

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books
and Chapters

University of Nebraska Press

2009

Border Crossings: Transnational Americanist Anthropology

Kathleen S. Fine-Dare

Steven L. Rubenstein

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Fine-Dare, Kathleen S. and Rubenstein, Steven L., "Border Crossings: Transnational Americanist Anthropology" (2009). *University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters*. 15.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples/15>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Nebraska Press at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.



BORDER CROSSINGS

[Buy the Book](#)



Border Crossings

Transnational Americanist Anthropology

Edited and with an introduction by
Kathleen S. Fine-Dare and Steven L. Rubenstein

University of Nebraska Press | Lincoln and London

[Buy the Book](#)

© 2009 by the Board of Regents of the
University of Nebraska. All rights reserved.
Manufactured in the United States of America.



Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Border crossings : transnational Americanist anthropology
/ edited and with an introduction by Kathleen S. Fine-Dare
and Steven L. Rubenstein.

p. cm. Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8032-1086-8 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Anthropology—America—Research.
2. Anthropology—America—Methodology.
3. Anthropology—America—International cooperation.
4. Intercultural communication—America. 5. Culture and globalization—America. 6. Indigenous peoples—America.
7. Transnationalism—America. 8. America—Ethnic relations. I. Fine-Dare, Kathleen S. (Kathleen Sue), 1953–
II. Rubenstein, Steven, 1962–

GN42.B67 2009 301.072'07—dc22 2008043187

Set in Scala by Bob Reitz.

Designed by Joel Gehringer.



Contents

Preface	vii
Introduction: Toward a Transnational Americanist Anthropology Kathleen S. Fine-Dare and Steven L. Rubenstein	ix
PART ONE — A NEW COMPASS FOR AMERICANIST STUDIES	
1. Racing across Borders in the Americas: Anthropological Critique and the Challenge of Transnational Racial Identities John M. Norvell	3
2. The Politics of Knowledge and Identity and the Poetics of Political Economy: The Truth Value of Dividing Bridges Linda J. Seligmann	34
3. Reinventing Archaeological Heritage: Critical Science in a North/South Perspective James A. Zeidler	43
PART TWO — TRANSAMERICAN CASE STUDIES	
4. Bodies Unburied, Mummies Displayed: Mourning, Museums, and Identity Politics in the Americas Kathleen S. Fine-Dare	67
5. Crossing Boundaries with Shrunken Heads Steven L. Rubenstein	119
6. Local Conflict, Global Forces: Fighting for Public Education in a New York Suburb Jean N. Scandlyn	171
7. <i>El Envío</i> : Remittances, Rights, and Associations among Central American Immigrants in Greater Washington DC Barbara Burton and Sarah Gammage	211

8. Global Indigenous Movements: Convergence and
Differentiation in the Face of the Twenty-First-Century
State Les W. Field 230
9. What Can Americanists and Anthropology Learn from the
Alliances between Indigenous Peoples and Popular
Movements in the Amazon? Lêda Leitão Martins 247

PART THREE — AMERICANIST REFLECTIONS

10. “That’s Your Hopi Uncle”: Ethical Borders in the Field
Enrique Salmón 263
11. The Dust Bowl Tango: Looking at South America from the
Southern Plains Peter McCormick 274
12. The Lizard’s Dream
Steven L. Rubenstein and Kathleen S. Fine-Dare 289
- Afterword: Fordism, Post-Fordism, and Americanist
Anthropology David L. Nugent 331
- Contributors 341
- Index 349



Preface

An edited volume takes a long time to produce, greatly trying everyone's patience, for each author is like a captive on a runaway bus hijacked in turn by the various delays caused by any one of the other editors or authors. We therefore offer our primary thanks to the individual contributors to this book, which began in 2003 as a session at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) held in Chicago, Illinois, titled "Moving across Borders: Re-Thinking and Re-Siting Americanist Anthropology in an Era of NAFTA, ALCA, and a 'War on Terrorism.'" In the time since the session, three new contributions were added, fresh fieldwork and other new research were incorporated into many of the essays, and events both north and south of the Rio Grande highlighted in often tragic fashion the need to remain focused on hemispheric links. Kathy spent a semester teaching cross-hemispheric issues to students in Quito, Ecuador, and Steven left his job in Ohio for a new post focused on Latin American studies in England. In early 2007 the largely Native American–composed advisory board to the fledgling American Indian studies program at Kathy's institution in Colorado voted to change the title and focus of the program to Native American and Indigenous Studies because, as one Navajo member put it, "We can't exclude consideration of South Americans, Maoris, Saamis, and the other indigenous people who share our concerns."

Thanks go to Orin Starn, for providing key inspiration and encouragement that led to the original AAA session and for contributing to the panel; to Byron Dare, for his patient, incisive, and multiple reviews of

the book (a task that seemed for him to span a decade); to David Nugent, for sticking with this project through significant professional changes; to the anonymous reviewers for the University of Nebraska Press, who provided the kinds of critique and praise indispensable to moving ahead constructively; to Elizabeth Chretien and Sara Springsteen, our patient and encouraging editors at the press; to Gary Dunham, formerly with the press and who provided much early support; to Barb Wojhoski, our superb copyeditor; to supportive colleagues at Fort Lewis College (particularly Philip Duke, then chair of the Department of Anthropology); and to the Fort Lewis College Foundation for providing some manuscript production funds.

As policies and practices regarding the movement of Latin Americans into U.S. territory become more rigid even as the United States inserts its military and economic regulatory will outside its national boundaries, we often wonder what relevance there can be to refining an Americanist anthropological tradition. Kathy responded to this query in the framing comments she made at the original AAA session by saying that in the end, she really didn't care: "I just want my students to be able to see that the skyrocketing suicide rate on the Pine Ridge reservation is somehow connected to the causes of increasing structural and physical violence in Ecuador." If improved thinking regarding "American studies," "Latin American studies," or an "Americanist tradition" can serve as a better educational and organizational tool regarding unequal power flows, poverty, and hypocrisy across this continent, then we're doing fine. If not, we Americanists of whatever variety need to continue developing our intellectual, activist, and advocacy tools in ways that go beyond the boundaries of specific academic disciplines and geographic areas. It is our hope that this book will be a small step in that direction.



Introduction

Toward a Transnational Americanist Anthropology

KATHLEEN S. FINE-DARE AND STEVEN L. RUBENSTEIN

One cannot approach a discussion of culture that abstracts cultural symbols from form and use. And a discussion of form and use directs us to specific economic, political, and social conjunctures.

William Roseberry, “Americanization in the Americas”

The “Americas” is the meeting place for some of the greatest movements in history. The ongoing encounters among inhabitants of the Americas—including human beings who left Asia, Europe, and Africa by will or by force—continue to involve heterogeneous cultural, social, and political formations.

Nonetheless, the relatively recent and overriding colonial nature of the European movement to the Americas has left us with a legacy of binary oppositions informed in part by an asymmetrical notion of “acculturation” that oversimplifies and misrepresents the heterogeneity of this meeting place: “colonist versus indigenous,” “Anglo-American versus Latin American,” “black versus white”—binaries that have often been used as proxies for “civilized versus savage” or “modern versus traditional” (see Derrida 1976; Roseberry 1989). We agree that America is a site of difference, but it is not the difference between the colonist and the Indian or between the Anglo and the Latino; it is the difference between *thousands* of different cultural, social, and political formations.

Nonetheless, what often serves as half of many oppositional binaries, indigeneity, has not only framed the doing and thinking of Americanist studies more than any other factor but has also been foundational to the history of anthropology (see Marzal 1998; Nutini 2001). We therefore propose to address the diversity of the American experience by taking indigeneity seriously, while simultaneously problematizing the ways people have conceptualized or understood it and in some cases fetishized it. Our stance is dual and is in part motivated by the call for an “intercultural” approach to teaching (see Whiteley 1997). As Vine Deloria made clear in his 1969 attack on anthropologists working around, with, and inside the communities of North American indigenous peoples, and as various authors have expressed regarding the “crisis of representation” in anthropological theory (Said 1978; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Marcus and Fisher 1986; Behar and Gordon 1995), anthropology can no longer sustain a view of the ethnographer as detached and omniscient.

The first prong of our effort to reverse this stance is a *reciprocal* anthropology. This approach has been discussed by anthropologists such as Paul Rabinow (1977, 5) and Vincent Crapanzano (1980, 139), who have proposed a hermeneutical anthropology by which the ethnographer and his or her audience gain insight into themselves through their encounter with the people they study. This is neither a means of imposing Western knowledge on former colonial subjects nor a simple reversal, placing natives in the role of “anthropologist” and anthropologist in the role of “native.” Rather, this hermeneutical reversal is a means of exposing ourselves and our work to the critical gaze of the people we study.¹

The second prong to our dual stance in rethinking Americanist studies is what Bruno Latour (1993, 100–103) calls a *symmetrical* anthropology. This point of view recognizes that some of the methodological and theoretical challenges associated with research on societies colonized by Europeans or on Europe’s periphery can and should be applied to centers of colonizing powers. Moreover, some of the methodological and theoretical challenges associated with “urban anthropology” or the “anthropology of complex societies” actually apply to *all* societies and settings.

The essays in this volume provide an experiment in the Americanist

tradition that employs reciprocal and/or symmetrical anthropology in challenging the boundaries and goals of traditional area studies. Since their formation at the time of industrial-based Western expansion and then during the cold war, the disciplines of anthropology, American studies, and Latin American and Caribbean studies have undergone a variety of transformations. With the collapse of the 1944 Bretton Woods Accord in 1973 (Bordo and Eichengreen 1993) and the end of the cold war in 1989, disciplinary boundaries are crossed more regularly as researchers seek insights from one another. Also, scholars are beginning to realize that the economic problems facing academe and academic research have the same sources as the economic and social problems they study. More recently, global border-crossing events such as 9/11, a shamefully ill-conceived war in Iraq, and concomitantly growing anti-North American sentiments across the globe have only added urgency to the plea Arif Dirlik made over a decade ago “to overcome a crisis of understanding produced by the inability of old categories to account for the world” (1994, 352).

The essays in this volume address this plea by invoking pre-cold war anthropology and by confronting the impact of the most recent forms of globalization. They also address the shift between a “Fordist” era dominated by a monopoly of northern universities in representing difference, and what David Nugent (in this volume) calls “a more flexible, post-Fordist regime of power, economy, and knowledge” (see Harvey 1989; Amin 1994) where the old “Americanist studies” merge in some interesting ways with the newer “American studies.”² We now briefly review the development of Americanist studies prior to the nineteenth century and the movement toward “critical regional studies” that emerged in a transnational, post-Fordist era.

EARLY AMERICANIST TRADITIONS

The first “border” addressed by Americanist studies was an exploration of John Locke’s 1690 pronouncement that “in the beginning, all the world was America” ([1690] 1952, 35). According to Locke the trajectory of human history was marked by a great moral and technological divide between humans living in a state of society and those in possession of

government (what anthropologists would later distinguish as “primitive” and “civilized” societies). The idea that American Indians represented the earliest stages of all humanity provided a framework for early archaeological studies and museological collecting, serving as the primary rationale for an academic focus on an “other” that would be echoed in Orientalist and other intellectual, aesthetic, and collecting rationales of empire (see Fine-Dare 2002; Kehoe 1998). By the nineteenth century the fascination with American Indians expressed in the works of writers such as Montaigne and Rousseau spawned the creation of several “geographical” organizations in France dedicated to presenting, understanding, and disseminating knowledge gathered in a variety of contexts.³

One of these, the Société Américaine de France, was founded in 1857 in Paris “to encourage the study of the past life of the peoples of the American continent and was an outgrowth of the interest in this subject aroused among European scholars by Humboldt” (Fletcher 1913, 529). Discussions were held over the years regarding transforming the French society into one that would bring together all “Americanists,” a plan that was realized by a call made on August 25, 1874, to “all persons engaged in the study of America, the interpretation of its monuments, and the ethnographical writings on the races of America,” to meet in Nancy, France, on July 19–22, 1875; this encounter became the First International Congress of Americanists (ICA) (Fletcher 1913, 530). According to Alice Fletcher, representatives from South America, Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and North America—most notably, the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and the president of the Massachusetts Historical Society—met to establish the articles of organization, sixteen of which were adopted. The main objective, according to these original bylaws, was to contribute “to the progress of the study of the ethnography, linguistics, and historical relations of the two Americas, especially during the pre-Columbian period” (Fletcher 1913, 530).

Papers delivered at the First Congress reflected the diffusionist theories of the times. Reports were given on the presence of “Old World” Phoenicians, Chinese, Buddhists, Scandinavians, and Aryans in the pre-Columbian New World. Subsequent congresses would straddle the line

between religion and science by addressing biblical questions regarding the disposition of the world's peoples after the flood, the presence of white men and the cross among New World indigenes before the arrival of Columbus, and evidence supporting the Mormon accounts of the reappearance of Jesus in the Americas.

THE AMERICAN (BOASIAN) AMERICANISTS AND THE ICA

Although Franz Boas helped found the short-lived (1910–14) International School of Archaeology and Ethnology in Mexico City (Stocking 2000, drawing from Godoy 1977), American anthropology would not move “decisively” into an international arena until after World War II (Stocking 2000, 179). Nevertheless, anthropologists of the Boasian tradition participated extensively in the ICA before the 1940s, responding to the ICA goals revised in 1900 that emphasized “the historical and scientific study of the two Americas and their inhabitants,” and which opened the door to inclusion of Boasian work on African Americans in the New World. This new focus also fit well within the Boasian paradigm of indigenous studies that had been worked out in the 1930s by Alexander Lesser and William Duncan Strong, who encouraged their students to present American Indian societies and cultures in both regional and historical contexts. In 1928 the congress was held in New York City, presided over by Franz Boas. Other anthropologists who would serve a two-year stint as president of the congress were Paul Rivet in 1947 and again in 1954, Alfred Kroeber in 1949, J. Eric S. Thompson in 1952, Kaj Birket-Smith in 1956, Ignacio Bernal in 1962, Hermann Trimborn in 1968, and José Matos Mar in 1970.

By the 1940s researchers affiliated with Boas and with bodies such as the Carnegie Institution, the Bureau of American Ethnology, the Viking Fund, and various universities were sending scholars to countries such as Guatemala, Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, Brazil, and Peru (Comas 1950, 565) to conduct research on a variety of topics, acculturation being a particularly strong motif (see Darnell 2001 and Valentine and Darnell 1999 for excellent accounts of Boasian Americanist anthropology on both sides of the border; see also Bashkow 2004 and Castañeda 2003).

CURRENT ICA TRENDS

In 2000 the Fiftieth International Congress of Americanists was held in Warsaw; it was the first time this former Eastern Bloc city had hosted the congress, signaling that the former division of the world into East and West was rapidly being replaced by an opposition between a consolidated North and the South. The guiding theme of these meetings, “Universal Messages from the Americas for the Twenty-first Century,” reflected concerns apparent in the present volume. In the preparatory address written in advance of the Fiftieth Congress, organizational committee president Andrzej Dembicz asserted that the primary challenge facing the congress was to encompass “both Americas,” “different Americas,” and that which is “common to the Americas.”⁴ He therefore suggested that congress participants pursue the following ad hoc issues, many of which involve border-crossing phenomena:

Brazil after five hundred years: experiences, social and political challenges,
both national and American

Latin American societies and cultures in the United States (spaces for coexistence, competition, and expansion)

Latin America in the interregional dialogue: North America-Europe-Asia
and Oceania-Africa; premises for the twenty-first century

Religions and churches in Latin America at the beginning of the twenty-first
century

The social functions of missions in the Americas: experiences and challenges

Rights to culture and self-determination: experiences and tendencies in
ethnic-cultural movements in the Americas—the State and ethnicity in
the Americas

Processes, tendencies, and projections for regional hemispheric, and global
integration in the Americas

Afroamericas: experiences and empirical and theoretical projections

Potheadhunting, archaeological tourism, and protection of cultural patrimony in
the Americas: experiences and challenges for the twenty-first century

Democracy in the Americas: challenges, dangers, expectations

The Caribbean, international border: social expectations, politics, and economics for the twenty-first century
 Identity and Latin American thought: challenges for the twenty-first century
 Narcotrafficking, social development, and inter-American relations: experiences and challenges⁵

Regardless of whether these themes can be seen as truly “universal,” they clearly reflect the distance covered in 125 years of the congress’s existence. Although the study of indigenous peoples and their cultures is vaguely implied by many of the topics, the list excludes any explicit mention of indigenous peoples, thus collapsing their particular identities and concerns into those of “North America” or “South America.” Nevertheless, although a few of the 153 symposia presented in 2003 at the Fifty-first Congress (held in Santiago, Chile) addressed topics such as environment, gender, tourism, border crossings, and African American experiences, the bulk of the papers continued to reflect the ICA’s main focus on archaeological, art historical, linguistic, folkloric, religious, and ethnohistorical research on indigenous peoples.⁶

As a final note, ICA-inspired research has been reflected perhaps more than anywhere else in the works published in the academic journal *American Antiquity*, the journal of the Society for American Archaeology. When this journal split into two in 1990 with the publication of the first issue of *Latin American Antiquity*, many Americanist anthropologists were vexed that their cross-borders interests, not to mention the hemispherical concept of Americanism itself, were now artificially divided across the Rio Grande. In our minds at least, the work of Americanist scholars was becoming indistinguishable from that found in American studies and Latin American studies interdisciplinary programs. In some ways this is true, not so much because of the changing relations within the Americas, but because of institutional changes in American studies programs, particularly over the past decade.

CRITICAL REGIONALISM AND COMPARATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES

An important genre of border studies concentrates on the movements of living peoples across American borders and the concomitant circulation

of objects, ideas, and wealth. This genre has its origins in a nationalist era in Americanist studies, one that has centered on the contributions and threats “outsiders” play in the building of communities, economies, and nations.

The work of Michael Kearney (2004) has extended this concept and an examination of the problems it has caused by combining what he calls a “metaphoric” view of borders as cultural boundaries “that demarcate identities such as nationality, citizenship, ethnicity, and so forth” with the political-ecological view of “formal geopolitical borders” discussed in works by border-area scholars such as Robert Alvarez, Hastings Donnan, Josiah Heyman, and Thomas Wilson.⁷ This more geographical notion of borders informs area studies disciplines that have their roots in the growth of U.S. economic hegemony and the intrusion of cold war politics into academic disciplines such as history, literature, and political science. We will not go into the specifics of the history of area-studies programs in the United States, as excellent treatments of what Vicente Rafael calls “a North Americanist style of knowing” (1994, 91) can be found in the works of Guyer (2004), Price (2003), and Rafael (1994). However, the national security interests underlying area-studies programs noted in detail by the works of Guyer and Price have fueled a desire for change in, particularly, American studies programs over the past two decades.

Whereas American studies once focused exclusively on North America, the development of what are now variously designated as “comparative American studies,” “inter-American studies,” “internationalized American studies,” or “reciprocal American studies” reflects an internationalization of the study of North America. It also indicates the desire of the funding sources for these programs to understand the roots of anti-American sentiments around the world. Finally, the launching of the *Journal of Comparative American Studies* in 2003 opened a valuable new space for discussing American studies beyond a North American framework (see Azam 2004; Ellis 2004; Gillman, Greusz, and Wilson 2004; Hones and Leyda 2004; Sadowski-Smith and Fox 2004; and Torres 2003).

These new area studies reflect what Nugent refers to (in this volume)

as “novel forms of Pan-American association and understanding that have emerged in the post-Fordist era.” Recognition of the changes taking place in area studies was also reflected in a Ford Foundation initiative “to build strength in area studies outside of the United States, and to broaden the perspectives of scholars and students in the United States” by awarding \$12.5 million “to foster linkages between scholars in the U.S. and other regions” (Berresford 1999, vi). The introduction to the Ford Foundation report, which summarized thirty pilot projects, provides a useful summary of the origin of academic area studies, which “was in part a response to the increasing global influence of the United States, to the competition for such influence between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and to postwar anxieties about the inadequacy of American understanding of the rest of the world” (Volkman 1999, viii). The hope of the Ford Foundation “Crossing Borders” project was to bring area studies into a new era, one characterized by an “explosion of interest in multiculturalism, postcolonialism, and cultural studies.” In summarizing the results from the funded studies, anthropologist Toby Volkman notes three major goals for future work: (1) “to ensure that knowledge and understanding of particular places continue to be grounded in serious study of culture, language, and history, while finding new ways of conceptualizing ‘area’”; (2) “to create a more truly international area studies,” one that formulates “important questions about the relationships between regional and global experience”; and (3) “to influence the policy climate in the United States in order to generate stronger, sustained support for area studies” (1999, xii).

In thinking about the ambitious Ford initiative and Volkman’s summary of it, we find that a sense of critical self-reflection is missing, one that asks just *who* benefits—beyond the academic institutions—from the new knowledges being produced and the deeper involvement of academic personnel with the lives being touched and objects and information circulated. With this in mind we decided to create the present volume, one that highlights the special skills that anthropologists bring to area studies.

WHY AND HOW A TRANSNATIONAL AMERICANIST ANTHROPOLOGY?

One reason that anthropologists keep a sharp eye on “the local” is, quite simply, because of what Henrietta Moore has called their “pre-theoretical commitment” to field methods such as participant observation. According to Moore the “global” is a “concept-metaphor” often invoked but rarely addressed in empirical terms. Following her discussion we suggest that “the Americas” is one such concept-metaphor, which like notions of “global, gender, the self and the body are a kind of conceptual shorthand, both for anthropologists and for others. They are domain terms that orient us towards areas of shared exchange, which is sometimes academically based. Concept-metaphors are examples of catachresis, i.e., they are metaphors that have no adequate referent. Their exact meaning can never be specified in advance—although they can be defined in practice and in context—and there is a part of them that remains outside or exceeds representation” (Moore 2004, 73).

Like the concepts of “life” or “mind” employed by other sciences but never precisely nailed down, concept metaphors used by anthropologists facilitate the contextualization of something more immediate and precise.⁸ The concept “America” serves as an imagined, internalized, and re-created space for people who live outside the Western Hemisphere (see Hones and Leyda 2004 regarding the production of American “geographies of subject and practice” by Americanists). Moore illustrates this idea by highlighting Mark Johnson’s research on the ways that gay transgendered identities in the Philippines draw their vision of “true love relations” from ideas about American love (Moore 2004, 81; see Johnson 1997, 1998). And as many authors have noted, one of the reasons that social movements across the world oppose “globalization” is because they read the “global” as a gloss for “American” (see Azam 2004, 163; Roseberry 1989).

The authors of the essays in this volume have each addressed the problem of defining, locating, and understanding the American context of their individual studies by locating their own work, or the subjects of their studies, across boundaries that are given great weight (and height)

in geopolitical terms. America has been concretized viscerally for many of these authors not only because of their physical movements through its vast space but also because of their engagement with peoples at various ends of their journeys and work. This book about studying “America” adds a dimension to the growing list of works (e.g., Goldin 1999) that examine the American experience by compiling insights from anthropologists who not only study border crossers but are themselves experientially and physically trans-American.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOOK

The chapters of this volume are organized into three overlapping areas of anthropological critique and inquiry that we believe to be of central importance in rearticulating the role of anthropology in the Americas, as well as refashioning American studies in a manner that decenters North America in the conceptualizing and “doing” of Americanist work. Part 1 explores some general insights drawn from comparative views applied to core anthropological concepts concerning the flow of peoples and ideas across borders; part 2 provides specific case studies of these flows as they relate to museums, migration, and indigenous movements; and part 3 examines the effects of transnational experiences on the bodies and memories of scholars who have lived and worked on both sides of several borders.

In chapter 1 John Norvell asks anthropologists who write about racial categorization in the Americas to look more closely at the Brazilian experience in updating and honing theories about difference that have vigorously “raced” across borders since at least the 1920s. Norvell urges us to examine the consequences of imposing ideas of race from one place onto another, suggesting that while the North American version of “race in Brazil” may serve the purposes of college professors, it does not help people in Brazil conceptualize their situation or combat racist practices.

Linda Seligmann then asks in chapter 2 how North American anthropologists—particularly those who not only study the Americas but also gain their professional livelihood by working in North American institutions—confront the “dissonant experiences . . . and the reach of power

into the practices of everyday life and the nature of institutions.” By applying her experiences working in Peru to those working and living in a Virginia suburb, Seligmann asks us to become more-engaged public intellectuals in the Americas by paying closer attention to the “small processes, big ideas, passionate beliefs, and heterogeneity that emerge daily”; and by worrying less about hegemony and more about the “substantive consequences of domination.”

James Zeidler concludes part 1 (chap. 3) by invoking the origins of Americanist studies in an indigenism undergirded and justified by archaeological research. Drawing on his own extensive archaeological work conducted on the coast of Ecuador as well as on North American public lands, Zeidler discusses how the transformations that have occurred in North America as a result of federal and state laws in general, and repatriation laws in particular, may have rendered obsolete an archaeology immersed in a hemispherically integrative approach. In spite of vigorous protests surrounding Kennewick Man and the like, there is no turning back for a significantly changed archaeology, one that now balances scientific inquiry with humanistic and ethical concerns.

Part 2 provides case studies that incorporate new ways of thinking about Americanist studies raised in this introduction and by Norvell, Seligmann, and Zeidler. Following the emphasis in chapter 3 on studying representations of the past, the section opens with two studies dealing with museums.

Kathleen Fine-Dare (chap. 4) follows Zeidler’s concern with the relationship of indigeneity to archaeological and museum practices by exploring texts that recount reactions to the display of South American mummies in North America and Argentina by a variety of lay and professional witnesses and participants. She suggests, following an observation made by Ian Fairweather in a special issue of *Social Analysis* on the subject of “Anthropology, Postcolonialism, and the Museum,” that museums provide “opportunities for performances that can express a number of, often conflicting, identity strategies” (Fairweather 2004, 2). That these responses and performances take place in an emotionally charged “liminal field” where the dead and the living share space and time introduces another

notion of border crossings, one essential to the possibility of realizing reciprocal relations.

Steven Rubenstein (chap. 5) develops an idea of what we might learn from “face-to-face” encounters between the living and the dead by examining what Shuar migrants who accompanied him to the American Museum of Natural History in New York City thought about the display of Shuar ancestral shrunken heads, or *tsantsas*. As Rubenstein illustrates, the cocooning of alienated *tsantsas* within the walls of Theodore Roosevelt’s monument to progress very much embodies the soul of Americanism, which is the contemplation of the other among us, the peripheral within the powerful. Rubenstein’s observations concerning North Americans who hated the *tsantsas* acquired by their relatives but couldn’t bring themselves to do what the Shuar do—destroy or bury them—evoke a powerful image of white Americanism. Instead of getting rid of these spooky trophies, they gave them to a museum “in the center of the world,” where amnesias are curated historically, and history is remembered forgetfully in the interest of crafting identities.

The next two chapters continue the thread of Rubenstein’s conversations with South Americans living in New York City by looking more closely at migratory circulations. In chapter 6 Jean Scandlyn applies her expertise working with both North and South Americans to understand the many dimensions of conflict over spending for public education in a suburban community of New York formed by many years of regionally and culturally diverse immigration. She explores the ways that public-education debates in this suburban locale illuminate deeply grounded class issues rooted in labor history, globalization, American nationalism, and other salient phenomena.

In chapter 7 Barbara Burton and Sarah Gammage—both of whom have worked extensively in both academic and nongovernmental organization settings—tease apart various aspects of the social organization of remittances sent between Central Americans living in the Washington DC area and their relatives “back home.” Although the centrally stated goal of these migrants is to send cash to their home communities, the creation of this new economic source has results that go far beyond the material.

Burton and Gammage elaborate the many ways that the rights of these U.S. residents are protected or ignored in precarious contexts, and how these migrants respond by constantly restructuring their local organizations to leverage more protection and reconfigure gender relations in the process.

The final two chapters in part 2 are in some ways the most emblematic of the volume in that they return to the theme of indigeneity and indigenous activism. In chapter 8 anthropologist Les Field reflects on the ways that global indigenous movements have converged and diversified as the result of a process of international and transnational political movements. Field, who has worked with Native peoples in California, New Mexico, Nicaragua, Colombia, and Ecuador, situates American Indian movements within indigenous movements globally, including those in New Zealand, Hawaii, and Australia. Field cautions us, however, against undue optimism as we enter this “matrix” where shifting axes of economic globalization, pan-indigenous struggles, nation-state control over bodies biological and political, and the “historico-cultural legacies of inter- and intra-indigenous borders and identities” converge.

Part 2 concludes with a study by Brazilian anthropologist Lêda Leitão Martins (chap. 9), who provides an excellent example of reciprocal anthropology in her critical examination of the growing alliances between indigenous and nonindigenous peoples in Brazil. For Martins, Americanist work means looking beyond culture as the sole means of mobilization for “ethnic peoples.” Culture may often be invoked strategically and pragmatically and in ways that appeal to Western notions of what Alcida Ramos (1994) has called the “hyperreal Indian” by those very people who have been harmed, like the Macuxi, by the construction and deployment of these notions.

Part 3, “Americanist Reflections,” provides four accounts of the embodied and personal nature of border-crossing work in the Americas. In chapter 10 Enrique Salmón—a Rarámuri ethnobotanist who regularly conducts research and consulting activities on both sides of the border—reveals some of the multiple binds presented to him as a Native anthropologist working in the Americas. What happens, he asks, when being

becomes doing? What kinds of cultural crises and “dualistic burdens” emerge when one person tries to occupy distinct cultural, cognitive, and physical spaces? Salmón’s questions are relevant not only for the growing number of Native American anthropologists who work in the Americas but for all shape-shifting border crossers who try to integrate academic endeavors with advocacy and the realities of kincentric behavior (*compadrazgo* obligations topping the list) into the research gambit.

Chapter 11, “The Dust Bowl Tango,” is a reflective essay written by cultural and political geographer Peter McCormick in which he traces the border crossings made by his own family members of mixed indigenous, Melungeon, Jewish, and other ancestries from Oklahoma to Buenos Aires to map the perils and promises of globalization. McCormick illustrates how globalization is often a deeply personal matter with the heart as a new territory for mapping seismic activities, drought, alienation, and revolution. His geographic work echoes the feminist geography of Altha Cravey and others that recognizes that “places are settings in which social relations and identities are constituted, while, on the other hand, space is produced through social practices operating across larger geographic domains” (Cravey 2002, 282). This point of view emphasizes that the global is not merely “context” but a dynamic realm where “place-based awareness” allows people to “shape worlds that extend beyond their everyday routines, even if these routines appear to be predominantly local” (Cravey 2002, 283–84).

When we began drawing together this collection, we also began work on an opening essay that could frame and justify it. We eventually acknowledged that this essay could escape neither its dialogical origins nor its attempt to tear down (*desalambrar*) conceptual and embodied fences (for a rich feminist read of this concept, see Hurtig, Montoya, and Frazier 2002). We therefore decided to place what was to have been the book’s preface in the final section of the collection (chap. 12) as we reflect in counterpoint fashion the parallel journeys that led us to the creation of the project.

The afterword is written by the anthropologist David Nugent, who has himself worked on both sides of the border. Nugent situates the

experiences of this group of researchers in what has been called the “post-Fordist” phase of capitalism, where knowledge, like other types of social production, emerges in a service- and information-oriented political economy, one to which, ironically, the academy and its system of recognitions and rewards have yet to respond satisfactorily.

Although some fear that all the recent attempts to “rethink” scholarly theory and practice may undermine the scientific and “value-neutral” methodological stance of disciplines long accustomed to an authoritarian voice, others view these changes with optimism (see especially Sahlins 1999).

The formation of the World Council of Anthropological Associations in 2004 gave an institutional foundation to the variety of changes reflected in a field that is now much more global than Euro-American-centered and much more concerned with the relationship of lived experience to theory. What John Gledhill calls a “post-imperial world anthropology” (2005, 6) not only includes more voices of nonacademics and non-Europeans but also concerns itself with the “creation of more level playing fields on a political level” (Reuter 2005, 8).

By the end of the book, we hope the reader will have moved conceptually and historically to an era of Americanist studies in which the voices of those studied take on new focus, urgency, and perhaps authority for historically oppressed peoples around the globe. One might say now, modifying Locke’s seventeenth-century pronouncement, that “in the end, all America is the world” as one looks at the ways that social movements focused on issues raised by indigenous, African American, and working-class peoples have opened the door for a variety of collaborations, alliances, and actions of solidarity.

NOTES

1. According to Paul Ricoeur, hermeneutics is “self-understanding by means of understanding others” (1974, 17). Eduardo Viveiros de Castro has argued that this kind of reflexive hermeneutics characterizes Amazonian cosmologies: Indians understand that the way they perceive “animals and

other subjectivities that inhabit the world—gods, spirits, the dead, inhabitants of other cosmic levels, meteorological phenomena, plants, occasionally even objects and artefacts—differs profoundly from the way in which these beings see humans and see themselves” (1998, 470).

He further argues that people’s own subjectivities are created precisely through conceptions of how others view them (what he calls “perspectivism”). Yet Viveiros de Castro’s list leaves out several equally important “subjectivities” that inhabit or move through the Amazon: traders, missionaries, and police, as well as invisible entities (which do, on occasion, take human form) such as “international human rights organizations,” “the state,” and “the world economy.” Tellingly, he also leaves out one other “subjectivity” that inhabits the world of every society we have studied: that of the anthropologist.

2. “Post-Fordism” is defined in different ways, but it refers primarily to the restructuring of social, cultural, and political relations in response to the changes that have occurred in the world economy since roughly the 1970s. These changes include new technologies, an increase in supranational neoliberalism, an increase in translocal linkages, and a decrease in national economic control. Production practices are more flexible and based on “just-in-time” minimalization of inventories (opposed to the old Fordist “just in case” stockpiling of spare parts and components; Rupert 1995). Increased transnationalization of labor and a reduction in job security are also characteristics of post-Fordism (see Jessop 1994).
3. Among these organizations were the American Society of France, the American Archaeological Committee, the Society for American and Oriental Ethnography, and the Society of Americanists (founded in 1895). As Pascale Riviale notes, until the second half of the nineteenth century none of the authors of “Americanist” studies could be considered specialists in the area. Many of these works were little more than compendia of reports from travelers or those who considered themselves to be followers of the tradition of “universal culture,” where expertise in any particular region was unnecessary (2000, 226–35).
4. Andrzej Dembicz, “Preparativos del 50 Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Varsovia, julio de 2000,” <http://www.filosofia.org/bol/not/bn009.htm> (accessed December 11, 2008).

5. Andrzej Dembicz, "50 Congreso Internacional de Americanistas (Varsovia, julio de 2000)," <http://www.ceisal98.uni-halle.de/cesla50.htm> (accessed December 11, 2008).
6. Themes under the broader category "Ethnic-Social Movements, Human Rights, and Gender" include "Indigenous Rights, Dialogue and Relations to National States," "Nationalism in the New World: The Americans and the Atlantic World in the Long Nineteenth Century," "Linguistic Politics and Intercultural Educational Projects since Ethnic Mobilization in the Americas," and "Transcultural Approximations of Gender and Health." Themes under "Social, Political, and Economic Studies" include "Student Movements in Latin America: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," "Communism as a National and International Actor in Twentieth-Century Latin American Politics," and sessions on global markets, utopian ideas, electrical energy past and present, emerging classes and the negotiation of power, and "Challenges and Tendencies in Security Policies in the Americas at the Beginning of the Twenty-first Century" (51st Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Santiago, Chile, July 14–18, 2003, 2nd Circular).
7. Kearney makes reference to the work of many border scholars in his 2004 paper, most of whom focus on the U.S.-Mexican border. See, for example, Alvarez 1995; Donnan and Wilson 1994, 1999; and Heyman 1991, 1998, 2001. See also Kearney 1986, 1991.
8. "Culture" itself is such a metaphor—as Richard Handler puts it, we "creatures of culture . . . create the world as 'culture'"—an inescapable creation of the human mind's own experience of its fundamentally social life (2004, 493).

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, Robert, Jr. 1995. The Mexican-U.S. border: The making of an anthropology of borderlands. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:447–70.
- Amin, Ash, ed. 1994. *Post-Fordism: A reader*. Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Azam, Kousar J. 2004. Resisting terror, resisting empire: The evolving ethos of American studies. *Comparative American Studies* 2 (2): 163–74.
- Bashkow, Ira. 2004. A neo-Boasian conception of cultural boundaries. *American Anthropologist* 106 (3) (September): 443–58.

- Behar, Ruth, and D. Gordon, eds. 1995. *Women writing culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Berresford, Susan V. 1999. Preface to *Crossing borders: Revitalizing area studies*, by Ford Foundation. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Bordo, Michael D., and Barry Eichengreen, eds. 1993. *A retrospective on the Bretton Woods system: Lessons for international monetary reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Castañeda, Quetzil. 2003. Stocking's historiography of influence: The "story of Boas," Gamio and Redfield at the cross—"road to light." *Critique of Anthropology* 23 (3): 235–63.
- Clifford, James, and George Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Comas, Juan. 1950. The teaching of anthropology and the role of the anthropologist in Latin America. *American Anthropologist*, n.s., 52 (4) (October–December): 564–68.
- Crapanzano, Vincent. 1980. *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cravey, Altha J. 2002. Local/global: A view from geography. In *Gender's place: Feminist anthropologies of Latin America*, ed. Rosario Montoya, Lessie Jo Frazier, and Janise Hurtig, 281–87. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Darnell, Regna. 2001. *Invisible genealogies: A history of Americanist anthropology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1969. *Custer died for your sins: An Indian manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1976. *Of grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dirlik, Arif. 1994. Third world criticism in the age of global capitalism. *Critical Inquiry* 20:328–56.
- Donnan, Hastings, and Thomas M. Wilson, eds. 1994. *Border approaches: Anthropological perspectives on frontiers*. Lanham MD: University Press of America.
- , eds. 1999. *Borders: Frontiers of identity, nation and state*. Oxford: Berg.
- Ellis, R. J. 2004. Postamerican studies? Something is happening here. *Comparative American Studies* 2 (2): 131–33.

- Fairweather, Ian. 2004. Introduction. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Cultural and Social Practice* 48 (1) (Spring): 1–4.
- Fine-Dare, Kathleen S. 2002. *Grave injustice: The American Indian repatriation movement and NAGPRA*. Fourth World Rising. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Fletcher, Alice. 1913. Brief history of the international congress of the Americanists. *American Anthropologist*, n.s., 15 (3) (July–September): 529–34.
- Ford Foundation. 1999. *Crossing borders: Revitalizing area studies*. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Gillman, Susan, Kirsten Silva Greusz, and Rob Wilson. 2004. Worlding American studies. *Comparative American Studies* 2 (3): 259–70.
- Gledhill, John. 2005. Reinventing anthropology, anew. *Anthropology News* 46 (7) (October): 6–7.
- Godoy, Ricardo. 1977. Franz Boas and his plans for the international school of American archaeology and ethnology in Mexico. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 13:228–42.
- Goldin, Liliana R., ed. 1999. *Identities on the move: Transnational processes in North America and the Caribbean basin*. Studies on Culture and Society 7. Albany NY: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies. Distributed by University of Texas Press.
- Guyer, Jane I. 2004. Anthropology in area studies. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33:499–523.
- Handler, Richard. 2004. Afterword: Mysteries of culture. *American Anthropologist* 106 (3): 488–94.
- Harvey, David. 1989. *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of culture change*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Heyman, Josiah McC. 1991. *Life and labor on the border: Working people of north-eastern Sonora, Mexico, 1886–1986*. Flagstaff: University of Arizona Press.
- . 1998. State effects on labor exploitation: The INS and undocumented immigrants at the Mexico–United States border. *Critique of Anthropology* 18 (2): 155–79.
- . 2001. Class and classification at the U.S.-Mexican border. *Human Organization* 60 (2): 128–40.
- Hones, Sheila, and Julia Leyda. 2004. Towards a critical geography of American studies. *Comparative American Studies* 2 (2): 185–203.

- Hurtig, Janise, Rosario Montoya, and Lessie Joe Frazier. 2002. Introduction: *A desalambarar*; Unfencing gender's place. In *Gender's place: Feminist anthropologies of Latin America*, ed. Rosario Montoya, Lessie Jo Frazier, and Janise Hurtig, 1–18. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jessop, Bob. 1994. Post-Fordism and the state. In *Post-Fordism: A reader*, ed. Ash Amin, 251–79. Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Johnson, Mark. 1997. *Beauty and power: Transgendering and cultural transformation in the southern Philippines*. Oxford: Berg.
- . 1998. Global desirings and translocal loves: Transgendering and same-sex sexualities in the southern Philippines. *American Ethnologist* 25 (4): 695–711.
- Kearney, Michael. 1986. From the invisible hand to visible feet: Anthropological studies of migration and development. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:331–61.
- . 1991. Borders and boundaries of the state and self at the end of empire. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 4 (1): 52–74.
- . 2004. The classifying and value-filtering missions of borders. *Anthropological Theory* 4 (2): 131–56.
- Kehoe, Alice Beck. 1998. *The land of prehistory: A critical history of American archaeology*. New York: Routledge.
- Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We have never been modern*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Locke, John. [1690] 1952. *Concerning civil government, second essay: An essay concerning human understanding*. Great Books of the Western World 35 (Locke, Berkeley, and Hume). Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- Marcus, George E., and Michael M. J. Fisher, eds. 1986. *Anthropology as cultural critique: An experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marzal, Manuel. 1998. *Antropología indigenista*. Vol. 1 of *Historia de la antropología*. 6th ed. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- Moore, Henrietta L. 2004. Global anxieties: Concept-metaphors and pre-theoretical commitments in anthropology. *Anthropological Theory* 4 (1): 71–88.
- Nutini, Hugo C. 2001. Aportaciones del Americanismo a la teoría y la práctica de la antropología moderna. In *Motivos de la antropología Americanista*:

- Indagaciones en la diferencia*, ed. Miguel León-Portilla, 13–72. México, D.F.: Impresora y Encuadernadora Progreso, S.A. de C.V. (IEPSA), Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Price, David H. 2003. Subtle means and enticing carrots: The impact of funding on American cold war anthropology. *Critique of Anthropology* 23 (4): 373–401.
- Rabinow, Paul. 1977. *Reflections on fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rafael, Vicente. 1994. The cultures of area studies in the United States. *Social Text* 41:91–111.
- Ramos, Alcida Rita. 1994. The hyperreal Indian. *Critique of Anthropology* 14 (2): 153–72.
- Reuter, Thomas. 2005. Towards a global anthropology. *Anthropology News* 46 (7) (October): 7–8.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1974. *The conflict of interpretations*. Evanston IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Riviale, Pascal. 2000. *Los viajeros franceses en busca del Perú antiguo (1821–1914)*. Trans. Edgardo Rivera Martínez. Lima: Institut Français d'Études Andines (IFEA) y Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Roseberry, William. 1989. Americanization in the Americas. In *Anthropologies and histories: Essays in culture, history, and political economy*, 80–121. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rupert, Mark. 1995. *Producing hegemony: The politics of mass production and American global power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sadowski-Smith, Claudia, and Claire F. Fox. 2004. Theorizing the hemisphere: Inter-Americas work at the intersection of American, Canadian, and Latin American studies. *Comparative American Studies* 2 (1): 6–38.
- Sahlins, Marshall. 1999. What is anthropological enlightenment? Some lessons of the twentieth century. *Annual Reviews in Anthropology* 28:i–xxiii.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House.
- Stocking, George W. 2000. “Do good, young man”: Sol Tax and the world mission of liberal democratic anthropology. In *Excluded ancestors, inventible traditions: Essays toward a more inclusive history of anthropology*, ed. Richard Handler, 171–264. History of Anthropology 9. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Torres, Sonia. 2003. U.S. Americans and “us” Americans: South American perspectives on comparative American studies. *Comparative American Studies* 1 (1): 9–17.
- Valentine, Lisa, and Regna Darnell, eds. 1999. *Theorizing the Americanist tradition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 1998. Cosmological deixis and Amerindian perspectivism. *Man: The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 4 (3): 469–88.
- Volkman, Toby Alice. 1999. Introd. to *Crossing borders: Revitalizing area studies*, by Ford Foundation. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Whiteley, Peter. 1997. The end of anthropology (at Hopi?). In *Indians and anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the critique of anthropology*, ed. Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman, 177–207. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.