

Indigenous Economies, Theories of Subsistence, and Women

Exploring the Social Economy Model for Indigenous Governance

RAUNA KUOKKANEN

Profit to non-Natives means money. Profit to Natives means a good life derived from the land and sea, that's what we are all about, that's what this land claims was all about. . . . The land we hold in trust is our wealth. It is the only wealth we could possibly pass on to our children. Good old Mother Earth with all her bounty and rich culture we have adopted from her treasures is our wealth. Without our homelands, we become true paupers.

Antoinnette Helmer

Subsistence is a word that means . . . my way of life.

Moses Toyuku

The significance of traditional economies in indigenous communities goes beyond the economic realm—they are more than just livelihoods providing subsistence and sustenance to individuals or communities. In the words of Simon Brascoupé, “it is the traditional economy, living on the land and with the land, that brings meaning to Aboriginal peoples.”¹ The centrality of traditional economies to indigenous identity and culture has been noted by numerous other scholars.² However, today one can detect a certain degree of cynicism when discussing traditional indigenous economies. The continued significance of subsistence economies is either downplayed or dismissed. Many have also internalized the tenet that there are no alternatives (often dubbed as the TINA syndrome) for global capitalism. In his essay “Resistance Is Futile: Aboriginal Peoples Meet the Borg of Capitalism” (2000), for example,

David Newhouse argues that the quest for a better life by Aboriginal people can only take place within capitalism and that Aboriginal people do not want to return to a subsistence economy. However, based on widely contested and somewhat dated development theories that assume that, eventually, modern market economic structures will replace informal, traditional economies and bring prosperity to everybody, Newhouse's analysis of both capitalism and Aboriginal economies remains somewhat one-sided.

There is little doubt that "there are an increasing number of Aboriginal people who want both to participate more fully in the capitalist economy of Canada and to maintain some sense of traditional values and social order." However, analyses that do not explore the complexities involved in processes of reconciling and negotiating between the two but are content with stating that "we simply have no choice" only obscure the resilience of subsistence economies.³

Other versions of TINA include views that, while recognizing the significance of subsistence activities and economic systems, lament the fact that they are no longer viable without addressing the reasons for their dissolution. For example, the previous vice president of Aboriginal Banking at the Bank of Montreal and the chair of the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business, Ron Jamieson from the Six Nations, notes:

Traditional Aboriginal economies have been decimated over the years. Once thriving economies based on gathering, hunting, fishing, and trade are no longer able to sustain Aboriginal communities. The results have been disastrous. Communities that were once self-sufficient are now ghettos of despair.⁴

It is clear that indigenous economies have been decimated in the course of history. Yet it is incorrect to argue that indigenous or subsistence economies are no longer able to sustain indigenous communities. Moreover, not giving a fuller account of the decimation of indigenous economies both past and present conceals the various historical and contemporary processes and conflicts—economic but also social and political—at play in indigenous communities. In order to present a more accurate picture of the state of indigenous economies, one has to consider competing land and resource uses, colonial state regulations and environmental destruction, the diminished or lack of access to traditional territories and resources due to expropriation of lands or intrusion of outsiders. Often

when the destructive effects of the global capitalist economy are being discussed, the focus is on the environment or the social impacts. What has received less attention—and needs to be examined more closely—are the effects of the global market economy on *indigenous economies*.

Indigenous communities are under increasing pressure to conform to the global market economy in the form of profit-driven development projects such as logging, mining, hydro, and oil and gas development in indigenous communities. Due to diminishing possibilities to practice subsistence economic activities, indigenous peoples are obliged to shift from subsistence to other forms of production. Discussing indigenous women in the Philippines, the chair of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, argues:

The most significant effect of globalization on indigenous women is the significant shift from subsistence production to the production of cash crops. . . . Indigenous methods of production and resource management are considered inefficient and backward by the global market economy whose mantra is global competitiveness and comparative advantage. Hundreds of thousands of indigenous women will have to abandon their sustainable agricultural and resource management practices.⁵

This leaves indigenous women particularly vulnerable, as they are often compelled to migrate to urban centers. In cities, many women end up living in poverty or leaving the country for overseas contract work. In both circumstances, women often face increasing incidents of violence and sexual abuse.⁶

This article considers the significance of indigenous economic systems in contemporary society. It argues that indigenous economic systems have to be taken into account much more systematically than thus far in considerations of indigenous governance. The article contends that indigenous economic systems need to play a more central role in envisioning and shaping meaningful, comprehensive, and sustainable systems of contemporary indigenous self-governance. If indigenous economies are not taken into account, there is a serious danger of losing the very identities that constitute indigenous peoples. Indigenous economies such as household production and subsistence activities extend far beyond the economic sphere: they are at the heart of who people are culturally and socially. These economies, including the practices of

sharing, manifest indigenous worldviews characterized by interdependence and reciprocity that extend to all living beings and to the land. In short, besides an economic occupation, subsistence activities are an expression of one's identity, culture, and values. They are also a means by which social networks are maintained and reinforced.

The article consists of three sections. The first section discusses definitions and contemporary significance of subsistence and indigenous economies. It questions the prevailing narrow, economic analyses and interpretations of subsistence. Although economic development projects such as resource extraction may improve fiscal independence and strengthen the economic base of indigenous communities, they also present serious threats to indigenous economies.⁷ The second section examines the relationship between subsistence and wage labor, particularly from the perspective of women. It also considers the "war on subsistence" waged by the development and modernization theories, which continue to contribute to views of subsistence as "primitive" and "pre-modern." The third section takes a closer look at the often glossed over roles of indigenous women in subsistence activities. It questions the conventional binary economic roles of man-the-hunter versus woman-the-gatherer and argues for a broader lens when assessing economic roles and divisions of labor along gendered lines. The article concludes with an examination of indigenous economic systems and the concept of the social economy as a foundation for contemporary indigenous governance.

SUBSISTENCE AND INDIGENOUS ECONOMIES

For many, the term "subsistence" carries negative connotations of primitive ways of life, a low standard of living, or "eking out" a wretched existence in conditions of poverty. For others, it refers to "primitive" societies of the past or rural communities in the developing world. As discussed below, however, these negative views of subsistence have a specific history stemming from discourses of development that have waged a war against subsistence and everything it represents.

Subsistence is both an economic and a social system, encompassing various spheres of life that often are inseparable from one another. It is characterized by endless circulation of goods, services, and other products. Subsistence, sometimes also called domestic production, fol-

lows the seasonal cycle of available resources—it has also been called the “seasonal, integrated economy”—and it includes hunting, fishing, gathering, trapping, and “other activities which provide income in kind—food, heat, clothing, shelter, and a variety of other subsistence goods and services” consumed by and shared within the family and community.⁸ The Inuit Circumpolar Conference defines subsistence as

a highly complex notion that includes vital economic, social, cultural and spiritual dimensions. . . . Subsistence means much more than mere survival or minimum living standards. It enriches and sustains Inuit communities in a manner that promotes cohesiveness, pride and sharing. It also provides an essential link to, and communication with, the natural world of which Inuit are an integral part.⁹

Indigenous economies refer to traditional and local economic systems of indigenous peoples. These systems include a variety of land-based small-scale economic activities and practices as well as sustainable resource management. Indigenous economies are often characterized by a subsistence mode of production. At the center of the economic activity is not the exchange for profit or competition but the sustenance of individuals, families, and the community. Surplus is shared at numerous festivals and ceremonies that maintain the social cohesion of the community but also bring prestige to those who give and share their wealth. The subsistence-oriented economy—including various contemporary versions of mixed economies—also ensures the continuation of the traditional social organization. Berger notes: “Subsistence activities link the generations and the extended family into a complex network of associations, rights, and obligations. This network both reflects and re-creates the social order and gives meaning and value to each person’s contributions and rewards.”¹⁰

The key principles of indigenous economies—sustainability and reciprocity—reflect land-based worldviews founded on active recognition of kinship relations that extend beyond the human domain. Sustainability is premised on an ethos of reciprocity in which people reciprocate not only with one another but also with the land and the spirit world. Indigenous economies are thus contingent upon a stable and continuous relationship between the human and natural worlds. Knowledge of taking care of that relationship has traditionally been an integral part

of social, economic, as well as spiritual structures and practices. In other words, there is a crucial link between subsistence and indigenous knowledge. Eugene Hunn notes that indigenous or traditional ecological knowledge “is a consequence of subsistence-based production” and that “we cannot preserve the one without preserving the other.”¹¹ Individuals and communities acquire special knowledge, skills, and a complex understanding of the local environment through their various subsistence activities. It is this knowledge that “enables the people to live directly from the land.”¹² Thus, the protection and promotion of indigenous knowledge requires encouraging “the continuity of subsistence-based communities where such knowledge is produced.”¹³ Besides sustainable practices, subsistence economy is based on customary law:

Subsistence activities in Alaska are governed by unwritten laws and beliefs that ensure the survival of families and villages. They include codes of customs and behavior that ensure a proper spiritual relationship between humans and animals and conserve resources. They strictly define the rights and duties and the obligations and privileges of tribal members. These laws operate effectively without any system of patents, land titles, or restrictions except self-imposed restrictions that have their origin in the Natives’ age-old knowledge of and reliance on the natural world.¹⁴

For some, however, subsistence represents a contested notion. For example, Arctic social scientists have debated “on how far into the transition, from wildlife harvest and principles of sharing, to a globalized world governed by the market economy, it is still meaningful to employ the concept of subsistence.”¹⁵ Poppel notes:

From an economic viewpoint, it is often emphasized that traditional hunting and fishing activities, taking place at a distance from modern infrastructure and market opportunities, can represent a “barrier” for broader participation in the market and thus limit access to what is provided from the market economy: not only wage income, but also access to credit, subsidies and market-related transfer payments.¹⁶

Obviously, indigenous economies represent an obstacle if we employ (dated) theories of evolutionary anthropology or development discourses that see societies progressing on a linear, inevitable, and pre-

determined path from simple forms of social and economic organization to highly complex ones such as the global capitalist system. Not surprisingly, the concept of subsistence is a problem within paradigms that consider subsistence as immutable, as something belonging to the past or in the process of being phased out to make space for other more modern or global forms of production and ways of life. Viewed through modernization and evolution theories, the expansion of the capitalist economy into indigenous societies is a measure of progress. As colonial Western society became synonymous with the modern, it came to represent “the ultimate cultural destination on the road to economic development.”¹⁷ However, indigenous peoples’ cultural or economic innovations should not be considered either “modern,” “premodern,” or “antimodern” or placed in the rigid modern-traditional dichotomy. Rather, as Colleen M. O’Neill suggests, indigenous peoples present “alternative pathways of economic development that transcend linear analytical categories.”¹⁸

Numerous studies demonstrate the resilience of subsistence economies in indigenous communities where at present they often exist side by side with the capitalist market economy. Today’s indigenous economies often are “mixed economies” in which subsistence production continues to play a considerable role. Mixed economies are characterized by a mix of activities such as subsistence, commodity production, wage labor, transfers (social assistance, unemployment insurance, welfare, pensions, and other statutory or fiduciary payments), and enterprise. Although a subsistence economy alone no longer meets all the needs of a community, it continues to play a significant economic, social, and cultural role in many indigenous communities. According to various estimates, a subsistence economy accounts for 30–80 percent of all production and income in many northern indigenous communities.¹⁹

While recognizing the importance of different forms of production and income, the mixed economy model emphasizes the traditional use of lands and the interaction with the natural environment.²⁰ Peter Usher explains the northern mixed economy as follows: “The two modes of production in the North today are the domestic and the capitalist. The capitalist mode has been superimposed on the pre-existing domestic mode, but the latter survives in modified form. The two coexist not as isolated, unconnected enclaves, but rather as interrelated parts of a larger social formation, that of industrial capitalism on the frontier.”²¹

Although one may question the characterization of contemporary northern indigenous economies as “industrial capitalism on the frontier,” many have recognized the lack of dichotomy between wage and subsistence economies often assumed by the capitalist system.²² Hugh Brody gives guiding as an excellent example of the absurdity of attempting to separate the two. Discussing the Dunne Za (Beaver) communities in northern British Columbia, he argues:

If income were rigidly divided into the traditional and modern economic sectors, it would not be easy to place guiding in one or the other. In fact, income from guiding illustrates how misleading such a dichotomy can be. In theory, the Indians’ earnings can be broken into the equivalent gained domestically (mean from trapping and hunting, fish, berries), and wages from working from others. In practice, these cannot readily be disentangled. Guides work for others, but in separating them from the traditional sector, cultural and historical associations are lost. It is this dichotomy of traditional and modern that creates this confusion.²³

Attempts to draw sharp divisions between subsistence and market economies usually result in misunderstandings of the scope of traditional economic systems and the ways in which they continue to be embedded in larger social organization of communities. Misinterpretations also result from a common failure to recognize subsistence economies as sources of income.²⁴

Another characteristic of mixed economies is that cash is often considered of less importance, an additional means to sustain subsistence activities.²⁵ Currently, subsistence activities usually require some cash income to purchase materials and equipment needed for these activities.²⁶ Steven Dinero notes: “Essentially, wage labor can be seen as necessary only insofar as it allows one to acquire the money needed to buy equipment to carry out subsistence.”²⁷ Brody also points out the difficulty of setting economic or monetary value on the produce of subsistence activities. This is often considered not only misleading but also inappropriate, as if subsistence activities could be understood and compensated for in dollars.²⁸ Moreover, subsistence is often considered the most reliable form of economy in the long run, whereas other forms are usually more short-term and unpredictable.²⁹

Considering subsistence and indigenous economies and their role

and significance today, it is important to bear in mind the destructive impacts of colonial processes, which have effectively limited opportunities—both individual and collective—to practice them. Residential schools and their cumulative, intergenerational consequences have erased much of the community way of life. There is a long history of various government policies and regulations limiting the possibilities to practice traditional economic forms and removing indigenous people from the land. State laws often restrict subsistence activities—even when claiming to protect them—and usually conflict with customary laws accompanying subsistence.³⁰ For example, in Canada the Aboriginal subsistence economy has been regulated since the late nineteenth century. The wildlife and game regulations under the guise of conservation, the establishment of parks, seasonal hunting closures, and moratoriums by the government imposed severe limitations on subsistence economies, radically altering the social and economic organization of indigenous societies. Especially in the 1950s, the government interventions based on assumptions of modernity had a particularly drastic impact on Aboriginal people and their communities.³¹

SUBSISTENCE, WAGE LABOR, AND WOMEN

A systematic and rigorous discursive “war against subsistence” emerged as part of the development paradigm after the Second World War.³² As Rosa Luxemburg has noted, only by destroying their capacity to subsist are people brought under the complete control and power of capital. Coercion is needed to destroy not only the capacity to subsist but also a people’s economic and political autonomy.³³ In many parts of the world, subsistence economy has traditionally been, to a large extent, the domain of women. In these communities, women’s subsistence and other economic activities have formed the foundation of community sustenance. Thus, the war against subsistence represents also a war against women and their economic, political, and social autonomy in society. Today, the autonomy and independence of women farmers, especially in the global South, is jeopardized, for example, by corporate attempts to commodify women’s labor, however cheaply. Interestingly, on continents like Africa, where the great majority of farmers and peasants are still women, corporations have not been very successful in establishing export-processing zones, which rely on semiskilled and “docile” labor.³⁴

Maria Mies and Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen argue that the modern contempt for subsistence is rooted in the high evaluation of wage labor and thus money. They maintain that this fixation is “the very instrument of modern patriarchal ideology.” In their view, the concept of wage labor

is already male-centred in its exclusion, indeed, negation, of female elements. The model of wage labour is industrial male labour, not the work of mothers and women in providing for the immediate needs of everyday life, especially children and old people. It is hardly surprising, then, that equality for women in wage labour (equal pay, equal jobs and equal promotion) means that they must increasingly adopt ways of living that have been shaped by men.³⁵

As a result of the idealization of wage labor as the only meaningful, viable labor relationship, several other forms of work (and thus other economic forms) have been rendered either invisible or insignificant. This idealization explains why it is possible to say, for example, of a homemaker with children that “she does not work.” In short, the fixation on wage labor has meant that the term “work” applies only to paid labor.

Wage labor and money play a growing role also in indigenous communities characterized by mixed economies. Cash income is required more and more to purchase goods, including those needed for subsistence activities such as hunting and fishing equipment and material for beading, sewing, quilting, and other activities. However, in mixed economies cash is often regarded as important only insofar as it enables the continuance of subsistence activities. Even in communities where the informal economy is largely based on market principles such as the Diné (Navajo), much of everyday life is grounded on the nonwage family economic unit.³⁶

Considering the male-centered conception of wage labor, it is interesting that in many contemporary indigenous communities it is often women who are involved in wage labor more than men or that women’s involvement in wage labor is more consistent and permanent than that of men’s. This has often resulted in more stable and autonomous economic positions for women, which in turn has increased their influence in their communities:

In this position, [women] have been able to provide a more constant and reliable source of support in the provisioning of their

households and in the assistance that they offer their kin. The erratic nature of wage-labor, particularly the jobs that men have traditionally entered, has made it difficult for many men to provide a steady support for their own household or to extend their help to other households.³⁷

Several scholars have noted the gradually changing kinship and gender relations that explain, at least partially, the larger involvement of women in wage labor in many contemporary indigenous communities. More households are headed by women, and in an increasing number of households, women are the primary breadwinners.³⁸ For example, following World War II, as Sioux women's access to steady incomes (either through welfare or employment) increased, "the balance of power in the Sioux household, and in wider community settings, increasingly shifted to women."³⁹ Further, the emergence of the mandatory educational system required women to stay in villages or settlements during the school year.⁴⁰ Moreover, jobs in the service sector such as post offices, stores, schools, banks, and health care are often filled by women. Discussing the Tlingit communities in Alaska, Laura F. Klein proposes: "One commonly reported reason for this is that women are steadier than men as they will not quit when the fishing is good in order to cash in on that industry."⁴¹

The fact that indigenous women are often more engaged in wage labor than their male counterparts does not necessarily negate Mies and Bennholdt-Thomsen's analysis of wage labor as embedded in the patriarchal ideology in the exclusion of "women's work." An indigenous feminist analysis may enhance their understanding by foregrounding the specific patriarchal mechanisms at play in indigenous communities that need to be taken into account for a more comprehensive understanding of colonial ideologies. Whereas the standard feminist theory points out how women's domestic, care-giving labor is not considered work, indigenous feminist analysis also reveals and calls attention to ways in which women's work in subsistence economies has been concealed and ignored. Women's subsistence roles are thus considered neither work nor an integral part of those economies, resulting in many women leaving indigenous economies altogether.

Colonial ideologies, which have always been deeply patriarchal, have either excluded women from or made them and their activities invisible in indigenous economies. The destruction of subsistence economies

and autonomous indigenous communities go hand in hand and date from early days of colonial and capitalist expansion. Contempt toward subsistence, however, is not limited to capitalism. Also under socialism, it was considered primitive, backward, and unprofitable. The Soviet policy of rendering nomadic reindeer herders sedentary, dating back to the 1930s, was based on an ideology according to which nomadism was incompatible with a socialist society. Nomads were not part of the socialist production, and their mobile lifestyle prevented their participation in public life. This policy led to a massive rationalization campaign in the 1950s aimed at establishing brigades where the reindeer herds could be counted and meat and hides produced. Only in this way was reindeer herding considered worthwhile and were reindeer-herding males seen as “ideal proletarians” not working merely for subsistence. At the same time, women were supposed to relinquish the reindeer-herding economy and way of life and take up new professions in the wage economy. These policies have been highly detrimental to the indigenous peoples and their economies based on reindeer herding, which is considered a “family business” where each family member has her or his specifically assigned activities.⁴²

The dependence of capitalist economy on the subsistence sector is also characterized by a gender dynamic that has remained largely unrecognized. For example, women farmers have long subsidized male wage labor. In a similar fashion, indigenous women’s household production has subsidized the formal market sector. Kathy M’Closkey shows how, in the early twentieth century, the lives of Diné women weavers were radically altered by the global market (the first wave of free trade) in the form of the commercialization of the Diné textile production. While textile production grew more than 800 percent and the workload tripled, Diné women weavers remained poor. There were several reasons for this outcome, one of them being that Diné women’s weaving was not considered work, and thus they could be paid next to nothing. M’Closkey notes: “Without the weavers’ productivity, the U.S. government may have needed to step in and subsidize the purchases of Diné wool. . . . Thus thousands of ‘dark-skinned housewives’ effectively subsidized the trading post system on the reservation system.”⁴³ In circumstances where their housework was not regarded as valuable as wage economy, it was not unusual for women to feel isolated and overburdened.⁴⁴ Saskia Sassen points out:

It was the “invisible” work of women producing food and other necessities in the subsistence economy that contributed to extremely low wages on commercial plantations and mines, mostly geared to export markets. Women in the so-called subsistence sector thereby contribute, through their largely unmonetized subsistence production, to the financing of the “modernized” sector.⁴⁵

It is a well-established fact that women’s economic contributions have a tendency of “counting for nothing.” As an example, some scholars have questioned the validity of current measuring tools that in the context of Aboriginal economic development often leave Aboriginal women’s work and economic activities out of the accounting. Not counting women’s economic contributions, however, is not merely a simple, innocuous oversight. By dismissing subsistence economies as backward and primitive, it is possible to devalue them and make them invisible while at the same time to exploit them to subsidize and uphold the process of capital accumulation.

ECONOMIC ROLES AND STRATEGIES OF INDIGENOUS WOMEN

In indigenous communities, women contribute to the family and community survival in many indispensable ways. Women have a crucial position in looking after resources and environment and ensuring access to food and other subsistence materials in addition to sustaining and taking care of (extended) families.⁴⁶ Women’s activities also focus on healing and health in their communities.⁴⁷ However, these activities often remain invisible even though they “form a vital, if unacknowledged, role in securing the economic survival and development of Aboriginal families and households.”⁴⁸

When considering traditional economic roles of indigenous women, there is a tendency to view them through a binary of man-the-hunter versus woman-the-gatherer. As many studies have shown, however, women’s economic roles in subsistence production are not nearly as limited and one-dimensional as conventionally perceived.⁴⁹ Also, women hunt and fish, although the nature and scope of their activities may differ from those of men in their communities. The important role of women in other hunting-related activities such as processing and preparing the meat, fur, and hides is also often neglected.⁵⁰ Hetty Jo Brumbach and Robert Jarvenpa argue that one of the reasons for the “myopia

concerning the role of women” is the conceptualization of hunting as an activity focusing on the act of killing the animal. According to them, this falsely isolates not only the hunter from family and society but also “the act of killing from a complex system of travel, preparation, and logistics preceding the kill and the intricacies of butchering, processing, and distributing following the kill.” A more appropriate view of hunting would see it as “an enterprise that produces food, clothing, tools, and other necessities of life and requires interdependence of female and male labor in any foraging society.”⁵¹

Another example of viewing indigenous socioeconomic activities through a narrow, biased lens that misrepresents the role of women is reindeer herding, which today is largely considered a male occupation and sphere. For example, the gradual exclusion of Sámi women from reindeer herding began after the government interventions following World War II. Since 1945 Nordic government policies have made Sámi women invisible in the livelihood in which they had always played a prominent role. In many cases, policies have erased the traditionally held right of ownership of women’s own reindeer. In official records since 1978, reindeer-owning Sámi women in Norway have been registered under their husband’s names, thereby losing their membership in the organizational unit for reindeer herding. This act has had ramifications ranging from who receives subsidies and grants to the status and recognition of women within a livelihood that is often considered one of the central markers of Sámi identity.⁵²

Reclaiming and upholding subsistence economies and values are often led by women around the world. For them, subsistence represents not only personal autonomy and agency and economic self-sufficiency but also a means of resisting the global capitalist economy and its patriarchal, colonial control over women, means of production, and the land.⁵³ For example, prior to the Quaker civilization program of the Seneca, women were largely in charge of agriculture, while men were involved in other economic activities. The goal of the Quaker program was to remove women from agriculture and transform it into a male activity, which in turn would create “a love of private property.”⁵⁴ However, this program was only partially successful—only a limited number of men began farming as a primary economic activity. Women continued to farm and “to control a large measure of the subsistence production.” This has sometimes been seen as counterproductive cultural conserva-

tism on the part of Seneca women. However, it can also be considered an intentional strategy of maintaining control and autonomy. As Diane Rothenberg argues, “the apparent conservatism of Seneca women was selective and was part of a rational strategy to maintain the control of the local production which provided subsistence base for a society dependent on a complementarity of economic sex roles.”⁵⁵

Even at present, women’s subsistence activities are strategies of survival and ingenious ways of erecting “buffers” against the economic instability created by top-down models and policies. For example, contemporary Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara women in the Upper Missouri River creatively combine “various sources of subsistence—including commodity food and other welfare programs—to craft an informal network through which they redistribute resources and ensure community cohesion.”⁵⁶ This is also the case in Lakota communities such as Pine Ridge and Rosebud, where people make a living by combining subsistence activities with microenterprise, odd jobs, barter, household production (e.g., beading, sewing, quilting, cooking for ceremonies), and giveaways. Thus, many contemporary Lakota households consist of “a mix of market and nonmarket activities.”⁵⁷

Partly out of necessity, Lakota households strive toward self-sufficiency. Household production is also considered a way of expressing culture and cultural identity, manifested particularly in ceremonies such as giveaways and feasts, during which objects and food are distributed to the entire community. While the capitalist market economy has had an impact on giveaway practices (e.g., bank loans, store-bought goods, cash), the ceremony and event itself continue to be deeply rooted in Lakota culture, and its intention remains the same. Goods are constantly accumulated, but only to be given away. Women continue to be in the center of these ceremonial, communal events and the various formations of mixed economy.⁵⁸

In some cases, the survival strategies developed within the household production have increased the relative autonomy in communities—a process that, ironically, has run counter to the government programs intended to increase the dependence on capitalist production. Significantly, “these strategies, including the intensification of subsistence production and the ‘stretching’ of provisions through distributive mechanisms based on sharing, had always been under women’s control.”⁵⁹ This in turn has often resulted in increased political and economic autonomy for women.

Subsistence economy is considered a threat to capital accumulation because it does not comply with the capitalist logic and goals but instead is a sign of independence, self-sufficiency, and self-reliance. Karl Polanyi maintains that the institution of the market economy requires the destruction of traditional social structures such as village communities and clan solidarity. He recognizes that “a social calamity is primarily a cultural not an economic phenomenon” and argues:

Not economic exploitation, as often assumed, but the disintegration of the cultural environment of the victim is then the cause of the degradation. The economic process may, naturally, supply the vehicle of the destruction, and almost invariably economic inferiority will make the weaker yield, but the immediate cause of his undoing is not for that reason economic; it lies in the lethal injury to the institutions in which his social existence is embodied.⁶⁰

The idea that the most destructive effects of the decimation of subsistence economies are not economic but social or cultural is significant when considering the role of indigenous economic systems in contemporary discourses of and struggles for self-determination. In other words, discussing and envisioning viable and just institutions of indigenous governance today requires that we include subsistence economies into our considerations.

The two UN covenants (the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights) that form the international human rights framework recognize the right of all peoples to their “own means of subsistence.” The recently adopted UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples acknowledges the extension of this right to indigenous peoples, noting that indigenous peoples have a right to their economic systems as well as a right “to engage freely in all their traditional and other economic activities.”⁶¹ This collective right to one’s own economic institutions and activities, however, is being regularly ignored and trampled by various processes (and projects) of global capitalism. Indigenous peoples are increasingly finding themselves “caught in a vicious circle through their integration into the market economy and globalization,” and, as a result, many “have become increasingly convinced that they have to look within their own systems if they are to survive and maintain important communal values.”⁶²

An illuminating example of indigenous people caught in the vicious circle of the market economy and globalization is the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971. The settlement required the establishment of local and regional corporations as a means to govern the resources allocated to the Native Alaskan communities. By and large, the ANCSA experiment has been a disaster that has alienated Native Alaskans from their subsistence-based economic system, their social organization, and, ultimately, their land. The corporate-style governance has not worked well, and many of the regional and local corporations have failed because the imposed corporate system was alien and artificial and, therefore, did not respond to the needs of the communities. As a result, the Native Alaskans have been seeking to return to their previous systems and to reclaim their subsistence economies.⁶³

Drawing on numerous examples around the world, Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies suggest that subsistence economies, practiced in various ways in different parts of the world, offer an alternative perspective and critique to the self-destructive growth logic of capitalism. It has been argued that “the marginalized subsistence and survival activities both in developed economies and in the new frontiers of capitalist penetration have become a central arena for the development of consciousness and action based on the right to live in the present crisis of capitalism.”⁶⁴ Initiatives to advance and enable indigenous peoples’ own systems include promoting indigenous economic principles, the recognition of subsistence livelihoods, and a human rights–based approach to development. For example, in Guatemala, a Mayan movement called *comunidades de población en resistencia* (CPRs, “communities of people in resistance”) emerged in the early 1980s to resist the genocidal and “scorched-earth” policies of the military regime. As part of their resistance, Mayans involved in CPRs refuse to engage in any paid (migrant) labor. Historically, the Mayans and other indigenous peoples were forced into slavery and indentured labor by the Spanish plantation owners, who had expropriated the communally owned indigenous peoples’ land and resources. Since the signing of the peace accord in 1996, the CPRs have restored their subsistence economy, organized on a cooperative basis. The principles guiding the subsistence cooperatives include reciprocity, sharing, and consensus.⁶⁵

When considering governance we often think of political and/or economic institutions and structures. However, governance is more than

institutions and structures. On a more fundamental level, governance is about social organization. The destruction of subsistence economies meant the destruction of social institutions in “traditional” societies. These social institutions were de facto governance systems through which communities were organized and governed, decisions were made, and disputes were resolved. I contend that subsistence economies need to be foregrounded as a guiding principle when considering indigenous self-governance (which does not imply that discussion of indigenous economies or economic development in indigenous communities ought to be limited only to subsistence activities). The focus of my argument is not on economic development but, rather, on reconceptualizing indigenous governance initiatives around the concept of the social economy. I suggest that situating the social economy at the center of indigenous governance enables the reinstatement of the vital social institutions that traditionally played a key role in the community governance. The concept of the social economy also allows us to see indigenous economic systems and subsistence activities as part and parcel of indigenous governance.

The term “social economy” was first coined by anthropologist Kalervo Oberg in the 1930s to refer to the inextricable link between economics and social organization in Tlingit society on the Northwest Coast. For Oberg, the concept of the social economy recognizes the ways in which in indigenous economic systems, economy is embedded in social relations. It emphasizes the fact that without taking the social relations and organization as well as the indigenous worldviews into consideration, economic systems of indigenous societies cannot be fully understood.⁶⁶

More recently, “social economy” has become a term with multiple definitions. In Canada, the term has been generally employed to refer to the third sector of the economy—nongovernmental, voluntary sector initiatives such as co-operatives, community-based organizations, community economic development, and not-for-profit organizations providing social, cultural, economic, health, and other services to communities.⁶⁷ In the context of northern indigenous communities, the mixed economy forms the centerpiece of the social economy. Frances Abele argues:

The mixed economy plays a role in Indigenous communities similar to that of “conventional” social economy institutions in other parts of Canada. Indeed, it might be said that social economy institutions such as neighbourhood associations, affiliation and

self-help groups, food banks, and the like, as well as aspects of the welfare state, take the place of the mixed economy in parts of the society where integration of all workers into the wage economy is more or less complete. The mixed economy is a form of social provision that elsewhere is substituted by either the programs of the welfare state or by publicly funded activities in the social economy.⁶⁸

The mixed economy is equivalent to the social economy in terms of its significance in creating social institutions and providing support systems in northern indigenous communities where there are very few or no third-sector organizations or enterprises usually associated with the social economy.⁶⁹ Therefore, in many ways it is an indispensable dimension of the community and individual welfare and security for many indigenous societies.

If we took the concept of the social economy as the starting point of deliberations in indigenous governance, we would foreground not only indigenous economic systems and their significance in their entirety but also social institutions as the basis of forming contemporary political organization and governance. Subsistence activities continue to form the core of the northern social economies. They inform the central cultural values, sustain customary social relationships, define identities, and shape personal and cultural well-being. As David C. Natcher maintains, subsistence activities “provide a fundamental basis for the social identity, cultural survival and spiritual life of northern Aboriginal peoples.”⁷⁰

If we were to reconfigure indigenous self-governance around the framework of the social economy, the initial steps would include the following. First, it would take into account the continued significance of indigenous economies when considering the economic base of indigenous governance rather than focusing solely on economic development projects. Second and equally important, it would involve employing the social institutions of indigenous economies as blueprints in establishing the primary political institutions of self-governance. Third, it would include structuring the legal and justice system around the principles of customary laws and codes of customs and behavior embedded in indigenous economic systems and affiliated social institutions.

Finally, the concept of the social economy helps us avoid false dichotomies between “traditional” and “modern.”⁷¹ Employing the concept of

the social economy rather than discussing the “cultural” or “traditional” foundations of indigenous peoples’ economic and political systems allows us to steer clear of unhelpful and distracting discourses of authenticity and traditionalism. The social economy framework also “draws our analytical gaze to the local level” and illuminates the often invisible contributions of women in the informal sector.⁷² As discussed above, women and their roles in the social economy have been the key to community survival. Taking this dimension seriously and incorporating it in indigenous governance models enables us to reverse the current tendency of excluding women from sociopolitical and economic participation and self-governance.

NOTES

The epigraphs by Antoinette Helmer and Moses Toyukuk are taken from Thomas R. Berger, *Village Journey: The Report of the Alaska Native Review Commission* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1985), n.p.

1. Simon Brascoupé, “Strengthening Traditional Economies and Perspectives,” in *Sharing the Harvest, the Road to Self-Reliance: Report of the National Round Table on Aboriginal Economic Development and Resources* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1993), 101.

2. For example, Berger, *Village Journey*; Hugh Brody, *Maps and Dreams: Indians and the British Columbia Frontier* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1988); Richard White, *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983); Stephen J. Langdon, ed., *Contemporary Alaskan Native Economies* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986); Kathleen Ann Pickering, *Lakota Culture, World Economy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000); David C. Natcher, “Subsistence and the Social Economy of Canada’s Aboriginal North,” *Northern Review* 30 (2009); Frances Abele, “The State and the Northern Social Economy: Research Prospects,” *Northern Review* 30 (2009).

3. David R. Newhouse, “Resistance Is Futile: Aboriginal Peoples Meet the Borg of Capitalism,” in *Ethics and Capitalism*, ed. John Douglas Bishop (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 149, 147.

4. Ron Jamieson, “Building an Aboriginal Economy,” in *Sharing the Harvest*, 271.

5. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, “Globalization and Its Impact on Indigenous Women: The Philippine Case,” in *Indigenous Women: The Right to a Voice*, ed. Diana Vinding (Copenhagen: IWGIA, 1998), 216.

6. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, *Globalization and Its Impacts on Indigenous Women: The Philippine Experience* (Penang, Malaysia: Third World Network, 2001).

7. See Frances Abele, "The Smartest Steward? Indigenous People and Petroleum-Based Economic Development in Canada's North," in *Canadian Energy Policy and the Struggle for Sustainable Development*, ed. G. Bruce Doern (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).
8. Peter Douglas Elias, "Northern Economies," in *Northern Aboriginal Communities: Economies and Development*, ed. Peter Douglas Elias (North York, ON: Captus Press, 1995), 8.
9. ICC, *Principles and Elements for a Comprehensive Arctic Policy* (Montreal: Centre for Northern Studies and Research, 1992).
10. Berger, *Village Journey*, 52.
11. Eugene S. Hunn, "The Value of Subsistence," in *Ethnoecology: Situated Knowledge/Located Lives*, ed. Virginia D. Nazarea (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1999), 31.
12. Berger, *Village Journey*, 51.
13. Hunn, "The Value of Subsistence," 31.
14. Berger, *Village Journey*, 59.
15. Birger Poppel, "Interdependency of Subsistence and Market Economies in the Arctic," in *The Economy of the North*, ed. Solveig Glomsrød and Iulie Aslaksen (Oslo: Statistics Norway, 2006), 65.
16. Poppel, "Interdependency," 65.
17. Colleen M. O'Neill, "Rethinking Modernity and the Discourse of Development in American Indian History, an Introduction," in *Native Pathways: American Indian Culture and Economic Development in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Colleen M. O'Neill and Brian C. Hosmer (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2004), 5.
18. O'Neill, "Rethinking Modernity," 3.
19. Elias, "Northern Economies"; Birger Poppel et al., *Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic: Results* (Anchorage: Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, 2007); Stephen J. Langdon, "The Integration of Cash and Subsistence in Southwest Alaskan Yup'ik Eskimo Communities," in *Commoditisation and Changing Foragers*, ed. E. Peterson and T. Matsuyama (Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 1991); Robert J. Wolfe and Robert J. Walker, "Subsistence Economies in Alaska: Productivity, Geography, and Development Impacts," *Arctic Anthropology* 24, no. 2 (1987); Steven C. Dinero, "Analysis of a 'Mixed Economy' in an Alaskan Native Settlement: The Case of Arctic Village," *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 23, no. 1 (2003); Peter Douglas Elias, "Models of Aboriginal Communities in Canada's North," *International Journal of Social Economics* 24, no. 11 (1997).
20. Elias, "Models of Aboriginal Communities."
21. Peter Usher, "The North: One Land, Two Ways of Life," in *Heartland and Hinterland: A Geography of Canada*, ed. L. D. McCann (Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall, 1982), 291.

22. Kathleen Ann Pickering, "Alternative Economic Activities," in *Lakota Culture, World Economy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004); Elias, "Northern Economies"; Dinero, "Analysis"; T. D. Lonner, "Subsistence as an Economic System in Alaska: Theoretical Observations and Management Implications," in Langdon, *Contemporary Alaskan Native Economies*; Tanya Korovkin, "Taming Capitalism: The Evolution of the Indigenous Peasant Economy in Northern Ecuador," *Latin American Research Review* 32, no. 2 (1997); Poppel, "Interdependency."

23. Brody, *Maps and Dreams*, 207.

24. Brody, *Maps and Dreams*, 207.

25. Ann Fienup-Riordan, *When Our Bad Season Comes: A Cultural Account of Subsistence Harvesting & Harvest Disruption on the Yukon Delta* (Anchorage: Alaska Anthropological Association, 1986).

26. Elias, "Northern Economies"; Pickering, "Alternative Economic Activities."

27. Dinero, "Analysis," 138.

28. Berger, *Village Journey*; Brody, *Maps and Dreams*.

29. Elias, "Northern Economies"; Elias, "Models."

30. Berger, *Village Journey*.

31. Peter Keith Kulchyski and Frank J. Tester, *Kiumajut (Talking Back): Game Management and Inuit Rights, 1900–70* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007); John Sandlos, *Hunters at the Margin: Native People and Wildlife Conservation in the Northwest Territories* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007). An example of misguided policies can be found in Labrador dealing with the Innu. In the 1950s government officials and various agencies reorganized and intervened Innu livelihoods and social structures. The Innu were considered a problem with regard to the economic development of the region, and to deal with the problem, the Newfoundland government established the Division of Labrador Affairs (DNLA) under the Department of Welfare in 1951. The view of the division was that the Innu in Labrador had to be integrated if not assimilated into the dominant society. The central approach was an "economic rehabilitation" policy based on an assumption that the Innu "would rather 'work' than hunt or fish. Consequently, DNLA undertook to replace the subsistence hunting economy with one based on wage labour" (James J. Ryan, "Economic Development and Innu Settlement: The Establishment of Sheshatshit," *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 8, nos. 1–25 [1988]: 8).

32. Ivan Illich, *Das Recht auf Gemeinheit* (Reinbeck: Rowohlt Verlag, 1982).

33. Rosa Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951).

34. Nigel G. Gibson, "Africa and Globalization: Marginalization and Resistance," *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 39, nos. 1–2 (2004).

35. Maria Mies and Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, *The Subsistence Perspec-*

tive: Beyond the Globalized Economy, trans. Patrick Camiller, Maria Mies, and Gerd Weih (London/Victoria, Australia: Zed Books/Spinifex Press, 1999), 172.

36. Michael Joseph Francisconi, *Kinship, Capitalism, Change: The Informal Economy of the Navajo, 1868–1995* (New York: Garland, 1998).

37. Patricia Albers, “Sioux Women in Transition: A Study of Their Changing Status in a Domestic and Capitalist Sector of Production,” in *The Hidden Half: Studies of Plains Indian Women*, ed. Patricia Albers and Beatrice Medicine (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983), 217.

38. Albers, “Sioux Women”; Elias, “Northern Economies”; Wanda Wuttunee, *Living Rhythms: Lessons in Aboriginal Economic Resilience and Vision* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2004); Poppel et al., “Survey”; Tony Haddad and Michael Spivey, “All or Nothing: Modernization, Dependency and Wage Labour on a Reserve in Canada,” *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 12, no. 2 (1992).

39. Albers, “Sioux Women,” 220.

40. Hetty Jo Brumbach and Robert Jarvenpa, “Ethnoarcheology of Subsistence Space and Gender: A Subarctic Dene Case,” *American Antiquity* 62, no. 3 (1997).

41. Laura F. Klein, “Contending with Colonization: Tlingit Men and Women in Change,” in *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. Mona Etienne and Eleanor Leacock (New York: Praeger, 1980), 103.

42. Tuula Tuisku, “The Displacement of Nenets Women from Reindeer Herding and the Tundra in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug, Northwestern Russia,” *Acta Borealia* 2 (2001).

43. Kathy M’Closkey, “The Devil’s in the Details: Tracing the Fingerprints of Free Trade and Its Effects on Navajo Weavers,” in O’Neill and Hosmer, *Native Pathways*, 119–20. Moreover, the value of weaving seemed to depend on the price of wool. At the time, the global wool market was volatile, and Diné wool sold for 50–70 percent less than other wool produced in the United States. High duties protected wool growers who produced mainly class I and II quality wool for clothing. Diné wool came from *churro* sheep and was classified as carpet grade (class III). After the 1850s the power looms transformed carpet manufacturing, and there was not enough carpet-grade wool produced domestically. M’Closkey writes:

Diné growers produced less than 5 percent of the more than 100 million pounds necessary to service the carpet industry annually. By 1890 the well-organized and powerful carpet manufacturers had successfully lobbied Congress to allow Class III wools into the country duty-free or with a small *ad valorem*. . . . Over a four-year period, nearly half a billion pounds of carpet-quality wool was imported into the United States. Is it a coincidence that the Navajo blanket was transformed into a rug dur-

ing that decade? After 1898 the tariff was reinstated, exempting Class III wools valued at less than 13 cents per pound. (119)

44. Phoebe Nahanni, "Dene Women in the Traditional and Modern Northern Economy in Denendeh, Northwest Territories, Canada" (MA thesis, McGill University, 1992).

45. Saskia Sassen, "Women's Burden: Counter-Geographies of Globalization and the Feminization of Survival," *Journal of International Affairs* 53, no. 2 (2000): 508.

46. According to the Canadian 2001 Census, the proportion of Aboriginal women involved with taking care of children and elders is notably higher than among non-Aboriginal women (Jeremy Hull, "Aboriginal Women: A Profile from the 2001 Census," in *Report Prepared for Women's Issues and Gender Equality Directorate* [Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2006]).

47. Wuttunee, *Living Rhythms*, 51.

48. Madeleine Dion Stout and Gregory D. Kipling, *Aboriginal Women in Canada: Strategic Research Directions for Policy Development* (Ottawa: Status of Women Canada, 1998), 18; also Corinne Jetté, "Creating a Climate of Confidence: Providing Services in Aboriginal Communities," in *Sharing the Harvest*; AFN, *Policy Recommendations to the National Aboriginal Women's Summit in Newfoundland* (Ottawa: Assembly of First Nations, 2007).

49. See Lillian A. Ackerman and Laura F. Klein, *Women and Power in Native North America* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995); Ron Bourgeault, "The Indian, the Metis and the Fur Trade: Class, Sexism and Racism in the Transition from 'Communism' to Capitalism," *Studies in Political Economy* 12 (1983); Tressa Berman, "'All We Needed Was Our Gardens': Women's Work and Welfare Reform in the Reservation Economy," in O'Neill and Hosmer, *Native Pathways*; John S. Milloy, *The Plains Cree: Trade, Diplomacy and War, 1790–1870* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1988); Sylvia Van Kirk, *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur Trade Society in Western Canada, 1670–1870* (Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer, 1980); Lorraine Littlefield, "Women Traders in the Maritime Fur Trade," in *Native People, Native Lands: Canadian Indians, Inuit and Metis*, ed. Bruce Aldon Cox (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1987); Patricia Albers and Beatrice Medicine, *The Hidden Half: Studies of Plains Indian Women* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983); Brumbach and Jarvenpa, "Ethnoarcheology"; Jo-Anne Fiske, "Fishing Is Women's Business: Changing Economic Roles of Carrier Women and Men," in Cox, *Native People*. The traditional economic roles of women in precontact societies is very difficult to trace for two main reasons: "(1) aboriginal societies and cultures experienced rapid disruption by the fur trade and (2) early recorders portrayed ethnocentric and patriarchal biases" (Nahanni, "Dene Women," 17). See also Somer Brodribb,

“The Traditional Roles of Native Women in Canada and the Impact of Colonization,” *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 41, no. 1 (1984).

50. For example, Brody, *Maps and Dreams*; Brumbach and Jarvenpa, “Ethnoarcheology.”

51. Brumbach and Jarvenpa, “Ethnoarcheology,” 418.

52. See Solveig Joks, *Boazosámi Nissonolbmot—Guovddážiis Báike-Ja Siidadoalus, Muhto Vajálduvvon Almmolaččat*, vol. 5, *Diedut* (Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta, 2001); Máret Sárá, “Reindeer Herding Women Are Oppressed,” *Sáráhkká: Newsletter of Sami Women’s Association*, 1990–91; Sámi Instituhtta, “Boazosámi Æmidiid Bargodilálasvuodat. Flyttsamekvinnens Arbeidssituasjon. Poronhoitossaamelaisnaisten Työtilanteesta,” *Diedut* 4 (1979). For a detailed account of the political and social exclusion of Aboriginal women from their own communities and the role of patriarchal and colonial federal laws, see Sharon McIvor, “Aboriginal Women Unmasked: Using Equality Litigation to Advance Women’s Rights,” *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 16 (2004).

53. For example, Gibson, “Africa and Globalization.”

54. Diane Rothenberg, “The Mothers of the Nation: Seneca Resistance to Quaker Intervention,” in Etienne and Leacock, *Women and Colonization*, 73. This was taking place in other Native American societies as well. Jean M. O’Brien writes:

New England Indians’ agricultural, hunting, fishing, and gathering economy was interpreted as wasteful, and the sedentary agriculture pursued by English men was seen as the only proper pursuit for Native men. . . . As they separated Indians from possession of virtually all their land, colonists also sought to “divorce” Indian women from their role as agriculturalists, replacing them with male Indians working drastically reduced plots of land to the exclusion of hunting and other older economic pursuits. (“‘Divorced’ from the Land: Resistance and Survival of Indian Women in Eighteenth-Century New England,” in *Native Women’s History in Eastern North America before 1900: A Guide to Research and Writing*, ed. Rebecca Kugel and Lucy Eldersveld Murphy [Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007], 337)

55. Rothenberg, “The Mothers of the Nation,” 82.

56. Berman, “All We Needed,” 133.

57. Pickering, *Lakota Culture*, 46.

58. Pickering, *Lakota Culture*, 46.

59. Albers, “Sioux Women,” 220.

60. Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957), 157.

61. See <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/drip.html>, Article 20.1.

62. Jannie Lasimbang, “Indigenous Peoples and Local Economic Development,” *@local.glob* 5 (2008): 44.

63. Berger, *Village Journey*.
64. June Nash, "Global Integration and Subsistence Insecurity," in *Plural Globalities in Multiple Localities*, ed. Martha W. Rees and Josephine Smart (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2001), 23.
65. Mies and Bennholdt-Thomsen, *The Subsistence Perspective*, 165–66.
66. Kalervo Oberg, *The Social Economy of the Tlingit Indians* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1973).
67. Chris Southcott and Valoree Walker, "A Portrait of the Social Economy in Northern Canada," *Northern Review* 30 (2009).
68. Abele, "The State," 40.
69. There are, however, important differences between the mixed and social economies. Southcott and Walker note: "The notions of non-profit activities or democratic decision making central to the social economy are not central to the mixed economy" ("A Portrait," 18).
70. Natcher, "Subsistence," 87.
71. Abele, "The State."
72. Abele, "The State," 46.