

Indigenous Lessons about Sustainability are not just for ‘All Humanity’

Cite as

Forthcoming in *Situating Sustainability: Sciences/Arts/Societies, Scales and Social Justice*, NYU Press. Edited by Julie Sze.

Kyle Whyte, Chris Caldwell, Marie Schaefer

Abstract

Indigenous peoples are widely recognized as holding insights or lessons about how the rest of humanity can live sustainably or resiliently. Yet it is rarely acknowledged in many literatures that for Indigenous peoples living in the context of settler states such as the U.S. or New Zealand, our own efforts to sustain our peoples rest heavily on our capacities to resist settler colonial oppression. *Indigenous planning* refers to a set of concepts and practices through which many Indigenous peoples reflect critically on sustainability to derive lessons about what actions reinforce Indigenous self-determination and resist settler colonial oppression. The work of the Sustainable Development Institute of the College of Menominee Nation (SDI) is one case of Indigenous planning. In the context of SDI, we discuss Indigenous planning as a process of interpreting lessons from our own pasts and making practical plans for staging our own futures. If there are such things as Indigenous sustainability lessons *for* Indigenous peoples, they must be reliable planning concepts and processes we can use to support our continuance in the face of ongoing settler colonial oppression.

Legend of Spirit Rock

One night long ago a Menominee Indian dreamed that Manabush, grandson of Ko-Ko-Mas-Say-Sa-Now (the Earth) and part founder of the Mitawin or Medicine Society, invited him to visit the god. With seven of his friends the Indian called on Manabush who granted their request to make them successful hunters. One of the band, however, angered the god by asking for eternal life. Manabush, seizing the warrior by the shoulders, thrust him into the ground and said, “You shall be a stone, and thus you will be everlasting.” The Menominee say that at night kindly spirits come to lay offerings of tobacco at the rock and that if one looks closely he can see their white veils among the trees. The legend is that when the rock finally crumbles away the race will be extinct.¹

Story of Menominee Relationship to Wild Rice²

“[T]he Menomini came into possession of wild rice at the very inception of their tribal organization. Mi'nibush... created the bear... [and] determined to make an Indian of the bear.... He called the Indian 'Shekatcheke'nau.'... Then taking the Indian to the river he showed it to him and gave it into his hands, with all its fish, its great beds of wild rice, and many sugar trees along its banks. He said, 'I give these things to you, and you shall always have them – the river, the fish, the wild rice, and the sugar trees.'” When Weskineu the Thunderer came from Lake Winnebago to the Menominee River, the Bear clan turned everything, including the river and the wild rice, over to the Thunderer. But the Thunderer always brought rain and storms, so the rice harvest was ruined. Weskineu then returned the rice to Sekatsokemau. So after that when rice harvest came Shekatcheke'nau called all his people together, and they made a feast, and smoked, and asked the Great Spirit to give them fair weather during the harvest. Since then there has always been a fine, stormless harvest season.³

Introduction

The first legend, displayed in a sign on Menominee lands, demonstrates some concepts of the Menominee for planning for the future. While the above depiction of the story is a simplified version of the actual telling, we can glimpse several concepts. People or communities that boast about certain visions of the future may not understand that for which they wish. We have to pay respect to the uncertainty that at any time our lives could change so drastically that our very existence is threatened. The wild rice story emphasizes the importance human responsibility within ecosystems. Human motivation to be responsible is energized through cultural activities, from feasts to ceremonies. Humans must always honor the sheer power of some of the nonhuman forces of ecosystems that cannot be controlled. The history of the Menominee Nation bears witness to many of these concepts—concepts which serve as lessons about sustainability.

The Menominee refer to themselves as *Mamaceqtawak* (the ancient ones). Since time immemorial, the Menominee have lived in close relation to the plants, animals and ecosystems of the area now known by most as the Upper Midwestern United States and Great Lakes region.⁴ The Menominee ancestral territories are around 10 million acres in the states Wisconsin and Michigan (the Upper Peninsula part). Menominee governance systems involved highly mobile seasonal rounds in which the societal institutions shifted structure and geographic location systematically throughout the year to take advantage of the best times to access

certain plants and animals. We use seasonal round in plural (seasonal rounds) to suggest that among even one group, such as the Menominee, it was likely that different families, clans and communities had their versions of seasonal rounds that were more tailored to the particular areas they tended to inhabit most each year.

The name of and activities associated with each month in the Menominee calendar generally correspond with an important plant that should be harvested in that month. Menominee seasonal rounds include complex regimes of monitoring, harvesting and storing foods and medicines from hundreds of plants and animals in the region, including berries in the summer, wild rice in the fall and maple sugar and sturgeon in the spring. In light of the seasonal round, *Menominee*—a name given by other Indigenous peoples—means *wild rice people*, indicating the importance of wild rice harvesting for Menominee society as part of seasonal rounds. It was often said that wherever the Menominee go, there is wild rice. As one historian discusses, “Menominee tradition says that when the Bear invited the Thunderer to become his brother, the Bear brought wild rice and the Thunderer brought corn and fire to the new family. This family consisted of distant band units comprising from several dozen to over one hundred members.”⁵

The Menominee wild rice camps usually began to form in early to mid-September. The Moose clan was charged with the responsibility of protection of the wild rice beds, the harvest, and ensured an equal distribution of the wild rice for the members.⁶ Once the rice was ripe, the guards would tell the leaders who would then inform all Tribal members that it was harvest time.⁷ Just as with their Anishinaabe neighbors, people with the gender identity approximating *women* in the culture of U.S. settler society, tended to lead the harvesting and processing of wild rice including threshing, dancing, winnowing and cleaning of the rice.⁸

During the 19th century, the Menominee started to learn lessons about how drastically their ways of life could change. European invasion through the fur trade and eventually U.S. settler colonialism imposed violence and disruption on the Menominee people. In the Treaty of 1854, the U.S. pressured the Menominee onto a 354 square mile reservation that is a fraction of the territory they had been accustomed to using. The subsequent treaty of 1856 carved out land for the Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians, a Tribe that had been forcibly relocated from the East Coast, further diminishing Menominee lands. Overall, Menominee land cessions occurred across 10 different treaties from 1817-1856 and transformed the once 10-million-acre range to roughly 226,000 acres.

As the Menominee range decreased, the population decreased too due to the turmoil of the fur trade and U.S. settlement, poverty and disease. An 1834 smallpox outbreak and an 1849 cholera epidemic drastically reduced the Menominee

population to 3,900 members (from a much larger population).⁹ Since time immemorial, the Menominee had developed a governance system centered on seasonal rounds and a certain type of mobility in a large territory. In a fairly short amount of time in the 19th century, the Menominee were faced with a much smaller population and a more fixed location of inhabitation.

Despite these changes and hardships, the Menominee adapted creatively in very uncertain conditions where their mobility had changed drastically. They designed a sustainable timber supply enterprise in 1856 upon establishment of the reservation.¹⁰ Though it is not generally discussed in the history of North American environmental stewardship, the birth of sustainable forestry can be traced back to Menominee when the first federal laws mandating sustainable forest harvesting in the U.S. were enacted on the Menominee Indian Reservation.¹¹ Today, Menominee Tribal Enterprises, an institution authorized under the Menominee Tribal Constitution, oversees forest management and sawmill operations through a board of directors of elected Menominee tribal members on behalf of the Tribe. The Menominee sustained yield forest is approximately 220,000 acres of forestland broken into 9,000 distinct timber stands according to various attributes such as tree species composition, tree size, soil type, and topographical or geologic features interspersed with streams and lakes. This combination of physical and biological elements provides an abundant and diverse array of plant and animal communities.

Different from monocrop commercial forests, the Menominee Tribal Enterprise seeks to pay respect to the agency of the forest itself as a living ecosystem that has cultural and spiritual significance for Menominee people. Management efforts of the Menominee have resulted in an old growth forest that supports a wealth of species and natural communities that are unique in northeastern Wisconsin. For example, the white pine forests within the Menominee Reservation are unlike any other stands within the Great Lakes states owing to their having specific ecological niches that are documented.¹² Menominee forestry continues to be world renowned for producing high-quality timber and economic resources for the community while maintaining and enhancing the health of the forest ecosystems.¹³

Many Menominee persons have close spiritual and cultural connections to the forest, using the forest as a place for ceremonies, family recreation and planting and harvesting. The idea to have these connections certainly arises from the Menominee's interpretation of their own history, where cultural and spiritual practices served to motivate human responsibility within ecosystems. The forest is also point of pride that Tribal members enjoy showing to respectful and appreciative visitors. Members feel this way because the forest reflects the community's unique

history, creativity and culture, expressing at once honor for Menominee ancestors and the future continuance for generations of Menominee people to come.

The planning it took to establish the forest contributes to the Menominee's continuance despite the fact that U.S. settler colonialism sought to eliminate and erase Menominee peoples from their own homelands. Continuance, here, refers to Indigenous survival and flourishing in the face of change, including change stemming from oppression. By the mid- 20th century, the U.S. terminated its sovereignty-to-sovereign relationship with the Menominee Nation even though the Menominee ran a successful forestry business and hospital. Post-termination, the Menominee closed the hospital and created a business with Menominee persons as shared-holders, Menominee Enterprises Inc., to generate financial support for the expenses of the newly designated Menominee county. One solution involved a collaboration between the Menominee and a development corporation that flooded several lakes on the former reservation to increase the shoreline for thousands of recreation properties to be sold to settler Americans.

The lots were widely advertised by settler Americans as a chance to buy land that was “never before owned” and “The Last Untouched Lake Forest Area in the U.S.”¹⁴ In response to Legend Lake and other issues, some Menominee formed DRUMS (Determination of Rights and Unity for Menominee Stockholders). One of DRUMS' expressions was that the land loss would make the Legend of Spirit Rock (from pg. 1) a reality.¹⁵ Through DRUMS and other political activism, a generation of prominent Menominee leaders emerged, including Ada Deer, who worked to push the U.S. to recognize Menominee sovereignty again. Restoration of Menominee sovereignty occurred in 1973. The Menominee continue to fight with other Indigenous peoples in the region against environmental injustices involving lands and waters that matter to them, including the now shut down Crandon mine project and more recently the Back 40 mining project.

Given this history, it is not surprising that the Menominee created the Sustainable Development Institute (SDI). The institute's goal is to reflect on what lessons can be learned from the Menominee's stories of continuance and to share with and learn from others. The institute, housed at the College of Menominee Nation (CMN), was founded in 1993 at the same time the College was founded. SDI is one of the first Indigenous-run research institutions. In collaboration with CMN, SDI provided one of the first Indigenous-run higher education programs in sustainability. The goals of SDI are to reflect on and interpret lessons about sustainability from the Menominee's transition from a seasonal round society to a primarily forestry dependent society and what lessons about sustainability arise from

the Menominee experience regarding all areas of community life. The heart of SDI is critical reflection that is situated *in place*.

The authors of this article are Potawatomi (Whyte), Menominee (Caldwell) and Odawa (Schaefer). Caldwell is the current Director of SDI; Schaefer spent several years working for SDI; Whyte is a frequent collaborator of SDI. While as members of Indigenous communities, we are often asked about whether our cultures have lessons about how humans and human societies can live sustainably or resiliently, we rarely have the chance to share the histories and processes of how our communities and nations have continued despite settler colonial oppression. Thinking about the Menominee case, *Indigenous planning* refers to how we as Indigenous peoples endeavor to sustain, revitalize and continue our social, cultural and ecological integrity under conditions of settler colonial oppression.

Indigenous Planning and Settler Colonialism

Indigenous peoples refer to the nearly 400 million people across the world whose communities, polities and nations exercised self-determination according to their own social, cultural and ecological systems—that is, governance systems—prior to periods in which other human groups dominated them through various combinations of imperial invasion, colonial exploitation and occupation, and settlement of their territories. Many Indigenous peoples continue to exercise self-determination today even though the nation states formed by the descendants of initial settlers, imperialists and allies of invaders are recognized by the majority of people in the world as the primary self-determining political sovereigns in those territories, such as the U.S. or New Zealand.¹⁶

While Indigenous peoples are distinct from one another, they often see themselves in mutual solidarity because they have overlapping political aspirations to continue their own self-determining governance systems in the face of colonial oppression. Planning is an important way in which to exercise collective self-determination. Broadly, we define planning as practical activities whereby a collective, such as a society or community or nation, envisions different futures that are more or less desirable for itself and its members, determines what capacities and strategies must be developed today to be prepared for different future scenarios, and revisits and revises its current capacities for preparedness to adjust to current and expected challenges.¹⁷

Many Indigenous persons in North America, such as the authors here, seek to play a role in Indigenous planning in our everyday lives as community members and in our professional careers, whether as Indigenous professionals and academics or community and cultural leaders or Indigenous government officials and staff.

Collectives can range from neighborhoods to nations and have many vague boundaries and hybrid members. For example, many Indigenous persons in North America are both citizens of an Indigenous Nation but also citizens of the U.S or Canadian nation states. Or some persons may be Indigenous but, for various reasons, are not enrolled formally in a Tribe. Indigenous communities today feature many religions and walks of life. Indigenous and settler collectives overlap, have borderlands, and hybrid social formations that have different expectations of the terms of negotiation and diplomacy. The Menominee, for example, include both Menominee living on or nearby the Menominee reservation but also those living in Green Bay, Chicago and other areas. Native American and Indigenous Studies scholars, such as Mishuana Goeman, have challenged understandings of Indigenous collectives that hold strict reservation/urban divides.¹⁸

For many Indigenous peoples, collectives are not anthropocentric. That is, they do not exclude animals, plants and ecosystems as members with the responsibilities of active agents in the world. In many cases, plants, animals and ecosystems are agents bound up in moral relationships of reciprocal responsibilities with humans and other nonhumans. Humans often identify themselves according to clans that are named for animals that those humans have a close connection to, such as cranes, wolves, bears and martens. Or in some cases humans see their own origins as arising from these particular clan species. Animals, plants and entities, such as water, are often considered as bearers of knowledge in their own right. Humans must exercise respect in their requesting counsel from these knowledge-bearers.¹⁹

Within Indigenous collectives, planning processes include diverse activities. That is, they can involve many slices of life. They involve ceremonies that express hope and emotional interpretations of the future. They involve researching knowledge archives. Archives may refer to the oral tradition or to actual formations in ecosystems, such as formations in the landscape created by plant and animal ancestors that can be used to reconstruct lessons from their time about how to live well.²⁰ Of course, knowledge archives also include old books and reports found in most Tribal offices or libraries. Planning processes involve ceremonial, narrative and analytical techniques for forecasting future scenarios, such as quantitative risk analysis used by elected Tribal officials or ceremonial protocols for building and expressing guiding visions for the future or community storytelling.²¹ They involve educational and ceremonial institutions for cultivating certain future-oriented attitudes and behaviors in younger generations, such as summer science education programs or traditional lodges.²²

Even though planning processes are processes of collectives—or collective processes—they are not always democratic or inclusive, and hence can be quite

problematic. As we can imagine, collective planning processes could be dominated by one person or a small committee of elite members or by members privileged by a form of oppression (e.g. patriarchy). Planning can be externally compelled by outsiders, as we have seen in North America when the U.S. imposed its own educational institutions, patriarchal gender systems, and governmental structures on many Indigenous peoples.

In these ways, as a general concept, *planning* can refer to a number of types of more or less democratic, inclusive or exploitative processes. For this reason, collective planning processes have enormous moral implications. In addition, what planners in one collective decide to do can impact many other collectives. The recent Indigenous resistance to the Dakota Access Pipeline is an example of this, as the U.S., the pipeline company and the investors (by implication) can be said to have engaged in a planning process that, among other things, led to the pipeline's route being moved away from Bismarck, North Dakota and closer to the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.²³

Indigenous planning does not refer necessarily to all planning processes in which every Indigenous peoples engages. Rather, for us here, it is more narrowly understood as planning concerned with the challenges of issues with which many Indigenous peoples identify, settler colonial oppression being a major one. Ted Jojola summarizes these shared issues well by claiming that Indigenous planning is an approach to “community planning” and an “ideological movement.”²⁴ He writes that the “key to the process is the acknowledgment of an indigenous world-view... A world-view is rooted in distinct community traditions that have evolved over a successive history of shared experiences.”²⁵

We take Jojola to mean that Indigenous planning is related to Indigenous governance systems that have roots prior to the incursion and establishment of North American settler societies and states. That is, Indigenous peoples have planning processes to draw on that are not part of the planning processes of settler states. Hirini Matunga refers to this as “classical” Indigenous planning, in which planners rely on “traditional knowledge, worldviews and values” and “traditional approaches, processes, and institutional arrangements to implement decisions.”²⁶ These classic planning processes can be useful for many reasons, depending on the context. They may use structures of leadership and decision-making processes that are more trustworthy to Tribal members; they may be based on values and knowledges of the ecosystem that have greater local precision and relevance; they may rely on symbolism, storytelling and cultural practices that are intrinsically valuable to Tribal members as part of their identities and family, clan, and band lives; they may require processes of research and recovery to bring back (in cases

where traditions are no longer practiced or remembered widely) that serve to bring community participants together, building better relationships through engagement in the processes of research and recovery.

We see Jojola as referencing “shared experiences” to *also* indicate the histories of Indigenous peoples having to adapt to settler colonialism. Indigenous peoples have learned many things from these experiences about what it means to achieve continuance under severe conditions of oppression and powerlessness. These points are why we discuss Indigenous planning as how we as Indigenous peoples endeavor to sustain, revitalize and continue our social, cultural and ecological integrity under conditions of settler colonial oppression.

Indigenous Planning, Settler Colonialism and Futurity

The U.S. and Canada continue to practice multiple forms of colonialism, including global imperialism, colonial occupation (e.g. U.S. territories) and neocolonialism.²⁷ They also perpetrate *settler colonialism*, which is one focus of our discussion here. Settler colonialism is a form of oppression in which settlers *permanently* and *ecologically* inscribe homelands of their own onto Indigenous homelands. Settlers do not, as in imperial or metropolitan forms of colonialism, seek fundamentally to extract wealth and harness Indigenous labor for the sake benefiting peoples in central homelands located somewhere else.²⁸ Some argue that settler colonialism is one condition for strengthening U.S. imperialism abroad because it establishes the needed land base for U.S. food security, manufacturing, military development and metropolitanism (i.e. being a global intellectual and cultural hub).²⁹

For the Menominee, U.S. settlement contained them on a small reservation to open up land for settlers to engage in the terraforming and hydraulic engineering needed to build and validate settler cultures and economies. Settlers quickly laid claim to the U.S. and then the state of Wisconsin, developing social identities and attachments to the land in relation to settler agricultural, industrial, cultural and recreational activities in the region. Settlers ignored and erased Menominee and other peoples’ social identities and attachments to the land, removing the footprints on the land that mark Indigenous histories and Indigenous cultural and economic activities (e.g. seasonal rounds). For a territory to emerge as a meaningful homeland for settlers, the origin, religious and cultural narratives, ways of life, and political and economic systems (e.g., property) must be engraved and embedded into the waters, soils, air, and other environmental dimensions of the territory. That is, settler *ecologies* have to be inscribed so that settlers can exercise their own governance

systems.³⁰ So it was no accident that U.S. settlers created the idea of Legend Lake as “unowned” and “untouched”—*such an ideal spot for (settler) recreation!*

Ecologies are systematic arrangements of humans, nonhuman beings (animals, plants, etc.) and entities (spiritual, inanimate, etc.), and landscapes (climate regions, boreal zones, etc.) that are conceptualized and operate purposefully to facilitate a society’s capacity to survive and flourish in a particular landscape and watershed. Waves of settlement seek to incise their own ecologies required for their societies to survive and flourish in the landscapes they seek to occupy permanently. In settlement, the territories were already inscribed with Indigenous ecologies that result from Indigenous practices of survival and flourishing.³¹

The Indigenous ecologies *physically manifest* Indigenous governance systems through origin, religious and cultural narratives, ways of life, political structures, and economies. The Menominee seasonal rounds described earlier serve as an example of Menominee ecology. The physical manifestation of the Menominee ecology featured extensive ricing lakes whose hydrology and biodiversity reflected Menominee stewardship. The rice ecology embodies environmentally the Menominee origin and other cultural stories that feature rice so prominently. The rice ecology, as it is inscribed in the land, bears witness to the Menominee peoples’ exercise of responsibilities to rice. The physical manifestations affirm the importance of and motivation for protecting ricing traditions for the sake of future generations.

For settlers, the presence of Indigenous ecologies—from the human activities themselves to their physical manifestations as particular ecosystems and ecological flows—delegitimize settlers’ claims to have honorable and credible religious “missions,” universal property rights, and exclusive political and cultural sovereignty. So as to remove any markers or physical manifestations challenging their moral legitimacy, power and self-determination, settlers systematically seek to erase the ecologies required for Indigenous governance systems, such as Indigenous seasonal rounds.³² Though the -ology in ecology may sound like a peculiar usage, we use it to denote human agency within ecosystems, whether that agency is the Indigenous knowledge of seasonal rounds that shaped the lands and waters of the Menominee ancestral territories or the settler desires to shape the same lands and waters to reflect and support their aspirations.

Shawano Lake was formerly a major Menominee wild rice bed and area for fishing, hunting and berry cultivation through systematic burning. Wisconsin settlers terraformed and hydrologically engineered the lake area into a recreational lake. The lake area no longer supports Menominee ricing or harvest and is now dominated settler homes and recreational businesses. The lake is, according to settler law, “off-reservation,” hence settlers believe they are not on Menominee lands

or waters. In a short time, the ecology of the lake is now a settler ecology, with few physical manifestations of Menominee ecologies remaining.³³ We seek to pause during this part of the essay to go into further detail about why settler processes, such as the terraforming and hydraulic engineering of Shawano Lake, are harmful to Indigenous peoples.

One society's erasure of the ecologies of other societies is harmful because, among other reasons, doing so undermines *qualities of relationships* of the colonized societies that have developed over many years. These qualities of relationships bolster continuance, as in the case of Menominee rice ecologies and the clan and gendered responsibilities to rice and rice's support of Menominee self-determination. Qualities of relationships are properties of relationships that make it possible for a relationship to have wide societal impact. Qualities of relationships motivate the discharge of responsibilities among the parties or relatives within relationships. Quality is different from *type* of a relationship. A type of relationship is simply the description of the relationship itself, for example, the human nutritional or religious connection to wild rice (e.g. "humans eat wild rice; humans use wild rice in ceremonies").

The qualities of the relationship are the actual properties of that relationship that motivate humans to care for rice and to gain and protect knowledge of rice. The motivation makes it possible for humans to have an emotional disposition to take responsibility for rice. As we will discuss shortly, the more humans take responsibility, the more the other parties or relatives reciprocate (e.g. flourishing rice harvests) if the appropriate causal relationships are also in place (such as causal relationships known via Indigenous knowledge systems about the impact of certain human practices on the growth of rice and the impact of certain ceremonies and educational practices on motivating and training humans to engage in stewardship practices skillfully). This reciprocity further secures and strengthens human motivation as the benefits of taking responsibility are physically manifest. We will review just two qualities of relationships here.

Trust refers to a quality of relationships among people in the community in which each party or relative, human and nonhuman, takes to heart the best interests of the other party or relative. People trust one another when they feel confident and at ease that the trustor takes the trustees' best interest to heart.³⁴ Trust facilitates collective well-being and collective planning when people can be trusted to discharge particular responsibilities, leaving others to take up the many other responsibilities in the society. Trust is emotional, and takes time to develop among different parties or relatives in a relationship.

Clan systems are based on trust. Specific clans are often charged with different responsibilities. Members of those clans, through exercising protocols and ceremonies and furnishing results, reaffirmed their identities as trustors having those responsibilities. For example, the Menominee's Moose clan has the responsibility of protecting the wild rice until it is ripe, overseeing the harvest, and ensuring an equitable and communal distribution. Clans provided leadership and expertise in multiple forms, from the political and diplomatic responsibilities of the Bear Clan to the knowledge of the Crane Clan in building products from naturally available materials. Clan members have particular knowledges and skills that are trusted by everyone else to contribute to seasonal rounds on the whole.³⁵

Gender is also closely related to trust. As discussed earlier, women of Menominee and related groups had special leadership and expert positions in relation to activities such as wild rice. Gender difference, then, was not associated with oppression, but with responsibilities entrusted within a society. This is why the connection between patriarchy and settler colonialism creates distrust between men, women and two-spirit persons in many Indigenous peoples, as trust is replaced with oppressive gender relations. This oppressive connection has played a role in what are now many morally-problematic, male-dominated Tribal governments and agencies today and the heightened risks of sexual violence and murder that Indigenous women and two-spirit persons face. Or even the most clearly recorded articulations of some Indigenous traditions, including perhaps some of those told in the epigraph, are now told in a masculinist way.³⁶

Redundancy is a quality that refers to states of affairs of having multiple options for adaptation when changes occur and for being able to guarantee sufficient opportunities for education and mentorship for community members. For example, in the case of wild rice harvesting, a society with high redundancy is one that can harvest from multiple ricing lakes in the event that some lakes stop producing rice for some period of time, whether naturally or through destruction or occupation by settlers. As described earlier, the Menominee seasonal round ranged over a large region that included many rice lakes and other sources of food and medicine. Redundancy is a quality of relationship because it refers to more than just the fact of there being a commodity or religious relationship to rice in some society. Redundancy refers to their being many options for maintaining the type of relationship. Redundancy is sustained by human motivation toward performing stewardship, mentorship, ceremonial, educational, monitoring, training, harvesting, and disposal practices with relatives of the nonhuman world. Analogous to language fluency, people are more motivated to learn and will learn better if all generations in a society speak (and prefer to speak) a particular language. Having many fluent

speakers can, by analogy, be compared to having many rice lakes. In literatures on sustainability, concepts such as *buffering* may also be compared to redundancy.³⁷

It is very important to note the ecological dimensions of these qualities of relationships. Redundancy and trust figure within the dynamics of ecosystems. Redundancy requires deep connections to lands and waters that allow people to monitor for change and maintain, as best as possible, the amount and diversity of habitats. Having a lot of habitats ensures that there are also sufficient opportunities to mentor youth and to foster the independence of particular families and other groupings through their being able to have easier access within their seasonal rounds to harvesting opportunities. For trust, in order to maintain a wild rice habitats as part of a rice ecology, precipitation, water levels, integrity of the shoreline and those plants and animals that interact with rice must be monitored by people, such as clan members. Trust is often rooted in knowledge that certain members or groups of a society have in depth knowledge of certain aspects of the ecosystem and that there are processes in place in a society to adequately vet and train knowledge bearers (including nonhuman knowledge-bearers).

Importantly, qualities of relationships support the ongoing futurity or future continuance of Indigenous societies. Futurity refers to the idea that members of a society ought to be able to experience that their own efforts and contributions to their society play a part in making it so that a vibrant future is possible for the coming generations and in the perceptual experiences of young people living today. Futurity has been shown to be significant for Indigenous peoples, for one way of understanding settler colonialism is as a form of oppression that destroys Indigenous futurity.³⁸ Settler colonialism, in relation to planning, attacks our capacities to assert or stage our own futurities.³⁹ To believe ourselves and our societies have futures, we need to witness a sufficient degree of our relationships and histories in the physical manifestations of ecologies. The physical manifestations furnish credence in our efforts' and contributions' potential to move forward or move cyclically into the next generation.

In other words, we need to witness that there is sufficient territory, with particular habitats, to sustain seasonal round activities. We need to witness landscapes that are referenced in stories. We need to be able to experience that what younger and older generations do in relation to one another affects the capacity of each generation to live well into the future. We need to be immersed in the presence of the markers of our ancestors in the lands and waters. Redundancy supports futurity because it allows us to witness the capacity of an ecology to support an Indigenous people throughout time. Trust is a basis for futurity because we see that people in positions of political or epistemic authority take our best interest to heart

and that it is worthwhile in our lives to put in the efforts required to cultivate ourselves as trusted members of our societies. In this way, the replacement of Indigenous ecologies with settler ecologies can inflict rapid changes. These changes, such as the destruction of rice ecology, undermine the plant and related species whose physical manifestation in ecosystems foster qualities of relationships (trust, redundancy, and others) that are important for our continuance.

Connecting Planning to Indigenous Studies and Institution-Building

In planning, Indigenous peoples imagine themselves strategically in ways that are not reliant on settler and other oppressive desires, discourses, and needs. Planning involves imagining futures in which qualities of relationships, such as trust and redundancy (but others too), flourish. We see these insights and principles reflected in the Menominee's planning through its forestry and other programs. The Menominee forest establishes and protects multiple relationships of redundancy and trust across humans and nonhumans of the Menominee collective. The forest relies on Menominee history, culture and knowledge in resistance to settler colonial oppression. Indigenous scholars and Indigenous persons working for Indigenous institutions offer lessons through their studies and work that are certainly in dialogue with what we have discussed already. We will share some of these lessons here.

Mishuana Goeman and Jennifer Denetdate write that “the structures of our lives as Native women and men are shaped by racism, sexism, and discrimination. We strive to recover our former selves and push toward creating better future selves by reclaiming Native values, which have seen us through multiple traumas, including land dispossession and the loss of our freedoms.”⁴⁰ Leanne Simpson claims that “Resurgence happens *within* Indigenous bodies and through the connections we make to each other and our land. That’s how we strengthen ourselves within *Nishnaabeg* intelligence.”⁴¹ Gerald Vizenor’s concept of survivance refers to “an active sense of presence, the continuance of native stories, not a mere reaction, or a survivable name. Native survivance stories are renunciations of dominance, tragedy, and victimry.” One commentator interprets survivance as “renewal and continuity into the future rather than memorializing the past”⁴² Audra Simpson’s politics of refusal arises from *Kahnawà:ke* actions, words and stances. Describing them, she writes that they “used every opportunity to remind non-Native people that this is not their land, that there are other political orders and possibilities.” She sees “It is just this sort of cognizance of differing social and historical facts that make for the posture of refusal.”⁴³

Dian Million draws on the concept of *naw’qinwixw* from Jeanette Armstrong. On Million’s interpretation, it is a concept of inclusivity that “Indigenous people of

many genders, ages, and abilities perform radical acts of determination around, above, and outside of nation-states' heteronormative, homophobic, misogynist, regulatory Indian policies. In [Million's] reading, "*naw'qinwixw* informs first practices, effectively performed ethical acts of interrelationship that involve all in any sustained effort to live in a place, with one another, generatively with life, rather than as that which seeks control."⁴⁴ Million's philosophy of "healing" looks to Indigenous women as "[offering] a specific vision of polity that encompasses diverse alliances, one that is informed by practices of *naw'qinwixw* in political struggles for land, food, and environmental justice."⁴⁵

Māori scholar Kepa Morgan in Aotearoa/New Zealand has created a model for environmental assessment based on their concept of Mauri. The concept is "central to Tangata Whenua belief regarding the environment. Mauri is the binding force between the physical and the spiritual aspects. When the mauri is totally extinguished, this is associated with death...Mauri is considered to be the essence or life force that provides life to all living things. Water also has mauri."⁴⁶ As an ecology, "Mauri also establishes the inter-relatedness of all living things. The linkages between all living things within the ecosystem are based on the whakapapa or genealogies of creation. This establishes the basis for the holistic view of the environment and our ecosystem held by the Tangata Whenua." This concept has been used to design a metric for evaluating the environmental actions of the New Zealand settler state in terms of whether particular actions increase or decrease Mauri, instead of relying on settler notions of economic costs and health impacts.⁴⁷

In the St. Lawrence River/Great Lakes region, the Akwesasne Mohawk Nation's Environmental Department, whose key lead contributors include Angela Benedict and Mary Arquette and numerous community members,⁴⁸ created a climate change plan based on their own knowledge of what we are calling *ecologies* instead of relying heavily on the scientific concepts of a U.S. federal agency or non-Mohawk adaptation planning organization. For example, their plan is organized according to the ecology of the Mohawk Thanksgiving Address, which includes, as categories through which to understand climate change: "The People, Mother Earth, The Waters, The Fish, Small Plants and Grasses, The Berries, Three Sisters, Medicine Herbs, Animals, Trees, The Birds, The Four Winds, The Thunderers, Grand Mother Moon, The Sun, The Stars, the Four Beings and the Creator." Each of these categories involves intricately woven human and nonhuman relationships and responsibilities. In terms of community engagement, and quoting from the plan itself, it calls for the Tribe to hold "a number of Adaptation Planning classes to teach community members how to prepare for climate change now, and uphold the

traditional culture of the Tribe under the changed climatic conditions of the future.”⁴⁹

The Diné Policy Institute of the Navajo Nation also use their own ecology to create a food sovereignty plan, using the principle of *Hozho* or holistic well-being (a Navajo word hard to translate into English). The plan, whose authors include lead such as Dana Eldridge, Institute staff and community members, seeks to “foster greater self-sufficiency, health, and sustainability for Diné people...by reconnecting them with traditional foods and revitalizing knowledge and practices around foods.” According the plan, “restoring *Hozho* will have positive impacts on the health of the people, relationships of the people as well as our interconnectedness with the land, while also leading to greater self-sufficiency for the Diné people and the Navajo Nation.” The plan recommends “rebuilding of a self-sufficient food system for the Diné people.” The plan carefully documents how settler colonialism has been enacted to create a disconnect between Indigenous people and their land, food and health, hence *Hozho* refers, among many things, to processes that can refuse and resurge against oppression.⁵⁰

The Sustainable Development Institute of the College of Menominee Nation

The Menominee Nation’s planning process for sustainability expresses many of the themes and ideas discussed earlier, especially through the work represented in its Sustainable Development Institute, founded by Tribal leadership in 1993 through the Tribe’s college. The College of Menominee Nation (CMN) is one of thirty-seven Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) in the United States.⁵¹ Tribes founded TCUs starting in the late 1960s to provide culturally and socially supportive environments for American Indian students, to support local tribal communities, and to produce indigenous research and scholarship (Boyer 1997). CMN was chartered by the Menominee Tribal Legislature in 1993 and reaffirmed by a vote from the general membership of the Menominee Tribe in 1996.

CMN’s mission is “to provide opportunities in higher education to its students. As an institution of higher learning chartered by the Menominee People, the College infuses this education with American Indian culture, preparing students for leadership, careers and advanced studies in a multicultural world.”⁵² From CMN’s founding, there has been a strong connection and commitment to sustainability. Dr. Verna Fowler, founding CMN president, describes the deep connection between sustainability, education and what we have described already as Indigenous planning. In an open letter, she states that “for our College and the Menominee People who chartered CMN, sustainable development has roots in the

moral code, governance structure, and sustainable forestry practices that evolved within the tribe over many centuries.”

Since its beginning, the College of Menominee Nation has built its curriculum around “respect for the land, water, and air; partnership with other creatures of earth; and a way of living and working that achieves a balance between use and replenishment of all resources.”⁵³ Sustainability has always been a part of Menominee life and was therefore a deliberate part of the values infused throughout CMN. This commitment was specifically expressed by Menominee Nation leadership through the initiation of the Sustainable Development Institute (SDI). Initial development of the institute focused on the promotion of the Menominee forest and its management through public education, a focus on Menominee youth, and to facilitation of forest-based economic development. This eventually led to the development of an enhanced mission statement for SDI which stated, “To continuously expand knowledge, understanding and resources related to Menominee Nation Sustainable Development for the purpose of ensuring ongoing protection, control and productivity of the Menominee culture, environment, economy, technology, and community.”⁵⁴

To advance this mission, the SDI Board of Directors began to develop a theoretical model of sustainable development to understand the success of Menominee forest management, to share the sustainability successes with others, and to begin to address sustainability issues in other aspects of tribal life. SDI began with a framework of sustainable development outlined in both the CMN and SDI mission statements, which postulated that sustainability comprises community, technology, culture, governance, interconnectedness, economy, and tribal control. In 1995, SDI created a Sustainable Development Advisory Council that paired Menominee leaders and Tribal experts with external partners and experts. The Advisory Council built upon the CMN and SDI mission statements to develop a theoretical model of sustainable development to guide research, education, and outreach. Over the next several years CMN, SDI, and the Sustainable Development Advisory Council convened meetings and held discussions among themselves, Menominee Tribal leaders, academics, and community members to understand the Menominee sustainable development experience and to build the SDI model.

What eventually emerged from the CMN and SDI process in the mid- 1990s was a model that defines sustainability as comprising six discrete but highly interrelated dimensions: (1) land and sovereignty; (2) natural environment (which includes human beings); (3) institutions; (4) technology; (5) economics; and (6) human perception, activity, and behavior (Fig. 1). The model can be used for a range of processes, including planning, research and evaluation.

Land and sovereignty has specific legal and cultural meanings for the Menominee and other Indigenous peoples that they exercised and continue to exercise sovereignty in their territories long before the U.S.⁵⁵ This dimension expresses the idea of redundancy, discussed earlier, which is important to the Menominee because they have fought to retain their land and sovereignty for centuries.⁵⁶ Menominee view this long struggle to have a terrestrial basis for (what we call) redundancy as one of the reasons they have been able to maintain a reservation within their ancestral territory, maintain the ecological diversity and spiritual and cultural value of their forestland through time, develop a world-renowned forest management system and establish CMN.

The natural environment dimension of the SDI model, broadly interpreted, goes beyond natural resources to include people, human communities, plants, animals, rocks, water, and air. The natural environment dimension incorporates Menominee understandings that everything is connected and related and the importance of building relationships based on trust, among other qualities of relationships. The natural environment dimension is compatible with Western/U.S. science based research methodologies assuming that intercultural engagement occurs on fair terms. Institutions in the SDI model refers to structures that develop and enforce rules of behavior and social interactions (which can include interactions among humans, plants and animals, and the environment). For the Menominee, institutions include the Menominee clan system, the contemporary Tribal government, and CMN, where trust plays an important role in ensuring good relations among members of the community.

Technology in the SDI model initially focused on rural community access to modern advances in telecommunications but later expanded to include cultural tools and practices. It includes Menominee technology for building birch bark canoes, processing wild rice, producing high-quality saw timber in a sawmill, and using Geographic Information Systems to implement sustainable forestry management activities. Today, technology can be understood as “how humans do things...or how humans get things done.”⁵⁷ Economics is an important dimension found in many models of sustainability. For the SDI model, economics incorporates multiple scales ranging from the individual household, to the tribe, to the region, to the nation, to the globe. Economics for the Menominee includes the coexistence of individuals engaged in subsistence harvesting and commercial timber harvesting for sale onto the international market. This includes individuals engaged in commerce and subsistence harvesting in addition to tribal economic ventures, such as Menominee Tribal Enterprises. Key to both the technology and economic

dimensions are the roles these systems play in collectives as providing trustworthy services that prioritize community well-being and establish and protect redundancy.

The final SDI model dimension is human perception, activity, and behavior. This dimension includes different scales ranging from individual perceptions, activities and behaviors to community understandings, values, and collective pursuits. This dimension incorporates everything from Menominee cultural beliefs and practices to the creation of forestry management plans that limit timber harvesting to sustainable levels. This dimension can be used to cover the importance for peoples' motivation and commitment to be able to live in ecologies that bear witness to Indigenous histories, cultures, economies and futurities. Trustworthy relationships, for example, are deeply emotional experiences, requiring time to establish.

According to the SDI model, sustainable development is defined as the process of maintaining balance and reconciling the tensions within and among the six dimensions of sustainability. This does not mean to imply that there is a functional equilibrium or a "natural" balance; change is an explicit feature of the model. Each SDI model dimension is dynamic, both in respect to its internal organization, and in relationship to each of the other five dimensions of the model. Change within one dimension will impact other dimensions in an ever-unfolding diffusion of responses to change. Change can be externally driven or inherent to the dynamic nature of any of the six dimensions. The SDI model recognizes that there will always be tensions within and among model dimensions. Tensions can be illustrated by placing SDI model dimensions adjacent to one another. Furthermore, as tensions among model dimensions are relieved new tensions will arise. Because new tensions will always arise, sustainable development is defined as a continual, and sometimes iterative, process. The model is intergenerational in its framework.

SDI is a case of Indigenous planning through its processes of reflection on how the Menominee and other Indigenous peoples have adapted to settler colonial oppression. The reflection concerns both lessons learned and how to apply them in planning processes to other areas of community life. It is all part of the sustainable forestry story that continues to have physical and ecological credence today in the presence of the forest itself as a living agent. The model is a planning tool that can be used to examine the tensions of human-environmental relationships within (what we call) ecologies. The model, if changed, should be changed in the manner that it was created. The model is dynamic, it can change, and it should change.

SDI is unique as an Indigenous research institution within the Tribal college framework. Tribal colleges typically focus on Tribal needs in a "technical" sense that is rarely reflective in ways that empower students to delve into their own Tribal

histories, experiences, and insights and explore the physical/ecological manifestations of Indigenous governance that express futurity, such as the Menominee sustainable forest. This is why SDI conceives itself as based on the idea of reflection on insights and lessons about sustainability *in place*. SDI is a *place* for students to focus on programs guided by the Indigenous peoples and not by an external institution.

The Sustainable Development Institute on Climate Change

Consistent with SDI's core mission to share insights within the Menominee community and beyond, it has embarked on a number of projects, with climate change emerging as a larger thematic area for exploring Indigenous ecologies and human-environmental relations more broadly. Climate change poses a threat to the traditional livelihoods and the sustainably managed forestlands of the Menominee Nation. However, climate change also presents an opportunity—a chance to apply Indigenous knowledge to adapt and sustain Native communities and, for the Menominee Nation especially, to share its understandings with others seeking to address this global issue. The experience and ability of SDI to work within and across the worldviews of both Indigenous knowledge and “western science” allows for opportunities to address a complex issue like climate change from multiple perspectives. SDI is a case of an overall process that seeks to understand, through multiple projects, how Menominee and other Indigenous peoples can sustain the continuance of our own societies despite the oppressive conditions we face.

The SDI model itself, a summary of Menominee indigenous planning expertise, provides a framework, or representation of an ecology, for addressing climate change outside of the mainstream thinking in a more integrative and holistic manner, taking into consideration—rather than separation of—spiritual aspects related to resilience and adaptation and the inclusion of elder and youth voices with the scientific voices. This focus on different perspectives and voices are just parts of the overall picture of Menominee's lessons on the meaning of place-based sustainability. The resulting climate change projects include those operating at regional, national and global climate scales. In all of these projects, SDI has served as a boundary organization that facilitates processes of Indigenous planning for climate change in the context of interactions with settler institutions, especially U.S. federal agencies.

For the past few years, the SDI has held a “Shifting Seasons Summit” to respond to the growing local, national, and global need to monitor and respond to climate change. The most recent summit was funded by largely the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs and Northeast Climate Science Center. The conferences were

organized dialogically, with Indigenous persons, nations and organizations as the lead-planners and major speakers, instructors and attendees. Participants had the opportunity to spend time directly on the Menominee land, such as visits to the Menominee Forest, culturally significant areas and specific communities. Participants also sat in circles or in other communicative arrangements, at different points in the conference, to discuss the importance of talking about topics not typically discussed in relation to climate change, which ranged from collaboration across cultural difference to colonialism to gender and patriarchy.

Measuring the Pulse of the Forest was a three-year project funded through a U.S. Department of Agriculture National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) Tribal Research Grant Program. Project partners included the Center for First Americans Forestlands (part of SDI), the Smithsonian Institution, and Michigan State University's Native American Institute. The integrated resource approach of this project not only identified predicted climate change impacts on the Menominee forest, but also how that would influence the Menominee peoples' relationships with the forest and impacted species. The study included the installation of three one-hectare climate change monitoring plots and the development and use of semi-structured interviews to assess community members' relationships and Indigenous knowledge with the forest in the past, present, and future. This project was a direct example of Indigenous planning through the use of a framework based on Indigenous knowledge and the utilization of western science to help illustrate these relationships from another perspective. In this instance, the work is controlled by a Tribal entity (College of Menominee Nation) with an Indigenous community as the main beneficiary.

Through a project funded by the Northeast Climate Science Center, SDI has worked to collaborate with Indigenous nations throughout the Northeast region to find planning solutions to climate change impacts that can be pursued by individual Tribes or through cooperative solutions. Initial development for this project grew from an earlier project between the Center for First Americans Forestlands (at CMN), the U.S. Forest Service, and the Great Lakes Integrated Sciences + Assessments Center to develop Indigenous methods of strategic foresight for adaptation planning. The project focuses on how Indigenous peoples can develop, specific to their locations, culturally-guided and community-based climate change programs, often inspired by seasonal round and other governance systems coming from the Indigenous communities. Some of the key developments have been the creation and refinement of nation- or community-specific public engagement strategies, a methodology of Indigenous scenario planning and culturally-rooted educational programs on climate change for youth.

SDI seeks to expand its work to better understand how to evaluate Indigenous partnerships with scientists and to offer more educational opportunities for Indigenous students that will prepare them for future work on climate change planning. SDI and Michigan State University recently received funding from the National Science Foundation to evaluate ethical training for scientists in climate science organizations, and the SDI worked with Carla Dhillon to evaluate the 2015 meeting of "Rising Voices: Collaborative Science for Climate Solutions" at the National Center for Atmospheric Research.⁵⁸ In both projects, SDI is developing Indigenous frameworks for evaluation that can measure or gauge relationship issues such as trustworthiness—expressed through Indigenous concepts such as family relatedness—that matter to many Indigenous persons in their interactions with scientists.

Also in 2015, SDI hosted its first “Indigenous Planning Summer Institute” for SDI summer interns at the College of Menominee Nation. In 2016 and 2017, the Indigenous Planning Summer Institute invited Indigenous students along with SDI summer interns and instructors from the Indigenous Design and Planning Institute at the University of New Mexico, and expanded its curriculum to include three Indigenous planning concepts from the Institute’s work that engender credence in Indigenous futurities: seven generation planning, Indigenous knowledges and cultures are already powerful resource for planning, and the history of oppression in Indigenous communities needs to be understood and learned from.

These concepts were shown in practice through placed-based and activity-based curriculum conducted by and occurring at the Menominee Nation, Oneida Nation and the Stockbridge-Munsee Community. The curriculum was developed in collaboration with Ted Jojola and Michaela Shirley of the Indigenous Design and Planning Institute at the University of New Mexico. In this way, the Indigenous students had the opportunity to learn from other Indigenous peoples about planning. The planning institute seeks to provide Indigenous-based, experiential training for the next generation of Indigenous scientists, leaders, activists and professionals. The institute seeks to motivate students’ creativity and provide what is unfortunately a rare but *powerful* opportunity for Indigenous persons to engage in intercultural exchange across different Indigenous peoples.

Conclusion

SDI focuses on what can best be described as reflective planning processes of Indigenous sustainability. The processes are rooted in what we can understand and recover from our experiences prior to and during settler colonialism and how our own interpretations can be used to support the continuance of Indigenous peoples.

A huge part of what SDI does is not so much centered on Indigenous lessons on sustainability for *all humanity*. Rather, SDI's work considers what processes support Indigenous peoples' sustainability in the face of the challenges of settler colonialism, starting from the Menominee experience and then branching out to others when mutual benefits are possible. This reflection on sustainability arises from concern about how Indigenous peoples can put planning processes into practice. It is an active effort that expresses our gratitude to those before us and shows our responsibility to those that will come after us. This line of sustainability is maintained by sharing cultural values that have been passed down from generation to generation to show how we can act on the potential futurities of our peoples.

This is different from how some non-Indigenous communities seek to understand our lessons of sustainability for the purpose of saving themselves, or *humankind*. Instead, Indigenous planning, as a way of reflecting on Indigenous sustainability, is about figuring out the planning processes arising from the contexts that we actually live in today, in which our societies are greatly limited and threatened by settler colonialism and other forms of oppression. Reflecting on sustainability in this way—whether regarding climate change, biodiversity conservation or food sovereignty—keeps us aware of how oppression endures as one of the largest threats to Indigenous peoples and many other groups. Whether settler and other privileged populations ultimately can achieve sustainability in the near or long term planning horizons is not so much our concern. Regardless of what happens with them, the odds are that Indigenous peoples will continue to face different forms of colonial oppression and must innovate strategies for protecting our continuance no matter what non-Indigenous populations end up doing.

¹ Wisconsin State Historical Marker on the Menominee Nation reservation.

² In both stories, spellings vary due to source.

³ David Beck, *Seige and Survival: History of the Menominee Indians 1634-1856* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2002): 8; also quoting Albert Ernest Jenks, *The Wild Rice Gatherers of the Upper Lakes: A Study in American Primitive Economics* (U.S. Government Printing Office, Vol 19, 1901).

⁴ David Grignon et al., *Menominee Indian Reservation historical review—commemorating the reservation sesquicentennial 1854–2004* (Keshena: Menominee Historic Preservation Department Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, 2004)

⁵ David Beck, *Seige and Survival: History of the Menominee Indians 1634-1856*, 7

⁶ University of Wisconsin, *The Menominee Clans Story* (2016)

⁷ David Beck, *Seige and Survival: History of the Menominee Indians 1634-1856*, 16

⁸ Ibid; Brenda Child, *Holding our world together: Ojibwe women and the survival of community* (New York: Penguin, 2012)

⁹ Felix Keesing, *The Menominee Indians of Wisconsin: a study of three centuries of cultural contact and change* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1939): 102

¹⁰ David Beck, *The struggle for self-determination: history of the Menominee Indians since 1854* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005); Brian Hosmer, *American Indians in the marketplace: Persistence and innovation among the Menominees and Metlakatlans, 1870-1920* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999); Marshall Pecore, "Menominee sustained-yield management: A successful land ethic in practice," *Journal of Forestry*, 90 (1992)

¹¹ David Beck, *The struggle for self-determination: History of the Menominee Indians since 1854*; Dockry 2012

¹² Menominee Tribe, *Menominee Forest Management Plan*, (Keshena: Menominee Tribe, 2012)

¹³ Marshall Pecore, "Menominee sustained-yield management: A successful land ethic in practice"

¹⁴ Advertisement in *The Post Crescent* May 16, 1969. Credit to Michael Dockry for this research.

-
- ¹⁵ DRUMS Newsletter July 1, 1972. Credit to Michael Dockry for this research.
- ¹⁶ James Anaya, *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Douglas Sanders, *The Formation of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples*. (Copenhagen, Denmark: The International Secretariat of International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 1977)
- ¹⁷ Ted Jojola, "Indigenous Planning--An Emerging Context," *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 17,1 (2008); Ryan Walker, David Natcher, & Ted Jojola, *Reclaiming indigenous planning* Vol. 70 (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013). See also S Yvonne Prusak, Ryan Walker, and Robert Innes. "Toward Indigenous Planning? First Nation Community Planning in Saskatchewan, Canada." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 36, no. 4 (2016): 440-50.
- ¹⁸ Mishuana Goeman, *Mark my words: Native women mapping our nations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013)
- ¹⁹ Robin Kimmerer, *Braiding sweetgrass: indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants* (Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 2013)
- ²⁰ John Borrows, *Recovering Canada: the resurgence of Indigenous law* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002); Val Napoleon, *Thinking about Indigenous Legal Orders* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013)
- ²¹ Treaty Indian Tribes in Western Washington. *Treaty Rights At Risk: Ongoing Habitat Loss, the Decline of the Salmon Resource, and Recommendations for Change*. (2011) Retrieved from <http://nwifc.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/08/whitepaper628finalpdf.pdf>
- ²² Kate McCoy, Eve Tuck, & Marcia McKenzie, *Land Education: Rethinking Pedagogies of Place From Indigenous, Postcolonial, and Decolonizing Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2016); Andrejs Kulnieks, Dan Roronhiakewen Longboat, and Young Young, *Contemporary Studies in Environmental and Indigenous Pedagogies: A Curricula of Stories and Place* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).
- ²³ Kyle P. Whyte. "The Dakota Access Pipeline, Environmental Injustice and U.S. Colonialism." *Red Ink - An International Journal of Indigenous Literature, Arts and Humanities* 19, no. 1 (2017): 154-169.
- ²⁴ Ted Jojola, "Indigenous Planning — An Emerging Context"
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ Hirini Matunga, "Theorizing Indigenous Planning," In R. Walker, D. Natcher, & T. Jojola (Eds.), *Reclaiming indigenous planning* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2013): 11.
- ²⁷ Alyosha Goldstein, *Formations of United States colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014); Adam Barker, "The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State," *American Indian Quarterly* 33 (3) 2009, 325-351.
- ²⁸ Tate LeFevre introduces the literature on settler colonialism that appreciates the diverse contributions, especially Indigenous feminism and gender studies. "Settler Colonialism," *Oxford Bibliographies in Anthropology*, edited by John Jackson, 1-26. (Oxford University Press, 2015). Lorenzo Veracini points out that though settlers certainly engage in the other forms of colonialism during processes of settlement: *Settler Colonialism*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). See also Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization is not a metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1,1 (2012).
- ²⁹ Alyosha Goldstein, *Formations of United States colonialism*.
- ³⁰ Kyle P. Whyte, "Indigenous Food Systems, Environmental Justice, and Settler-Industrial States." In *Global Food, Global Justice*, edited by M Rawlinson, 143-66 (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015).
- ³¹ Ibid.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ We learned of this history through teachings at the Indigenous Planning Summer Institute in 2017, hosted by the Sustainable Development Institute of the College of Menominee Nation. Though see also Menominee testimonies about rice in Jenks, *The Wild Rice Gatherers*.
- ³⁴ Annette Baier, "Trust and Anti-Trust," *Ethics* 96 (1986): 231-60.
- ³⁵ For a philosophical account of trust and knowledge related to the claims here, see Naomi Scheman, "Toward a Sustainable Epistemology," *Social Epistemology* 26, no. 3-4 (2012): 471-89.
- ³⁶ Mishuana Goeman & Jennifer Denetdale, "Native feminisms: Legacies, interventions, and Indigenous sovereignties," *Wicazo Sa Review* 24, 2 (2009); Joyce Green (Ed.), *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*. (London: Zed Books, 2007); Sarah Deer. *The Beginning and End of Rape* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).
- ³⁷ Ronald Trosper, "Northwest coast indigenous institutions that supported resilience and sustainability," *Ecological Economics* 41 (2012)
- ³⁸ Eve Tuck & Ruben Gaztambide-Fernández, "Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity," *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 29, 1 (2013)
- ³⁹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁰ Mishuana Goeman & Jennifer Denetdale, "Native feminisms: Legacies, interventions, and Indigenous sovereignties"
- ⁴¹ Simpson and Coulthard 2014
- ⁴² Gerald Vizenor. *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1994): vii. Karl Kroeber, "Why It's A Good Thing Gerald Vizenor is Not an Indian," In G. Vizenor (Ed.), *Survivance: Narratives of native presence*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008): 25.
- ⁴³ Audra Simpson, "Consent's Revenge," *Cultural Anthropology* 31, 3 (2016)
- ⁴⁴ Ibid. 28
- ⁴⁵ Dian Million, *Therapeutic nations: Healing in an age of indigenous human rights*, (Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 2013).

⁴⁶ 5

⁴⁷ Te Kipa Morgan, "The Value of a Hapū Perspective to Municipal Water Management Practice: Mauri and potential contribution to Sustainability Decision Making in Aotearoa New Zealand" (PhD diss., University of Auckland, 2008).; Te Kipa Morgan, "Waiora and Cultural Identity Water quality assessment using the Mauri Model" *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 3,1 (2011).; Te Kipa Morgan (2016). *Mauri Meter*. Retrieved from <http://www.mauriometer.com/http://www.mauriometer.com/>

⁴⁸ Mary Arquette, "Tribal Adaptation Case Study," presentation at the Shifting Seasons Summit: Building Capacity for Tribal Climate Change Adaptation, 2014. College of Menominee Nation.

⁴⁹ St. Regis Mohawk Environmental Division, "Climate Change Adaptation Plan for Akwesasne," Akwesasne, St. Regis Mohawk Tribe (2013)

⁵⁰ Diné Policy Institute, *Diné Food Sovereignty* (2014)

⁵¹ See the American Indian Higher Education Consortium at <http://www.aihec.org> for information about TCUs.

⁵² CMN 2013

⁵³ Fowler 2013

⁵⁴ CMN 1994

⁵⁵ see Vine Deloria & Clifford Lytle, *The nations within: the past and future of American Indian sovereignty* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984)

⁵⁶ David Beck, *Seige and Survival: History of the Menominee Indians*; David Beck, *The struggle for self-determination: history of the Menominee Indians since 1854*; David Grignon et al., *Menominee Indian Reservation historical review—commemorating the reservation sesquicentennial 1854–2004*; Nicholas Peroff, *Menominee drums: Tribal termination and restoration, 1954-1974* (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 2006).

⁵⁷ James Dator, "The futures of cultures and cultures of the future," *Perspectives on Cross Cultural Psychology* (New York: Academic Press, 1979).

⁵⁸ Maldonado, J., H. Lazrus, S. Bennett, K. Chief, C.M. Dhillon, B. Gough, L. Kruger, et al. "The Story of Rising Voices: Facilitating Collaboration between Indigenous and Western Ways of Knowing." In *Responses to Disasters and Climate Change: Understanding Vulnerability and Fostering Resilience* edited by Michele Companion and Miriam S. Chaiken, Chapter 2. New York, NY, USA CRC Press, 2016.