Territorializing Indigeneity and Powwow Markets

Blaire O. Gagnon *University of Rhode Island*

Abstract: North American powwows are presented by organizers and presumed by society at large to be Native events. Research has rarely considered the processes by which powwows become places or the role of territorialization in that process. This article examines the socio-spatial practices powwow organizing committees employ to construct powwows and their arts and crafts markets as places from undifferentiated space and the responses to these practices. I suggest that powwow committees construct powwow space as a form of sovereign political space from which they can manage relations with multiple constituencies and in which contemporary conceptions of Nativeness are negotiated.

Keywords: powwow, art markets, indigeneity, borders, Native, space

Résumé : Les powwow nord-américains sont présentés par leurs organisateurs, et sont perçus par la société en général comme des événements autochtones. La recherche s'est rarement attardée aux processus par lesquels les powwow deviennent des lieux, ou au rôle de la territorialisation dans ce processus. Cet article examine les pratiques socio-spatiales utilisées par les comités organisateurs pour construire les powwow et les marchés d'artisanats et d'art qui s'y rattachent, en les distinguant de lieux indifférenciés, et les réactions à ces pratiques. Je fais l'hypothèse que les comités de powwow construisent l'espace des powwow comme une forme d'espace politique souverain, à partir duquel ils peuvent gérer leurs relations avec de multiples entités politiques, et au travers duquel il est possible de négocier les conceptions contemporaines de l'identité autochtone.

Mots-clés : powwow, marchés d'art, autochtonie, frontières, Premières Nations, espace

> The powwow began in 1979 [and] in 1981 we held what could really be called a picnic, a little festival in a horse arena. There was no powwow dancing like there is now; there was social dancing, someone told us about the powwow dancing going on in Oklahoma at that time and we contacted Zeke ... he brought 10 dancers and people were amazed. So we learned how to have a powwow and from that point on it just grew.... We had it at Suggs Creek Farm; there was a one lane bridge heading in there and traffic backed up onto the highway and the police came. Then we moved it to Hermitage Landing ... this caused an uproar with many Natives who said they wouldn't come because the Hermitage is President Andrew Jackson's home. Though we tried to explain it wasn't the same place, many Natives didn't come. We stayed there 6 or 7 years and then moved to Four Corners Marina and stayed there 5 or 6 years, though we grew out of there practically the first day. We've been at the present location two years (FN 10/20/2006).[1]

In the story just presented, an everyday practice—narration—and its use of space and time to ethnographically map the history of a particular powwow[2] suggests socio-spatial processes that condition the social life of Native[3] powwow participants. The powwow committee's choice to locate the event to a larger, more easily accessible space to lessen tensions with the police and improve access can be read as spatial practices designed to improve social relationships with the larger society and local governmental authorities. While the Native participants' refusal to enter a particular space, Hermitage Landing, is a spatialized protest of the Federal government's colonial removal policies of the 1830s because of its link to President Andrew Jackson's estate, "The Hermitage." These acts make up "the powwow" as a place, much as Michel de Certeau's (1984:97) pedestrian movements construct "the city." If the narrative had merely identified the locations of the powwow through space, we would only have a fragmentary, two dimensional geographic mapping

of the powwow and miss out on the nuances of how people construct their worlds through spatial practices (de Certeau 1984). Also within this narrative, the flows of history and people temporarily coalesce, or are territorialized, in simultaneous time and space to form the powwow as a place.

Thomas Biolsi's (2005) analysis of four types of indigenous space challenged the nation-state model of territorializing sovereignty and citizenship with regard to American Indians. He found that,

> the nation-state is only one among several (perhaps many) geographies generated within the horizon of the modern political imaginary. A critically observant anthropology would see these heteronomous or non-nation-state geographies not as anomalies or exceptions to the nation-state rule, but as concrete realities in which many people live and think about their rights and interests. (254)

While in the lower 48 States, there are 350 Indian areas associated with federally recognized tribes (Development 2008:6), the *Powwow Calendar* lists more than 1100 places where Native North Americans gather (Hutchens 2006). Presented by organizers as Native and presumed by society to be Native events, gatherings such as powwows, in sheer numbers alone, rival reservations as key Native spaces. Thus, the question posed by James Clifford (1988), about how we are to think about Native lands, still resonates in the 21st century. Processes of territorialization, through which powwows become places, offer rich ethnographic possibilities for understanding how identities and communities are shaped because place making always entails constructions of difference engendered through socio-spatial processes of exclusion and inclusion (see Gupta and Ferguson 1997).

Fieldwork and Methodology

This article examines the socio-spatial practices employed to construct powwows as places, with specific attention paid to the powwow market. While powwow markets have two primary groups of sellers—arts and crafts vendors and food vendors[4]—my research and this essay focus on arts and crafts vendors. My analysis draws primarily upon multi-sited fieldwork conducted at 22 events on the powwow circuit between August 2006-October 2007, informal attendance at powwows since 2007, and a review of publications produced by powwow organizing committees conducted during fieldwork and updated in preparation for this essay (see Hannerz 2003; Marcus 1995). The geographic foundation of my fieldwork was four major, late summer powwows held by the Narragansett of Rhode Island, the Mohegan and Mashantucket Pequot of Connecticut, and the Shinnecock of Long Island, New York. These events draw arts and crafts vendors into the Northeast from all over the country. Ulf Hannerz's (2003:207) important reflection on multi-site ethnography "wonder[ed] if it is not a recurrent characteristic of multi-sited ethnography that site selections are to an extent made gradually and cumulatively, as new insights develop, as opportunities come into sight, and to some extent by chance." My powwow circuit developed in a similar fashion to that of the vendors I studied. I added new events to my research based on the recommendation of those with whom I worked and as time and finances allowed. This research strategy made visible the socio-spatial processes involved in the creation of individual powwows and powwow vendor circuits across time and space. The circuit I followed began in Southern New England, moved south in the fall, and incorporated two of the largest events in the United States and Canada: the Gathering of Nations in Albuquerque, New Mexico and the Canadian Aboriginal Festival in Toronto, Ontario.

The primary focus of this research is on arts and crafts vendors who travel the powwow circuit. Powwow committees were not the primary focus of my research, though I often had contact and brief conversations with committee members and observed committee/vendor interactions during powwow events. At two events, I had extensive conversations with powwow committee members in charge of the event's market. Powwow committee practices, however, were often the topic of conversation and sites of conflict with the arts and crafts vendors with whom I worked. Vendor opinions of powwow committee practices and vendor contracts, which they often referenced in conversation, became important points of analysis for understanding powwow market practices, particularly in relation to the creation of the powwow as a short-lived socio-spatial place (see Lefebvre 2002).

Central to my analysis was a focus on social and spatial bordering practices related to exclusion and inclusion. Through a focus on the construction of a place—a powwow and its arts and crafts market—socially and spatially, I sought to understand issues of importance to powwow participants, particularly the arts and crafts vendors in the market. As Renato Rosaldo (1989) observed, ritual events are often perceived to be outside of everyday experiences with seemingly defined centres and outer edges. However, he suggested that ritual events should instead be thought of as "busy intersections...places where a number of distinct social processes intersect" (17). There is also a perception that borders and boundaries are becoming more porous because of the increased flows of people,

objects, ideas, finances and more. According to Manuel Castells (1996), flows dominate the economic, political, and symbolic life of today (see also Inda and Rosaldo 2002). If, instead of presuming borders that are crossed by flows, we presume flows, then we can shift the analysis to where, when and how flows coalesce in time, producing a place from interconnected space in which sociality is expressed (Gupta and Ferguson 2002). Because, if space is becoming more interconnected, it is also becoming more indeterminate or undifferentiated;[5] thus, culturally distinct places perhaps become even more salient.

The significant body of literature that has developed around particular points of intersection, often framed as borders and border zones, grew out of studies of the U.S./Mexico border (see Alvarez 1995; Alvarez and Collier 1994; Flynn 1997; Michaelson and Johnson 1997; Migdal 2004; Wilson and Donnan 1998). This literature has contributed much to an anthropological shift away from predetermined, spatially fixed and culturally bounded conceptions of communities and identities, to inquiries into the multi-vocal identities emerging at the borderlands. For example, Cory Willmott's (2010:170) interesting essay on Amerindian fashions looked at the border zone between "tradition" and "contemporary" where the design, production, and cultural performance of intertribal nationhood becomes everyday fashion. In Kathleen Buddle's (2004) essay, the urban Ontario Indian powwow domain becomes a "critically important contact zone wherein Aboriginal interest groups gather with multiethnic audiences to negotiate, perform and exchange ideas about contemporary Aboriginality" (30). Powwows are socially, temporally, and spatially delineated. They are highly complex and coded "representational spaces" where multiple forms of identity and community are engendered (Lefebvre 2002:139). Sometimes the events in this study were held on tribal land where arbors, dance rings, or other structures were permanently constructed. However, at every event, additional geographies are constructed and, during the events, the embodiment of space, the sociality of space, becomes an important parameter for ethnographic analysis.

Michael Kearney's (1996) analysis of the concept of the peasant has greatly influenced my approach to understanding powwow markets. The processes Kearney identified in relation to the containment of ambiguous rural communities in the construction of the concept of the peasant are bordering processes, such as, but not limited to, the invocation or imposition of the authentic. He called for a shift of focus to the processes of containment, for "acts (by agents and laws) that constitute identities inscribe channels (like banks on the river) in which run identities so constituted, and in acting out these identities the actors carve more deeply these constituting channels" (65). The engendering of contemporary identities, however, runs into the reality of the complex social landscape of the 21st century requiring a constant focus on border work (Kearney 1996).

Through a focus on bordering processes, both inclusive and exclusive, this essay seeks to understand how the production of space sheds light on issues—such as recognition, economic viability, and social differentiation and reproduction—that are important to the contemporary powwow domain. I begin with a brief review of powwow scholarship to illustrate the historic relationship between powwows, space, and social differentiation. Next, drawing upon my research data, I discuss how contemporary powwows draw socio-spatial distinctions and illustrate how the powwow market is an important site for these processes of containment. Finally, I return to Biolsi's argument on indigenous political space and suggest that powwows are political spaces, perhaps "graduated" Native and/or indigenous sovereign spaces, where what it means to be Indian, Native, non-Native, a vendor and much more is continuously negotiated through every day socio-spatial practices (Biolsi 2005:241).

Powwow Revisited

My focus on powwow arts and crafts markets was solidified during preliminary fieldwork when a dancer pointed to the arts and crafts booths surrounding the dance arena and said, "you need to study that. I can judge the authenticity of an event by the market." My understanding of the dancer's comment is that the arts and crafts market at a powwow is authentic if it conforms to definitions of Indian art and Indian artisan codified in the Indian art field of cultural production. (see Barker 2003; Dubin 2001; Meyn 2001; Sheffield 1997). Moreover, the authenticity that is an important parameter of the field of Indian art and the powwow domain is both human and material. A review of literature, however, finds that very little powwow scholarship has focused on the market, which is considered today to be a "customary" part of the event (FN 6/12/2007). I have argued elsewhere (Gagnon 2009) that this lack of attention to the powwow market is grounded in the development of the Indian art market over the past 100 years and the nature of the relationship between art, authenticity and the ethno-political identity "Indian" that has been constituted in its development. In the following section, I offer a brief review of powwow scholarship in general and the characterization of the powwow market within that literature.

From the beginning, the powwow has been a complex site for the negotiation of relationships between and among several constituencies, including Natives and non-Natives.

> Powwow celebrations provide a framework for strengthening the solidarity of established tribes and create the grounds and opportunities for cohesion among reorganized claimants to tribal status. They also demonstrate cohesion and cultural persistence to outsiders, foster intertribal cooperation in the preparation of shared events, and serve as the ritual focus of emergent multi-tribal urban communities. [Eschbach and Applebaum 2000:68]

The current powwow form developed during the first half of the 20th century out of the dance forms of the 19th century (see Brewer 1999; Ellis, Lassiter and Dunham 2005; Rynkiewich 1980). In the early 20th century, Native people sought to make visible their continued presence and, with the help of social reformers, fought constraints on their ability to perpetuate cultural traditions, such as the ban on Indian ceremonial and religious activities. Gatherings such as powwows became important sites where Native people could assert their right to "cultural and political sovereignty within the twentieth-century United States" (Warren 2005:4). The diffusion of the powwow form was bolstered by the large-scale relocation of Indians from reservations to urban areas after World War II (Nagel 1997).

A scholarly focus on the powwow began in the 1950s. Initial studies understood powwows to signal cultural decay (Slotkin 1957) and the rise of Pan-Indianism, an emergent ethnic identity (Howard 1955; Kurath 1957, 1966). Generally, powwow participation is inter-tribal and includes non-Natives. Ethno-political identity is often a focus of powwow analysis whether the author is researching giveaways, dance, music, tourism, community, or suggesting that powwows are sites for social integration or differentiation (see Ellis, Lassiter and Dunham 2005; Kracht 1994; Krouse 1991; Laudin 1974; Lerch and Bullers 1996; Mattern 1999: May 2001; Mitchell-Green 1994; Ono 2003; Roberts 2001; Rynkiewich 1980).

Powwows are held in small community buildings, fields, developed powwow grounds, university gymnasiums and major arenas on and off reservation and reserve lands. Usually, powwow space, particularly the dance arena, is consecrated as sacred through ceremonial blessings (Brewer 1999). It is common for powwow analyses to include composite temporal and spatial descriptions that differentiate the powwow from its socio-spatial surroundings. For example, such descriptions often begin with a call for dancers to enter the dance ring and references to the powwow being on Indian or "moccasin time" (Rynkiewich 1980:65). Indian time refers to events starting when they are meant to start and is contrasted to "white time" that follows a clock and expects punctuality regardless of social readiness. Gloria Young's (1981) dissertation used a concentric circle analytical structure to understand the Tulsa, Oklahoma powwow. The drum occupies the centre, which is surrounded by a dance arena, the participant seating, audience seating, the vendors and the camping and parking lot areas. Young then situates the powwow grounds within the park in which it was constituted, the city of Tulsa, the State of Oklahoma, and lastly, the United States. According to much powwow analysis, as you move out from the centre, the most sacred area, the level of attentiveness and participation decreases, ending with the most secular and profane, the camping areas (see Gelo 1999; Mattern 1999).

Powwow scholarship has not considered the vending of arts and crafts a significant topic of scholarly inquiry. Only two studies make the selling of arts and crafts a significant focus of their research. During fieldwork with Iroquois powwow vendors, Jack Campisi (1975) identified three social units—Iroquois, Indian, and hobbyist—that interacted with each other in prescribed ways. Using the analysis of ethnic boundary maintenance put forward by Frederick Barth (1969), Campisi found that markets are where diverse groups meet and interact, and the limits of their interaction identify social boundaries. Three price levels were identified: black, white, and Indian. Indians demand from whites and blacks a higher recognition of their products and identity by demanding higher prices from them. Recognition of identity, through devaluation or rejection of commercialization, is expected from other Indians.

Victoria Sanchez's (1995) complex analysis looked at many levels of ethnic identification, the relation of cultural practices to identity, and the relation of social and political spheres. She identified the role of the Indian Arts and Craft Act of 1990 in constructing boundaries around cultural development in powwow practices. The Act makes political the production of Indian arts and crafts by defining who is and is not Indian. This becomes problematic for Sanchez's study population because "tradition" is considered a significant parameter of objects being "Indian made"; therefore, culturally unaware Indians may not produce in "traditional" ways and this is read as lacking the right to represent "traditional" Indians within the social and political context of Central Ohio. She also notes that, "to what extent this law is publicized and enforced at a powwow seems to depend on the sponsoring

organization's political role in supporting tradition-oriented self representation.... For the Central Ohio Native American community ... putting on a powwow is an act of political positioning" (Sanchez 1995:30).

The lack of scholarly attention to the powwow market is grounded in the geographic analytical focus of powwows, which has created a hierarchy of powwow practices that locates true "Indianness" within the dance arena and marginalizes the powwow market because of its geographic position between the dance arena and the parking/camping areas. The influence of valuation related to the Indian art field, as noted in the dancer's comments, also contributes to this disinterest. This marginalization contrasts sharply with the customary inclusion of the market, and the importance of the market and market participation noted by the participants in my study. Thus, focusing on socio-spatial bordering processes of inclusion and exclusion can help us understand what role these distinctions play in engendering contemporary Native identities, since "spatializations are constitutive of subjectivities" (Biolsi 2005:253).

Powwow Committees, Space, Power and Indigeneity

As the opening narrative of this article suggests, constituting the powwow as a place requires the mediation of social relationships on several levels: between the committee, governmental structures, the community at large and Native peoples. My analysis is informed by Michel de Certeau's (1984:35-36) discussion of the relationship between place making, power, and the management of relations with others. To have the ability to step into a field of power relations, one has to delimit one's own space of power and have it recognized by others (see Warren 2005). Buddle's (2004:41) discussion of Aboriginal agricultural fairs found that Native-authored events created "temporary power microcosms" where local socio-political systems could override the dominant social order. In the contemporary Southern Ontario context, the powwow is still a site where Aboriginal peoples "police" the boundaries of their difference (Buddle 2004:58). Powwow committees demarcate powwow space by determining where the event will be held, by seeking recognition from governmental entities and the larger society, by choosing who is allowed to occupy powwow space in general and specifically in relation to its market, and by controlling the movements of people across and within powwow space. Through claiming space and defining rules of access to that space, powwow committees create a Native place through bordering processes that coalesce flows of people in time and space. In addition, bordering processes make visible the social relationships engendered between powwow committees and their constituencies. Place as imagined is important, but so too is lived space, i.e., the relation between "place and space," for "important tensions may arise when places that have been imagined at a distance must become lived spaces" (Gupta and Ferguson 2002:70).

Constituting Powwow Space

Locating the powwow on the socio-spatial landscape is one of the first steps in locating a base where economic, political, and social capital can be created and leveraged. This is also a process that has been successful for almost 100 years (see Rynkiewich 1980;Warren 2005). Powwows are located both on and off tribal lands; yet, often both types of powwow spaces are referred to as "home." The Native American Indian Association (NAIA) of Tennessee, Inc., a "statewide Native American Indian organization with an all Indian Board of Directors," holds a yearly powwow in October.[6] President Sally Wells' "Welcome" in the 2006 powwow program described the event as "an extended family of friends coming home for a special reunion each year" (NAIA 2006:2). The "Welcome" also noted that there are over 15,000 Native American Indians living in the state of Tennessee, "yet there are no reservations or federal programs specifically available for Native American Indian residents" (NAIA 2006:2). NAIA sees its role as twofold: to improve the social conditions of the Native population of Tennessee and the relationship between that population and the larger society. Through the powwow, they are able to locate Tennessee's Indian population on the geo-political landscape, educate the public about that population and raise funds to support the local Indian population through such programs as the NAIA Scholarship Fund and the NAIA Emergency Relief Funds.

In 2006, the NAIA powwow program included State of Tennessee and Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County proclamations recognizing the historical and contemporary importance of the Native population to the state of Tennessee's history and the significant role NAIA's powwow has played in the support of that community over the past 25 years. The proclamation ends with declaring the month of October 2006, Native American Indian Month, a designation that continued in 2011.[7] A separate welcome statement by the Governor also locates the powwow and its Indians as part of the heritage and tradition of Tennessee, a heritage visitors are encouraged to consume along with other historic and entertainment sites (NAIA 2006:10). The Metro Nashville Arts Council and the Tennessee Arts Commission sponsorship of the 2011 NAIA event suggests important links

between art, cultural recognition, and political positioning.[8] In a state without reservations, NAIA is the political entity that constructs a Native "homeland," the powwow, and a Native identity grounded in history and the arts, that are recognized by Tennessean governmental agencies, Native peoples, and society at large.

In 2003, "in an effort to scale back and return to its roots," the Mohegan Wigwam Festival "returned home" to Fort Shantok Park from its previous location at a local school.[9] Fort Shantok is where Uncas resettled the tribe in the mid-17th century and is the site of an ancient tribal burial ground. Tribal Historian Melissa Jayne Fawcett (1995:8) summed up the significance of Fort Shantok: "It is a place that we Mohegans come from, the place from which we draw strength, and the place where we ultimately journey to the Spirit World." Fort Shantok was taken from the tribe in 1926, and was the site of a Connecticut state park until its return to the Mohegan Tribe August 30, 1995 shortly after the tribe received federal recognition (Fawcett 1995). Returning the powwow to Fort Shantok, a place marked historically by Uncas, ancestral graves, state confiscation and tribal reclamation, gives the powwow committee a time depth and spatial authority grounded in tribal sovereignty.

Beyond formal recognition by outside constituencies, such as local governments and non-profit organizations, powwows are public events to which powwow committees attract and seek attendance from the larger society, Native and non-Native alike. Powwow programs "welcome Tribal families from all across the United States, Canada, South America, and abroad" (Colebut-Jackson 2006). They invite "all races and creeds. By being a part of our Canadian showcases for Aboriginal people, you would in affect [sic] be honoring us with your presence."[10] Programs advertise powwows as "A Family Event: EVERYONE (the public) INVITED!"[11] The variety of peoples and the distance from which they travel is celebrated: "nearly 1000 native dancers and drum singing groups from across North America join together" and "over 3000 indigenous/Native American/Indian dancers and singers representing more than 500 tribes from Canada and the United States come to Albuquerque annually to participate socially and competitively at the Gathering of Nations Pow Wow."[12]

Powwows are most successful if they coalesce the flows of people from far-flung spaces within powwow time and space to create a welcoming, family oriented place. The intermingling of diverse peoples is important to the construction of the powwow as Native space. While powwow committees welcome everyone to attend, not everyone is welcome to participate in all powwow activities. By drawing diverse peoples into the powwow, yet differentiating among them within that context through such things as delimiting access to certain powwow spaces, an environment is created where ideas of indigeneity, Nativeness, Indianness and more are engendered and recognized as contemporary identities. In the next section, I analyze the invitations and vendor contracts powwow committees use to construct the powwow market as a separate form of powwow social space in order to understand how committees manifest their power through social and spatial governance processes.

Powwow Vendor Invitations and Contracts

Mark C. Suchman (2003) argues that contract documents are important social artifacts. "Like most artifacts, contracts emerge from the labors of specific artisans; but also like most artifacts, contracts necessarily bear the markings of broader social contexts" (92). It is important to understand not only why contracts are constructed by social actors but also why "multi-actor economic communities generate and sustain particular 'contract regimes'" (93). The production site of powwow vendor contracts is the powwow organizing committee, and committees often assign a particular individual or group to focus on the logistics of the market from invitation, to setup and breakdown. Their titles vary, but include Director of Food, Beverages and Native Vendors, Vendor Coordinator, Director–Circle of Art and Arts, and Craft Coordinator. Powwow contracts fit Suchman's (2003:94) middle of the road definition of a contract as "a formally documented arrangement for governing a voluntary exchange relationship in the shadow of the law." Invitations and contracts can be seen as tools for "resolving common governance challenges" such as the number of artisans allowed access to the site, the size of booths, the number who can occupy each powwow vending space/or booth, and the location of booth space (109). Beyond seemingly mundane bordering processes, however, they also draw upon extra-contractual inputs such as the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 and cultural meaning systems that reveal powwow committees negotiate their authority and power in relation to broader economic and ethno-political conditions.

The number of vendors that constitute a powwow market varies significantly and is often a point of conflict between committees and vendors because, while vendor fees are significant economic revenues for the powwow organizers, too many vendors or too little variety dilutes the economic success of those present. The Gathering of Nations Powwow, "North America's Biggest Powwow," boasts "800+ Native American artists,

crafters, and traders."[13] The Mashantucket Pequot's Schemitzun solicited approximately 100 in 2006 and 2007, and the Mohegan Wigwam Festival and the Native American Indian Association (NAIA) work with about 35 to 40 vendors. The spatial limitations of an area do not necessarily coincide with vendor numbers as Gathering is held in parking lots and inside the University of New Mexico's Arena, affectionately known as "the Pit," while the Wigwam Festival is held outside at Fort Shantok Park in Uncasville, Connecticut. One vendor coordinator explained that he tried to keep the number of vendors to less than 45—"if too many, people can't sell and then they don't want to come back" (FN 10/20/2006). This same individual made the point of saying that their organization does not design their event to make their money from the vendors, a practice common to many events. They make their money "off the gate" (FN 10/20/2006). He argued that this is why they are able to charge a lot less than other events.

Vendors will often complain about the number of vendors and the cost of vendor space and, by doing so, remark on the value of powwow space and their important role in producing this space. When a powwow run by a wealthy casino tribe raised its powwow booth fees, a vendor remarked, "don't they have enough money?" (FN 8/26/2006). Powwow vendors will refuse to participate in powwows they deem are too expensive, claiming there is always another powwow they can attend. Thus, while powwow vendor booth fees place a dollar value on powwow market space depending on the needs of the powwow committee, they are either legitimated through payment by the powwow vendor or denied by refusal to participate. The fees paid by vendors must be considered in light of how other participants gain access to powwow space. For example, the public is often charged an entrance fee, though this is sometimes waived for particular tribal members and/or Native people in general. In addition, dancers are usually charged much less, if at all, for their powwow participation. Powwow committees told me this is because vendors have the potential to earn money through sales, though one could argue a dancer has the potential to earn money through participation in the competition. Charging booth fees, like charging gate fees, can be read as signaling social distance. Some powwow vendors can obtain booth space for free by providing additional services to the powwow committee, such as entertainment, educational programs, or artistic demonstrations. Vendors are invited to perform these services; thus, recognition of vendor value can be measured through the waiving of powwow contract fees associated with economic spaces within the powwow. These practices socially differentiate and hierarchically rank powwow vendors based on their value to the powwow committee. Value is an important aspect of powwow market practices that is engendered in numerous ways (Gagnon:n.d.a, n.d.b).

Solicitation of powwow vendors varies. Yet, a commonality is that powwow committees control the acceptance of vendors. Applications are "accepted." Vendors are "chosen." Vendor access is "extended." Some events are by invitation only. One vendor coordinator keeps a file of over 300 vendors from which he can draw for any one event (FN 10/20/2006). Once, an uninvited vendor sent in a contract and deposit that was mistakenly cashed. When the individual showed up on site, they were confronted and admitted to have copied a relative's contract. They were allowed to stay, but were told they would not be invited back because the committee decides who can access their space. The next year, the committee changed its contracts and invitations to coloured paper. At most events, powwow vendors can initiate access by requesting applications from vendor coordinators or downloading them from event websites. Solicitation of vendor applications does not constitute application acceptance or access to the powwow space. Contracts often include a clause that denies acceptance through mere application. The 2012 Tunica-Biloxi Powwow vendor application states: "This application does not constitute an agreement or promise to accept you as a vendor at our event.... After the Committee reviews all available applications, booth spaces will be offered to select vendors."[14]

Who is allowed to be a vendor is the greatest point of contention between powwow committees and powwow vendors. Committee invitations and contracts define who can participate in the powwow market, and thus define vendors as a particular kind of powwow participant. Their choices delimit the powwow as Native space and construct a social hierarchy within the market that is continuously contested. As Joanne Barker (2011) has written, terms like "Native" are "put to work in many ways to represent specific political concerns and agendas. As a consequence, who is and is not included as Native is contingent on the social context of use" (19).

The 2003 Mohegan Wigwam Festival vendor *Rules and Regulations* required that "all persons under contract must be Native American and enrolled/recognized by the State or Federal Government with proper identification. A *copy* of this identification must be submitted with this signed contract in order to be considered for said booth space." While the Mohegan committee chose State or Federal documentation of the ethno-political identity Native American in the construction of their powwow market as Native space, the 2012 Gathering of Nations application

does not set the political identity Native American as a criterion for its vendors. Instead, they insist that they will "accept original applications from Native artists, crafters, Indian Traders, Institutions, and those who demonstrate only positive images for and about Native people." [15] The wording of Gathering's 2012 contract shows a change from the 2007 application: the term "Native American artists" has been changed to "Native artists" and the term "Native American" has been changed to "Native people." [16] This change suggests a significant ethno-political shift from a Native North America to a Native/indigenous peoples focus. During the 2006 Grand Entry, the emcee at the Narragansett Annual Meeting commented on the power of the powwow committee to define who has access to their market space and specifically drew a distinction between their boundaries and those held by others. In reference to the vendors present, she pointed out that they were "from all over the continent...we don't draw or recognize the boundaries of others...we are all one people and all are welcome" (FN 8/12/2006). Through discourse and contracts, powwow committees exercise their authority to deny and legitimate market participation within their powwow space through geographic, ethnic and political criteria that reflects sociopolitical differences between Native groups and changes in the politics of indigeneity.

The use of contracts by Powwow committees to define who has access to space sheds light on ethno-political issues; yet, they are also littered with regulations that highlight the committee's role as gatekeepers to that space through specific references to set up and breakdown times, booth placements and their ability to contain vendors within the booth spaces assigned. Powwows are places that occupy or, better yet, stake a claim to a space for a limited amount of time. During that time, the powwow committee retains all rights to police its space. Acceptance of vendor applications and the payment of vendor fees merely constitute a "revocable license to participate" issued by the powwow committee (Center 2007:8).

Seemingly innocuous contract stipulations, such as the following, illustrate how authority is linked to spatial control in everyday powwow market practices. While this discussion might seem just a matter of managing a market setting, the regulations regarding vendors are often much different from how other powwow participants, particularly dancers, are managed and it is this contrast that makes these rules even more significant.

> Set-up time shall be Friday, August 12, 2003 beginning at 12:00 noon.
>
> **Please wait until this time as to not cause any confusion.**
>
> **ALL VENDORS WILL BE GIVEN SET UP LOCATIONS CHOSEN BY THE COORDINATOR, NO SWAPPING SPACES WILL BE PERMITTED UNLESS APPROVED BY COORDINATOR** [Mohegan Contract 2003].

The 2012 Gathering of Nations vendor instructions state that "No vendor will be allowed to set up or bring merchandise in before completing the registration process."[17] The 2006 NAIA contract demands the vendor acknowledge that they

> understand that the NAIA Powwow Committee will make space assignments and there will be NO BOOTH CHANGES OR SWITCHING!!!!!....no setup may be started until the Powwow office, with all fees paid, has given clearance. Set-up hours: Thursday 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and Friday 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.
> NO EXCEPTIONS without approval from the Powwow Committee.

The specificity accorded to time in these contracts is significant when contrasted with the focus on Indian time noted in powwow scholarship. Emcees often have to coax dancers into the arena to start the program, and powwows rarely start their public performance programming according to their published schedule. The reasons for this are often couched in the differences between white and Indian time. This is very different from how the market is constructed in terms of time and space in these contracts, suggesting perhaps that committees associate the market more closely with non-Native ways of being because of its economic focus. This is not, however, how vendors view their participation or their market status.

The location of booth spaces is also something that is very important to vendors, and obviously something that committees want to control, as noted by the consistent reference to booth locations in their contracts. According to powwow vendors, booth locations directly affect their economic success, are associated with statuses accorded to vendors by committee members, and contribute to positive vending experiences. Powwow committees create the powwow and its market from undifferentiated space and from a constantly changing group of individuals. Contracts might "provide the stitches and quilting that piece together the social fabric," but vendors have their own opinions on how the market should be constituted,

opinions that can be in conflict with those of the committees (Suchman 2003:99).

A seemingly innocent provision in powwow contracts, but one that is common, requires powwow vendors to remain within the space assigned to them. If vendors do not conform to this stipulation, they can be expelled from the powwow grounds or denied future access. On the other hand, the lack of enforcement of these types of clauses causes ill feelings among vendors and between committees and vendors. The 2003 Mohegan Wigwam contract stated that "all booth spaces will be 25 x 25 [feet], and no extra racks or partitions will be allowed. The coordinator reserves the right to request vendor to leave the Festival grounds." The Saratoga Native American Festival, a new event to the powwow circuit in 2006, went so far as to produce a *Vendor Handbook* that was available on line. Their rules required that "all merchandise and goods exhibited, including signage, must be contained within the Vendor's assigned booth. Absolutely no selling, trading, buying, bartering, or other business activities of any type whatsoever will be allowed except at the Vendor's assigned booth" (Center 2007:6).

Confinement to booth space is an issue of fire codes, emergency lane regulations, and the desire of the committee to control where sales occur within powwow space but it has many other meanings according to vendors who balk at spatial intrusions by their neighbours and who take affront at complaints made regarding their vendor booth practices. At one powwow, a vendor, upset by the booth set up of her neighbour, called me into her booth and complained about how the vendor next to her had extended his booth along the back of her own blocking her ability to get into her camper located at the rear of the booth. The vendor had "impinged on their space" (FN 8/26/2006). Both committees and vendors alike equate keeping merchandise within booth space with being a "good neighbour." Another vendor was reprimanded for moving some of his stock into a walkway even though it was done only temporarily to facilitate a demonstration of one of his products (FN 10/14/2006). The committee did not complain directly to him, but talked about it to others, suggesting he might be excluded from future shows. The criticized vendor found out and considered not returning to that event because he felt he was being treated unfairly. In both instances, good relations were predicated on vendors remaining within their booths, thus not expanding their spatial control beyond the booth spaces allowed by the powwow committees. Unlike many other kinds of powwow participation, powwow market vending is expected to remain inside pre-determined space. This suggests that vending is a form of participation that must be contained, not only within the larger market, but also within individual booths. The economic aspect of the market perhaps is threatening and thus seen as a socio-spatial site that needs more border work.

Committee vendor contracts also regulate when booths are open and when vendors must relinquish their spaces. Most contracts require that booths remain open during festival hours; however, vendors often close during inclement weather, during periods of slow event activity and at the end of events where turnout and sales have been poor. Vendors are rarely penalized for these practices, which suggests that while contracts attempt to impose "white time," vendor practices are informed by other parameters. Relinquishing powwow space signifies not only the termination of the vendor's right to occupy space, but limitations to the powwow committee's ability to carve Native space. Enforcement of rules about vacating powwow space is the last opportunity for powwow committees to control powwow space through the imposition of time: "Vendor(s) must clean and vacate the booth space by noon on Monday, October 1" (Center 2007:7). Unlike other powwow constituencies, such as dancers, spectators and consumers, powwow vendors occupy powwow space for longer periods of time associated with set-up, security provision, camping and break-down of their powwow booths. Vendors often stay in campers parked directly behind their booths or in adjacent parking lots, sometimes never leaving the powwow or its market space for the duration of the event. When a committee has contracted with the government or another entity to occupy a particular geography, outside agents limit their ability to exercise spatial authority. For example, the NAIA powwow held at Long Hunter State Park in 2006 and the Ormond Beach Native American Festival held yearly at the Casements, in conjunction with The City of Ormond Beach Department of Leisure Services, must conform to externally imposed rules of access and occupancy. The Mohegan Wigwam Festival is held on Mohegan land, and the committee often lets vendors remain on site until they are allowed access to the next event. This is probably why their contract does not stipulate the relinquishing of powwow space. The nature of the circuit and their greater control over the Fort Shantok site allows for this flexibility.

Powwows, Markets, Space and Sovereignty

The power to control space and define citizenship is central to conceptions of sovereignty, and the invocation of sovereignty is often central to worldwide campaigns for indigenous rights (Brown 2007). Kevin Bruyneel (2007:23) defines sovereignty as "the ability of a group of people to

make their own decisions and control their own lives in relation to the space where they reside and/or that they envision as their own." This definition also encompasses the ideas behind self-determination. Traditionally, within the United States, tribal sovereignty and its association with reservations is the quintessential hallmark of sovereignty. Thomas Biolsi (2005), as noted above, expanded the idea of indigenous political space beyond the nation-state/tribal sovereignty model to include territorial based rights to off-reservation resources, national indigenous space claimed by pan-Indians, and hybrid political space where multiple sovereignties such as tribal and nation-state models co-exist. Powwows are constituted as Native political spaces by the powwow committees that organize them, but are they a form of political space that we can discuss in relation to the concept sovereignty?

Two important parameters to any discussion of the concept of sovereignty is territory and the power to control decisions made in relation to that space. Powwow research has rarely considered the processes by which powwows become places or the role of territorialization in that process. This paper has sought to consider the role of the powwow committee in the creation and recognition of the powwow as a Native space, through a focus on socio-spatial processes. Renato Rosaldo (1994:246) has suggested that nation-state sovereignty is located in a "flat, homogeneous territory, defined by its boundaries." By focusing on border work, the processes through which social and spatial boundaries are defined, we learn how the powwow becomes a place and how anywhere can be claimed as Native space, even if only for a few days.

Powwow committees constitute the powwow from undifferentiated space through site choices, garnering public recognition, attracting diverse populations to attend and creating and policing the powwow market through vendor invitations and contracts. Unlike nation-state models of sovereignty, the powwow is not a homogeneous territory. It is diversity that is central to its importance as a site for the engendering of contemporary identities, Native and non-Native. Putting on a powwow is an act of political positioning, but it is not merely a process designed to mark ethnic difference between Natives and non-Natives. Through the constitution of the powwow, powwow committees create a position of power from which they can become players in the power structure. They do this by creating a place that affords them the economic resources, political influence, and cultural capital to engage the power system. While committees seek to construct their position of power through socio-spatial processes, other powwow constituencies, such as vendors, either legitimate or challenge these practices in both overt and subtle ways. In addition, because of the temporality and diversity of individual events, yet alone their sheer number across time and space, powwows provide the social space where the conceptualization of contemporary identities can be negotiated in the blurred reality of social practice (Willmott 2010).

The history of the powwow is a history of Native peoples' struggle to mark on the landscape of North America, Native space among non-Native populations as a means of fostering a continuously evolving Native presence in contemporary society. While recognition by those on the outside, such as governmental agencies and dominant society, is important, recognition and authority to manage powwow territory is also important. By focusing on powwow market contracts, we begin to see that the arts and crafts market is a part of the powwow that draws a significant amount of focus from the powwow committee in terms of border work related to social and spatial processes of inclusion and exclusion. I wish to suggest that the powwow market is the socio-spatial border of powwow sovereignty that Rosaldo suggests is where control must be exercised rather than the territorial middle—that is, the dance arena. Perhaps this is why the dancer pointed to the market as the site where a powwow's authenticity is marked. Analysis of vendor contracts shows that the market is an important site for formal socio-spatial policing by the powwow committee. Usually, the dance arena is located in the territorial middle of the powwow. The market surrounds the arena and becomes the border that breaks interconnected space and defines the edge of the powwow as a form of differentiated political, perhaps sovereign, space. Thomas Biolsi's (2005:245) important discussion of imagined geographies focused on the need to look beyond the nation-state model of sovereignty to the lived reality of "quasi," "permeated," and/or "graduated" sovereignty that is a much more open-ended process. The concentric circle analysis of most powwow scholarship has highlighted the different social spaces within the powwow but has often assumed the center, the dance arena, was the most important and movement away signaled a lack of attention to the event. By shifting our analysis, to the border, the market and processes of border work, we find an affinity to the literature on sovereignty, which can help us more fully understand the contemporary powwow domain and the identities being engendered within. "For to be a political subject of any kind—is necessarily to inhabit particular forms of imagined or achieved—even if unstable and contested—political space" (Biolsi 2005:252). Powwows are unstable and contested political spaces. Focusing on the processes by which the powwow becomes a place, particularly in relation to its market, we see that

contemporary Nativeness is engendered in relation to conceptions of ethnic and political identity, economics, recognition and social reproduction negotiated through socio-spatial practices.

Blaire O. Gagnon, Department of Textiles, Fashion Merchandising and Design, University of Rhode Island, Quinn Hall Room 310, 55 Lower College Road, Kingston, RI, 0288, U.S.A.
E-mail: bgagnon@uri.edu.

Notes

1 Throughout the text, I use the citation form (FN MM/DD/YYYY) to reference data collected during my fieldwork and recorded in my field notebooks.

2 My use of the terms powwow and powwow circuit in this paper are consistent with their application by powwow participants. The use of these terms should invoke a commonality across these events, but they also hide a great diversity in terms of size, organizational focus, ethnic makeup, and performative purpose. Moreover, I do not conflate the term powwow with the term dance, which is commonly done in the literature, because powwows are not just dances. Moreover, some events on the powwow circuit and incorporated into this research focused more on arts and crafts than dance.

3 At this time, I would like to clarify my use of the terms indigenous, Native, and Indian. The term indigenous is the broadest term, and my use of it, aligns with the definition put forth in the Martinez Cobo Study: "Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them" (Issues 2004:2). My use of the terms Native and Indian is influenced by Federal Indian policies, the writings of Gerald Vizenor (1998), and their use by informants to this study. I employ the term Native in reference to descendants of the indigenous populations inhabiting North America. I use the term Indian as it is commonly used to denote such fields as Indian Art, Federal Indian policy, and the political category Indian. While I differentiate between the terms, informants to my study often used them interchangeably.

4 The term vendor is commonly used within the powwow context to refer to anyone who sells within the market. There are two primary groups of sellers: those who sell arts and crafts and those who sell food. Under the umbrella term arts and crafts vendor, I include sellers of t-shirts, pottery, jewelry, powwow drums, paintings, dream catchers and much more. The types of merchandise sold from event to event can vary considerably. In this article, I will use the term vendor to refer to anyone who sells within the arts and crafts market.

5 While Gupta and Ferguson (2002) use the term "interconnected space," I use the term "undifferentiated space" to highlight the processes through which space becomes a place. The processes of bordering or differentiation, social and spatial, that turn part of a state park into a powwow, highlights the delimitating of a Native space from otherwise interconnected space.

6 Native American Indian Association homepage. http://www.naiatn.org, accessed February 1, 2012,

7 "The 30th Annual Fall Festival & Tennessee Powwow," Native American Indian Association of Tennessee, http://www.naiatn.org/powwow/index.html, accessed February 1, 2012,

8 "The 30th Annual."

9 "Heritage: The Green Corn Festival," 2009. The Mohegan Tribe. http://www.mohegan.nsn.us//Heritage/wigwam.aspx, accessed February 1, 2012.

10 "The Powwow & Open Drum Competition," 2011, The Canadian Aboriginal Festival presented by Indian Art-I-Crafts, http://www.canab.com/mainpages/events/powwow.html, accessed February 1, 2012.

11 "Vendor Application," 2007, Gathering of Nations, Ltd., http://www.gatheringofnations.com/powwow/indian_traders_market/tr_appl.htm, accessed January 26, 2007.

12 "The Powwow & Open Drum Competition;" "Welcome to the Gathering of Nations Website," 2011, Gathering of Nations, Ltd., http//:www.gatheringofnations.com, accessed January 7, 2012.

13 "Indian Traders Market," Gathering of Nations, Ltd., http://wwwgatheringofnations.com/powwow/indian_traders_market/index.htm, accessed January 7, 2012.

14 "Vendor Application," Tunica-Biloxi Pow Wow Committee, http://www.tunicapowwow.org/application.html, accessed May 10, 2012.

15 "Vendor Application," 2012, Gathering of Nations, Ltd., http://www.gatheringofnations.com/powwow/indian_traders_market/index.htm, accessed January 7, 2012.

16 "Vendor Application," 2007, Gathering of Nations, Ltd.

17 "Vendor Application," 2012, Gathering of Nations, Ltd.

References

Alvarez, Robert R. Jr.
1995 The Mexican-U.S. Border: The Making of an Anthropology of Borderlands. Annual Review of Anthropology 24:447-70.

Alvarez, Robert R., and George A. Collier
1994 The Long Haul in Mexican Trucking: Traversing the Borderlands of the North and South. American Ethnologist 21(3):606-627.

Barker, Joanne
2003 IndianTM U.S.A. Wicazo Sa Review 18(1):25-79.
2011 Native Acts: Law, Recognition and Cultural Authenticity. Durham: Duke University Press.

Barth, Frederick
1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference. Long Grove: Waveland Press, Inc.

Biolsi, Thomas
2005 Imagined Geographies: Sovereignty, Indigenous Space, and American Indian Struggle. American Ethnologist 32:239-259.

Brewer, Terence
1999 Touching the Past, Teaching Ways Forward: The American Indian Powwow. *In* Indigenous Religions: A Companion. Graham Harvey, ed. Pp. 255-268. London: Cassell.

Brown, Michael F.
2007 Sovereignty's Betrayals. *In* Indigenous Experience Today. Marisol de la Cadena and Orin Starn, eds. Pp. 171-194. Oxford: Berg Publications.
Bruyneel, Kevin
2007 The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Buddle, Kathleen
2004 Media, Markets and Powwows: Matrices of Aboriginal Cultural Mediation in Canada. Cultural Dynamics 16(1):29-69.
Campisi, Jack
1975 Powwow: A Study of Ethnic Boundary Maintenance. Man in the Northeast 9:33-46.
Castells, Manuel
1996 The Rise of the Network Society. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
Center, Ndakinna Educational
2007 Saratoga Native American Festival Vendor Handbook. Greenfield Center: The Ndakinna Educational Center.
Clifford, James
1988 The Predicament of Culture: Twentieh-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Colebut-Jackson, Marjorie
2006 Wequassin (Welcome)! *In* The Official 2006 Schemitzun Program Book. M. E. Johnson, ed, Pp. 2. Mashantucket: The Mashantucket Pequot Tribe.
de Certeau, Michel
1984 The Practice of Everyday Life. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Development, The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic
2008 The State of the Native Nations: Conditions under U.S. Policies of Self-Determination. New York: Oxford University Press.
Dubin, Margaret
2001 Native America Collected: The Culture of an Art World. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Ellis, Clyde, Luke Eric Lassiter and Gary H. Dunham, eds.
2005 Powwow. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Eschbach, Karl, and Kalman Applbaum
2000 Who Goes to Powwows? Evidence from the Survey of American Indians and Alaska Natives. American Indian Culture and Research Journal 24(2):65-83.
Fawcett, Melissa J.
1995 Shantok: A Tale of Two Sites. Cultural Resource Management 18(7):8-10.
Flynn, Donna K.
1997 "We Are the Border": Identity, Exchange, and the State along the Benin-Nigeria Border. American Ethnologist 24(2):311-330.
Gagnon, Blaire O.,
2009 Powwow Arts and Crafts Markets and the Engendering of Social Relationships. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
N.D.a Engendering Status and Value in the Powwow Art Market. Cultural Dynamics.
N.D.b "I Won't Even Let You Hold It for That Amount": Price, Value, and Social Relationships in the Powwow Market. Unpublished manuscript, last modified September 15, 2012.
Gelo, Daniel J.
1999 Powwow Patter: Indian Emcee Discourse on Power and Identity. Journal of American Folklore 112(443):40-57.
Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson
1997 Culture, Power, Place: Ethnography at the End of an Era. *In* Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, eds. Pp. 1-29. Durham: Duke University Press.
2002 Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *In* The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader. Johnathan X. Inda and Renato Rosaldo, eds. Pp. 65-80. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
Hannerz, Ulf
2003 Being There...and There...and There!: Reflections on Multi-Site Ethnography. Ethnography 4(2):201-216.
Howard, James H.
1955 Pan Indian Culture of Oklahoma. Scientific Monthly 81(5):215-220.
Hutchens, Jerry Lee
2006 Powwow Calendar 2007: Directory of Native American Gatherings in the USA and Canada. Summertown: Native Voices.
Inda, Johnathan X., and Renato Rosaldo, eds.
2002 The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
Issues, Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Peoples
2004 The Concept of Indigenous Peoples. Pp. 4. New York: United Nations.
Kearney, Michael
1996 Reconceptualizing the Peasantry: Anthropology in Global Perspective. Boulder: Westview Press.
Kracht, Benjamin R.
1994 Kiowa Powwows: Continuity in Ritual Practice. American Indian Quarterly 18:321-348.
Krouse, Susan Applegate
1991 A Window Into Indian Culture: The Powwow as Performance. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
Kurath, Gertrude
1966 Michigan Indian Festivals. Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Publishers.
Kurath, Gertrude Prokosch
1957 Pan-Indianism in Great Lakes Tribal Festivals. The Journal of American Folklore 70(276):179-182.
Laudin, Harvey Golden
1974 The Shinnecock Powwow: A Study of Culture Change. Ph.D. dissertation, New York University.
Lefebvre, Henri
2002 "The Production of Space." *In* The Spaces of Postmodernity: Readings in Human Geography. M.J. Dear and S. Flusty, eds. Pp. 131-149. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Lerch, Patricia Barker, and Susan Bullers
1996 Powwows as Identity Markers: Traditional or Pan-Indian? Human Organization 55(4):390-395.
Marcus, George
1995 Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. Annual Review of Anthropology 24:95-117.
Mattern, Mark
1999 The Powwow as a Public Arena for Negotiating Unity and Diversity in American Indian Life. *In* Contemporary Native American Cultural Issues. Duane Champagne, ed. Pp. 129-143. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
May, Stephanie A.
2001 Performance of Identity: Alabama-Coushatta Tourism, Powwows, and Everyday Life. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
Meyn, Susan Labry
2001 More Than Curiosities: A Grassroots History of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board and Its Precursors, 1920-1942. Lanham: Lexington Books.
Michaelson, Scott, and David E. Johnson, eds.
1997 Border Theory: The Limits of Cultural Politics. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Migdal, Joel S., ed.
2004 Boundaries and Belonging: States and Societies in the Struggle to Shape Identities and Local Practices. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mitchell-Green, Bonnie L.
1994 American Indian PowWows in Utah, 1983-1994: A Case Study of Oppositional Culture. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
Nagel, Joanne
1997 American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture. New York: Oxford University Press.
NAIA (Native American Indian Association)
2006 25th Annual NAIA Intertribal Pow-Wow and Fall Festival Program. Nashville: Native American Indian Association of Tennessee, Incorporated.
Ono, Azusa
2003 The American Indian Community in Denver: 1952-2002. MA thesis, University of Northern Colorado.
Roberts, Kathleen G.
2001 Giving Away: The Performance of Speech and Sign in Powwow Ritual Exchange. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
Rosaldo, Renato
1989 Culture and Truth: the Remaking of Social Analysis. Boston: Beacon Press.
Rynkiewich, Michael A.
1980 Chippewa Powwows. *In* Anishinabe: Six Studies of Modern Chippewa. J.A. Paredes, ed. Pp. 31-100. Tallahassee: University Presses of Florida.
Sanchez, Victoria E.
1995 "As Long As We Dance, We Shall Know Who We Are": A Study of Off-Reservation Traditional Intertribal Powwows in Central Ohio. Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University.
Sheffield, Gail K.
1997 The Arbitrary Indian: The Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Slotkin, James S.
1957 The Menomini Powwow: A Study in Cultural Decay, vol. 4. Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Museum.
Suchman, Mark C.
2003 The Contract as Social Artifact. Law and Society Review 37:91-142.
Vizenor, Gerald
1998 Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence. Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press.
Warren, Stephen
2005 "To Show the Public That We Were Good Indians": Origins and Meanings of the Meskwaki Powwow. American Indian Culture and Research Journal 33(4):1-28.
Willmott, Cory
2010 Designing, Producing and Enacting Nationalisms: Contemporary Amerindian Fashions in Canada. *In* The Force of Fashion in Politics and Society: Global Perspectives from Early Modern to Contemporary Times. B. Lemire, ed. Pp. 167-190. London: Ashgate Publications.
Wilson, Thomas M., and Hastings Donnan
1998 Nation, State and Identity at International Borders. In Border Identities: Nation and State at International Frontiers. T.M. Wilson and H. Donnan, eds. Pp. 1-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Young, Gloria A.
1981 Powwow Power: Perspectives on Historicand Contemporary Intertribalism. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.