UC Berkeley
UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Toward a Culture of Tribal Power: The Promise and Power of Culture in Development and Nation Building in the Hoopa Nation

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7jz9f2bh

Author

Huerta, Ricardo Guadalupe

Publication Date

2013

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Toward a Culture of Tribal Power: The Promise and Power of Culture in

Development and Nation Building in the Hoopa Nation

By

Ricardo Guadalupe Huerta

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

City and Regional Planning

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in Charge:

Professor Malo Hutson, Chair
Professor Karen Christensen
Professor Fredrick Collignon
Professor Thomas Biolsi
Professor Beth Rose Middleton

Fall 2013

Dedication

I dedicate this work to the people without whom I could not have made it here, in this way…
Para mis padres, quienes trabajaron, lucharon, y sacrificaron tanto: José y Lupe Huerta. To my
wife Laurel for her patience, encouragement, love, and commitment to our family. Para mi hija
Maité Xóchitl Santos por su alegría, ánimo, y cariño: I never knew a love like this. To my Niño
and Huerta Families, especially to our grandparents, tíos, and tías who showed us what it means
to be family, always there for each other, and always celebrating!

Even
After
All this time
The Sun never says to the Earth,
"You owe me."
Look
What happens
With a love like that,
It lights the whole sky.
-- Hafiz

…Y quiero que me perdonen los muertos de mi felicidad.
-- Silvio Rodríguez

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to the Hoopa Indian Nation and to the many individuals who generously gave their time, their insight, and their knowledge. While the list of the many people on and off the reservation who participated and supported this project is too long to include here, I am grateful to a few key people whose support and participation was critical to the completion this work. Among these are Byron Nelson Jr., Salis Jackson, Daniel Jordon, Bill Carpenter, Darren Jarnaghan, and Tammy Carpenter. Additionally, I appreciate the guidance and insight from key Native Nation Building scholars who informed this study: Stephen Cornell, Miriam Jorgensen.

To my dissertation committee I owe an enormous amount of gratitude for their guidance, patience, encouragement and support throughout the research and writing process: Malo Hutson, Karen Christensen, Fred Collignon, Tom Biolsi, and Beth Rose Middleton. Other key faculty members to whom I am also very grateful include Inés Hernández Ávila, Stefano Varese, Ananya Roy, and Robert A. Williams, for the encouragement and guidance in understanding and navigating the balance between academia and the community. I am also deeply indebted to Christine Trost for her relentless enthusiasm and encouragement, the writing and research support, and the many hours of work she has dedicated to helping me get this dissertation finished and in preparing for the next steps. I need to also thank staff members in the department of City and Regional Planning who played key roles in helping me stay on course at critical moments: Kaye Bock, Pat Ramirez, and Malla Hadley. Lastly, I am grateful to some fellow Ph.D. students who also provided support, insight, and camaraderie at critical moments, including the ISSI Fellows cohort, and other DCRP students and alumni.

Chapter 1: Native American Culture and Economic Development

Culture and Development on Native American Reservations

> Tribal Governments are unique in that they function mostly based on a blend of tradition
> as well as "modern" approaches to exercising sovereign powers. The traditional unwritten
> systems have been used since time immemorial to help the Tribe meet challenges, adapt
> to changing environments, and progress and survive.   –The Hoopa Indian Nation.

The Stakes and Hopes of Community & Economic Development

The unique political standing of Native American tribes as "domestic dependent nations," coupled with federal devolution policies of the 1970s and 1980s, opened opportunities for Native Nations to promote tribally-directed economic development projects which have resulted in a number of modest to highly-remarkable success stories in Indian Country. Despite the compelling nature of these success stories, these cases remain absent from key development literatures, including city and regional planning and international development. The absence offers an opportunity for a close examination of a number of key concerns including: 1) what tribes are doing right; 2) what the key components to the success are; 3) whether, how and where these are replicable; and 4) how these practices might inform urban development and planning theory. Here the focus centers on the question of culture and its relationship to development in a contemporary Native American context: the ways in which the conceptualizations, discourses, and practices of culture have been included in community and economic development efforts in the Hoopa Nation of Northern California.

This dissertation examines Hupa language programs and efforts as well as the Hoopa[1] Tribal Forestry enterprise. By drawing from archival research as well as a number of in-depth interviews with tribal leaders, officials, attorneys, archivists, managers, and planning practitioners, I show the everyday practices and discourses surrounding the emergence, implementation, and ongoing work in these areas as they relate to the links between economic development, culture, and sovereignty. Specifically I show the ways in which they have been conceived, implemented, and perceived as a critical part of tribal community and economic development.

The broader purpose of this study is to contribute to the growing body of research that privileges Native American knowledge, definitions, and sovereignty in development approaches and models. What is becoming increasingly clear in the many cases of economic success across the country is that Native American communities are redefining capitalism and adapting economic practices to fit "Native pathways" of development (Champagne 2003, 2004, O'Neill 2004, Cattelino 2008, 2010). Part of this paper's contribution is to help highlight the ways in

---

[1] The autonym of the tribe is "Na:tinixwe." When referring to the people, their culture, or language, "Hupa" is used. When referring to the official name of the tribe, as with the "Hoopa Indian Nation," or the Hoopa Valley, "Hoopa" is used.

which the Hoopa understand and define economic development in broader terms which include considerations for culture, nation building, and sovereignty. In this way, "native capitalism" offers an alternative approach to envisioning and effecting development (Champagne 2004). These broadly defined Native American development approaches do in fact share a number of commonalities with "community development". Namely, both attempt to build the economic capacity of communities in order to generate income for its members while at the same time, through the same or related efforts, work to improve the social conditions through community empowerment, all within a framework of sustainability. However, there are a number of very significant and critical differences between urban communities, defined ethnically or geographically, and Native American Nations on the reservation.

Among the most instrumental are land tenure, self-rule, and sovereignty. Unlike urban communities, Native Nations' reservation lands are held in federal trust, which means that forces such as gentrification, which is experienced in urban areas as a looming threat to community development, is not a factor on the reservation. Self-determination, where tribes have the institutions to carry out these rights, means that they have powers and opportunities that urban communities simply do not. For example, tribes have inherent and treaty based rights and they have the power to negotiate with local and state governments over key development opportunities. They have rights and powers similar to state and municipal governments: to have their own constitutions, courts, and police departments, as well as administer businesses on their own lands. And lastly, the broad concept of sovereignty cuts across all aspects of Native American life to provide a number of rights unique to Native Americans and unavailable to any other racial/ethnic group.

These rights are linked to nationally-defined, pan-indigenous conceptualizations of rights and powers. These key differences offer tribes opportunities (and challenges) that are unique to Native Americans in their efforts to build community and economic development on the reservation. They also provide an opportunity for a close examination of the ways in which these opportunities intersect with the Native American context to provide best practices for development on the reservations. That Native American context is, of course, rooted in the many and very diverse cultures of Native American communities, which nonetheless share key commonalities based both in the indigenous cultural milieu as well as the common experience of internal colonization by the Anglo-American settler state and subsequent federal Indian law and policy.

Central to this context is the concept and practice of "culture". If it is true, as I argue here, that culture plays a critical and identifiable role in the conceptualization, implementation, and practice of development projects, this legitimization can contribute to a recalibration of development practices and theories at various levels and among various stakeholders: from tribal development practitioners and tribal leaders to government agencies; and from philanthropic foundation staff to planning and development scholars. This examination has implications for communities, for governance, and for development practice and theory. At stake here, in the most urgent and dire way, are the very lives and livelihoods of Native Americans who continue to live in extreme poverty.

A 2010 US Senate Report on unemployment on reservations revealed the alarming numbers: the average unemployment rate on reservations had reached 50%, with the highest rates in the Northern Plains region at 77% (US Senate, p. 1). In addition to hunger, stress,

violence, drug abuse, and a lack of basic goods, for many, poverty on these reservations means living without indoor plumbing, without electricity, and for many it means living in thin-walled, shack-like homes in places like the Northern Plains with unforgiving weather. I recognize the fact that in noting these details of Native American poverty, I do so at the risk of contributing to a poverty discourse that renders people as victims and as disempowered. However, while these conditions are known (personally or intellectually) by some readers, I note them to inform the uninformed, to remind those who have known or have a vague notion, and to counter the trend of Native Americans being left out of development debates as well as the "rich Indian stereotype" (Corntassle 2008) that has gained wide and rapid credence --promoted by *Time* magazine and employed by former Governor Schwarzenegger in his election campaign (Corntassle 2008). These statistics are a glimpse of the reality for many Native Americans on the reservation.

There are a number of key concepts and issues that are intertwined in the field of Native American community and economic development. In other works, I examine community and economic development in Native American contexts and the complex question of sovereignty, the history of development theory and urban community and economic development theory, and their failure to adequately account for the Native American experience.

Overview of the Dissertation: A Road Map

This introductory chapter includes a brief discussion of my positionality and research methods along with an explanation of how I came to these research questions through my research in city and regional planning. The chapter also includes a discussion of the existing literature both to explain the theoretical framework I use to analyze the data, but also to provide an explanatory discussion of three key concepts: the nation building model, indigenist theorizations, and tribal sovereignty. I dedicate a significant amount to this section because I assume that the majority of potential readers will not be familiar with the Native American context for community and economic development and nation building, and much less with indigenist theorizing which compellingly challenges conventional development theories and discourses. In chapter 2 I examine the tribe's language efforts, including formal programs and informal efforts to show the ways in which planners and development practitioners can begin to develop methods for operationalizing the identification and application of cultural information for the purposes of a Native American-centered and defined economic development, including considerations for the prerequisites of development in the Native American reservation context. Chapter 3 is dedicated to exploring the case of the Hoopa Tribal Forestry enterprises, a forest management and timber sales tribal corporation responsible for a large portion of the tribe's income as well as the management and protection of the tribe's sacred sites and ceremonial grounds and materials. Whereas chapter 2 provides methods for locating culture and exploring the value of cultural information for development, chapter 3 provides a concrete example of the next step in the process by describing how the Hoopa Tribe has instituted a formal role for cultural knowledge in the administration on forestry and timber efforts.

Chapter 4 aims to pull back from the local scope of the case study to explore several key issues the emerged from the research to discuss the ways in which this case, and other like it, speak to the various larger, long-term, pan-Indigenous issues that also relate to the fields of planning, development, and other fields working with indigenous communities in community

and economic development. The conclusion chapter briefly examines the ongoing US-wide project among Native American communities to forge a pan-tribal set of sovereignty-based rights, powers, and efforts which together seem to be producing what I have termed a "Culture of Tribal Power". Non-Native American residents in areas and in states that are home to tribes with increasing economic power and political influence have no doubt noticed that the visibility and influence of Native American tribes has steadily increased. Especially, for example, during election periods, the advertisements by tribes have increasingly made tribes visible to their decades-long neighbors who hardly knew of their existence. Additionally, gaming tribes have flooded the advertisement spaces of areas with ads for their casinos. These are other examples that provide an opportunity to examine the ways in which Native Americans as well as the mainstream of the US have come to expect that tribes have achieved some level of power and influence, locally and nationally, the characteristics of which are identifiably Native American, even if they are continually growing, changing, and challenged. The growth of this power is the reassertion of individual tribes as much as it is a collective assertion of a country-wide construction of a "culture" of tribal power, a pan-Native national culture.

Methodology: Positionality, Approaches and Interviews

I came to the study of a Native American Nation with a personal affinity for the indigenous communities of the Americas. While I do not have tribal affiliation[2], this affinity was developed on two counts. First, as a Mexican American from California's Central Valley who was raised in the 1970s and 1980s in the context of the Chicano Movement[3] and the Farm Worker Movement, my family and community contexts reaffirmed our indigenous heritage. Second, my academic and personal interests as an undergraduate reflected this growing interest: among other things, a major in Native American Studies, an honors thesis on indigenous Guatemalans, and my participation in an Mexica (Aztec) spiritual practice group (something I continue today). In my interviews it was immediately clear that these characteristics and experiences lent themselves to gaining trust with the community. I was often asked if I was Native American, and when I explained my identity people seemed to respond very positively. One respondent said, "My mom always said 'Mexicans are Indians from a different country'".

Another interviewee expressed exceptionally strong feelings against the idea of Berkeley researchers coming to the reservation to do, as she said, "resources extraction" from which the community would not benefit. She explained that she was willing to meet with me given my identity as a Person of Color. After initially having a significantly tense in-person opening conversation, it was my experiences and positionality that allowed us to find common ground. By the end of the conversation she was offering to help me find not only funding but also a place to stay while I did my research. It was also clear that, among those who declined to be interviewed and those who did not show up for an interview, there was a deep sense of distrust and strong aversion to allowing academics to benefit from the community as resource extractors.

---

[2] Many argue Chicano identity is an indigenous identity. Historically, many tribal groups and Native American activists recognized Chicanos as such. Even today, I occasionally meet activists from the 60s and 70s who continue to recognize Chicanos in this way and feel a deep connection stemming from the historical solidarity between the groups.
[3] See Rodolfo Corky Gonzáles's "I Am Joaquin."

I first came to know the Hoopa Nation when as a master's student I was interested in the role of philanthropy in economic development on reservations. I was curious to know what the patterns for grantmaking were, what the models being used for development were, and what was informing foundation staff's decision in grantmaking for development. I began looking into the work of various foundations on reservations and noticed that Native-based foundations seemed to be providing grants listed for the purpose of economic development, but which, at the time, did not seem related to economic development, at least not within the framework of conventional community and economic development that I was learning in city and regional planning.

Typical community and economic development efforts focused on the various inputs and community assets include education, job training, investments, business-friendly climate, location, etc. Native-based foundations, however, were providing seed money for language projects and cultural programs. This vision of economic development was a significant departure from the conventional "wisdom" of development. At the same time, my research also led me to the Nation building model of the Harvard American Indian Economic Development Project and the University of Arizona's College of Law. As I detail below, this model and the work of Native-based foundations clearly have had an enormous impact on the way many tribes have come to conceive and articulate their vision for development on the reservation: a focus on self-determination, sovereignty, and culturally-informed development.

In this early research on philanthropy and the Nation Building model, I came across the Hoopa Indian Nation of Northern California because they were a grantee of the First Nations Development Institute, a philanthropic foundation. The Hoopa received two grants in 1998 and one in 2000. The first grant was for their Sustainable Forestry Fund in the amount of $3,600, "to assist the Tribe in achieving forest certification" which included, "training … in the process of certification and the attributes of a certified forest management program." The other grant in 1998, in the amount of $4,622, was for their Individual Development Accounts program to fund the research needed to establish the need and viability of an IDA program on the reservation. The 2000 grant, in the amount of $3,200, was also for the Sustainable Forestry Fund- for technical assistance in order to "support the first-year audit of their SmartWood certification" – a sustainable forestry certification (First Nations Development Institute, 2008). I was intrigued by a number of aspects of these grants. I wondered what kind of impact such small grants could possibly have for longer term, "sustainable" development. I also wondered how these projects fit into the larger project of nation building for the tribe, if they were even envisioning their work as such.

My first interview was with Daniel Jordan, the Self-Governance Coordinator and Director of the Department of Commerce. The first document that he referred to was a report by Cornell and Kalt, the two scholars who are the most published and cited in the field and who are leading proponents of the Nation building model. The discussion quickly focused on sovereignty, and how this new opportunity to exercise sovereign rights had opened up opportunities for tribes to initiate, build, and manage a number of new economic development activities throughout the reservation; from a salmon cannery to a pre-fabricated home manufacturing plant, as well as cottage industries and small businesses. Some tribal governments gained or regained federal recognition while others sought to establish tribal councils that matched federal requirements for governance. In doing so, tribes were able to convert *de jure* rights, those rights they had in principle, to *de facto* rights: rights they exercised in practice. Possessing rights much like those

of state governments, tribal governments can issue business licenses and manage commerce on their lands, in addition to other governing rights, such as criminal and civil courts on tribal lands.[4] I was fascinated by the ways in which the tribe had envisioned, implemented, and now are managing development projects as nation building efforts.

The Hoopa Indian Nation provides a very good case to examine some of the key challenges and opportunities in the field of community and economic development. There are complex, controversial, and difficult processes that are unique to Native American nations in general, and unique even between tribes. In addition to dealing with federal agencies, other local and regional external interests often have a large influence on tribal efforts in economic development and nation building. These include a range of government agencies –city, county, and state- as well as private interests and stakeholders –fishing, farming, ranching, gaming, tourism, neighbors, etc. In ever-changing external political and economic climates, the tribe continues to embark on new enterprises, manage existing enterprises, and adapt to the changes. As they build their capacity to implement development in line with their goals and principles – sovereignty, culture and self-reliance– they have to negotiate, navigate, and manage those external interests with their nation building goals and with the reality that they very often have to create the road they are attempting to travel.

I end this section with a simple example of the ways in which these tensions –between the pursuit and promotion of tribal sovereignty and culture and the jurisdiction and interests of outside agencies– play out and can be resolved when tribes have the wherewithal to exercise their sovereignty. The Hoopa Nation has a number of economic development projects underway and in the planning stages. These projects promote tribal sovereignty and self-reliance by focusing on nation building efforts, a diversity of economic enterprises, and the promotion of culture and community cohesion. One such project is a design process for improving transportation safety in downtown Hoopa. Sweeney and Pernell note the centrality of sovereignty in the tribe's sense of identity, noting the mission statement. They write, "The following Hoopa Valley Tribe's mission statement emphasizes the significance of sovereignty to the Hoopa people: 'To promote and defend the Hoopa Valley Tribe's rights, culture, lands, resources, and integrity by strengthening government, elevating the quality of life, developing human resources and creating economic growth and financial security'" (Sweeney and Pernell, 2006, p. 4). The authors' concern for the issue of sovereignty emerges from a practical application of tribal sovereignty.

The tribe wanted to improve safety along the downtown area of the main road that passes through the reservation. In 2003, Caltrans awarded the tribe a grant to implement a participatory design model for these traffic safety improvements. The authors note that Humboldt County has the third highest traffic-related deaths, which prompted the need for improvements. As a result of receiving this grant, they explain:

> Issues related to sovereignty surfaced early during contract negotiations between the Hoopa Valley Tribe and Caltrans. As the first EJ [environmental justice] grant between the State and an Indian Tribe, new language was required to acknowledge and clarify the sovereign status of the Tribe. Tribal leaders… negotiated language that recognized Hoopa Valley Tribe sovereignty in its

---

[4] Though only as relates to Native people and not non-Native people, even though on the reservation

> contractual relationship with the State. The resulting and precedent-setting Fund Transfer Agreement for Native American Tribes has since been used by at least one other Tribe in contracting with the State (2006, p. 4).

The Hoopa Nation has had federal recognition since 1876 when the reservation was established. But it was not until 2003 that "new language" was institutionalized and formalized between the state and the tribal government.

What is underscored in this example is that sovereignty is indeed process-oriented and ever-changing. And it is through this process that tribes continue to redefine the meanings, the reach, and the nature of both individual tribal sovereignty as well as pan-Indian sovereignty. Tribal sovereignty, as Cattelino notes, is often constructed through interdependent arrangements (2008). The precedent set by the Hoopa opens the possibility for state-government recognition and institutionalization of the sovereignty of other tribes in the region and beyond, thereby contributing to a pan-Indian interdependent sovereignty. This example reflects several key concepts for the paper. First is the essential role that tribal sovereignty plays in these development efforts, and how sovereignty is rooted in culture. Next is that culture is clearly expressed as a means and a goal of development. As a means, cultural sovereignty, the Hoopa-defined nature and parameters of Hoopa sovereignty, informs the ways in which sovereignty is understood, implemented and protected. As a goal, it has among the highest prominence in the mission of the Tribal government. And lastly, the example provides a framework for understanding how culture and sovereignty play direct and expressed roles in the everyday practices of development. These concepts can help frame the ways in which culture can be found throughout tribal enterprises, administration and everyday practices, expressly and through the concept of sovereignty. They can also help highlight the ways culture is a means and ends to development in conventionally unexpected places, as is the case with language programs and basketry. And much like culture and sovereignty are central to a transportation design planning project, they are also central to the promotion and production of cultural practices.

To examine these practices, I used in-depth, semi-structured, in-person interviewees at the Hoopa reservation that took place in 2012 and 2013. Other interviews were done via phone and email. The in-person interviews were planned for 45 minutes to an hour each but many lasted 90 to 120 minutes, while others only lasted 30 minutes. Most interviews were recorded and transcribed. I interviewed key respondents, including tribal officials, administrators and managers, as well as community leaders - all public figures. These include such key consultants as the tribal Vice-Chair who is also the premier tribal historian, the Self-Governance Director, the Tribal Archives Director, the Planning Director, the tribal lawyer, the Grants Manager, the Museum Director and language teachers, and several Hoopa Forestry management staff, among others. Most of the data discussed here come from these interviews. They are also complemented with background research data from interviews and conversations with Native American and Native Americanist scholars. These interviewees include key scholars on Native American economic development from the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development (Miriam Jorgensen), The Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy at the University of Arizona (Stephen Cornell), The Native Nations Institute of Arizona (Ian Record), The Indigenous Peoples Law and Policy Program of the College of Law at the University of Arizona (Robert A. Williams), and faculty at the University of California at Berkeley (Thomas Biolsi) and at Davis (Beth Rose Middleton).

Culture, Development, and Nation Building: The Literature

If identity is the cognitive, cerebral component of ethnicity, culture is its heart and lifeblood. Those ideational and material aspects of social life—language, religion, ceremony, myth, belief, values, folkways, mores, kinship, worldview, as well as the worlds of art, music, tools, food, housing, dress, adornment—are the substance of a people.
                                                                                --Joanne Nigel

The bulk of the literature on Native American economic development narrowly focuses on very local cases, without placing the work in the broader contexts of development theory or practice, or the wider context of globalization trends, among other contemporary analytical frameworks. Instead, much of the work reports on the specific details of a given economic development project, its successes, shortcomings, and future opportunities. Many forego the opportunity to link the local to the regional, national, or global, regarding development theory or otherwise.

While culture and cultural considerations do often appear in these studies, they are not examined as potential or actual assets to development but rather a contextual setting for the challenges of development. It is a major improvement from earlier works in which the assumption was that culture was an obstacle to "modernizing" the tribe and professionalizing the governance structures; traditions, kinship, and beliefs were perceived as obstacles to assimilation and to mimicking mainstream economic practices. Nevertheless, these cases are not helpful in understanding the power of culture as an asset for development and the broader implications for the field of development in Native American communities.

This brief literature review examines a few key works, especially pertinent to the focus on culture and development, which have begun to develop a framework for discussing these broad and often complicated concepts in Native America: sovereignty, culture, economy. It is important to note that literature pertinent to these issues includes literature in planning theory, development theory, community and economic development theory and practice, critical race studies, and Native American Studies. Perhaps most notable are the indigenous and indigenist scholars who have challenged conventional theories and have argued for a Native American-centered theorization of reservation economics. The literature on Native American community and economic development is limited and often the works are narrow case studies on a particular sector without broader discussion of key concerns for the field, including tribal sovereignty. Many reference sovereignty as a basis for the opportunities that are being developed on reservations but missing is a significant body of work that engages the theoretical and practical considerations of sovereignty with regard to community and economic development, and nation building.

Tribal Sovereignty: Definitions, Key Concepts, and Contextualization

There are a few key points to note about sovereignty for the purposes of this study. The first is that the concept of sovereignty, central to economic development on reservations, continues to be challenged, redefined, and reinterpreted through the cultural lenses of Native Americans and indigenous- and indigenist scholars. This study draws on the work of such scholars as Cattelino (2008), Tsosie (2003), Coffey and Tsosie (2001), and Biolsi (2005), who have articulated a more nuanced, seemingly more accurate, and comprehensive understanding of sovereignty, beyond the limited popular and academic notions and definitions—it is a Native American-based understanding of lived sovereignty. Her case study of the Seminole helps illustrate some of the unique challenges, opportunities and dimensions of the various understandings of sovereignty. She writes:

> Tribal sovereignty is most often understood to mean the political authority of American Indian tribes over their citizens and territory, and it is based both on indigenous claims to pre-colonial government status and on colonial and United States recognition of this status in law and practice. Although most often claimed and challenged by lawyers, bureaucrats, and political activists, tribal sovereignty is not only a formal legal status: instead … [we can] understand it ethnographically to be Seminoles' shared assertions, everyday processes, intellectual projects, and lived experiences of political distinctiveness (2006, p. 700).

Moving from rigid boundaries and definitions of sovereignty and citizenship, for example, Cattelino opens up new understandings of these concepts, locating them in such material and lived experiences such as tribal housing and casino revenue philanthropy. This broader, Native American-centered interpretation of sovereignty helps us unpack and begin to understand the overlapping and inextricable nature of three key ideas: sovereignty, development, and culture.

Cattelino argues that "Taking indigenous sovereignty seriously forces us to conceptualize sovereignty beyond the European nation-state and the model of sovereign autonomy, both of which have dominated social and political theories of sovereignty from Foucault to Agamben, Hobbes to Rousseau" (2006, p. 701). She emphasizes the materiality of sovereignty: how it is "constituted by relations of interdependency that take material form in people's bodies, houses and lands" (2008, p. 200) and culturally expressed in a number of tangibles, such as Seminole-envisioned housing practices: specific entryway direction orientation, clan-centered housing cluster siting, and "hybrid" housing using "modern" and "traditional" materials. Cattelino's work remains among the very few sources that theorize key concepts --sovereignty, culture, and economy-- in a concrete, lived-experience ways. It is a critical framework for examining the case of the Hoopa Nation

My research also draws from Thomas Biolsi's work which includes an analysis of reservations as "spatial modes of governmentality, whereby modern individuals (and subjects) were produced" (in Cattelino 2006, p. 702). In particular, his piece, "Imagined Geographies: Sovereignty, indigenous space, and American Indian struggle" provides a useful framework for thinking about sovereignty spatially. He examines "four kinds of indigenous spaces imagined, fought for, and… achieved and lived by American Indian people" (2005, p. 240). Of particular interest is the third space, the "supratribal" space of indigenous rights, "within an inclusive space

that ultimately spans all of the territory of the contiguous United States… 'national indigenous space'"(2005, p. 240). Citing the passage of the Indian Religious Freedom Act Amendments of 1994, Biolsi explains that, "this law produced a Native space in which Indian people have indigenous rights across the national landscape, not just within reservation enclaves" (2005, p. 248). Thus, Biolsi also brings attention to the ways in which Native American sovereignty is lived outside of the rigid boundaries and conventional understandings of sovereignty to include spaces of multiple types of sovereign rule and cultural expression.

This literature provides context for the philosophies, discourses, and proposals employed in the literature. By keeping in mind that the authors are engaging in and challenging the assumptions of the field and calling for a greater role for indigenous perspectives, it is possible to understand the context in which they are at the same time advocating for a modified (perhaps hybrid) form of participation in the market. We can also understand that the means (how communities participate in the market) and the ends (what outcomes are being sought, i.e. collective as well as individual) to this participation necessarily differ from conventional means and ends. In introducing the idea that indigenous people would seek market-based resources to support "indigenous cultural forms and practices, and strengthening of indigenous political forms and organization" (2003, p. xxviii), Champagne highlights the idea that indigenous people, vis-à-vis the market, are in fact significantly different from other communities, in that they are looking to sustain and bolster alternative economic and political structures, independent of the State.

These comparisons serve to contextualize the experiences and potential opportunities of Native Americans in the globalizing neoliberal world contexts: the "re-scaling and re-form" of the state, and the "hardening of regionalism, parochialisms, and fundamentalisms" (Roy 2002, p. 1). These reforms and reiterations of the state provide new political and economic apertures and possibilities as well as new forms of control, discipline, and regulation often driven and justified by insertions and reconnections to the local, national, and international markets. Sovereignty must be understood in this context and as a mechanism by which tribes have wrested power from local, state, and federal governments to stave off some aspects of these new forms of control and exploitation. Sovereignty must also be understood as a dynamic modality of self-determination, one in which tribes, individually and collectively, must continuously negotiate the scope and boundaries of their sovereign powers with a variety of entities including city and county governments, state and federal agencies, other tribes in the area or the state, and increasingly international government entities, as with the cases of tribes owning businesses in other countries.

The Nation Building Literature: Culture Assumed, Not Examined

It is especially interesting for the field of community and economic development -urban, rural and Native American- that a growing number of Native Nations have emerged in the last two decades to implement what appears to be a new theoretical and practical development model called "Native Nation Building" (Cornell 1994, Cornell and Kalt 1998, Jorgensen 2007a). The Native Nation Building model (NNB) has rather convincingly established that this approach has had remarkable success. Proponents of the NNB model are the most prolific and referenced scholars in the field. They argue that this approach to development can do what millions of

dollars of federal aid and programs, as well as private funding, have not been able to do in nearly a century of investment. Their long-standing, widely-accepted and broad research shows that the model offers an approach to development that brings remarkable gains. Nevertheless, a number of unanswered questions remain regarding the relationship between sovereignty, culture, and development.

The NNB model is presented as a sovereignty-based approach in which "economic development flows from sovereignty" (Cornell & Kalt) but what is not clear is why and how that flow occurs. Moreover, among Native communities, sovereignty is inextricably linked politically, conceptually, and practically to culture. More research is needed to examine the cultural aspects or components of tribal sovereignty. In addition to NNB scholars, many other scholars identify sovereignty and culture as key factors in economic development but they do not provide a deep examination of the full value of each of these nor the impact they can have when coupled in a development approach. Studies cite evidence that development efforts are bolstered by the inclusion of cultural projects such as language revival, Native-based school curricula, and various cultural events and practices but they do not provide an examination of the relationship between these projects and development. There is an assumption that they play an important role, something Native Americans and practitioners "know," but which has not been closely examined.

For this study, I draw on the now decades-long experience of Native Nations building scholars, their studies and their theoretical framework to understand the trajectory of community and economic development especially in the Self-Determination Period (beginning in the 1930s but really taking hold in the 1960s) and in the contemporary period which Robert A. Williams, preeminent legal scholar and NNB proponent, has termed the "Nation Building Period" (Williams 2010). The present study builds on their work by closely examining the specific role of culture in their model. My argument here does not contradict the NNB but rather provides a case study to show the ways in which culture is conceived, perceived and practiced as a key component of community and economic development.

The Indigenist Literature: Sovereignty, Culture and Alternative Development

In my approach to the study and the analysis I offer, I also draw significantly from the works of a small set of authors whom I've labeled here as "indigenist" (indigenous-focused) because their frameworks for analyzing Native American economic development are explicitly Native-centered. By using these works, I am able to strengthen the analysis by drawing parallels to other places, spaces, nations, and practitioners who conceive, perceive, and implement economic development in ways that are similar to those in the Hoopa Nation, especially as it relates to culture and sovereignty. The work of these scholars is in contrast to the conventional modernization models of development as well as the to the dependency theorists, both of which have failed to provide either an accurate explanation for the persistence of poverty on reservations or a viable development approach for Native Americans. These scholars engage a broader analysis that is informed by the variety of disciplines related to the fields of planning and development. Outstanding examples of these analyses are found in works such as the edited volume, *Contemporary Native American Political Issues* (Johnson, 1999), which includes

articles directly dealing with the intersection of economic development with culture, sovereignty, international indigenous rights, and "traditional" practices. For example, Johnson writes:

> Economic struggles are grounded in issues of sovereignty, tribal status, and jurisdiction, as well as resource use, and world view. Discussions of economic development on Indian reservations, and also in urban settings, necessarily unite questions of political power with the cultures and traditions of native people (1999, p. 9-10).

The works' analyses are increasingly complex, comprehensive, and holistic, taking into account the variables Johnson notes, including the "cultures and traditions".

These cultural considerations are among the central themes in this small body of literature and thus prove a number of applicable frameworks that I use in the analysis. Additionally, however, there is in the literature an effort and a call to both challenge and go beyond the existing conventional frameworks, debates, and discourses and create an indigenous-centered, culturally-relevant theoretical approach. For example, in another book, *Native Pathways: American Indian Culture and Economic Development in the Twentieth Century*, (Hosmer and O'Neill, 2004), the editors bring together a collection of articles on development which not only provide provocative examples of alternative and hybrid models of development from Native American communities -- that is, development with Native American meaning and community-centered goals-- they also explicitly intend to challenge the assumptions and conventions in the field, many of which have guided the failed development practices which have keep tribes impoverished. O'Neill writes:

> Revisiting the terms of the debate may inspire scholars and policy makers to see American Indian cultural and economic innovations as neither 'modern' nor 'pre-modern' nor even 'anti-modern'. Instead, we are suggesting that American Indians have crafted alternative pathways of economic development that transcend their linear analytical categories (2004, p. 3).

Most of the conventional, non-indigenist literature does not offer the depth and scope of this analysis. Most of it is neither characterized by the insightful critique of the modernization project nor by the optimism in Native American-based, presumably culturally-driven, "reinterpretation" of economic development models found in much of the indigenist recent works.

Indeed, it is not that the authors challenge the field to dismiss it, but rather they engage with specific as well as the broad ideas in the field of development to transform it, to force it to reconcile with other realities, and to include other definitions, understandings and practices of key concepts including culture, sovereignty, citizenship, nation building, and even progress, development, and modernity. For example, discussing modernity, O'Neil explains that it

> "[H]as become synonymous with capitalism, and that narrative, a history in which Indians are portrayed as irrelevant victims of military and economic conquest, pronounces the "cultural death" of indigenous peoples in twentieth-century America. It seems there is no room for tradition in modern context" (2004, p. 3).

To refute the idea that the modern and the traditional cannot coexist, various articles in the book describe cases of "tribal capitalism" and "native entrepreneurship" illustrating the ways in which Native peoples have engaged with the market while integrating native traditions and philosophies (Champagne 2004, p. 320). These examples of "alternative pathways of economic development" that provide income and possibilities for individuals and communities are at the same time examples of Native American resistance, survival, sovereignty, and cultural expression: philosophical and ideological considerations in the field of development. This engagement with broader, more complex issues offers new insights and opportunities in the field that can make development projects more "successful" in economic terms but also more successful and sustainable in culturally-relevant terms. These analyses and frameworks of "tribal capitalism" and "native entrepreneurship" provide a critically useful lens for examining economic development project in the Hoopa Nation and the ways in which culture plays a role in guiding, informing, mobilizing, envisioning, and giving meaning to the means and ends of tribal development projects.

These scholars' works show the false dichotomy of the modern versus the traditional/cultural by illustrating how communities have drawn from both the modern and the traditional to create new alternatives of participation that are successful, meaningful and culturally-relevant. According to O'Neill, "American Indians in the twentieth century blended their Modern and traditional worlds as a matter of course and in the process redefined those categories in ways that made sense to them" (2004, p. 3). In examining these experiences among the Hoopa Nation, there are opportunities to identity trends and lessons in the field that can inform both theory and practice. This appears to be a new prospect in the field, as scholars are drawing from a variety of experiences to inform their analyses and speak to economic development, whereby the considerations of sovereignty, nation building, culture, and identity are of equal or greater importance for Native American constituencies.

Chapter 2: The Promise and Power of Culture in Economic Development

> Tribal Governments are unique in that they function mostly based on a blend of
> tradition as well as "modern" approaches to exercising sovereign powers. The
> traditional unwritten systems have been used since time immemorial to help the
> Tribe meet challenges, adapt to changing environments, and progress and survive.
> --The Hoopa Nation

In 2010, a major controversy unfolded on the Hoopa Reservation, one that would involve accusations of corruption against tribal officials and tribal agency directors. The controversy that unfolded demonstrates the challenges associated with pursuing economic development in a way that preserves the community's culture. Beginning in approximately 2008, the Trinity River had a significant and rapid increase in the number of salmon swimming upstream to spawn. In June 2011, tribal members discovered several fishing nets set by Mike Orcutt, who was at the time director of the Tribal Fisheries Department, and Daniel Jordan, director of the Tribal Self-Governance Office. Orcutt and Jordan, along with some of their family members and other employees at the fisheries department, were accused of having concealed their fishing practices and the off-reservation sales that were generating a substantial personal profit (Jenkins, 2011).

Before June, tensions in the community had been rising because so few people on the reservation were benefitting from commercial fishing and because some tribal members simply opposed commercial fishing on cultural grounds. According to one source, by 2009, almost 75 percent of the fish caught on the reservation was being sold to people off the reservation, and only a total of 27 people were fishing commercially, in part because the fishing in the gorge area of the river requires powerful boats, prohibitively expensive for most tribal members (Jenkins, 2011).

The controversy divided the community and quickly became a source of heated debates and efforts to set regulations for commercial fishing. Dania Rose Colegrove, a Hoopa tribal member and an activist with Klamath Justice Coalition, wrote the local newspaper to advocate the position and concerns of many tribal members:

> We believe commercial fishing is not compatible with the cultural and
> environmental traditions of the Hoopa Valley People. We want to protect our
> river for cultural and subsistence purposes only! We do not approve of the
> harvesting of salmon for sale for individual financial gain without regard to the
> subsistence and cultural ways of the Hupa people. We believe in order to preserve
> our way of life in the Hupa way we need to protect our environment, our river,
> and our fish (Colegrove, 2011).

By September of that year, tribal leaders responded to the community's concerns and anger by calling a special session of the tribal council. After the council met, a referendum on the issue

was put forth for a vote in the next election, and in June of 2011, the tribe voted to ban commercial fishing.

This dispute over commercial fishing on the Hoopa reservation illustrates one of the key challenges facing economic development in Native American nations: How can Native American nations pursue successful economic development in contemporary regional, state, national, and international contexts in a way that not only avoids loss of culture and sovereignty, but also preserves and promotes the integrity of tribal culture and sovereignty? Due to the high unemployment and poverty rates on the Hoopa reservation, from a conventional planning perspective, it is difficult to understand how the tribe could forgo the opportunity to engage in what promised to be an exceptionally lucrative business enterprise, especially given the record number of salmon in the river that year and the expected high numbers in years to come. But from the perspective of members of the Hoopa tribe, there are other matters to consider as well. Some see commercial fishing as an opportunity for the tribe to adapt and change in order to survive, as has been the case with other development efforts that were once highly criticized by the community, including forestry, the tribal casino, and tribal hotel. Others, however, emphasize that the salmon has an exceptional place in Hoopa culture and spirituality; it should be treated with the utmost respect, and not converted into a commodity.

Cornell and Kalt (1992, 2007) have shown that when economic development projects conflict with cultural norms and values, they have either limited success, struggle to remain viable, or simply fail. Despite the crucial role that culture plays in economic development, scholars, including scholars associated with the Harvard Project on American Indian Development, the leading center in the field, have developed neither the theory nor the research to help tribes, practitioners, foundations, and policy makers navigate the relationship between culture and economic development in order to pursue culturally sustainable projects. This chapter attempts to fill this gap by offering a new approach for understanding the key role of culture, as well as the power and potential of culture for shaping viable and broadly-supported development projects and practices.

Drawing upon the experiences of the Hoopa Nation of Northern California, this chapter examines the following broad question: what is the role of culture in economic development? More specifically: 1) What are the approaches and tools needed to identify the links between culture and economic development in a Native American context? Where is this information found? 2) What are the ways in which the conceptualizations, discourses, and practices of culture inform and support economic development efforts? 3) What is the potential for culture to be a source of power and development? 4) How are cultural programs, projects, and practices envisioned and experienced as part of economic development efforts? To engage these questions, I examine language projects and efforts undertaken by the Hoopa Nation and tribal members, including in-school instruction, community-based instruction, and informal instruction, along with the cultural spaces and institutions that serve as contexts for the language instruction. My analysis will show that in the Native American context, culture, which in this case assumes the form of language, is both a means and an outcome of successful economic development.

The chapter has five sections. Following the introduction, in Section II I offer a brief description of the data and methods used to inform the chapter's findings. In Section III, I review existing literature, both to introduce the theoretical framework applied to analyze the

data, and to define and explain how I am using the key concepts (language, culture, and development) that inform the analysis presented in this chapter. In Section IV, I examine the Hoopa Nation's various language efforts, both formal and informal, to demonstrate the ways in which language informs the values and practices of the community, as well as the ways in which language is perceived as having the potential to greatly improve and inform development practices and principles. I also use the findings presented in the chapter to offer a framework for a culturally-informed development approach. In Section V, I offer a brief conclusion and a caveat about the changing nature of these issues.

Central to the context of Native American capitalism, as I describe in chapter 1, is the concept and practice of "culture." If it is true that culture plays a critical and identifiable role in the conceptualizations, practices, and discourses surrounding development projects on the Hoopa reservation, these findings help legitimize a view of development embedded in culture. This chapter will show that while some tribal members articulate a very clear awareness of the value of culture in development, others live their culture without reflecting on these connections in specific ways. Sharing the stories, histories, experiences, and teachings associated with cultural projects allows tribal members to see the opportunities that culturally-relevant development promises. Showing the ways in which culture is linked to development also establishes the legitimacy of culturally-relevant economic practices for the various kinds of professionals who are directly and indirectly involved in the wide range of community and economic development efforts on the reservation, including both tribal development practitioners and tribal leaders, as well as off-reservation policy-makers, foundation staff, planning practitioners, state and federal agency staff, and development scholars, among others. Once viewed as legitimate, culturally-relevant sustainable development practices can greatly improve the chances for success in community-based economic development.

Methodology

The data for this chapter are drawn from in-depth, semi-structured in-person interviews with 12 Hoopa tribal members and more than three weeks of participant observation. From January to March of 2012 I made four visits to the Hoopa Reservation in Northern California. Each visit lasted from 4 to 7 days. The interviews were planned for 45 minutes to an hour each but many lasted 90 to 120 minutes. Most interviews were recorded and transcribed. I interviewed tribal officials, administrators and managers, and community leaders – all public figures, including such key figures as the tribal Vice-Chair, who is also the premier tribal historian, the Self-Governance Director, the Tribal Archives Director, the Planning Director, the Grants Manager, the Museum Director, and language teachers, among others. In addition to conducting interviews, I spent time observing a variety of spaces on the reservation including community events (such as an athletic field clean-up); spaces of tribal economic development (the tribal supermarket, museum/cultural center, pre-fabricated housing factory, hotel, gas station); spaces of tribal community development (tribal housing, the clinic, schools, newspaper, and the library); and spaces of tribal governance (tribal headquarters, planning department, and the archives department).

I have tried to represent the information that was shared with me in the most accurate and respectful way possible. I am, however, very aware of the shortcomings of the medium of the

written word and the English language to communicate the depth, richness, and vastness of the Hupa language about whose full nature I have only a minute understanding.

Situating Culture in the Planning and Development Literatures

> In the dominant model of development, useful knowledge was only generated in central places – in universities, on research stations, in laboratories, then to be transferred to ignorant peasants and other poor people.
>
> -Chambers and Richards, 1995

> Indigenous knowledge – the local knowledge that is unique to a given culture or society – […] is important as it forms the information base for a society which facilitates communication and decision-making. By taking the time and effort to document these systems, they become accessible to change agents and client groups.
>
> -Warren, Slikkerveer and Brokensha, 1995

The literature on Native American economic development has clearly shown that successful development on the reservation requires improved governance structures and processes. It also argues for culturally-informed development practices and approaches, but it does not provide approaches, tools, or sufficient examination of the cultural aspects of development to be useful for development practice[5]. In a subsequent chapter, I examine issues related to governance and sovereignty. This chapter examines the role and potential role of culture in economic development on Native American reservations, a topic that remains absent in the planning literature, and has received only limited attention even in the Native American development literature that privileges cultural considerations. I begin with a brief review of the planning literature to demonstrate how culture has been largely ignored. Then I turn to a review of recent literature that begins to explore the role of culture in development, albeit on a limited and narrow basis.

Historically, the city and regional planning literature has not examined the relationship between culture and economic development. Stemming from the experiences of earlier planning periods, the old industrial-based economy, and the experiences of the social policies and politics of the post-World War II period, much of the literature is grounded in an orientation that emphasizes the business base and economic growth of cities and communities while trying to account for contemporary economic changes, political complexities, and the emergence of theories and practices, such as sustainable development, that challenge conventional approaches. Some works examine economic development by explaining the series of development theories that have informed planning practices (neoclassical economic theory, economic base theories, product cycle theories, new markets theories, location theories, and central place theory), the history of federal economic development policy, and the rise and role of community based institutions (Blakely and Bradshaw, 2002; Levy 2012), without examining the role of culture in these processes and histories. Instead, most of these works focus on conventional development models based on neoclassical economic theory, emphasizing top-down, pro-business, local

---

[5] Key literature includes Cornell and Kalt 1992, 1993, 2000, 2007; Jorgensen, 2007

development strategies such as sales and promotion, subsidization, special small area financing, revolving fund financing, and providing reduced-rate infrastructure for businesses (Levy, 2012; Fulton and Shigley, 2005).

Other literature emphasizes a community development approach and favors capacity-building that is focused on the role of community development corporations in securing gains in key areas such as resources, organization, political mobilizing, networking, and programs (Glickman and Servon, 1998). Yet in this literature culture remains absent even though it is clear that the local culture would inform approaches to *community* development. Even those scholars who take a broader approach by accounting for the role of communities within such concepts as "community participation" – generally understood as residents being brought into a specific development project by practitioners – do not consider the role of culture in these developments (Forester, 1999; Wiewel et. al., 1993). Similarly, communicative planning theorists, who argue for an inclusive approach to addressing economic development by bringing stakeholders to the table through a consensus building model (Innes and Booher, 2010) do not account for the ways in which culture supports or hinders development, nor do they explain how planners might manage that information for the benefit of economic development.

Part of the difficulty in understanding the relationship between culture and economic development is that this field and its guiding concepts are still being developed and debated. Blakely and Bradshaw (2002) note that "local economic development is an emerging field, and currently more of a *movement* rather than a strict economic development model specifying a uniform approach" (55). As a result, they argue, "no theory or set of theories adequately explains regional or local economic development" and "existing development theories are inadequate to describe and direct local economic development activities" (55, 66). This inability either to explain development or to provide reliable guidance for development leaves the field far from accounting for the complexity produced by adding cultural considerations to the mix of inputs and variables that shape economic development. Adding to the problems raised by these limitations is the fact that economic development planning models based on neoclassical economic theory and neoliberalism have been increasingly questioned by a wide range of theorists from a variety of disciplines (Escobar, 1995; Peet, 1999; Harvey, 1973).

More recent trends in the literature show that scholars have begun to examine the relationship between culture and economic development, although in somewhat narrow and limited ways. Much of the recent literature conceptualizes culture by following sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's formulation of the three fundamental forms of capital: economic, social, and cultural (1986). Planners who think about culture and economic development tend to understand culture as "cultural capital" which "represents forces such as family background and educational qualifications that can be converted into economic capital and help to explain the structure and function of a community" (Green and Haines, 2012, 256). These planners and development practitioners adopt a business and growth orientation when considering the role of culture in development, rather than a community-centered, bottom-up, and self-determined orientation. Consequently, in this planning approach, the concept of cultural capital is used to inform top-down planning strategies.

According to scholars who write about culture in these terms, local neighborhood culture can be harnessed by outsiders (city planners, developers, the tourism sector) to primarily benefit the economic growth of the city and consequently the local neighborhood. The best example of

this literature is from one of the most influential authors on the question of culture and development in planning, Richard Florida (2002). According to Florida's controversial argument, "regional economic growth is powered by creative people" (p. 249). As a result, cities need to develop strategies and quality of life amenities that will attract the "creative class," which includes architects, engineers, scientists, educators, artists, musicians, and entertainers, as well as people in business, finance, law, and health care, among others. Following a "cultural capital" approach, adherents to this model understand culture as those aspects of the region that will attract the creative class: museums, art galleries, historical sites, the arts (performing, visual, literary), as well as shape the neighborhood's characteristics (diverse, tolerant, Bohemian) and lifestyles (hiking and running trails, outdoor recreation opportunities). Informed by Florida's work and other studies showing the positive economic impact of arts programming, some planners and practitioners continue to focus on the arts in the development of a local "culture" that links empowerment zones, arts districts, and entertainment businesses. Yet these conceptualizations of culture are limited and do not fit the Native American context, nor can they be used to inform our understanding of Native American-centered strategies for achieving culturally-sensitive and sustainable economic development.

The literature on Native American economic development highlights the critical role of cultural considerations in development, but it does not provide detailed examinations of the relationship between culture and development. This literature is dominated by scholars of the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development (HPAIED) (Cornell and Kalt 1992, 2000, 2007; Jorgensen, 2007). In their seminal work, *What Can Tribes Do?*, Cornell and Kalt provide a compelling comparative analysis of several tribes to show the key institutional and development strategies necessary for self-determined Native American economic development. Their ground-breaking research shows that contrary to conventional wisdom, the problem of underdevelopment on the reservation is primarily political, not economic. Native American tribes that undertook changes to their governance institutions, such as rewriting constitutions and revising elections in order to adhere to the rule of law, were able to achieve significant economic gains. While these scholars emphasize the idea of needing to have governance and development strategies that are a "cultural match" with traditional governance and cultural sensibilities, their research does not provide detailed examination of the critical areas of concern, including the relationship between culture and development, the ways in which culture can and has informed and supported development, the potential for culture to be a source of power and development, and how and where the kind of critical cultural information needed for culturally-relevant development can be found.

Outside of both the planning and Native American economic development literatures, there is a growing body of interdisciplinary work focused on the role played by indigenous knowledge in development (Sillitoe et al., 2005; Warren et al., 2005, Pottier et al., 2003; Schech and Haggins, 2002; Blaser et al., 2004; Warren et al., 1995). Emerging largely from social anthropologists and agricultural scientists in the 1970s and 1980s, these works emphasize the value of working and learning with rural people to address development needs, reflecting a "sea-change in the paradigms that structure conceptions of development" (Sillitoe et al., 2005, 8). Until about the mid-1990s, the dominant paradigms in international rural development were modernization theory and dependency theory (Peet, 1999; Sillitoe et al., 2005). Both rejected indigenous knowledge and considered it part of the development problem. Modernization theory, which is associated with the political right, emphasizes technology transfer approaches to

development, focusing on growth, rejecting cultural considerations, and in many cases blaming culture and cultural beliefs for the underdevelopment of indigenous communities. Dependency theory, a Marxist model of the left, focuses on class analysis, emphasizing a need for class-based social movements for egalitarian development, but also rejects culture and cultural affinities of indigenous peoples.

More recently, development approaches, such as market-liberalism and neo-populism, have recognized the value of indigenous knowledge. The approach taken by market-liberals emphasizes the benefits of indigenous knowledge for shaping market-oriented strategies, while the neo-populists give local knowledge priority throughout the development process, including research and planning. The market-liberalism approach takes local knowledge into account, however, it uses this knowledge "largely as market information relating to available technical options, how it will influence choice and the appropriateness of various options to farmer's environments and households" (Sillitoe et al., 2005, 3). The neo-populist approach, emphasizing participation, does incorporate local knowledge and prioritize local contexts in its development schemes, but it "does not necessarily accommodate cultural diversity but may rather encourage people to enter the contemporary capitalist world…sharing modernization's assumptions" (Sillitoe et al., 2005, 4). These models represent efforts in a number of disciplines, especially anthropology, to move the field in a more inclusive, progressive direction, but the efforts remain contradictory and complicated. In response, Sillitoe, Bicker and Pottier (2002) have called for a "new third way" – an "action approach" to indigenous knowledge. This approach, they argue, can be used to "facilitate others' expression of their understanding of the rapidly changing world, while informing them about our thoughts." Doing so makes room for "others' culturally conditioned knowledge and expectations…not forcing our view or understanding down their throats but trying to advance mutual comprehension and allowing them to speak effectively for themselves." It also responds to the need "to evolve new collaborative research arrangements" (5).

Despite the recent recognition of the relevance of indigenous knowledge for development in some of the literature, development practitioners as a whole have not integrated practices that prioritize this knowledge into their development initiatives. According to Chambers and Richards (1995) , key scholars in the field of rural development and critics of top-down development practices:

> The awareness, attitudes and behaviour of many development practitioners have changed less than the language they have learnt to use. Many have acquired the easy skill of using words like 'participation' and even 'empowerment' but without changing the way they see poor people or the way they feel development should be undertaken. The language has become bottom-up but the inclination remains top-down (xiii).

The development literature is moving in the right direction by attempting to privilege indigenous knowledge in development and showing the ways in which this knowledge is useful and necessary for successful development practices, as well as for bolstering development that is self-determined and culturally-relevant. However, the literature remains inadequate and incomplete with regard to the Native American context. There remains a need for research that identifies, locates and documents the ways in which indigenous knowledge provides a basis for

sustainable, self-determined, and culturally relevant development. There is also a need for an analysis of these practices in the context of a Global North country such as the United States..

Understanding how indigenous knowledge is transmitted underscores the critical role that language plays in culturally-sensitive development. Indigenous knowledge, conveyed in indigenous communication, is increasingly threatened, "eroded by exogenous systems – the mass media, schools, agricultural extension, bureaucracies – endangering the survival of much valuable information" (Mundy and Compton, 1991, 122). Mundy and Compton argue that, much of the existing research on indigenous communication has "concentrated on using indigenous channels to promote exogenous innovations" (122), as in the typical development case of outside planners using communication channels to gain "buy-in" for a given project. They conclude that, "development efforts are likely to be less effective if we continue to ignore the communication of information on indigenous knowledge" and that "it is necessary to study communication patterns to design interventions that benefit from this knowledge" (122).

Mundy and Compton's (1991) work on indigenous communication offers six key findings that help frame the analysis presented in this chapter, in addition to highlighting the value of studying language as a component of culture and as a resource for self-determined sustainable development. These are: "[1] Indigenous communication has value in its own right. [2] Exogenous channels have limited range. [3] Indigenous channels have high credibility. [4] Indigenous channels are important conduits of change. [5] Development programs can use indigenous communication. [6] Indigenous channels offer opportunities for participation" (133-114). If we ignore indigenous communication, they warn us, we get inappropriate development. Moreover, they argue that "to ignore existing knowledge is not only to ignore a potential major development resource. To ignore it is to ignore local people themselves" (122).

In this section, I have discussed the literature on culture and economic development and the ways in which certain areas of the literature help frame a broader understanding of what development can mean to Native American communities. What remains to be examined are case studies that illustrate the links between the cultural context and economic development. While indigenist scholars, like those of the Harvard Project, have identified culture as an asset rather than an obstacle to development, there is a need for scholarship that draws out the specific ways in which culture can and has played a role in the ways communities have envisioned, structured, and implemented development projects. This, of course, is a complex and somewhat messy project given the often intangible and evolving nature and definition of "culture" and the ways in which economic development has been narrowly defined and imposed from the outside. Some scholars have looked to outcomes and institutions to find "native capitalism," noting, for example, that profits from tribal enterprises and corporations are redistributed to the membership and invested in tribal infrastructure and institutions not directly related to the businesses (Champagne 2004). This chapter takes a different approach. It begins to fill the gap in the literature by providing evidence and analysis of the everyday practices, discourses, and assumptions that draw on cultural aspects to inform existing, emerging, and future development efforts.

Language and Economic Development: The Power and Potential of Culture

In this section, I present the findings from an examination of language projects and efforts undertaken by the Hoopa Nation and tribal members, including in-school instruction, community-based instruction, and informal instruction, along with the cultural spaces and institutions that serve as contexts for language instruction. I argue that in the Native American context, culture, which in this study is examined though language teaching and learning, is both a means and an outcome of successful economic development. Language informs the values, norms, and practices of the community, and the ways that language is perceived as having the potential to shape and greatly improve development practices and principles. This section also describes some of the key opportunities and challenges that Hoopa interviewees identified in development and the ways in which they see language teaching, learning, and fluency, along with related cultural practices and revival efforts, as being part of a larger project of addressing the challenges of poverty and disempowerment with much greater success than would be possible without these cultural components.

The section begins with a brief description of language programs and efforts on the Hoopa Reservation. It then provides a two-part discussion of key functions performed by language as it pertains to development preconditions, knowledge, impacts, and practices. The first part focuses on preconditions and knowledge necessary for development by examining the role of language in engaging identity, direction, and healing. The second part considers the impacts and practices of language in shaping development, especially with regard to social change, development theory, and development practices.

Teaching and Learning the Hoopa Language

> "I work for ancestors and descendants"
> -Salis Jackson, Director of the Hoopa Tribal Museum

On the reservation, there have been several formal and informal initiatives to document and teach the Hupa language, since at least the 1960s. Official initiatives have included formal language teaching as well as informal language gatherings, which, respondents lamented, lack an efficient learning structure. These informal language gatherings have often been organized by tribal government officials, given meeting space by the tribe, and attended by tribal elders who try to teach the language to younger tribal members. Various approaches to formal language instruction have been developed by and offered to tribal members at different times, beginning in the mid-1900s. The tribe's current formal language program is offered through the local elementary and high school. The program dates back to the 1970s when the bilingual education program at Humboldt State University began to work with Hoopa college students who were interested in teaching the Hoopa language on the reservation. Among the first and most involved of these students was Jackie Martins, who has been teaching Hoopa language for over 20 years. Over the years, this official language program has come to include classes at both the elementary and high school. At the latter, students now have the option of choosing Hoopa to fulfill their "foreign language" requirement.

Since the 1970s the tribe has been active in supporting a number of language efforts including sponsoring classes, workshops and the production of language material, such as the Hoopa dictionary. One of these programs, the Tribal Language Project, is administered by Salis Jackson, Director of the Tribal Museum. There are important distinctions between the formal

programs at the school, the formal official language project at the museum (which includes learning the language, recording fluent speakers and building the tribe's knowledge of the language), and long-standing informal community efforts to teach the Hoopa language. There is not a single language program; rather, there are multiple and diverse efforts that reflect the broad interest of the community and show the depth and breadth of the desire to rescue and revive the language.

Salis Jackson is working with tribal elders, the tribal historian, university linguists, and others on a number of projects including: making audio recordings of elders to preserve stories and songs; revising historical records and historical studies to more accurately translate the documents; and developing Hoopa language courses. Despite the fact that native fluent speakers of Hoopa are estimated to number less than a dozen, these tribal efforts have resulted in an estimated dozen people reaching fluency in Hoopa as a second language (Golla, 2011).

Fortunately for the tribe and those interested in preserving and promoting the language, there have been significant amounts of resources directed toward these efforts, as Hupa is one of the most studied California Native American languages. In 1905, a University of California at Berkeley linguistics student earned the first Ph.D. in linguistics awarded by a US university for a dissertation on Hoopa grammar. Since then, Berkeley continues to play a role in Hoopa language efforts, including compiling a 19,000 word vocabulary index and producing a forthcoming multimedia language resource with both texts and recordings to facilitate Hoopa language learning.

Language and Identity: Accessing Hoopa Knowledge, Values and Norms

"For you, he is connected" -- The Hoopa translation for "ceremonial dance leader"

One of the key themes that emerged in the interviews was the idea that language was an invaluable tool with which access to a number of key knowledge bases that respondents strongly felt the tribe had been losing, and which the tribe was beginning to slowly regain over the last few decades through their language programs and efforts. In the next chapter I discuss the ways in which language provides access to knowledge that can inform economic practices for greater efficiency and a better cultural match, as with the case of tribal forestry. Here, the focus is on how language is understood as a key component of identity. The Hoopa language allows its speakers (both fluent and, to a lesser degree, non-fluent) to access, understand, and express Hoopa identity, awareness, knowledge, and cosmology.

According to some respondents, including tribal lawyer and non-profit executive Mary Jane Risling, part of the struggle of the Hoopa and a source of their social problems has been the inability of some tribal members to reconcile two opposing cultural paradigms – the mainstream and the traditional. The mainstream paradigm rejects tribal culture and encourages, even forces, people to embrace mainstream values and norms that privilege individualism and consumerism. The Hoopa traditional paradigm values and prioritizes tribal identity, community, and the local environment, and rejects commodification of culture as seen in the banning of commercial fishing.

Hoopa people, whether or not they are fluent speakers or are "traditional," continue to be informed and influenced by traditional Hoopa culture. Some aspects of Hoopa culture, including, for example, values and communication patterns, are in conflict with mainstream US culture, which has come to greatly influence the community since at least the establishment of the boarding schools. Often, assimilation has meant that mainstream US values and communication patterns, imposed on and dominant over Hoopa culture, create an incongruity. For example, a communication norm in mainstream culture is to wait for a pause before interjecting a comment. That norm includes the frequency of appropriate interruptions and the amount of time one waits before speaking at the pause. Hoopa communication patterns differ from the mainstream. It is permissible to interject sooner, as the language facilitates these kinds of quicker replies.

Mary Jane Risling, who lived and worked off the reservation for some time, then moved back to the reservation and was working as the tribal lawyer when I interviewed her, explained that Hoopa communication patterns are present when some Hoopa people speak English, causing a perception among the community and from outsiders that Hoopa people are curt or impolite, and as Risling noted, leading to a stereotype of Hoopa women as "difficult". Some Hoopa have concluded or have been told directly or indirectly that Hoopa norms are undesirable since they are incongruent with outside-world norms. But acceptance of outside-world norms undermines Hoopa identity, which is shaped by Hoopa values and norms, and the prospect for establishing culturally-appropriate development models and practices. Risling explained,

> If we then move to label [these Hoopa norms] as inappropriate or un-cultural, or
> whatever, we actually undercut some of our cultural thought and interactive
> patterns and we may not be equipped to properly analyze that, but we reject it on
> some emotional level... We fail. It carries over to economic development and
> program development very much so...

For Risling, like others, the value of language, in a most urgent and fundamental way, is that it allows the community to access the knowledge needed to "properly analyze" the disjuncture in communication and come to the realization that there are two paradigms working from two different cultural contexts, both valuable and useful if understood and used appropriately. In providing the proper tools to analyze the disjuncture, language offers the potential to help the community rebuild cultural integrity and heal the wounds caused by the forcible imposition of mainstream culture and the subsequence rejection, denial or misunderstanding of Hoopa culture by the people themselves. Language is understood and envisioned as having the power to heal individuals, families and the community at large.

Language and Direction: The Hoopa Way of Being

Language provides information about traditional values and direction, which can serve as a foundation for community and economic development. In addition to having the power to heal at the individual, family, and community levels and to provide access to and an understanding of underlying Hoopa values, language is also experienced as having the power to provide the community with "direction." This is a term the interviewees often used when speaking about personal behavioral norms, community responsibility, and leadership, as well as guiding principles and values for what should (and should not) be done and what practices and efforts

should (and should not) be pursued. One example came from Salis Jackson, the tribal language and museum director. Salis lived off the Hoopa reservation while growing up, but he spent all of his summers with his family on the reservation and moved back several years ago. Salis has been in what might be considered a language apprenticeship with Verdena Parker – the most fluent Hoopa speaker and a septuagenarian who now lives in Oregon but who has recently been working with the tribe on a number of language projects including recording pronunciations, improving the Hoopa dictionary, correcting early linguists' records, and teaching the language. Salis tells the story of how, with Parker's help, he came to understand the meaning and context of the Hoopa word for ceremonial "dance leaders":

> A lot of people lose things when they don't understand the language because the word… especially when it came to ceremonies, we've been having a lot of trouble in my opinion. Our dance leaders say that this is their dance and it belongs to them, that we got to do what they say and that type of thing… And then I remember sometime last summer the word for a dance leader… I always thought it had something to do with being good looking because [it was similar to] the word for good looking. Verdena, when we got a hold of her and asked her to break that down and… she said… what it really means is 'for you, he is connected'. That's what the word means. So then, when people really realize what the word means, they wouldn't be saying that [the dance belongs to them], and that would relay what they're supposed to be doing for [the community] and not for themselves.

Here, the Hoopa language provides instruction in and imparts culturally-based values and direction. If, as Salis notes, the community and the dance leaders were aware of the meaning of the word, there would be a shift that privileges community values in the relationship and responsibilities between the leaders and the community. This, according to Salis and other interviewees, is fundamental to the tribe's short and long-term success. Additionally, in this case, language provides a way of experiencing and understanding a key leadership position – one that provides for and serves the community – that can serve as a model and inform other leadership positions in the community, from council members to fisheries department directors. This direction or orientation for leadership is modeled, reinforced, and manifested through yearly ceremonial dances. Salis's example shows the ways in which, by clarifying the meaning of words through providing the context from where the word and its meaning are derived, Hoopa language provides values and direction.

Like healing and values-informed development, one of the fundamental elements of successful economic development is competent leadership. As in other reservation communities, the Hoopa continue to experience political and social discord with factions vying for resources and political power. As Cornell and Kalt have noted (1992, 2007), tribes who have experienced success in community and economic development have been able to work through these conflicts enough to have leadership that sees the importance of unbiased, transparent, stable governance adhering to the rule of law. In the case of the Hoopa, there is hope and the expectation that language efforts can promote responsive culturally-informed leadership models and practices that help the tribe set the foundation for greater economic success and cultural integrity.

Language and Healing: Spirituality, Reverence, and the Power of Being Hoopa

Development planning needs to acknowledge the connections between development, culture, and spirituality, and aim to reconcile the contradictions conventional planning brings to communities. For nearly all of the interviewees there was a clear and expressed spiritual and reverent aspect to their commitment to learning and teaching the language. Language provided guidance and awareness through a connection to the land, to loved ones who have passed, and to the long lineage of Hoopa people in the valley: ancestors. Throughout the interviews, the respondents frequently made reference to their own spiritual practice and beliefs, to Hoopa traditional spirituality, and to the ways in which they saw their work as linked to forbearers. In nearly every one of these interviews, there were moments that were emotional, moving, and even spiritual. It seemed impossible to talk about the power of the Hupa language without acknowledging the ways in which contemporary language instruction efforts – from elementary school language classes to Salis's language apprenticeship – are directly linked to traditional ways and knowledge, and to the parents, grandparents, relatives and mentors who deeply influenced the interviewees and continue to inspire and motivate them in their work. I was often deeply moved by the very personal stories of commitment and passion that teachers and community leaders told, involving dear relatives and mentors who have since passed but who continue to inform and inspire the language teaching and learning.

These conceptualizations and understandings about how language instructors see their work, involving elders and deceased relatives and mentors, directly influences the nature, the values, and the goals of language efforts. For language instructors, the work of teaching and learning the language is directly related to the production and expression of Hoopa culture, to the retention and reclamation of Hoopa values, to their relationships with ancestors and the Hoopa Valley, as well as to the tribe's effort to continue to build the Hoopa Indian Nation in culturally-grounded ways. Moreover, people experience the language as providing personal and community awareness, both in the form of individual vocations to the community and as instructions for how to be Hoopa in a communal and ecological orientation.

One example of how learning and teaching the language is experienced and understood in spiritual and reverential terms comes from Jackie Martins, who was raised on the reservation, left to study at Humboldt State and returned to the reservation to teach. She has been the Hoopa language teacher at the elementary school since 1991. In interview with Jackie Martins, I asked her how she came to teach Hupa. She returned to the question throughout the conversation, each time going further back in time and revealing deeper motivations. She began by explaining that she was a student at Humboldt State University in the Indian bilingual education program and that during her time there, there was an effort to have Hoopa taught in the schools. She and another student were asked to teach, and she has been at the school ever since. But later she explained that, more than being asked to teach, she drew her inspiration and her passion for the language from her grandmother who was fluent, her mother who was not, and her mentor Raymond Baldy, key figures in her personal life, revealing that beneath the external reasons were motivations that were related to culture, spirituality, and reverence.

For many, language offers a spiritual connection with and a means to honor those who have passed as well as a way to preserve this connection so that others can also experience what it means to be Hoopa, in that specific place. Martins explains,

So I have a commitment that I will sustain, as long as I am alive, to my mother who brought me into this world that gave me my connection here; that is like a salmon who at some point swam away but vowed to come back, and we do, we all come back, just like salmon, we got that calming effect and we all come home. And I am home and this is my mission and there are other people like me here that have a need to be connected and where else, where best to do that is right here. So it's my contribution and it's my responsibility and it's because I love my people.

Martins also explained that part of her commitment to teaching Hoopa comes from her spirituality. While living off the reservation, a friend introduced her to Native American spiritual practice. She began to understand the value of language in Native American spirituality:

Not all things of the heart can be expressed in English, and that really in the native language there is just so much more of a connection in our language that can't be explained in English, and so that had a big impact on me. I thought, 'I need to learn to pray in my language and I need to be able to communicate'... It's a responsibility, in my time on this earth to share with others and especially youth.

These examples illustrate the ways in which the Hoopa language is conceived, perceived, and experienced as providing some of the fundamental first steps toward a Hoopa-defined sense of development: healing, reclaiming values, and pursuing a culturally-appropriate direction. The Hoopa language is not only a form of communication. It facilitates approaches to community healing, provides a context for understanding and reclaiming Hoopa values, and offers a means to use those values to build a collective vision around the direction the tribe can take in development.

A major challenge to teaching the Hupa language is overcoming the long-standing stigma associated with speaking Hoopa. The healing needed to do this is both a pre-condition and a contributing factor to tribally-defined economic development. Part of this healing includes coming to terms with and overcoming the deep harm caused by various federal Indian laws and policies. The experience that came up in nearly all the interviews was the terrible impact that the boarding school experience had on a generation of Hoopa tribal members and the ways in which many of the problems and challenges the tribe faces today have to do with the violence of forced assimilation. For example, one of the most destructive forces against the Hoopa language was the experience of being abused, teased, and harassed at boarding school by teachers and other students for speaking the language. Many elders have been reluctant to speak Hoopa even though they understand it and could speak it, even if not with ease and fluency. Many have terrible memories of being punished for *speaking* Hoopa and being made to feel shame for *being* Hoopa.

The Hoopa people share this experience with other tribal nations. In their case, many community leaders, officials, and tribal members are convinced of the power of language as one component that can bring about healing in response to these experiences. They see language efforts as part of a reclamation and revival of Hoopa culture that can lead to a cultural shift among tribal members, especially young people, to view Hoopa identity as desirable, valuable, and something they can embrace. Responding to a question about what it would mean if the Hoopa people regained the language with general fluency and comfort in speaking, Salis Jackson noted the following,

If we would do that, it would be a big jump away from basically vestiges of oppression and genocide, in my mind, because those are things that took away the language and took these things away from us. And in my mind they would bring these things that we lost back… we will have connections back to where we're from and [understand] why we're from here and [understand the accounts of] 'this is what's going to happen when the world ends', or, 'this is how the world was created', or 'this is why we dance the way we do', and to look at time and to look at each other and to look at yourself differently than we do now.

Language is experienced as having the potential to significantly contribute to the rebuilding of cultural integrity and to address the wounds of forced assimilation. Reclaiming the Hoopa language is part of the necessary healing that the tribe must do in order to build a solid foundation from which more desirable, culturally-appropriate development can take place.

What these and other respondents make clear is that what is at stake in the concern for community and economic development on the Hoopa reservation is whether or not the Hoopa Nation will be able to maintain the integrity of their indigenous identity. Language is perceived as being closely linked to and having the potential to help with reclaiming identity, healing, and providing values and direction; language also holds the promise of being able to "fully experience what it is to be Hoopa." Jackie Martin states,

You can't separate culture from religion and when you go to the dances if you don't understand the language, if you don't really understand the core of what's happening there, and feel it, and feel it resonating within you, and have that ability to discuss it with people around you, then you're not fully experiencing what it is to be Hoopa.

For many, the Hoopa language and the Hoopa culture continue to inform the lives of people, even those who are not fluent or only know a few words. That, they say, is possible because most adults on the reservation were raised hearing the language either at home, at dances or ceremonies. However, as the years pass and fewer people are exposed to the language, the Hoopa people may become not "fully" Hoopa, unable to access the healing, values and direction the language offers. It is possible to have economic development without community development and cultural integrity, and the tribe may someday achieve economic success as defined by the outside world. But for some, if the language and culture – "what it is to be Hoopa" – were not part of it, this would not be *Hoopa* economic development.

Language and Social Change: The Power to Shape Individuals

Anger: "Toward him my spirit is broken"

As a small nation, community cohesion among the Hoopa Indian Nation is critical in promoting an effective economic development agenda and development practices. In this section, I demonstrate the power of language to inform, direct, and promote development by shaping individual behavior and by orienting individuals toward the collective good, including community cohesion and cooperation. The first example comes from Salis Jackson who described the language classes he was teaching and the impact they were having on his students.

28

According to Salis, students began to notice that in the Hoopa language, because of its complexities, it is "hard to lie and harder yet to keep your lies in order." After a while, the students began to mention to him that they all "seem[ed] to be nicer and better mannered in general." Those students, like Salis and others I interviewed, were convinced that the knowledge and awareness they were gaining through learning and understanding the Hoopa language was very clearly and concretely having a positive effect on the ways they understood themselves in space (in relation to places in the Valley) and in relation to others in the community, including their classmates. Salis explained this key asset of the language:

> I think the big thing is… this way of thinking that I'm trying to get across that changes the outlook. So when you think of time as a circular or seasonal… instead of a linear thing, it will really, that will change you... It's like a gradual thing. They don't notice it happening, only maybe every once in a while you'll notice… like, I don't like that [way of thinking] or I don't think that way no more. I don't say that anymore… I'm always surprised by those types of things but it's not only changed my language it has changed my thought process along the way.

The students in his class began to experience a shift in their awareness, leading them to experience a noticeable and shared shift in behavior: They became better tribal citizens, aware of their connectedness and responsibilities. This aspect of the power of language is related to the idea of healing and values, but there is also a social dimension. It is clear that Salis and his students, like others, experience language learning as having a significant and positive effect on the way they interact socially. The language provides a knowledge base and a communal orientation that reinforces interdependent positive social relationships, instructing or reminding people of their role and responsibilities in social relations. As such, there is a clear connection between the power of language, the social change it has the potential to effect, and the preconditions and foundations needed for viable sustained community and economic development. Language learning involves a re-socialization of the individual in a community-oriented, kinship-based, interdependent culture, in contrast to the tendencies of mainstream culture, which reinforce individual, insular, and independent orientation and behavior.

Just like his students, Salis has been experiencing similar changes in himself. In the Hoopa language, there is no word for "anger." The Hoopa language is a verb and description based language, without the use of nouns. One often expresses action to communicate the idea of a noun. To say that one is angry at someone, the closest wording would be "toward him my spirit is broken." Using the Hoopa language and the Hoopa cultural context to understand and name one's experiences requires a shift in the way one perceives one's relationships and, in this case, forces a shift from blame to shared burden. Salis explains, "Like… when I told you that when I'm mad at somebody, I don't think 'I'm mad' anymore, I think 'my spirit is broken'. [And I think], 'how do I fix that'?" The power of language here is that it frames the experiences of interpersonal relationships and provides guidance for behavior in such a way as to promote positive social change, grounded in a collective, connected, and shared Hoopa identity.

Language and Development Theory: Locating the Cultural Match

Cornell and Kalt have explained that tribes that pay close attention to the "cultural match" between the kinds of economic projects they pursue and the cultural context of the tribe have been more successful in identifying economic activities that would be best received by tribal members. An example of a poor match would be a tribal council's efforts to get grants for developing tourism infrastructure when the tribe has traditionally preferred to remain insular and does not want strangers coming into the community. In cases like this, there might be initial buy-in from the tribal members, but the underlying values of the community are "at cross-purposes," as interviewee Mary Jane Risling noted in explaining the conflicting cultural values, and the project is likely to either falter repeatedly or simply fail. This was a concern expressed by a number of interviewees, described in different ways and from different perspectives, but essentially sharing the concern for better development projects and better development practices that are informed by the cultural context, a process in which language would factor into and contribute to significantly. Without a cultural match tribes either continue to struggle with failed or limited development projects or they engage in development that eventually means assimilation: economic gains with loss of identity.

Examining the relationship between language and economic development offers the opportunity to build on Cornell and Kalt's Nation Building Model by providing an approach to locating the cultural information needed to make culturally-informed development decisions and to better understand the ways in which cultural values and norms may be in conflict with a given development enterprise or practice. Mary Jane Risling addressed this issue of poorly matched development projects in the Hoopa context. Commenting on the possibility of gold mining as an economic development project, which had come up recently on the reservation, Risling stated,

> Under some economic development models if we want to maximize our return,
> [we would have to] just lay it bare. Get those old water cannons out. It didn't have
> to be the miners, it can be us being successful with economic development and
> maximizing return by abusing and destroying our resources. [But] that is not most
> Indian people's definition of success, so if we set out to do that, we are going to
> fail because we really don't want that to happen. We've got to actually identify
> what are those basic principles that constrain and define what success means to
> us. Unless and until we do that, I just think we fail because success becomes
> assimilation. But we don't state it. We're out there, cutting down our own forests
> and mining and casino and whatever else.

For Risling, there is a need to identify underlying values and ways of being through the Hoopa language in order to know what will work in terms of economic activities on the reservation and how these activities are grounded in a relationship to the environment. Of course, it is easy to say that communities don't want environmentally destructive economic development projects, but Risling is using this example to argue for a deeper understanding of the "basic principles that constrain and define" success for the tribe. Cornell and Kalt call for a cultural match, but they have not explained how and where to find the tribal knowledge that contains the information to evaluate and assess the cultural match it. Language, as it is experienced and envisioned, can serve as one of the key resources for making such an assessment and thus for making better-informed development decisions. Language also provides information about how to improve development practices.

Language and Development Practices: Reorienting Tribal Economic Enterprises

The Hoopa Indian Nation has several modest economic enterprises including a mini-mart gas station, a tribal motel, a casino, leasing space to the reservation's only supermarket, as well as the moderately lucrative forestry department, the focus of the next chapter. The fisheries department is not presently a profit-making enterprise though it does employ scores of tribal members who are paid by grants that the tribe administers for the various monitoring and management projects involving fish, water, and riparian areas. Should the tribe reverse the recent ban on commercial fishing, this sector may provide much-needed income, but it is not likely to happen without the tribe first addressing the culturally-based conflict inherent in the commodification of a revered common good.

The fisheries department and the forestry department provide good examples of the potential power of language. According to the language teachers I interviewed, there is a role for language to inform and improve fishing practices in ways that are reflective of traditional culture and thereby increase the chances that these economic development enterprises would receive broader, sustained, and even whole-hearted support from the community. While Cornell and Kalt have argued that this kind of support is critical to development on the reservation, this study provides the missing data regarding where and how we find the information that can inform development practices.

In addition to informing the cultural match question of what kinds of economic projects and activities will be best received by the tribe, language can also help to improve development practices at existing key enterprises. To understand how this works, it is important to note that, like other tribes, the Hoopa have a deep connection to their environment. The Hoopa language and Hoopa identity are intricately linked to the Hoopa Valley, including the forest (Baker, 2003)—a resource that has kept the tribe alive by providing both sustenance and a haven from whites—as well as the Trinity and Klamath rivers, and more specifically the salmon that swim in them. Predictably, then, forestry management, the timber industry, and fishing, as well as any economic development effort affecting the environment, are key areas of development that concern a large number of tribal members.

Over the years, there have been multiple struggles and controversies related to these tribal resources. These include ongoing disputes involving irrigation diversions of river waters and tribal sovereignty in fishing rights, as well as a recent referendum banning commercial fishing on the reservation. The latter, as I described in the opening of this chapter, entails a struggle between the opportunity for individuals with access to commercial boats and nets to benefit personally and the culturally-based value of salmon as a communal good: the fish belong to everyone and it is against Hoopa cultural values and norms to sell salmon for personal gain.

Given these conflicts, Salis Jackson and others see the need to reintroduce Hoopa culture into these areas of tribal economic development. Explaining the long-term impacts he hopes will come from language efforts as they relate to economic activities on the reservation, Salis explains:

> Our goal is, with these language classes, to go to each department and say, come
> do language classes for a while, we will teach your department what is important
> and how to say it in your department, like fisheries or forestry, or even

administration, or the Head Start. These are things you would say… so they can get an appreciation for that aspect of Hoopa thought…. beyond just vocabulary… aspects of fish runs, how the fish were treated, how to take care of them, restoration, about fresh salmon ceremony and the language that goes with it. There is a word that is part of the prayer in that first ceremony, it means 'when everything comes together.'

And then we're supposed to recite the origins of where salmon came from and who brought them… and how they're sacred and why are they sacred, and then it also teaches how the people are connected, how the villagers are connected… All these different aspects, I would like to see that. And, because now, especially this year, there's going to be a huge fish run, to see the fish taken care of properly, [based on the] language, [so] they don't throw away the heads or the tails or the spine or the back. Just if you say a fish in general, you have to use all of those parts. To throw something away, it would sound like you're throwing away the fish. So, for fisheries, those types of things [would be useful] because I think they think too scientifically… Because once you have a respect for life, a respect for the fish, once you know where they come from and how they're supposed to be treated and the things you'd say to them or think to them, then I don't think you're going to treat them in the same way.

This is perhaps the strongest, clearest and most direct articulation of the ways in which culture, through language and cultural revival projects, is conceived, perceived, and beginning to be implemented as part of the broader community and economic development efforts of the Hoopa Nation. This example also demonstrates the multi-scaled, multi-faceted, and interconnected nature of development projects on the Hoopa reservation. Unlike their urban counterparts, these kinds of development projects and efforts cannot be easily separated from other efforts and aspects of Hoopa life and culture. This is both due to the scale of the community, and to Hoopa culture itself, which envisions the community and the space in which it lives as interconnected and inseparable. What happens at the smaller scale level of a small group of Hoopa language learners informs and shapes a number of other areas and scales, from the tribal council to language instruction in the school. Culture, in this specific case, language and development, are intimately connected. This is documented in the ways in which the interviewees describe language and other cultural components, their value, and how they inform goals and hopes for influencing key economic activities. It is also evident in the conviction interviewees have in the power of language and identity to be transformative at personal, social, and tribal government levels.

Expanding Knowledge and Sharing Best Practice

These findings, while in many ways quite solid and compelling, should also be read as preliminary and exploratory. One of the recurring discussions that came up early in the interviews centered on the fact that for nearly all of the interviewees, this was the first time they had taken a moment to reflect on "culture" in the ways I was asking, and it was certainly the first time they had examined their cultural practices, discourses, and assumptions in relation to economic development. Anyone visiting the Hoopa Indian Nation, for example, will quickly get

a clear sense of the very strong presence of Hoopa culture in the everyday lives of the community. It is evident physically in the signage (in Hoopa language and with Hoopa designs), the local institutions (the museum, the youth center), the visitor sites (the vista pullouts overlooking traditional village sites), and intangibly in the quotidian interactions with and between Hoopa tribal members (at the headquarters, at the supermarket, and at the local restaurant). However, as in any community, the interviewees went about their work as tribal officials, educators, administrators, and managers without enumerating the ways in which Hoopa culture informed their work. It was not until asked and given the chance to examine their work in this light that they were able to articulate some of the assumptions they make about the value of Hoopa culture, the benefits it has provided and can provide, and the ways it shapes their current work as well as their vision for where the tribe can and should be in the future. While there is great value in documenting what people said initially, we must also be cautious when assigning meaning to these responses, as they may change over time with further consideration. It is helpful to keep in mind, for example, that it has only been since the 1970s that the Hoopa Valley Tribe, like tribes across the country, have been able to exercise tribal sovereignty rights and rebuild their nation. These early decades of the post Self-Determination Era (The "Nation Building Era" according to legal scholar, Robert A. Williams) have brought significant challenges, growth, and changes to the Hoopa Nation, and as they continue down this path of Nation Building, opinions will undoubtedly change. The data represent only a snapshot of the tribe's conceptualizations of the issues as they experience them today, which will certainly change as the tribe continues to grow and respond to new challenges and opportunities.

In this chapter I have shown the ways in which community leaders and tribal officials in the Hoopa Nation have located culture, cultural values, and ways of being in the Hoopa language. I have also shown that language has significant beneficial effects at both the individual and community level, and it has the potential to inform and direct development practices in several key areas. Language has the power to positively affect development efforts by allowing for a deeper understanding of the cultural match – one that expands the idea of the cultural match to include considerations of the ways in which language provides access to underlying identity, epistemology, direction for development, healing, and ultimately serves as a force for social change. Language also informs practical approaches to improve development theory and practice.

This chapter has shown that the idea of a cultural match, as articulated in the Nation Building model, can be better understood through approaches for locating and identifying cultural values, norms and practices that capture the depth, richness and complexity of cultural considerations. Culture should be understood as a component of development that offers a variety of critical support, knowledge and values for development. Language provides a medium by which critical cultural information can be accessed in support of self-determined economic development on the reservation. This self-determined, culturally-informed development is understood as contributing to larger projects of community healing, nation building, and tribal sovereignty.

Explaining what it would mean to have the Hoopa people speaking Hoopa fluently, Salis Jackson provides a glimpse into the depth and gravity of the challenge of cultural revival, as well as the deep hope tribal members have in the power and potential of the Hoopa culture:

I would feel like we are more whole and more connected to these future aspects, like [the Hoopa word that translates as] 'I work for ancestors and descendants' [but which means] 'within they are born out through time, past and future': that we would see the connections between them, and we would use them, and we would be more spiritual that way when it comes to our everyday thinking about today and that we would act more as a people who [are] a self-governed people… that we would have this sense of self that's strong enough, that we would feel that way and we would act that way.

By identifying ways to locate the cultural information needed for self-determined development, which in this case is found in one's native language, this chapter endeavors to contribute significantly to development theory and practice, offering an approach for how to connect development with indigenous knowledge.

Chapter 3: Community Forestry Builds Communities, Tribal Forestry Builds Nations

> Port-Orford Cedar… has been and will continue to be of the highest importance to the Hupa people for ceremonial and religious purposes…
>
> <div align="right">--Forest Management Plan, Hoopa Forestry Department</div>

> Beginning in the 1970s, tribal management shifted the emphasis to values rooted in sustained utilization, interrelationship, and balance – to what is commonly called ecosystem management. Although this concept has recently become fashionable, Indian tribes had been practicing it for thousands of years before they were displaced from their territories.
>
> <div align="right">--Gary S. Morishima</div>

> The Hupa People successfully avoided the physical destruction of their valley homeland, and in modern times created one of the first successful Self-Governance Tribal structures in the nation.
>
> <div align="right">--Hoopa Valley Indian Tribe</div>

At the heart of the economic development challenge for the Native Americans on the reservation is how to preserve their culture, including their ancestral lands, their cultural practices, values and norms, and at the same time engage productively, efficiently, and competitively in development in uncertain and punishing local, regional, state, national, and international market and political contexts, biased against many of the tribe's characteristics: rural, remote, community-oriented, and a Community of Color[6]. Despite the seemingly widespread news coverage of successful tribes, especially casino tribes, economic development efforts on the reservation have failed to bring relief to the grave impoverishment of a great number of communities. There is a way to view the political and economic status of Native Americans on the reservations as 'the glass half-empty,' given the situation across the country of deplorable living conditions and neglected communities living in abject poverty and suffering from treatable diseases, and given the fact that many tribes are wholly dependent on the various state and federal funding sources to not only employ tribal members but to administer the very tribal political apparatuses, tribal government agencies, and economic enterprises that are at the center of their ability to exercise their tribal sovereignty.

This pessimistic view of the current political and economic status of Native Americans can tend to obscure and distract a more comprehensive, more nuanced, and longer term analysis. This more optimistic, realistic, and clearer approach unveils a 'glass half-full' vision of where

---

[6] One 2010 example is a settled lawsuit against the USDA for denying thousands of Native American famers (like other farmers of color and women) the same access to Farm Loan Program opportunities, loans and services, as they gave to white farmers (Keepseagle v. Vilsack).

tribes are today and in this case helps clarify the state of the forestry management and timber harvest enterprise of the Hoopa Valley Tribe. This approach is grounded in the ways in which communities have always described their own history—as stemming from "time immemorial"—and their relationship to their lands.

> The Hupa People have occupied their lands since time immemorial, and the past century has really been the shortest in our history. However, up until the late 1800's there is little or no written record on the rich history and culture that is now the Hoopa Valley Tribe. Much of the tradition and lore that still exists today has been passed along between generations via an extensive oral tradition. The ceremonies and traditions continue in the similar manners as they have since the beginning, and will continue in this custom (Hoopa Valley Tribe, 2013).

In the case of the Hoopa Valley Tribe, contemporary science has validated their account by showing that the tribe has lived in the Hoopa Valley for thousands of years. They experienced European-US invasion into their territories during the Gold Rush, and only in the early part of the 1900s, like other tribes, did they constitute themselves as a "tribal government"[7] modeled after the BIA tribal government structures, in order to deal with federal agencies. And only beginning in the 1970s did tribes experience the opportunity to engage in real self-governance and self-determination with regard to economic development.

In the Hupa historical timeline, given both the "shortness" of the contemporary period of the 1850s to the present, and the fact that it has only been about 40 years since the US federal government provided political opportunities for effective self-determination, it is possible to see that the Hupa people have in fact come a long way in their nation building, and particularly in administering a lucrative, sustainable, culturally-responsive business enterprise of forestry and timber sales. While in the various campaigns of European colonization and US Westward Expansion countless tribes were completely slaughtered, or forced to disappear in diasporas for survival, the Hupa people, aided by the remote and rugged landscapes, have been able to survive extinction and today claim the largest reservation territory in all of California with a premier forestry and timber enterprise that is a leader in the industry for its culturally-based sustainability practices and for the forestry and timber management practices it employs to secure the protection and promotion of cultural spaces, practices, and values.

One story from Darin Jarnaghan, the Hoopa Forestry Department manager, shows both the conditions under which Hoopa forest resources were managed, and mismanaged, right up to the time that the tribe took over the forestry management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs left the reservation. Describing how things were different in forestry and timber sales under the management of the BIA, Darin Jarnaghan explains:

> They went out and did a policy commission, a group of people went out and surveyed tribal members to ask, "What's your biggest concerns?" [The tribe] wanted to keep the tan oaks, obviously, protected, and then when the Bureau of Indian Affairs was here...they came to a tribal elder and said, "Well, where do you

---

[7] The origins and development of the Tribal Council is a complicated story involving power struggles with the BIA. The first Hoopa Tribal Council was established in 1911 by elections, abolished in 1927, and reconstituted in 1955. See Joachim Roschmann's (1991), *No "Red Atlantis" on the Trinity: the rejection of the Indian Reorganization Act on the Hoopa Valley Reservation in Northwestern California*.

guys gather your stuff?" and she was really hesitant, she said, "You know, I don't want to tell you," so they kept asking her until finally they told her, "We're going to protect it. We don't want to go and harm it if that's your area." So she told them, and lo and behold, the next time they went out and logged something, it was right where she had asked them to protect. So, that's the type of story that you come from: it is trying to wipe out the cultural component, you know, the tie to the land.

Among the forestry officials interviewed, and in informal conversations with tribal members, there was a clear recognition that the BIA had severely mismanaged the forestry both in terms of the timber harvesting practices—clear cutting, destroying creeks, creating erosion, and disregarding aesthetic considerations and reforestation—as well as in managing the multiple millions of dollars in profits that came out of the area and the 14 mills that were once located in the Valley.

Particularly disgraceful was the ways in which the BIA not only failed to protect culturally important spaces, flora, and fauna (sacred sites, ceremonial grounds, trails, food-gathering areas, medicinal and ceremonial plants, and ceremonial-use birds and mammals), but very often actively sought to destroy these resources, as Darin Jarnaghan goes on to describe:

> The Bureau of Indian Affairs, their [approach] was, 'you know, just put a square on a map and that's what we're cutting this year.' There wasn't a lot of planning that we use today [nor] the concept of meeting with your cultural committee, looking at mushroom growing areas, looking at the traditional species, looking at the traditional plants, looking at all these other sort of components that you put on top of the management … so you sift out all these other concerns and then you get to an allowable cut.

Just in these two excerpts from the interview, it is clear to see the major changes that have taken place in the Hoopa Valley with regard to forestry and timber harvesting. The tribe went from essentially having no say in forestry and timber harvest, to full management of these, implementing practices that respect, protect, and promote Hupa culture, cultural values, and sacred sites. Two decades after the tribe took over for the BIA, they were able to secure a small measure of restitution when in 2012 they were awarded a $49.2 million settlement for a 2006 lawsuit against the federal government over "federal mismanagement of tribal trust funds and funds from trust resources like timber" (Korns, 2012): a recognition of the exploitation and abuse of power the BIA had been committing on the Hoopa Reservation.

In addition to the settlement funds in that case, specific to the Hoopa, the tribe also received settlement money from the $3.4 billion Cobell v. Salazar case in 2009. The case revealed a pattern of gross mismanagement and negligence by federal agencies in handling individual and tribal funds and resources across the county: "mismanagement and lack of accounting for individual trust funds and lands held in trust" (Heitkamp, 2012). These cases acknowledge the severe conditions and exploitation that were part of the local and national economic and political contexts in which the Hoopa Tribe was trying to survive, and protect its culture and lands. It is out of these contexts that the Tribe emerges in the early 1990s to wrest control of forestry management and timber harvest from the BIA, and manages to reverse the Bureau's policies and approaches, instituting, for example, a cultural committee comprised of

37

elders representing the various traditional village areas (tribal members identify with one of the several villages) to oversee the management and timber harvest in order to assure the protection of sacred sites and areas, and the promotion of medicinal and cultural-use of flora and fauna, as well as traditional food gathering areas. It is a case of a remarkable transformation that can serve as a model for viable, sustainable economic development that offer Native American Nations the opportunity to provide jobs and income for their communities and the tribal government while at the same time providing the resources and approaches which respect, protect, and promote culture and tribal lands, all while protecting and bolstering their ability to continue to exercise and expand both their own community's tribal sovereignty as well as the conceptualization and practice of Native American tribal sovereignty across the country.

In chapter 2 I examined the link between culture and development and argued that key cultural information, values, and direction can be found in language and that this information can play a critical role in improving development practices. In this chapter I examine a case of forestry and timber sales development practices—by looking at the Hoopa Forestry Department and the related Hoopa Forestry Industries, the tribe's timber company—to show examples of this link between culture and development and how cultural information can guide the work to improve development practices both in terms of sustainability practices—by "taking only as much as you need"—and in terms of the viability of a project that can be supported by the broader community because it respects, protects, and promotes the culture and rebuilding of the tribal nation. It shows how in the Hoopa case, as with other Native American communities, culture is a means and an end to development.

In both sustainability and nation building these practices are not new, as many have argued, like Morishima, who writes, "Indian tribes had been practicing [forestry] for thousands of years before they were displaced from their territories" (1997, p. 9). This case and the many cases like them in reservations across the country need to be examined in this framework: one in which the nationhood of the tribe is acknowledged, and their tribal sovereignty prioritized in the analysis, and one in which the emergence of these practices is seen as a resurgence, or a reemergence of tribal practices, culture, and knowledge. It has to be analyzed in light of the thousands-of-years history of forest and natural resource management that tribes have employed—and the concomitant Traditional Knowledge they have developed about the environment—as well as the trajectory that tribes use to frame their own history, the present, and the future. In doing so, the analysis privileges a Native Nation perspective, prioritizing tribal sovereignty in economic development discourse, and recognizing the power in culture, in the land, and in the awareness that tribal cultures, practices and knowledge were never a hindrance to development—as the colonial, internal-colony, and modernization projects argued they were—but instead these have always been the basis for survival and the basis for viable, sustainable, holistic development and environmental conservation.

Even though the Tribe considers the landscapes, the Reservation lands, and the natural resources as critically important to their survival and their cultural identity, they accept timber harvesting and sales, in part, precisely because the forestry work is being done while respecting Hupa culture and values; something many said was not being done, and perhaps not possible, in the recent commercial fishing practices, which explains the ban. Since logging has been a crucial part of life in the Hoopa Valley and Hupa people have worked in logging for many decades with many mills throughout the Valley, it may be the case that logging has become part of the Hoopa

experience over time, whereas commercial fishing has not had that trajectory in the Valley. In either case, as I show in this chapter, the tribe has supported the work of the Hoopa Forestry Department and the Hoopa Forestry Industries in their management and timber sales because these entities have proven to be reliable stewards of the forest in very specific and critical ways that are important to the Hupa people.

For example, since the Tribe took over the management from the BIA, the Forestry Department has prioritized the protection of the Port-Orford cedar tree, and the tan oak tree, two of the most important cultural resources in the Valley. The tribe uses the Port-Orford tree to build various housing structures used for ceremonies and ceremonial dances, and none of these trees are to be harvested for timber sales. The tanoak provides the community with acorns that supplement their diet and it is associated with Hupa culture, traditions, and history. This cultural value, of protecting and promoting these trees, is prominently placed in the Forest Management Plan, which states: "Port-Orford Cedar tree has been and will continue to be of the highest importance to the Hupa people for ceremonial and religious purposes (p. 28); and for the tanoak it instructs the management to, "[a]dopt existing sale layout guidelines which…emphasize saving vigorous and mature full-crowned trees which are easily accessible particularly on flat areas and adjacent to landings and roadsides," (p. 29) for accessibility to tribal members who gather acorns. These priorities reflect the culture, values, norms, and Hupa way of being and as a result the Forestry Department enjoys the support of the tribe, making timber sales a viable income generating enterprise with broad approval.

In order to examine the link between culture and development, and in this case the link between Hupa culture and the successful forestry and timber sales industry on the Hoopa Reservation, this chapter shows that by managing and implementing forestry and timber sales in this culturally-grounded way, the tribe is also promoting cultural survival, environmental sustainability, and tribal sovereignty. The chapter examines the link between culture and economic development in the context of a sovereignty Native American nation, which, as I have argued in chapters 1 and 2, remains an understudied topic, despite the critical role that culture is supposed to play, according to key scholars in the field and according to subsequent scholars who draw on their work and reaffirm this key role but whose work also leaves out an examination of what culture is, with regard to development, where it is found, and how it specifically informs development practices and approaches.

As I have also noted in earlier chapters, examining how culture is linked to development establishes greater legitimacy for culturally-relevant economic practices in the various professions directly and indirectly involved in the wide range of community and economic development efforts on the reservation, including both tribal development practitioners and tribal leaders, and off-reservation policy-makers, foundation staff, planning practitioners, state and federal agency staff, and development scholars, among others. Once viewed as legitimate, culturally-relevant sustainable development practices can greatly improve the chances for success in community-based economic development by both drawing on the internal culture and cultural resources as well as by receiving the appropriate support and cooperation from policymakers, foundation staff, and scholars.

An examination of the link between culture and economic development in the Hupa economic development context is a critical step in understanding how Native American communities can pursue viable development. In their 2002 assessment of development projects

on the Hoopa Reservation, Baker and Kusel arrive at the same conclusion as Cornell and Kalt regarding development projects and approaches that do not take into consideration culture and sovereignty: "the crucial, and missing link is acknowledgement of the relationship between sustainable economic development and tribal sovereignty" (p. 27). They go on to warn against failing to address the centrality of culture and sovereignty in development, saying:

> In fact, almost every [Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative] project could be re-evaluated in terms of how it might have been more effectively designed and administered in light of these issues. A whole host of questions, issues, and opportunities arise that otherwise not only remain hidden, but in the long run sabotage well meaning but ill-informed efforts to promote sustainable reservation development and reduce the unacceptably high unemployment and poverty rates that prevail on many reservations (p. 29).

Baker and Kusel frame their concerns as issues of tribal sovereignty. I use "culture and sovereignty" together because of their inextricable link and the ways that they inform each other and overlap in issues of economic development, governance, institution building, and nation building.

Hoopa tribal sovereignty is expressed and conceptualized uniquely precisely because it draws on the Hupa culture—values, norms, knowledge—to define and inform these. Similarly, Hupa culture is bolstered, defined, and conceptualized, at least in part, through the tribe's exercise of sovereignty and the vision they have for a future Hoopa tribal sovereignty in which the Tribe can exercise full sovereign powers on all their ancestral territories, even beyond existing reservation boundaries, and enjoy full nation-to-nation relations with the federal government. In the literature, "culture" remains undefined and somewhat vague, in part because of the nature of culture and how each tribe is unique in its experience and deployment of culture in economic development. It also is just an area of the field to which scholars have not dedicated much time. The contribution of the present study to the literature is that it provides concrete examples of how culture and cultural information play—and can play—identifiable roles in economic development, tribal sovereignty, and nation building.

To examine the issues surrounding economic development, culture, sovereignty, and nation building, this chapter focuses on the question of how the Hupa, through their forest managements and timber sales enterprise have managed to help preserve their culture, their cultural practices, values and norms, and at the same time have successfully engaged economic development. The chapter examines these issues by focusing on key concerns including tribal survival and culture materials as they relate to the tribes forestry and timber management. This is not an exhaustive examination, and there are various ways to organize and structure this analysis, but these concepts provide a concrete basis for understanding the link between culture and economic development from a variety of perspectives and concerns shared in the interviews.

Following the introduction, I offer a brief description of the data and methods used to inform the findings in this chapter. Next then review existing literature, both to introduce the theoretical framework applied to analyze the data, and to define and explain the context of tribal forestry and the concepts that inform the analysis presented in this chapter. I then examine the idea of the forest as a source of *subsistence* and argue that by preserving the landscape,

protecting sacred spaces, and promoting cultural-use flora and fauna, the tribe is able to preserve, protect, and promote Hupa identity, so that their economic development in forestry is understood as Hupa development efforts as well as cultural preservation and production, and an exercise and expansion of tribal sovereignty.

Methodology

The core data for this chapter are drawn from in-depth, semi-structured in-person interviews of nine key officials and managers involved with the tribal forestry, with some interviewees being interviewed multiple times. The interviewees included officials from the Hoopa Forestry Department (Forest Manager, Chair of the Cultural Committee, Fuels Specialist, Wildlife Biologist, Planning Forester), the tribal timber company "Hoopa Forest Industries" (Chief Executive Officer), the tribe's "Tsemeta Nursery" (Lead Technician), and the Tribal Environmental Planning Department and Land Management (Director, Realty Specialist). Some of the interviewees also had multiple roles in the community, as with the Realty Specialist who was also the Chair of the tribe's Hoopa Fish Commission. Other interviewees also provided various data on context, history, and the socio-political and cultural issues surrounding forestry management and culture, which inform this chapter directly and indirectly. These include the Tribal Chair and Vice-Chair (also a well-known tribal historian), the Director of the Tribal Fisheries Department, the Tribal Self Governance Coordinator, and other council members. I had visited the Hoopa Reservation to conduct research for my Master's thesis in 2006, but beginning in January 2012 I began visiting the reservation for week-long research trips until April of 2013.

 The interviews were planned for 45 minutes to an hour each but some lasted only 30 minutes while others went on for 120 minutes. Most interviews were recorded and transcribed. In addition to conducting interviews, I spent time touring and observing a variety of spaces on the reservation including the forest management offices, the tribal nursery, the tribe's mill, and various forest areas across the reservation where forest management teams had worked and were working.

Insurgent Planning, Community Forestry, and the Nation building Era

A range of actors may participate in insurgent planning practices: community activists, mothers, professional planners, school teachers, city councilors, the unemployed, retired residents, etc. Whoever the actors, what they do is identifiable as insurgent planning if it is purposeful actions that aim to disrupt domineering relationships of oppressors to the oppressed, and to destabilize such a status quo through consciousness of the past and imagination of an alternative future…

Insurgent planning is transgressive in time, place, and action… Insurgent planning is counter-hegemonic… Insurgent planning is imaginative… Above all, insurgent planning holds stubbornly to its ideal of justice.

– Faranak Miraftab

In previous chapters, I have discussed the dearth of literature on Native American economic development, and the urgent need for a variety of disciplines to take-up the challenge of engaging development questions on the reservations both as paradoxical space of severe "underdevelopment" located in the Global North, as well as spaces of "insurgent planning." The present chapter aims to contribute toward this effort by situating the successful forestry management and timber enterprise experience first within the literature on insurgent planning, showing how the economic development planning work of the Hupa tribe mirrors efforts in the Global South to, "disrupt domineering relationships of oppressors to the oppressed, and to destabilize such a status quo through consciousness of the past and imagination of an alternative future" (Miraftab 2009, p.44). It also mirrors efforts in the US among rural communities where newcomers are driving revitalization in otherwise shrinking rural towns, implementing community and economic development and planning without the help of formal planning institutions, support, and infrastructure: informal planning.

This literature helps provide a framework for understanding development on the reservation, even though many tribal communities would resist an exogenous paradigm imposed on what they argue are nation building projects that are significantly different from Global North informal planning and Global South insurgent planning. The data sections delve into the ways in which the Hoopa case provides evidence for this argument. Similarly, the present section situates forestry management within the community forestry literature to understand the economic sector context for the case, even though some would resist the comparisons, arguing that tribal forestry involves a set of key considerations that significantly differ from the goals and means of community forestry. From planners, scholars, practitioners, and others who are not familiar with the reservation and nation building contexts, these framing approaches are critical in order to provide an accessible framework to situate the work in familiar paradigms, but at the same time it is important to keep in mind that Native American communities, activists, and scholars alike all resist exogenous frameworks of the Native American experience. The data sections are organized in such a way as to allow these framings to be helpful in ways that not only recognize the Native American perspective, but also provides data that concretizes the kinds of examples showing the sovereignty and nation building means and goals of development on the Hoopa Reservation.

Drawing on the work of key insurgent citizenship scholars (Holston 1995, 2008; Sandercock1998), insurgent planning theorizes planning from a broader perspective that includes formal and informal spaces of participation, and formal and informal modes of planning practice, within the context of counter-hegemonic, anti-neoliberal social movements for social justice. There are key parallels to the Hupa case and the tribe's efforts to wrest control of governance and economic development from federal agencies and the participation in planning and development efforts, models, visions, implementation, and oversight by the kinds of stakeholders Miraftab identifies in insurgent planning; "community activists, mothers, professional planners, school teachers, city councilors, the unemployed, retired residents" (2009, p. 44)—the kind of Hupa tribal members that have a role to play in forest management and timber sales.

While this framing conflicts with Native American efforts to reframe these questions from a Native Nation perspective, the effort is useful as a tool to understand the ways in which tribal economic development is different from conventional development practices, the ways in which tribal development planning is more akin to insurgent planning efforts, and the ways that

it goes even further than insurgent planning to constitute a planning paradigm of nation building. Situating tribal economic development planning in the insurgent planning literature also highlights some of the key contextual realities of planning in the 21st century. In addition to noting the debates about the cooptation of citizen participation in the neoliberal paradigm of planning, as well as the threat of fragmentation and criminalizing of citizen participation, Miraftab reminds readers of various other aspects of the reality of contemporary global context for planning found in planning literature:

> [Radical] planning scholarship demonstrates how de facto community and urban developments take place through everyday practices of squatter citizens, determined poor women, illegal immigrants and other disfranchised and marginalized communities…. Through their development of houses and infrastructure such actors also build deep democracies... That material reality is widely observable in the global South: more than two thirds of Third World cities are developed through the spontaneous, unplanned activities that Holston … conceptualizes as insurgent urbanization. Eighty-five percent of Third World urban residents 'occupy property illegally'… Worldwide, the informal economy has grown as a percentage of nonagricultural employment, by the 1990s reaching 43.4 percent in North Africa, 74.8 percent in sub-Saharan Africa, 56.9 percent in Latin America and 63 percent in Asia…. These figures make clear that only a limited share of the spatial and economical development in Third World cities occurs through formal structures and professional planning… The majority of marginalized people take into their own hands the challenges of housing, neighborhood and urban development, establishing shelter and earning livelihoods outside formal decision structures and 'professionalized planning'. The protagonists of urban development have thus shifted from planning agencies to community-based informal processes; from professional planners and formal planning to grassroots activists and strategies (2009, p. 42).

In some very clear and critical ways, the economic development practices and models being developed and implemented on the Hoopa reservation resemble efforts in the Global South of communities organizing and mobilizing to wrest control from oppressive state agencies over key elements of development, including governance, housing, resource management, and economic development. But as Miraftab and McConnell (2008) note, these trends are increasingly found across the United States: "[I]n the heartland of the United States… much of the rural towns' development takes place by immigrant newcomers and through local commissions and committees that are not staffed or overseen by professional planning practitioners. It is retired teachers, businessmen and women and elected officials that constitute the committees that make the development planning decisions of these small towns" (in Miraftab 2009, p. 42). In some ways, tribal economic development planning represents a little of both of these scenarios: it shares the counter-hegemonic, liberation and social justice aims of the efforts in the Global South, while at the same time the "local commissions and committees" parallel both the early formal efforts of Hoopa mobilizing, as well as contemporary commissions, as with the case of the volunteer Hoopa Fish Commission, "charged with the responsibility to develop

draft regulations for commercial fishing on the Hoopa Reservation" using a "member driven approach" (Hoopa Valley Tribe, 2011).

The similarities with insurgent planning in the Global South and with heartland non-native rural communities are strong, and the comparison is useful in framing these issues of economic development, at least in part, using insurgent planning. However it is critical to emphasize that Native American communities are also nations and as such have their own state with a national tribal government that is at once enacting and building sovereignty, as well as a engage a counter-hegemonic project against the US federal government, while developing state apparatuses that can be culturally resonant and politically viable in government to government relations. This reality, of course, complicates the framing of tribal economic development in insurgent planning and community forestry, and it is a subject that is covering in greater detail in chapter 4, but for the present chapter, it is useful to conceptualize tribal economic development as both grounded in the two trends described above, while at the same time also grounded in the US-wide project of pan-Indian tribal sovereignty—the conceptualizations, powers, and practices that tribes across the country share in common and which as both rapidly expanding and highly contested. Miraftab's conclusion on the global context for planning reminds us that, "These realities expand the definition of planning" (2009). The Hoopa Valley Tribe case shows that tribal economic development practices and models are also part of those realities that are expanding the definition of planning.

"Community Forestry" Builds Communities: "Tribal Forestry" Builds Nations

Now that the general hostilities against the Indians have commenced we hope that the Government will render such aid as will enable the citizens of the north to carry on a war of extermination until the last Redskin of these tribes has been killed.

--Yreka Herald, 1853

..Indian tribes are here to stay. We will not sell our land or shear down our forests during wavering economic times... Our ancestors, our culture is committed to the land upon which we live. We have become new pathfinders searching for ways to revitalize our environment and thus our communities. When our work is done, our greatest honor is not in what we celebrate in ourselves today. The greatest honor lingers in the future when our grandchildren will stop and say, 'Our elders, our grandmothers and grandfathers, did do it right.' They will enjoy the success of our lifetime in their future.

--Jaime A. Pinkham, Nez Perce Tribe President, Intertribal Timber Council Senate Committee on Indian Affairs Oversight Hearing on the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act, 1995.

The Hupa tribal forestry case shows the link between culture and viable development practices, highlighting the fact that tribes are expanding the meanings and purposes development to support not only economic growth but also to protect, promote, and enact culture, identity, environmental stewardship, and tribal sovereignty. It provides a clear example of how *culture*

supports economic development; how *economic development* supports tribal sovereignty; and how *tribal sovereignty* supports culture. The following sections aim to details some of these links by discussing the ways in which the 10,000 year old relationship between the Hupa people and their forest (culture) has resulted in the forestry knowledge and practices that have produce sustainable forestry management (economic development), and how, as a result, the tribe has been able to invest timber profits back into the tribe's land purchases, governance institutions, resource management, and a stronger position in tribe to federal and state government relations (*sovereignty*).

In contrast to the approaches in conventional economic development models and practices, there are key differences in Hupa economic development described in this analysis that are lessons for understanding and implementing economic development on reservations. It is useful to keep these lessons in mind while reading the subsequent sections to help frame the overall view of culturally relevant development. These include: 1) the clear examples of culture directly supporting, informing, shaping, and even limiting economic development in ways that emphasize cultural integrity; 2) the ways in which the meanings and purposes of economic development are broadened to be appropriate and relevant to the tribe's goals and sensibilities, including rearranging development priorities to privilege culture and environment over profits; and 3) the ways in which, unlike in community forestry, Hupa tribal forestry to is conceptualized, perceived, and implemented as a means to exercising ever greater tribal sovereignty to build, or rebuild, the nationhood of the Hupa people and regain sovereignty powers over all of their current and ancestral territories.

The tribal forestry example illustrates the link between culture and viable development practices, highlighting the fact that tribes are expanding the meanings and purposes development to support not only economic growth but also to protect, promote, and enact culture, identity, environmental stewardship, and tribal sovereignty. This section examines the link between culture and economic development by examining the ways in which the forest has been managed to continue to provide a source of survival and subsistence for the Hoopa Tribe both in literal terms of providing supplemental foods to the Hupa diet as well as by providing the space and material goods by which to produce and enacts Hoopa culture. By preserving the landscape, protecting sacred spaces, and promoting cultural-use flora and fauna, the tribe is able to preserve, protect, and promote Hoopa identity, so that the economic development attained through forestry remains culturally Hoopa, serving Hupa cultural needs and goals, in addition to providing income for the tribal members and the tribal council, as well as promoting its nation building efforts, grounded in Hupa cosmology and cultural practices.

In a number of ways, the fact that the Hoopa have managed to retain a strong sense of tribal unity and nationhood is a remarkable story of survival. As I note in chapter 1 the political atmosphere of the mid 1800s, during California's Gold Rush period, was one in which the federal government had moved away from the earlier treaty and reservation policies that had been characteristic of federal policies toward Native Americans of the eastern US. By the time Westward Expansion brought European Americans to the western US, the federal government had been taking a more aggressive and less treaty-diplomacy approach to removing and destroying Native American communities. Leading up to and concurrent with this period of official extermination, northern California Native Americans were frequently victims of

kidnapping in order to be sold into slavery for both their labor and for sexual violence by both wealthy Anglophone as well as Mexican ranchers (McGovern 1995, p. 62).

The federal "Indian Wars" –officially lasting into the 1880s-- are well known to many, but lesser known is the official role that state and local governments played in the "war of extermination." McGovern (1995) writes that, "This program of genocide was sanctioned and supported by government at the local, state, and federal levels. Municipal governments offered bounties for Indian heads or scalps (p. 69). Explaining the details in the local context of the region of the Hoopa Reservation, he writes about two northern California cities, one about 100 miles from the reservation:

> Shasta City, for example, offered five dollars for every Indian head presented at city headquarters. A community near Marysville paid bounties for 'every scalp or some other satisfactory evidence' that an Indian had been killed. In addition to the bounties paid by local governments, members of volunteer militias engaged in Indian extermination could submit claims on the state treasury for their expenses. … [T]he federal government reimbursed the state for the militia expenses. Murdering Indians had become a cornerstone of public policy (69).

These informal efforts and the official, sanctioned, extermination policies were followed by a period of reformed approached in the early years of the 1900s, informed by and coinciding with national efforts of Progressivism and Good Government Movements. However, whereas the brutal violence of extermination of the earlier period sought complete physical annihilation, the new period of cultural genocide sought to "Kill the Indian, Save the Man" (Churchill, 1994, 2004).

Churchill explains that the national policy of stealing children as young as six from their families and send them away to boarding school, a system founded and headed by Captain Pratt – a veteran of the Civil War and the "Indian Wars-- is a key example cultural genocide. Boarding schools sought to forcibly, and often violently, remove Native American culture from the students, banning native languages, culture, attire, and practices while keeping the children away from their families and communities. As I noted at various points in this dissertation, the boarding school experience was one that was raised by nearly all of the interviewees as a source of some of the problems that the tribe has experienced in the last several decades. Indeed it is a policy one that has significantly and directly affected generations of Native Americans across the country. On the Hoopa in 1920s, "Indian Service" –what today is the Bureau of Indian Affairs-- established a boarding school that followed the national policies and forbade students from going home during the school year for even the most urgent emergencies, even though the students' families were on the same reservation. It is important to note the presence and the policies of the boarding school at Hoopa in order to underscore the remarkable story of Hoopa survival; a survival that is in large part due to the relationship the tribe has had with the forest, at once a haven and a source of sustenance.

Similarly, other national policies seriously undermined the tribe's integrity and culture, and threatened their survival, including the allotment of reservation lands which gave European Americans access to tribal reservation lands. The changing socio-political context of the

reservation forced many into wage employment that in some ways undermined traditional culture, as the Hoopa lifeway changed, and with it changes in diet, hunting and gathering, as well as traditional governance which relied on interdependence. Despite these varied and sustained efforts, with the full support of local, state and federal government, the Hupa people have survived. This of course is a surprise to outsiders, and would certainly be to the federal agents in charge of these policies, as Cahill notes:

> If at the time somebody had informed the Indian agents at Hoopa Valley that almost 100 years later, the Hupa tribe would not only still exist but also continue to hold sacred dance ceremonies, fish for salmon, and manage several business enterprises and a museum, and that many members would continue to live along the banks of the Trinity River, they might have been shocked... After all, the Indian Office's theory of assimilation posited that educating and employing so many of the Hupa people meant that they would long since have been absorbed into the citizenry, leaving the valley a community of white landholders—some, perhaps, with a small measure of Indian Ancestry (2011, p. 205).

However, both in the many interviews with tribal members, as well as in numerous text on the Hupa people, it is clear that the Hupa themselves are not so surprised. Interviewees recognized the extent and severity of the violence, exploitation, and extermination efforts their elders and ancestors had to endure, but they discuss it in terms of a tragic but temporary period in the millennia-long trajectory of the Hupa people.

Without exception, interviewees described the critical role that the forest played in the tribe's ability to survive the various periods and various strategies of extermination and dispossession. By understanding the overwhelming forced and resources behind the various forces seeking to displace, destroy, or completely exterminate the Hupa people, it is possible to begin to understand both the nature and the depth of the relationship of the people to the forest – as their protector and provider— as well as the how that relationship undergirds concepts of culture and economic development. Hupa culture is inextricably linked to the forest because Hupa culture is grounded, in so many critical ways, in the cultural practices enacted and practiced in the forest, with specific flora, fauna, and sites. In order to understand the link between culture and economic development in the Hupa case it is critical to recognize the ways in which the forest has been experienced, and later managed, as assuring survival and providing subsistence.

In the context of the extermination policies, the Hoopa tribe relied on the forest for survival both in literal terms of providing main staples or supplemental foods to the Hupa diet as well as by providing the space and material goods by which to produce and enact Hoopa culture. In very simple and clear terms, it is possible to understand the Hupa forest *is* Hupa culture. One can say "it is a part" of the culture or even that "it is a crucial part" of the culture, but in Hupa practice and epistemology, the Hupa people are inextricably linked to the landscape in ways that are not paralleled in other cultural contexts familiar to most, including urban citizenship –the culture of being a New Yorker--, regional identity –southern culture--, nor most nation-state identities—Mexican culture, Chinese culture--. The forest provides the context and the material by which Hupa define what is means to be Hupa and what it means to practice Hupa culture,

47

even, for example, for those tribal members who have converted to Christianity and no longer participate in Hupa ceremonies but who strongly support the practices –as with staff I interviewed in the forestry department— but who are absolutely clear that they remain Hupa, in their own eyes and in the eyes of the community, by virtue of living in the Hoopa Valley and continuing to engage in some of the key cultural practices that make them Hupa .

The key practices and beliefs related to the forest are foundational to what it means to be Hupa. These include for example, the access to various forest fauna for Hupa diet and for Hupa ceremonial and material cultural uses, including deer (for diet and the Deerskin Dance), the pileated woodpecker (for ceremonial regalia use), fishers (a forest mammal also used in ceremonies), and salmon (for diet and for various ceremonial uses). Additionally, the key practices include a variety of flora that are central to Hupa diet and identity, as well as ceremonial and material cultural uses. These include, the tanoak acorn (for diet and ceremonial use), mushrooms (for diet), various plants and roots used for medicinal purposes (physical and spiritual), as well as a variety of grasses and plants used for baskets, baby carriers, hats, and quotidian and ceremonial regalia. In order to understand what Hupa culture is, how cultural information has and can support economic development, and how to, in turn, support and reinforce culture with development, it is necessary to examine the basis of that culture, found in the flora, fauna, and sacred spaced.

The importance of this relationship and the basis of Hupa identity was clear to early settlers and federal agents who sought to not only exterminate native communities physically, but then sought to destroy the basis of Hupa culture though a variety of efforts that aimed at separating the Hupa people from their culture. Lois Risling, Realty Specialist of Hoopa Valley Tribe explains the central place tanoak acorns have in the Hupa diet and in Hupa ceremonies, and the practices of the federal agents:

> Tanoak tree [acorns are] a staple food source for us and culturally very important. When you go to the high dances or even the other personal ones it is required that you eat acorns. They'll give you acorns, fish and water… Everybody is always picking up acorns here, and everybody has their tree... But if you read the bureau record, there's a report that was put out by the Bureau of Indian Affairs Forestry Division. [They] said, "Oh, cut down the Tan Oak." The Tan Oak was not considered at that time a tree that's worth money… And so the guy said, "there's nobody who eats these acorns except pigs and deer, and so just cut them all down. They're not worth anything." [That had been] the attitude, where they were trying to stop you from [harvesting acorns] and where they were not valued….

While ostensibly removing tan oak trees because they were not profitable and did not produce food that was deemed edible by the agents, it was clear to the Hupa that cutting down tanoaks was an attempt to destroy Hupa culture and force the people into mainstream culture and labor. This was especially obvious in light of the series of policies with similar aims, including for example the banning of Hupa dances on the reservation.

These policies have created a destructive legacy on the reservation with regard to some of these practices, including acorn: the negative stigma associated with acorns along with the

introduction of commodity foods has resulted in an atmosphere in which younger Hupa are often "forced" to eat acorn –much like parents force their children to eat their veggies--by their older relatives who are trying to pass on to the new generation an appreciation for the lifesaving, and spiritually crucial role that acorn, along with salmon and water have in the culture. The existence of the ceremonies, the ceremonial dances, and the quotidian and ceremonial consumption of these key staples speaks to the resilience of the tribe, the key role that the forest played in their survival, and to the opportunity to draw on the knowledge and practices of these cultural expressions to inform economic development. Development efforts can be designed and implemented more effectively by connecting the contemporary efforts and methods of development –the means by which the Hupa can continue to survive into the future-- to the traditional, historical efforts and methods that have provided the Hupa with the means by which to have not only flourished for 10,000 years in the Valley, but to have survived the ravages of genocidal policies of the last 170 years, implemented by powerful, well-funded, well-armed ranchers, militias, as well as local, state and federal governments.

The reservation's Fort Gaston and BIA offices represented the might of these forces and the subjugation of the Hupa, though their presence did not completely eliminate the tribe's power to inform and influence policies. Indeed, through a variety of means and methods, the tribe participated in forestry management or otherwise shaped and directed management and timber practices in ways that sought to protect Hupa culture. Under various administrations and onsite BIA regional directors, the Hupa actively sought to preserve the landscape, protect sacred spaces, and promote cultural-use flora and fauna. It is precisely because of the relationship to the forest, and the longstanding active participation in its protection, the tribe has been able to preserve, protect, and promote Hupa identity so that the economic development achieved and supported by forestry remains culturally Hupa, serving Hupa cultural needs and goals. This prioritization of the culture, and cultural meanings and uses of the forest, has always informed the Hupa perspective on forest management and timber, as Darin Jarnaghan explains:

> Yeah [the priority] is culture. [The priority is] managing for the landscape and the multiple values, aesthetic being one of the higher priorities, and then financial gain … it's not necessarily the typical order for the land managers in the typical mill who managed for the most money you could get off the land.

This approach is informed by the traditional knowledge about the forest that the tribe developed over thousands of years. It is a knowledge base that actively, explicitly, intentionally informs the everyday experience of tribal officials and forestry staff alike. Many interviewees drew from collective knowledge and person family experiences to explain the ways in which traditional knowledge played an active role in their everyday work. Remembering his grandfather, a "traditional Hupa," Ken Norton, Director of Tribal Environmental Planning Department and Land Management, explained his grandfather's teachings,

> "He would harvest deer, but it was always in a respectful manner… always through a cultural practice… I remember him harvesting the deer and it was always with respect, and he would take the internals and place them for other animals to you know consume… At one point, as I became more aware of the cultural practices and understanding the cultural practices, I understood why we did those teachings, for those reasons. He didn't come out philosophically, sit down with us and say, you know this is the reason why, because it's tied to the

dances and the prayers, you do this because they deserve respect and this is what we believe… He came from a very traditional background and the traditional backgrounds [instructs us to] just use what you can and never overuse the resources and you always treat it with respect.

Ken explained that his grandfather worked in logging like many others on the reservation, an occupation that for many was the only opportunity for waged labor. For Hupa of the early and mid-1900s, like for those of the tribe today, participating in logging was a conflictive experience. On the one hand, they "tore everything up," as Ken explained, implementing destructive BIA clear-cutting logging plans. On the other hand, Ken's grandfather, like others, "had a side of him that related to the responsibilities and the prayers of renewal, and the prayers of treating things with respect, treating all elements of life with respect, and giving back -- and I always remembered him talking about only taking what you need, and never over taking and never killing things just to kill things." The story is a representative example of the ways in which tribal members managed to survive the most destructive periods of extermination and colonization, while keeping key practices, beliefs, and knowledge that not only allows them to remain culturally Hupa but that would eventually lead to a successful forestry and logging enterprise that is characterized by high levels of sustainability practices, sustained income generation, and a culturally prescribed and informed management.

Many of the key teachings of traditional knowledge have since been institutionalized in the tribes' Forestry Management Plan of 1996 and 2011. The 2011 Plan includes a number of sections prescribes tribal policies that protect culturally important flora, fauna, and sites, as in the following examples:

> Cultural sites consist of existing recorded and future recordable ceremonial sites such as the White Deerskin Dance grounds. The overall objective for protection of cultural sites is to preserve their existing conditions. Cultural areas would be managed to mostly maintain the existing cultural, aesthetic, visual and biological resources of most of the areas delineated. The imprint of man would mostly not be noticeable (92).

> Archaeological Resources consist of existing recorded and future recordable archaeological sites. The overall objective for protection of archaeological sites is to preserve their existing conditions, map all sites, and avoid all impact to known archaeological sites from all harvest-related activities (39).

By making these values part of the official policies and practices of forestry management and timber harvesting in the Forest Management Plan, the tribe has achieved a remarkable reversal in practices and conceptualization for forestry compared to those of the BIA and the privately owned mills that processed Hoopa lumber.

In these achievements the tribes have secured key components to the protection, preservation, and promotion of Hupa culture. The forest has played in key role in these achievements, in a circular relationship in which the forestry provided sustenance, protection, and spirituality for the Hupa before European invasion, and especially acutely during the onslaught of Europeans into the areas. In this way, the forest sustained the culture, the people. As a result the culture holds key values around the forest and its crucial role in Hupa survival and

subsistence. The Hupa people, by means of cultural practices, have implemented forestry management and timber harvesting methods that in turn protect the forest, the Trinity River, creeks that feed into the river, and environmentally sensitive and culturally important riparian areas.

When in the early 1990s the tribe took over forest management on the reservation from the BIA, the tribe could have easily taken a profit-oriented approach that disregarded cultural and environmental considerations. The longstanding extremely high rates of poverty on the reservation certainly would be a strong reason to seek quick profits from timber and other forest products (namely mushrooms). Instead the tribe chose to protect the forests based on both a reverence for the role the forest has played in their survival and subsistence traditions, as well as based on the role it was to play in Hupa culture into the future.

One of the key roles that the forest continues to play stands out as an example of the ways in which cultural considerations help explain the complexity and nuance of economic development on Native American reservation, realities that need to be part of the analysis practitioners, planners, funders, and scholars, need to understand in order to support tribally defined and driven development. From a number of the interviews, there was a common theme related to the idea of survival and subsistence: Hupa people rely on a healthy, well-managed forest to be able to practice a subsistence lifeway both because these activities –hunting, gathering, fishing, and the individual and family level resource management the entail—allow a large number of Hupa people on the reservation to supplement their diet and because the activities allow tribal members to practice or enact Hupa identity.

It wasn't possible to accurately ascertain the extent to which tribal members highly relied on hunted and gathered foods as their main source or substantive portion of their daily diet, but there were interviewees who explained that there certainly were many families, especially some further away from the central downtown area, who depended heavily on salmon and deer to meet their nutritional needs. Tribal leaders and forestry department staff were personally knowledgeable about these conditions and explained that they were informed by these critical needs and made significant efforts to support policies and efforts that facilitated access to food. I noted one example earlier, of how the forestry department had a policy of protecting tanoak trees near roads in order to allow easy access to tribal member for acorn collection.

Another example is that the tribe was exploring the expansion of a fish distribution program: Fish for Elders. The program was an effort to manage fish donated by Hupa fishers and get them into the homes of elders in the community. Started in 2012 with 227 donated fish, the program is an example of the need to supplement diets on the reservation as well as the central role of certain foods in traditional Hupa diets. One donor stated, "I want to smoke some fish for my elders, and for the disabled, and for single mothers. My reward would be the elder's faces lighting up when they get a case of fish" (Korns 2013, p. 1). It is conceivable that a nutritional supplement program might be more effective in collecting and distributing commodity goods in terms of prices, ease of distribution, and perishability: for example canned goods. But the decision to distribute salmon is grounded in Hupa culture and identity. It is a traditional food that elders enjoy but it is also a cultural marker; eating Trinity River salmon is a cultural practice that allows Hupa people to express and enact their Hupa identity. The Hoopa Tribe, along with other tribes in the region, have been tireless champions of water and fish protection efforts that have achieved remarkable gains resulting, as noted earlier, in the recent high levels of salmon runs in

the Trinity River. These protection and procurement efforts --procuring *de* jure water and fishing rights—focused on the forest and forest resources has secure the tribes ability to continue to live off of their ancestral lands and to practice key every day and ceremonial acts that reinforce cultural traditions, values and norms.

Darin Jarnaghan, Forestry Department Manager, estimated that upwards of 75 to 80 percent of the people on the reservation supplement their diet out of necessity or out of choice. Though I'm not sure he, or others, would have framed a distinction in that way, the question I asked sought to identify this last point about subsistence, forestry, culture, and development. It was clear that there were many families in need of supplementing their diet, given the high poverty and unemployment rates that have been part of the reservation reality for several decades. Additionally, there are many whose income was high enough to cover the costs of food without needing to supplement their diet with hunted, gathered, and fished foods. Nevertheless, these Hupa tribe members continued to participate in traditional food procurement practices as important markers of Hupa identity. For example, forestry staff explained that they "liked to" hunt, fish and gather, but that by doing so they were also participating in activities that made them Hupa, and that supported the production of Hupa identity in their families and among the communities, teaching others the crafts and knowledge, including younger family members. Under the Forestry Department, the tribe has a Hunter Education Project that aims to teach young people traditional knowledge for hunting. These and other efforts point to the high importance the community places on having access to a health forest in order to continue to practice, express, and enact their Hupa identity.

Chapter 4: Planning, Culture, Sovereignty, and Nation Building

[M]odern statecraft is largely a project of internal colonization, often glossed, as it is in imperial rhetoric, as a "civilizing mission." The builders of the modern nation-state do not merely describe, observe, and map; they strive to shape a people and their landscape that will fit their techniques of observation.

--James C. Scott

Questions around knowledge are at one and the same time questions about power, and planners working in indigenous communities are unavoidably implicated in intersubjective as well as intergroup power relationships.   –Leonie Sandercock

[O]ur challenge today is to reach back into the past and locate the core elements which will play a role in the development of our collective future. Cultural sovereignty is one of those elements, and our struggle to locate our sovereignty is a little bit like coming home. We know who we are and we know the places we were born. Once in a while we may take a journey away, but ultimately, we always come home.   --Coffey and Tsosie

In examining the case of the Hoopa Indian Nation in this dissertation, I have aimed to provide an approach to operationalizing the identification of cultural information in order to draw on culturally relevant and responsive information for economic development efforts in the Native American reservation context. Key scholars in the field have identified cultural components and elements to economic development efforts as critical to the success of development efforts. One of the broader goals of the present study has been to fill the gap in the literature regarding the ways in which practitioners can actively and systematically draw on culture to inform, shape, guide, and legitimize development projects, approaches, and theories on reservations. As I have noted in earlier chapters, the literature is clear regarding the key role that culture plays, but what remained unclear is how and where to find "culture" and cultural information that can be helpful to economic development efforts. In earlier chapters, the present study introduced some of the methods and approaches for locating culture, drawing out critical knowledge, and translating this into inputs for economic development efforts. This case study of the Hoopa Indian Nation needs to be understood in the context in which it has been elaborated: one in which this new terrain of inquiry requires more time, energy, resources, and theorizing than a dissertation could cover. It does, however, illuminate key areas for further research and provides a series of rationales for the values and uses of these approaches, namely the support for self-determined, viable, sustainable, culturally responsive and relevant economic development under self-determined definitions and rubrics related to the ways in which development is assessed: development, success, growth, investment, and goals. The Hupa, like other tribes, has decided in favor of cultural preservation and cultural values over conventional development approaches. All of these areas of the research need further examination and comparative case analysis, beyond the scope and resources of this dissertation.

Leaving the practical questions about the location, knowledge, and operationalizing of cultural information, this chapter turns to a brief discussion about the broader implications that this research has for critical areas of economic development on the reservation. What is known, and for the most part, agreed to by a wide range of key scholars and practitioners of economic development in Native American communities (Cornell 1998, Hibbard and Lane 2008), well as a range of internationally acclaimed scholars (Escobar 1992, Scott 1998, Yiftachel 2001, Sandercock 2001), is that conventional approaches to economic development among indigenous people has be at best a tragic failure and at worst, a savage colonial project of massive exploitation. Critical to understanding the Native American economic development context is the understanding of the link between, on the one hand, late and contemporary planning and development practice and theory, and on the other, the various colonial and extermination policies (in the case of the Hupa, this include Spanish, Mexican, US, and California state policies). Hibbard and Lane summarize it this way:

> Top-down," rationale approaches to land and resource planning, the case study literature reports, disempowered and marginalized indigenous communities, rejected their cultural, religious, and other concerns as irrational, and facilitated the imposition of external values, interests, and plans in indigenous communities and landscapes (2008, p. 147).

Within this context of development, in which "modern statecraft is largely a project of internal colonization" (Scott, 1998, p. 82), the work of Native American nations who have been devising, pursuing, and reaching success in their counter-conventional economic development approaches provides the field with an opportunity to reflect on what these efforts mean for the practice, teaching, and scholarship of field like planning and international development. If, as Scott argues, "many state activities aim at transforming the population, space, and nature under their jurisdiction into the closed systems that offer no surprises and that can best be observed and controlled" (1998, p. 82), what are the implications of Native American tribes achieving economic development using tribal sovereignty powers? In simple terms, these cases can be understood as decolonization projects. However, there are considerations and contexts that complicate the analysis, rendering the situation both difficult to unpack but also providing rich and hopeful analyses from a Native American perspective. For example, there is the complexity of the status of Native American nations vis-à-vis the federal government, and the ever-present threat of Congress's "plenary power" over all Native American nations, which could, in theory, make sweeping changes to Native American communities in favor of national interests. There is a need to examine what it means for Native Americans to have successful economic development, have sovereign tribal governments running all aspects of the tribal life, and have nation-to-nation relations, all within the context of the US settler state having ultimate power over tribal sovereignty.

This study on the role of culture in economic development in the case of the Hoopa Indian Nation, needs to also be seen in the broader context of community and economic development on reservations across the US, and in the context of the fields and disciplines related to these development efforts, namely planning. The experiences of the past few decades in which tribes have had the opportunity to exercise their sovereignty over self-governance, and self-determination provide an opportunity to examine the patterns and trends in these efforts, including lessons learned and analysis for what they mean in terms of culture, sovereignty, and

nation building, as well as prospects for development. This also includes an opportunity to examine the experiences in the range of development-related activities including land-use management, resource development and management, and the range of inputs: labor, investment, social capital, and the like. As Lane observes, the experience with the planning field and practitioners can be understood in "three inter-related themes":

> First, the power of European developmentalism as an ideology in planning processes and its tendency to marginalize indigenous perspectives in planning and decision-making is a common lament. Second, the reduced capacity of indigenous participation in planning and other political processes as a result of the interaction of political, cultural, economic and geographic factors. Third, the dominant epistemology of planning, best encapsulated as the rational-comprehensive paradigm, tends to marginalize indigenous cultural perspectives, discarding them as irrational relics of an earlier age (2006, p. 386).

Against this background of experiences with top-down development, which consist of exogenous development efforts, the case of the Hoopa and other tribes who have managed to survive and are increasingly thriving, reveal the existence of alternative models of development that have succeeded despite the involvement of federal agencies and well-meaning foundations. These successes, small and large, compel an examination of the broader implications and lessons learned for improved methods of development and for the dissemination to other tribes of these practices. Given the limited scope of the present study, the discussion will be limited to a few central, even indispensable concerns for development.

Culture in the Nation Building Era

> We are the land…that is the fundamental idea embedded in Native American life… the Earth is the mind of the people as we are the mind of the earth. The land is not really the place (separate from ourselves) where we act out the drama of our isolate destinies. It is not a means of survival, a setting for our affairs… It is rather part of our being, dynamic, significant, real. It is our self.   -- Paula Gunn Allen

> If the voices and desires of indigenous peoples are to be respected, acknowledged, and to count for something, then… a certain amount of rethinking is necessary within the planning profession.   --Leonie Sandercock

Throughout the literature, as in my interviews with Hupa tribal officials and leaders, the question of land and land tenure remains central to the questions of not only community and economic development but also central to culture, identity, and sovereignty. One of the key lessons for planners and development practitioners is to understand the centrality of land to the variety of issues, concepts, and components of economic development as well as the various components of culture, identity, and sovereignty for Native American communities. Ted Jojola, a long-time, respected, and prominent scholar in the field of Native American economic development provides an exceptional summary on the question, one worth citing at length:

Unlike Western approaches, indigenous planning approaches were formulated on practices associated with land tenure as well as the collective rights associated with inheritance. Land tenure in land-based communities is distinguished by long and sustained patterns of ownership. In the case of indigenous communities, such ownership was sustained over successive generations. Land became the embodiment of collective groups whose intent was to sustain the productivity of the land for those who would inherit it. As such, the assignment of land among families became a birthright and stewardship was the primary means for maintaining it over time. Given this legacy of land tenure, it becomes apparent how traditional communities evolved their own distinctive world-views. Such world-views embody values that are essential for attaining a balanced and symmetrical interrelationship between humankind and the natural ecosystem that it occupies. A world-view functions much in the same way as an ontological blueprint. In other words, it is a long-range collective concept that supersedes an individual's lifetime (2008, p. 37).

Jojola offers insight into the centrality of land to the key concepts of culture, identity, and sovereignty. In this and the section that follows, I discuss these concepts, with an attempt to somewhat isolate them in order to further explore the broader implications of this study on the field. While these concepts are separated here for the sake of an organized approach to the issues, these concepts are in fact inextricably linked and overlap in a variety of ways. As a result, the discussions here will also have some overlap. In the literature, as with my interviews, this has been a formidable challenge, one that is not soon going to be resolved. Among the complex questions, for example, are the following: What is the relationship between culture and sovereignty? How does place, in this case ancestral lands, shape and inform culture and sovereignty? What are the boundaries between culture and sovereignty? That is, where does culture end and sovereignty begin? Obviously, these questions are beyond the scope of this dissertation, but they are important to keep in mind as background to these discussions on culture, identity, and sovereignty to understand the limits and challenges involved in engaging these concepts and trying to draw some lessons and insights from the case study. Nevertheless, these discussions are offered as a contribution to the ongoing and growing debates, conversations, and nation building efforts across the country.

Several important lessons regarding culture provide a useful context for planning practitioners, and tribal leaders interested in pursuing more viable and lasting economic development projects. These lessons, insights, and conclusions provide the appropriate context for the work, tools, approaches, and understandings presented in earlier chapters. They provide a basis for a discussion about the future of Native American economic development. As many interviewees have noted, and as many works in the literature note, the last four decades have seen tribes enact a series of efforts that have resulted in more effective self-governance, self-determination, and in many cases, massive economic development gains. Brought about, in large part, by federal devolution of power to tribes, a hands-off approach rather than an empowerment policy, these changes seem to be just the beginning of the slow but eventual greater Native American renaissance of the 21st century, leading at least a few key scholars, like Robert A. Williams to declare this new period as the Nation building Era of Native American history, leaving the Self-Determination Era of the post 1970s. Key to understanding these changes is, as Zaferatos notes, that "Native American culture and religion are inseparable from tribal policy

development" (2004, p. 94). As true for the Hoopa, as it is for a majority of tribes, this link between policy and culture has to be a point of departure for planners and other development practitioners working in the Native American contest. It is also an insight into at least one source of the ongoing failure of planning and policy to provide viable and lasting development on reservations.

There are various ways to begin to frame these considerations in ways that allow planners and other development practitioners to develop a deeper, more culturally-responsive understanding. For example, as I noted in earlier chapters, by looking at culture through language, we can find information on culturally-based and prescribed values, norms, and behaviors. In doing so, it is also possible to locate key information about the link between on the one hand, culture, identity, and governance, and on the other, land, resources, and space. As Zaferatos notes, "Tribal cultural norms often assign to reservation lands and natural resources a social use value that emphasizes the sustainability of the reservation homeland and a concern for developmental effects that may negatively impact the social community" (2004, p. 94). Planners will notice the stark contrast between this analysis of land and natural resources compared to the conventional theories of economic development, from classic liberal to Marxist.

The Self-Determination Era also coincides with international social movements of indigenous peoples, many with links to Native Americans across the country, which have worked to regain tribal sovereignty and self-governance, as well as to retake tribal lands. These movements (or movement, as some see it), are not only anti-colonial projects, they are also nationalist struggles, as well as what could be called insurgent planning efforts: they are confronting the central practices and values of planning and development practices. As Leonie Sandercock explains, "At the heart of this movement are land claims that are potentially destabilizing of established practices of land-use planning, land management and private property law, all of which are found at the core of planning practice" (2004, p. 119). This point deserves further emphasis. As tribes are increasingly able to hire more outside, non-indigenous planners and development experts, there is a clear need for these fields to provide the kind of training, analysis, and historical context needed to understand not only the local, tribe-centered context, but also the national context of the Nation Building Era (and the development of a culture of tribal power, as I discuss below), as well as the international context of global movements and solidarity work among indigenous people. Sandercock further notes,

In the claims of indigenous peoples for the return of, or access to, their lands, planners are sometimes confronted with values incommensurable with modernist planning and the modernization project which it serves, a planning which privileges 'development' and in which exchange value usually triumphs over use value (2004, p. 119).

These are critical discussions that need to be brought to the forefront of planning for reservations. Typically, these cultural considerations have been relegated to secondary or tertiary concerns, at best. As I note in earlier chapters, the 'cultural turn' has influenced some fields to place cultural concerns at the center of development efforts, but as the cited scholars note, the turn has in large part been rhetorical. Similarly, in planning there has been some effort to include culture in primary discussions of economic development, but these two have overwhelming left out the kinds of cultural issues, values, and norms that tribes know to be central to viable development efforts, the kinds of concerns discussed here. Coffey and Tsosie, like others, have

noted the key role of land in both economic development *and* culture: "This relationship between land and Native people transcends the idea of land as a means of physical survival or subsistence. Land also ensures the cultural survival of Indian people as distinct groups and nations" (2001, p. 205). The profoundly critical importance of land should be clear to planners and practitioners. Moving these cultural considerations from peripheral concerns to central, guiding principles for practitioners is among the first steps for drawing on culture to improve economic development efforts.

> Coffey and Tsosie go on to further explain;

> For Native peoples, land is often constitutive of cultural identity. Many Indian tribes identify their origin as distinct people with a particular geographic site, such as a river, mountain, or valley, which becomes a central feature of the group's religion and cultural world view… Thus, the efforts of Native peoples to repatriate the sacred lands that were forcibly taken from them comprise some of the most compelling instances of cultural sovereignty (2001, p. 205).

The Hoopa, like so many other tribes, continue to relate to, engage with, and use ancestral lands that are not currently part of their recognized reservations lands. They also continue to try to purchase land held by non-Hupa people. As noted earlier, federal policies have left many reservation lands in a checker board pattern of tribally and non-native held land tenure patterns. As a result, land parcels may be within the area of the reservation area but are titled to non-Native owners.

> During my research, Ken Norton, director of the tribe's Tribal Environmental Protection Agency (TEPA) described his work in leading the tribe's efforts to purchase non-Native held lands, noting that this was a high priority for the tribe. He was clear about the vision that the tribe had for recuperating these lands and the connection to cultural survival, identity and sovereignty. Similarly he links sovereignty with their struggle to have their water rights respected and the adequate amount of water is released on the Trinity River that cuts through the reservation and which has the kinds of cultural and identity meanings and values described by Coffey and Tsosie: "a central feature of the group's religion and cultural world view" (2001, p. 205). Ken Norton explains;

> [I]t's going to be the big one, right here it's going to be the management of water. That's where sovereign issues are going to be played out…We know right now that our war chest, our big guns and protecting who we are as an identity… is currently the next phase of our survivability, is in regards to maintaining water within the reservation, the free flowing of water that prevents the salmon and there's going to be a continual assault. That's the next termination act to Indians is water. Diverting the water to the "greater good", to southern California, the population is growing exponentially and the tribes will have to assert their jurisdiction as entities under their inherent rights and those are going to have to have a big war chest… the assault is continuing, they're looking at how to dismantle our arguments and retake that water and take it back down and it's that evolving mechanism or that evolving legal statements or that evolving narrative that we have to become always aware, for… the litigations, we have to be aware

and become knowledgeable and understand… the case laws and the politics and develop what I need to

Norton's discussion serves as an example of the overlapping complexity of these issues and the kinds of operationalization of cultural information that is needed for better planning and economic development on reservations. It is the kind of information that planners and development experts need to both begin with as a point of departure –the "background" context—but also, and what this dissertation aims to impress convincingly, is that these practitioners need to draw on these kinds of "traditional knowledge" bases for the envisioning, development, implementation, evaluation, and growth of development plans on the reservation. In earlier chapters, I discuss the relatively empty rhetoric of the development field in its acknowledgement of traditional knowledge and culture as important and in its failure to significantly and successfully integrate that knowledge in any meaningful way. That experience is a cautionary tale for planners and development experts working on Native American reservations to avoid similar practices by only engaging cursorily in these critical, profound concerns. These issues are not "background" or simply "context." They are experienced by the communities as critically important considerations, which itself is reason enough to require planners and practitioners to take these as seriously as communities demand. Moreover, as I have argued in earlier chapters, they are in fact an important source of very critical and useful information for developing the appropriate and culturally relevant tools, methods, approaches, models, and discourses for Native American development on the reservation.

Under these terms indigenous knowledge-centered efforts can be understood as yet another alternative planning approach, among others that also have challenged conventional planning including insurgent planning. As I discuss above, the principles of Native American-centered development efforts are in stark contrast to many conventional planning tenets and practices. As a result, these models that are being developed in Native American communities are part of a larger effort to change planning and development, in both theory and practice. Clammer provides a helpful analysis;

> We are all aware of the common perception of there being a widespread crisis in or of 'development' as a practice, and certainly in development theory. In practice, the 'great development failures' (Scott 1998, p. 37) —and their environmental consequences—have brought the whole project of growth, poverty, and democratization into question. In theory, the 'impasse' in development thinking (Schuurman 1996) has left what, given the magnitude and human centrality of the issues that it addresses, should be the most imaginative and creative areas of social thought, trapped within a narrow range of conventional options (classical Marxist, neo-Marxist, or neo-liberal), very weak on alternatives or visionary thinking and still mired in the economism deplored in principle by its more sociological exponents (2005, p. 102).

Clammer notes some of key concerns for the field, concerns that planners need to engage with in general but especially those working in Native American communities. These include the recognition of the crisis in development practice and theory. Many economic development projects continue to be drawn from conventional, increasingly obsolete, planning practices and theories. The Native American context provides an opportunity to develop both practices and theories that engage alternative approaches. Like many other scholars, namely Scott, Escobar,

Sandercock, Clammer also recognizes that "great development failures," which for indigenous people have been more than failures, but intended catastrophes. In addition to noting the concomitant environmental devastations, Clammer also notes such critical issues in the "impasse" as the questioning of the "whole project of growth," the bases of contemporary liberal economic practice, as well as the prospects for democratic governance in these contexts. Lastly, Clammer notes the field as "very weak on alternatives or visionary thinking" and that as a result, there are many who are "calling for the abandonment of the term 'development' altogether, arguing with some justification that it represents simply the latest phase of colonialism, but this time wrapped up in more user-friendly terms such as 'globalization'" (2005, p. 102). This is the context in which Native American economic development is being pursued and it is the kind of critically important understanding that planners and practitioners need to have in order to engage the challenges and opportunities found on reservations. The impasse in development can be seen as a major opportunity for indigenous-centered kinds of development tools, methods, and models to be developed, the kinds of approaches that are strong alternative with visionary thinking, and which are grounded in the very knowledge that planning has conventionally ignored and development has sought to marginalize.

Clammer is concerned with the larger context of these development-and-culture debates, and not with indigenous people per se. He and others are calling for major changes in development practice and theory. He writes, "..we need not abandon the notion of development, so much as to attempt to redefine it radically, to create a new lexicon for talking about and witnessing the inequalities and distortions of the contemporary world order.." (Clammer 2005, p. 102). In describing various efforts and scholars who have pursued this radicalization of development practice and theory (anti-corporatism, sustainability, eco-socialist, mixed economy, technological liberationism, social movements, civil society) he notes the common characteristic among them: the centrality of culture. He writes:

> Common to all of these approaches is a central concern with culture. Not only is development seen as (rightly) as much a political process and a politically contested terrain as it is an economic one, but also development is viewed as pre-eminently a social and cultural process. It is one that is based upon, transforms, or destroys cultures, both as a whole and as represented in the elements that anthropologists often identify as characteristic of culture – values, systems of belief, material artifacts, expressive, and performative practices, modes of livelihood, kinship patterns and strategies, and so forth. What they all recommend is to put culture back into the analysis of social change and into the analysis of stubborn development problems such as why poverty apparently will not go away despite the resources and variety of policy options devoted to its eradication, not only as a theoretical move, but with the very practical intention of suggesting solutions (Clammer 2005, p. 102).

In these analyses, culture is a source of understanding the socially-formed definitions and understanding of such concepts as development and growth. The analyses also centers cultures as a source for understanding the pernicious problems and for developing new approaches. These analytical frameworks are a clear and significant departure from earlier conventional development efforts, a remarkable shift in the field. But most important to the context of Native American economic development is the fact that these analyses have been deployed among

Native American scholars, activist, leaders, and practitioners for several decades. The impasse, the cultural shift, as the fragmenting of schools of thought in planning and development seems to have opened the discourses to indigenous knowledge-based analyses, affording legitimacy to the work of tribes and Indigenist scholars of the last few decades. The analysis and the framework that Clammer, and others have begun to develop, provide a lens from a more mainstream perspective on the value, depth, scope, and the stakes in thinking about and practicing economic development on reservations. This framework provides a way to understand and to make legible the concerns and priorities of Native Americans regarding development, culture, identity, sovereignty, and indigenous-centered development models and theories.

A number of scholars have shown the planning histories of Native American communities long before the Anglo-US tradition of city planning was introduced. One of the key scholars in this regard has been Ted Jojola, who writes, "Before traditional authority had been wrestled away from or usurped by Euro-Western agencies, tribal societies actively planned their communities (2008, p. 37). Despite the long traditions of pre-Colombian and colonial-contemporary planning among Native American in the US, including irrigation, sewage, governance institutions, land use, and other planning areas, the literature on Native American, historical or contemporary is woefully limited. The lack of literature on Native American economic development examined through an explicit planning lens leaves any analysis in this area without the benefit of a body of knowledge to draw on to theories about the link between planning practice and Native American knowledge. However, key scholars Hibbard and Lane have produced a number of key works that help reconcile some of the conflicts between planning and Native American economic development. While some scholars like Sandercock (2004) argue for alternative planning approaches that go beyond the State, Hibbard and Lane see opportunities with the existing political, social, and economic contexts to work within planning to shift the field. They identify two "personalities" of planning, one in which there is hope for responsive planning practices and one that will remain entrenched in conventional approaches. They write, "While indigenous peoples have long suffered the repressive and dominating effects of planning, as commentators such as Escobar (1992) and Yiftachel (2001) have remarked, they have also glimpsed the emancipatory and transformative potential of planning that Friedmann (2002), in particular, has charted" (2008, p. 148). But this potential of planning has to be understood in the context in which, "…the historic failure of state-directed planning processes to recognize and validate indigenous knowledges has been an ongoing source of frustration for indigenous communities" and in the context where there is "the assumption by non-indigenous members of society that indigenous knowledge has been lost through dispossession (Sandercock, 2004, p. 122). The responsibility of the planner in this sense is to become as familiar with these contexts and cultural priorities as she is with the other key areas of planning in rural areas: job markets, export potential, natural resource extraction opportunities, investment potential, and the accessibility of various kinds of capital. In placing the cultural, historical, and social considerations at the same priority level as other development considerations, planner and practitioners have a chance of developing tools, methods, models, and approaches to culturally-relevant and viable economic development.

Central to any project in Native American communities is the participation of the community. This is a lesson that has been seen in development projects throughout Native American communities. In chapter 2, I discuss the Hoopa Tribe's recent experience with the question of commercial fishing. The tribe voted to ban all commercial fishing on the reservation

during a time when there had been, and there was predicted to continue to be, a record number of salmon in the Trinity River— a success in river restoration and fisheries management that is largely due to the activism and leadership of key members of the Hoopa Tribe. One of the main complaints from the opponents of commercial fishing was that the fishing that was taking place before the ban, against which the ban had responded, had been done by only a handful of people to the great personal benefit of those individuals and their families. Most families did not have the equipment needed to engage in commercial fishing, namely large motorboats that could allow them to get access to the deeper, more fish-heavy areas of the river. While the claims were on cultural grounds –commercial fishing is not the Hupa way—there was also the idea that the collectivism of the tribe dictated more inclusive participation in decision-making, in fishing, and in sharing the benefits, especially to seniors who are no longer able to fish for themselves but for whom salmon remains not only a critical food staple but also a major culturally-significant food.

The case illustrates the need for planners and practitioners to engage in the "mobilization and participation of indigenous groups," a critical component to planning which "is central to the future of both their communities and their landscapes" (Hibbard and Lane, 2008, p. 148). At the same time, as Zaferatos notes, "planning should carefully protect the community's cultural stability, ensure the sustainability of reservation natural resources and, especially, foster the abatement of cultural alienation" (2004, p. 94). Part of this abatement against cultural alienation must begin with the recognition of the centrality of land, and an understanding of the links to sovereignty, as Hibbard and Lane explain:

> Regaining control over custodial lands and the (sometimes) valuable resources
> they contain is a project of great symbolic importance for indigenous peoples, one
> that has often been vigorously resisted by both states and majority populations. It
> is also of profound practical importance: indigenous peoples see sovereignty as a
> means of rebuilding community and culture and ameliorating the pernicious
> legacies of contact and dispossession (Lane 2004, p. 103).

The excerpt touches on two final thoughts to add to the discussion. First is the idea of symbolic value and importance of a number of these considerations. Few tangible gains could represent cultural survival and tribal renaissance more than the power and wherewithal for tribes to be able to reclaim ancestral and reservation lands. It may be a little perplexing for outsiders to see the great effort and expense involved in the struggle to regain tribal lands. The Hoopa case provides an opportunity to illustrate this. I have noted in earlier chapters that from an outsider's perspective it is sometimes difficult to understand the rationale behind the commercial fishing ban given not only the predicted record salmon but especially given the dire poverty and unemployment rates on the reservation. Similarly, it was at first difficult to reconcile the tribe's efforts and expenses to surround land acquisitions given the context of poverty on the reservation. In an area with such high unemployment it would seem that there would be other more urgent priorities for tribal budget expenses. However, in speaking to Ken Norton of the tribe's TEPA office, it became clear that purchasing land was not simply to close the gaps in the reservation's checkerboard tribal land holdings, but it was representative of the tribe's sovereignty and self-determination. It symbolized the power of the tribe in managing its lands, governing its people, and building the capacity of the tribal nation. Indeed, Ken Norton spoke with great pride and hopefulness about this aspect of his work. For planners and development practitioners, this is an important lesson to consider. What may seem incongruous in

conventional planning often has multiple meanings and multiple purposes in the tribal planning and development context. It is important to look for the symbolic and social values and meanings of projects and approaches. For many tribes, as with the Hoopa, the improvement they have managed has taken a significant amount of time and they understand that the next set of gains will similarly take time, which means that priorities under a long-term plan look different to those seeking overnight changes and making assumptions about priorities. The work of regaining tribal lands and of protecting and reclaiming river water rights serves multiple purposes simultaneously, some directly related to development, others related to social cohesion, community healing and mobilization, and reclaiming sacred spaces, sacred materials, and ceremonial materials. It is critical to understand the symbolic value of tribally-determined projects outside of the rationale of conventional planning and development.

The second important point in the excerpt, "of profound practical importance," is related to the topic of the next section: sovereignty. For Native Americans, as with many indigenous people in Anglo settler states (Canada, Australia, New Zealand), sovereignty is understood as a critical means of nation building, protecting culture and as a way to remedy the consequence of "the pernicious legacies of contact and dispossession" (2004, p. 103). Lane highlights the link between sovereignty, culture, survival, revival, and, I would argue, consequently to development, as defined, practiced, and experienced by Native American communities. In early chapters, I have shown that in the case of the Hoopa, as with cases across the literature, indigenous peoples have pursued alternative, or enhanced, "development" goals. Among these goals are cultural integrity and revival, community healing, protection of tribal land tenure, protection of land and resources, and the capacity and freedom for self-governance. All of these goals are directly related to the kind development outcomes that tribes are pursuing. As a result, the link between sovereignty, culture, identity, land, and development is more readily understood and made legible.

Sovereignty and Indigenous Planning

Planning in reservation communities is fundamentally a political process that seeks to advance the autonomy of tribal nations through the exercise of political sovereignty.   --Zaferatos

The way our Ancestors used to think about the things they believed in was perhaps their greatest attribute. They died for their most central beliefs and gave their lives for their most critical possessions. Because of this we are here today. Cultural sovereignty is their legacy to us.   --Coffey and Tsosie

Readers who are familiar with the extensive literature on nation building and sovereignty in the international context may find the present discussions lacking an engagement with some of the literature on nation building in Eastern Europe, or the debates around sovereignty in East Asia. Early in the research process it became clear that "sovereignty" and "tribal sovereignty" in the literature on Native American economic development and politics where not closely-enough related to the kinds of sovereignty debates in other fields. There are, of course, areas of convergence, and some scholars writing about Native American contexts are beginning to

engage those discussions. However, the case of tribal sovereignty as experienced in the US and Canada is exceedingly unique. Even in the international indigenous sovereignty movement that I mentioned earlier, it is often difficult to make comparisons with Native Nations in the US and Canada, given both the history of boarding schools in the US, and the rights and powers afforded by the status of sovereign nations. Similarly, comparisons between tribal sovereignty and the national sovereignty of a country fail to render useful analyses, at least for the questions and concerns of the present study.

This section aims to provide discussion on the implications of operationalized culturally-relevant development effort on tribal sovereignty through an examination of some of the key concerns and considerations related to the overlapping and inextricably linked concepts of culture, identity, development, land, governance, and nation building. The point of departure for any discussion on tribal sovereignty is the recognition of the often dire circumstances under which tribes have been trying to reassert sovereign powers and rights. Moreover, as many scholars have noted, the efforts are severely constrained by the fact that the efforts are done in the context of a mainstream culture whose values and norms are often in conflict with tribal cultures. As Sandercock writes, "In struggling for rights and sovereignty, [tribes] are… operating in and through Western political and legal structures" (2004, p. 121). Legal scholar, and preeminent federal Indian law and policy scholar, Robert A. Williams, has written extensively on the challenge of tribes dealing with Western institutions, from the 1455 Papal Doctrine of Discovery (*The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest*, 1990) to role of Supreme Court Chief Justice Renquist on key court cases (*Like a Loaded Weapon: The Rehnquist Court, Indian Rights and the Legal History of Racism in America*, 2005).

The unfortunate experiences with political and legal institutions, according to many scholars, provide the rationale for seeking development outside of these structures. Others remain convinced that tribes can change key institutions and use conventional planning and development means to pursue Native American goals. Out of these debates emerge a diversity of discourses surrounding sovereignty, including its uses, nature, and definition. Consequently, a discussion about tribal sovereignty quickly becomes complicated, and even controversial, with schools of thought vying for prominence and adherents. Still, the Hoopa case, and the discussions and findings of early chapters provide a helpful set of guiding experiences to explore the implications of operationalizing culture in economic development on tribal sovereignty.

As with the earlier discussion on culture, the topic of tribal sovereignty also includes a myriad of interrelated concerns, issues, and concepts. In order to understand the complexity of the struggle for sovereignty, it is necessary to also understand the ways in which these struggles are linked to other key concerns. Coffey and Tsosie provide a helpful summary analysis;

> Contemporary legal battles center around the concept of political sovereignty as Indian nations attempt to define and defend the boundaries of their jurisdictional authority. However, these legal struggles for political sovereignty coincide with a larger battle: the battle to protect and defend tribal cultures from the multitude of forces that threaten the cultural survival of Indian nations. After enduring nearly two centuries of government policies directed at the forcible assimilation of Indian people, we stand at a moment in time in which our languages, ceremonies, and ways of life are increasingly jeopardized by the forces of mass media, the

educational system, and a host of court decisions failing to protect the religious or cultural rights of Native peoples (2001, p 196).

Sovereignty is often understood in the first instance as political sovereignty, but, as the excerpt notes, these struggles over territorial boundaries and jurisdictional power are at the same time struggles to protect tribal cultures –"languages, ceremonies, and ways of life"—against the massive forces of assimilation, dispossession, and disempowerment, including "a host of court decisions."

It is possible to group the concerns regarding tribal sovereignty "in terms of three interlocking matters: how to have some measure of political autonomy; how to maintain particular sets of social relations and more or less distinct cultural orders; and how to maintain or regain control over resources, especially land" (Hibbard and Lane, 2004, p. 97). Like Coffey and Tsosie, among others, Hibbard and Lane highlight the link between struggles for tribal sovereignty with political, cultural, and identity concerns of tribes.

Another critical lesson for understanding Native American economic development on the reservation has to do with the role of planning in the context under which demands for tribal sovereignty emerge. According to Hibbard and Lane, tribes began to demand tribal sovereignty as a result of the "failure of state-directed planning to accommodate, respect and give expression to their interests. The failure of planning… is implicated in the… demand for indigenous control of relevant planning processes." They add that, "for indigenous people, sovereignty offers decolonized relations with the settler state, self-government, and the means of controlling custodial lands and protecting cultural heritage" (2004, pp. 97-99). This excerpt highlights the link between conventional planning, sovereignty, nation building, land, and culture. Additionally, it is critical for planners to understand and deal with the issues of power, knowledge and "expertise."

The present study has been developed in an effort to contribute to the ongoing conversation and debates involving a number of fields, including Native American community and economic development, planning, development theory, and practice, among others. While the thrust of the work has been to help operationalize the role of culture in economic development, the study is not intended to provide answers. Instead it mirrors the work of Coffey and Tsosie in an effort to, "to open a dialogue about sovereignty and our collective future that is generated from within… tribal communities, rather than as a defensive response to attacks from outside" (2001, p 192). To that end, in addition to the political sovereignty efforts described above, the section also includes a discussion of cultural sovereignty and inherent sovereignty, iterations of the sovereignty discourse, with similar characteristics and goals, but with some important differences. Political sovereignty is generally characterized by its effort to interface with the state, with federal agencies and institutions, in an effort to seek recognition of tribal rights. Some scholars have argued for different approaches, and different definitions of sovereignty, ones that return to tribe itself for definition and legitimacy. Among those scholars are Coffey and Tsosie who write:

> The concept of cultural sovereignty is valuable because it allows us, as Native
> people, to chart a course for the future. In that sense, cultural sovereignty may
> well become a tool to protect our rights to language, religion, art, tradition, and
> the distinctive norms and customs that guide our societies. Indeed, cultural

sovereignty may ultimately prove to be our most valuable legal tool (2001, p. 196).

In this definition, the authors argue for a similar understanding as the more conventional understanding of sovereignty. However, they go on to qualify the statement, saying, "it is important to construct this tool from within our Native societies, rather than looking to external definitions of "sovereignty" to determine what the concept means (2001, p. 196). They warn against the pattern of Native American communities being "forced to litigate our rights within the dominant society's appraisal of tribal sovereignty" (2001, p. 196). This last comment speaks to the desire of these scholars to reject the pattern of tribes looking to Western legal and political structures for definitions and legitimacy. They recognize the conflict of interest in seeking affirmation of sovereignty from the very settler state that both limits tribal sovereignty and territory, and at the same time has the plenary power to rescind or award federal recognition, meaning the state retains the power to eliminate a tribe's status as a sovereign nation. Citing Dagmar Thorpe Coffey and Tsosie write:

> If we permit our existence to be solely defined by Euro-American law, we give the United States the power to define who we are and who we are not. If we follow the original instructions given to our people, then no one has the right to seize, define, or diminish the sovereignty of our people because this sovereignty comes from a higher power. If we follow the Euro-American definition, we submit to the will of a government which was conceived with the intention to destroy our ways of life. (2001, p. 209).

Coffey and Tsosie call for an operationalization locating tribal sovereignty: "[O]ur challenge today is to reach back into the past and locate the core elements which will play a role in the development of our collective future. Cultural sovereignty is one of those elements" (2001, p 196). The go on to explain, "our struggle to locate our sovereignty is a little bit like coming home. We know who we are and we know the places where we were born. Once in a while we may take a journey away, but ultimately, we always come home" (2001, p 196). This "coming home" seems to parallel the experiences I describe in chapter 2 related to the interviewees with language teachers who explained that in learning the language, students reported having significant changes in, for example, their cultural and social awareness, causing them to improve the way they interacted with each other. A similar process is involved in the development of tribal sovereignty in the face of the journey tribes were forced to take away from their homelands, their language, and their cultures, and in light of the journey home they have been involved with throughout, but especially in the last forty years.

The value, depth, and scope of the implications of effective tribal sovereignty cannot be overstated. For many tribes, sovereignty is at the heart of all of the key issues, concerns, projects, and tribal plans. It is the rationale for the rights and powers that Native American communities exercise, which are not available any other group in the US. It is also the basis of tribal cultures, identities, and their link to tribal lands and culturally meaningful "natural resources". Jessica Cattelino's study of the Seminoles in Florida offers clear insight into the importance and value of sovereignty:

…Seminoles assert that gaming wealth emerges from their sovereignty and facilitates its exercise through social service provision, natural resource management, economic development, direct benefits support to tribal citizens, cultural production, and an ever-growing array of governmental activities (2010, pp. 236-237).

In addition to providing further evidence for the claim about the critical importance of the link between culture, development, and sovereignty, the quote also provides support for the claim that these links are related to many, if not all, of the key activities in the tribe, those that are at once the most critical to their survival and integrity, and the most pertinent to development and governance. One of the goals of these discussions is to point toward an operationalization of these best practices, including, here, an approach to developing tribal sovereignty. According to Coffey and Tsosie, this alternative vision of tribal sovereignty "ultimately depends upon the willingness of Indian nations, including their leaders, attorneys, and citizens, to engage in a dialogue about what cultural sovereignty means and how it can be used to protect the collective future of Indian people" (2001, p. 191-192). They mention the concept of "the collective future of Indian people" as the context for these deliberations, and not just the individual tribe engaging in the dialogue. This is a major point to examine, but one I leave for the next chapter. I return to the idea of the implications of this study and these findings on an understanding of pan-Indian sovereignty project and what I am calling a "culture of tribal power". Returning to the discussion on the role of sovereignty in the multiple key areas of concern, the Hoopa case provides a helpful example.

Interviews with the Hoopa reveal that the tribe has a clear vision about the central role of sovereignty in the variety of nation building, development, and cultural projects that the tribe is involved with. These include the increasing jurisdiction that the tribe continues to wrest from federal and state agencies related to governance as well as water management, forest management, and judicial and police powers. Ken Norton, director of the tribe's TEPA, made the distinction between the conventional political sovereignty concept envisioned vis-à-vis the relationship to the federal government, and "inherent sovereignty." Norton explained that the former is understood as a concept developed from the internal-colonization status as "domestic dependent nations," the official status of Native American nations in the US. Inherent sovereignty, as he and others define it, is the sovereignty tribes have had since before European colonization. This concept includes all the rights and powers identified by the tribe itself, in its own understanding of its nationhood and sense of community as a people. Coffey and Tsosie have a similar understanding when they write, "Inherent sovereignty is not dependent upon any grant, gift or acknowledgment by the federal government. It pre-exists the arrival of the European people and the formation of the United States. Cultural sovereignty is inherent in every sense of that word, and it is up to Indian people to define, assert, protect, and insist upon respect for that right (Coffey and Tsosie, 2001, p 196).

There are also other important areas of rights and powers related to tribal sovereignty, some of which are related to land, sacred spaces, and repatriation efforts. The excerpt from Coffey and Tsosie serves as a helpful summary for some of the key ideas for this chapter, as a way to begin to close out the discussions, and to introduce another important link between culture, sovereignty, development, and identity. They write:

… [C]ultural sovereignty, as it relates to land and resources, is being exercised in a number of ways today, as Indian nations attempt to rebuild their landbases and mitigate the devastating legacy of allotment. Many Indian nations are acquiring lands outside the reservation and attempting to place them in trust status. Some Indian nations are exploring ways to protect cultural resources located off the reservation, within the boundaries of their traditional lands. And Indian nations are litigating to preserve their treaty rights to hunt, fish, and gather resources outside the reservation. The crucial intersection of political and cultural sovereignty is represented by each of these efforts. Perhaps the most compelling examples of cultural sovereignty, however, are the cases in which Native people actually fought for and achieved repatriation of sacred lands… Of course, the tangible repatriation of Native culture represented by the return of ancestral remains and cultural objects is only one aspect of cultural restoration. Restoration of language, spirituality, and Native educational systems are other components of the repatriation of culture (2001, p. 205).

The struggle to return ancestral remains and ceremonial objects has increasingly drawn on sovereignty claims by a variety of tribes.

Coffer and Tsosie differentiate between political and cultural sovereignty, a debate that is outside the scope of this study, but for planners and development practitioners, the key lesson is to understand the wide range of efforts and issues related to tribal sovereignty, and the profoundly intimate issues related to these issue, such as the repatriation of ancestral remains and ceremonial objects. Similarly, it is critical for planners to understand the profound and inextricable links between sovereignty, culture, identity, survival, renaissance, land --ancestral and tribal lands (lands to which tribes were moved on to as reservations), landscape features, and the resources within the land-- and the nation building efforts of each tribe and the pan-Native American efforts as well. This is a critical piece, as Jojola writes, "As long as they are able to sustain their territories, then the values associated with land-tenure should allow them to harbor a sense of identity" (Jojola, 2000, p, 14). This point parallels arguments I introduced in an early chapter, showing, for example, that language contains values, norms, and guidance. Jojola seems to be arguing something similar when he notes that land-tenure provides access to and knowledge of tribal values which in turn promotes and protects tribal identity. The present study has shown the power of language learning on the behavior and cultural awareness of language learner, and the power the values have in informing and shaping development efforts, as with the case of the Hoopa Tribal Forestry practices.

Remarkably, the relationship between land, culture, identity, development, and nation building remains strong among the majority of tribes regardless of the level of "assimilation." As Jojola has argued, "understanding of the traditional world-view has become lost [in some tribes], in others fragmented, and in others secularized. In spite of this, indigenous people have always held onto the basic belief that their collective responsibility is to become the principle stewards of the land" (2000, p. 14). This discussion shows the profoundly important role that land plays in economic development, culture, and tribal sovereignty. It is difficult to overstate how critical it is for planners and development practitioners to understand these concepts and their interconnectedness and interdependence from the perspective of Native American communities.

Earlier in this chapter, and in earlier chapters of the dissertation, I have noted that the key Indigenist scholars like Ted Jojola have argued for some time for the recognition of pre-Columbian indigenous planning and the recognition of indigenous planning that has taken place outside of the Anglo-US history of city and regional planning (Jojola 1997, 1998, 2013). He writes, "Planning… was not a concept imposed on indigenous people by Euro-Americans. Indigenous communities existed in myriad highly coordinated and planned towns and villages… [G]reat native civilizations, such as those of the Aztec and the Inca, indigenous people… established urban centers equal to any European centers of the same period" (1998, p. 101). At the same time that these scholars call for a recognition of Native American urban planning histories, traditions, and achievement, others would also caution against trying to gain acknowledge from Anglo-US planning as a goal, and they would caution against juxtaposing urbanized, settled communities against tribes who choose to live more "nomadic" ways of life. In seeking recognition for urban achievements the analysis could threaten to reify the urban to the detriment of other ways of life. Nevertheless, there is increased interest in drawing from these traditional knowledge bases and planning histories to inform both local tribal planning as well as the national movement for tribal sovereignty as it related to planning and development.

To date there doesn't seem to be agreement, at least not in the literature, regarding what many now refer to as Indigenous Planning, despite the above-referenced histories, the now four decades long experiences with contemporary planning (often a hybrid of traditional practices and conventional planning), and despite such events as the establishment of an Indigenous Planning Division in the American Planning Association in 2004. From the Division's website;

> The Indigenous Planning Division advocates community development based on land-tenure principles and informed by the distinctive worldviews of indigenous peoples. Members are committed to social, economic, and political change and welcome all those interested in sustaining traditional indigenous approaches to planning… This effort has been long forthcoming and is the result of many years of discussions among tribal planners and indigenous practitioners throughout the country. It has been established to fill a critical void that exists among professionals and will serve to bring visibility and give credibility to the unique and necessary planning approaches that have evolved on indigenous lands and among their communities. We consider this a place for anyone who is interested and involved with communities that sustain traditions that are tied to land-tenure and cultural identity (APA 2013).

The Division reflects the kinds of tribal concerns, worldviews, and priorities discussed in this chapter, as this excerpt from their web site indicates. But again, despite the commonalities among proponents of indigenous-centered planning, there doesn't appear to be consensus on what exactly constitutes Indigenous Planning. That shouldn't be surprising given the increasingly fragmented nature of conventional contemporary planning, and the accompanying heated debates around the role of the planner, the role of the state, and the responsibilities of planning to advocate for the powerless or to serve development priorities. Additionally, like any large project, the unfolding and development of Indigenous Planning have proceeded slowly, with the literature being limited and slow to publish. Even the Indigenous Planning Division's website indicated that is it "presently under development."

There are of course a number of scholars and practitioners who are engaged in the development and promotion of indigenous planning, among them Jojola, who writes:

> Indigenous planning represents both an approach to community planning and an ideological movement. What distinguishes indigenous planning from mainstream practice is reformulation of planning approaches in a manner that incorporates "traditional" knowledge and cultural identity. Key to the process is the acknowledgement of an indigenous world-view, which not only serve to unite it philosophically, but also to distinguish it from neighboring, non-land-based communities (2008, p. 45).

There are several key points regarding indigenous planning that are critical to understand the context of Native American economic development on reservations. Jojola notes the aspect of "ideological movement" of indigenous planning. In the next chapter I conclude the dissertation with a discussion on this idea of planning, development, and nation building among Native American Nations constituting a national project toward the construction of a culture of tribal power. Here the point serves to further examine what development and planning mean in the context of nation building with regard to culture and sovereignty, and how the ideas of political sovereignty, cultural sovereignty, and inherent sovereignty, all of which share common core values and goals, are mobilized and deployed on reservations as planning tools, methods, and approaches in ways that conventional Anglo-US planning has failed to account for in practice or in planning theory.

In chapter 3 I discussed the literature on traditional knowledge and the failure of development and planning fields, among others, to make the work of putting local knowledge and culture at the forefront of their work as something more than rhetorical changes. In stark contrast, indigenous planning distinguishes itself from these fields in that it prioritizes traditional knowledge in the work. It draws directly from the culture and the tribal knowledge, including sensibilities around what kinds of development projects are most compatible with the tribe's history and preferences. Moreover, indigenous planning is also conceived of not just a means to planning and development but also as an end, a goal of planning it. Throughout the case study data that I present on the Hoopa, I have shown a variety of ways that culture and traditional knowledge and practices have been envisioned and implemented as a way to reclaim, revive, protect, and promote Hupa culture beyond the production of culture: they are nation building, development efforts.

The case of Hoopa Tribal Forestry is perhaps the strongest example of these kinds of efforts which rely on culture and tribal knowledge to conduct forestry and timber management in a culturally-relevant way and which in turn supports the tribe's effort to exercise and grow their tribal sovereignty. Surrounding communities have implemented community forestry to build and support communities, as with the case of the City of Arcata's Community Forest, the "first municipally owned forest in the State of California", intended to be "managed for the benefit of all citizens of the city, with attention to watershed, recreation, timber management, and other values" (Humboldt Times in City of Arcata). But, as I discussed in chapter 3, while forestry builds communities, tribal forestry and the related development, planning, and sovereignty efforts are intended to build nations.

One of the most salient differences in indigenous planning is the way in which tribes and tribal members are portrayed, envisioned, and inserted into planning and development methods and approaches. In conventional planning and development, there is the sense, to a greater or lesser extent (depending, it seems, on the degree to which the planner or practitioner has integrated the rhetoric of placing communities at the center), that tribes and tribal members are victims, that they and their culture are deficient (or not indigenous enough), and are often simply literally left out of the process, and figuratively, in that planning is imagined in cookie-cutter development project approaches that may have worked in a similar rural but non-native context. Indigenous planning as a concept, a social movement, and as the set of principles, practices, and methods, is seeing an endogenous answer to the failures of conventional planning and development, and is increasing being received and pursued with great hope, as Hibbard and Lane note, "Indigenous community-based planning represents an exciting change in 'Indian Country' partly because it sweeps away the construction of indigenous peoples as passive victims, but mostly because it is assisting indigenous groups to regain control of their lands and communities" (2008, p. 146).

The other danger for Native American communities from conventional planning and development methods and practices is one that tribes have long fought and critiqued; the exploitation of intellectual property, and cultural knowledge. Sandercock explains:

> …[T]he trend for Western consultants and academics to make forays into indigenous communities, to conduct research and then take that knowledge away with them, continues. (This is a modernist version of the colonial practice of robbing the graves of 'the natives' and bringing their skeletons to Western museums and scientific laboratories). Rarely is the information produced by consultants shared with the indigenous communities whom they have plundered. Rarely are indigenous people involved in the co-production of new knowledge (2004, p. 122).

Indigenous planning provides tribes with a framework and a series of methods and approaches that can offer protection against the theft and misuse of tribal knowledge by outsiders. While tribes will have to engage within the existing political, social, and economic structures and institutions related to their domestic dependent nations status, as well as the nature of development and planning funding patterns and practices. It is important to understand that the "knowledge and values underpinning such state processes and structures constitute the rules of the game at the moment and cannot be done away with" (Sandercock, 2004, p. 121). Sandercock also reminds us that there is a role for well-informed (and not just "well-intentioned") outsiders: "Non-indigenous planners with knowledge of these structures can assist indigenous organizations in operating in the current political environment, while also working to change that environment in ways that would, for example, recognize indigenous knowledge (2004, p. 121). Interviews with the Hupa revealed this similar sentiment that there is a role for outsiders to play; with tribes being in control of planning and development, but that there was a steep learning curve for non-Native experts and advocates. In fact, there were a number of conversations that acknowledge the role of not only experts and advocates as practitioners on the reservation, but also that there was a critical need for interdependence among Native American tribes for a full realization tribal sovereignty and the need to work closely with and partner with other

communities, namely Communities of Color for mutually-beneficial alliances that recognize and support tribal sovereignty around such critical things as water rights. Fully realized tribal sovereignty requires these kinds of interdependence and alliances in order to provide the full range of power and rights inherent in, as tribes have argued, nationally-constituted sovereignty, a culture of tribal power. The present studies aims to contribute to the ideological movement toward indigenous planning and the movement of tribal sovereignty.

Chapter 5: Conclusion--Toward a Culture of Tribal Power

[T]ribal sovereignty is not isolated. Tribal sovereignty is going to be based upon cooperation amongst all tribes. That's where tribal sovereignty strength's going to come from. So many times as we see now... it's tribal sovereignty based upon our unique area here, but tribal sovereignty-- the strength of tribal sovereignty is going to be based upon the whole of nations...

–Ken Norton, Hoopa Tribal Planning Dept.

The concept of cultural sovereignty seeks to revitalize and affirm the values and norms embedded within Native belief systems. Thus, repatriating values and norms is an important aspect of tribal cultural survival.

--Coffey and Tsosie

For indigenous people, sovereignty offers decolonized relations with the settler state, self-government, and the means of controlling custodial lands and protecting cultural heritage.

--Hibbard and Lane

By understanding the philosophical structure of Native cultures, we can appreciate "sovereignty" as a cultural as well as a political phenomenon.

--Coffey and Tsosie

The present study provided an examination of the relationship between culture and economic development through the case of the Hoopa Indian Nation by looking at Hupa language programs and efforts, as well as the Hoopa Tribal Forestry enterprise. Drawing from archival research as well as in-depth interviews with tribal leaders, officials, attorneys, archivists, managers, and planning practitioners, I show the everyday practices and discourses surrounding the emergence, implementation, and ongoing work in these areas as they relate to the links between economic development, culture, and sovereignty. Specifically, I show the ways in which they have been conceived, implemented, and perceived as a critical part of tribal community and economic development. Among the central objectives of the research is to contribute to the growing body of research that privileges Native American definitions, knowledge, and

sovereignty in development approaches and models as Native American communities redefine key concepts in community and economic development --planning, development, growth, success, capitalism, and modernity--adapting practices to fit "Native pathways" of development. Similarly, the research highlights the ways in which the Hoopa understand and define economic development in broader terms to include considerations for culture, nation building, and sovereignty. In this way, "native capitalism" offers an alternative approach to envisioning and effecting development (Champagne 2004).

Central to these ideas is the concept and practice of "culture". As I discussed earlier, a wide range of key scholars have identified the indispensable role of culture in Native American economic development. Similarly, the 'cultural turn' "has finally reached development thinking" (Clammer, 2005, p. 111), including such seemingly improbably converts as the Word Bank, albeit problematically and often only rhetorically, as I discuss in earlier chapters. Despite these concrete examples of a change in thinking and discourse, the field has remained devoid of literature that operationalized the practices of locating cultural information, drawing useful meaning from it, and implementing economic development efforts that are both congruent with local norms and beliefs as well as efforts that are guided and informed by cultural knowledge. The present study is a first effort toward the production of a body of knowledge that provides best practices for this kind of practical approach to bridging culture and development, intentionally, responsively, and within the framework of tribal sovereignty and nation building, both of which provide guiding principles for economic development on reservations. It is similarly and simultaneously an effort to contribute to a body of knowledge that also engages the critical larger-picture, long-term concerns of tribes in the global, neoliberal world contexts: the "re-scaling and re-form" of the state, the "hardening of regionalism, parochialisms, and fundamentalisms" (Roy 2002, p. 1).

Very specifically, the research aims to fill a critical gap in the literature. As I noted in earlier chapters, according to the key scholars in the field, culture is an indispensable component and consideration for community and economic development on reservations. Some like Cornell and Kalt (Cornell 1994, Cornell and Kalt 1998), the most prolific and cited scholars describe a critical need for a "cultural match" between economic development efforts and the tribes sensibilities, values, norms, and practices in order for a development project or model to have lasting buy-in in the community. They don't, however, explain how planners and practitioners can operationalize that practice, how tribes can pull back from their lived experience enough to identify key information for this approach. Tribal members, like the scholars who work with them in these "cultural match" approaches, are aware of the presence of critical knowledge and information in culture—language, traditions, ceremonies, values, norms, behaviors, etc. For example, Coffey and Tsosie, write:

> As many participants in tribal language restoration projects have discovered, Native languages constitute an important repository of knowledge about tribal concepts of spirituality, values, and philosophy. By acquiring this foundation, Indian people are able to regain their identity, which helps overcome the negative legacy of colonialism and promotes healing (2001, p. 207).

This analysis coincides with the arguments I made in chapter two and in this conclusion chapter, showing that this awareness of the role of culture needs to be operationalized to expedite and facilitate the ways in which cultural information can inform, guide, and legitimize development

73

efforts. It also underscores the need in the Native American context for engaging the prerequisite work for viable, lasting economic development; community healing and cohesion. Citing Marvin Weatherwax, Coffey and Tsosie's analysis further supports the analysis I have provided from the findings when they write;

> Marvin Weatherwax elaborates with an example from the Blackfeet language. In English, a person might say "Would you give me a glass of water?" In Blackfeet, the same request translates as "Would you please take me to the water?" The difference between "give" and "take" is not merely semantic; it has an entirely different spiritual connotation and indicates a clear cultural divide. According to Weatherwax, the loss of language is the loss of culture: "I cannot teach you culture. Culture is something you have to live. Through language we can give a part of the culture that can be lived" (2001, p. 208).

On many of these points, the literature is in agreement, even if they differ in their perspective and in their terminology, among other ways. What had been missing was an approach for converting this awareness into practical approaches for accessing the information, the contribution of the present study.

Until the present dissertation, the literature had not delved into an exploration of: where culture can be found; what kinds of information, useful to a Native American defined development approach, are available; what methods there are for locating and operationalizing this information; and how that information can be applied to development efforts. This study has sought to provide some answers to these questions while also engaging some of the meta-level concerns, pertinent concepts, and the central issues that tribes and scholars have identified as inextricably linked to economic development on the reservation. With this study, future research can continue to use the methodologies in this research to produce comparative studies that can help inform the work of other tribes in other historical, geographical, and cultural contexts. For example, it would be helpful to compare the Hoopa Tribe, a Pacific Northwest woods tribe, with a desert tribe in Arizona to explore the ways in which the difference in natural resources setting may influence culture and development.

In chapter 3 I examined a case of an economic development enterprise and the ways in which culture has been playing an intentional, planned, and indispensable role in maintaining a culturally-responsive, sustainable, lucrative forestry and timber sales corporation. By looking at the Hoopa Forestry Department and the tribe's timber company, Hoopa Forestry Industries, I show examples of this link between culture and development and how cultural information can guide the work to improve development practices both in terms of sustainability practices and in terms of the viability of a project that can be supported by the broader community because it respects, protects, and promotes the culture and the rebuilding of the tribal nation. It shows how culture, in addition to playing a central role in how the forest and timber is managed, is also experienced and practiced as a means and an end to development. I explain that even though the tribe considers the land and the natural resources as fundamental to their survival and to their culture, they have come to accept timber sales as part of their livelihood partly because this development work is systematically informed by and respects Hupa culture and values. The tribe has supported the work of the Hoopa Forestry Department and the Hoopa Forestry Industries in their management and timber sales because these entities have proven to be reliable stewards of the forest in very specific and critical ways that are important to the Hupa people. This link to

culture is in contrast to neighboring areas which were over-logged and have resulted in forest areas that no longer sustain logging communities. In prioritizing culture, the Hoopa Tribe has been able to establish a viable industry on the reservation and to secure cultural integrity, as well as practice and promote tribal sovereignty for themselves, and for the larger project of US-wide tribal sovereignty.

The present conclusion chapter briefly examines the ongoing US-wide project among Native American communities to forge a pan-tribal set of sovereignty-based rights, powers, and efforts which together seem to be producing what I have termed a "Culture of Tribal Power". Non-Native American residents in areas and in states that are home to tribes with increasing economic power and political influence have no doubt noticed that the visibility and influence of Native American tribes has steadily increased. Especially, for example, during election periods, when the advertisements by tribes have increasingly made tribes visible to their decades-long neighbors who hardly knew their existence. Additionally, gaming tribes have flooded the advertisement spaces of areas with ads for their casinos. These other examples provide an opportunity to examine the ways in which Native Americans as well as the mainstream of the US have come to expect that tribes have achieved some level of power and influence, locally and nationally, the characteristics of which are identifiably Native American, even if they are continually growing, changing, and challenged. The growth of this power is the reassertion of individual tribes as much as it is a collective assertion of a country-wide construction of a "culture" of tribal power, a pan-Native national culture.

In all of the various efforts and research experiences that have gone into the production of this research, there has been a very clear sense from a variety of sources that the work of tribes around economic development, cultural protection and production, and sovereignty all contribute to the ongoing unstated, yet unnamed pan-tribal project of building a US-wide awareness and practice of tribal power. With every instance of a tribe drawing on their economic or political wherewithal, as well as every instance a tribe draws on culture or tribal sovereignty for the construction or exercise of rights and powers –inherent, treaty, or policy-based--, the awareness and practice of tribal power grows. It is a project that is greater than the sum of its parts in that the existing abilities and examples of tribal sovereignty (the "parts") are understood as only the tip of the iceberg of the kinds of rights and powers tribes will eventually exercise as they continue to grow economically, politically, and culturally during this "Era of Nation Building". The "leaps and bounds" of growth and changes, as interviewees in the Hoopa case noted, witnessed in the last 30-40 years, compared to the period of heavy BIA control and administration on the reservations, represent for many the very early stages of full tribal sovereignty and the societies that they are rebuilding to interface in the contemporary world, fully "modern" and fully Native American. At the same time, at least at this stage, there doesn't seem to be agreement on what that will be, what will characterize tribal sovereignty and tribal societies in another 40 years. Few could imagine the remarkable gains many tribes have managed in the face of long-standing obstacles and ongoing federal and state neglect of reservations. Similarly, few can pinpoint for sure what gains will be made in federal Indian law and policy, nor in the community economic development efforts on reservations.

Yet, in this context there is a clear sense that future economic development, sovereignty, and cultural production, among other key concerns, will definitely have Native American sensibilities and characteristics. In this sense, there is a way to understand these efforts in terms of these tribes constructing a pan-Native American "culture," a shared set of guiding, defining, empowering principals and models that allow for individual tribe diversity but which champions,

constructs, and exercises US-wide Native American tribal power. The ongoing lessons being learned from the successes and failures in economic development are part of the experiences which help inform the culture. Similarly, the international context and the links tribes have to indigenous peoples across the world contribute to the envisioning, debates, and the construction of this collective power. Additionally, the increasing examples of tribes entering into new agreements with local, state, and federal agencies, as well as the increasing examples of tribes engaging in international trade, contribute to the lessons and construction of this collective power. Given the diversity of the tribes that constitute this US-wide imagined community, and the variety of experiences and contexts which inform the construction of this community, as well as the ever-changing federal Indian law and policy contexts, the use of the framework of "culture" provides a way to think about these powers.

  Over the last 30-40 years the role of Native American tribes in the political, social, and economic contexts of their regions has grown, sometimes exponentially. Gaming tribes are the most widely known and the easiest example to cite. Tribes in New England, southern California, and south Florida play enormous roles in the lives of millions in their area, and they have become powerful in regional and state politics. Similarly, gaming tribes across the country, with smaller casinos, also exert increasing influence on the local economy and political arena. These major changes in the status and power of these tribes have had profound effects on both tribal members and their neighbors alike. Unlike 40 years ago, local, regional, and even state politicians and governments can no longer ignore these tribes. Both tribal members and their non-Native neighbors have come to expect the tribe to be an active participant in regional economic and political issues. Some have come to expect the tribe to also play a major philanthropic role in their area: from funding local non-profits to endowing chairs in local universities. The invisibility of Native Americans to mainstream communities will soon be a thing of the past. In university courses, for example, when one asks students to name tribes, many cite the commonly known names of tribes made famous by film and television. But students from places like southern California now can name several of their local gaming tribes. While I am not making an argument for or against an awareness based on the gambling context, I am arguing that this newly-gained power contributes to the construction of tribal power and the internal and external expectation that tribes *have* power, and in some cases huge amounts of power, and that all tribes are moving toward increased power, sovereignty, and cultural production. In this context, the work of economic development on Native American reservations is an enormously important contribution toward that culture of tribal power, giving shape to the values, norms, behaviors, directions, purposes, and meanings regarding development, growth, success, capitalism, modernity, economics, sustainability, and, consequently planning practice and theory. Every success story of economic development in Native American reservation contributes toward this collective understanding and collective project, an imagined community of tribes and what their sovereignty means in today's geo-socio-political contexts.

  There is a way to frame the literature through this lens, one in which a longer-term vision of economic development emerges and provides an understanding for the way tribes talk about the timeline of their struggles. Earlier I cited a Hoopa leader as describing the last century as the "shortest" century, one in which so much happened to the community, but also one that has given way to the present rebuilding of the Hoopa Nation. Ken Norton, Tribal Planning Department explains:

[T]ribal sovereignty is not isolated. Tribal sovereignty is going to be based upon cooperation amongst all tribes. That's where tribal sovereignty strength's going to come from. So many times as we see now… it's tribal sovereignty based upon our unique area here, but tribal sovereignty-- the strength of tribal sovereignty is going to be based upon the whole of nations, tribal nation sovereignty compared to individual sovereignty and so that is where the [growth by of sovereignty by] leaps and bounds and strength is going to come from and this is not a unique concept, we know that individually we're going to have many struggles, but collectively as a group, as a sovereign group we can make great gains, so that's where I see us in the 30 years.

 In this same sense of seeing tribal history in tribal terms, the construction of the culture of tribal power is a shared, long-term project in which, vis-à-vis the federal government, tribes are increasingly uniting to share best practices, speak with one voice, set their collective agenda, and work together under their own terms and their shared cultural experiences. Some have begun to sign nation-to-nation treaties among themselves, bypassing the federal government altogether. These examples point to an alternative project of pan-Native American identity. In earlier chapters, I cited the work of Thomas Biolsi and his examination of various "kinds of indigenous spaces imagined, fought for, and… achieved and lived by American Indian people" (2005, p. 240). Of particular interest is the third space, the "supratribal" space of indigenous rights, "within an inclusive space that ultimately spans all of the territory of the contiguous United States… 'national indigenous space'"(2005, p. 240). The passage of the Indian Religious Freedom Act Amendments of 1994 recognizes the right of any Native American to ceremonial use of peyote anywhere in the US –and not, as it had been implemented, limited to their reservations. This law, Biolsi explains, "produced a Native space in which Indian people have indigenous rights across the national landscape, not just within reservation enclaves" (2005, p. 248). In other words, the whole of the United States was understood as a space of "supratribal" sovereignty, where Native Americans had the right to religious freedoms not available to non-Native American. Much like Biolsi identifies Native American sovereignty as lived outside of the rigid boundaries and conventional understandings of sovereignty to include spaces of multiple types of sovereign rule, so too is it possible to think about the "supratribal" implications of the great variety of lived practices, economic development efforts, and culturally-derived projects which construct and contribute to a framework of understanding that a culture of tribal power is the set of supratribal rights and powers that tribes are living every day and which they are collectively building.

A critical component to this culture of tribal power is the increasing awareness among tribes of the need to move away from tribal sovereignty that looks to external, non-indigenous definitions and understandings of tribal sovereignty, whether US federal models or other European and European based models, framed by and drawn from such deplorable concepts as the Doctrine of Discovery (Williams 1990), among others. Instead, like Coffey and Tsosie urge, there is a need for "…a reappraisal of the tribal sovereignty doctrine, one which looks within-to the "cultural sovereignty" of Indian Nations-for the core of its meaning rather than to an externally defined notion of tribal "political sovereignty" (2001, p. 191-192). They further write:

Our continued acceptance of the idea that Native peoples' legal rights depend upon recognition by the very government that has attempted to divest Indian nations of their sovereignty exemplifies a psychological mode of dependence in which Indian peoples' reality is contingent upon that of the exterior society. Federal Indian law is premised on the rhetoric of conquest and assimilation. The rhetoric of conquest speaks to the annihilation of sovereignty, but the rhetoric of assimilation (vividly represented by the image of the "vanishing Redman" that characterizes cinema westerns), speaks to the annihilation of culture. Conquest and assimilation are part of our history, but they need not be part of our contemporary existence as sovereign nations (2001, p. 191-192).

An examination of the actual and potential connections between economic development and tribal sovereignty reveal these kinds of analyses and calls from a reformulation of tribal sovereignty that move toward Native American-based conceptualizations of sovereignty. What is also clear is that there isn't a consensus about what tribal sovereignty is today nor what it will be in the near future. As a result, these debates, discussions, and the ongoing research on economic development on the reservation are actively contributing to the construction of the contexts in which tribes will be assumed to have both collective US-wide power and influence, as well as individual tribe power and influence locally and regionally. Additionally, these contribute to the construction of contexts in which individual tribal members will have more of their inherent rights recognized and protected under federal Indian law.

These arguments are based on the trajectory of the growth in economic power, tribal sovereignty, and cultural cohesion witnessed in the last few decades. This is not to say the path is assured, or even one without major obstacles. It is to say that if tribes continue to move along the Nation Building path that they have been traveling, there is great reason to believe that these efforts are building a sense among tribal and mainstream societies that there is a collective identity of tribal power. Despite the great variety of experiences, tribes "share a common set of concerns derived from a collective past—they each strive for cultural survival, political independence and economic betterment" (Zaferatos, 2004, p. 90). The feasibility of each tribe achieving, and even promoting, these three goals -- cultural survival, political independence and economic betterment-- among others, is dependent on the collective efforts of many tribes working in these areas.

The construction of a culture of tribal power depends, as this discussion has shown, depends on the ways in which tribes interpret their individual and collective histories, their individual and collective contemporary successes and shortcomings, as well as the ways in which they conceptualize the next several decades (the next seven generations). It is critical for planners and development practitioners to consider these efforts and the meanings they have for tribes. In particular it is important to remember to examine the discourses and conceptualizations that tribes have around what tribal sovereignty, the culture of tribal power, and economic development will mean to future tribal members and to the collective pan-Native American community of the coming decades. To that end, I conclude this chapter with a quote from Ken Norton, director of the Hoopa Tribe's Tribal Environmental Protection Agency, to give voice to a Hupa tribal member on the conceptualization of tribal sovereignty:

…[W]hat is a sovereign? What does sovereignty mean to me? Sovereignty means to me a continuation of our identity, and the policies of the decision makers of our

community, to move forward, and as a priority to continue that identity as Hoopa people, in education, speaking [Hupa], cultural type of practices: that is sovereignty. Sovereignty without those [means] you become acculturated… without your… language, without your… place, those are criteria for termination and that has been used in congressional termination of tribes. So sovereignty to me is identity in place. It's just not economics, it's just not exploiting of a resource for the benefit of a [consumerism that says] I want a newer model of car because I have more money in my pocket and I have a better life. To me sovereignty is ability of the tribe to make decisions based upon their past, who they are from the past, who they are in the present and where they're going [to be] in the future, that's what sovereignty relates to me… we base our identity of who we are from who we were and who we are now and where we're going, and that's what sovereignty is to me.

References

Adamson, R., Warner, R., & Kanegis, R.A. (2003). Asset building in native communities. Fredericksburg, VA: First Peoples Development Institute.

Albers, P. (2002). Marxism and historical materialism In American Indian history. *Clearing a path: Theorizing the past in Native American studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

American Planning Association. (2013). Indigenous Planning. Retrieved May 6, 2013 from http://planning.org/divisions/indigenous/

Anderson, R. B. (1997). Corporate/indigenous partnerships in economic development: The first nations in Canada. *World Development*, *25*(9), 1483–1503.

Anderson, T. L. (1992a). *Property rights and Indian economies*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Baker, M. (2003). Against the odds: (Re-)Building community through forestry on the Hoopa reservation. In J. Kusel & E. Adler (Eds.), *Forest Communities, Community Forests* (pp. 27–54). Lanhan, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Baker, M., & Kusel, J. (2002). *Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative Assessment.* (p. 34). Taylorsville, CA: Sierra Institute for Community and Environment.

Barker, J. (2005). Sovereignty matters : locations of contestation and possibility in indigenous struggles for self-determination. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Bauer, W. (2004). Working for identity: Race, ethnicity, and the market economy in northern California. In B. C. Hosmer & C. M. O'Neill (Eds.), *Native pathways: American Indian culture and economic development in the twentieth century*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Beatty, C., & Leighton, A. (2012). Intertribal Timber Council Survey of Tribal Research Needs. *Forestry Chronicle, 88*(5), 565-570.

Berkes, F., Davidson-Hunt, I., Deutsch, N., Burlando, C., Miller, A., Peters, C., … Strang, M. (2009). Chapter Three: Institutions for Algonquian Land Use: Change, Continuity and Implications for Sustainable Forest Management. Retrieved from http://culturallandscapes.ca/blahdocs/uploads/chap3_berkes_et_al_institutions_for_algonquian_land_use_676.pdf

Biolsi, T. (2001). *"Deadliest enemies": Law and the making of race relations on and off Rosebud Reservation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Biolsi, T. (2005). Imagined geographies: Sovereignty, indigenous space, and American Indian struggle. *American Ethnologist*, *32*(2), 239–259.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

Cahill, C. D. (2011). *Federal fathers & mothers: a social history of the United States Indian Service, 1869-1933*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Calliou, B. (2005). The culture of leadership: North American indigenous leadership in a changing economy. In D. Champagne, K. J. Torjesen, & S. Steiner (Eds.), *Indigenous peoples and the modern state*. Lanham, MD: Altamira.

Cattelino, J. (1994). Casino roots: The cultural production of twentieth-century Seminole economic development. In L. H. Legters, F. J. Lyden, & Policy Studies Organization (Eds.), *American Indian policy : Self-governance and economic development*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Cattelino, J. R. (2006). Florida Seminole housing and the social meanings of sovereignty. *Comparative Studies in Society & History*, *48*(3), 699–726.

Cattelino, J. R. (2008). *High stakes: Florida Seminole gaming and sovereignty*. Durham: England: Duke University Press.

Cattelino, J. R. (2010). The double bind of American Indian need-based sovereignty. *Cultural Anthropology, 25*(2), 235-262.

Chambers. R., & Richards, P. (1995). Preface. In Warren, D. M., Slikkerveer, L. J., & Brokensha, D (Eds.). *The cultural dimension of development: Indigenous knowledge systems* (pp. xiii-xiv). London: England: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Champagne, D. (2005). Rethinking native relations with contemporary nation-states. *Indigenous peoples and the modern state*, *Contemporary Native American communities*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Champagne, D. (2004) Tribal Capitalism and Native Capitalists: Multiple Pathways of Native Economy. In B. C. Hosmer & C. M. O'Neill (Eds.), *Native pathways: American Indian culture and economic development in the twentieth century*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Champagne, D. & Abu-Saad, I. (2003). *The future of indigenous peoples: Strategies for survival and development*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.

Champagne, D., Torjesen, K. J., & Steiner, S. (2005). *Indigenous peoples and the modern state*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Churchill, W. (1983). Introduction: Journeying toward a debate. *Marxism and Native Americans*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Churchill, W. (2004). *Kill the Indian, save the man: The genocidal impact of American Indian residential Schools*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Publishers.

City of Arcata. (2013) Arcata Community Forest History. Retrieved May 6, 2013 from http://www.cityofarcata.org/departments/environmental-services/city-forests/forest-history

Coffey, W., & Tsosie, R. (2001). Rethinking the tribal sovereignty doctrine: Cultural sovereignty and the collective future of Indian nations. *Stanford Law and Policy Review*, *12*, 191.

Cornell, S. E. (1988). The return of the native: American Indian political resurgence. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cornell, S. E. (1994). *Five myths, three partial truths, a robust finding, and two tasks*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Cornell, S. (1990). *The return of the Native American Indian political resurgence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, USA.

Cornell, S. (2010). Personal interview. March 2012.

Cornell, S., & Jorgensen, M. (2007). The nature and components of economic development in Indian country. National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center.

Cornell, S., & Kalt, J. P. (1990). Pathways from poverty: Economic development and institution-building on American Indian reservations. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, *14*(1), 89–125.

Cornell, S., & Kalt, J. P. (1992). Culture and institutions as public goods: American Indian economic development as a problem of collective action. In T. L. Anderson (Ed.), *Property rights and Indian economies*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Cornell, S. E., & Kalt, J. P. (1992). *What can tribes do?: strategies and institutions in American Indian economic development.* Los Angeles, CA: American Indian Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles.

Cornell, S., & Kalt, J.P. (1993). *What can tribes do? Strategies and institutions in American Indian economic development. American Indian manual and handbook series No. 4.* Los Angeles, CA: American Indian Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles.

Cornell, S., & Kalt, J. P. (1998). Sovereignty and nation-building: The development challenge in Indian country today. *American Indian Culture & Research Journal*, *22*(3), 187.

Cornell, S. E., & Kalt, J. P. (2000). Where's the glue? Institutional and cultural foundations of American Indian economic development. *The Journal of Socio-Economics, 29*, 443-470.

Cornell, S., & Kalt, J. P. (2007). Two approaches to the development of native nations: One works, the other one doesn't. In M. Jorgensen (Ed.), *Rebuilding native nations: Strategies for governance and development*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Cornell, S. E., & Kalt, J. P. (1992). *Reloading the dice: Improving the chances for economic development on American Indian reservations* (Vol. 59). Cambridge, MA: Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Corntassel, J., & Witmer, R. C. (2008). *Forced federalism: Contemporary challenges to indigenous*

nationhood. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Davis, T. (2000). *Sustaining the forest, the people, and the spirit*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Duffy, D., & Stubben, J. (1998). An assessment of Native American economic development: Putting culture and sovereignty back in the models. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, *32*(4), 52.

Ebona, A. (1984). Federal government policies and Indian goals of self-government. In L. Little Bear, M. Boldt, & J. A. Long (Eds.), *Pathways to self-determination: Canadian Indians and the Canadian state*. Toronto: Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Florida, R. L. (2002). The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Fulton, W. B., & Shigley, P. (2005). *Guide to California planning* (3rd ed.). Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books.

Glickman, N. J., & Servon, L. J. (1998). More than bricks and sticks: Five components of CDC capacity: A report to the Ford Foundation. *Housing Policy Debate, 9*(3): 497-539.

Golla, V. (2011). *California Indian languages*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gordon, J., Franklin, J. F., Johnson, K. N., Patton, D., Sedell, J., Sessions, J., & Williston, E. (1997). An independent report on tribal forestry: Redefining the government's role. *Journal of Forestry*, *95*(11), 10–14.

Graham, L. M. (2004). An interdisciplinary approach to American Indian economic development. *North Dakota Law Review*, *80*(4), 597–655.

Green, G. P., & Haines (2012). *Asset building & community development* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Harris, R. R., Blomstrom, G., & Nakamura, G. (1995). Tribal self-governance and forest Management at the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation, Humboldt County, CA. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, *19*(1), 1–38.

Harris, R. R., Nakamura, G., & Blomstrom, G. (1997). The Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation: Weighing the tradeoffs with computerized forest planning. *Journal of Forestry*, *95*(11), 19–22.

Heitkamp, K. (2012, May 29). Cobell disbursements may be in the mail soon. *Two Rivers Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.tworiverstribune.com/2012/05/cobell-disbursements-my-be-in-the-mail-soon/

Hibbard, M., & Lane, M. B. (2004). By the seat of your pants: indigenous action and state response.

Planning Theory and Practice. 5, 97-104.

Hibbard, M., & Lane, M. B. (2008). The split personality of planning: Indigenous peoples and planning for land use and resource management. *Journal of Planning Literature, 23*(2), 136-151.

Hicks, S., & Jorgensen, M. *Large foundations' grantmaking to Native America*. (2005). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Holston, J. (1998). Spaces of insurgent citizenship. In L. Sandercock (Ed.), *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History* (pp. 37-56). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Holston, J. (2008). *Insurgent citizenship: Disjunctions of democracy and modernity in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hoopa Forestry Department. (2012). *Hoopa Valley Indian reservation forest management plan 2011 revision* (p. 250). Hoopa, CA: Hoopa Valley Tribal Council.

Hoopa Valley Tribal Council. (2011). Hoopa tribe establishes fish commission [Press Release]. Retrieved from http://www.tworiverstribune.com/2011/02/hoopa-tribe-establishes-fish-commission/

Hosmer, B. C. (1999). *American Indians in the marketplace : Persistence and innovation among the Menominees and Metlakatlans, 1870-1920*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Hosmer, B. C., & O'Neill, C. M. (Eds.), *Native pathways: American Indian culture and economic development in the twentieth century*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Indian Forest Resources Management Act: Hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate. 104th Cong. (1995*).* Retrieved from http://archive.org/details/indianforestreso00unit

Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2010). *Planning with complexity an introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy*. Oxfordshire: England: Routledge.

Johnson, T. R. (1999). *Contemporary Native American political issues*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Jojola, T. S. (1997). Pueblo Indians and Spanish Town Planning in New Mexico. In B. Morrow & V. P. Price (Eds.), *Anasazi Architecture & American Design* (pp. 171-185). Albuquerque, NM: UNM Press.

Jojola, T. S. (1998). Indigenous planning: Clans, intertribal confederations, and the history of the All Indian Pueblo Council. In L. Sandercock (Ed.), *Making the invisible visible: A multicultural planning history*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Jojola, T. (2000). Indigenous Planning and Community Development. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/2553722/Indigenous_planning_and_community_development

Jorgensen, M. (2007a). *Rebuilding native nations: Strategies for governance and development*. Tucson,

AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Jorgensen, M. (Ed.). (2007c). Development, governance and culture: What are they, and what do they have to do with rebuilding native nations? *Rebuilding native nations: Strategies for governance and development*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Kalt, J., & Cornell, S. (1994). The redefinition of property rights in American Indian reservations: A comparative analysis of Native American economic development. In L. H. Legters, F. J. Lyden, & Policy Studies Organization (Eds.), *American Indian policy : self-governance and economic development*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Kimmerer, R. W. (2000). Native knowledge for native ecosystems. *Journal of Forestry*, *98*(8), 4–9.

Korns, K. (2012, December 19). Settlement checks arrive in Hoopa mailboxes. *Two Rivers Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.tworiverstribune.com/2012/12/settlement-checks-arrive-in-hoopa-mailboxes/

Korns, K. (2013, April 19). River rights committee working to expand fish for elders program. *Two Rivers Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.tworiverstribune.com/2013/04/river-rights-committee-working-to-expand-fish-for-elders-program/

Kusel, J., & Adler, E. (2003). *Forest communities, community forests: Struggles and successes in rebuilding communities and forests*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

La Vere, D. (2004). Minding their own business: The Kiowa-Comanche-Apache Business Committee of the early 1900s. In B. C. Hosmer & C. M. O'Neill (Eds.), *Native pathways: American Indian culture and economic development in the twentieth century*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Lane, M., & Hibbard, M. (2005). Doing it for themselves. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, *25*(2), 172–184.

Lane, M. (2006). The role of planning in achieving indigenous land justice and community goals. *Land Use Policy, 23*(4), 385-394.

Latorre, J. G., & Latorre, J. G. (2012). Globalization, local communities, and traditional forest-related knowledge. In J. A. Parrotta & R. L. Trosper (Eds.), *Traditional Forest-Related Knowledge* (pp. 449–490). Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-2144-9_12

Levy, J. M. (2012). *Contemporary urban planning* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lewis, D. R. (1997). *Neither wolf nor dog: American Indians, environment, and agrarian change*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Long, A. J., & Frank, J. (1997). The Seminole Indian Reservations: Conservation of a subtropical forest. *Journal of Forestry*, *95*(11), 33–36.

Mason, L., White, G., Morishima, G., Alvarado, E., Andrew, L., Clark, F., … Wilder, S. (2012). Listening and learning from traditional knowledge and western Science: A dialogue on

contemporary challenges of forest health and wildfire. *Journal of Forestry*, *110*(4), 187–193. doi:10.5849/jof.11-006

McCorquodale, S. M., Leach, R. H., King, G. M., & Bevis, K. R. (1997). The Yakama Indian reservation: Integrating Native American values into commercial forestry. *Journal of Forestry*, *95*(11), 15–18.

McGovern, D. (1995). *The Campo Indian landfill war: The fight for gold in California's garbage*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Middleton, B. R., & Kusel, J. (2007). Northwest economic adjustment initiative assessment: Lessons learned for American Indian community and economic development. *Economic Development Quarterly*, *21*(2), 165–178. doi:10.1177/0891242406298136

Miller, R. R. (1997). Southwest woodlands: Cultural uses of the "forgotten forest." *Journal of Forestry*, *95*(11), 24–28.

Miraftab, F. (2009). Insurgent planning: Situating radical planning in the global south. *Planning Theory*, *8*(1), 32–50. doi:10.1177/1473095208099297

Miraftab, F., & McConnell, E.D. (2008). Multiculturalizing rural towns—Insights for inclusive planning. *International Planning Studies*, *15*(4), 343–360.

Moretti, E. (2012). *The new geography of jobs*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Morishima, G. S. (1997). Indian forestry: From paternalism to self-determination. *Journal of Forestry*, *95*(11), 4–9.

Mundy, P., & Compton, J. L. (1991). Indigenous communication and indigenous knowledge. *Development Communication Report, 74*. Arlington, VA: Clearinghouse on Development Communication.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1990). *Clinical training in serious mental illness* (DHHS Publication No. ADM 90-1679). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nigel, J. (1996). *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

O'Brien, S. (1989). *American Indian tribal governments*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

O'Neill, C. (2004). Rethinking modernity and the discourse of development. In B. C. Hosmer & C. M. O'Neill (Eds.), *Native pathways: American Indian culture and economic development in the twentieth century*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Paci, C. D. J., & Krebs, L. (2004). Local knowledge as traditional ecological knowledge: Definition and ownership. In C. M. O'Neill & B. C. Hosmer (Eds.), *Native pathways: American Indian culture and economic development in the twentieth century*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Peet, R., & Hartwick, E. R. (1999). *Theories of development*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Peet, R., & Hartwick, E. R. (2009). *Theories of development: contentions, arguments, alternatives* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Roschmann, J. (1991). *No Red Atlantis on the Trinity: The rejection of the Indian Reorganization Act on the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation in northwestern California* (doctoral dissertation). University of California, Davis.

Rosser, E. (2005). This land is my land, this land is your land: Markets and institutions for economic development on Native American land. *Arizona Law Review*, *47*(2), 245–312.

Royster, J. V. (2008). Practical sovereignty, political sovereignty, and the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act. *Lewis & Clark Law Review*, *12*(4), 1065–1101.

Sandercock, L. (Ed.). (1998). *Making the invisible visible: A multicultural planning history* (Vol. 2). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sandercock, L. (2004). Commentary: indigenous planning and the burden of colonialism. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *5*(1), 118–124.

Sillitoe, P., Dixon, P., & Barr, J. (2005). *Indigenous knowledge inquiries: a methodologies manual for development*. Rugby: United Kingdom: ITDG Publishing.

Smith, D. H. (2000). *Modern tribal development: Paths to self-sufficiency and cultural integrity in Indian country*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Trosper, R. L. (2006). Indigenous influence on forest management on Indian reservations in the United States. *Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Forest Management: The Role of Traditional Knowledge, 1,* 92-99.

Tsosie, R. (2003). Land, culture and community: Envisioning Native American sovereignty and national identity in the twenty-first century. In D. Champagne, I. Abu-Sa`ad, L. A. A. I. S. C. University of California, Merkaz le-heker ha-hevrah ha-Beduit ve-hitpathutah (Israel), & L. A. C. for C. E. University of California (Eds.), *The future of indigenous peoples: Strategies for survival and development*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.

Unemployment on Indian reservations at 50 percent—The urgent need to create jobs in Indian country: Hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs of the United States Senate. 111th Cong. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-111shrg57830/html/CHRG-111shrg57830.htm

University of California, Department of Linguistics. (n.d.). Survey of California and Other Indian Languages. Retrieved May 6, 2013, from http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~survey/images/posters/hupa-poster.pdf

University of California, Department of Linguistics. (1852). Map of Hupa by George Gibbs. *California Athabascan Groups: University of California Anthropological Records*. *16*, 157-237.

Walker, R., Natcher, D., & Jojola, T (Eds.). (2013). *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning*. Canada: McGill-

Queen's University Press.

Warren, D. M., & Brokensha, D (Eds.). (1995). *The cultural dimension of development: Indigenous knowledge systems.* London: England: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Wiewel, W., Teitz, M, & Giloth, R. (1993). The economic development of neighborhoods and localities. In R. D. Bingham & R. Mier (Eds.), *Theories of Local Economic Development: Perspectives from Across the Disciplines.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Yiftachel, O. (2001). Introduction: Outlining the power of planning. In O. Yiftachel, J. Little, D. Hedgecock, & I. Alexander (Eds.), *The power of planning: Spaces of control and transformation* (pp. 1–20). Dordrecht: Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Zaferatos, N. C. (2004) Developing an effective approach to strategic planning for native American Indian reservations. *Space and Polity, 8*(1), 87-104.