Journal of Planning Literature
Volume XX Number X
Month XXXX xx-xx

10.1177/0885412208322922
http://jpl.sagepub.com
hosted at
http://online.sagepub.com

The Split Personality of Planning

Indigenous Peoples and Planning for Land and Resource Management

Michael Hibbard
Department of Planning, Public Policy & Management, University of Oregon
Marcus B. Lane
Division of Sustainable Ecosystems, CSIRO, St. Lucia, QLD
Kathleen Rasmussen
Trust for Public Land, Seattle

The international movement toward recognition of indigenous rights over the past thirty years has created a number of complex and compelling issues in planning for the use of land and natural resources. Planning should have much to say about many of these issues, given its concern for the use of land and resources, its focus on problem-solving, and its normative disposition. There is, however, only a modest literature on indigenous planning. Thus, we draw on the planning literature, but also call heavily on work from associated disciplines to introduce to planning scholars some of the problems and opportunities indigenous communities face with respect to land and resource management.

Keywords: *indigenous communities; indigenous planning; indigenous resource management; Native American community planning; reservation planning; land and resource co-management*

1.0 Introduction

The international movement toward recognition of indigenous rights over the past thirty years has created a number of complex and compelling issues in planning for the use of land and natural resources. Indigenous peoples argue that state-directed land and resource planning has largely failed them and has contributed in many instances to their marginalization. Such a position flies in the face of planning's idealized self-image, which John Friedmann recently described as "an ethical commitment to the future, a commitment to make a difference in the world" (Friedmann 2002, 151). Planning's rational toolkit and epistemological framework have made it difficult for the field to grasp the moral-historical aspects of indigenous claims and their insistence on viewing land and natural resources in cultural and religious terms. Further, the legal and political rights claimed by indigenous peoples are distinctive and therefore frequently unsettle and complicate the objects and methods of state-directed land and resource planning (Kingsbury 1998; Lane 1999).

Planning should have much to say about these issues, both as a scholarly discipline and as a practicing profession—given its concern for the use of land and resources, its focus on problem-solving, and its normative disposition. There is, however, only a modest literature on indigenous planning (see, e.g., Berke et al. 2002; Hibbard 2006; Hibbard and Lane 2004; Jojola 1998, 2000; Lane 2002, 2003, 2006; Lane and Corbett 2005; Lane and Cowell 2001; Lane and Hibbard 2005; Zaferatos 1998, 2004). The collection by Sandercock (1998a) provides a useful and insightful historical/theoretical overview. Despite its suitability to the task, though, the field of planning has not much involved itself in the concerns of indigenous peoples.[1] Urban and regional planning scholars have given significantly less attention to state responses to indigenous claims than have those from anthropology, political science, and geography. Thus, we draw on the planning literature, but also call heavily on work from associated disciplines to introduce to planning scholars some of the problems and opportunities

Address correspondence to Michael Hibbard, Department of Planning, Public Policy & Management, 1209 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403; mhibbard@uoregon.edu

indigenous communities face with respect to land and resource management.

The topic is almost limitless. Indigenous communities are found in every part of the world, of course, and they have long experience with the sort of forward-thinking, anticipatory practices in managing land and resources that have been appropriated under the rubric of planning (Jojola 1998). To put some bounds around the topic, we focus here on Indigenous peoples in "post-settler" states, primarily Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States.

We begin by discussing who indigenous peoples are and why their relation to the post-settler state is problematic. We then present several contextual considerations necessary for understanding the situation of indigenous peoples in post-settler states. Next we take up the issues surrounding the management of indigenous lands and resources in post-settler states, with a special eye toward the role of such emerging planning approaches as community-based natural resource management, collaboration, and the like. In the following section, we critically assess the efficacy of these emerging approaches for the self-empowerment of indigenous communities. We conclude with some comments about the future of planning by indigenous communities in post-settler states.

2.0 Indigenous Peoples in Post-Settler States

At its simplest level, a state is the single, supreme authority over a group of people occupying a common territory (Maybury-Lewis 1997). A "settler state," such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or the United States, is formed through colonial processes of "discovery," acquisition, subjugation of indigenous inhabitants, and ultimately, claims of state sovereignty. Sovereignty can be understood as independence from other states, the uncontested authority to govern (Morris 1998). When a state achieves "post-settler" status, the settler residents no longer view themselves as migrants from the colonial power, but rather as "natives" of the newly formed state, at which point, ironically, indigenous populations form ethnic minority enclaves within post-settler states (Pearson 2002).

Post-settler states have achieved statehood by, *inter alia,* systematically dispossessing and subjugating indigenous populations. This usually involved, first, attempts to physically remove indigenous groups through relocation and/or (formal or informal) policies of extermination, followed by programs of social and political assimilation (see, e.g., Cook and Lindau 2000, Haveman 1999). But as Werther comments, "assimilation is extinction by other means" (1992, xxiv).

Thus, the indigenous peoples with whom we are concerned are the descendents of the survivors of the pre-colonial inhabitants of post-settler states. Their increasingly forceful claims for economic and social equity, for control of land, resources, and culturally significant places, and for political autonomy threaten powerful private economic interests that benefit from control of land and resources (Maybury-Lewis 2003). And more abstractly, they threaten the state itself. The claim of political autonomy by indigenous peoples implies that they have a different relationship with the state than other citizens (Duffy and Stubben 1998; Garcia-Aguilar 1999).

As well, the concepts and systems of land and natural resource ownership established by colonial and post-settler states were, and are, markedly different from those of indigenous societies. Historically, this has been a considerable legal and political challenge to states such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States, where land acquisition was a central objective of colonial state expansion (Wilson 2002). In contemporary circumstances, where environmental policy and politics are important national concerns, the fundamental differences between indigenous concepts of land and resource ownership and the legal systems established by post-settler states creates important and ongoing conceptual, legal, and political tensions between indigenous enclaves and nation states over questions of land and resource ownership and management. Indigenous commentators regard state resistance as the central constraint on their efforts to achieve indigenous justice and self-determination (Dodson 1994).

State responses to the legal, political, and moral challenges represented by indigenous claims, have been diverse. A common early response to the post-settlement indigenous "problem" was heavy-handed state control and oppression. Indigenous peoples became wards of the state and subject to (sometimes brutal) assimilationist policies directed toward Christianizing and "civilizing" them. However, indigenous cultural identity has proved persistent and largely resistant to these efforts (Perry 1996a). Indigenous peoples have survived and even thrived (Wilkinson 2005).

In the current post-colonial era, indigenous claims and political strategies aimed at land justice, resource sovereignty, and community security have elicited new responses (Howitt et al. 1996; Maybury-Lewis 1997). Following two decades of litigation over native title, the Canadians have pursued negotiated

agreements that provided for shared resource control and access as a means of reconciling First Nations claims with the interests of non-indigenous actors (see Richardson et al. 1995). Australian states first sought to resist the recognition of native title in their domains, then sought to develop detailed legal and administrative procedures for assessing the veracity of aboriginal claims (Lane et al. 1997). This response has produced a legal and political morass that makes progress towards meaningful reconciliation difficult. In New Zealand, following a failed attempt to reach a comprehensive settlement with the Maori, an integrated resource management approach has been used to ensure Maori participation in the development of regional resource management plans (Berke et al. 2002). In the United States, the Supreme Court established that Indian tribes can exercise regulatory authority when conduct threatens or has a direct affect upon the tribe's health and welfare. This authority, when combined with the considerable revenues produced by gaming, has enabled many U.S. tribes to become significant actors in land and natural resource planning (Wilson 2002).

The claims of indigenous peoples reflect the centrality of land and place to their culture and religion, as well as their aspirations for self-determination and economic self-sufficiency. Because the fundamental concerns of planning include the organization and management of land and resources, the importance of place, and support for democracy (Healey 1997; Sandercock 1998b; Yiftachel 2001), planning is a very pertinent lens through which to address state responses to indigenous claims. More broadly, planning is concerned with mediating between diverse claimants, especially in the use of urban and rural landscapes; it has a problem-solving focus; it has a future-seeking dimension that is concerned with improving the circumstances of human existence, commonly expressed as equality and sustainability (Friedmann and Rangan 1993; Sandercock 1998b). Most important, it has an emancipatory role; it has the potential to *transform* the structural dimensions of oppression—what John Friedmann (1987) has called the transformative force of planning.

3.0 Contextual Considerations

3.1 Background

The process of colonialism, with its emphasis on territorial acquisition and state building, had dramatic consequences for the indigenous peoples of the new world:

> "[I]ndigenous peoples' assets, interests and property have been sold, leased, traded, and despoiled; communities have been dispossessed, displaced and impoverished; lands have been submerged, cleared, fenced and degraded; seas, rivers and lakes have been polluted . . . and appropriated for private use; sacred sites have been dynamited, excavated, desecrated and damaged in every possible way; cultural knowledge and material has been stolen, displayed, appropriated as national heritage, and commodified as an economic good; and even indigenous peoples themselves have been classified, subjected to repressive legislation, arbitrarily removed from their families by state apparatuses, and most recently, subjected to patenting of their genetic materials" (Howitt et al. 1996, 15).

In the aftermath of colonial conquest, marginality is one of the defining characteristics of indigenous people (Maybury-Lewis 1997). Marginality and exclusion have been a fundamental reality for indigenous peoples the world over since their lands were first subsumed by state expansion (Perry 1996a).

The interests of indigenous peoples and the state intersect in two major ways. First, states make and implement policies in relation to indigenous peoples. Indigenous policy has often been a subset of ethnic or race policy and is generally concerned with managing cultural difference. As noted above, a common early response to the post-settlement indigenous "problem" was heavy-handed state control and oppression. More recently, as multiculturalism has become the dominant paradigm in race policy, such policies commonly promote (degrees of) indigenous self-determination (Dodson 1994). A related concern of indigenous policy is efforts to improve the economy and living conditions of indigenes (Duffy and Stubben 1998).

Second, the state's role in allocating rights to land and diverse natural resources between and among multiple claimant groups is a crucial point of intersection between state policy and indigenous interests. As Rangan and Lane have noted:

> "state institutions exercise control over their public domains by prescribing rights of access and use of resources contained within them throughout time-bound, tenurial, or usufructuary rights to individuals, households, or groups; maintenance and management of resources; recognizing customary uses and accommodating intermittent use for nonprescribed purposes and, in many instances, arbitration of conflicts between resource users" (2001, 149).

State policymaking is influenced by a host of factors, including domestic and international macroeconomic imperatives, competing perspectives on

resource use, and dominant systems of (resource) production. Indigenes add another dimension by making particular land and natural resource claims based on their status as first peoples (Kingsbury 1998; Tully 2000). These claims increase the importance of the mediation role of the state, complicate tenurial systems and rights, challenge dominant thinking about systems of natural resource management, and even the continued viability of existing systems of production (Gedicks 1993; Howitt et al. 1996; Lane et al. 1997; Rangan and Lane 2001; Trigger 2000; Wilson 2002; Wolfe-Keddie 1995). Indigenous claims and resulting policy or resource contests have been a feature of contemporary land use planning (Zaferartos 1998), forest management (Hoberg and Morawski 1997; Rangan and Lane 2001), conservation (Bray and Thomson 1990; Stevens 1997), mining (Howitt et al. 1996; Lane and Cowell 2001; Trigger 2000); water allocation and management (Wolf 2000), fisheries (Bess 2001; Castro and Nielsen 2001; Wilson 2002) and a host of other issues.

Several critical dimensions of the state-indigenous enclave relationship configure their interactions.

3.2 State Expansion and Nation Building

Perry has observed that

> "State colonial expansion generated kaleidoscopic processes and myriad motivations, but most often land was a central concern. Appropriation of land took various forms, ranging from the violent eradication of the inhabitants to a bland disregard of their presence" (Perry 1996b, 15).

One important aspect of state building was the need to establish order and quell troublesome indigenous populations within newly-established states to consolidate state boundaries (Perry 1996a). The impacts on indigenous peoples were catastrophic: violence and death on such a scale as to be described as genocidal, the deliberate usurping or contrived ignorance of indigenous land rights, and massive efforts to subdue and control indigenous populations by herding and corralling them into "reservations" (Dyck 1985; Maybury-Lewis 1997; Perry 1996a; Wolf 1997). Both the colonial expansion of imperial powers such as Britain and the building of new settler states such as the United States were centrally concerned with territorial acquisition and establishing new regimes of control.

3.3 Socioeconomic Situation of Indigenous Peoples

Establishing and maintaining regimes of control ensured that indigenous peoples were the victims of genocide, ethnocide, and active discrimination. One result of this long history of state-instituted persecution is that indigenes are "overrepresented in the categories of people who lack basic human rights, live below the poverty datum line, and work for others under exploitative or unjust conditions" (Schweitzer et al. 2000, 11); they "continue to suffer from multiple and interlinked disadvantage as measured by standard socio-economic indicators" (Martin 2005, 108).

Two of the most widely used measures of social well-being are life expectancy and infant mortality.[2] The life expectancy of New Zealanders as a whole is about 10 percent higher than for New Zealand indigenes; and for Australians as a whole it is more than 30 percent higher than for Australian indigenes. The infant mortality rate of U.S. indigenes is 24 percent higher than for all Americans; in New Zealand it is about 50 percent higher for indigenes; and in Australia it is an astonishing 150 percent higher for indigenes.

These dreadful social conditions might be accounted for by the economic situation in which indigenous people find themselves. The median income of American Indians/Alaska Natives is about 80 percent of that of the United States as a whole; in New Zealand, the median income is about 75 percent of the nation as a whole; and in Australia it is 59 percent. However, a full understanding requires a look beyond the standard socioeconomic indicators to indigenous cultural foundations.

Many indigenous people, while they desire greater access to the material stuff—goods and services—available through post-settler society, have no interest in joining it or adopting its values and lifestyles (Martin 2005; Raibmon 2005). Among the most frequently cited examples are the Hopi, Hualapai, and Havasupai, all in Arizona. Each of these tribes has made a conscious decision to forego substantial revenues (from tourism and mining), deciding that the opportunity costs of cultural interference outweigh the benefits to be gained from additional goods and services (Smith 2000).

Also, there is substantial evidence that aspects of indigenous lifestyles are inimical to certain forms of participation in post-settler society. Because of the enormous variety in indigenous cultures, it is difficult to generalize, but the case of the Oglala Sioux in the United States is illustrative. Hostilities between the

United States and the Oglala ceased following the Wounded Knee massacre in 1890. The Oglala, who had a long tradition of animal husbandry, began to rebuild their life around a livestock operation on their 2.5 million acre Pine Ridge reservation. By 1912, they had a tribal herd of 40,000 head. However, when the United States entered World War I in 1917, the Bureau of Indian Affairs encouraged the Oglala to sell their herd and grow wheat instead, as part of the war effort. Because the tribe had neither the necessary capital nor experience in farming, most of their lands were leased to whites. As a result, by 1930 more than a quarter of the reservation had been sold to non-Indians and another third rented out to non-Indians on a more or less permanent basis. Ownership of the reservation was so fragmented that any enterprise suited to the tribe's land and traditions was impossible (Hibbard 2006). Today Pine Ridge is among the poorest communities in the United States.

Numerous scholars and policy professionals (Allen 1989; Cornell and Kalt 1998; Smith 2000; Wood 1994) have concluded that successful indigenous community economic development and the concomitant improvement in social well-being is much more likely when indigenous people control their land and resources. Some go so far as to argue that tribes with current governmental structures similar to traditional structures are more likely to be economically successful (Cornell and Kalt 1992).

The conclusion is inevitable. One of the most effective ways of improving the well-being of indigenes would be to honor their claims to control of land and natural resources. Whether using the American term—socially compatible development (Smith 2000), or its Australian analogue—culturally appropriate development (Martin 2005), the lesson is the same: Indigenous control greatly increases the likelihood that indigenous socioeconomic objectives and goals will be met. Tribes with a greater degree of control of their resources have policies and programs that align better with their goals and vision than those that have less autonomy (Rasmussen et al. 2007).

Achieving such control is difficult, however. One characteristic of state systems is that they coordinate and regulate important economic activities and access to resources—farmland, irrigation water, mineral deposits, and the like (Perry 1996a). For many commentators on indigenous-state relations, the asymmetrical relations between dominant populations (and their institutions) and indigenous enclaves are so assiduously exploitive that indigenous communities are considered "internal" colonies of post-settler states.

> ". . . the tiny internal colonies that make up the Fourth World are fated always to be minority populations in their own lands. In the present, as in the past, aboriginal peoples are being subjected to government policies that, from one country to another, range from genocide to forced assimilation, from segregation to cultural pluralism" (Dyck 1985, 1).

This asymmetrical relationship of a dominant state and subordinate indigenes clashes deeply with the political positions and objectives of indigenous peoples.

3.5 The Demand for and Implications of Sovereignty

Autonomy is at the core of the ongoing indigenous rights movement, a people's capacity to guide and control their own fate. Indigenous peoples fundamentally question the state's *authority* in relation to custodial lands and resources. Because the jurisdiction of post-settler states over indigenous peoples and their lands was founded on deliberate and violent subjugation, there is a high degree of scepticism—one might even say cynicism—about the *legitimacy and morality* of the state's rule (see, e.g., Cook and Lindau 2000; Davidson 1991; Dean and Levi 2003; Dyck 1985; Haveman 1999; Ivison et al. 2000; Maybury-Lewis 1997; Renwick 1990; and Wildenthal 2003) "(F)inding appropriate political expression for a just relationship with colonized indigenous peoples is one of the most important issues confronting political theory today" (Ivison et al. 2000, 2). From the perspective of indigenous peoples, a just relationship must be based in some form of political sovereignty, by which they mean: control of land and resources; control of community—being able to maintain particular sets of social relations and more or less distinct cultural orders; and some degree of political autonomy (Cornell 1988).

The efforts of indigenous peoples to reclaim control of tranditional lands and establish a resource management role for themselves are guided by three concerns. First, attachment to place is the dominant referent in definitions of indigenous peoples. Place is central to indigenous culture, identity, and social organization. Land and sense of place "remain the essence of native identity and sovereignty" (Lewis 1995, 436). Indigenous claims to land and control of natural resources can only be understood within this context. Second, many indigenous peoples view control of land and natural resources as critical to their future economic well-being. Wilson (2002, 399) quotes a tribal government representative: Indigenous

control "enables us to prevent exploitation of resources and promote development with economic benefits." Third, control of traditional lands enables indigenous peoples to design and implement management policies that honor their traditions and reflect their priorities (Wilson 1999).

As noted above, multiculturalism has become the dominant paradigm in race policy. One manifestation of this is that most post-settler states are pursuing an approach of reconciliation—legal and political recognition of indigenous peoples' rights. The turn toward reconciliation is both a response to the indigenous rights movement of the past thirty years and a sincere attempt by some states to modify the imperatives of state sovereignty by acknowledging some degree of indigenous sovereignty (Renwick 1990).

However encouraging the turn toward reconciliation may be, the legacy of ethnocide has debased cultures and shattered communities. That indigenous groups survive at all is testament to their remarkable resilience. It is little wonder that an important dimension of the claim to sovereignty is control of community to guard against future ethnocide, and to provide a space within which to maintain and rebuild their own particular social relations and distinct cultural orders (McIntosh 2003).

Political autonomy is at the heart of sovereignty. As we discussed above, one of the defining characteristics of a state is control of all the territory within its boundaries; a settler society achieves statehood when it attains such control—largely by seizing it from the indigenous population. But from the viewpoint of indigenous communities, political autonomy is what makes possible the maintenance of a distinct culture and control over resources and land. The turn toward reconciliation is in important part an attempt to find new forms of sovereignty through various approaches to shared governance between post-settler states and their indigenous populations (Tully 2000).

The degree of political autonomy held by indigenous communities and the means for achieving it vary widely, but all seem to have three key features in common. They ensure some degree of indigenous control on custodial lands. They provide for the operation of settler governments and institutions on ceded lands, though indigenous peoples also often retain some rights on ceded lands. And they create a means for sharing jurisdiction by providing for relations between roughly equal entities (the state and the indigenous community), with procedures to work out consensual and mutually binding relations of autonomy and interdependence (Lane and Hibbard 2005).

In sum, the indigenous claim to sovereignty is part of a systematic program of resistance to internal colonization—the process through which the dominant society incorporates and subordinates indigenous societies. The claim to sovereignty is an effort to reconfigure the terms of indigenous-state relations. It does this by: providing indigenes their own stateless, popular sovereignty on custodial lands, providing for the operation of settler governments and institutions on ceded lands, and creating the means for *sharing* jurisdiction. In other words, this is a project of decolonizing relations with the settler state, enabling indigenous self-government, and providing the means for controlling custodial lands and protecting cultural heritage (Perry 1996a).

4.0 Indigenous Land and Resources

4.1 Indigenous-Environment Relations

Indigenous peoples are often referred to as the original stewards of the environment, caring, protecting, and managing agricultural and forest lands in a sustainable manner. Implying the respect and sense of stewardship indigenous peoples are thought to have for the land and its resources, Lakota writer and activist Vine Deloria, Jr., asserts that "the Indian lived with his land" (quoted in Krech 1999, 22).

In living with the land, however, indigenous peoples shaped their environment—and not necessarily for the better. Diamond (2005), Flannery (1994), and Krech (1999) have all presented powerful evidence of the ways indigenes have modified their environment, intentionally and unintentionally, based on short-term and cultural considerations that led to problematic—sometimes catastrophic—results.

Most indigenous peoples have recognized their dependence on the land and its resources, however. Lewis (1995) describes American Indians as students of their environment, who developed a land ethic based on long-time experience and the recognition of the interrelationships between inanimate and animate, natural and supernatural, inhabitants of the world. To this end they practiced adaptive land management as environmental conditions changed over time. They did not leave the ecology or the natural environment untouched—they shaped the environment as it shaped them. And Warren observes that "Indians often manipulated their local environments for specific purposes . . . the idea of 'preserving' land in some kind of wilderness state would have struck them as impractical and absurd" (Warren 1996, 19).

In short, though indigenes revered the land and its resources, they regularly shaped their environments as part of the cultural adaptation process in which traditions persisted and evolved as necessary.

A central feature of the worldview of many indigenous groups is the notion of land and place as the keys to their survival, identity, and beliefs (Lewis 1995). In her discussion of Indian land and native sovereignty, Wood (1994) stresses that the greatest threat facing the tribes today is the deterioration of their land base. Although the land-grabbing days of the past are unlikely to reoccur, and in fact indigenous peoples' land bases are generally growing, they are threatened by rapid development, pollution, and loss of resources. Wood describes the land base as the "linchpin" to other attributes of sovereignty and notes that "the tribal territory forms the geographical limits of the tribe's jurisdictions, supports a residing population, is the basis of a tribal economy, and provides an irreplaceable forum for religious practices and cultural traditions often premised on the sacredness of the land" (Wood 1994, 1474).

4.2 Indigenous Dispossession and Land Rights

Although the legal-political bases for indigenous dispossession varied among the post-settler states, they had the common result of creating "reserves" and "reservations' as refuge areas for remnant indigenous populations. These lands typically represent a fraction of what previously constituted the custodial lands of pre-colonial indigenous populations. Moreover, these are usually economically marginal areas—unwanted by European settlers—and often at the geographic margins of the new colony.

A common feature of natural resource policy and politics in these post-settler societies is the emergence—at different times—of indigenous social movements concerned with the assertion of traditional and custodial entitlements to these appropriated lands (Wilson 2002). While the characteristics and strategies of these "land rights" movements differ, they are unified by a concern to re-acquire lost lands through processes of litigation, political agitation, and/or purchase (Lane 2006; Wilson 2002). This mobilization has had some important successes, resulting in legal recognition of indigenous rights in land, including common law native title recognition in Canada and Australia, legislative recognition in New Zealand, and Supreme Court decisions in the United States (Howitt et al. 1996; Lane et al. 1997; Perry 1995a; Wilson 2002; Wolfe-Keddie 1995). Beyond securing title to land, indigenous mobilization has also resulted in the widespread recognition of indigenous *usufructory* rights in public lands and natural resources. Usufructory rights are rights to enjoy the "fruits of the land," in other words to hunt, fish, gather, and so on, on lands in which others have proprietary rights. The recognition of indigenous usufructory rights in lands and natural resources creates a circumstance in which two or more parties enjoy rights and this, in turn, has necessitated processes for brokering agreements for how the *concurrent* rights of diverse parties will be managed in an effective way (Lane 2006).

4.3 Indigenous Experience with Environmental Planning

The experience of indigenous communities with scientific approaches to environmental planning, and the so-called "rational-comprehensive" model of planning more generally, has not been a happy one (Lane 2003; Sandercock 1998b; Scott 1998). Such approaches, the literature repeatedly reports, have tended to disempower and marginalize indigenous communities and interests, dismiss their cultural, religious, and other concerns as irrational, and ensure the imposition of external values, interests, and plans in indigenous domains (see, e.g., Howitt 2001; Lane and Cowell 2001). As James Scott has so brilliantly argued, such approaches have tended to fail with unremitting regularity. The tendency of scientific management to eschew indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing is a crucial factor in explaining this outcome (Scott 1998).

Escobar, by contrast, points to a much deeper, but related, pathology. Commenting on the role of planning in the developing world, he famously wrote:

> "Perhaps no other concept has been so insidious, no other idea gone so unchallenged. This blind acceptance of planning is all the more striking given the pervasive effects it has had historically, not only in the Third World, but also in the West, where it has been linked to fundamental processes of domination and social control. For planning has been inextricably linked to the rise of Western modernity since the end of the 18th century. The planning conceptions and routines introduced in the Third World during the post-World War II period are the result of accumulated scholarly, economic and political action; they are not neutral frameworks through which 'reality' innocently shows itself. They thus bear the marks of the history and culture that produced them" (1992, 132).

As a result, a discourse has surfaced in indigenous domains concerned with advocating alternatives to the rational-comprehensive approach. Those who observed its pernicious consequences were quick to call for alternative approaches that "empowered" indigenous communities (Howitt 2001) by ensuring they had greater control over relevant planning processes and the utiliszation of indigenous knowledge in planning and management (Lane et al. 2003). Such calls have emerged in relation to diverse aspects of environmental planning, including environmental and social impact assessment (O'Faircheallaigh 1999), conservation (Stevens 1997), and fisheries (Bess 2001) as well as land management more generally (Howitt 2001).

4.4 CBNRM and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

A loosely woven transnational movement emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s, in response to the critique of rational comprehensive planning. Termed community-based natural resource management[3] (CBNRM), this approach works at the interface among concern for environmental degradation, social justice, rural poverty, and indigenous rights. CBNRM entails local, place-based projects, programs, and policies that aim to "meld ecology with economics and the needs of community in pursuit of symbiotic sustainability" (Weber 2000, 238; see also, e.g., Baland and Platteau 1996; Friedmann and Rangan 1993; Lane and McDonald 2005; Peluso 1991; Western and Wright 1994). It seeks to alter the top-down, "environment versus economy" approach to environmental management by infusing decentralized decision making, stakeholder collaboration, and citizen participation into the process.

CBNRM retains some elements of conventional environmental management, while deviating from this orthodoxy in important ways (Hibbard and Madsen 2003; Weber 2000). First, it is place-based. People engage the planning process out of their attachment to a particular locale. They participate because they have a stake in the community and want to work together to shape the decisions and policies affecting it. Second, CBNRM views problems or issues from a number of standpoints and seeks balance between the needs of the community, environment, and economy. Central to this philosophy is the symbiotic relationship between humans and nature; each is essential to the survival of the other and each exists to benefit the other. A third significant feature of CBNRM is collaboration between diverse participants. Acknowledging the increased complexity and intensity of environmental issues, it recognizes the necessity of involving a diversity of interests, organizations, expertise, and levels of authority in planning processes. In contrast to conventional approaches that privilege professional knowledge to the exclusion of other forms of knowing, CBNRM admits the importance of local knowledge to the planning process. It uses a variety of sources of knowledge to work toward a common vision and solution.

Essentially, CBNRM uses collaboration to blend "expert" and "folk" knowledge in local-level decision making. As such it has many similarities to the approaches to natural resource planning and management preferred by indigenous communities (Agrawal and Gibson 1999; Carr and Halvorsen 2001; Kellert et al. 2000; Leach et al. 1999; Li 2002). This dimension of CBNRM is particularly relevant in indigenous domains where there have been concerted calls for the incorporation of local or traditional knowledge into resource management. The traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) of many indigenous groups has proven to be a valuable resource in the resolution of resource management issues. The TEK is a type of folk knowledge that is passed down from generation to generation, usually among indigenous groups. Fikret Berkes (1999) defines TEK as

> "a cumulative body of knowledge, practice, and belief, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission, about the relationship of living beings (including humans) with one another and with their environment" (p. 8).

Although CBNRM is a rather recent focus of natural resource management policy, Morishima (1997) notes that many indigenous groups have practiced the basic principles of sustained yield, interrelationships, and balance for thousands of years. The incorporation of TEK into resource management or restoration plans may provide a significant foundation for local ecosystem processes and factors influencing biodiversity (Berkes 1999). Insights based on TEK can be especially helpful because of their long tenure and connection with a particular landscape. As well, the inclusion of TEK provides the community with the opportunity to be involved in the decision-making processes that affect current and future generations (Lake 2004).

Thus, the integration of TEK into the resource planning and management process may have several

positive effects, including a more integrated approach to resource management (Morishima 1997), the opportunity for local ownership and involvement (Kimmerer and Lake 2001; Lake 2004), a greater balance of development and environment needs (Lewis 1995), and a broader knowledge foundation on which to base decisions (Lake 2004; Sallenave 1994).

4.5 Indigenous Peoples and CBNRM

The ability and capacity of indigenous groups to participate effectively in relevant environmental policy and management processes—of either the "top-down" or "bottom-up" mode—is also important in explaining the outcomes of planning in this domain. Indigenous agency is, in general terms, constrained by three factors. First, language and cultural barriers, geographic isolation, lack of resources, and lack of familiarity with planning and decision-making processes can serve to limit the effectiveness of indigenous participation. Second, patterns of land tenure can be a limiting factor. The widespread dispossession of indigenous groups means that their participation in environmental policy inevitably involves the assertion of custodial, cultural, and other interests in lands now designated as publicly- or privately-owned. The "standing" of indigenous groups is therefore often contested on this basis by a range of other actors and stakeholders. Finally, insufficient access to organizational resources and limited organization capacity can also work to impede indigenous participation (Lane 2002).

In summary, we have shown that new approaches to natural resource planning and management—with their emphasis on place, the interdependence of human and ecological communities, and stakeholder collaboration—hold great promise for indigenous peoples who have not faired well under orthodox, "top-down" approaches to planning. Moreover, we have shown how land and environment plays a significant role in the indigenous belief system and worldview. The emphases of indigenous groups on interdependence, balance, reciprocity, adaptive management through knowledge and experience, and place closely parallel the principles of CBNRM. We suggest that this convergence offers hope that environmental planning will help fashion just outcomes for indigenous groups, that they will have opportunities to give expression to their cultural beliefs and practices in environmental management, and that the lands and natural resources that they own will be managed for both environmental and community sustainability.

5.0 Indigenous Futures and the Changing Face of Planning

5.1 Introduction

We turn now to an examination of how indigenous communities are using emergent approaches to environmental planning to regain control over their lands and natural resources. We focus on two key issues: how indigenous communities are faring under decentralized, community-based, collaborative approaches to land and resource planning; and how indigenous communities are using community-based planning on their own lands.

5.2 CBNRM and Indigenous Groups

Given the political, institutional, and socioeconomic circumstances of indigenous communities in the post-settler societies of the world, it might not be surprising to learn that the discernable turn toward more decentralized, place-based, "bottom-up" modes of environmental planning turn in recent years has had mixed success when it comes to providing fairer outcomes for indigenous peoples. That said, it must be acknowledged that the jury is still out on the question.

In relation to CBNRM, the literature reports that such approaches have served to entrench indigenous marginality and deep intolerance towards minorities (Agrawal and Gibson 1999; Diamond 1999; Kellert et al. 2000). Recent Australian research has shown that community-based or "bottom-up" environmental management is no panacea to indigenous marginality because the exercise of power at the local level can also work to exclude indigenous groups (Lane and Corbett 2005). This is an analysis that has been applied to other ethnic minorities and also to women (Kapoor 2001; Sarin 1995). The principal reason, it seems, is because, as Li (2002) has put it, community-based planning rests on an "engaging simplification" of community as a distinct, relatively homogenous, spatially fixed social group that shares a consciousness of being a "community" and characterized by social consensus and solidarity (Agrawal and Gibson 1999).

There is, however, evidence and argument to the contrary. O'Faircheallaigh (1999) has shown how, given the opportunity, forum, and adequate organizational and financial resources, indigenous groups have negotiated beneficial outcomes with resource management agencies and with private sector firms (see also Davies and Young 1996; Lane and Hibbard

2005). Some Indigenous groups have used community-based planning to protect their custodial land interests (Davies and Young 1996), achieve their land acquisition objectives, and build their communities (Hibbard 2006). Jojola (1998), speaking of the case of American Indians, argues that such efforts are in fact built on a long tradition of planning within Native American society.

And what of collaborative approaches to environmental planning? Here, too, the evidence is thin and contradictory. Waage's (2001) analysis of collaborative environmental planning in eastern Oregon suggests that such approaches can overcome entrenched antagonisms and thus fashion fair and consensual agreements between indigenous and non-indigenous groups in relation to land and natural resources. The prolific scholar of environmental management, Fikret Berkes, has also reported on indigenous involvement in successful co-management regimes in Canada and the Arctic (see, for example Berkes et al. 2001; Folke and Berkes 2004; Laronde 1993). A conceptually similar approach is being applied in New Zealand where, following a failed attempt to reach a comprehensive settlement with the Maori, an integrated resource management approach has been used to ensure Maori participation in the development of regional resource management plans (Berke et al. 2002).

As an example of institutionalized collaboration, the co-management of protected areas and important natural resources, is widely regarded as a model of giving expression to indigenous rights and interests within a framework that also resolves conflict and respects other users and provides for effective environmental management (see, for examples, Castro and Nielsen 2001; Pinkerton 1989; Poffenberger and McGean 1996; Prystupa 1998). However, the progress of achieving co-management arrangements has been painfully slow in some jurisdictions where recognition of indigenous rights has been opposed (as has been the case in New Zealand, see Taiepa et al. 1997).

Another setting in which collaborative environmental management occurs (although it is not referred to in this way) is through agreement making between indigenous people and governments of Canada, Australia, and the United States. One key legal-administrative context in which agreement making occurs is the effort to comprehensively settle property rights unsettled by indigenous claims to land and natural resources (O'Faircheallaigh and Corbett 2005; Richardson et al. 1995). The trend towards negotiating agreements between indigenous groups and other land and resource claimants has resulted from the need to provide a solution to the contestation over land and resources that is often entrained by indigenous claims. We see agreement making as a form of environmental planning, not merely because it exists to solve multi-party problems over access, use, and management of land and natural resources; the use of negotiation is also congruent with planning as communicative rationality, and with the upsurge of interest within the planning discipline with consensus building (Innes 2004), which, in turn, reflects planning's longer-standing interest in negotiation and dispute resolution (e.g., Dorcey 1986).

Canada's approach—which has been influential in Australia—is to pursue negotiated agreements at a regional scale that provide for shared resource control and access between indigenous and non-indigenous actors (see Richardson et al. 1995). This Canadian approach was pursued following two decades of litigiousness and conflict over the question of indigenous rights. With limited success, this approach has been pursued in Australia under Native Title legislation (Langton and Palmer 2003).

A more widespread use of negotiated agreements is the negotiation of agreements between indigenous groups and resource developers (such as mining companies) and/or governments (Langton and Palmer 2003). These agreements represent an effort to reconcile—through negotiation and agreement—the needs and interests of indigenous landowners with the imperatives of resource developers in the context of specific resource development proposals. Agreements in respect of mining proposals, which typically deal with environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic concerns of indigenous peoples, are now common in the mining sectors of Canada, Australia, and the United States (O'Faircheallaigh 2004; O'Faircheallaigh and Corbett 2005). While some (e.g., Langton and Palmer 2003) are hopeful that agreement making represents a tool to restructure the relations between indigenous groups and nation states in a just way, others (e.g., O'Faircheallaigh and Corbett 2005) are less optimistic. O'Faircheallaigh and Corbett report on their analysis of a number of Australian negotiated mining agreements and conclude that:

> "while negotiated agreements to have the potential to substantially enhance Aboriginal participation, many of the agreements to date do not have this effect. In a small minority of cases they actually *reduce* opportunities for Aboriginal participation in environmental management. In a substantial majority of cases their contribution is non-existent, or is limited to allowing

> Aboriginal people to take legal action to remedy breaches of environmental legislation after the event, or to giving them a right to be consulted by developers" (2005, 644-5, emphasis in original).

In summary, the evidence is mixed. The turn to decentralized, community-based or collaborative environmental planning has not banished the marginalization of Indigenous peoples from the environmental management practices of the post-settler states of Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the US. However, a number of empirical reports indicate that the paradigmatic shift in approaches to environmental planning offers real hope to Indigenous societies (see, for example, Berkes et al. 2001; Lane and Hibbard 2005; Richardson et al. 1995; Waage 2001). It seems clear that it is too early to judge the impact—in terms of environmental justice for Indigenous peoples—of these new approaches to environmental planning. Moreover, the complexity and diversity of the legal, institutional, and political conditions that obtain in the different countries with which we are concerned makes geographic generalization extremely hazardous. Finally, it is perhaps also the case that we are still learning how to 'do' community-based environmental planning and to establish the conditions for just and effective processes of collaboration and negotiation. We have much to learn.

5.3 Indigenous Community-based Planning

Community-based planning is an approach that emphasizes community control of planning activities as a means of ensuring that local (rather than externally imposed) goals and agendas are pursued (Kellert et al. 2000). The central characteristic of community-based planning is that planning activity is instigated, controlled, and conducted at the local community level (Li 2002). The premise is that community control will help overcome the dysfunctions of imposed planning solutions and meet locally derived goals for community development.

Community-based planning is becoming an important agenda among indigenous organizations (Dale 1999; Wilson 2002). The disenfranchisement of indigenous people from mainstream planning processes, particularly in the highly political field of resource planning, combined with the difficulty of understanding and reconciling the nature of indigenous perspectives, has led some to argue that *local* control is central to making planning effective and relevant in indigenous domains. The typical focus of community-based planning in indigenous communities is in relation to matters such as the management of custodial lands, the achievement of community development objectives, or the management of an indigenous township (Dale 1999; Wilson 2002).

Indigenous community-based planning should be understood as significantly more than resistance and resilience on the part of subordinated groups (see, e.g., Douglass 1999; Scott 1991), and more then episodic mobilization and protest (O'Faircheallaigh and Corbett 2005). Instead, the literature reports—in a host of differing contexts—that indigenous communities have developed purposive and sophisticated strategies to achieve their land management, community, and economic development objectives (see, for example, Baker et al. 2001; Dale 1999; Davies and Young 1996; Hibbard 2006; Hibbard and Lane 2004; Jojola 2003; Prystupa 1998; Walsh and Mitchell 2002). The strategies being used are diverse and include direct negotiation (Bradley 2001; Dale 1999), the development of new alliances and collaborative relationships (Prystupa 1998; Robinson and Mununggurit 2001), community organizing and development (Hibbard and Lane 2004; Lehman 2001), acquiring and strategically using technical information and communicating more effectively with scientists (Kwaku Kyem 2000; Liddle 2001), and the deliberate use of discursive strategies (Lane and Cowell 2001).

Indigenous community-based planning represents an exciting change in "Indian country" partly because it sweeps away the construction of indigenous peoples as passive victims, but mostly because it is assisting indigenous groups to regain control of their lands and communities. One important, nagging question remains unanswered however: how to make sure such potentialities become systemic, rather than episodic.

6.0 Conclusion: Planning and Indigenous Peoples

The great Enlightenment project of colonizing the New World and fashioning modern, prosperous nations has had catastrophic implications for indigenous societies. Modern nation building in these same post-settler states used rational planning—another Enlightenment project—to manage their urbanizing landscapes, allocate land and natural resources, and furnish productive resources for their respective national economies. In turn, these "traditional," or orthodox, approaches to land and resource planning, have served indigenous peoples poorly and, on occasions, been an

accomplice (both before and after the fact) in securing indigenous marginality (Lane and Hibbard 2005). The allied field of environmental management has a similarly lamentable record (Kapoor 2001).

"Top-down," rational approaches to land and resource planning, the case study literature reports, disempowered and marginalized indigenous communities, rejected their cultural, religious, and other concerns as irrational, and facilitated the imposition of external values, interests, and plans in indigenous communities and landscapes. Moreover, such approaches failed to deliver (Scott 1998). But planning has, of course, undergone considerable change in recent decades. Contemporary approaches—while methodologically diverse—are conceptually unified by being place-based, community-focused, collaborative, and sensitive to (rather than dismissive of) local or experiential knowledge (Lane and McDonald 2005). Community-based and collaborative approaches to environmental planning are thus concerned with overcoming the vicissitudes and failings of "top-down," rational planning.

Have these new approaches redressed indigenous marginality and fashioned effective and just environmental management regimes? As we have seen, the case study literature reports mixed success. For every case that celebrates the consensually-developed outcomes of collaboration (e.g., Van Driesche and Lane 2002; Waage 2001), it seems there is another in which more powerful interests suborned both the potential of agreement and the promise of justice for indigenous peoples (e.g., O'Faircheallaigh and Corbett 2005; Lane and Corbett 2005).

Before considering this bifurcated record, it is necessary to dwell for a moment on the nature of our evidence. A problem with a review of this kind is that it requires us to depend on a database of case histories and analyzes that inevitably vary according to scope, purpose, and quality. Relying too heavily on the case study record can cause analysis to lurch from success to failure and back again without the ability to discern underlying themes and causes. The character of our evidence—as described here—might inhibit our ability to reach more penetrating analyzes and causes us to reflect that future research needs to develop and analyze larger and purposively-developed datasets of the kind that Berke et al. (2002) and O'Faircheallaigh and Corbett (2005) have used.

To help us understand the apparently divergent outcomes of new approaches to environmental planning for indigenous groups, three explanatory points should be considered. First, the new technologies of planning, emphasizing community empowerment, participation, and collaboration are relatively nascent—it could be that we are still learning how to broker agreement, empower communities, and incorporate other ways of knowing. Like all learners, planning—as both a discipline and a profession—will sometimes fail as it seeks to master a new and complex suite of skills. Second, so much of the promise of collaborative and community-based planning depends on the participatory and communicative competence of communities. This is problematic in indigenous domains where the processes of colonialism and paternalism have frequently bequeathed a range of socioeconomic problems that impede or complicate effective indigenous participation. This leads to a third, possible explanation. Perhaps in our enthusiastic embrace of decentralized, participatory approaches, we have given insufficient regard to the question of *difference,* particularly in circumstances of entrenched disadvantage or historically based antagonisms. Perhaps planners need to recognize that such approaches are not *axiomatically* fairer and, therefore, there needs to be deliberate accounting for the potential for unjust outcomes.

Perhaps a more unambiguously promising change can be found in the use of planning by indigenous communities to manage their lands and resources and address pressing community and economic development concerns. Although a host of communities, in a range of differing contexts, have demonstrated that the potential to achieve these goals is real, perhaps a more important legacy of such efforts will be realized over the longer term—in assisting indigenous groups to overcome entrenched disadvantage to become better participants in the planning processes that currently swirl around them.

It would be counter factual to provide a "Hollywood" ending to this review. We cannot conclude that planning processes in which indigenous communities are involved now routinely provide fair processes that lead to just outcomes. The facts are more ambiguous. We can report, on the one hand, that land and resource planning processes are now much less likely to ignore or dismiss indigenous concerns; that indigenous knowledge is now recognized as valid and is frequently utilized in planning; that participation, negotiation, and collaboration are now commonly used approaches to plan making; and that planning appears to have a newfound sensitivity to the justness of its work. We must also report, however, that the case study of the planning process, which actively served to marginalize indigenous communities and rationalize manifestly unfair outcomes, cannot yet be consigned to

planning history. We must also caution against the assumption that planning's journey is likely to lead inexorably towards a fairer form of practice and environmentally just outcomes. We can, however, report that indigenous communities, in a host of contexts, are pressing their interests in land and resource management, that planners are becoming used to encountering indigenous people and their interests, and that creative people laboring on complex problems are now setting the benchmarks for what constitutes a fairer form of environmental planning.

While indigenous peoples have long suffered the repressive and dominating effects of planning, as commentators such as Escobar (1992) and Yiftachel (2001) have remarked, they have also glimpsed the emancipatory and transformative potential of planning that Friedmann (2002), in particular, has charted. Perhaps these two potentialities—indeed personalities—of planning are unlikely to be reconciled; they will forever remain alternative expressions of the power of planning. In such circumstances, the mobilization and participation of indigenous groups is central to the future of both their communities and their landscapes. Perhaps it is also central to determining which of planning's personalities eventually defines the character of the vocation.

Notes

1. The recent establishment of the Indigenous Planning Division within the American Planning Association may be an indication that this is beginning to change.

2. These figures and those on income that follow have been calculated from data in the U.S. Census 2000, the Indian Health Service Data 1997, the Australia National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Social Survey 2002, and the New Zealand Census 2001.

3. Other terms for this approach include community-based resource management, civic environmentalism, grassroots ecosystem management, community-based environmental management, and collaborative resource management. As well, there are a number of sector-specific variations, most notably community-based forest management and collaborative watershed (or catchment basin) management.

References

Agrawal, Arun, and Clark C. Gibson. 1999. Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Development* 27(4): 629–49.

Allen, Mark. 1989. Native American control of tribal natural resource development in the context of the Federal trusteeship and tribal self-determination. *Boston College Environmental Affairs and Law Review* 16: 875–95.

Baker, R., J. Davies, and E. Young, eds. 2001. *Working on country: Contemporary indigenous management of Australia's lands and coastal regions.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Baland, J. M., and J. P. Platteau. 1996. *Halting the degradation of natural resources: Is there a role for rural communities?* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Berke, P. R., N. Ericksen, J. Crawford, and J. Dixon. 2002. Planning and indigenous people: Human rights and environmental protection in New Zealand. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22(2): 115–34.

Berkes, Fikret. 1999. *Sacred ecology: Traditional ecological knowledge and resource management.* Philadelphia, PA: Taylor and Francis.

Berkes, F., J. Mathias, M. Kislalioglu, and H. Fast. 2001. The Canadian Arctic and the Oceans Act: The development of participatory environmental research and management. *Ocean and Coastal Management,* 44:451–69.

Bess, R. 2001. New Zealand's indigenous people and their claims to fisheries resources. *Marine Policy* 25 (1): 23–32.

Bradley, J. J. 2001. Landscapes of the mind, landscapes of the spirit: Negotiating a sentinent landscape. In *Working on country: Contemporary indigenous management of Australia's lands and coastal regions,* edited by R. Baker, J. Davies, and E. Young, 295–305. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Bray, M., and A. Thomson, eds. 1990. *Temagami: A debate on wilderness.* Toronto: Dundurn Press.

Carr, D. S., and K. Halvorsen. 2001. An evaluation of three democratic, community-based approaches to citizen participation: Surveys, conversations with community groups, and community dinners. *Society and Natural Resources* 14:107–26.

Castro, A. P., and E. Nielsen. 2001. Indigenous people and co-management: implications for conflict management. *Environmental Science and Policy* 4 (4/5): 229–39.

Cook, Curtis, and Juan D. Lindau, eds. 2000. *Aboriginal rights and self-government: The Canadian and Mexican experience in North American perspective.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Coombs, H. C., H. McCann, H. Ross, and N. M. Williams. 1989. *Land of promises: Aborigines and development in the East Kimberley.* Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Cornell, Stephen. 1988. *The return of the native: American Indian political resurgence.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Cornell, Stephen, and Joseph P. Kalt. 1998. *Sovereignty and nation-building: The development challenge in Indian Country today.* John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

_____. 1992. Reloading the dice: Improving the chances for economic development on American Indian reservations. In *What can tribes do? Strategies and institutions in American Indian economic development,* edited by Stephen Cornell and Joseph P. Kalt, 1–59. Los Angeles, CA: American Indian Studies Center, University of California.

Dale, N. 1999. Cross-cultural community-based planning: Negotiating the future of Haida Gwaii (British Columbia). In *The consensus building handbook: A comprehensive guide to reaching agreement,* edited by L. Susskind, S. McKearnan, and J. Thomas-Larmer, 923–50. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Davidson, Alastair. 1991. *The invisible state: The formation of the Austrian State, 1788–1901.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, J., and E. Young. 1996. Taking centre stage: Aboriginal strategies for redressing marginalisation. In *Resources, nations and indigenous peoples: Case studies from Australasia, Melanesia and Southeast Asia,* edited by R. Howitt, J. Connell, and P. Hirsch, 152–71. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Dean, Bartholomew, and Jerome M. Levi, eds. 2003. *At the risk of being heard: Identity, indigenous rights, and postcolonial states.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Diamond, Larry. 1999: *Developing democracy: Toward consolidation.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Diamond, Jared. 2005. *Collapse: How societies choose to fail or succeed.* New York: Viking.

Dodson, M. 1994. Towards the exercise of indigenous rights: Policy, power and self-determination. *Race and Class* 35 (4): 65–76.

Dorcey, A. H. J. 1986. *Bargaining in the governance of Pacific coastal resources: Research and reform.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia, Westwater Research Centre.

Douglass, Mike. 1999. Geographies of resilience: Slums, squatters and community-state relations in Seoul and Bangkok. *Plurimondi* 1 (2): 213–33.

Duffy, Diane, and Jerry Stubben. 1998. An assessment of Native American economic development: Putting culture and sovereignty back in the models. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 32 (4): 52–78.

Dyck, Noel. 1985. Aboriginal peoples and nation states: An introduction to the analytical issues. In *Indigenous peoples and the nation-state: Fourth World politics in Canada, Australia and Norway,* edited by N. Dyck, 3–26. St. Johns: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Escobar, A. 1992. Planning. In *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power,* edited by Wolfgang Sachs, 132–45. London: Zed Books.

Flannery, Tim. 1994. *The future eaters: An ecological history of the Australasian lands and people.* New York: Grove Press.

Folke, C., and F. Berkes. 2004. Adaptive comanagement for building resilience in socio-ecological systems. *Environmental Management* 34 (1): 75–90.

Friedmann, John. 1987. *Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2002. *The prospect of cities.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Friedmann, J., and H. Rangan, eds. 1993. *In Defense of livelihood: Comparative studies on environmental action.* West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

García-Aguilar, José L. 1999. The autonomy and democracy of indigenous peoples in Canada and Mexico. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 565:79–90.

Gedicks, Al. 1993. *The new resource wars: Native and environmental struggles against multinational corporations.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Haveman, Paul, ed. 1999. *Indigenous peoples' rights in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand.* Aukland: Oxford University Press.

Healey, P. 1997. *Collaborative planning.* London: McMillan.

Hibbard, Michael. 2006. Tribal sovereignty, the white problem, and reservation planning. *Journal of Planning History* 5 (2): 87–105.

Hibbard, M., and M. B. Lane. 2004. By the seat of your pants: Indigenous action and state response. *Planning Theory and Practice* 5 (1): 95–102.

Hibbard, Michael, and Jeremy Madsen. 2003. Environmental resistance to place-based collaboration in the U.S. West. *Society and Natural Resources* 16 (8): 703–18.

Hoberg, G., and E. Morawski. 1997. Policy change through sector intersection: Forest and aboriginal policy in Clayoquot Sound. *Canadian Public Administration* 40 (3): 387–414.

Howitt, Richard. 2001. *Rethinking resource management: Justice, sustainability, and indigenous peoples.* London: Routledge.

Howitt, R., J. Connell, and P. Hirsch. 1996. Resources, nations and indigenous peoples. In *Resources, nations and indigenous peoples: Case studies from Australasia, Melanesia and Southeast Asia,* edited by R. Howitt, J. Connell, and P. Hirsch, 1–30. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Innes, Judith 2004. Consensus building—clarifications for the critics. *Planning Theory* 3 (1): 5–20.

Ivison, Duncan, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders, eds. 2000. *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jojola, Theodore S. 1998. Indigenous planning: Clans, intertribal confederations, and the history of the all Indian Pueblo Council. In Leonie Sandercock, ed., *Making the invisible visible: A multicultural planning history.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2000. Indigenous planning and community development. Paper presented at the 7th Annual IASTE Conference, *The End of Tradition?* October 12–15, in Trani, Italy.

Kapoor, Ilan. 2001. Towards participatory environmental management? *Journal of Environmental Management* 63 (3): 269–79.

Kellert, S. R., J. N. Mehta, S. Ebbin, and L. L. Lichtenfeld. 2000. Community natural resource management: Promise, rhetoric, and reality. *Society and Natural Resources* 13: 705–15.

Kimmerer, Robin W., and Frank K. Lake. 2001. The role of indigenous land burning in land management. *Journal of Forestry* 99 (11): 36–41.

Kingsbury, B. 1998. "Indigenous peoples" in international law: A constructivist approach to the Asian controversy. *American Journal of International Law* 92 (3): 414–57.

Krech III, Shepard. 1999. *The ecological Indian: Myth and history.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Kwaku Kyem, P. A. 2000. Embedding GIS applications into resource management and planning activities of local and indigenous communities: A desirable innovation or destabilizing enterprise? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20:176–86.

Lake, Frank K. 2004. The integration of traditional forest-related knowledge and practices: Case study from the Klamath-Siskiyou Ecoregion. *Community Forests in Review* (Fall):18.

Lane, Marcus B. 1999. Resource planning and indigenous peoples in northern Australia: Re-shaping or reproducing existing practice? *Plurimondi* 1 (2): 181–93.

———. 2002. Buying back and caring for country: Institutional arrangements and possibilities for indigenous lands management in Australia. *Society and Natural Resources* 15 (9): 827–46.

———. 2003. Participation, decentralization, and civil society: Indigenous rights and democracy in environmental planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22 (4): 360–73.

———. 2006. The role of planning in achieving indigenous land justice and community goals. *Land Use Policy* 23 (4): 385–94.

Lane, M. B., and T. Corbett. 2005. The tyranny of localism: Indigenous participation in community based environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Planning & Policy* 7 (2): 142–49.

Lane, Marcus B., and S. Cowell. 2001. Land and resource planning and indigenous interests: Reproducing or transforming the social relations of resource use. In *The power of planning: Spaces of control and transformation,* edited by O. Yiftachel, J. Little, D. Hedgcock, and I. Alexander, 155–170. London: Kluwer Academic.

Lane, Marcus B., and Michael Hibbard. 2005. Doing it for themselves: Transformative planning by indigenous peoples. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 25 (2): 172–84.

Lane, Marcus B., and G. T. McDonald. 2005. The limits to community-based environmental planning: Operational dilemmas, planning principles and possible remedies. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 48 (5): 709–31.

Lane, Marcus B., Helen Ross, Roy E. Rickson, and A. P. Dale. 2003. Sacred land, mineral wealth, and biodiversity at Coronation Hill, Northern Australia: Indigenous knowledge and SIA. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 21 (2): 89–98.

Lane, Marcus B., A. L. Brown, and A. K. Chase. 1997. Land and resource planning under native title: Towards an initial model. *Environmental and Planning Law Journal* 14 (4): 249–58.

Langton, M., and L. Palmer. 2003. Modern agreement making and indigenous people in Australia: Issues and trends. *Australian Indigenous Law Reporter* <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/AILR/2003/1.html> (retrieved July 1, 2006).

Laronde, M. 1993. Co-management of lands and resources in n'Daki Menan. In *Rebirth: Political, economic and social development in First Nations,* edited by A. M. Mawhinney, 93–106. Sudbury: Institute of Northern Ontario Research and Development, Laurentian University.

Leach, Melissa, Robin Mearns, and Ian Scoones. 1999. Environmental entitlements: Dynamics and institutions in community-based natural resource management. *World Development* 27 (2): 225–47.

Lehman, G. 2001. Turning back the clock: Fire, biodiversity, and indigenous community development in Tasmania. In *Working on country: Contemporary indigenous management of Australia's lands and coastal regions,* edited by R. Baker, J. Davies, and E. Young, 308–320. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, David Rich. 1995. Native Americans and the environment: A survey of 20th century issues. *American Indian Quarterly* 19 (3): 423–49.

Li, T. M. 2002. Engaging simplifications: Community-based resource management, market processes and state agendas in upland Southeast Asia. *World Development* 30 (2): 265–83.

Liddle L. 2001. "Bridging the communication gap": Transferring information between scientists and aboriginal land managers. In *Working on country: Contemporary indigenous management of Australia's lands and coastal regions,* edited by R. Baker, J. Davies, and E. Young, 145–55. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Martin, David. 2005. Rethinking aboriginal community governance. In *Community and local governance in Australia,* edited by Paul Smyth, Tim Reddel, and Andrew Jones, 108–30. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Maybury-Lewis, David. 1997. *Indigenous peoples, ethnic groups, and the state.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

———. 2003. From elimination to an uncertain future: Changing policies toward indigenous peoples. In *At the risk of being heard: Identity, indigenous rights, and postcolonial states,* edited by Bartholomew Dean and Jerome M. Levi, 324–34. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

McIntosh, Ian S. 2003. Reconciling personal and impersonal worlds: Aboriginal struggles for self-determination. In Bartholomew Dean and Jerome M. Levi, eds. *At the risk of being heard: Identity, indigenous rights, and postcolonial states.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 293–323.

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

Morris, Christopher W. 1998. *An essay on the modern state.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Faircheallaigh, C., and T. Corbett. 2005. Indigenous participation in environmental management: The role of negotiated agreements. *Environmental Politics* 14 (5): 629–47.

O'Faircheallaigh, C, 1999. Making social impact assessment count: A negotiation-based approach for indigenous peoples. *Society and Natural Resources* 12:63–80.

———. 2004. Evaluating agreements between indigenous peoples and resources developers. In M. Langton, L. Palmer, and K. Shain, eds. *Honour among nations? treaties and agreements with indigenous people.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 303–28.

Pearson, D. 2002. Theorizing citizenship in British settler societies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25 (6): 989–1012.

Peluso, N. L. 1991. *Rich forests, poor people: Resource control and resistance in Java.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Perry, R., ed. 1996a. *From time immemorial: Indigenous peoples and state systems.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1996b. A long view. In *From time immemorial: Indigenous peoples and state systems,* edited by R. Perry, 3–24. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Pinkerton, E. 1989. *Co-operative management of local fisheries: New directions for improved management and community development.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Poffenberger, M., and B. McGean, eds. 1996. *Village voices, forest choices: Joint forest management in India.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Prystupa, V. 1998. Barriers and strategies to the development of comanagement regimes in New Zealand: The case of Te Waihora. *Human Organization* 57 (2): 143–54.

Raibmon, Paige. 2005. *Authentic Indians: Episodes of encounter from the late-nineteenth-century northwest coast.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rangan, Haripriya, and Marcus B. Lane. 2001. Indigenous peoples and forest management: Comparative analysis of institutional approaches in Australia and India. *Society and Natural Resources* 14 (2): 145–60.

Rasmussen, Kathleen, Michael Hibbard, and Kathy Lynn. 2007. Wildland fire management as conservation-based development: An opportunity for reservation communities? *Society and Natural Resources* 20 (5): 497–510.

Renwick, William, ed. 1990. *Sovereignty and indigenous rights: The treaty of Waitangi in international contexts.* Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Richardson, B. J., D. Craig, and B. Boer. 1995. *Regional agreements for indigenous lands and cultures in Canada: A discussion paper.* Darwin: North Australia Research Unit, Australian National University.

Robinson, C., and N. Munungguritj. 2001. Sustainable balance: A Yolngu framework for cross-cultural collaborative management. In *Working on country: Contemporary indigenous management of Australia's lands and coastal regions,* edited by R. Baker, J. Davies, and E. Young, 92–107. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Sallenave, John. 1994. Giving traditional ecological knowledge its rightful place in environmental impact assessment. *Northern Perspectives* 22 (1): 1–7.

Sandercock, Leonie, ed. 1998a. *Making the invisible visible: A multicultural planning history.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1998b. *Towards cosmopolis.* Chichester: Wiley.

Sarin, M. 1995. Regenerating India's forests: Reconciling gender equity with joint forest management. *IDS Bulletin* 26 (1): 83–91.

Schweitzer, Peter P., Megan Biesele, and Robert K. Hitchcock, eds. 2000. *Hunters and gatherers in the modern world: Conflict, resistance, and self-determination.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Scott, James C. 1991. *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

———. 1998. *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Smith, Dean Howard. 2000. *Modern tribal development: Paths to self-sufficiency and cultural integrity in Indian country.* Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Stevens, S., ed. 1997. *Conservation through cultural survival: Indigenous peoples and protected areas.* Washington, DC: Island Press.

Taiepa, T., P. Lyver, P. Horsely, J. Davis, M. Bragg, and H. Moller. 1997. Co-management of New Zealand's conservation estate by Maori and Pakeha: A review. *Environmental Conservation* 24 (3): 236–50.

Trigger, David S. 2000. Aboriginal responses to mining in Australia: Economic aspirations, cultural revival, and the politics of indigenous protest. In *Hunters and gatherers in the modern world: Conflict, resistance, and self-determination,* edited by P. P. Schweitzer, M. Biesele, and R. K. Hitchcock, 192–205. New York: Berghahn Books.

Tully, James. 2000. The struggles of indigenous peoples for and of freedom. In *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples,* edited by Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders, 36–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Driesche, J. and Marcus B. Lane. 2002. Conservation by conversation: Collaborative planning for reuse of a former military property in Sauk County, Wisconsin. *Planning Theory and Practice* 3 (2): 133–53.

Waage, S. A. 2001. (Re)claiming space and place through collaborative planning in rural Oregon. *Political Geography* 20:839–57.

Walsh, F., and P. Mitchell, eds. 2002. *Planning for country: Cross-cultural approaches to decision-making on Aboriginal lands,* Alice Springs: Jukurrpa Books (IAD Press).

Warren, Louis S. 1996. Seeing the people for the trees: The promise and pitfalls of Indian environmental history. *OAH Magazine of History* Spring:18–23.

Weber, E. 2000. A new vanguard for the environment: Grassroots ecosystem management as a new environmental movement. *Society and Natural Resources* 13 (3): 237–59.

Werther, Guntram F.A. 1992. *Self-determination in western democracies: Aboriginal politics in a comparative perspective.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Western D., and M. Wright, eds. 1994. *Natural connections: Perspectives in community-based conservation.* Washington, DC: Island Press.

Wildenthal, Bryan H. 2003. *Native American sovereignty on trial.* Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Wilkinson, Charles F. 2005. *Blood struggle: The rise of modern Indian nations.* New York: Norton.

Wilson, Patrick. 1999. Wolves, politics and the Nez Perce: Wolf reintroduction in central Idaho and the role of native tribes. *Natural Resources Journal* 39:543–64.

———. 2002. Native peoples and the management of natural resources in the Pacific Northwest: A comparative assessment. *American Review of Canadian Studies* 32:3, 397–414.

Wolf, Eric R. 1997. *Europe and the people without history.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2000. Indigenous approaches to water conflict negotiations and implications for international waters. *International Negotiation* 5 (2): 357–73.

Wolfe-Keddie, J. 1995. First nations' sovereignty and land claims: Implications for resource management. In *Resource and environmental management in Canada: Addressing conflict and uncertainty,* edited by B. Mitchell, 55–79.Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Wood, Mary Christine. 1994. Indian land and the promise of native sovereignty: The trust doctrine revisited. *Utah Law Review* 4:1471–1567.

Yiftachel, O. 2001. Introduction: Outlining the power of panning. In *The power of planning: Spaces of control and transformation,* edited by O. Yiftachel, J. Little, D. Hedgecock, and I. Alexander, 1–20. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Zaferatos, Nicholas Christos. 1998. Planning and the Native American tribal community: Understanding the basis of power controlling the reservation territory. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 64 (4): 395–410.

———. 2004. Tribal nations, local governments, and regional pluralism in Washington State: The Swinomish approach in the Skagit Valley. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70 (1): 81–96.

Michael Hibbard is Director of Institute for Policy Research and Innovation and professor in the Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management at the University of Oregon. His research focuses on the social impacts of economic change on small towns and rural regions, in the United States and internationally. Before becoming a full-time academic, he worked for more than ten years in planning and community development with migrant farm workers and Indian reservations.

Marcus Lane leads the social and economic sciences program in the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Organization in Brisbane, Australia. This program comprises about ninety social and economic scientists undertaking research on all aspects of natural resource management and policy. His own research is concerned with environmental management and governance, indigenous lands management, and environmental policy in the southwest Pacific.

Kathleen Rasmussen is on the staff of the Trust for Public Land. She recently completed her master's degree in community and regional planning at the University of Oregon, with a thesis analyzing the possibilities of biomass utilization for economic development on Indian reservations.