charter. . . . Contemporary human rights discourse has the welfare of human beings as its subject and is concerned only secondarily, if at all, with the interests of sovereign entities.

Yet international Indigenism has pressured the United Nations to recognize collective group rights in addition to its normative focus on human rights. Ronald Niezen (2003: 4) uses the term *indigenism* to describe "the international movement that aspires to promote and protect the rights of the world's 'first peoples.'" As de Costa (n.d.: para. 2–3) explains,

> Embedded in this use of the term is the idea that local assertions of the cultural difference of Indigenous peoples, though frequently expressed in the language and symbolism of nations, only become fully visible through a global lens and can only be protected under a broadened understanding of universal principles of human rights. The strategy has been to bypass nation-states—who have rarely recognized Indigenous rights, sometimes even denying the existence of Indigenous peoples within their borders—and to present Indigenous concerns to higher political forums. Consequently the goals of this "indigenism" are largely institutional: the creation of formal measures of protection of Indigenous peoples' rights under international law.

In 1982, the United Nations established the Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) with the mandate to review developments regarding "the promotion and protection of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people, giving special attention to the evolution of standards concerning the rights of indigenous people."[9] Six years later, the U.N. Economic and Social Council requested that the WGIP begin preparing a set of principles and preambles for a draft declaration of principles on the rights of Indigenous populations.[10] That document, the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, was vigorously negotiated, and ratification began to seem elusive because of the vigorous objections of major settler states—in particular, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand—which stalled the finalization of this key instrument of international law setting forth covenants to protect the collective rights of Indigenous peoples.[11] In the meantime, some structural changes were under way. The United Nations in 2000 established the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues to serve as an advisory body to the council and to "(a) Provide expert advice and recommendations on indigenous issues . . . ; (b) Raise awareness and promote the integration and coordination of activities relating to indigenous issues within the United Nations system; and (c) Prepare and disseminate information on indigenous issues."[12]

In 2006, the United Nations disbanded the Commission for Human Rights and replaced it with the Human Rights Council. At its inaugural session in June of 2006, this new body approved the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and sent it to the General Assembly for ratification. After more than a year of frustration by Indigenous representatives during which time the vote was tabled and further delayed, the General Assembly of the United Nations finally ratified the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples on September 13, 2007 by a vote of 143–4. The United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand voted against it, while eleven nations abstained. A news article quoted Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, the chairman of the U.N. Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, as saying that the declaration was "a major victory" for the United Nations in establishing international human rights standards since it "sets the minimum international standards for the protection and promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples. Therefore, existing and future laws, policies and programs of indigenous peoples will have to be redesigned and shaped to be consistent with this standard." However, Tauli-Corpuz emphasized that the most challenging issue would be to

gain implementation by all countries, since the Declaration is not legally binding ("U.N. Adopts" 2007).[13]

The U.N. bodies also have served as important gatherings for historic intercultural dialogue among representatives of various Indigenous peoples to strategize about the future of Indigeneity in the face of globalization. In a 2004 report of a WGIP meeting, El Hadji Guissé asserted the need to defend the rights of Indigenous peoples, at both the local and national level, to their territories, resources, cultures, identities, traditional knowledge, and right to self-determination. Guissé (2004: 9) argued that Indigenous social, political, and economic systems, along with sustainable resource management practices, should be allowed to coexist alongside other systems rather than being forced to integrate into the global market economy. This included "recognition of prior rights of Indigenous peoples over lands and resources they have occupied and nurtured since time immemorial" (ibid.). Guissé's report noted that globalization "prioritize[s] profits over social concerns," increases disparities among and in nation-states, and has had long-lasting damaging impact on the environment.

Indeed, many Indigenous WGIP representatives spoke of "the negative effects of globalization on indigenous communities, particularly on their lands, cultures, identities and lives" (Guissé 2004: 3). They linked globalization with Indigenous poverty and expressed concern that globalization would lead to eventual assimilation into dominant societies, emphasizing the increasing political and economic exclusion of Indigenous peoples, along with the trend of younger Indigenous peoples migrating from rural to urban areas "as a force promoting assimilation that was generated by globalization" (ibid.). The representatives noted the severe and negative effects of transnational corporations on Indigenous peoples—especially extraction of natural resources and building of large hydroelectric dam projects on their lands. The WGIP discussed the role of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other financial institutions in facilitating access of transnational corporations and extractive industries to Indigenous peoples' territory, disregarding Indigenous rights. These actions have been coupled with a lack of respect for Indigenous traditional knowledge, environment, and human rights. WGIP participants called for the development and implementation of binding international standards for transnational corporate conduct, as well as strong rules acknowledging the specific needs of Indigenous groups in relation to looming international agreements regarding intellectual property.

At the same time, some WGIP representatives noted the more positive

results of globalization, particularly improved communication and networking among Indigenous communities that "gave rise to a sense of belonging to a global society." They recognized, with some irony, that the mere existence of the Working Group contributed to this process, allowing Indigenous representatives to dialogue with each other and with governments and to develop an international perspective. In this sense, international Indigenism is another significant call for "globalization from below," or a globalization defined by the people affected, as opposed to a globalization determined by and serving corporate interests.

Still, the concept of "indigenous peoples" has largely been undefined in U.N. discourses, with significant disagreement over whether Indigeneity is necessarily place-based, to what degree Indigeneity ought to be tied to claims to primacy of mutual belonging in a relationship between a cultural group and a geographical territory, and to what degree claims of territorial (and cultural) autonomy define characteristics of Indigeneity. In the 1990s, the WGIP attempted to standardize terminology, requesting that the Greek legal scholar Erica-Irene A. Daes (1996: 4)[14] review prevailing definitions of Indigeneity[15] given that "the attendance at the Working Group of certain persons describing themselves as 'indigenous peoples' had been challenged by other indigenous peoples' representatives in the Working Group."[16] Daes, however, questioned the desirability of defining the concept, since "the concept of 'indigenous' is not capable of a precise, inclusive definition which can be applied in the same manner to all regions of the world" (5). Daes (1996: 12–13) noted that "'*self-identification*' as indigenous or tribal is usually regarded as a fundamental criterion for determining whether groups are indigenous or tribal, sometimes in combination with other variables" such as language or historical continuity in and ancient connection to a geographic location. In terms of individuals, the issue of subjective self-identification as Indigenous must also respect the community's right to define its own membership.

Most scholars agree that Indigeneity as we commonly conceptualize it is inescapably linked to either current regimes of colonialism or the legacy of empire. But which empires are considered to be those spawning Indigeneity and which are not? If we are consistent in our definition, then any cultural groups that meet the criteria for Indigenous peoples and that have been subject to empire might be eligible, no matter what period in history (or how far removed from the present time). In this case, many of the minority groups in China and groups in Europe such as the Welsh, Scots, and Basque would also be considered Indigenous as Donald

Browne (1996) sees them, or as Andrys Onsman (2004) considers the Frisians. However, for various reasons, the United Nations does not consider these groups among those it should shelter. Thus, even the self-identification of Indigeneity may be limited by the discourses, perceptions, and policies of the encompassing states and the refusal of certain states to accept the existence of any Indigenous peoples within them that use terms politically steeped in opposing ideologies.

For this reason, some Indigenous U.N. representatives from Asia have urged that a formal definition of Indigeneity is indeed necessary to prevent states from denying the existence of Indigenous peoples in their countries.[17] For example, the People's Republic of China, denying the history of Chinese colonialism—historically in the imperial eras and currently with internal colonialism of its geographic minority nationalities—conceptualizes Indigeneity as a phenomenon faced only by those carrying the legacy of European colonialist policies and claims that "there are neither indigenous people nor indigenous issues in China."[18] The Chinese argument is, in essence, a restatement of the "salt water thesis," which extended the right of self-determination *only* to former colonies.[19] Elaborating this argument, some delegations to the WGIP reasoned that "the concept of 'indigenous' is applicable only to situations in which the original inhabitants of the territory were subjugated and physically dispossessed by settlers *from overseas*, bearing alien cultures and values, and where these settlers, rather than the original inhabitants, have been the real beneficiaries of decolonization and independent statehood. These circumstances, the same delegations contend, have largely been restricted historically to the Americas and Oceania" (Daes 1996: 19). Daes argues that it is unfair to determine degrees of cultural difference solely based on whether "conquest, colonization, subjugation or discrimination [was] at the hands of persons from other regions of the world rather than [at the hands of] neighbours" (20). She points out that many African and Asian state governments conceptually critique the use of the term *indigenous* to distinguish between groups that have been neighbors for millennia (as in the case of China discussed above).[20] Instead, she advocates that "we think of 'indigenous' peoples as groups which are native to their own specific ancestral territories within the borders of the existing State, rather than persons that are native generally to the region in which the State is located" (20). Based on these discussions, the WGIP adopted a flexible approach to defining which groups are Indigenous (and therefore eligible to participate), relying on Indigenous organizations to draw attention

to "any improper assertions of the right to participate as 'indigenous' peoples" (21).

In summary, the factors identified by the WGIP that modern international organizations and international legal experts consider relevant to understanding "indigenous"—but which do not and cannot constitute an inclusive or comprehensive definition, though they may provide some general guidelines—include: (a) priority in time with respect to occupying and using the resources of a particular territory; (b) the voluntary perpetuation of cultural distinctiveness (which may include language, social organization, religious and spiritual values, modes of production, laws, and institutions); (c) self-identification, as well as recognition by other groups or by state authorities as a distinct collectivity; and (d) an experience of subjugation, marginalization, dispossession, exclusion, or discrimination, whether or not these conditions persist (Daes 1996: 22).

THE RHETORIC OF NATION: INDIGENEITY AND/AS NATION

The policies of states or nation-states[21] regarding the management and administration of their internally colonized Indigenous peoples have shaped, and continue to shape, the daily lived experiences of the members of those Indigenous groups. Ideologies of assimilation and development often pervade academic as well as government projects and are frequently reflected in the creation and funding of outlets for mass media in a nation-state. Similarly, Indigenous media often must define themselves and their work against the idealized or stereotypical images that dominate the popular culture and discourses of mainstream societies. We often find such discourses situated in master narratives of evolution / progress in which Indigenous groups are seen as "simple," "primitive," or "backward." This condescending discourse justifies the "assistance" and intervention of the dominant state into, first, the management of the land and resources traditionally occupied and used by Indigenous peoples and, second, into Indigenous cultural practices and social / religious institutions.

Indigenous identities have, for several centuries, been predicated on relationships to the states in which they have been enveloped by colonization and under whose political control they have fallen. Duane Champagne (2005: 3), who identifies Indigenous peoples as "submerged nations," argues that "while native peoples have identities that predate the

formation of nation-states, and many aspects of these pre-state identities continue to persist and make their weight felt in everyday life, native identity is largely defined in relation to colonizing cultures and state governments." In many cases, the nation-states have assigned, relocated, carved out, separated, labeled, defined, and imposed legal status on the identity of various Indigenous groups, with or without their input or consent, in order to establish official government recognition of and relations with these peoples, using domestic definitions of Indigeneity distinct to each nation-state. In states as wide-ranging as the United States and the People's Republic of China, for example, the decision of whether the government should officially recognize Indigenous groups (or minority nationalities, in the case of China) has been a controversial and ultimately flawed political process, with many cultural groups not receiving recognition while others have been lumped together arbitrarily or assigned labels reflecting dominant perception rather than local knowledge. Hundreds of Indigenous groups are still petitioning for official recognition by states around the world.

Interrogating how ethnic groups are constructed and maintained, as well as their processes and permutations, the social historian Paul Spickard (2005) underscores the fact that different ethnic markers have salience in different geographic contexts—to wit, in the United States, physical, "racial" markers that are "laid on the body" are the most powerful determinants of categories of difference, while elsewhere language, class, religion, and region may serve as important organizing principles, even for Indigenous groups. For example, Laurel Smith, in this collection, writes about Oaxaca, Mexico: "Often speakers of Indigenous languages identify themselves not as members of an ethnic group but as campesinos and / or as people from particular communities or regions. Ethnicity is difficult to isolate and identify in Oaxaca because it is not an essential category entered at birth but rather a constructed identity formulated in relations of power and difference." Spickard sees ethnicity as that "critical juncture between peoples when they come to see each other, and are seen by outsiders, as fundamentally, essentially, immutably different"; this inevitably results in attempts by one group to exert power over another or to highlight its own disempowerment. Discussing the common elements and models in colonial processes across the globe, Spickard notes the alternating attempts by nation-states to either (1) separate and restrict colonized groups (e.g., on reservations, often following the U.S.

Indian Affairs model), or (2) assimilate the colonized in an attempt to wipe out cultural difference and incorporate the colonized into the mainstream, dominant society of the colonizers (15).

States tend to deal with Indigeneity, minimally, at two levels: by officially recognizing and assigning political and legal status to particular cultural *groups or collectivities* (a political determination often couched in cultural and socioscientific terms); and by officially setting up criteria for *individuals* to determine who is Indigenous (either distinct from, or working in collaboration with, the internally determined criteria of the officially recognized groups). Although the politics of recognition and sovereignty has taken different paths in former English colonies (especially the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia) as well as in Latin America and Asia, Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliot (1992: 220–31) have noted the extent to which even the most seemingly progressive policies of liberal nation-states evince a double movement between the recognition of rights of self-government and policies that encourage forms of institutional assimilation. In Canada, such contradictions are visible in the distance between the establishment of Nunavut as sovereign territory (1999) and the completion of the Nisga'a Treaty (2000), on the one hand, and the persistence of land claims cases in British Columbia, on the other. For the Maori, the New Zealand government's decision to respect the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) and the subsequent establishment of a tribunal to determine Maori claims seemed like progress. Yet, as Fleras and Elliot argue, the record again has been mixed (190). Latin America has seen an increasing political participation by and influence of Indigenous people in recent years, including constitutional reform and / or the approval of ILO Convention number 169 in Colombia (see Mario Murillo's essay), Ecuador, Bolivia, Brazil, and other states; also, the elections of 2006 brought pro-Indigenous candidates into the presidencies of Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela (the newly elected president of Bolivia, Evo Morales, is an Aymara Indian). However, as Gustavo González (2005) points out, these changes have "not yet led to a modification of their dire social and economic conditions or to a reduction in government resistance to addressing native peoples' demands for autonomy and respect for their cultures" (see also Kearns 2006).

In the United States, federal recognition is a formal political act that permanently establishes a government-to-government relationship between the United States and the recognized tribe as a "domestic dependent nation" and imposes on the government a legally defined relation-

ship to the tribe and its members. Historically, tribes have been granted federal recognition through treaties, legislation, or administrative decisions.[22] However, in the United States, no single federal or tribal criterion establishes an individual person's identity as an "Indian." Each tribe has the authority and power to define its own eligibility criteria for membership. Concomitantly, there is also a federal definition of "Indian" for purposes of federal benefits. It typically requires membership in a federally recognized tribe or a particular blood quantum. Government agencies use differing criteria to determine who is eligible to participate in their "Indian" programs. Furthermore, the U.S. Census Bureau counts anyone an "American Indian or Alaska Native" who declares himself or herself to be so—yet many of these people who self-identify are not eligible for tribal membership or for federal benefits (see Stockes 2000). These examples illustrate the confusing, inconsistent, and often contradictory nature of the criteria used in the United States to determine who is an Indigenous person and which groups may be officially classified and "recognized" as Indigenous.

The People's Republic of China (a state that, as we have seen, officially denies the existence of "indigenous" peoples within its borders) does recognize minority nationality (*minzu*) status, indicating it on an individual's passports, identification cards, and all official documents. After the formation of the People's Republic in 1949, Mao's regime shaped and defined New China as a multiethnic, multinational state and undertook a project to officially classify the ethnic nations and peoples within it. Over four hundred groups applied for official recognition; in the end, the government's social scientists recognized fifty-six minzu, including the dominant Han, in an ethnic structure that has served as the framework for China's minority policies and governance for the past half century. Despite contention over the selection and naming of groups, according to anthropologists, most of the peoples have now accepted their state-assigned identities.[23] In time, over the course of several generations, these processes of internal colonialism often have an impact on the self-conceptualization of the people, whose identities are shaped by the colonizing labels and discourses. Today, states often adopt a discourse of official "diversity" that, paradoxically, in the name of the multiethnic state, forcibly contains and silences the claims for self-determination of disparate peoples that fall under the jurisdiction of official nationalism.[24]

Over the years, states have devised an array of strategies for managing the competing claims to sovereignty of Indigenous peoples. As a remedy,

many Indigenous groups have adopted the mantle of "nation" as a direct appeal to international law meant to force settler states to acknowledge treaty relations entered into at the time of settlement. The last century has seen the rise of regional pan-Indigenous movements that have mobilized disparate organizations, networks, and sociocultural identities to challenge the state's power, to enforce treaty relations, and / or to support Indigenous groups recognized and unrecognized by the encompassing state.[25]

As Randel Hanson (2004) notes, the expansion of Indigenous sovereignty and discourses of self-determination in the era of globalization since World War II, especially in the decolonized settler states such as the United States, Canada, and Australia, has been intimately connected with globalization processes and related to the formation of a new global infrastructure in bodies such as the United Nations, in the pan-Indigenous movements, and in the rise of scores of NGOs and alliances for international activism. Hanson points out that the U.N. charter for the first time recognized that the concept of self-determination was a right not only of states but also of peoples, and that the implications of these new global developments widely challenged the colonial practices of the settler states and pressured them to begin to make structural changes in their domestic policies, marking a profound shift in the very notion of state sovereignty, since this was no longer seen as inviolable but was now being judged in terms of the legality and morality of its domestic practices (289–93). These developments afforded groups multiple venues for renegotiating their status in relation to encompassing states, but these opportunities were not without risks. Specifically, Hanson identifies the mixed blessing of development projects beholden to neoliberal agendas that might undermine Indigenous values while offering a measure of economic self-determination.

CENTRALITY OF MEDIA TO INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' MOVEMENTS

In the context of globalization and the rise of international Indigenism of the last two decades, the use and mobilization of media have become increasingly central at all levels of organization: local, national, and inter- or transnational. Media produced by and for Indigenous peoples, usually in their own languages and for internal consumption, under Indigenous control and funding, have come to exist alongside media produced in the media industries of the dominant society. In these cases, questions of

ultimate control, funding, and editorial decision making are central. A third category of media often labeled "indigenous" (but which in many cases calls into question the definition of this term) is media produced in the mainstream, dominant industries that address Indigenous topics and issues or media that appropriate Indigenous knowledge and / or tell Indigenous stories, with or without the consent and involvement of those to whom that knowledge or those stories culturally, traditionally, or ethically belong. In recent debates in international law relating to Indigenous peoples, issues of appropriation and control of Indigenous knowledge and of cultural and intellectual property rights have become as important as questions of sovereignty over land and resources, "human rights and fundamental freedoms" protections, and cultural preservation.

Article 17 of the proposed U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples declared: "Indigenous peoples have the right to establish their own media in their own languages. They also have the right to equal access to all forms of non-indigenous media. States shall take effective measures to ensure that State-owned media duly reflect indigenous cultural diversity."[26] In January 1998 the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, in cooperation with the government of Spain, organized a groundbreaking workshop for Indigenous journalists in Madrid.[27] A second U.N. workshop, "Promoting the Rights and Cultures of Indigenous Peoples through the Media," was held in New York in December 2000 (United Nations 2001). Participants included journalists, editors, filmmakers, photographers, academics, radio and television producers, communications consultants, public relations specialists, lawyers, students, and public information officers from the Americas, Europe, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, and Southeast Asia.

A major focus of both workshops was the role the United Nations might play in protecting the free flow of information—a fundamental condition for realizing and protecting human rights and international security—in an era of globalization, with an emphasis on the urgent responsibilities of both the mainstream and Indigenous media to cover Indigenous issues and voice the perspectives of Indigenous peoples. Participants emphasized the essential role of Internet-based media to create new information models through which Indigenous voices might be heard, viewing Indigenous media "as an indispensable tool to promote Indigenous identity, language, culture, self-representation and collective and human rights, and as a vehicle for communicating regional, national and international issues to Indigenous communities as well as conveying

community concerns to a wider public." Workshop participants highlighted "the urgent need to strengthen Indigenous media," generally community-based rather than commercial, by building capacity, developing a sounder financial base, keeping up with technological developments, and building partnerships and networks (United Nations 2002).

Less than two years later, in July 2002, an Indigenous Media Dialogue was held in Durban, South Africa, during the World Conference against Racism, Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance. Focusing on strategies to strengthen Indigenous media and to improve coverage of Indigenous issues by mainstream media, participants called for the establishment of professional training and career pathways for Indigenous people working in the media industries, with a special emphasis on new media. Participants at this workshop also proposed the development of an international code of ethics for media personnel working with Indigenous peoples and issues. Further dialogue occurred when the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union established the World Summit on the Information Society, with international meetings held in 2003 and 2005, and U.N. agencies helped organize the Global Forum of Indigenous Peoples and the Information Society in 2003.

The aim of all of these efforts has been to increase access by Indigenous peoples to new media technologies for production and distribution of their creative and political works, thereby raising the profile of Indigenous aesthetic perspectives and cultural / political issues both in the mainstream and in new venues for Indigenous media expression. The past decade has witnessed the establishment of a major presence for Indigenous visual media in a number of nations. In 1999, the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN) premiered as a cable network distributed across Canada, showcasing to a mainstream audience the artistic and cultural expressions of scores of tribal filmmakers and television producers. In 2004, after decades of negotiation and planning, Maori Television was launched in New Zealand. The following year saw the premiere of the first Indigenous television station in Asia, Taiwan's Indigenous Television Network, a mix of news and features originally funded by the Council for Indigenous Peoples and subsequently acquired by Taiwan's Public Television Service.[28] In Australia, the local Aboriginal television station Imparja began broadcasting in 1988 in central Australia as a project of a group of Aboriginal journalists, but the negotiations about developing a national Aboriginal television network have been clouded by complex politics.[29]

Recent international cinematic successes have propelled feature films by or involving Indigenous peoples, such as *Smoke Signals*, *Rabbit-Proof Fence*, and *Whale Rider*, into the mainstream limelight. Zacharias Kunuk's 2001 *Atanarjuat* (*The Fast Runner*) swept theatres and film festivals in North America and Europe, winning prizes at many international film festivals as well as six Genie awards in Canada. The favorable reception of these productions has helped bring the discussion of Indigenous cultures and Indigenous rights into the mainstream, while also helping to increase nation-state support for local Indigenous film industries. Local control over media has often fostered political and economic sovereignty, while also helping to forge international networks. Yet the crucial role of Indigenous media in communities around the globe tends to be obscured by the media exposure of the art-house successes. The complex dynamics of international Indigenous politics and Indigenous media have yet to receive sufficient and comprehensive attention.

The Internet and related technologies have been extremely important channels of media communication among Indigenous peoples politically, culturally, artistically, and commercially. As early as 1991, a listserv for international Indigenous issues, NATIVE-L, was launched by Gary S. Trujillo, inspired by discussions held at the "From Arctic to Amazonia" environmental conference of Native representatives from around the world in September 1989 at Smith College.[30] NATIVE-L spun into a number of different specialized listservs and also became the basis for NativeNet and later NativeWeb, Web portals on Indigenous issues that became central cyberspace gathering places and resource banks for Indigenous activists and scholars during the 1990s. Key members of these Native networks held the "Internet Native Peoples Conference" in 1994 in Berkeley, California. These virtual networks became the bases for global virtual communities whose participants shared common interests and goals, and in no small way this dialogue contributed to the international Indigenism movement we have discussed.

In 1994 the Oneida Nation was perhaps the first Indigenous nation to set up a tribal Web site, and many others soon followed. As Prins (2001: 520) points out, many are using the Internet to archive their written and visual records (see Woods 1996; Zimmerman, Zimmerman, and Bruguier 2000; d'Errico 2000; Prins 2001; Becker, Vivier, and d'Errico 2002; and *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 1998a). In 2001 Earthwatch Institute sponsored an online roundtable that questioned whether the dominance of English in Internet content promoted "the capitalist ideals and products of mod-

ern industrialized society." Key questions asked on the roundtable were: "Is the Internet just another example of Western domination that will speed cultural homogenization? Or can indigenous peoples and cultural minorities join the information revolution to ensure their cultural survival, thus protecting the world's precious cultural diversity?" (see Earthwatch Institute 2001).

In addition to these issues, Indigenous producers are concerned about funding, connectivity, and digital access—in short, the digital divide between those who are "connected" and those who are not (see Ginsburg's essay in this collection; and *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 2006). Kyra Landzelius (2006) offers the most recent research on Indigenous Internet use, providing a collection of ethnographic case studies of Indigenous and diasporic cyberactivism around the globe. Landzelius's collection details the ways cultural groups take up virtual media—both to enhance internal communication in their communities and to forge alliances across ethnic and tribal boundaries, including alliances between Native peoples and grassroots activists surrounding a common cause.

Given the resource-intensive nature of media production, Indigenous media producers often must negotiate the agendas and structures afforded by state institutions or granting agencies, whose interests do not necessarily harmonize perfectly with Indigenous goals and aspirations. As many of our contributors demonstrate (see, in particular, the essays by Murillo, Smith, and Halkin), negotiating does not inevitably entail "selling out" or assimilating. As Kathleen Buddle argues in her contribution to this collection, "Over the course of the colonial era, *engaging* rather than *resisting* larger-scale processes of change provided the means with which to reconfigure and productively expand on localized practices, thereby ensuring their relevance in the modern world."

GLOBAL INDIGENOUS MEDIA: A COLLECTION OF PERSPECTIVES

This collaborative anthology has grown out of a broader project to provide a cultural space for dialogue between Indigenous media producers, scholars, and activists who might otherwise not have the opportunity to come together and share their perspectives, visions, and works of art. As Ginsburg writes in her essay, "Increasingly, the circulation of these media globally—through conferences, festivals, coproductions, and the use of the Internet—has become an important basis for a nascent but growing transnational network of Indigenous media makers and activists. These

activists are attempting to reverse processes through which aspects of their societies have been objectified, commodified, and appropriated; their media productions and writings are efforts to recover their histories, land rights, and knowledge bases as their own cultural property." This collection attends to the diversity of this expression by addressing as full a range of media production as possible: feature film, documentary, video art, multimedia works, television programs, radio broadcasts, Internet activism, and journalism. Clearly, growing international and national support has multiplied the distribution outlets for cultural expression, expanding the audience and strengthening global advocacy.

We have selected essays that not only speak to the particulars of their geographic and cultural contexts but also provide significant theoretical insights into the larger questions and processes of Indigeneity and media. We regret that limitations of space and access to the talents of a wider range of Indigenous producers do not allow us to be as comprehensive as we might wish and to cover every form of Indigenous media in every cultural corner of the globe, and we particularly lament the fact that we do not have case studies from India, Africa, or China. However, we hope that this work will inspire future collections that will continue to speak to the centrality of the media for Indigenous movements. This collection identifies the working goals of Indigenous artists and cultural activists in building community, in reenvisioning the political stakes of contemporary Indigenous aesthetics, in mobilizing movements for cultural survival and self-determination, in creating self-sustaining media institutions and places in government institutions, and in fashioning new technologies to articulate and negotiate the meaning of Indigeneity in the twenty-first century.

From Poetics to Politics: Indigenous Media Aesthetics and Style
The chapters in the first section focus on Indigenous media—particularly film, video, and animation—as artistic productions rooted in their culturally specific histories, offering distinct aesthetic and narrative perspectives while positioning themselves in dialogue with, and in contrast to, mainstream media forms and industrial products in both their modes of production and their stylistic elements. They frequently reflect culturally specific and localized Indigenous systems of knowledge and aesthetics adapted to the new technologies that media proffers. Exploring the work of individual artists and media collectives, these essays detail both the vibrancy of contemporary production and the way it opens up a dialogue

between generations and across communities: highlighting the emergence of new aesthetic strategies, the reworking of traditional forms, and the cultural politics of media making in larger regional, national, and global networks of funding and distribution.

Indigenous movements for self-determination require careful analysis of both the conditions of the Fourth World in general and the independent stakes of each group's struggle in particular. Juan Salazar and Amalia Córdova compare Indigenous media to the "imperfect cinema" described by the Cuban filmmaker and theorist Julio García Espinosa, emphasizing that the concept of a *poetics of media* may provide a way to identify the varied and complex Indigenous processes of making culture visible through media practice. Tracing several decades of the development of Indigenous video in Latin America, they provide a critical overview of the debates that have emerged in visual anthropology and Indigenous media activism. For Salazar and Córdova, the models of imperfect and Third Cinema may lead Indigenous filmmakers past the quest for the glossy production values of international art cinema and refocus the question of media in a movement for self-determination. As a movement dedicated to self-representation, "imperfect cinema" puts forth a powerful agenda for an anticolonial cinema. Salazar and Córdova provide a much needed history of how Indigenous media in Latin America have nurtured transnational Indigenous movements.

Jennifer Gauthier, a film scholar, focuses on the pioneering partnership of Barry Barclay with other Maori filmmakers to spark a rebirth of Maori cinema in New Zealand, coupled with increased state funding and creative support. Gauthier outlines Barclay's elaboration of Indigenous aesthetics in his definition of Fourth Cinema and his concept of "doing justice" by "tackling head-on questions of justice in land rights, civil rights, and cultural representation in the nation." Barclay works to produce a cinema that "does justice" to Maori on these terms: including as many Maori as possible on productions and transforming the style and aesthetics of filmmaking to respond to Maori economic, political, and cultural needs and values. As Gauthier explains, Maori cinema must navigate the particular institutions and models of identity and prestige in New Zealand. However, the successes of Maori cinema have opened it up to the dual pressures of commercialization and appropriation by the state.

Some Indigenous producers have responded to these pressures by turning inward and focusing on how media might first serve local needs.

The Cache Collective, a curatorial group of young scholars, examines how the Igloolik Isuma and Arnait Video collectives have adapted video technologies to invent hybrid temporal environments: the tapes store the past in the form of recorded memories while actors and videographers simultaneously use such archived "pasts" to discuss the present and to inform collective video practices. This chapter reveals the complexities of video production in Nunavut by exploring the social, political, and economic dynamics of contemporary Inuit artistic practices, arguing that the videos function as a new form of cultural memory. The collective's rich characterizations of Igloolik and Arnait production show how Indigenous media can reference mainstream genres and production techniques without surrendering to them, dynamically participating in the invention of Inuit tradition for present and future generations.

Examining issues of hybridity, representation, language, and pedagogy in her study of Indigenous-controlled animation production companies in the United States and Canada, Joanna Hearne, a film scholar, describes creative uses of animation to educate and entertain both Indigenous and mainstream audiences. Countering the legacies of intrusive pedagogies from the residential school systems, as well as mainstream media images of "vanishing natives," these short animated films reconstruct Indigenous cultural identities—and cultural futures—by redeploying both traditional oral narratives and Western image-making technologies. Hearne asserts that Indigenous animation intervenes in contested sites of education in several ways: by re-presenting pedagogical iconographies as scenes of storytelling rather than as classroom lessons and by presenting native-controlled images that counter stereotypical productions of "Indianness" in mainstream children's films. Bringing tales and characters of the oral tradition to life in contemporary settings, native animators assert the vitality of storytelling and dynamically preserve cultural continuity.

Indigenous Activism, Advocacy, and Empowerment through Media
The essays in the anthology's second section examine the role played by Indigenous media in cultural and political struggles such as combating discrimination, preserving Indigenous cultures and environments, and advocating for cultural rights—including the right to one's own language, the protection of Indigenous traditional knowledge, and the provision of sufficient resources to Indigenous peoples and their media, as well as mobilizing in advocacy for the ongoing movement for self-determination. These essays directly address the ways that Indigenous media serve local

struggles for recognition by nation-states. Moreover, these chapters emphasize the necessity for media self-representation in the international public sphere—representation that challenges mainstream and official state narratives, helps forge international solidarity movements, and often protects communities by bringing land claims and human rights issues to international attention.

Here, too, local movements strategically engage the state by mobilizing national and international resources and rhetoric whenever possible. As the media scholar Lisa Brooten's chapter on Indigenous media production in Burma suggests, Indigenous peoples must frequently bypass the nation-state in order to achieve international visibility and protection. Brooten examines the role of Indigenous media in a multiethnic opposition movement against the Burmese regime that is slowly changing not only the outside world's picture of Burma but also the self-image of many Indigenous groups. Brooten describes the work of two Indigenous video production groups, both tied to the work of NGOS protecting Indigenous communities and promoting human rights. This work entails great risk, but producers know that only the immediacy of the images and the stories of Burma's Indigenous peoples will bring international pressure to bear on the state.

Kathleen Buddle, in her anthropological study of the social construction of urban Aboriginal women's networks through radio programs in Ontario and Manitoba, provides case studies of the contemporary cultural and gender politics of local Indigenous media centers and projects, demonstrating how media projects themselves may become a focal point for community organization and detailing the complex negotiations between community media centers and state policies for minority cultural content. Buddle demonstrates how such resources can become crucial modes of sustenance and activism for disempowered sectors of Indigenous communities and can provide opportunities for political intervention. Buddle's work illuminates the ways urban radio and kinesthetic practices organize Native women's projects by resignifying the meanings of tradition, womanhood, home, and work, and by creating alternate sites for reception. Buddle examines the implications of Aboriginal women's radio interventions into political domains for the realigning of native nationalist structures of feeling. Thus, against both the mainstream and dominant Aboriginal media, women's community-access radio programs have helped Aboriginal women reimagine their social and political roles.

The contributions by Mario Murillo and Alexandra Halkin, focusing on Indigenous radio in Colombia and the media activism of the Zapatistas, respectively, demonstrate the critical function of the media in Indigenous resistance movements in Latin America, providing additional case studies to enrich and supplement the overview provided by Salazar and Córdova. Murillo's personal experience with Radio Payu'mat attests to radio's power to help sustain local organizing in northern Cauca, one of the most highly militarized and conflictive areas of the Colombian Andes. There, Indigenous communities use radio as a form of resistance to a Colombian national consciousness—a settler-state nationalism and mythology perpetuated by mainstream media and shaped by "materialism, militarism, and corruption." Existing within—or *engaging* (as Buddle would say)—a public sphere affected by both the state and commercial forces, Indigenous radio, Murillo argues, must be assessed in terms of how effectively it fosters not merely a space for Indigenous voices to be heard but also a space for genuine critique.

Halkin, a documentary filmmaker, offers a model of cooperative, transnational Indigenous media making through her experience as founder of the Chiapas Media Project / Promedios, a binational NGO providing video, computer equipment, and training to Indigenous Mexican (Zapatista) communities. Her story illuminates the complex interplay between Zapatista media production, state funding, and international support. The Chiapas communities have adapted video technology as an important tool for internal communication, cultural preservation, and human rights, a medium through which they communicate their own truths and realities to the outside world. A witness to some of the stunning international media interventions made by the Zapatistas in their struggle to promote the visibility of Indigenous people living in Mexico, Halkin illustrates some of the organizational intricacies and intercultural politics of establishing a sustainable local media training and production center.

Cultural Identity, Preservation, and Community Building through Media
The essays in the third section illustrate the critical role of Indigenous media in preserving and maintaining cultural identity and in building community, drawing attention to the interpersonal, local, and everyday aspects of media production and reception and to the connective links formed through such practice. Exploring a variety of community-based Indigenous media projects, these contributors provide a snapshot of the

vitality of Indigenous communities and their media. Given the reality of ongoing internal colonialism, Indigenous activists and filmmakers often operate in national or international institutions. Still, Indigenous media producers do not uncritically take up official categories of identity or the institutions and technologies that enable self-representation. These essays detail how Indigenous media operate in and against states around the world and articulate with different levels of nationalist discourse.

Laurel Smith interrogates the relationship between media, representation, and cultural identity in the Oaxacan pueblo of San Pedro Quiatoni. A cultural geographer, Smith investigates place-based identity by focusing on the production of a community-based video and the role of communications technologies in transnational networks of advocacy: a dialectic between local movements and global political rhetorics. Analyzing the politics of representation, Smith outlines how transnational relations and state institutions contribute to community development initiatives in rural Mexico. Deftly mapping the terrain of ethnopolitics, Smith demonstrates how Indigenous groups fashion politically savvy representations that engage larger translocal and transnational organizations by appropriating their terms for local ends.

The Finnish communication scholar Sari Pietikäinen examines the role of the Sámi-language media, serving a population spread across several nation-states in northern Scandinavia, in communal revitalization, considering such features as cultural renewal, language preservation, and transnationalism. Describing the range of Sámi media, Pietikäinen suggests that a population as "transnational, multilingual, pluricultural, and partly diasporic" as the Sámi require media that are able, as the Sámi say, "to breathe two airs." As such, Sámi media resonate locally *and* serve a specifically "pan-Sámi" function, nurturing broader, transnational needs throughout the diaspora.

Galina Diatchkova, a Chukchi cultural historian, asserts the increasingly vital role that Indigenous media have played in the growth of the Indigenous movement and the institutional and cultural politics in post-Soviet Russia. She chronicles the development of Indigenous broadcasting and journalism, particularly in Chukotka and Kamchatka, as well as the most recent mobilization of information technologies for cultural preservation and advocacy. Diatchkova delineates the political and financial challenges facing Indigenous media initiatives and the development of professional Indigenous media networks coupled with international networks of support. Diatchkova's personal experience with these move-

ments provides valuable insights into how Indigenous groups have mobilized media over decades that witnessed tumultuous changes in state politics and policies. Against official policies of "integration" (assimilation), regional and federal paternalism, and economic crisis, indigenous-language newspapers, radio, television, and now the Internet have preserved language and rallied Indigenous groups.

The Welsh media scholar Ruth McElroy provides a case study challenging the received definition of Indigenous media in the shape of the Welsh-language channel, Sianel Pedwar Cymru (s4c), which began broadcasting in 1982 following an extensive political campaign conducted by both a political party and a social protest group. McElroy considers how discourses of Indigeneity in Wales operate politically in a predominantly white, nonsettler state, only relatively recently afforded a channel of its own and only just beginning to deal with its imperial past and established multiracial and multilingual communities. One of the earliest established European minority-language broadcasters, s4c offers a case study for the analysis of how changing media ecologies and cultural practices have been negotiated by broadcasters, audiences, and program makers alike. Rather than seeing cultural nationalism as necessarily fixing identity, McElroy problematizes the interlocking rhetorics of race, language, nation, and identity as they play out in Welsh-language media.

New Technologies, Timeless Knowledges: Digital and Interactive Media
The final section of the collection brings together exciting new work on the emergence of digital technologies and interactive media among Indigenous artists and in Indigenous communities. These chapters highlight the importance of new media to preserving and disseminating Indigenous knowledge. Demonstrating that new media function as more than mere storage devices for Aboriginal knowledge, these essays show the dynamic interplay between digital technologies and traditional forms of knowing and remembering. As in earlier chapters, these contributors address what Ginsburg (1991) has called the "Faustian contract" facing Indigenous media by demonstrating the vital ways Indigenous producers connect and reconfigure identity via digital technologies and new media, often in a tense partnership with government, academic, and / or commercial interests, yet still maintaining creative and editorial control to ensure representation of their culture. Such insights point again to the centrality of Indigenous poetics and aesthetics in organizing and expressing distinctive cultural ideals, logics, and knowledge. These

chapters also foreground the emerging role of Indigenous digital media in creating interconnected global networks as well as archiving and digitizing heritage and cultural knowledge, using new technologies for very local purposes. Rejecting both absolutist narratives of assimilation through technology and naive arguments about global villages, Indigenous media producers recognize both the pitfalls and promises of digital technology.

The scope of Indigenous media today vanquishes the old stereotype of the "vanishing native" standing passive in the face of the overwhelming forces of modernity. The anthropologists Priscila Faulhaber and Louis Forline detail the proactive self-positioning of the Ticuna Indians of Brazil in relationship to the global via the transposition of Ticuna Indigenous knowledge and rituals into a digitized form for the CD-ROM *Magüta Arü Inü: Recollecting Magüta Thinking*. For the Ticuna, magical thinking is associated with the possibility of reproduction of cultural information disseminated on a large scale. The Ticuna custodians who collaborated on the production of the CD-ROM consider the project an opportunity both to introduce Ticuna epistemology to the world and to be affected—on their own terms—by the world's reception of Ticuna magical thinking.

Michael Christie, a linguist writing about the databasing of Australian Aboriginal knowledge, tells the story of collaborations regarding the new Desert Knowledge Cooperative Research Centre in Alice Springs. Christie cautions that the institutional and technological parameters of "preservation" efforts can indeed affect traditional knowledge in ways not imagined or intended. Aboriginal ways of knowing and theories of knowledge are particularly compromised when information technologies are at work, bringing with them a bias toward Western assumptions about knowledge and its commodification and commercialization. Christie charts the complicated intersection of academic, commercial, state, and local goals, often encoded by the "scale" informing feasibility studies and public projects. For Christie, digital technology is more than a mere medium; it imports a host of assumptions about social relations and economies—about how communities relate to their own cultural production—that may not be compatible with Aboriginal forms of knowledge or Aboriginal desires. Thus he cautions that participants and researchers should ensure that initiatives emerge from local communities and that they begin with a critical analysis of scale.

In our closing chapter, Faye Ginsburg—the anthropologist widely re-

garded as one of the founding scholars of Indigenous media studies—draws together the themes laid out in this collection by providing some insights into the changing landscape of Indigenous media production in our twenty-first-century digital global village. In "Rethinking the Digital Age," Ginsburg examines how the concept of the digital age has taken on a sense of evolutionary inevitability, creating an increasing stratification and ethnocentrism in the distribution of certain kinds of media practices despite trends to de-Westernize media studies. Ginsburg notes that many Indigenous artists and activists not only dispute the logic of inevitability, but that, increasingly, Indigenous media makers are laying bare and rejecting the institutional and philosophical frameworks smuggled in with programs to bring Indigenous communities *into* the digital age. Indigenous media makers and activists recognize both risks and opportunities as they shout for audibility, desiring to be heard on their own terms, amid the triumphalist din of new media rhetoric. Critical of unadulterated techno-utopianism, Ginsburg argues that Indigenous groups must be the ones to determine their specific needs with regard to new media. Ginsburg seeks to reopen that space by discussing some of the work in new media being produced by Indigenous communities and to suggest how it might expand and complicate our ideas about the digital age in ways that take into account other points of view in the so-called global village. Ginsburg sees these efforts as ways "not only to sustain and build their communities but also to transform them through what one might call a 'strategic traditionalism.'"

Indeed, all of the contributions to this collection can be seen as strategically traditionalist in that they endeavor to protect the distinctive values of community traditions while simultaneously recognizing that culture itself is a living, dynamic organism. Indigenous media makers are producing such dynamic cultural and artistic works: works that question dominant worldviews while at the same time promoting a strategic, internationally conceived Indigenism. International Indigenism, as the contributors to this volume demonstrate, has forged a global support network for artists, activists, and communities. Using contemporary technologies as building blocks, producers dialectically engage Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and relating. In a world where perhaps no culture can hope to enjoy total isolation and autonomy, Indigenous media suggest a way to recognize and nurture local cultural distinctiveness while supplying resources for transnational affiliation.

NOTES

The authors wish to acknowledge those whose influences have led us from our previous research on the cultural politics of Native American representation in the mainstream news media (Wilson 1996, 1998 and 1999) and the rise of Native American filmmaking (Stewart 2001 and 2007) to embrace a global perspective and to see the connections between Indigenous issues and movements throughout the world. We have been especially inspired by Faye Ginsburg (1991, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2005a, b, and c), whose pioneering work has defined the field of indigenous media studies.

1. "ABC Television and the Walt Disney Studios Extend Partnership with the Institute of American Indian Arts to Offer Workshops for Talented Native American Students," ABC press release, June 6, 2005, www.thefutoncritic .com / cgi / pr.cgi?id=20050606abc01; "IAIA Forges Major Partnerships to Support 2005 Film and Television Workshop," IAIA press release, June 13, 2005, www.iaia.edu / apressrelease _ 63.php; see www.nativenetworks.si.edu / eng / purple / awards _ honors.htm; "IAIA's Film and Television Workshop Places Four Students on Hollywood's Fast Track," IAIA press release, October 10, 2005, www.iaia.edu / cpressrelease _ 81.php.

2. "2006 Sundance Film Festival to Feature Native Forum Workshops along with 4 Native American and Indigenous Films," Sundance Institute press release, January 11, 2006; "2006 Sundance Film Festival Issues Call for Submissions from Native American and Indigenous Filmmakers," Sundance Institute press release, September 12, 2005, festival.sundance.org / 2006 / festival / press.aspx.

3. Profile of Bunky Echo-Hawk, retrieved November 2005 from www.thenaica .org / images / artists-in-residence / artists-in-residence _ be.htm.

4. See, e.g., regarding the imaging of Native Americans by the dominant media: Bataille and Silet 1980; Churchill 1998; Deloria 1998; Kilpatrick 1999; and Rollins 2003.

5. Indigenous media activists have continued to work in partnership with non-indigenous specialists such as anthropologists and other community activists (see Alexandra Halkin's essay in this collection), and one training ground in the United States for aspiring Indigenous media makers was the Anthropology Film Center in Santa Fe, founded in 1965.

6. In 1972 a group of anthropologists founded the Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communication (SAVICOM), which became a section of the American Anthropological Association. In 1984 SAVICOM was replaced by the Society for Visual Anthropology (Prins 2002b: 304–5).

7. Another significant venue for advocacy reporting on Indigenous media issues around the world has been the work of Cultural Survival, an NGO founded by

the anthropologist David Maybury-Lewis in 1972 and dedicated to "promoting the rights, voices, and visions of indigenous peoples" (www.culturalsur vival.org). Beginning as early as 1983, this organization has focused a number of issues of its *Cultural Survival Quarterly* on issues related to media: "The Electronic Era" (1983); "Native American Journalism" (1994); "The Internet and Indigenous Groups" (1998a); "Aboriginal Media, Aboriginal Control" (1998b); and, most recently, "Indigenous Peoples Bridging the Digital Divide" (2006).

8. Quote is from the Web site of 3Cmedia, an annual scholarly electronic journal published by the Community Broadcasting Association of Australia; see www.cbonline.org.au/3cmedia/. Although community broadcasting and Indigenous broadcasting share many of the same interests and issues, not all community broadcasting is Indigenous.

9. U.N. Document E-RES-1982–34. All documents from the U.N. Commission on Human Rights regarding Indigenous Peoples are available online in a database searchable by access number at ap.ohchr.org/documents/sdpage_e.aspx?s=75. For sake of brevity, in subsequent listings only the specific information and access number will be provided rather than the search chain URL.

10. U.N. Document E-RES-1988–36.

11. United Nations Economic and Social Council 1994: 105–15. See also Daes 1993. For comments on recent sessions, see *Indian Country Today* 2005; Roy 2005; and c 2005.

12. U.N. Document E-RES-2000–22.

13. Macdonald 2006; Rizvi 2006.

14. For more on Daes's contribution to Indigenous rights work at the global level, see Alfredsson and Stavropoulou 2002.

15. Daes builds on two previous definitions of Indigeneity that laid the groundwork for the concept in international discourses. The first was in the International Labor Organization's (ILO) Convention no. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, adopted in 1989 "to include the fundamental concept that the ways of life of Indigenous and tribal peoples should and will survive." Convention no. 169 set out a working definition of Indigenous peoples: "(a) Tribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations; (b) Peoples in independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonisation or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions, . . . self-identification as indigenous or tribal shall be regarded as a

fundamental criterion for determining the groups to which the provisions of this Convention apply" (www.ilo.org / public / english / indigenous). The second definition, formulated during this same period, appeared in José Martínez Cobo's five-volume U.N. *Study of the Problem of Discrimination against Indigenous Populations* (1986), which presented the first comprehensive definition of *indigenous* in a U.N. document: "Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with preinvasion and precolonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them. They form at present nondominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems" (Cobo 1986, quoted in Daes 1996: 9–10).

16. See Daes 1996 and an addendum to that Working Paper: "The Concept of 'Indigenous Peoples' (U.N. Document E / CN.4 / Sub.2 / AC.4 / 1996 / 2 / Add.1).

17. As cited in Daes 1996: 13; see U.N. document E / CN.4, Sub. 2 / 1995 / 24, para. 41 for original.

18. David Goodman (2004) and others suggest a model of internal colonialism for the governing and development of many of China's ethnic minorities, even though Goodman surmises that such a concept does not sit well with the worldview of a communist regime. Quote is from Embassy of the Peoples' Republic of China in Switzerland 1997.

19. Although the U.N. Human Rights covenants are meant to support the right of self-determination to all peoples, the "blue water" or "salt water" thesis has been used by some nation-states to exclude peoples living under internal colonialism from the right to self-determination. Annette Jaimes (1992: 74) explained that the "Belgian Thesis" argued that "decolonization should extend to all colonized peoples, even if they are bound in enclaves entirely surrounded by colonizing states," such as those of Indigenous peoples: "Despite this attempt to extend decolonization to indigenous peoples, the 'salt water thesis' has predominated in international debate." The notion of the Fourth World was also meant to address the distinct conditions supporting the self-determination of Indigenous peoples often *against* postcolonial states.

20. Daes (1996: 23) hints that the inability of some governments to recognize the Indigeneity of groups within their states is not due to a lack of definition but rather to the "efforts of some Governments to limit its globality, and of other Governments to build a high conceptual wall between 'indigenous' and 'peoples' and / or 'Non-Self-Governing Territories.' "

21. In this book, we use the term *nation-state* (or *state*) to represent the sovereign political bodies, generally recognized by the international communities such

as the United Nations, within and across the boundaries of which Indigenous peoples and Indigenous nations have historically found themselves subsumed by conquest and empire. This does not negate the sense of nation, and sometimes (as in the case of many Native American tribal nations) the claims to sovereignty vis-à-vis their treaty status, that many Indigenous peoples embrace. It is a political designation that allows us to discuss the structures of power and governance in which Indigenous groups must negotiate their cultural and political status. As Gérard Chaliand (1989) notes, empires "gave way to states which sought to be nations," yet rarely has such a state been homogeneous and reflected a unified population. Rather, the irony of most modern nation-states is that they are primarily states exercising their power to attempt to either assimilate or manage the segments of their population who represent internal nationalities, or as Fleras and Elliot (1992) term them, "the nations within."

22. For a history of the evolving definition of aboriginality in Australia, see Gardiner-Garden 2000. For a history of these issues in Canada, see Asch 1997 and Hylton 1994.

23. For recent anthropological discussions of the classification of China's ethnic minorities, see Gladney 2003, 2004; Harrell 2001; and Schein 2000.

24. State-owned media in China promote such discourse in reports about the country's minority nationalities. For example, a 1999 article in the *People's Daily* anticipating the new *xibu da kaifa* (Great Western Development) program explained that such development would "help the people of various nationalities to speedily shake off poverty and become prosperous [and] will further the unity of the people of various nationalities and strengthening of national defense on the borderland in contribution to the building of a united stable motherland" (from *People's Daily* 1999).

25. In the United States, for example, the pan-Indian movement emerged in the early twentieth century with regional intertribal organizations leading to nationwide political advocacy groups by midcentury such as the Association on American Indian Affairs and the National Congress of American Indians.

26. United Nations, *Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (1994).

27. For the report, see U.N. Document E / CN.4 / Sub.2 / Ac.4 / 1998 / 6.

28. Gluck 2005; Tsai 2007.

29. See Jakubowicz 2006; and the 2005 Indigenous Television Review Report from Australia's Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts ("Department of . . ." 2005).

30. This conference became the basis for an independent video, *Arctic to Amazonia* (1993), produced by Robbie Leppzer of Turning Tide Productions.