



PROJECT MUSE®

Transnational Settler Colonial Formations and Global
Capital: A Consideration of Indigenous Mexican Migrants

Lourdes Gutiérrez Nájera, Korinta Maldonado

American Quarterly, Volume 69, Number 4, December 2017, pp. 809-821
(Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0067>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/680486>

Transnational Settler Colonial Formations and Global Capital: A Consideration of Indigenous Mexican Migrants

Lourdes Gutiérrez Nájera
Korinta Maldonado

The Los Angeles Central Library's exhibition "Visualizing Language: A Zapotec Worldview," which opened this past September, features a series of murals produced by the Oaxacan artists collective Tlacolulokos. The murals are envisioned as providing a "counter-narrative" to existing ones painted by Dean Cornwell, in 1933, depicting a history of California in four stages: Era of Discovery, Missions, Americanization, and Founding of the City of Los Angeles.¹ In these paintings Native people are depicted as marginal and subservient figures within grander visions of colonization. The new murals are thus intended to provide a new voice by putting "a different protagonist in the center of the story."² What is of interest for the present essay is *who* gets to tell *this* story. It is not Native artists on whose land the library is built, but Oaxacan Indigenous people. In this way, this project continues a legacy of erasure embedded in current discourses of multiculturalism that reinforce settler colonial dispossession and hegemony.³

Taking Indigenous Mexican migration as a point of departure, this essay joins critical scholarship on settler colonialism exploring the role of the migrant in settler processes. Following Patrick Wolfe's theorization of settler colonialism as a structuring force rather than as a historical passage,⁴ we ask: How might a comparative framework on settler colonialisms help us articulate theoretical discussion beyond the dominant settler–Native racial binary? And in which ways does the settler colonial theoretical framework render visible the ways in which distinct bodies are racialized within and beyond national boundaries? We understand settler colonialism as the complex reverberations originating from Indigenous dispossession and white possession.⁵ As a global and transnational phenomenon,⁶ settler colonialism is a structuring force that in coproduction with the transatlantic slave trade, indentured labor, and other forms of racial

ordering enables particular racial logics and forms of exclusions integral to global capital and empire.⁷

We also examine settler colonialism within a relational framework promoted by Indigenous and Indigenous studies scholars. A comparative perspective provides synergistic opportunities to compare histories of dispossession and racialization between US and Mexican native populations while recognizing differing colonial experiences. A relational framework examines specific contingencies and conditions of settler colonial contexts to avoid a flattening of distinct historical trajectories that are contained within differences. Thus we place settler colonialism in relation to other imperial formations that allow us to better understand how Indigenous migrants move among distinct race, class, gender, and other colonial formations, as Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein have argued.⁸

Our consideration of settler colonialism expands beyond Latinx or Chicana contexts by destabilizing hegemonic categories that draw on national or racial distinctions and erase Indigenous peoples' experiences.⁹ Despite constitutional reforms recognizing Mexico's plural composition, Indigenous peoples in Mexico are subjected to racism, oppression, and dispossession, much like Native Americans in the United States. The multicultural shift in Mexico has served as a governance strategy¹⁰ that aims to control and disable radical politics by creating legal frameworks of "conditional inclusion"¹¹ while erasing Indigenous peoples' demands for autonomy and self-determination. Ultimately these policies further promote Indigenous migration.

Through a comparative analysis of settler colonialism in the context of Mexican Indigenous migration to California and Washington, we demonstrate distinct ways in which Indigenous migrants mobilize and articulate their indigeneity. We argue that Indigenous migrant forms of engagement are framed by the particular settler logics and imperial formations in which they find themselves. We show that settler colonialism is contingent and historical. Further, we examine how Los Angeles becomes a site where logics of erasure stand out, while in Yakima connections and relationality that move us beyond settler-colonial binaries prevail. By looking at the case of Zapotecs in a dense urban environment inhabited by many Indigenous bodies, we propose that Natives become invisible at different places and historical moments, whereas in the Yakima valley a rural context renders Indigenous recognition more visible.

Indigenous Mexicans in the United States

Until recently, we have tended to think of migrants in terms of their countries of origin. Given this level of monochromatic distinction, scholars question dominant national categories (e.g., Guatemalan, Mexican, Peruvian) for understanding Latinx experiences.¹² Indeed, these national narratives continually promote the erasure of Indigenous people in migration narratives. Research on Indigenous migration provides fertile ground for reconsidering national and hemispheric comparative narratives of indigeneity and migration.¹³

According to the 2010 population census, some 1.2 million Hispanics in the United States identified as American Indian and Alaska Native.¹⁴ Indigenous Mexicans are the largest group. Indigenous Mexicans express multiple racial and ethnic identities, speak many different languages, and express a diversity of cultural traditions. Zapotecs and Triqui described in this essay have migrated between the United States and Mexico since the 1960s.¹⁵ Unlike other dominant migrant groups, Indigenous migrant experiences are shaped by racial and ethnic structures. They face not only racial prejudice and discrimination in both their home countries and the United States because of their Indigenous origin but also a rapacious anti-immigrant sentiment. Cultural and linguistic differences as well as legal status also shape their reception and adaptation.

Today, Indigenous migrants are living in spaces shaped by settler colonialism. In Los Angeles, they have settled on Tongva territory; in Washington State, they have settled on Yakama land.¹⁶ An examination of Indigenous Mexicans highlights how their presence and incorporation into California's multicultural landscape, like that expressed through the Los Angeles Public Library's public recognition of a strong Zapotec presence in Los Angeles, accentuates aspects of their cultures that render them acceptable within a framework of cultural assimilation while obscuring Native people on whose land these same immigrants have settled.¹⁷ By comparison, an examination of Indigenous Oaxacans in Washington's Yakima Valley provides alternative contact narratives within a context of Oaxacan–Yakama relations. Specifically, the occupation of Indigenous and non-Indigenous migrants of the Yakama reservation allows us to pay attention and analyze the tensions, contradictions, and the possibilities emerging from such encounters. Such comparison asks us to consider: How do recent flows of Indigenous Mexicans to the United States align with or disrupt settler colonial logics? How does the presence of Indigenous migrants challenge the notion of settlers and to what extent does the recognition of Indigenous

Mexicans, through multicultural narratives, obfuscate the presence of Native Americans (and their histories) in areas of migrant settlement?

Indigenous Settler Transcolonial Relations

Our engagement with Indigenous Mexicans living in the United States attempts to understand ways in which indigeneities are constructed in relation to both their natal homes and Native landscapes on which they reside. Scholars have only begun to place Indigenous migrants within a larger set of relations that include Native peoples in the United States.¹⁸ Yet as Hokulani Aikau's poignant study of Native Hawaiians at Iosepa, Utah, suggests, we stand to gain tremendously from such interrogations. Aikau's examination of diasporic Native Hawaiians' relationship to the land seeks to understand the commingling of settler colonialism with indigeneity. As she aptly states, "When we shift our analytical gaze from homeland to alternative contact narratives, we must recalibrate the way we understand the articulation of settler-colonialism with indigeneity."¹⁹ In other words, as Native Hawaiians settle and reproduce colonial relations by occupying Native American lands, they draw on intimate knowledge to reproduce Indigenous forms of social organization and relations to the land. Thus alternative contact narratives allow us to move beyond European and Native American points of contact to examine alternative encounters, including inter-Native encounters.²⁰

We recognize that Indigenous Mexicans and Native peoples in the United States share experiences as targets of discrimination and exclusionary practices. But this does not mean that they are exempt from perpetuating contemporary settler logics. Despite some overlapping circumstances and histories, including their limited sovereign capacities and the fact that they are both defined by conquest,²¹ Indigenous Mexicans may nevertheless participate in contemporary neoliberal structures of settler states.²² Even as Indigenous peoples who migrated by force, they are settlers in the United States. In this capacity, we must recognize their complicity in perpetuating erasure and other forms of violence (even if unintended) toward Natives.

In the remainder of this essay we examine Oaxacan Indigenous migrants to Los Angeles and Yakama to demonstrate the complex relations between migration, indigeneity, and settler colonialism. The example of Mexican Indigenous migrants in Los Angeles provides a context to better understand the dispossession and erasure of Native people beginning with colonialism and extending into present-day multiculturalism. The case of the Indigenous farmworkers

on the Yakama Indian reservation and in Washington's Yakima valley draws attention to alternative Indigenous encounters and provides a contemporary guide for comparative and transnational constructions of indigeneity and Indigenous resurgence. Such encounters in this particular case are concealed through settler colonial logics of intense capitalist labor extraction.

Transcommunal Indigeneity and Multicultural Erasures

Numerous works engage with the question of the reproduction of settler colonialism and the location of migrant communities within these contexts. For example, scholars studying the Hawaiian case argue that all migrants, even those with less economic power or pushed out by US colonial/empire endeavors in their own countries, are settlers.²³ Migrant attempts to gain economic and political power by asserting "local" identities become complicit with settler colonialism by subordinating Hawaiian claims to their rightful homeland. Immigrant communities' political agency can bolster a colonial system initiated by White settlers.²⁴

The case of Zapotec Indigenous peoples living in Los Angeles provides insight to the ways in which they, like other "settlers of color"²⁵ or "brown settlers," perpetuate dispossession. Drawing on Aikau's notion of "alternative contact narrative," we show how Indigenous Mexicans simultaneously perpetuate Native dispossession in the United States as they lay roots and reconstruct transnational forms of indigeneity. Consequently, any understanding of Indigenous Mexican migrants as settlers must examine the relationship between settler colonial processes and indigeneity, as argued by Aikau.²⁶ The opening vignette provides an opportunity to begin this examination.

Los Angeles today is recognized as a place marked by a large presence of Indigenous Mexicans, the majority hailing from the state of Oaxaca. Mixtecs, Zapotecs, and Mixes constitute three of the most prominent linguistic and cultural groups. Zapotecs constitute the largest group of urban residents in Los Angeles, representing Oaxaca's main regional distributions—sierra norte, valles centrales, and isthmus. The communities representing the sierra form the largest enclave in Los Angeles. Zapotecs have left an indelible mark on the city, transforming neighborhoods into town and regional specific enclaves (e.g., valley Zapotecs in West Los Angeles versus sierra Zapotecs in Koreatown) and contributing to the growing presence of restaurants (e.g., La Guelaguetza, La Zapoteca, Sierra Juárez) and stores (e.g., La Mayordomia). Equally important are the numerous cultural groups representing hometown and regional brass

bands, basketball teams, and dance groups. Zapotecs participate in collective celebrations commemorating patron saints, life-cycle events, and pan-ethnic festivities like *guelaguetza*. Not surprisingly, Oaxacans have transformed Los Angeles into a rich cultural space referred to as Oaxacalifornia.

This re-envisioning of Los Angeles, and the broader state of California, as a space where Zapotecs can experience their culture, traditions, and cosmogony signals the continued importance of place in reconceptualizing indigeneity within this transnational space. Yet we suggest that the reconfiguration of Oaxacalifornia spanning Zapotec indigeneity between natal homes and Los Angeles via webs of social relations and cultural practices reproduces settler colonial logics of erasure and dispossession. In part, this erasure is achieved through US national practices of multiculturalism, but it is further reinforced by broader nationalist projects of assimilation and manifest destiny.

Numerous postcolonial scholars are critical of multiculturalism and the contemporary politics of recognition for reinforcing, rather than transforming, structures of colonial domination in relations between settler states and Indigenous communities. While Dean Saranillio stresses white supremacy as integral to logics of multiculturalism, Jonathan Okamura points to the systemic economic inequality within multicultural regimes. Other scholars further suggest that a distorted vision of Hawai'i as a model of racial harmony and multiculturalism is often based on a common perception of a shared "local" identity among its residents that frames Native Hawaiians as "one more racial minority," ostensibly eliminating Native rights to land, resources, and sovereignty.²⁷ In the case of Los Angeles, Zapotec migrants are incorporated into California's multicultural landscape through the city's public recognition. In August 2014 the Los Angeles Public Library held a cultural event, "Welcome to Oaxacalifornia, Oaxaqueños in the Global City of L.A.," that integrated multiple generations of Oaxacans through music and dance, a pop-up photo exhibit, and speaker panels.²⁸ This type of recognition accentuates folkloric aspects of Oaxacan cultures that render them acceptable within a framework of assimilation.

Recognition of Los Angeles as Oaxacan obscures Native people on whose land immigrants have settled. While Los Angeles residents increasingly recognize and celebrate Oaxacans by taking part in cultural events and festivities sponsored by the city, many people remain unaware that Los Angeles is "the second most Indigenous populated city in the country, with around 54,000 people who self identify as Native. When displaced Latin American and Pacific Island Indigenous peoples are considered, LA has the largest population of

Indigenous peoples in the entire country.”²⁹ The truth is, Native Californian populations—most noticeably, Tongva, Chumash, Tataviam—remain invisible in the Angeleno imaginary. “Replacement narratives” reflected in the Los Angeles Public Library’s Cornwell murals have erased their histories and, more important, so have nationalist narratives of multiculturalism that celebrate the latest wave of Oaxacan migrants as part of the city’s landscape.

Beyond multicultural policies, manifest destiny and historical erasure have been used to dispossess Tongva from their lands as much today as in the past. Again, Cornwell’s mural relies on images of Natives as subservient people relegated to the past. The most prominent images of Native people (over twenty-five across several panels) are visible in the mural depicting the “mission” period, dependent on Indigenous labor. Only three are visible in the last mural depicting Americanization and progress. What accounts for such a narrative? Here we enter a more complete rendering of Native triple colonization and continual dispossession of land and resources that contributes to their invisibility. For Native peoples in California, dispossession began in the eighteenth century with Spanish colonization followed by extermination campaigns during the gold rush. In the 1900s Native Californians who had survived were subjected to forced relocations and boarding school education to assimilate them to “American” society. Yet through all these campaigns to erase them, Native people survived and continue to fight for their sovereignty. Tongva peoples, on whose lands the urban center was built, are at the forefront of struggles for recognition, protection of sacred sites and lands, and resources.

The Public Library’s decision to invite a Oaxacan art collective builds on this colonial history of erasure, dispossession, and replacement. Inadvertently, Indigenous Mexicans in the city, unaware of California’s history of Native dispossession and the Tongva enduring presence in the city, partake in symbolic erasures. In part, this is accomplished through their own claims of transcommunal belonging contingent on transformational practices of space that incorporate Los Angeles into their sphere of relations between Oaxaca and California. While Indigenous Mexicans themselves are targets of erasure within their country of origin and are forced to move by neoliberal policies that seek to dispossess them of their lands and resources, in Los Angeles they nevertheless participate in settler logics of Tongva elimination through their complicity with the city’s multicultural agenda.

Disappearing Indigenous Migrants in Yakama Land

The growing presence of Mexican Indigenous and non-Indigenous migrants on the Yakama nation reservation provides a novel context for analyzing the complexities and specificities of settler colonial formations. Migrants unintentionally have become complicit in erasing and dispossessing the Yakama from their homeland. We draw on the 2015 Latino USA “Reservation” program on Yakama land.³⁰ The evocative imagery and voices help us understand why Native and migrant experiences continue to be considered separately rather than together as part of imbricated processes across settler colonial imperial formations.³¹ Looking at the historic specificity of Indigenous Mexican farmworkers in Yakama from a lens that considers indigeneity and Indigenous resurgence allows us to move beyond binaries without distressing settler colonial structuring logics.³²

Yessenia, a Mexican migrant, recalls her experience moving as a child to the Yakama Indian reservation. “I remember in the closet of the house, there were beads: Native Americans beads. For as long [as] we lived in that house we kept finding beads on the closet.”³³ The beads that she and her family kept unearthing work as a specter, an ongoing reminder of previous inhabitants. Yet Yessenia admits that “living in the reservation . . . it was not something we were conscious about it was just something that we figured: Indians live here,”³⁴ an explicit acknowledgment of a presence that is always there but which Yessenia’s family was unable to grasp or recognize. Rather, they found unthreaded pieces of histories, beads that were unearthed as the migrants settled in the land. These beads illustrate the ways that settler coloniality obscures and promotes Indigenous recognition.

Yessenia’s recollection provides a glimpse at the complexities arising in the Yakama Indian reservation, where a thriving Latinx population has dramatically exceeded the native Yakama people in the last thirty years.³⁵ This demographic shift is visible at Heritage University, which was established within the Yakama reservation in the 1980s to serve the local native population. Today, its student body is 62 percent Mexican / Central American / South American ancestry and 16 percent Native American / Alaskan Native.³⁶ Such layered social geography is reminiscent of Jodi Byrd’s delineation of the Americas, “where histories of settlers and *arrivants* map themselves into and on top of Indigenous peoples.”³⁷

In this case the dominant historical narrative of the Yakima region starts with White settler habitation, dispossession, and genocide of Native Americans, like that depicted in Cornwell’s historical murals. The notion of settling on emptied

land, void of “people,” is central to a settler colonial project that continues to uphold and reproduce settler logics. Yet what the Yakima example illuminates is the ways in which settler colonialism produces racialized others and their location in relation to native peoples.³⁸ The racialization of labor in Yakima Valley pits local native populations against Indigenous and non-Indigenous migrants, mostly from Mexico.³⁹

Washington state and Oregon have experienced an influx of Triqui, Mixtec, and Purépecha people since the early 1990s.⁴⁰ Initially, laborers in the region included Native Americans and indentured workers from Asia. But by the mid-twentieth century, Mexican American workers from South Texas and Mexican migrants from rural regions dominated the landscape. The Bracero program was instrumental in this shift: “[It] enabled growers to lower wage scales and tightly control labor to such a degree that Anglos were no longer willing to work on farms.” Latinxs, primarily of Mexican origin, ultimately come to replace Filipinos, Native Americans, and Anglos as apple workers in the 1970s and 1980s.⁴¹ Mexican migration was predominantly of mestizo origin, but by the early 1990s Indigenous migrants dominated this flow. In Washington state, the upsurge of the Indigenous migrant population quadrupled from 1991 to 2008,⁴² feeding the agribusiness with cheap labor from the South.

Distinct violences erase and dispossess Native Americans at the same time that Mixteco, Triqui, and mestizo migrants arrive from Mexico seeking to escape that country’s own logics of elimination through assimilation, land encroachment, and state and narco violence. These Indigenous migrants take residence on stolen lands. These are the same lands that Yakama people are precluded from owning unless they can prove tribal membership through blood quantum. Such racialized entanglements foment anti-immigrant sentiments among some members of the Yakama nation. Matt Damaskins, a government liaison for the Yakama nation, says, “Indians are the only race that have to prove we are Indians. . . . we have to produce an enrollment card.”⁴³ He points to the contradictions between Yakama and Indigenous Mexican reception and settlement experiences. While Yakama people struggle to be recognized as legitimate heirs of their lands, Indigenous migrants appear to blend into the social fabric more seamlessly. Yet Indigenous migrant identities are also flattened into either Mexican and/or Latinx, making their presence suspect of illegality. At other times, they play an important role within liberal multiculturalism settler colonialism as “exotic” others,⁴⁴ carriers of ancestral knowledge, and noble savages in need of protectionism. An imperialist nostalgia is scripted over Indigenous migrants’ bodies, its exotic celebration and/or its

protection as in the case of the Zapotec in California, and its multicultural reverberations. Such racialized and vulnerable positioning serves the settler colonial project even as it obscures its relationality.⁴⁵ This embodies a process of colonial unknowing, which “renders unintelligible the entanglements of racialization and colonization.”⁴⁶

“Reservations” concludes with one nodal aspect that decenters settler colonial constructions and forms of relationships and circles back to the beads and the politics of unearthing. Yessenia explains that despite the tensions, she sees important points of convergence between Indigenous experiences: a deep connection to the land, distinct language, importance of family, and a veneration of elders: “My Indigenous roots are very similar to the roots of the Yakama nation. . . . The desires we have for our families, our mothers and grandmother being key to maintaining culture, ritual and tradition and in needing to be grounded to the earth and to our language.”⁴⁷ Her story allows us to imagine the beads as a venue for thinking through Indigenous relations framed not only by settler colonialism but also by alternative contact narratives. Every bead unearthed is a reminder of whose lands they settled on, political projects, and resistance. Her story also reveals a relational understanding of indigeneity that allows Yessenia to position herself as a Latinx migrant and as an Indigenous person.

Conclusion

We end with a reflection on the productive tensions that emerge when studying Indigenous migrants through a settler colonial framework. We emphasize these tensions to denaturalize and destabilize dominant settler–Native racial dichotomies. Recognizing the colonial present and the effects in the everyday lives of Indigenous migrants is not only crucial but urgent. Turning away from complicated and entangled conversations of the ways we (Indigenous and non-Indigenous migrants) perpetuate settler colonial logics is not an option. Neither is discarding the crucial role that production and reproduction of race and racial hierarchies play within settler colonial regimes. We are responsible in recognizing the limits of such frameworks. In so doing, we elucidate the ways in which Indigenous migrants root and reconstruct transnational indigenous identities and hemispheric articulations. Hence we need comparative and relational analysis when using settler colonial frameworks.

We return briefly to the opening vignette to ruminate further on the unveiling of the murals by the Tlacolulokos, at the Los Angeles Public Library.

In our opening, we note how the retelling of California history by Oaxacan Indigenous migrants contributes to a process of erasure that renders Tongvans, Chumash, and other local tribes invisible, despite their rightful claims to the land on which the library is built. Yet we must also acknowledge the spaces that the new images may provide for alternative contact narratives between recent Mexican Indigenous *arrivants* and Native Americans. We hope the exhibition will foster hemispheric and intertribal dialogues in the context of an upsurge of anti-Indigenous and anti-immigrant narratives.

Notes

- We would like to thank Bianet Castellanos for inviting us to participate in this forum and for her critical feedback in editing this essay. We also thank Ellen Moodie and the editorial board at *American Quarterly* for their helpful comments and suggestions.
1. See www.lapl.org/branches/central-library/art-architecture/painting (accessed January 13, 2017).
 2. See lfa.org/reimagining-central-libraris-rotunda-with-a-zapotec-worldview/ (accessed January 13, 2017).
 3. Dean Isuji Saranillio, "Why Asian Settler Colonialism Matters: A Thought Piece on Critiques, Debates, and Indigenous Difference," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3.3–4 (2013): 280–94, doi: 10.1080/2201473X.2013.810697.
 4. Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology* (London: Cassell, 1999).
 5. Aileen Moreton-Robinson, "Writing Off Treaties: White Possessions in the United States Critical Whiteness Studies Literature," in *Transnational Whiteness Matters*, ed. Aileen Moreton-Robinson, Maryrose Casey, and Fiona Nicol (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008).
 6. Drawing from Edward Cavanagh and Lorenzo Veracini, a global and transnational perspective highlights the ways in which settler colonialism shapes the global order. See Cavanagh and Veracini, eds., Editors' Statement, *Settler Colonial Studies* 3.1 (2013): 1, doi:10.1080/18380743.2013.768169.
 7. Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).
 8. Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein, "Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing," *Theory and Event* 19.4 (2016), muse.jhu.edu/article/633283.
 9. Rosaura Sánchez and Beatriz Pita, "Rethinking Settler Colonialism," *American Quarterly* 66.4 (2014): 1039–55.
 10. Shannon Speed, "Dangerous Discourses," *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28.1 (2005): 29–51; Charles R. Hale, "Neoliberal Multiculturalism," *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28.1 (2005): 10–19.
 11. Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, "*Ch'ixinakax utxiwa*: A Reflection on the Practices and Discourses of Decolonization," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 111.1 (2012): 95–109.
 12. Lourdes Gutiérrez Nájera, "*Hayandose*: Zapotec Migrant Expressions of Membership and Belonging," in *Beyond El Barrio: Everyday Life in Latino/a América*, ed. Adrian Burgos Jr., Frank Guridy, and Gina Perez (New York: New York University Press, 2010), 63–80; Lynn Stephen, *Transborder Lives: Indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico, California, and Oregon* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).
 13. M. Bianet Castellanos, Lourdes Gutiérrez Nájera, and Arturo Aldama, eds., *Comparative Indigenities of the Americas: Toward a Hemispheric Approach* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2012).
 14. Karen R. Humes, Nicholas A. Jones, and Roberto R. Ramirez, *Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010 Census Briefs* (2010BR-02) (Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration), www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf (accessed February 1, 2017).

15. Jonathan Fox and Gaspar Rivera Salgado, *Indigenous Mexican Americans in the United States* (La Jolla, CA: Center for US–Mexican Studies and Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, 2004); Michael Kearney, *Changing Fields of Anthropology: From Local to Global* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004); Stephen, *Transborder Lives*.
16. Yakama is a name used to refer to a group of Indigenous people who live in Washington State. Yakima, also discussed in this essay, refers to a city in Washington State.
17. Elizabeth Povinelli, *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002).
18. Castellanos, Gutiérrez Nájera and Aldama, *Comparative Indigenities*; María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, *Indian Given: Racial Geographies across Mexico and the United States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016).
19. Hokulani K. Aikau, “Indigeneity in the Diaspora: The Case of Native Hawaiians at Iosepa, Utah,” *American Quarterly* 62.3 (2010): 478–79.
20. Paul Lai and Lindsey Claire Smith, “Alternative Contact: Indigeneity, Globalism, and American Studies Introduction,” *American Quarterly* 62.3 (2010): 407–36.
21. Lorenzo Veracini, “Natives Settlers Migrants,” *Politica & Società* 1.2 (2012): 187–204.
22. Dean Isuji Saranillio, “Settler Colonialism,” in *Native Studies Keywords* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2015), 284.
23. Monisha Das Gupta and Sue Haglund, “Mexican Migration to Hawai’i and US Settler Colonialism,” *Latino Studies* 13 (2015): 455–80, doi:10.1057/lst.2015.40; Haunani-Kay Trask, “Settlers of Color and ‘Immigrant’ Hegemony: ‘Locals’ in Hawai’i,” *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawaii*, ed. Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008).
24. Saranillio, “Settler Colonialism.”
25. Trask, *Asian Settler Colonialism*.
26. Aikau, “Indigeneity in the Diaspora,” 478–79.
27. Das Gupta and Haglund, “Mexican Migration to Hawai’i,” 458.
28. See iqmultimedia.wordpress.com/2014/08/04/oaxacan-migrants-and-their-children-celebrate-traditions-in-dtla-video/ (accessed December 17, 2016).
29. Dina Gilio-Whitaker, “Native Americans in L.A. Almost Saw Their Culture Erased—Now They’re Getting It Back,” *Los Angeles Weekly*, November 21, 2016.
30. See “Reservations,” soundcloud.com/latinousa/1547-reservations (accessed December 28, 2016).
31. Vimalassery, Pegues, and Goldstein, “Introduction”; Byrd, *Transit of Empire*.
32. Aikau, “Indigeneity in the Diaspora,” 478–79.
33. “Reservations.”
34. Ibid.
35. The Yakima valley is built over the ancestral lands of the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation. Today the Yakama nation owns a 1,130,000-acre reservation. The bands and tribes in the Yakama confederation are the Kah-milt-pah, Klickitat, Klinquit, Kow-was-say-ee, Li-ay-was, Ochechotes, Palouse, Piquose, Se-ap-cat, Shyiks, Skinpah, Wenatshapam, Wishram, and Yakama. After the 1855 Treaty they were forced to cede 12 million acres. See www.yakamanation-nsn.gov/history.php (accessed February 15, 2017).
36. See indiancountrymedianetwork.com/news/native-news/10-things-you-should-know-about-the-yakama-nation/ (accessed February 7, 2017).
37. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 53.
38. Scott Lauria Morgensen, “The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 1.1 (2011): 52–76; Evelyn Nakano Glenn, “Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of US Race and Gender Formation,” *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1.1 (2015): 52–72; Iyko Day, “Being or Nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiracism, and Settler Colonial Critique,” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1.2 (2015): 102–21.
39. California, Oregon, and Washington are among the states where Indigenous Triqui, Mixtec, and Purépecha migrants have settled since the 1990s. In Washington State alone, Indigenous migrant populations quadrupled from 1991 to 2008, providing a cheap source of agricultural labor. See Lucy Jarosz and Joan Qazi, “The Geography of Washington’s World Apple: Global Expressions in a Local Landscape,” *Journal of Rural Studies* 16.1 (2000): 1–11.

40. newamericamedia.org/2013/07/what-we-learn-from-the-Indigenous-farmworker-strike-in-pac-north-west.php (accessed February 2, 2017).
41. Jarosz and Qazi, "Geography of Washington's World Apple."
42. See www.Indigenousfarmworkers.org (accessed February 2, 2017).
43. "Reservations."
44. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*.
45. Day, "Being or Nothingness."
46. Vimalassery, Pegues, and Goldstein, "Introduction," 1.
47. "Reservations."