In the decades, the category 'indigenous peoples' has emerged as a major and powerful force on the global scene. Yet the meaning of indigenous remains ambiguous. In theory, who is and who is not an indigene is largely defined through self-identification, and the possibility of inclusion is determined by birth. As many indigenous leaders have pointed out, indigenous status is not congruent with that of a state or state-like governing entity, nor with the authority to define indigenous membership. In actual practice, indigenous peoples are not those who simply say they are indigenous. Claiming to be (or disavowing one's) indigenous has both positive and negative implications for the recognition of one's status. In practice, state agencies, multilateral banks, or international agencies may recognize some indigenous peoples as having the authority to define indigenous membership. The primary actors are the indigenous peoples themselves. It is because indigenous identity is neither universally nor universally apparent. Rather shifting regimes of recognition can be observed. The recognition of indigenous peoples' status can be both fragile international and a historically changing, collective identity. And we ask: what are the effects of these emergent capacities? Fundamentally, we are asking about 'indigenous' as a socially produced, not immutably given, category. There is a need to explore the enabling and constraining power that certain actors can bestow. Through these processes, it is instructive to think of indigenous identity as an assemblage. Following Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1987) and those they inspired by them, an assemblage is an entity - be it an identity, organization, or nation state, and so on - whose properties emerge from the interactions between parts. As such, it is a phenomenon of multiple determinations and whose presence is not reducible to any one aspect of the world. On the other hand, the notion of assemblages can serve to understand in radical multiplicity into phenomena that