most seemingly benign of acts (or arts) can have deeply political implications.

**Glossary**

| aloha       | love, affection, compassion; a greeting |
| hula        | a genre of indigenous Hawaiian dance performed by men and women |
| Kānaka Maoli | Native Hawaiians |
| po'e hula   | hula practitioners |
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This book is a masterful synthesis of 20 years’ ethnographic fieldwork in one Bolivian community, the Aymara-speaking Andean settlement of Wila Kjarka. Over this period, the author, a renowned Andean anthropologist, has cultivated his own intimate relationships with the people of Wila Kjarka, a fact that is revealed on every page of this intellectually and emotionally engaging work.

The central focus is uncovering “what it means to be indigenous to indigenous people themselves” (p. 2). In contrast to many other studies on indigeneity, Canessa explores “these multiple identities … through their [people of Wila Kjarka] own lived experiences and their own voices rather than the lens of globalized concepts and discourses” (p. 4). This is both an intellectually rigorous and profoundly ethical approach, since Canessa fully respects the voice and agency of his informants.

The inhabitants of Wila Kjarka define themselves as jaqi (Aymara term meaning “people”) as opposed to q’ara (urban outsiders); “one of the central tasks of this book is to explore what jaqi means to the people of Wila Kjarka and how the term differs from indigenous or indian” (p. 5). The Spanish term “indio” (indian) stresses the marginalized status of the people referred to; calling someone indio is thus insulting across Latin America. Nonetheless, this term interacts with Wila Kjarkeans’ own distinction between jaqi and q’ara, which reinforces the “otherness” of q’ara. The indio/non-indio and jaqi/q’ara binaries are thus mutually reinforcing.

Canessa thereby reveals the contested nature of naming, since the locally accepted term (jaqi) is inseparable from the ideological baggage of an unaccepted alternative (indio). Both result
from a historical process of discrimination. This is why Canessa chooses to deploy the term “indian” throughout his book, rather than the more accepted term “indigenous”. While the latter term can be empowering, its very acceptability may obfuscate the discriminatory practices that render it meaningful; “indian”, by contrast, forces a critical reflection on these practices.

The book comprises eight chapters sandwiched between an introduction and postscript. Each explores different dimensions of what it means to “be” jaqi (or indian, or indigenous): Chapter 1 locates Wila Kjarka in its “kaleidoscope” of spatial relations with neighbouring communities; Chapters 2 and 3 discuss the reinterpretation of history according to contemporary needs and desires; Chapters 4 and 5 explore the distinction between jaqi/non-jaqi in the respective contexts of the life cycle, and the mythical, demonic figure of the kharisiri (fat-eater); Chapter 6 examines how discourses of “progress” in the school are often counterproductive in perpetuating marginalization; Chapters 7 and 8 explore the inextricable relationship between gender, sexuality and ethnic/national/cultural identity.

While each theme is foregrounded in a different chapter, Canessa’s holistic vision means that every chapter references every theme to at least some extent. Likewise, while the book broadly moves from the “local” (in earlier chapters) to the “national” (in the later chapters), both are seamlessly interwoven throughout the book. This interpenetration of themes allows Canessa to identify general tendencies while avoiding the obfuscation of particularities. Indeed, while the later chapters pertain to more general national issues, they also “examine more closely the personal and the intimate” (p. 32). This kaleidoscopic approach emanates from Canessa’s recognition that any category is multiple, dynamic and contingent, constantly disputed in each dialectic encounter: “It is important to remember that women and men themselves are not consistent in the values attached to different forms of labor, dress, identity, and so on” (p. 242).

The ambiguity of categories is particularly salient in Canessa’s final discussion of the intertwining of race and sexuality. Canessa, like Weismantel (2001) in her study on race and gender in Ecuador, notes a profound ambivalence of non-jaqi towards the indian “other”: “The despised racial other is often sexually desired” (p. 30), since fear and desire both stem from the same discourse of exoticization. Insofar as this discourse rhetorically enacts the discrete categories of “indigenous/non-indigenous”, endowing each with a specific socioeconomic role, it perpetuates their mutual dependence: “The peasant sector cannot survive without cash income, and the capitalist sector is dependent on the cheap labor supplied by the peasantry” (p. 228).

This ambivalent racial identity is profoundly gendered given that it is jaqi men who work in the urban centres, women generally remaining in Wila Kjarka as agriculturalists. Nonetheless, jaqi men are feminized by non-jaqi just as jaqi women are masculinized through their heavy agricultural labour. Thus, Canessa shows how ethnic and gender categories are never fixed but shift according to context. One particularly novel way that he explores this is by analysing humour, a topic that is relatively uncommon in ethnographies. Likewise, Canessa’s frequent references to the Aymara language are refreshing for a study that does not define itself as linguistic-anthropological.

Much of Canessa’s discussion draws on historical themes, since he (plausibly, I think) understands “indigenous consciousness” as “how [people] think of themselves as historical subjects” (p. 69). What differentiates this study from Abercrombie’s (1998) and Arnold’s (2006) ethnohistorical accounts of Aymara people is the fact that Canessa found “no continuous narrative” relating present-day institutions to the pre-Columbian past (p. 87). Canessa’s foregrounding of ambiguities and disagreements is what gives the book such interpretive richness,
yet his acknowledgement that these divergences all stem from shared historical processes maintains the cohesion of his account.

In sum, this book is a delight to read, both in terms of the author’s clear and engaging style, which frequently blends humour and pathos, and in the non-judgemental approach which testifies to an eagerness to understand others on their own terms. Thus, the account is situated without being biased, and the result is a profoundly honest, subtle and wide-ranging study that is sure to inspire scholars from diverse disciplinary backgrounds.

Glossary

indio Spanish for “indian” (written by Canessa in lower case); a pejorative term that denotes the indigenous peoples of Latin America
jaqi Aymara for “people”; members of the Aymara ethnic group
kharisiri a mythical monster of Aymara lore which extracts human fat
q’ara Aymara for “bare, peeled”; refers to non-Aymara “outsiders”
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Among the world’s Indigenous populations, American Indians enjoy a unique degree of self-determination and sovereignty. Once an Indian tribe has been recognized by the United States Government, it is then afforded not only the right to form a government, but also the authority to deliver services to its citizens, and even the right to determine its membership (or citizenship). While such a status would be the envy of many Indigenous peoples around the world, it is important to recall that even this basic recognition of tribal sovereignty is fraught with colonial undertones.

On this score, the University of North Carolina’s Jean Dennison offers an important reminder of the basic colonial impediments that pervade the tribal constitutional process. Taking the example of her own tribe—the Osage Nation of Oklahoma—Dennison uses an anthropologist’s eye for detail in her analysis of five key concepts in the tribal constitutional process that are inextricably linked to the American legacy of colonization. These “colonial entanglements” provide a framework that