The articles in this edition address two critical concerns that can be broadly characterised as Indigeneity as a spectacle and the elision of Indigenous sovereignty by multiculturalism and diversity. The first article, by Maryrose Casey, examines nineteenth and early twentieth century Indigenous performances that drew on cultural practices for entertainment. She highlights how these commercially driven performances were, in fact, demonstrations of sovereignty that white colonisers paid to observe. A measure of the success of these demonstrations can be found in the reactions of audiences, which often involved disrupting the spectacle by physically occupying the performance space.

The second article, by Pei-Hsin Hsu, interrogates notions of Indigenous authenticity from an Indigenous perspective. Through her study of Smangus village, an Indigenous tourism site in northern Taiwan, she challenges how authenticity has been defined by tourism by stressing ways in which the Indigenous ‘host’ authentically receives the tourist through Atayal Gaga, “a traditional social norm that stresses communal action toward shared goals”. These goals have included the very decision to encourage tourism as a way of maintaining village life, with the villagers, themselves, defining authenticity through their role as willing educators.

Noorie K Brantmeier examines the unique position occupied by Native American and Indigenous Studies (NAIS) courses. Liberally orientated diversity courses cannot, by definition, capture continuing Native nationhood and sovereignty, so reactions of non-Native and white undergraduates to the content of NAIS courses are bound to be instructive in terms of attitudes towards Indigenous people. Brantmeier, an NAIS educator herself, offers a qualitative analysis of the ways in which these students react to Indigenous people, their history and contemporary experiences. Her findings inform the wider debate within Indigenous Studies as to the efficacy of such courses in fostering positive attitudes towards Indigenous peoples.

The final article, by Lainie Schultz, addresses the vexed question of the location of Indigenous sovereignty within those human rights discourses that identify cultural difference as the principal means of recognition. In this paradigm, Indigenous self-determination is predictably lost to state sponsored, top-down multiculturalism, thereby “reproducing colonialisit priorities and jurisprudence, and significantly undermining goals and meanings of Indigenous self-determination”. Schultz suggests, by way of an alternative approach, that self-determination be approached “from the bottom-up” so that we can see new perspectives on the right to self-determination.
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