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Abstract

The Nisqually, Puyallup, Muckleshoot, Cowlitz, and Yakama Indian Tribes historically utilized the plant resources of Mount Rainier until the National Park Service established Mount Rainier National Park in 1899. Since 1992 there have been formal, written requests by these Tribes to revitalize the harvest of these culturally significant plant resources in their original collection location. Through archival analysis, participant observation, and interviews with Indigenous consultants, I investigated the impetus for these requests and furthermore the role of Mount Rainier in tribally relevant plant harvesting. Data indicates a lack of plant resource monitoring in the United States Forest Service has resulted in unsustainable practices that leave available resources within the boundaries of the National Park. Firstly, this research determined Tribes with historical resource connections to Mount Rainier increasingly value sovereignty over their traditionally utilized plant resources. Finally, contemporary Tribal harvesting events of plant resources in Mount Rainier National Park are indicative of a movement of resource sovereignty facilitated through collaboration rather than a revitalization movement.
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CHAPTER 1: Introduction / Previous Research / Theoretical Background

Introduction

I was first introduced to the majesty of Mount Rainier and her natural and cultural resources during an internship in June – September of 2008 for Mount Rainier National Park’s (MORA) Department of Archaeology and Cultural Relations. In addition to performing my various internship duties, it was once requested of me to attend a meeting between my department at the National Park and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. This meeting was one of many that had occurred intermittently since 1992 to discuss the establishment of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Park and the Tribe that would allow the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe to harvest traditionally utilized and culturally relevant plant resources within the boundaries of MORA. Despite the presentation of the Muckleshoot-MORA harvesting agreement status by Park Cultural Relations Liaisons, very few words were spoken by Tribal members at that time. The few times they were spoken, they were passionate, decisive, and full of disappointment at the slow process through which their cultural practices associated with Mount Rainier were being recognized. When this meeting concluded and even months later for that matter, there was still neither an MOU nor harvesting agreement of any type established between the two parties.
It was not until my admittance into the MA program at the University of Denver in Fall 2012 that my thoughts returned to Mount Rainier National Park and traditional Tribal plant harvesting. Upon reconnecting with my former boss at MORA and conducting background research, I developed a hypothesis that assumed the current efforts of Tribes like the Muckleshoot to reinstate plant harvesting within the National Park were not novel requests. The Tribes of the Puget Sound had historically struggled to maintain access to and control over treaty allocated resources. In the process of analyzing two precedent setting cases involving salmon and shellfish in the Puget Sound, there were indications that the current efforts of traditional plant harvesting among the Tribes were motivated by similar factors thereby indicating a reemergence of a similar sort of resource struggle. I sought to understand how Indigenous Tribes with historical resource connections to Mount Rainier viewed sovereignty over traditionally utilized and culturally significant plant resources.

The resulting research and analysis allowed me to conclude two things. Firstly, Tribes with historical resource connections to Mount Rainier increasingly value sovereignty over their traditionally utilized plant resources and secondly, contemporary Tribal harvesting events of plant resources in MORA are indicative of a movement of resource sovereignty facilitated through collaboration rather than a revitalization movement.

The concept of resource sovereignty was developed throughout this research to represent the current state of plant harvesting in the Puget Sound and I have defined as “the ability of a group to politically and practically control, govern, and manage their
traditionally utilized plant resources” (Nemecek 2014). This concept of resource sovereignty is in contrast to a revitalization movement which was defined by A. F. Wallace as “a deliberate, organized, conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture” (1956:265). Revitalization movements tend to remain focused on positive change within the Tribal realm of influence on a local scale. On the other hand, resource sovereignty has a similar but larger goal of positive change for Indigenous groups on a larger political and governmental scale.

This investigation was undertaken through archival research in Nisqually Tribal Archives for the purpose of content analysis. The archives are located on the Nisqually Indian Tribe’s reservation near Olympia, Washington. Other methods utilized included participant observation of tribal activities and consultant interviews with tribal members and MORA employees. These methods were chosen due to their enhanced ability to convey Indigenous voice towards accurate understanding of this topic from the perspective of those Indigenous Tribes who value such natural resources.

In accordance with the tenants of Indigenous ontological frameworks, I strove to analyze the current requests of plant harvesting within MORA in a way congruent with Indigenous American conceptions of sovereignty and self-determination. These concepts and their definitions were adopted from Anne Waters (2003). She defines an Indigenous conception of sovereignty as “having political power to exercise community or individual self-determination” (Waters 2003:192). Thus, individual self-determination or “the ability to make decisions by, for and about a particular person or community, without
undue limitations on freedom” (Waters 2003:192) is understood as a prerequisite to more
general Tribal sovereignty and resource sovereignty.

**Term Choice**

The concept of what it means to be an “Indigenous” human can mean a variety of things depending on the contexts within which one is working and who is speaking. While there are plenty of complex and controversial definitions of what it means to be “Indigenous” in order to avoid misunderstanding I will ascribe to one alone, that of Jose Martinez Cobo, the first Special Rapporteur for the UN Human Rights Commission’s Working Group on Indigenous Populations (Working Group on Indigenous Peoples).

His definition identifies five factors that tend to characterize “Indigenous peoples” although even these characteristics are not without controversy. Martinez-Cobo identifies individuals and groups as “Indigenous” if they have some sort of 1) historical continuity with pre-invasion/pre-colonial societies on their territories, 2) possess a continued self-defined distinction as different from larger society, 3) have a political status of non-domination, 4) have some sort of determination to persist ethnically in whatever form that determination might take form, and 5) they should possess distinct cultural, social, and legal institutions (Martinez-Cobo 1986/7).

Additionally, due to the 1850s designation of the Puget Sound Indigenous peoples into tribal units, the term “Tribe” will be used synonymously with “Indigenous” and “Indigenous American”. Terms with similar functional issues of multiple definitions are
utilized within this thesis (i.e. sovereignty, self-determination, worldview) but are addressed thoroughly in the following chapters.

Previous Research

Research that has laid the foundation for my investigation cross cuts disciplinary boundaries and lies within the fields of Indigenous resource management and conservation, treaty rights and sovereignty over resources (resource sovereignty), ethnobotany, resource management, historical analysis, and place theory.

In order to evaluate current ideologies associated with the organization and goals of the National Park Service (NPS), it is necessary to understand and acknowledge the impact of past historical contexts and ideological developments within the organization itself. The original, accepted ideology of the NPS at inception was adopted from George Perkins Marsh’s work *Man and Nature* (2002[1864]). The thought behind his work laid the foundation for the elimination of human use and presence within the national parks. Among others, this mindset was challenged by William M. Denevan’s article *The Pristine Myth* (1992) which called for a reintroduction of humans back into the ecosystem and its management.

A parallel resource management organization, the United States Forest Service (USFS), was formed around the same time in 1891. Contrastingly, the mission of the USFS, after reforms by Gifford Pinchot in the early 20th century, aimed to serve the functions the NPS was created to prohibit. Specifically, the mission of the organization was reformed then and continues today to focus on planned use and renewal of natural
resources in order to “…sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation’s forests and grasslands to meet the needs of the present and future generations” (USFS 2013). The goals of the USFS focused on providing adequate natural resources for continued human use. Contrastingly, the NPS focused on preservation with a strict “no use” policy. Since then, the topic and research of Indigenous use in areas of conservation such as the NPS and USFS has become somewhat interdisciplinary, including contributors from the fields of natural resources (Ross et al. 2010), natural resource management (Crespi 1991; Flanders 1998), and anthropology (West, Igoe, and Brockington, 2004; LeBlanc and LeBlanc 2010).

Much of the early work regarding Indigenous treaties and resource rights emerged during the height of the salmon fishing activism preceding the Boldt Decision (United States vs. Washington); colloquially referred to as the “Fish Wars”. These works were partially contributed by Indigenous peoples (Deloria Jr. 1976), sympathetic organizations (American Friends Service Committee 1970; Native American Solidarity Committee, 1976) and legal scholars (Goodman 2000). Currently, Indigenous treaty rights and sovereignty are addressed by a wide variety of disciplines including human rights, philosophy, law, and anthropology (Biolsi 2006; Cattelino 2010).

The field of ethnobotany is additionally useful because it specifically addresses the use and maintenance of Indigenous identities intertwined with the resources specified in the Pacific Northwest treaties. The term is derived from the Greek word “ethnos”, meaning people, and “botany”, the science of plant life. By combining these terms and their constituent definitions you are provided with an accurate definition of
“ethnobotany”, the study of how humans utilize plant resources and the cultural meanings humans give to them through this process of use. Essentially ethnobotanical research strives to understand plant biology as it is intertwined cultural significance. The tradition of ethnobotany in the U.S. was nourished in its infancy through the works of Chamberlin with the Goshu-Utes (1911), AF Whiting with the Hopi (1939) and Julian Steward with the Western Shoshone (1938). Within the region of the Pacific Northwest, Erna Gunther (1945) was one of the first researchers to specifically address ethnobotanical research. Her research has recently been furthered by Eugene Hunn (2003), Kat Anderson (2009), David Hooper (p.c.), Valerie Segrest, (Krohn and Segrest 2010), and Joyce Lecompte-Mastenbrook (p.c.).

Other critical knowledge for this investigation is drawn from the field of Indigenous resource management. Of specific use in this study are the subfields of Indigenous Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) (Berkes and Berkes 2009:2) and the use of tribal-agency collaboration within Western resource management frameworks (Ross and Pickering 2002).

The classic authors of cultural, anthropological, and archaeological accounts of the Tribes of western Washington have provided background information (i.e. historical Indigenous contexts) critical to informing this research project. Sources drawn from include Marian W. Smith (1940), Allan H. Smith (2006), Cecelia Svinth Carpenter (1971), Herman K. Haeberlin (1930), and one of the current experts regarding Indigenous use of Mount Rainer National Park, Greg C. Burtchard (2007).
Finally, while the foci of my research revolves around resource use and sovereignty over them, I realize that resources are tied to places. Among the many anthropologists, archaeologists, and philosophers that discuss place (Richardson 1980; Lefebvre 1991; Low 2000), Basso in particular grasps the inextricability of Indigenous resources to the places in which they grow (Basso 1996). Similarly, within the field of geography the sub-discipline of “therapeutic landscapes” has emerged. These were uncovered in my research as well. The discipline addresses the importance of place in the maintenance of identity and holistic health (Wilson 2003).

Within the literature that has informed this research are also the theoretical frameworks and definitions that have assisted in this analysis. It is within the following theoretical frameworks that these discourses concerning place, conceptions of health, and TEK in relation to identity and worldview are addressed.

**Theoretical Background: Post-Colonial Theory**

World powers of the 21st century like to believe that human civilization is in a post-colonial state where the majority of former colonies have been given their freedom and are as Western society deigns “sovereign”. This theoretical discussion will illuminate the ways in which colonialism continues to have negative impacts on the present and the future of so called post-colonial peoples.

Post-colonialism as a concept is the status of a nation after a colonial power has removed itself physically and governmentally from an area. The ways in which post-colonial peoples are continually influenced after colonization is the dynamic that post-
colonial theory strives to further analyze. Academics and post-colonial peoples around the world are those who participate in the larger discussion of post-colonial theory and form what is known as post-colonial discourse. But it is the continued presence and occurrence of similar situations around the world that have allowed the discourse to blossom and become a popular method in which to comprehend the state of modern society.

Upon entering an area of what Western colonial society considered terra nullis, original intent was to create and enforce strict categories of “colonizer” and “colonized” with the purpose of exploiting the areas human and natural resources. While attempting to achieve these goals though, colonizers were confronted with the difficulty and impossibility of enforcing discrete categories of “us” and “them.” Roles within colonized society became blurred and categories, originally easy to define by visual characteristics, (i.e. skin color), became increasingly difficult as the groups of society intermingled. The hybrid identities between colonizer/colonized that formed in such situations have become one of the main topics within post-colonial discussions and form part of this thesis analysis.

Stuart Hall is one such author within post-colonial discourse that brings the discussion of colonialism and resulting hybrid identities into the context of the United States. Hall ascribed to theoretical analysis formulated by post-colonial authors Aimé Césaire and Léopold Senghor. Their theory attempts to analyze the way in which cultural identities hybridize in the aftermath of colonial situations. The metaphor of the Presence
*Americaine* was developed to represent a hybrid of two dissimilar and competing worldviews, the Africaine and the Europeanne.

The *Presence Africaine* represents the memories and cultural facets of Africa that were outlawed under slavery but endured in every individual long past its outlawing. Dissimilarly, the *Presence Europeanne* represented “…exclusion, imposition, and expropriation” or the factors that were imposed by European colonizers on the colonized (Hall 1994:400). The Presence Americaine is defined by Césaire, Senghor, and Hall as the essence of diversity and hybridity and is one that exists “…by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of ‘identity’ that lives with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity” (Hall 1994:402).

Within this metaphorical instance, no longer do the worldviews associated with the Presence Africaine nor the Presence Europeanne exist in pure form. The acknowledgement of a hybrid identity and its associated worldviews is deemed necessary by the authors to describe the identities of African Americans. The authors encompassed this syncretic identity within the concept of the Presence Americaine. Thus, the Presence Americaine is a similarly useful concept to describe hybrid Indigenous American identities that have developed over the course of European colonization in the Pacific Northwest US and furthermore, the identities and worldviews that were discovered in the process of this research.

Waubageshig argues against this analysis though in that the situations of Indigenous peoples in Canada and the United States cannot be categorized as post-colonial. Thus, an embracing of heterogeneity of identities involved in the development
of a Presence Americaine cannot occur. He understands the current Canadian and American situation as one where colonial processes of discrimination and domination continue albeit more covertly than previous colonial enterprises (Waubageshig 1970). If one accepts this argument than the metaphor of Césaire and Senghor is inappropriate for Indigenous groups in the Pacific Northwest of North America who have yet to gain any true agency outside of a colonial system. Those Indigenous groups in the United States are in a continued state of colonialism. There has yet to be a period of decolonization in which to usher in a post-colonial period. Yet similar to the way in which Hall identified a hybrid worldview of Africans in America within a post-colonial context, my research has identified a hybrid worldview that developed within what is thought to be a continued colonial context. Therefore, if decolonization has yet to occur for American Indigenous peoples, how have they obtained agency within the colonial system of US government?

According to Robert K. Thomas (1966/7), colonial domination upholds static categories and dominates others through the promotion of traditional institutional decay and social isolation of the colonized. Theoretically, by revitalizing traditional institutions and socially uniting across cultural boundaries these effects of colonization can be resisted. In essence, by once again experiencing society, economic pursuits, and the environment personally, Indigenous peoples have the ability to make their own decisions which thereby leads to change. It is these characteristics of experience and change that resist the very core of colonization. It is about “facing other kinds of people and your environment in terms of your own aspirations and in terms of the kind of life you’re leading” (Thomas 1966/7:42-43). This sort of experience-based resistance with goals of
change has appeared in this research and best exemplifies the situation of current Puget Sound Indigenous peoples.

Whether or not North America is in a state of post-colonialism is not up for debate. What is notable is that in the process of North American colonization Western enlightenment concepts such as sovereignty, originating with the Doctrine of Discovery, were adopted and translated to serve the needs of colonized peoples (Appadurai 1990). The classical characteristics of the term ‘sovereignty’ originally included “absolute, unlimited power held permanently in a single person or source, inalienable, indivisible, and original (not derivative or dependent)” (D’Errico 2008:114). As D’Errico states “these are characteristics of power associated with divine right monarchy and the Papacy of the Christian church” (D’Errico 2008:114). Thus, such terms as sovereignty are questioned by non-state societies whose power relations never functioned in traditional ‘state’ methods. Furthermore, in many cases of modern non-state societies these concepts are as Appadurai (1990) says adopted and translated into more useful iterations.

While the body of post-colonial research is vast, these arguments over the impacts and effects of colonialism are critical to acknowledge when research among Indigenous societies is conducted. This is necessary in order to accurately comprehend the many contextual and historical factors that influenced current societal identities and conceptions of self-determination, sovereignty, and independence.
Worldview Theory

In order to adequately comprehend the influence of a nation’s colonial past on its present and future, one must acknowledge there are a variety of perspectives in reference to the context in question. This research attempts to understand the current opinions of the colonized, in this case the Indigenous peoples of Washington State’s Puget Sound region, regarding the importance of the availability of traditionally utilized plant resources. Thus it is necessary to have an understanding of previous Indigenous perceptions of plant and animal resources in order to understand current perceptions within the current cultural context.

Prior to European colonization of the Americas, Indigenous perceptions of the importance of the natural world and its resources were intrinsically connected with their entire worldview. Therefore, there needs to be a clarification of what constitutes an Indigenous resource worldview in contrast to the colonizer resource worldview. Those authors who have informed my understanding of worldview throughout the course of this research include L. Shelbert (2003), A. Waters (2003), E. Salmon (2000), Schlanger (1992), and Berkes & Berkes (2009).

Shelbert best deconstructs the concept of worldview by defining it as “a mental structure, more deeply embedded than ideology” and that a worldview:

lies behind the textured forms, like the skeleton composed of interrelated elements. Worldviews…Mostly remain hidden, unseen, unperceived and rarely emerge into the field of vision…They are taken for granted as the roads to be traveled and often escape the process of questioning. Thus the realm of worldview structures…is…the frame, the pattern, the paradigm that shapes understanding. [Shelbert 2003:62]
An *Indigenous worldview* was understood by the authors to be one inextricably bound to interaction with the natural world and things which compose it (i.e. plant and animal resources) (Salmon 2000:13, 31). This *Indigenous worldview* of resources is inextricable from what is commonly referred to as *traditional ecological knowledge (TEK)*. TEK in itself is defined as “a cumulative body of knowledge, practice and belief, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission” (Berkes and Berkes 2009:2).

Anne Waters believes American Indian understandings of resources are grounded in what she calls “being with the land (being of the land, or landed)” and that “*Indigenous worldview* survives interdependently with the land, in all its physical, spiritual, and sociological ways of being with a sustainable or future orientation that existed in balance with the world” (2003:197). Furthermore, the *Indigenous worldview* survives with knowledge that “intimacy with, and interdependence of, all our relations with the land are as important (to human survival) as the air we breathe” (Waters 2003:197).

These qualities that compose *Indigenous worldviews* are considered by some to be informed by *animic ontology* (Ingold 2006:3; Moore and Thompson 2012). Animic ontology is in direct opposition to Western ontology in that it understands movement as going through instead of across the world. In other words, life and organisms are in a web of paths where the environment is an entanglement of those paths and places of persistence (persistent places) are nodes within those webs. There is an assumption that landscapes are saturated with social relations between people and animals, people and
objects, and people and places. This assumption allows for the formation of the concept of *persistent place*.

Nodes of persistent place are defined by Schlanger (1992) as “places that were repeatedly used during long-term occupations of regions” and are representative of “the intersection between particular human behaviors on a particular landscape” (1992:97-98). Certain factors were identified by Schlanger as critical to persistent place formation and development including 1) unique landscape qualities that make it suitable for specific activities, practices, or behaviors, 2) the location of certain features in a place that serve to focus reoccupations, and 3) the development of place based upon long processes of “occupation and re-visitation independent of cultural features but dependent on the presence of cultural materials” (1992:97-98). Prior to the formation of the National Park, it is reasonable to assume that Mount Rainier historically served as one such persistent place for the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, Puyallup, Cowlitz, and Yakama with limited activity locus in response to its unique landscape and resources.

Through the initiation of colonial contact, new ways of understanding human-environment interactions were introduced which thereby modified Indigenous worldviews. Waters insinuates that the pre-colonial Indigenous worldview never disappeared and continues to affect the way American Indians view the world today, specifically in reference to issues of sovereignty. This research affirms the continuation of the Indigenous worldview, but more importantly this research identifies a way in which it is currently being expressed by Indigenous peoples themselves.
Conversely, a *Western worldview* of resources generally is what Waters distinguishes as “being on and acting on the land” (Waters 2003:197). Therefore, it generally involves quantitative scientific, technological, and economic data. This is very unlike the Indigenous worldview in that the Western worldview fails to include “explicit social context” (Berkes & Berkes 2009:8). The philosophy of science is heavily utilized and relied upon by a Western Resource worldview and generally include results based solely upon evidence, repeatability, and quantification (Berkes & Berkes 2009:8). Worldview hybridization and modification in the Puget Sound tribal context will be explored further in the data analysis and results chapter.

Finally, in her understanding of Indigenous worldviews Waters addresses how the concepts of sovereign and self-determination previously played and possibly continue to play into an Indigenous worldview. She defines *sovereign* as “having political power to exercise community or individual self-determination” and *self-determination* as “having the ability to make decisions by, for and about a particular person or community, without undue limitations on freedom” (Waters 2003:192). These conceptual definitions were adopted throughout this research.

This is not to say that there is universal agreement as to the appropriateness of the definition and use of the term sovereignty. Gerald Taiaiake Alfred addressed the original definition and use of the term sovereignty in Canada and the United States. He believes the term of sovereignty as it was originally conceived is an inadequate concept and word for Indigenous populations to utilize and with which to engage. Based upon this research, Alfred appears to be correct in this belief. Of course this assumes the new term
of resource sovereignty, whose essence is based in collaboration, is truly more useful to describe the current state of tribal collaborative resource management.

Furthermore, these definitions differ from the original Enlightenment conception of sovereignty. Formed during the late 17\textsuperscript{th} and early 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries in Europe, the concept of sovereignty as it is understood by Western society emphasizes a person’s or groups ability to choose their own fate. This right is based not upon myth of creation, but upon Western society’s political systems and rules.

Even though Waters herself utilizes the Enlightenment Age definition as a basis for her understanding of Native American sovereignty, it is applied differently. As was mentioned earlier, she states that to be sovereign means “having political power to exercise community or individual self-determination” (Waters 2003:192). This definition is similar to the original conceptualization of the enlightenment ideal in that it places utmost importance on the power principle of control. Yet Waters believes that the power/control concept should be initiated by an individual over themselves first in order to create a sovereign group entity and ultimately, a self-sustaining society and culture. This will be discussed in more detail later.

\textbf{Current State of Resource Management in the United States}

There are massive ideological chasms that differentiate what we have defined as Indigenous Resource and a Western Resource worldviews. It is critical though to understand the way these worldviews and their distinctive assumptions have shaped the way environmental regulation and management function in the United States. Without
sufficient room to discuss in detail the extensive history of global natural resource management, this section provides a brief discussion of the development of techniques and worldviews governing the management of natural resources.

As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, a close relative to what I have referred to as an Indigenous resource worldview is what Fikret Berkes calls traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). Until recently, the TEK of Native Americans and other Indigenous peoples worldwide were promptly dismissed as antiquated and counter to the productive model of modernization. As is stated by Harries-Jones, Indigenous knowledge (TEK) was understood as just that, traditional, in the past, and incompatible with modernity (Harries-Jones 2004:287-88). Over the past 30 years though there has been a distinctive set of steps that have led to a slightly more accepting atmosphere of environmental management.

The basic concepts encompassed by the term TEK have had a long history. It was through close and daily human-environmental interactions such as Indigenous harvesting, hunting, and gathering that detailed and accurate knowledge of local environments were gained thereby ensuring survival. Much later these historical farming methods were given the name we know them by today as traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). Once again, TEK is defined 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. [Berkes et al. (1995); Gadgil et al (1993)]
Simply put, these detailed human-environment practices have only emerged over time from daily interactions between farmers and the environment without external inputs, capital or scientific knowledge (Altieri 2004). In fact it is the continued utilization of Indigenous farming methods throughout the world that appears to be “a testament to the remarkable resiliency of traditional agroecosystems in the face of continuous environmental and economic change” (Toledo and Barrera-Bassols 2008; Altieri and Toledo 2011). Furthermore, it is through these practices that we gain insight into promising models that exhibit “high biodiversity, thrive without agrochemicals, and sustain year-round yields” (Denevan 1992).

Derived from further understanding of these methods of TEK that originated with basic methods of hunting and gathering came the development of practices in the early 20th century such as agroforestry and agroecology that utilized traditional agri-methods discovered within TEK (Friederichs 1930; Klages 1928, 1942; Bensin 1928). These sciences were created as “a way to protect natural resources, with guidelines to design and manage sustainable agroecosystems” (Altieri, 1989; Gliessman 1997, 1998). This reformulation of environmental management as well as natural resource utilization are thought by some to have been partly reactionary to the debates of the time concerned with the effects of conventional farming’s habitual use of pesticides, herbicides and other toxic chemicals (Altieri 1989). As will be discussed next, the general ecological failures of modernity are thought by some to have been partial impetus for the search for and acceptance of alternative environment management models such as TEK.
Since the 1990s the concept of TEK has taken on new meanings and assumptions. A redefining of the term has occurred and emerged from the environmental and ecological failures of so-called modernity. Harries-Jones adeptly explains the process of the 19th century modernization by drawing on theoretical considerations of Beck (Beck et al 1994:181-82) that see “risk” as the ultimate outcome of goods production based on a set of necessary material conditions. To that effect, exposure to risk is “an outcome of industrial and political processes” and those risks (i.e. more technology, government, market opportunities) intrinsically “accumulate because they are automatic side effects of the whole industrial process” and “have already undermined the foundations of the society out of which it has emerged” (Harries-Jones 2004:280-81; Beck et al 1994:181-82). These failures have led to creation of what Beck calls *life-politics* which “strives to introduce new sources of meaning to life itself, as collective disenchantment exhausts other sources of meaning” (Harries-Jones 2004: 281; Beck et al 1994:181-82).

Beck argues that traditionalism is dead and therefore does not have the ability to reshape society from below, but Harries-Jones argues this is not the case. He and others such as Arnakak et al. (2000) cite evidence within Alaskan Inuit society as to the capability of traditional practices in resurging and opposing modernity and modernization. They refer to TEK, in this case also an opposition to modernity, as reflexive traditionalism (R-T). R-T is so much more than the continuation of traditional practices such as berry-picking and hunting. It is also a re-conceptualization of the traditional referring to “healthy, sustainable communities regaining their right to a say in the governance of their lives using principles and values they regard as integral to who
and what they are” (Arnakak 2000). Furthermore, TEK and its approach of R-T comes to include all:

- the knowledge of country that covers weather patterns, seasonal cycles, wildlife, use of resource…interrelationships of these elements, and practical truisms about society, human nature and experience passed on orally, from one generation to the next, that one can learn best through observing, doing and experience. [Harries-Jones 2004: 288]

The family-kinship resource management model used by the Inuit is based upon traditional familial relations and values. These traditional values and the relations between humans and the environment that are promoted, assist in the greater Inuit goal of reliance on traditionally utilized resources. Through renewing self-reliance as a group, they are better outfitted to pursue their larger goals of governance and environmental stewardship (Harries-Jones 2004:288). This example provided by Harries-Jones allows insight to be gained into how TEK and the family-kinship resource management model can be integrated into management systems around the world. Furthermore, this example demonstrates how groups can adopt the TEK model to additionally counteract the negative ecological and environmental side effects of modernization and promote stewardship of the environment.

In the context of the United States some aspects of the colonizers (i.e. enlightenment concepts) were adopted by the colonized (Indigenous Americans) to suit their needs. Additionally, many of the qualities and consequences of the Indigenous worldview such as ‘being with the land’ and persistent place were retained. It is the combination of these colonizer and colonized worldviews and their different methods of living that compose this syncretic worldview.
This is not to say that Indigenous American citizens have simply accepted their continued state of colonization. It can be interpreted that subtle resistance to colonialism and modernity is indicated by the maintenance of Indigenous worldviews. Harries-Jones concept of R-T also encompasses continued use and revitalization of traditional Indigenous practices as a form of opposition to modernity and colonialism.

It is the continued use of TEK and its adoption by the colonial system that creates a place for Indigenous American peoples within a colonial context and assists in restoring aspects of individual Indigenous and societal agency. The hybrid worldview discovered in this research involves the use of colonized collaboration by the colonized with the colonizer to seemingly restore agency, maintain traditional plant resources, and ensure long-term cultural survival.

As you will read later, this research has discovered that the application of TEK through collaborative environmental management appears to be on the rise between federal agencies and tribal entities. These collaborative efforts appear to be more common due to institutional changes involving decreases in budget allowances, increased recognition of tribal treaty rights, and the potential benefits of utilizing TEK that is catered to a local environment to manage resources (Donoghue et al. 2010:1). While there is great hope for collaborative resource management between Tribes and the federal government, there are various factors that complicate such efforts which are addressed later in this thesis.
CHAPTER 2: Historical Background

In pursuing this research close attention is paid to the ways in which geological and environmental features of the Mount Rainier area have historically conditioned Indigenous peoples utilization of plant resources. Furthermore, this background provides preexisting ethnographic and archaeological records which allows determinations to be made regarding the quality and cultural significance of that usage. Also determinable from this data are what influences political and governmental contextual changes might have had and continue to have on Indigenous use of Mount Rainier.

Mount Rainier Geography Conditioned Indigenous Use

Rising just over 14,410 feet, Mount Rainier, known as Takhoma to some Indigenous peoples, was part of the latest mountain-building event that took place a few million years ago in which the Cascadian volcanoes emerged (Kruckeberg 1999:55). Standing above all others in the eastern Cascade Range, Mount Rainier is a dormant stratovolcano that is connected by a mountain spine to Mt. Baker in northern Washington State to Mt. Lassen in California (Burtchard 2007:1). Mount Rainier also has the largest glacial system in the contiguous United States, numbering at 26 (Burtchard 2007:1).
The geography of Mount Rainier and the surrounding region were formed during the period of Pleistocene glaciation. Descending from and returning to Canada between 14,000 - 11,000 B.P. (Kruckeberg 1999:57), portions of the upper limits of the Cascade range, including Mount Rainier, are thought to have been completely free of ice between around 8-9,500 B.P. (Burtchard 2007:1). Lowland areas were shaped into their current states by glaciations and de-glaciations to form the “low-lying hills trending north to south, U-shaped mountain valleys and the many small depressions appearing now as lakes or ponds” (Kruckeberg 1999:56).

Within the period of Pleistocene de-glaciation, the upper limits of Mount Rainier became exposed. This exposure allowed for humans to roam its peaks and valleys, hunting and gathering seasonally, and worshipping. Worship was thought to occur due to various ethnographic references which have informed the interpretation of the archaeological record. It was the extreme environmental conditions of the various mountain zones that conditioned the ways in which Indigenous peoples utilized the landscape during the precontact period (Burtchard 2007:2). The typical categorizations of elevation have been modified in the area of Mount Rainier to reflect the different vegetative-resource zones that would have been valued by prehistoric peoples. The zones include 1) Northwest Maritime Forest (low-mid elevation forest and floodplains), 2) subalpine parks, 3) alpine tundra (above the tree line) and 4) permanent snow fields and glaciers (Burtchard 2007:4).
Indigenous peoples have been using the mountain and its resources for thousands of years and this use has been partly conditioned by environmental and geologic factors. It has been only recently that use has been completely disallowed. Towards pursuing the rest of this background section, comprehension of Indigenous resource use will be illuminated through archaeological, ethnographic, and historical data of the area that is known today as Mount Rainier National Park (MORA). Additionally, accounts of use will be divided into two categories; 1) precontact (pre-1854) and post-treaty (1854 – 1950s) and 2) current use (1950s - present).

Precontact/Post-Treaty Indigenous Use of Mount Rainier

In the precontact era, archaeological evidence and ethnographic accounts indicate use of the mountain and surrounding landscape was based on the harvest of subsistence resources seasonally available and for ceremonial activities (Ballard 1929:142-144; Haeberlin 1924:417-18). These resources, typically available in greatest abundance in the subalpine and alpine zones, included (but were not limited to) mountain goats, elk, deer, marmots, bears, game birds, and huckleberries (Burtchard 2007:4). These patterns of use similarly appear in archaeological records as well as Indigenous histories and early ethnographies of the Tribes surrounding Mount Rainier. The following evidence highlights archaeological evidence which concretely establishes Indigenous resource use and presence, and additionally some of the reasons why Mount Rainier played an important role in traditional Indigenous plant harvesting.
Archaeological Evidence: Early Surveys

As was mentioned previously, utilization of areas of Mount Rainier is known through archaeological and ethnographic evidence. In 1963, Daugherty completed the first archaeological site survey of the Park (Daugherty 1965). He led the investigation under the assumption that river valleys were of primary importance to Indigenous subsistence, as opposed to the seemingly barren and formidable upper limits of the Cascade Range. These assumptions regarding the unimportance of the upper limits of the Cascades gradually became accepted as doctrine. This continued into the 1970s by way of various statements by Park employees who “alluded to the Park’s limited potential for archaeological remains” (Burtchard 1997; Bohannon 1974, 1975). Skeptical of non-use of mountainous environments by Indigenous peoples, Allan W. Smith challenged this doctrine who in previous research had identified data that alluded to the occurrence of seasonal subsistence in the higher elevations of the Cascade Range. Subsequently, this research inspired Allan Smith’s ethnographic survey of the park in 1964 formed the basis for this investigation and later, MORA Archaeologist Greg Burtchard’s field work. As of 2008, the fieldwork of Greg Burtchard and others had yielded 95 precontact archaeological sites located in alpine, subalpine, and forest environmental zones (Burtchard 2007:4).
Modern Survey Results and Interpretations

The approximate 100 archaeological sites located on Mount Rainier are categorized into six ‘Intensification Periods’ of which will be described later (see Figure 1).

These periods of intensification are defined by known environmental conditions at certain points in history and archaeological evidence to suggest that the presence of certain Indigenous subsistence methods and patterns. They are differentiated through the use of either the word foraging or collecting.

The differentiation between these two terms and their conceptual elements were first clearly defined by Lewis Binford (1980:5-10). The term foraging is defined by Binford (1980:5) as “seasonal residential moves among a series of resource patches” in

Figure 1: 2008 Documented precontact sites and environmental zones in Mount Rainier National Park. (map generated by Mount Rainier National Park GIS office)
which “foragers typically do not store foods but gather food daily”. Foraging is an activity where individuals “range out gathering food on an “encounter” basis and return to their residential bases each afternoon or evening” (Binford 1980:5). Thus, it is sustenance activity in which “a group “maps onto” resources through residential moves and adjustments in group size” (Binford 1980:10).

Conversely, he understands collectors as characterized by 1) food storage for at least part of the year and 2) “logistically organized food-procurement parties” (Binford 1980:10) in the form of special task groups. The collecting method is understood by Binford to occur in situations where “consumers are near to one critical resource but far from another equally critical resource” (1980:10). Therefore specialization food-procurement strategies are needed to exploit necessary resources instead of the encounter basis food-procurement used by foragers.

In applying these concepts to the Indigenous resource use history of Mount Rainier, foraging refers to the period before Indigenous populations around Mount Rainier increased in density and established sedentary villages. In essence, these foraging periods exemplify a more nomadic lifestyle (Burtchard 2007). Contrastingly, collection refers to the period after sedentary villages were established in the foothills and river valleys, thereby indicating that collection became intentional seasonal operations in which large amounts of resources were gathered and stored for winter consumption such as berries, roots, and fish (Burtchard 2007).
The *intensification periods* are characterized by the linear time in which they occurred, the known environmental and ecological conditions that existed during that period, and the corresponding subsistence strategies that were utilized by humans to capitalize on the available natural resources. Proceeding from oldest to most recent these periods consist of 1) *post–pleistocene foraging* (11,000 – 8,000 BP), followed by 2) *rest-rotation foraging* (9000 – 6000 BP), 3) *semi-sedentary rest-rotation foraging* (7,000 – 4,000 BP), 4) *semi-sedentary collecting* (5,000 – 1,500 BP), 5) *intensive collecting* (2,500 – 400 BP), and finally the 6) *mixed strategy hunting and gathering period* (400 – P) that existed on Mount Rainier until the establishment of the National Park around the turn of the 20th century (Burtchard 2007:14).

In response to this thesis focus on human use of the environment, this background will begin with the first period characterized by human resource use, the rest-rotation foraging period (RRF). The earliest archaeological evidence of Indigenous use on Mount Rainier lies within the RRF period at a site called Buck Lake (45PI438; see Figure 2). Due to climate characteristics of Washington State in the RRF period, it is theorized that accompanying these climate conditions were increases in upland forest density and an opening up of forest land in the lowlands (Burtchard 2007:19). In general, large game animals favor less dense forest habitat. This is due to the fact that vegetation favored by large game (such as elk or deer) is commonly most abundant when forest floor tree coverage is at a low density. Consequently, one can assume hunting of large game would have occurred in lowland forest environments. While this is thought to have been the
case there is archaeological evidence for Indigenous use of the heavily forested alpine and subalpine limits of the mountain in this time period. The use of the upper mountain areas despite a lack of game is theorized by some to potentially indicate the occurrence of ceremonial trips (i.e. spirit quests) that have been documented through ethnographic evidence (Burtchard 2007). Overall, the period is so named due to the activities that are thought to have been practiced during this time. These activities are thought to include group movement to new foraging areas when productivity declines in the former areas. This freedom to move to new foraging areas allows for resource regeneration and ensures productivity of those former foraging locales in the future (Burtchard 2007:19).

Figure 2: 3D Archaeological site inventory with 2 oldest sites. (Map generated by Mount Rainier National Park GIS office)

The transition to Indigenous 3) semi-sedentary rest-rotation foraging (7,000 – 4,000 BP) is thought to have occurred with increased population density in the lowlands,
corresponding decreases in lowland ungulate habitat, and the opening up of subalpine parklands which most likely attract elk and deer during summer foraging months. Consequently, while continuing rest-rotation and entire group movement for resource exploitation, human foraging strategies added times of limited sedentism and food storage for winter consumption (Burtchard 2007:20).

The 4) semi-sedentary collecting (5,000 – 1,500 BP) period is considered to be marked by a transition from high mobility foraging to a limited mobility collecting pattern. This period, defined by winter subsistence on stored anadromous fish, was characterized by greater population increases and consequent increases in resource competition that made the former lifestyle of rest-rotation foraging unreliable as resources were overharvested. Therefore, lifestyles and resource use became reliant on settlement and subsistence strategies based upon riverine habitats (Burtchard 2007:22).

Around 2,500 BP there is a theorized transition to a period of 5) intensive collecting (2,500 – 400 BP). Collection intensification is thought to be a result of social mechanisms that were formed in order to counteract the effects of population pressures on resources. Under these assumptions expected outcomes might include increased use of mass harvestable resources (i.e. huckleberries), increased movement into marginal habitats (i.e. further up Mount Rainier), development of alternative resource capture methods (i.e. trade network expansion), more defined and defended territories, and increased competition and conflict among groups.
Finally, bringing us to the precontact period is the mixed strategy hunting and gathering period (400 – Present). The methods by which Indigenous peoples of the Puget Sound exploited their environment changed dramatically in this period primarily due to diseases introduced through European contact. The resulting population loss altered and imposed stress on social structures and land-use systems. Thereafter, the settlement of Europeans and Euroamericans increased and brought with them lifestyles independent of foraging and collecting activities.

Stratigraphy places the presence of Indigenous use through lithic materials (see Figure 3b) back to roughly 9,000 – 9,500 BP (p.c. Burtchard). Other material artifacts at Buck Lake and such sites as Sunrise Ridge Borrow Pit (45PI408) indicate Indigenous use of alpine and subalpine areas continued sporadically, until around 3500 14C yr. BP when use increased significantly and the mixed hunting strategy was adopted as the primary hunting method. Mixed hunting strategy is suggested by the presence of dart and arrow sized projectile points that were used for smaller and quicker game (Burtchard 2007:28). The period of Mixed Strategy Hunting and Gathering, spanning 400 14C yr. BP to the current era, has so far left very little archaeological evidence. Ethnographic and oral accounts are the primary evidence of more recent Indigenous usage of the mountain.

Most of the archaeological material evidence discovered on the upper limits of Mount Rainier fall into the period of Intensive Collection between 2,500 and 400 14C yr. BP. This period was characterized by the opening up of the uplands of the mountain, increased lowland forest density creating unsuitable habitat for larger game animals, and
a peaking of prehistoric regional population density (Burtchard 2007:29-30). Notably, ethnographic materials from the 19th and 20th centuries resonate with the archaeological evidence discussed above.

The corroboration of results from different data sources concretely establishes the presence of Indigenous Americans on the upper limits of Mount Rainier. The archaeological presence of lithic materials associated with resource collection in prehistoric sites attests to one of the reasons why Indigenous peoples journeyed up the mountain. Furthermore, current requests for the continuation of such resource collection activities are legitimized within the archaeological record that places these activities as having occurred in the historical record of Mount Rainier.

*Figure 3(a) FS2005-29 Site at the margin of the alpine/subalpine; Figure 3(b) Lithic materials from site FS2005-29*
In order to understand Indigenous subsistence usage of Mount Rainier and the area immediately adjacent, Smith attempted to clarify tribal associations within MORA. In order to do so, he categorized the Tribes with interest in the Park into the topographic and settlement-based dimensions of 1) Interior (upriver of the coastal area), 2) Puget Sound/Coastal (on or adjacent to the Puget Sound), and 3) the Cascades area (farthest inland with connections to the East side of Mount Rainier. These peoples were then further differentiated into their constituent linguistic families of either Salishan or Sahaptin (A. Smith 2006[1964]:41). Within these categories, the Tribes with historical affiliations with Mount Rainier included the Yakama Nation and Kittitas as the Interior Sahaptin speakers, Wenatchi as the Interior Salishan speakers, Taidnapam (Upper Cowlitz Indian Tribe) and the Meshal/Mical (Upper Nisqually Indian Tribe) as the Puget Sound/Coastal Sahaptin, the Nisqually Indian Tribe, Puyallup Tribe of Indians, and Muckleshoot Indian Tribe as the Puget Sound/Coast Salishan, and lastly the Kliktat/Klickitat as the only Cascade area Sahaptin Tribe (Smith 2006[1964]:8).

These tribal names were thought to have been determined by the wintering village location of the small band which was located anywhere within the river valley deigned as the territory of the Tribe. The small bands were generally independent of one another and constituted their own political units, but from time to time small bands did unite to
accomplish goals such as to resist raiding parties by Indigenous peoples from the area of what is now Canada (A. Smith 2006[1964]:35).

While these tribal names and affiliations seem straightforward, there was by no means consensus over tribal membership within the bands themselves. For example, some of the terms understood by academics, such as the term ‘Yakama’, were used in a variety of ways with reference to various entities. According to Allan Smith, this was primarily due to the “views of the natives themselves, who had differing definitions of who the Yakama are” (2006[1964]:31). Additionally, due to the multitude of small villages, “it [was] not always obvious which precise village or groups of communities is referred to under a “tribal” term” (A. Smith 2006[1964]:38).

It should also be noted that intertribal marriages within the structure of small bands were common and likely further complicated the defining of recognizable tribal boundaries (A. Smith 2006[1964]:37). Therefore, “it may have been this extensive intermarriage that also allowed for the free use of the park area by several groups” (A. Smith 2006[1964]:48).

According to Allan Smith, on the western side of the mountain the edges of tribal boundaries corresponded to the crests of mountain ranges and territories roughly followed river valleys up to the tree-line of Mount Rainier. Within those upper limits of the Park, the concept of boundaries became more theoretical, at times representing something similar to a “common use” area and if threatened by Eastern Tribes at other times, was defended as tribal property. These territorial limits designated it the right of
the group to “effectively exploit the natural resources of those slopes that faced toward their tribal villages or localities” (A. Smith 2006[1964]:39, 41).

Various methods by which to concretely determine the tribal boundaries were proposed by academics throughout the early 1900s (Spier 1936; Haeberlin and Gunther 1930; Ray 1936; Jacobs 1931, 1937; M. W. Smith 1940, 1941), but it wasn’t until 1965 that the Tribes themselves became intimately involved in defining their historical territories.

The U.S. Indian Claims Commission (ICC) organized various hearings in the early 1960s in order to “precisely define tribal boundaries” (Onat 1999:53). Each of the parties that testified during the proceedings claimed to have aboriginal possession at the time of the Medicine Creek Treaty of 1854 and the Yakima Treaty of 1855. The territories thus were defined as is illustrated below (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Traditional Use Areas as of the 1850s approximately (courtesy of Greg Burtchard)](image-url)
American Culture and its Effect on Indigenous Resource Use within the Precontact/Post-treaty Eras

Early European settlement in the Puget Sound was mediated through the joint use mandate negotiated between Great Britain and United States in the Treaty of 1846. Until the creation of Washington Territory in 1853, the dominant colonial presence in the area was that of British settlers. Consequently, early colonial-Indigenous interactions were between the British and Indigenous peoples and were characterized by amiable interactions with an emphasis on mutual respect and freedom. Due to this fact, “the Tribes of the region did not object to or harass the extensive British farming and ranching presence” (Kluger 2011:25). Only with the designation of the area as Washington Territory, the opening of the West for American settlement, and the negotiation of resettlement treaties between Territorial Governor Issac Stevens did resource use dramatically change for the Indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest.

In the process of treaty negotiations, specifically the Treaties of 1855, Medicine Creek, and Point Elliot, the goal was to attempt to consolidate an innumerable variety of culturally distinct Tribes into a few large tribal entities and reservations. This goal was sought largely in order to legally “void” the land occupied by the Indigenous peoples of the area so that settlers could formally certify their land claims allowed through the Donation Act of 1850 (Kluger 2011:67). The movement of people to the reservations was a volatile and slow process. This is obvious from the post-treaty Puget Sound War from 1855-1856 that was led by Chief Leschi in resistance to treaty conditions and later,
on-reservation census data. While important for the US government to make distinctions of on and off-reservation Indigenous Americans, these categories were meaningless within the Indigenous populations themselves. According to Harmon, there were not these categories because most people with “homes on reservations still left for long periods to fish or pick berries, to visit relatives, and to work in mills, logging camps, hop fields, and the homes of white settlers” (Harmon 1998:120). It is these peoples, known today as the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Nisqually (Meshal) Indian Tribe, Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Yakama Nation, and Cowlitz Indian Tribe, that claim traditional usage of the area of MORA (A. Smith 2006[1964]:2) and form the subject group of this thesis.

Not only did the aforementioned treaties establish tribal reservations in areas not typically inhabited by human communities and remote from where the Tribes traditionally dwelt, they were also far removed from their sources of seasonal subsistence and ceremonial purposes. This factor of dislocation would seemingly discourage use within traditional subsistence areas, whether intended or not by Governor Stevens. Indigenous use of resources “at all usual accustomed grounds and stations” was legalized in the wording of the treaties (The Treaty of Medicine Creek of December 26, 1854, Article 3), but the numbers of American settlers who “displayed little patience with the natives who stood in the way” (Kluger 2011:57) became increasingly frequent.

Historian Alexandra Harmon notes that as the numbers of American settlers swelled, their confidence proportionally grew, and consequently Euroamerican settlers more often abused the respectful relationship the Indigenous peoples of the area had
extended since such immigration to the area had begun. This Euroamerican disrespect toward local Indigenous American inhabitants manifest itself in “…natives return[ing] from seasonal subsistence rounds to find charred ground or Boston homes where their own longhouses had been” (1998:105). Undoubtedly, such destructive actions committed by Euroamerican settlers and the increased distance of reservations from traditional subsistence areas discouraged some Indigenous Americans from partaking in their seasonal subsistence patterns (i.e. trips to Mount Rainier).

Notably, some historical sources imply that off-reservation (potentially traditional seasonal mountain subsistence) harvesting continued despite all these discouraging factors. It is a fact that governmental supervisors were frustrated in their efforts to administer the Puget Sound reservations. Part of the mission as a reservation supervisor was to encourage Indigenous peoples to live solely on and off the resources on reservation lands. The prototype for the management of the Washington State reservation peoples was the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851. The Fort Laramie Treaty dictated agricultural and social skill instructions were to be encouraged among reservation populations in order to expedite assimilation into American society (Kluger 2011:71). These efforts to uphold the mission were often stalled by Indigenous Americans though due to what Harmon calls “a release valve.” This valve they possessed was essentially the option to continue to use traditional off-reservation lands which were secured through 1850s government treaties. Consequently, there were additional attempts to discourage these activities through the formation of strict
regulations demanding reservation police to accompany off-reservation activities or the issuing of certificates granting permission for Indigenous Americans to travel outside reservation boundaries (Harmon 1998:117, 120, 123). Despite such laws discouraging continued traditional subsistence practices, documentation by Park employees between 1910 and 1930 speaks to the fact that use of the seasonal subsistence areas on Mount Rainier continued.

Park Establishment

MORA was established in 1899 (totaling 235,612 square acres), but activities that have occurred within the Park since 1916 to present day are governed according to regulations established by the NPS Organic Act of 1916 (16 USC 1). This act dictated that use of National Park land is limited to “conserve the scenery and the natural and

Figure 5: Photo of current SW MORA Park Entrance (personal photo)
historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for future generations”.

In addition, the duty of the Secretary of the Interior, who presides over the Park and the entirety of the NPS, is to:

make and publish . . . rules and regulations . . . [to] provide for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders . . . and their retention in their natural condition. [NPS 2001]

It is the combination of these government mandates that disallows any collection of resources within park boundaries.

Nonetheless, Park literature documenting accounts of Indigenous subsistence prove that seasonal collection of traditional Indigenous resources on Mount Rainier continued into the early 1930s (A. Smith 2006:102). Although, due to the fact that no accounts of Indigenous harvesting, by employees or otherwise, are to be found within Park archives after the 1930s, one can safely assume all conspicuous Indigenous use of Park resources ceased until the 1990s.

**Ethnographic Evidence of Precontact and Post-treaty Plant Use within the Park**

Ethnographic and Park records indicate Indigenous peoples, known today as the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, Puyallup, Yakama, and Cowlitz Indian Tribes, were dependent on plant resources associated with Mount Rainier prior to and for a long period after the treaties of the 1850s. According to Smith, the Park area was used annually towards the
end of the summer season specifically for gathering and hunting purposes by both Tribes on the west and east side of the Cascades (A. Smith 2006 [1964]: 103; Onat 1999:60). What was commonly unknown, were the tribal affiliations that made up the documented accounts of Park usage. In the pre-contact period, Hoverson states:

aboriginal Tribes “for miles around” knew well the berry areas within today’s national park. Trails led to these ground from both east and west. Each fall, parties from the different Tribes made the trip to their favorite sites, where they not only gathered and dried the berries for winter storage, but also hunting with good success. [A. Smith 2006[1964]:111; Hoverson 1936:82-86]

In the post-treaty period and within the publication *Mount Rainier Nature Notes*, F. W. Schmoe noted on various occasions the witnessing and knowledge of Indigenous peoples harvesting plants within the Park boundaries. In 1926, Schmoe documented that:

local Indians…still were coming…each season into the open parks and gather[ing] the years supply of berries. Several varieties of huckleberries…[were] abundant in the region, and these…[were dried] for the winters food supply. [A. Smith 2006[1964]: 103; 1926f:3; 1925g: 82-83]

This evidence was confirmed by Charles Landes, another contributor to the *Mount Rainier Nature Notes* publication (A. Smith 2006[1964]:103; 1925a:1) and the presence of berry resources as documented in lists of Park plants compiled by Jones (1938:10, 131 – 32) and Brockman (1947: 127 – 28).

According to Smith’s informants and prior literature, the most important and abundant food sources utilized by local Indigenous peoples were the huckleberries and blueberries (A. 2006[1964]:106). In 1916, Piper (255, 268) described the species of huckleberry (*V. macrophyllum*) as “the most valuable of all the native
huckleberries…nearly black…Plentiful at 3,000 to 4,000 feet altitude”. Similarly, Landes (1925a:1) and Hoverson observed how it was “highly prized by the Indians for its taste” (1936: 82-86). The species mentioned above, while not listed, are indicated by Smith to correspond most closely with *V. membranaceum* (A. Smith 2006[1964]:109).

Notably, Landes and Fogg documented three types of berries during collection activities in which their observations suggest they were the most desirable within the Park to Indigenous collectors. They included *V. membranaceum* (high-bush huckleberry), *V. ovalifolium* (Indian Blueberry), and *V. deliciosum* (low-bush huckleberry) (Landes 1925a:1; Schmoe 1925g:162; A. Smith 2006[1964]:110).

Exceptional examples of use accounts naming tribal affiliations include some referring to Indian Henry, ‘Satulick’, who “used to visit the region [the southwest part of MORA] in company with other Indians to hunt and pick huckleberries in order to provide for the coming winter” (Brockman 1929g:3). Len Longmire, grandson and inheritor of Mount Rainier homesteader James Longmire, also described similar circumstances in which Satulick annually “led his Tribe…[to the large ‘park’ north of Satulick Point known as Indian Henrys Hunting Ground] for their summer camping grounds; the men hunting game while the women picked huckleberries” (A. Smith 2006[1964]:105). Additionally, what Smith believes was most likely the Nisqually, there exists an account recorded in 1925 by Landes observing:

> the Indians usually camp on this [southwest] side of the mountain ether up the Kautz a few miles from the road or at Rocksecker [Ricksecker] Point, where the large wine-colored or nearly black variety, without bloom,
(Vaccinium macrophyllum) grows in great abundance in the burned over land, [Landes 1925a:1; A. Smith 2006[1964]:112]

According to Smith, these and other references in literature have identified areas of particular berry abundance located in the southern and northwestern part of the national park (A. Smith 2006[1964]:113).

While there is no written botanical data to confirm or deny any of these accounts, the late summer harvest season, the species of berries sought, and the inclination for harvest at the higher rather than lower elevations are corroborated between various forms of written documentation and informant interviews (A. Smith 2006[1964]:118). Consequently, it is highly probable that the Park witnesses of Indigenous harvesting represent accurate accounts.

While ethnographic and Park accounts indicate berrying was the primary resource harvested on Mount Rainier, there are none to indicate that it was the only resource and activity that went on there. Other plant resources found on Mount Rainier and known to be culturally utilized by the Indigenous peoples of the area of whose harvest and use were not documented, included Bear Grass (Xerophyllum tenax) used in basket making, cedar in which wood and bark were used for house, canoe, and utensil construction, and giant hellebore (Veratum vitride), Valerian blossoms (Valeriana), and Arnica (Arnica) for medicinal purposes (Onat 1999:63,68,73).
Methods of Collection, Hunting, and Social Interaction Involved

Documented descriptions of plant collection methods are primarily drawn from witness accounts of the all important, late summer, berry harvesting. According to Hoverson (1936:82-83), well into the 1930s huckleberry harvesting occurred within the highland areas of the Park. What he comments as having changed was the mode of transportation. At the time Hoverson collected his data, it was said by Park Rangers that the “transport of berries had changed by then from horses to cars” (Onat 1999:62; Hoverson 1936:82-86). Probably, this was due to the convenience and ease of automobile use, but also especially after the Longmire family constructed roads connecting the Park to more inhabited areas outside the Park boundary. It seems likely that Indigenous groups traveling to the Park would have used the newly constructed roads because, due to their intimate knowledge of the environment, they would have known the difficulties involved in transecting the thick temperate forests of the lower elevations. According to Marian Smith, in the 1940s and earlier this was one of the reasons why the Nisqually and Puyallup had used rivers as their main form of transportation and travel (1940:5).

The actual methods of berry collection on the mountain seemed to have continued relatively unchanged after contact with white settlers and the creation of the National Park. It was described by Smith’s informants in 1964, that after berries were picked they were “collected in hard, coiled, root baskets” (A. Smith 2006[1964]:120). This statement coincided with an account by Curtis (1911:5) of Yakama collection methods that
included the use of coiled baskets ornamented with Bear Grass. Additionally, ethnographic literature recorded that most of the berries collected on the mountain were dried either on mat-covered racks with fires below to generate heat or on long mounds of earth (A. Smith 2006[1964]:120-21).

Berry collecting is said to have taken place in tandem with high-country hunting expeditions. Hoverson reported that while women gathered berries, a small group of two or three men (A. Smith [1964]:121), would go hunting in the area because “animals also were attracted by the abundant berries”. While berrying was “the primary economic activity” in the area of Mount Rainier, hunting was an important secondary source of subsistence of which “the men procured a good share of their winter’s meat supply” (Hoverson 1936:82-86). The resources frequently hunted by peoples within the Park included Columbia Black-tail Deer (Odocoileus hemionus columbianus), Elk (Cervus canadensis), Mountain Goat (Oreamnos americanus americanus), Mountain Sheep (Ovis canadensis), Hoary Marmots (Marmots caligata cascaden시스), and Grouse (Bonasa umbellus, Dendragapus f. fuliginosus).

While on occasion several groups or Tribes in the pursuit of berry collecting might run into one another on the same field and form a seemingly larger group, the normal pattern of collecting behavior was to go in small groups. Smith believes details of berry collecting accounts indicate “berrying-hunting camps were small, temporary affairs” (A. Smith 2006[1964]:120). Although Marian Smith’s data indicated that whichever subsistence role the small groups were most successful at, either berrying or
hunting in this context, production might shift to accommodate the most successful subsistence event of the moment (1940:140). Most likely, this was due to the fact that Tribes like the Nisqually and Puyallup of which she was referring to did not have strictly gendered subsistence roles (M. W. Smith 1940: 139-141).

It should be noted that there is ethnographic and Park literature which suggest hunting expeditions did take place on occasion without the accompaniment of women. In 1962, Haines recorded that the Nisqually and Puyallup men that guided Dr. William Tolmie to Mount Rainier in 1883 did so apparently for the opportunity to hunt elk, deer, and mountain goat (1962:4). More recently, in 1915 Yakama Chief Sluiskin and some of his Tribesmen were discovered by Park Rangers hunting in the northeast corner of the Park. The same sort of hunting expeditions were witnessed and reported by Rangers within Park boundaries to the MORA Supervisor and Secretary of the Interior (Reaburn 1916; O’Farrell 1915).

**Ceremonial and Religious Park Use**

According to M. W. Smith’s ethnographic literature, details of ceremonial and religious quality were typically not divulged to others nor herself and only referred to in generalities (1940; 1941). Much of the information known about the common Puget Sound practice and ceremony of ‘spirit questing’ is known from myths and legends about the mountain, documented mythic references by Indigenous peoples (Haeberlin 1924), and actual occurrences recorded by non-Indians (Ballard 1929:142-144).
After the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) was passed in 1978, there was an attempt on the behalf of Blukis-Onat and Hollenbeck to compile an inventory of religious sites and resources just north of Mount Rainier in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest. In the process, there was difficulty compiling exact locations then due to the nature of the local religion which believes it is dangerous to “one’s spirit to reveal the place where one had received that power” (Onat 1999:89); which is the goal of spirit questing. Due to the intensely private character of this process in tribal entities neighboring Mount Rainier and its users, in tandem with the common occurrence of intermarriage between Puget Sound Tribes, this could very possibly be part of the reason why there is little information within Nisqually, Puyallup, Muckleshoot, Cowlitz and Yakama ethnographic literature as well.

One of the studies gathered by Hadja et al. (1995:34-55) most closely arrives at locations of spiritual significance within the southern portion of the Park. The results of the study indicate not only do the mountains provide many resources (ie. water, clean air, food), but they also provide medicinal plants that can grow there because they are not bothered by people. As is said by Hadja et al. (1995: 64-65), “these things are of symbolic as well as practical importance in times of change”.

Between 1910 and 1930 the ways in which Indigenous groups had historically used the Park dramatically changed. As is evidenced by the various government correspondences between Rangers and the Mount Rainier Superintendent, officials began to push for more strict enforcement and regulation of resource use within the Park. In the
process of increasing rule enforcement, Indigenous peoples who were caught hunting within Park boundaries had their guns confiscated and/or were forced to leave the area. Obviously, this molestation and loss of necessary technologies (ie. expensive guns) could have very well contributed to decreases in Indigenous use of traditional utilized Park resources. This situation represents only one of the contextual changes Indigenous peoples were forced to cope with after the 1850 treaties.

The evidence presented above supports the argument that for thousands of years up to the 1930s, whether for subsistence or ceremonial reasons, Mount Rainier contributed somehow to the maintenance of the local Indigenous cultural identities.

**Current Era Resource Use within the Park**

As was mentioned previously, all visible Indigenous use of Park resources seemingly ceased to exist from the 1930s on due to stricter enforcement of Park rules and regulations. While not taking place within the Park itself or having a tangible affect there, between the 1950s and 1970s there occurred the first collective Indigenous movement against a state authority (Washington) to retain the resource rights allocated in treaties. These events of the Pacific Northwest were and continue to be colloquially known today as the “Fish Wars”.
In this fight for treaty rights, the United States Congress sided with the treaty Tribes and upheld their right to sovereignty over resources allocated in their treaty negotiations of the 1850s. The events of the “wars” set a precedent in that rights allocated in treaties made between Indigenous groups and the United States superseded all state laws and regulations. Notably, while the movement addressed the sovereignty of treaty Tribes over their traditional water resources (salmon), the question of control over terrestrial resources mentioned in the treaties was not addressed. As was stated earlier, in the context of this investigation sovereignty will refer to the right of a people to govern themselves or their cultural patrimony. It is this question of treaty Tribes’ sovereignty and right to control access to, harvest, and use of traditional terrestrial resources that has yet to play out in society as did the “Fish Wars”. It is unclear yet whether there is a direct
connection between current harvesting events and a reemergence of the interpretation of sovereignty and worldview associated with the “Fish Wars”.

**Taking a stand?**

In 1992, the Nisqually Indian Tribe won a small victory for the Indigenous Americans of the Puget Sound when they officially gained legal access to harvest within the Park. That year, MORA jointly agreed to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Nisqually Tribe allowing for “tribal members collecting plants and/or plant material resources from MORA for cultural or religious reasons” (MOU 1992:1). The MOU continued until its planned end date in 2005, but collection immediately resumed and continues to this day under the auspices of scientific research permits.

Potentially reiterating the same type of relationship the Nisqually have with the mountain, other local tribes traditionally associated with the mountain are asking for the same sort of agreement the Nisqually have to harvest small amounts of traditional resources on Mount Rainier. The Puyallup and Muckleshoot have both been trying to work with the Park since the early 2000s to compose their own Memorandum of Understanding for cultural harvesting reasons. In addition to making requests for new MOUs, the Muckleshoot and Puyallup have their own on-reservation gardening programs in which they are attempting to revitalize their practices of traditional plant collection and use.
In conclusion, there exists ample archaeological, ethnographic, and Park literature to claim that the Indigenous Tribes closest to Mount Rainier and the subject of my thesis research (Nisqually, Puyallup, Muckleshoot, Yakama, and Cowlitz), have consistently used the area of the Park since precontact times and up until the recently, despite increasing discouragement by government regulation. Additionally, the literature cited in this chapter provides evidence and some clues as to when, how, and potentially why Mount Rainier played and continues today to play an important role in the maintenance of local tribal identities.

The question my research will attempt to answer is why there been renewed interest in Park resources since the early 1990s. Are tribal desires to harvest small quantities of traditional resources within MORA indicative of a resurgence of the same fight for resource sovereignty that originated largely during the “Fish Wars” of the 1950s-1970s? Have the traditional resources found within the Park been transformed into “cultural charters” symbolizing ethnic touchstones of communities in danger of cultural homogenization? These answers and the definition of a “cultural charter” will be addressed in the next chapter.

In order to further convey the importance of Mount Rainier to Puget Sound tribal members within modern day society, I provide you with this poem recited by Nisqually Tribal Elder, Cecelia Svinth Carpenter:
Ta-co-bet, Majestic Mountain,
Silhouetted against our eastern sky
Guardian over the land of the Nisqually people
Who sends the rains to renew our spirits
Who feeds the river, the home of our salmon
Who protects our eagle in her flight,
Who reaches upward through the floating clouds
To touch the hand of the Great Spirit.
Ta-co-bet, we honor you.

[Courtesy of MORA Paradise Visitors Center]
CHAPTER 3: Data Analysis and Results

Methodology and Methods

This project was initially to be pursued through an investigation of past and present Indigenous plant resource use and conceptions of sovereignty over those resources from an Indigenous perspective. The methods planned were to involve archival research, participant observation, and consultant interviews with tribal members from the Nisqually, Puyallup, Muckleshoot, Cowlitz, and Yakama Indian Tribes and Nations.

While the project plan specified steps with which to gather all the necessary information to address the questions originally posited, various factors limited my ability to perform all the steps as planned and therefore some of the questions proved inconclusive. Consequently, the hypothesis focuses on current tribal understandings of resource sovereignty over culturally relevant plants. Less discussion has been devoted to a comparative analysis of tribal conceptions of resource sovereignty since the 1974 Boldt Decision.

In order to pursue this focus from an Indigenous, emic perspective, data was collected by two methods. First, content analysis was chosen due to the ability of language, both written and verbal, to “both facilitate and reveal the development of persons and cultures” and its ability to “permit inferences regarding subjective
experiences, intentions, and internal structures that influence overt behavior” (Smith 2000:313). For similar reasons, ethnography and interviews were the additional methods chosen to gather the necessary information.

Throughout a two month fieldwork period, content analysis of the Nisqually Tribal Newsletter was conducted for the years 1994 – 2013. The Tribal Newsletter was chosen due to the presence of Indigenous voice in the articles and therefore, the likelihood of it closely if not exactly portraying tribal viewpoints concerning resources. Any articles addressing plant resources (i.e. garden and berries) or animal resources (i.e. big game, fish, shellfish), written by Indian authors or those closely affiliated with the Tribe were included in the final content analysis.

Additionally, interviews were conducted with any willing members of the Tribes historically associated with Mount Rainier resources. Consultants could potentially have been drawn from the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, Puyallup, Cowlitz, and Yakama Tribes. As it was, consultants willing to participate in the research included individuals from the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Cowlitz Tribes, with the majority coming from the Nisqually Tribe.

In order to supplement the small amount of interviews conducted with non-Nisqually tribal members, pre-1994 archival data, and opportunities for participant observation, the data collected, and the final results primarily reflect the opinions and goals of the Nisqually Indian Tribe from 1994 - Present. Although the scope of this research is limited to the Nisqually Indian Tribe, the few non-Nisqually interviews
acquired corroborated many of the Nisqually consultant attitudes. The occurrence of corroborating opinions across Tribes potentially allows for this analysis to be generalized to those other Tribes that historically utilized the resources of Mount Rainier including the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, Cowlitz, and Yakama.

Content Analysis Data

Content analysis of the Nisqually Tribal Newsletter was undertaken by first designating what constitutes a ‘worldview’.

Indigenous and Western Resource Worldview

As was stated earlier, those authors who have informed the understanding of worldview throughout the course of this research include Shelbert, Waters, Salmon, Schlanger, and Berkes. In utilizing these sources I identified values generally constituting Indigenous and Western Resource worldviews (Shelbert 2003; Waters 2003; Salmon 2000; Schlanger 1992; Berkes & Berkes 2009:8) and chose key terms that best exemplify those values and indicate what it means to possess either of those worldviews of resources.

The Process

Utilizing these definitions as the basis of what generally constitutes and differentiates between an Indigenous and Western worldview of resources, I chose 55 key
words to exemplify an Indigenous resource worldview and 26 to exemplify a Western Resource worldview (see Appendix A). The key words selected attempt to represent the definitions elaborated upon in the theoretical background. For example, some of the words chosen to represent an Indigenous worldview included familial terms (i.e. father, elder, ancestors), creator and creation, tradition and heritage, ritual and ceremony, collaborate, and relationship. Dissimilarly, words chosen to compose a Western Resource worldview included sustainable and conservation, ecological quantification (i.e. limit, take, amount, population, release), monetary quantification (i.e. catch, value, income, cost, price), and politically oriented terms (i.e. trial, hearing, court, lawsuit, action, decision).

Notably, the use or disuse of the variety of key words for each worldview was not static throughout the process of content analysis. Throughout article selection and initial analysis, there was allowance for the addition and/or subtraction of certain key terms in an attempt to cater to the language characteristics specific to the cultural context of the Nisqually Indian Tribe.

After key words were selected in an attempt to summarize the meaning associated with each worldview, the existence of these terms were searched for and tallied within each newsletter resource article. This was an attempt to determine with what kind of resource worldview the individual and/or Tribe is engaging. Then logically, if an article uses a greater number of key words from one worldview than the other, the article can
then be thought to be engaging primarily with the worldview to which those key words are associated.

**Data Collected**

Analysis of content from the Nisqually Tribal Newsletter regarding plant and animal resources between the years 1994 and 2013 produced the following data. As is demonstrated in the pie chart below, amongst the 59 articles addressing either plant or animal resources from available editions of the Nisqually Tribal Newsletter 21/59 addressed plant resources and 38/59 addressed animal resources.

![Pie chart of animal versus plant newsletter articles (Nemecek 2014)](image)

*Figure 8: Pie chart of animal versus plant newsletter articles (Nemecek 2014)*

The following pie charts indicate the proportion of articles from the two different categories that engage with either an Indigenous Resource Worldview, “being with the land” and the interconnectedness of all life, or a Western Resource worldview, “acting on the land” and analysis disassociated from social context. The data revealed that 20/21 (.96) of the plant resource articles available for analysis engaged with an Indigenous Resource Worldview and the exception was 1 article, written in 2013, that engaged with a
Western Resource worldview. One possible explanation for this exception is that due to the fact that the Nisqually Tribe is preparing to deal with plant and hunting resources in a court of law, they are trying to address the resource from a scientific point of view that functions better with mainstream resource managers and governmental entities. This dynamic will be thoroughly discussed later on.

![Pie chart of Plant Resource Articles](image)

*Figure 9: Pie chart of Plant Resource Articles (Nemecek 2014)*

Finally, content analysis data revealed that among articles addressing animal resources, 26/38 (.68) of those available engaged with a Western Resource worldview. The data further indicated that 9/38 (.24) of the same articles engaged with an Indigenous Resource Worldview and 3/38 (.08) engaged equally with both worldviews. Important to note is that before searching for key terms within the articles, the articles were read in full and analyzed for their theme as an entire article. This was done in order to decrease the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of articles based solely upon their word choices.
Themes among Consultant Interviews

During the two month fieldwork period, 10 interviews were conducted in-person with tribal members from the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, Cowlitz, and Puyallup Tribes. Additionally, 7 interviews were conducted with former and current MORA employees over the phone and in-person.

By utilizing the same method of content analysis previously described, 100% of transcribed tribal consultant interviews were identified as engaging with an Indigenous Resource Worldview. The four topics most commonly addressed in conversation were water/river/stream/pond/creek, fish, berries, and hunting/big game and the three words most commonly used were 1) familial terms, 2) teaching/education, and 3) mountain. The keys words of teaching and education were categorized as descriptive of an Indigenous Resource Worldview rather than a Western Resource Worldview. This is due to the difference between the Western sense of the concept where any desirous individual is taught about a place based upon its quantifiable facts which is in direct contrast to
Indigenous society where cultural knowledge is primarily passed on through oral transmission. Overall, there are different implications for those educational efforts undertaken. From the Western perspective teaching is a job rather for Indigenous peoples teaching is a way to continue a cultural tradition and connect with an identity. In a similar way, as one might suspect all seven interviews with former and current MORA employees engaged with a Western Resource worldview.

There were unifying threads among the interviews and those commonalities referenced to 1) collaboration, 2) importance of Mount Rainier to spiritual and physical health, and 3) resource availability and access. Relevant references to these themes made during consultation interviews will be addressed in this chapter.

Among interviews with MORA employee consultants, 1) collaboration between the Park and the local Tribes to facilitate plant harvesting is a welcomed activity. Generally, the Park staff is very aware of the importance of their task as managers of a multi-cultural, symbolic place and they try to cater to all cultural groups that use the area of the National Park. Importantly, Park employees and managers understand that the current status of plant harvesting with the Nisqually and the lack of agreements with the other Tribes traditionally associated with the mountain is not a long-term solution. Park Superintendent Allen Oberon understands:

> there needs to be an agreement between the Tribes and the park service to be able to actually monitor and ensure that what is occurring there is something that everyone feels is appropriate; that it’s not having that adverse impact that people are concerned about. So we need to know what’s going on and you need to work together, but I think we can do that.  
> [interview, August 22, 2013]
Within these discussions regarding collaboration, both the Park and tribal natural resource managers recognized the need for sound ecological research and data that must accompany long-term collaborative agreements. This is especially the case when tribal agreements are sought with stakeholders such as the NPS who actively engage with a Western Resource worldview based upon quantifiable methods. Additionally, collaboration is identifiable in a print context by engagement with a hybrid Indigenous worldview composed of Western and traditional Indigenous Resource worldviews.

Tribal consultants referenced the importance of Mount Rainier to spiritual and physical health or as a “therapeutic landscape” (Wilson 2003). The Indigenous Resource worldview mentioned above is one that needs direct physical contact with the natural world. While quantifiable evidence is the main characteristic of a Western worldview of resources, the Indigenous resource worldview focuses primarily on methods of understanding involving the relationship of personal experiences with the natural world. The term “personal autonomy” captures this relationship.

Richard Preston best addresses the connection between personal autonomy, group sovereignty, and the natural world in the concept of personal autonomy (2010:200). He defines Cree autonomy as dependent on the spirituality that results from personal life-experiences of the land which unite the larger group through universal practice. Universally practiced individual spirituality through land-based activities results in unions on the “small-scale personal community” (Preston 2010:200). These relationships between individuals and the land, between family groups, and between communities rely
on personal autonomy developed through land-based practice. In essence, understanding of the natural world is achieved by the Western Resource worldview through quantifiable evidence and conversely, through qualitative, land-based practice derived evidence by the Indigenous Resource Worldview.

Tribal consultants spoke to this concept in interviews, expressing that the establishment of MORA disallowed the continuation of tribal cultural activities that informed the Indigenous resource worldview. There is an assumption that without physical contact leading to personal qualitative experiences, there is a decrease in identity comprehension that ultimately leads to spiritual malaise over time. Consequently, in response to the inextricable nature of spiritual and physical wellbeing, composing Indigenous understandings of holistic health, the aforementioned spiritual malaise has the potential to have very real, physical repercussions (Jilek 1974).

Lastly, another common theme in tribal consultant interviews referenced the current status of resource availability and access. This topic will be thoroughly discussed in later in this chapter. Thus in order to avoid redundancy, consultant references to this topic will be postponed.

Results: Interest Levels of Non-Tribal Stakeholders to Influence Tribal Resource Discussion and Access

While the results of that analysis did not contribute to a temporal cross comparison of resource discussions within the Nisqually Indian Tribe, they did indicate
the Tribe has engaged with a specific worldview since 1994 in print context depending on
the category of resources being discussed. It appears that this is due to the interest, or for
some resources the lack thereof, by different levels of non-tribal government and outside
stakeholders. The following article content will be addressed first in terms of animal
resources (AR) and then in plant resources (PR).

**Nisqually Animal Resource Articles Engage with a Western Resource Worldview**

As was mentioned above, 68% of the animal resource articles available for the
Nisqually Tribal Newsletter between the years of 1994 and 2013 engage with a Western
Resource worldview. Leo Shelbert understands word choice as a conscious decision.
Thus one can assume the key words chosen for this research accurately portray the
current state of a general Indigenous worldview. Additionally, it can be assumed that this
evidence supports the hypothesis that differing worldview engagement regarding
different resources is intentional on the Tribes behalf.

Historically, competition and demand for fish and other marine resources
significantly increased after the turn of the 20th century. The excessive demand came to a
volatile apex in the period of the 1950s-70s, colloquially referred to by Native Americans
as the “Fish Wars”. This was partially due to overharvesting originating with the
institution of large cannery operations in the late 1800s. From then on demand for the
resource within the region and nationwide only increased and with it came uncontrollable
degradation of watershed environments. In the 1970s, the Tribes of the Puget Sound
united to pursue a court decision on the interpretation of their treaty rights regarding salmon. This led to the Boldt decision (US v WA) which ruled in favor of the Tribes, placing the treaty agreements as supreme over State law, securing 50% of the salmon run for Indian use, and helped to create a place within the state resource management structure for the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission. The Commission gave the Tribes of the Puget Sound a mandated role within the resource management structure of the State in monitoring the all important fishery resource (Ross and Pickering 2002:201). While the institution of the organization was meant to encourage a co-management approach, the struggle was and continues to lie today in the willingness of non-Indian resource managers to collaborate and integrate tribal suggestions and management strategies (Ross and Pickering 2002:202). Ultimately, it is the cooperation and communication between various scales of government and organizations that tend to lead to the failure or success of resources and their management.

It appears that the use of a Western worldview in print context when discussing animal resources is an effort at proving to non-tribal communities and resource managers that the Tribes can manage commonly utilized resources with both Indigenous and Western worldviews. This can therefore be interpreted as tribal acknowledgment of the necessity to compromise and collaborate in order to insure tribal access and the longevity of traditionally utilized resources.

This hypothesis is reaffirmed in tribal consultant interviews. Joshua Telling, resource manager for the Puyallup Indian Tribe, expressed the necessity of quantifiable
information in combination with collaborative efforts. Specifically, he believes that “…generating the opportunity really isn’t what would be sufficient, it would be generating opportunities based upon high quality information with an advanced planning view to go along with it” (interview, July 23, 2013).

It should be mentioned that there are various limitations and frustrations on the behalf of tribal members that come with attempts at collaborative efforts between the tribal nations and various other entities.

Nisqually Plant Resource Articles that Engage with an Indigenous Worldview

In direct contrast to the content analysis of the animal resource articles, the data revealed that 95% of the plant resource articles engage with an Indigenous worldview. A potential explanation for this difference in worldview engagement might lie within 1) a delay in the physical manifestation/representation of the collaborative element (collaborative Indigenous spirit) characterized by the Indigenous Resource worldview from practice to print or 2) this collaborative Indigenous spirit is intentionally emphasized in articles regarding those resources of greater stakeholder interest. Therefore, a collaborative Indigenous spirit won’t appear in plant resource articles until there is greater stakeholder interest in plant resources.

Until recently, the plant resources the Nisqually Tribe traditionally utilized were not in demand by any stakeholders other than the Tribes themselves. In fact, even the demand of these plant resources by Tribes in the Puget Sound was not very great. This
was due in part to loss of this knowledge through gradual acculturation into Western society. Similarly, the knowledge of these culturally relevant plant resources was metaphorically, put on the backburner, until the basic needs of the Tribe were met. Through the creation and success of the Nisqually Four Winds Casino, consistent income has allowed the Tribe to meet those basic needs. Despite these basic needs being met more regularly, gathering and knowledge of these plants is still limited to a few family groups and individuals within the Nisqually, a common pattern generally found within the Puget Sound.

According to tribal consultants cultural knowledge such as plant collecting continues to be limited to a few individuals. Notably though, the Nisqually Tribal Council is attempting to remedy this fact by making such knowledge more readily available through the development and support of tribal programs focused on the promotion of such cultural activities. In the past ten years, the Tribe has had the financial means to build a new Tribal Youth and Community Center and purchase land for a Cultural Center and Community Garden. Despite these successes, there are some Tribal members such as Nisqually consultant, Harrison Murray, believe these programs lack essential elements for further future success. He believes there needs to be greater internal infrastructure within the Tribe to create opportunities for interested tribal members to actually participate in these new programs. Factors which limit participation at times include transportation to sites and permanent access to places where cultural activities need to occur.
Tribal Members Emphasize Necessity of Collaboration

It is interviews with tribal consultants such as the Murrays and recent legislative measures concerning non-plant resources which justify the suggestion that the condition of and access to these culturally relevant resources are becoming increasingly limited with each passing year. According to not only Nisqually Tribal members, but Muckleshoot and Puyallup, there is recognition that in order to secure access to culturally relevant plant and also animal resources, collaborative agreements must be initiated and actively pursued. Notably, various Tribal members see the need for collaboration among the Tribes and other entities to be initiated first by the Tribes themselves.

A sense of urgency regarding the need for increased collaboration with outside governmental levels and organizations was emphasized by Indian consultants from within and without the Nisqually Tribe. For example, during a meeting between MORA cultural relations liaisons’, George Bales and Bill Dowdey, and Nisqually tribal historic preservation officers (THPOs), it was emphasized that not only do the Nisqually desire increased collaboration with the Park, but so do their neighboring Tribes.

Similarly, Roseanne Telling, a Muckleshoot Tribal Member heavily involved with the Northwest Indian College’s Food Sovereignty Project, understands the urgency of securing places to continue plant resource harvesting practices. Since the Muckleshoot do not have an official harvesting agreement with the National Park, she believes that one way to progress forward towards this goal is to develop a “…stronger relationship with the Parks department” and while they are advancing towards this goal, the Tribe is “…at
such a critical point, headway isn’t enough. We need to collaborate better” (interview, August 5, 2013).

Furthermore, Joshua Telling, Muckleshoot Tribe member, feels similarly in that he believes there is a need for “…everybody to be on the same page [governmentally and tribally] so we know where we [Indians] fit [in the resource management structure]” (interview, July 23, 2013).

Collaboration was a key word within the process of content analysis, but more importantly was a crucial element of the ideology put forth by Waters and Salmon regarding what constitutes an Indigenous worldview. Prior to colonization, without collaboration and reciprocity between humans and the natural environment, Indigenous ways of life would not have been possible. Multi-scalar collaborative efforts facilitate survival within an Indigenous worldview. It is my conclusion that collaborative efforts, identified through the utilization of the scientific method and quantification, are similarly being utilized to ensure the longevity of tribal practices linked to historically utilized resources.

Although, if one is to accept that the engagement of a Western Resource worldview within a print context as an indication of Tribal compromise to engage with a dissimilar resource worldview towards facilitating collaboration and ensuring access to culturally relevant resources then, a question remains. Why do the Nisqually engage with it in reference to animal resources and not in relation to plant resources? Interviews with Nisqually Tribal consultants indicate a desire to collaborate to secure access to
traditional plant resources, yet there is little engagement with the Western Resource worldview. Despite containing a few exceptions, there are two possible explanations.

1. If the analysis of animal resources is correct in indicating that increased interest in a resource precipitates Tribal compromise and collaborative effort in integrating the two worldviews and the Nisqually Tribal members quoted as valuing collaboration in accessing plant resources also holds true for the general Tribal populace, then it is possible that not enough time has elapsed for the collaborative mindset to have been translated to print references.

2. Due to the fact that plant gathering and hunting rights are addressed in the same clause of the Treaty of Medicine Creek and furthermore, because currently hunting rights have more stakeholders interested in the management of the practice and resource, it is possible the Tribe acts as accordingly in hopes that a collaborative spirit will have a greater impact on the cooperative relationship between the Tribe and state management structures if it is addressed in the articles of greater of interest.

**Critiques**

A critique of the first explanation is that we don’t have a set number of years or comparative example to indicate how long it takes a new worldview to integrate itself into a print context. In part this is due to the difficulty in generating a statistic or number that would apply to cultures in general. Each society is multifaceted and includes
different factors which might expedite or slow the translation of certain mindsets into
different mediums. Additionally, a comparative analysis is difficult for the Nisqually
context because their newsletter archives are very incomplete and lack many issues and
years. If the archive had been more complete, one might have been able to use another
culturally relevant resource that was of interest to various stakeholders outside the Tribe
(i.e. elk) and analyze the way in which the Tribe did or did not engage with a Western
Resource worldview.

Regarding the second, a critique of this explanation might be that the data
supporting it is entirely drawn from Tribal consultant interviews. But this explanation is
an intriguing possibility because when the right of the treaty Tribes to gather traditionally
utilized plant resources is addressed, it is done so commonly in tandem with hunting
rights. For example, Natural Resource employee Gale Kazmir stated “The State loses a
lot of their battles and we’re going to go on to the hunting one, but apart of hunting is our
gathering rights…so we need to protect them, you know like the MOU we have [with the
National Park]” (interview, August 22, 2013).

Furthermore, currently hunting seems to be an even more pressing issue to the
Tribes of the Puget Sound. As of 1999 in the State v. Buchanan, it was ruled by the
Washington State Supreme Court that the right of Tribal hunting extends to 1) the lands
formally ceded by the Tribes to the United States as those land are described in the
treaties (see Figure 11&12); and 2) other areas where it can be shown that those areas
were “actually used for hunting and occupied [by the Tribe] over an extended period of time” (Washington State (WA) Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) website).

Unbeknownst to the court, in not creating a “formal mechanism to evaluate and determine traditional [tribal] hunting areas” (WA DFW website), the judicial system set the State and the Tribes on a path full of debate and disagreement. While the original wording of the treaty attempted to denote the exact location of the land ceded in the treaty, discrepancies in the interpretation of those boundaries have made establishing a permanent boundary difficult (Bjorgen & Uebelacker N.d.).

One of the factors that made boundary assignment difficult involved determining areas actually occupied by the Nisqually and other Medicine Creek Treaty Tribes versus the areas which were utilized for reasons other than occupation (i.e. hunting and subsistence activities). This was according to the following phrase, the Tribes ceded "all their right, title, and interest in and to the lands and country occupied by them" (Treaty of Medicine Creek; Bjorgen & Uebelacker N.d.). Not only was the geographical description of the treaty boundary that followed the above clause unable to be exactly traced by modern day survey methods, but disagreements were had over the definition of what it means to “occupy” an area. After all, as was described in the Background Section, within the Medicine Creek Treaty Tribes inter-tribal marriage was a common practice thought to exist for the purpose of expanding hunting and gathering territories and securing long-distance familial ties. Thus, tribal relationships to certain territories were vague and blended as far back as the precontact era.
The year 2000 marked the first step towards establishing a temporary southern boundary to the Medicine Creek Treaty for the purpose of resource management and hunting enforcement. In 2001, an agreement between the Washington State Legislature and the Medicine Creek Treaty Tribes was officially formed to temporarily deal with hunting rights and boundary disputes. According to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, “the parties to the agreement specifically agreed that the determination was not a final determination of the southern boundary, but was an interim determination” (WA DFW website).
According to Kazmir, since the establishment of this interim southern boundary it has been increasingly difficult for tribal members to know the exact location of their designated treaty hunting and gathering land. Even though the Tribes were part of the interim boundary decision, there were some things they couldn’t have foreseen. For example, since there are different rules governing tribal and non-Indian hunting, if the Tribes cross the interim boundary without their knowledge, they risk large fines and court litigation. Kazmir mentioned that the State suggests tribal members use global positioning system (GPS) maps to know their exact locations. Whether it is intentional on the states behalf or not, Kazmir believes this is a type of limitation when tribal members are financially struggling as it is (see Figure 12). Kazmir stated:

you gotta have GPS, maps, that tell you where you can hunt…they’re making it hard…because if you go down south, there’s a line you can’t cross. So the guys [State] are asking we put together a map, and we said no, we want the landscape, we want different things to tell what we’re doing. [interview, August 22, 2013]

In response to the temporary nature of the interim boundary line and the increasingly prevalent limiting factors, the treaty Tribes of the Puget Sound have “tried for ten years to get the Tribes to all come together”, but now “…about 10 or 12 Tribes are ready to file. And we’re [the Nisqually Tribe, are] one of them” stated Kazmir. To her chagrin, despite the patience the Tribes have demonstrated in gathering the essential “background [information]” to support their treaty allocated hunting rights in the past 10 years, just months ago the Skokomish Indian Tribe “jumped the gun” (Kazmir) and filed
against the State DNR without the support of the government, of whose support helped them succeed in the past in their other court actions regarding shellfish and salmon.

**Factors Limiting Tribal Resource Collection: Factors Limiting All Forms of Tribal Resource Collection**

Collaborative efforts are being pursued to access plant resources by the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, and Puyallup Tribes. Tribal consultants indicate various pressures, developing over the past ten to twenty years, have increased the necessity of such collaborative agreements. Additionally, some of the pressures limiting tribal hunting partially intersect with limitations that factor into the continuation of traditional plant resource harvest. These factors which limit the continued access to and use of both plant and animal resources do not result from a lack of interest in doing so on the behalf of the Tribes. Rather, the pressures result primarily from a lack of land availability and collaboration between levels of land management to create access.
The available land that lies within each Tribe’s traditional hunting and gathering grounds grows smaller with every passing year. According to census figures, between 1990 and 2010 the State of Washington has gained 830,400 residents, almost doubling its population from 40 years ago, and bringing the total population to 6.7 million (Washington State Census 2000, 2010). Additionally, available statistics indicate that in 1994, Washington State sold and raffled off a total of 667,645 hunting licenses, tags, permits, and stamps (American Firearms Industry website). Take into consideration that this figure was taken ten years ago and since then, census data indicate the population has almost doubled since then. One can imagine the increase in the number of licenses sold would likely rise simultaneously as well.
With these population increases, the demand for private land plots would increase, prices of the land most desired by the Tribes for hunting and gathering would simultaneously increase, and this would create a situation where less financially strapped non-Indian land seekers would be favored over potential tribal purchasers. In addition to decreases in available private land, other pressures have been imposed on the available lands under the jurisdiction of the state and the federal government. The state has governmental jurisdiction over all the land managed by the Department of Natural Resources which includes a variety of forest, range, and agricultural landscapes. These landscapes then fall under the auspices of state parks, state forestry programs, and land reserved for watershed management, just to name a few. On various types of land managed by the state, the Tribes historically and until recently continued traditional plant harvesting practices. A larger non-native population has put pressure on available resources in these common/public use areas, whether for individual purposes or in the creation of new corporations focused on wealth attainment through utilizing certain resources.

If private land ownership is unattainable due to the lack of land available for sale, and if state managed lands are over utilized, overharvested, or of insufficient quality to produce the resources needed, there are few, if any, places for tribal peoples to go to continue these harvesting practices. The remaining available lands lie within the management areas of the federal government and include places such as the USFS and the NPS. Once again though there are numerous factors limiting the use of these places.
Not only is any use of the Parks for harvesting purposes prohibited by the establishing mandate of the NPS, the Organic Act (16 USC 1), but a strict interpretation of MORA’s General Management Plan (GMP) disallows use of the Park for tribal harvesting purposes in any quantities. Additionally, due to the ecological niche many of these plants and animals occupy, locating them in higher Park elevations is either possible or not at all.

According to tribal perceptions, in many circumstances different levels of government fail to communicate therefore the access issues the Tribes face either go unnoticed or ignored. Consequently, it is this interaction and lack of communication regarding tribal access between the various land management organizations, governmental levels, and private owners that make hunting and gathering in the traditional tribal areas increasingly difficult to continue and navigate.

Factors Limiting Tribal Plant Resource Collection

For example, Mountain Huckleberries and Bear grass have been traditionally harvested and utilized by the Nisqually and other Tribes of the Puget Sound for hundreds of years. Yet, they are becoming increasingly unavailable at what has been the Nisqually Tribes traditional harvesting grounds since the outlawing of harvest within other traditional grounds located in MORA. Tribal consultants reported that the two primary reasons for the disappearance of these traditionally utilized plant resources is due to overharvesting by individuals and unsustainable harvesting by commercial entities.
Since harvesting was made illegal in the National Park in 1919 with the Organic Act, the Nisqually Tribe moved their primary berry collection area to directly south of the NP. Much of the harvesting territory lies within Gifford Pinchot National Forest and under the same ownership as the NPS, the federal government. Even though the NPS and NFS are both lie within the jurisdiction of the federal government, their use mandates differ. The NPS is managed by the Department of the Interior with a focus on preservation with little or no use, as was mentioned in background chapter. The NFS on the other hand is managed by the Department of Agriculture in order to “…sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation’s forests and grasslands to meet the needs of the present and future generations” (US Forest Service website) and focuses on sustainable use of natural resources.

Historically, the Nisqually, as well as various Tribes who interacted with the high country of Washington State, utilized the high elevation huckleberries as a winter food.
source and for regulating health. Between ten and twenty years ago though, it also became popular to create small commercial entities with the focus of harvesting the sweet, uniquely flavored Mountain Huckleberry. Individual consumers and restaurants were and continue to be willing to pay great deals of money to possess the unique berry in large quantities. According to Jan Murray, some pickers have customers that will pay exorbitant amounts of money for Huckleberries. Specifically she mentioned a fruit stand in Packwood, WA who owner “…was selling gallons of berries for 55 dollars. 55 dollars a gallon” (interview, September 4, 2013)!

Originally, there were enough berries to provide all interested stakeholders with a fair amount while ensuring the annual return of healthy berries. With the establishment of commercial harvesting companies, inexpensive labor of migrant workers has altered the berry’s life cycle and harvesting locations. As is understood by my consultants, berry laborers are paid based upon the amount of berries gathered and consequently, they gather as many as possible. Furthermore, being foreign to the region the laborers are unfamiliar with the huckleberry’s nutrient needs and life cycle. These processes of overharvesting and unsustainable gathering occur and compound to have negative consequences for the plants the following year in that the bushes produce very few berries and/or simply do not make it through the winter. Consequently, traditional harvesting families like the Nisqually family, the Murrays, who have been harvesting berries in that area of the mountain for generations, have had to move their harvesting areas further up the mountain with each year. But even these areas are less populated and
as I found when I accompanied them to a huckleberry harvesting event, even interactions among the tribal harvesters are transforming into a boundary determined activity rather than what it was historically a solidarity building activity among harvesters. These invisible boundaries containing certain bushes in certain areas were enforced in the most outright manner by the children harvesting during the event I attended.

This year of 2013, as is the case every year, the Nisqually Huckleberry camp was located at a lower elevation in the National Forest south of Mount Rainier. After the entire camp assembled into groups which were to go to different harvesting locations around the area, I was invited to join a caravan of four cars with about four different families. Before finding what was to be the day’s harvesting spot, the lead car manned by the most knowledgeable of our group, the Murray family, stopped two times in order to see if berries were available at other spots harvested in past years. We moved on from these areas due to the fact that the bushes were either picked clean already or simply hadn’t produced berries yet this year. Our final stop and harvesting location for the day was at approximately about 3,500 feet and had an exposed hillside facing the south and southeast. The variety of berries we were to harvest included only the Mountain Huckleberry that grows at about the elevation of the foothills surrounding and adjacent to Mount Rainier.

As the cars parked on the side of the road, the fifteen kids that had accompanied the harvesting party were vibrating with anticipation. The adults then proceeded to unload berry harvesting tools including plastic buckets with a rope around the rim for
tying to one's waist and plastic gallon zip-lock bags. The kids received their tools and run to the nearest visible trail while the adults equipped themselves. In the midst of following the children who were conducting a mass exodus to the berry bushes, a quarrel immediately began when the first bushes and ripe berries were seen. Shouts expounded from behind the bushes and scrub trees of “This area's ours!” and “You have to go somewhere else!”. As I moved on to observe the adults in their element, I was confronted by one of the kids who hollered at me “You can't pick here! There is our area”. He was immediately told that I was allowed to harvest with them and that it was acceptable for me to be there. According to Harrison Murray, competition and territoriality over berry bushes was never quite so stiff when he was a kid.

The way they grow up is berries, especially the younger ones, it’s just, it seems like there’s not an abundance anymore. Now, when I was ten years old and I was on the mountain they were all over. You didn’t have these commercial pickers so it seems like you could just pick pick pick and you were done. Now it’s just like, there’s a bush here and then you go down and there’s another bush and then you go down another five bushes and there’s another big bush. [interview, September 4, 2013]

Recently a small subgroup of the Nisqually Tribe, who returns to the same area annually, alerted the Forest Service to these commercially-practiced unsustainable harvesting activities that were occurring within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Due to the difficulty of monitoring all berry harvesting locations within the large area that is the National Forest, there are many places that this unsustainable practice cannot be monitored and therefore continues to occur. Additionally, the budget cuts that have been experienced by all levels of government have created a lack of human resources to
monitor such violations. To this day, the Nisqually continue to see these violations take place and are forced to move their harvesting locations to different and higher elevations. A lack of regulation of these unsustainable activities on public lands has forced the Nisqually Tribe to explore alternative places where they can continue the harvest of this treaty allocated resource.

**Bear Grass**

Traditionally the grass varietal, bear grass (*see Figure 14a*), was valued for detailing in Salish basketry and other weaving methods. Historically and more important today, cultural activities such as basketweaving (*see Figure 14b*) provide a cultural sense of identity to Tribes that cannot necessarily be replaced simply by another activity. Today it is also commercially valued for its use in commercial flower arrangements (*see Figure 15*). The method in which the Nisqually Tribe harvests its bear grass is by taking only the middle layers of the plant, neither the new blades nor the old.
This prolongs the plants seasonal life and while initial studies indicate no new growth is promoted, tribal members believe they see more growth in the area in general with each following year (interview, September 4, 2013). The way those hired by commercial harvesting companies collect is by taking the entire plant, from the root up. When harvested in this method, the plant does not return the next year and commercial harvesters must find new sites for collection.
Beargrass typically grows in lower alpine elevations, but the areas to harvest the plant lay within the common use areas and these are obviously becoming increasingly limited due to the aforementioned commercial harvest. Potentially soon, these resources locations will run out entirely.

Importance of Continued Plant Resource Collection in Traditional Places

Within recent history there have been attempts at the revitalization of traditional plant resource collection and use within the Puget Sound. The primary reasons for this attempt at revitalization appear to be a practical consequence of increased monetary income. Prior to the creation and success of the casino industry within the organizational structure of the Puget Sound Tribes, my consultants indicate that there simply had not been enough monetary resources to focus on needs other than the very basic ones of food,
shelter, and healthcare. As seems to be the case with the Nisqually Indian Tribe, by having the financial resources to meet these basic human needs, the Tribe has recently had the ability to address those tribal aspects most in need of assistance which include cultural education and lifestyle diseases and mental health.

Since the success of the Nisqually Four Winds Casino the Tribe has had the ability to build a Youth and Community Center, a new Tribal Headquarters and a Health Center. Additionally and most recently the Tribe has bought and developed 60 acres for a Cultural Center on which they have planted a Tribal Garden that provides free garden fresh foods on a weekly basis for the Tribal elders. The buildings provide venues to support and foster development of cultural education and spiritual nourishment, the side which my consultants believe is a part of their health problems. According to tribal consultants, cultural practices and spiritual health are steps in the same process. The formulation and maintenance of this process is best explained by Muckleshoot Tribal member Joshua Telling.

Puyallup tribal resource manager, Joshua Telling, created a flow chart explaining the connection between these factors. Titled The Eco-Centric Subsistence Model (see Figure 16), it attempts to explain the way in which interaction with an ecological system is the foundation for fulfilling all needs which facilitates overall cultural survival.
Within the model these needs can include interaction with family and community to improve identity recognition and skill specialization through cultural resource activities. These processes consequently foster “self esteem, self image, self worth” (J. Telling, interview, July 23, 2013). Anne Waters similarly referenced this dynamic in saying that “one such principle of sustainability is self determination of cultural creations and continuance” (Waters 2003:190). This statement alludes to the possibility that the
reemergence or revitalization of traditional cultural activities is a move towards greater
tribal self-determination in the context of dominant Western society.

Furthermore, these needs of the community are:

driven by even deeper elements like spirituality and ancient concepts so you know people have these concepts of what they should be doing, and then express it culturally and then they use the ecological system as their foundation for fulfilling all their needs. [J. Telling, interview, July 23, 2013]

In the context of the Nisqually Tribe, structural improvements have allotted buildings and recruited tribal volunteers to focus on such skill specialization and cultural enrichment, in this case through culturally relevant plant education. Through cultural practice enrichment such as plant harvesting, the Tribe simultaneously pursues increased affiliation with tribal identity, positively impacting spiritual health, and thereby contributing to holistic tribal health of which consultants agree is where Western medicine falls short.

For those Nisqually tribal members that participate in plant harvesting activities, there is a definite connection between and related to the ancestors through cultural practices, strength of identity, and holistic health. In interviews with those affiliated with the Nisqually Tribe, these concepts are expressed. This connection is explained best by Alexander Fox.

So there is different ways of looking at the importance and values, and the value of having them, I call it ‘moded harvesting’, that spiritual foundation for the cultural identity, it helps that person that’s saying that prayer, heal, why did the creator put us here? He put us here to do something good right? He put us here to take care of our families, and our communities,
and our loved ones and our lands. So that persons are fulfilling their, remember the concept of manifest destiny? Our manifest destiny is different, it is to take care of the land, pray for the land, so that’ll make life better for the native person to say prayers on the mountain. [interview, July 26, 2013]

Fox married into the Nisqually Tribe and has been heavily involved with cultural activities of the Nisqually for fifteen years. He explained that harvesting and other cultural activities in traditional places are often used as a way to combat negative mental states within the Tribe.

As is the case with other tribal nations in the United States, lifestyle and mental health diseases are two major issues the Nisqually Tribe deals with on a day to day basis (Indian Health Service website). He personally experienced the consequences of mental and spiritual illness when one of his family was involved in what is called a suicide cluster. Immediately following the group suicide, the Tribe put four programs into action, some of which continue to this day. The programs included one in youth employment for structure, river camp, mountain camp, and canoe camp.

The goal of these programs was to take the youth and adults to traditional places in hopes that “the connectedness, the sacred dynamic of getting your plants and food” from on and near Mount Rainier would heal (A. Fox, interview, July 26, 2013). These camps and the continuation of these cultural practices are a part of what Fox calls “…the Tribes big picture of healing”. In my personal experience of the mountain camp, also called berry camp, part of the healing essence of the camp involves the eating of
wholesome, unpackaged foods, cultural craft creation, story telling, and physical activities that naturally take place with hiking to berry harvest locations.

As Fox states:

the main teachers are just the river and the mountain and the ocean, that’s the main teachers not the human teachers. Those little children learn to value and reciprocity of scheme, you have to give something to the natural world and the spiritual world, you have to earn your gifts, you don’t just do anything you want in life and expect some good outcomes. [A. Fox, interview, July 26, 2013]

Among the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot, there are various plans which use cultural practices and knowledge to improve identity and health conditions on their reservations. These goals are increasingly unattainable though due to an increasing lack of access to the ecological systems where cultural practices like plant harvesting traditionally occur.

Solutions

According to the Nisqually, Puyallup, Muckleshoot, and Cowlitz consultants I talked to, litigation is the last thing the Tribes want to do to retain their rights to cultural plant resources. The developing situation in the past ten years is troubling to the Tribes because it resembles the same struggle dealt with during the 1950s-70s and in the 1990s over salmon and shellfish resources. In these cases litigation was needed because efforts at collaboration failed.
In the treaties of the 1850s, the federal government endowed the Tribes with sovereignty over their own affairs. This decision was upheld in 1979 with the *US vs Washington* and dictated that the original treaty rights with the United States government were above the mandates of the State. As was exemplified above though, the state finds ways in which to subvert treaty allocated rights. The Tribes interpret certain management methods as more discriminative than others. One such management method, debated for the past ten years, was the establishment of a southern tribal hunting boundary for the Medicine Creek treaty Tribes in 2002. Then again, some management methods are less formal and are seen by the Nisqually as discriminatory in the State’s lack of action in protecting and sustaining tribally valued plant resources. In the process of increasing pressures on treaty rights whose extent have yet to be determined within the court system, collaborative efforts of various degrees and with various entities have been attempted by not only the Nisqually Indian Tribe, but the Muckleshoot and Puyallup as well. Next I will illuminate how growing tribal support and utilization of collaborative agreements is the tribal alternative to litigation and that it has the potential to mitigate discriminative practices and encourage understanding between dissimilar resource worldviews.

The Potential of Collaborative Agreements in Counteracting Limiting Factors

There are various definitions for the terms co-management, cooperative, or collaborative management. For this research, collaborative management will be
considered a combination of three definitions put forth by Borrini-Feyerabend et al. (2004), Carlsson & Berkes (2005), and Berkes (2009). Collaborative management can be understood as the joint management of commonly pooled resources, involving multiple actors with distinct interests (2004), and can be seen as a continuous problem solving process involving extensive deliberation, negotiation (2005), management of social relationships (2009), and joint learning.

Over time, as outside stakeholders have gained interest in traditional tribally utilized resources, the Indians of the Puget Sound have seemingly realized the necessity of collaboration in assuring the continuation of tribal access to resource locations and the availability of such culturally relevant resources. As will be explained hereafter, there is no one way a collaborative resource management structure can be developed or implemented, there are many. But in analyzing the past tribal/non-tribal struggles over certain resources, in this case salmon and shellfish, one can find a pattern in those that also appears to be playing out today regarding hunting and gathering rights.

**Historical Utilization of Collaboration: Salmon Resource Struggle**

One could argue the first overt and legal struggle for control and access to an important tribal and non-Indian resource was the events of the “Fish Wars”, resulting in the 1974 Boldt decision. In this case the collaboration was not with State and local authorities, but instead with various non-governmental organizations (NGOs), religious groups, Pan-Indian organizations, the Tribes themselves, and most essentially the United
States Federal Government. If there hadn’t been collaboration of these various groups, it is likely the violence perpetrated by the Washington State police against tribal fishermen over the precious salmon resource would not have been questioned, litigation and victory for the Tribes in the court system would not have occurred, and the Tribes today would still have no rights over their salmon resources. More importantly, without the collaborative effort of the various groups to promote awareness and fight for the Tribe’s treaty mandated rights, there wouldn’t have been a place created for Indian involvement in the management of the Puget Sound Fishery (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission website). In a sense, it was the collaboration of various entities that was able to counteract the unequal treatment and discrimination by the State concerning the management of a culturally relevant resource.

**Shellfish Resource Struggle**

Similarly, in the 1990s the next struggle for resources occurred, this time over the tribal resource of shellfish. It was the previous discussed Boldt decision that is said to have set the precedence for the legal decision in 1994, coined “Boldt II”. U.S. District Court Judge Rafeedie ruled the Tribes had the same 50% right to shellfish as they did to salmon.

Unfortunately for the Tribes there was a loophole for commercial growers. On commercial shellfish beaches, the Tribes were entitled to half of only ‘naturally’ occurring shellfish. Therefore, if improvements were made to these beaches, the
resulting increases in shellfish populations would not be considered the ‘natural’ yield and therefore would not be counted as part of the shellfish available to the Tribes.

Instead of taking further legal action to determine case by case what constitutes the ‘natural’ proportion of the improved shellfish yields, commercial growers and seventeen Puget Sound Tribes attempted to collaborate instead to improve the watershed as a whole and improve yields everywhere. In 1998, the two entities agreed that the Tribes would not need access to commercial, private harvesting areas if there were sufficient shellfish yields on their own property. Consequently, in that year 17 Tribes of the Puget Sound signed a settlement that agreed to end the Tribes’ treaty rights to harvest shellfish from commercial, private beaches and in compensation they would receive $10 million from the state’s general fund and $22 million from the Bush administration’s President’s Budget to buy, lease, or improve other tidelands for tribal harvest (NWIFC website). Therefore, the tidelands available to the Tribes after this settlement included publicly and noncommercial privately owned beaches.

Additional collaboration outside of court litigation now occurs on a daily basis. The shellfish resources of the tribal shellfish aquaculture areas are monitored and managed by the same resource management organization that do the same for salmon, the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission. Recently, 2007 marked another Treaty Rights Settlement which put into action further opportunities for collaboration between the Tribes and commercial growers. The settlement specifically focuses on a sharing of
shellfish aquaculture technology between the two entities in order to better facilitate Puget Sound and watershed restoration as a whole (NWIFC website).

Without the collaboration between the 17 different Tribes to participate in the out-of-court settlement and the cooperation of the commercial growers, the outcome of the settlement would not have been possible. Strength and consequent success came from collaboration of large numbers of individuals and Tribes. Just as it had in Boldt I, collaboration counteracted the primary limiting factors.

**Utilization of Collaboration in Hunting and Gathering Resource Struggle**

Today, the struggle over resources lie within the realms of hunting and gathering, which fall into the arena of terrestrial resources that were not interpreted in the Boldt decision nor Boldt II. Yet, unlike the previous two examples, litigation over the interpretation of the areas to which the Tribes have rights to continue hunting and gathering activities have not yet been fully realized and acted upon.

Certain collaborative efforts and agreements have been developing for the past ten years within various different levels of government and cultural structures. It is yet to be seen whether or not these efforts at collaboration have counteracted the various and ever increasing limiting factors in the continuation of traditional hunting and plant gathering practices. While there are some collaborative efforts between Tribes and non-native entities (i.e. private landowners, environmental organizations), these agreements and
other of their type need to be improved upon if the past successes concerning shellfish and salmon are to be repeated.

These types of collaborative agreements mentioned above currently concern hunting and plant resource access. In this case these can include, but are not limited to, collaborative agreements between the 1) Tribes and the NPS/Federal government, 2) Tribes and private landowners, 3) Tribes and compositions of various entities and individuals, 4) Tribes and the state, and 5) amongst the Tribes themselves. But before any of these agreements can begin, a process of education must precede a process of collaboration.

**Education Precedes Collaboration**

It is critical to understand that what creates these opportunities for agreements with those entities that hold the key to accessing land and constituent resources is a general understanding of the importance of plant and animal resources to the maintenance of tribal identities and more practically, in terms of meals and health. This understanding is promoted in a number of different ways.

It was referenced by a Nisqually tribal member involved with the Cultural Center and community education, Harrison Murray, that through the continued education of government employees of the State, the National Park, and children of the community through school systems, understanding has the potential to generate cooperation and a more opportunities for collaboration regarding the watershed and its resources (interview,
Corroborating this mindset was Nisqually tribal member Gale Kazmir, who is involved with tribal environmental resources and management. She was adamant in her belief that “…consultation is good with Mount Rainier, with all the farmers and people within this community, of working with them, of restoration. So I think the Tribe has made a big step, and I think that more Tribes are finding that this works” (interview, August 22, 2013). Open lines of communication and continual educational efforts of employees have lead to cooperative agreements such as the ones described below.

**Type I: Collaboration with MORA/Federal Government**

In response to the various limitations mentioned above on the continuation of plant harvesting in the traditional tribal areas, the Nisqually Tribe initiated a collaborative agreement in 1992 with MORA. Logically, the NPS and the Nisqually Tribe are more similar to one another in their goals than other entities interested in natural resources, such as the State and private companies, in that both have a primary goal of continuation of resource longevity and access to these resources.

As was previously discussed in the background chapter, harvesting of plants in the Park since the 1920s went largely undocumented and was assumed to have been nonexistent until 1992. It was in 1992 that MORA jointly agreed to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Nisqually Tribe. The agreement allowed for “tribal members collecting plants and/or plant material resources from MORA for cultural or
religious reasons” (MOU 1992:1), Prince’s Pine, Bear grass, and Cedar Bark to name a few. This process was initiated by a group of Nisqually elders who composed a tribal board called the Cultural Committee. According to original committee member Gale Kazmir, the committee saw the need for use of the National Park plant resources because “…if we couldn’t get it here [on reservation or outside the Park] we wanted to work with Mount Rainier for access and vision quests” (interview, August 22, 2013).

Kazmir cited primarily two reasons for the Tribe initiating the collaborative agreement request in 1992. First of all, she stated that Mount Rainier was becoming increasingly important in the continuation of plant harvesting practices due to the fact that there were “…a lot of the plants the Indians use for medicine and there’s so much destruction of habitat and the building of houses” (interview, August 22, 2013). Her statement is of course in reference to lower elevation harvesting sites that became traditional places of harvest after the same practices were outlawed within the boundaries of the National Park. Early on in the decade, the Nisqually Tribe had already realized the potential role the National Park could serve in the maintenance of their cultural practices that were becoming increasingly hard due to the disappearance of resources from increasing habitat destruction.

Secondly, the Park area allows access to a unique spiritual experience only Mount Rainier can provide. Kazmir truly believes in the power of Mount Rainier in that “the mountain has, it’s very spiritual, a connection to the Tribe, the access to it, and the things we need out of it” (interview, August 22, 2013). Traditional plant gatherer and healer,
Jan Murray, was taught and believes that “…the most powerful medicines is by Mount Rainier”. She was told by an elder that “…down here it’s good to use it too and you can walk out and gather it sometimes, but up in the mountain it’s more powerful” (interview, September 4, 2013).

The original collaborative effort, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between MORA and the Nisqually Indian Tribe, expired in 2005 yet collection continues under the auspices of a scientific research permit. It should be noted that the MOU and later, the scientific research permit, were not considered long-term solutions for the Nisqually nor the National Park. The true goal was to change the Park’s Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) so that Native American plant harvesting would be completely legal in relation to the various mandates governing the National Parks Service and MORA specifically. Additionally, the change in the CFR would allow all Tribes that traditionally utilized plant resources within MORA to have the opportunity to do so once again through collaborative agreements similar to the one in existence with the Nisqually; for which there have been many demands since the creation of the Nisqually agreement. These demands have been in the form of formally written requests by the Muckleshoot and Puyallup Tribes to Mount Rainier National Park. The Nisqually Tribe has not been alone in attempts of collaboration with the Park.

As one can see, the current limitations on Tribes collecting culturally relevant plants outside the park are the same, if not worse, than they were prior to the Nisqually-MORA MOU in 1992. Furthermore, the Tribes are loosing patience. It is true the
Nisqually can harvest in the Park, but only certain plants, certain times of the year, and only when supervised. But at least they have some type of access. The Muckleshoot and Puyallup have been requesting since the mid-1990s to form a similar agreement with MORA, but due to protests by the environmental organization, PEER (Public employees for environmental responsibility), their desires were sidelined early on while an official change in the CFR was pursued (George Bales, p.c.).

According to various interviews with MORA employees from various departments, the CFR change appears to be wholeheartedly supported by the staff and importantly, Director of the NPS, John Jarvis. The CFR change was proposed by Director Jarvis when he was appointed in 2008 by President Obama. According to a conversation cited by MORA Natural Resources employee, Randel Anderson, as of September 2013 Director Jarvis believed the official change in CFR was close to being completed. This was the status of the change until the United States government shutdown in October of 2013. The mercuriality of governmental administration and the likely lengthy bureaucratic processes are yet two additional limiting factors that make collaborative agreements between the most optimistic of players difficult to fully accomplish and implement.

Consequently, while the agreement and end goal are supported by the two main players within the collaborative agreement, thus far the agreement has not succeeded in a way to fully counteract the factors that are limiting the continuation of tribal plant collection in areas outside the National Park. Notably, other types of collaborative
agreements have been and are being pursued by the Nisqually and other Tribes in attempts to mitigate these pressures outside the National Park which are increasingly limiting tribal access to traditional hunting and plant gathering areas.

Type II: Collaboration with Private Landowners

In response to the same factors that initiated collaborative use agreements between the Nisqually and the NP, the Tribes that traditionally used the resources of Mount Rainier are pursuing collaborative agreements with private landowners in these traditional areas. Furthermore, many of these collaborative agreements have a wider watershed health focus. This wider focus is adopted with the hope that a healthier watershed will create more opportunities for the growth of high quality culturally relevant plant and animal resources in order to assist in mitigating the access issues discussed earlier.

The Puyallup Tribe for example, has been attempting to draft an access agreement between the Tribe and a private landowner. According to Joshua Telling, “this dialogue I’ve been having with the private landowner that has been so long in coming and we agree that it hasn’t really come together yet and I said how do we want to formalize this, maybe as an MOU, he felt that an access agreement was really the best thing for now” (interview, July 23, 2013). Telling believes that there needs to be some sort of system set up to negotiate these types of agreements. Notably, not only is there a need for patience and compromise, but “…in these more modern times, generating the opportunity really
isn’t what would really be sufficient, it would be generating opportunities based upon high quality information with advanced planning view to go along with it as well” (interview, July 23, 2013).

As mentioned earlier, education and outreach to private landowners and other stakeholders is an essential component in order to facilitate these sorts of collaborative agreements. The long process described by Telling is partially due to the education process and relationship the Tribe develops with private landowners to help them understand why access to these places is crucial for the Tribes.

Similar education efforts have been undertaken by the Nisqually Tribe to educate nearby residents in the community, who are majorly farmers. The Tribe organized a program called Stream Stewards which educates anyone interested in how to better maintain, restore, and protect the salmon in the Nisqually River watershed. According to Tribal member Kazmir, many of the participants include farmers from the community and it is programs like this that promote the current collaborative state. She said “…we have a whole lot of people all along this river, you know, that care about what happens to us. “Salmon safe”, you see it on the farmers down below, if there’s someway we can help you we’ll do it” (interview, August 22, 2013).

It is true that programs such as Stream Stewards are not exclusively aimed at helping to solve the Tribes lack of access to hunting and gathering resources. But programs that address a watershed as a whole do have the potential to create greater awareness of the importance of these places to tribal entities. The relationships
developed in reference to the watershed might very well facilitate other relationships
cconcerning hunting and plant gathering in the future.

**Type III: Collaboration with Composite Stakeholder Organizations**

It is not a stretch to say that these efforts at education and community outreach
have helped to foster support for the tribal stewardship of the Nisqually watershed and
restoration efforts. Large organizations have been established to collaboratively restore
the Nisqually River watershed. In 1985, the Nisqually Watershed Stewardship Plan was
created by the Nisqually River Council and Task Force as mandated by the Washington
State Department of Ecology. The Plan was created to serve as a comprehensive
management plan for the entire Nisqually River watershed with the goal of
collaboratively restoring the Nisqually watershed.

In response to the wide array of land management bodies the watershed crosses
on its way from the top of Mount Rainier to the Puget Sound, a large variety of entities
were brought in to the Nisqually River Council/Task Force to collaborate in the
facilitation and implementation of the Plan. Facilitation of the Plan is undertaken by a
composition of federal, state, and local governments including joint military base Lewis-
McChord, representatives from local businesses, the Nisqually Indian Tribe, and
community activists. If collaborative management of the Nisqually watershed has the
ability to promote awareness and understanding of tribal needs, leading to potential
Type IV: Collaboration with the State

As one may notice by now, the State and local Tribes have historically had and continue to have a turbulent relationship regarding the management of shared land and natural resources. The difficulties and potential acts of discrimination on the behalf of the state are becoming increasingly prevalent over tribal rights to hunting and plant gathering. But this is not to say that collaboration between the two does not occur. In fact, in the example above it was the state itself that mandated a collaborative approach regarding watershed restoration. But of course this is referring to a topic that has already been litigated and appealed to no avail various times before. Therefore, collaboration is the only way in which the state can have some hand in the practices the Tribes choose to implement as well as the Tribes with the State.

In terms of the current issues over hunting and gathering, there has yet to have been federal government intervention and legal proceedings. Therefore, collaboration is not necessary for the state to do their duties and remain within the rule of current laws. Yet for the Tribes, collaboration is the only non-litigative method for them to counteract factors that limit their hunting and plant gathering rights.

Currently, one commonly held desire of both the Nisqually and Muckleshoot is a hope to collaborate with the state to designate tribal berry harvesting areas within state
managed land. Their hope is that official areas, only open to tribal groups, will help to counteract limiting factors they encounter in most public berry harvesting areas and provide a reliable annual source of berries for future tribal members. Where many of these common goals are delayed is in the Tribes’ inability or lack of desire to collaborate between themselves as Indigenous Tribes and peoples.

**Type V: Collaboration among the Tribes Themselves**

Finally, the Tribes agree there must be greater collaboration amongst themselves, the sort demonstrated by the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission over marine resources, if they truly want to find solutions to the various factors limiting their hunting and plant gathering rights. As the situation is, there are as many limiting factors to facilitating inter-tribal collaboration as there are in the other examples discussed.

As was seen in the example of salmon and shellfish, the Tribes have been the most effective in collaborative and legal efforts when they are united by the common relationship to the United States government, in other words, their treaties. In reference to strength created through inter-tribal collaboration Kazmir stated “before when we were Medicine Creek Treaty Tribes we were strong and we could beat anybody, but now we are kinda fighting with each other. It’s like fighting over the last fish” (interview, August 22, 2013). Consequently, in regards to hunting and gathering inter-tribal goal unification has yet to occur.
According to my consultants, the goals and complaints over their rights and access to hunting and plant gathering areas are extremely similar, if not identical. Where difficulties tend to arise is over the discrepancy between what were once certain Tribes' traditional hunting/gathering lands, what land is now available, and which Tribes have jurisdiction over areas that were once loosely defined and enforced due to the former abundance of those resources.

Gale Kazmir described one such dispute over fishing grounds between the Nisqually Tribe and Squaxin Island Tribe that is currently causing frustration. According to her:

"before, tribal people didn’t do things like that. Like what Squaxin did to us, coming to the mouth of the river, there would’ve been a war. And there might still be one because guys were saying, should we take our guns? And I said, no, please don’t! But they don’t understand how serious it is! And especially when you fought so hard for it you know? [interview, August 22, 2013]"

Just as Western values and concepts can influence how Tribes like the Nisqually write about resources, they can also heavily influence how the Tribes interact with one another and whether or not they are united towards the same goal. The artificial boundaries of the reservation system imposed by the United States government in combination with the decreasing availability of land and resources has led to competition between the tribal groups of the Puget Sound. Roseanne Telling explained the dynamic best.

"We really need to step back and remember that colonization really put us in this mode to fight like we are in, we need to get out of that space, that is"
really a governmental standard that isn’t our own, that’s not how our people operated. And so now we are fighting for the same resources because they are being allocated differently, reservation lands and those kinds of thing. Someone like my dad for example, he works for the Puyallup Tribe even though he is a Muckleshoot tribal member, but it’s because we share a treaty, he can work on both sides of the line. Those kind of collaborations are important and it is roles like that that can break down those kinds of barriers. [interview, August 2, 2013]

Additionally, all Tribal members have different personalities and levels of willingness to compromise. Either way, no matter how one Tribe might feel about the actions or inaction of another Tribe, Kazmir believes “it’s just individual Tribes and what they believe, but you have to respect them and that’s where I draw the line. If they have to fight this way than we need to support them. You can’t turn your back on them” (interview, August 22, 2013).

The Tribes are not ignorant to these dynamics. These respectful relations appear to be out of respect for the sovereign status of each Tribe and for each treaty Tribes allocated ability to decide their fate. These respectful interactions also lead to inter-Tribal discontinuity between goals and communication concerning similar resource issues. Of course, it is these very factors that make inter-tribal collaboration very difficult and disappoint tribal natural resources managers like Joshua Telling.

There are reasons I don’t know about these tribal programs and personnel and I consider it unfortunate. It’s contrary to the kind of system I would like to see in place and I’ve actually put efforts to pull together in the past. That other kind of system where we really are aware of each other, and know about each other and supporting each other like that…We do lack that total comprehensive system where the vision and resources that would go along with it. [J. Telling July 23, 2013]
Although these factors limit the ability of the Tribes to collaborate amongst themselves, the Tribes have been attempting to collaborate their efforts. For the past ten years, the Tribes of the Puget Sound have been meeting on occasion to discuss how they should best prepare to take the state to court concerning an interpretation of their treaty hunting and gathering rights. Primarily, these meetings have discussed the background information that might be needed to justify their claim. This is positive action, but in combination with those meetings there might have been inter-tribal collaborative efforts that might have produced results and lessen the immediate pressure of the state and commercial industry. After all, as the example of salmon and shellfish has shown, collaboration has historically been the best way to handle commonly utilized and desired resources.
CHAPTER 4: Conclusion

This investigation suggests that Tribes with historical resource connections to Mount Rainier increasingly value sovereignty over their traditionally utilized plant resources. As this research documented, the Tribes of the Puget Sound historically struggled to maintain access to and control over treaty allocated resources. In the process of analyzing the two main precedent setting cases involving salmon and shellfish, there were indications that the current efforts of traditional plant harvesting among the Tribes were motivated by similar factors thereby indicating a reemergence of a similar sort of resource struggle.

In order to investigate these questions, the first question posed was done so in order to understand the motivation of the Tribes in gaining sovereignty over traditional plant resources. Are current plant harvesting efforts motivated by the same factors involved in the two previous struggles or is the current situation representative of entirely different factors and Tribal struggles? Furthermore, what role does Mount Rainier itself play in tribal plant harvesting efforts and what does resource sovereignty mean to those Tribes, especially the Nisqually Tribe, that have access to traditional places of harvest like Mount Rainier?

These questions are investigated in the current context of the Puget Sound Tribes which background research appeared to indicate is a period of Tribal revitalization of traditional
plant resource harvest and use. Therefore, in the process of fieldwork and analysis this research I was also able to determine whether the instances of tribal plant harvesting in the Puget Sound region meet the criteria for what A. F. Wallace defines as a *revitalization movement* with identifiable inter-Tribal leadership.

In order to investigate the previous questions posited, methods of content analysis, participant observation, and tribal consultant interviews were chosen to pursue this research. If within this investigation there was evidence of an inter-tribal traditional harvesting effort, united by a charismatic individual then I would have had the ability to identify the Puget Sound dynamic of harvesting as a revitalization movement. Instead of this dynamic, the best explanation for the current efforts of reinvigorating traditional plant harvesting in the Puget Sound is the development of new hybrid Indigenous worldview. Unlike a revitalization movement that is developed with primarily cultural longevity and sustainability in mind on a local scale, the development and Tribal adoption of a syncretic Indigenous-Western worldview is with the larger scope of creating a structure for and legitimization of Indigenous resource use within the governmental sphere.

**A New Type of Tribal Sovereignty: Resource Sovereignty**

Ann Waters believes Native Americans historically conceptualized the term sovereignty from the individual level up to the collective level. As an Indigenous philosopher, Waters believes that if native individuals feel they have control over their
lives and value themselves they are more self-determined. Consequently, if every individual feels they have self-determination over their own lives, the Tribe as a whole is more self-determined and therefore more sovereign. This perception is further illuminated with Telling’s Eco-Centric Subsistence Model which understands the development of self-worth as occurring on the individual level through the continuation of resource collection activities that directly interact with local ecological systems. It is the identity of an individual that is formed or rediscovered in the process of developing self-worth and becoming more sovereign.

These definitions of Waters concerning what it means to be sovereign make sense in the context of pre-contact Indigenous society where collaboration (cooperation) among all sizes of groups was necessary for physical and cultural survival. Historically though, cooperative efforts aimed at collaboration were not included within the essence of the Western enlightenment ideal of ‘sovereignty’. Resource sovereignty is representative of a hybrid worldview of natural resources that includes collaborative elements of the Indigenous Resource worldview and the Western Resource worldview and their conceptions of political independence and control (sovereignty).

The concept of *sovereignty* as it is generally understood today was formed during the Age of Enlightenment/Reason beginning in late 17th and early 18th century Europe. Interpretations of history and reality changed from factuality based upon myth, religion, and qualitative experience to those based upon reason, scientific understanding through systematic investigation and written texts, and quantitative methods. The emphasis of
this period consequently defined sovereignty as a person or groups ability to choose their own fate. Furthermore, this right was based not upon myth but upon Western society’s political systems and rules.

Even though Waters herself utilizes the Enlightenment Age definition as a basis for her understanding of Native American sovereignty, she applies it differently. She states that to be sovereign means “having political power to exercise community or individual self-determination” (Waters 2003:192). This definition is similar to the original conceptualization of the enlightenment ideal in that it places utmost importance on the power principle of control. Yet Waters believes that the power/control concept should be initiated by an individual over themselves first in order to create a sovereign group entity and ultimately, a self-sustaining society and culture.

In the context of the Enlightenment Age, sovereignty as a group was achieved first and foremost through control and power by one individual over the others within a group (i.e. a nation-state with a monarch). This is obviously in contrast to the aforementioned definition of Indigenous sovereignty that depends on only control over one’s own actions. Therefore theoretically, if one had all the political power to make decisions affecting a group as is the case in the Western sense of the word, then collaboration simply is not necessary to maintain sovereignty. Control and collaboration by these definitions are antagonistic ideas. One cannot have complete control while simultaneously collaborating. Consequently, collaboration was an ideal inherent in pre-
contact Indigenous worldviews, but was transformed after contact with a Western worldview focused on group control solely from an individual at the top.

Conversely, one might argue that collaboration tends to decrease tribal self-determination. Specifically, that in the process of cooperating with another entity tribal sovereignty decreases because the Tribe has lost complete control of their resources. The modern reality is that the competition between federal, state, commercial, and private stakeholders is far too high for all to take as much as they desire whenever they choose. Compromise and cooperation between the stakeholders must occur in order to insure longevity of access to and effective monitoring for maintenance of important resources.

But as was theorized by Appadurai (1990:560), it is through the dispersion and translation of the Enlightenment worldviews (ie. democracy, sovereignty) of colonizers that “…ever new terminological kaleidoscopes” (560) and definitions are created. In this research, the traditional Western conceptualization of ‘sovereignty’ has been translated into the current era where collaboration, originally a part of the Indigenous worldview, once again plays an essential role in tribal entities maintaining control over traditionally utilized natural resources on the basis of personal autonomy. This translation and evolution of the original concept of sovereignty now includes the element of collaboration, creating what I argue is a hybrid ideal of two worldviews and thus demands the use a new term, resource sovereignty.

With the adoption of collaborative efforts in managing resources occurring more regularly since the Boldt Decision, it is my conclusion that the Puget Sound Tribes have
actively participated in the amalgamation of two opposing worldviews. This syncretic activity has consequently brought into existence a new Indigenous Resource worldview composed of both Western and Indigenous worldviews. The creation of this hybrid Indigenous worldview is ultimately with the goal of developing the infrastructure necessary to secure a place for Indigenous plant resource management within the Western governmental sphere. The hybrid Indigenous Resource Worldview found throughout this research appears to represent a reassertion of traditional values in a new form and a reinitiating of experiential interaction that initiates positive cultural change and opposes colonization in its most basic form.

For all these reasons, I suggest discussions concerning the right of Tribes to control culturally relevant plant resources demand a new term, resource sovereignty. Other variations of the term sovereignty (i.e. food sovereignty) simply do not address resource use for reasons outside of food consumption and as this research has shown, cultural survival is just as important to Indigenous societies as physical survival. Resource sovereignty is a useful term to describe the right of Tribes to have access to all resources utilized for practical and cultural purposes in order to ensure physical as well as cultural survival. Collaboration has become an essential part in Tribes retaining and ensuring such longevity of control over their resources.

Gerald Taiaiake Alfred addressed the original definition and use of the term sovereignty in Canada and the United States. He believes the term of sovereignty as it was originally conceived in the “Enlightenment Era” of European history is an
inadequate concept and word for Indigenous populations to utilize and with which to engage. Based upon this research, Alfred appears to be correct in this belief. Of course this assumes the new term of resource sovereignty, whose essence is based in collaboration, is truly more useful to describe the current state of tribal collaborative resource management. Since 1974, a new approach toward achieving greater sovereignty over plant and animal resources has been adopted by the Nisqually and that process possesses a hybrid worldview characterized by compromise and collaboration between interested stakeholders.

Examples provided earlier indicate that different types of collaboration appear to partially mitigate the factors that limit tribal access to and longevity of plant resource collection. However it appears that collaboration goes only to a point and then according to consultants, breaks down due to a lack of cooperation and effort by the State of Washington and the Federal Government. This leaves the only long-term solution being obtaining permanent collaborative roles within resource management systems established through inter-tribal legal action. If this continues to be the case, collaboration and the potential exercising of legal action itself is becoming an essential component of what it means to be a sovereign tribal nation and additionally, what it means to collaboratively manage resources and be resource sovereign.
Mount Rainier as a Cultural Charter

In response to the failing of some collaborative agreements regarding maintenance of access to hunting and gathering areas, the Nisqually and other Puget Sound Tribes are preparing for court action. It is uncertain what the results of such court action will mean for the Tribes ability to harvest in places such as the NPS and more directly, MORA. One can only attempt to understand what the mountain and its resources currently mean to the Tribes that historically utilized its resources.

In addition to the statements the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, and Puyallup consultants made regarding the importance of the mountain during interviews, this importance is reiterated in the various formal harvesting requests that have been made on the behalf of those Tribes that historically utilized the resources within MORA. As was mentioned throughout this paper, the mountain historically symbolized a location of food necessary for winter survival, annual intra and inter-tribal family reunions, and spiritual connection.

While currently not all historically associated MORA Tribes have formal agreements with the Park to collect minimal amounts of specific plant resources, almost all have expressed the desire to do so through written requests to the Park. This desire indicates that the area of the mountain within Park boundaries continues to serve as a symbol of something even though the Tribes have not had the ability to continue all those practices which historically gave symbolic importance to the mountain.
Historically, the boundaries of resource collection in the higher elevation areas of the Park were primarily determined by family and/or tribal affiliation. Intimate knowledge of harvesting times was well known among those individuals whose survival depended on them. Consequently, this made meetings among families and inter-Tribal a fairly common occurrence during certain times of the year. These meetings were expected and anticipated as types of reunion and solidarity building events within families and across Tribes.

Since the establishment of the 1916 Organic Act the harvesting of natural resources was outlawed within the boundaries of the National Park. In the process of outlawing collection, the various memories and practices associated with the mountain were limited and the symbolic meaning of the Mount Rainier area was simultaneously altered. This is not to say that the original knowledge and symbolic meaning of the mountain have been completely extinguished and forgotten by the Tribes. On the contrary, the mountain continues to play a significant role in the spiritual lives of tribal members as was expressed in interviews across the Muckleshoot, Nisqually, Puyallup, and Cowlitz Tribes.

If one draws upon the recent and current data collected from content analysis and tribal consultant interviews, Mount Rainier and the National Park appear to symbolize a tribal desire to return to traditional practices in traditional locations. The reasons for this desire to return to culturally relevant places and practices vary by Tribe, but for the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, and Puyallup fall into categories of resource depletion, lack of
collaboration and communication between resource management levels, and maintenance or improvement of cultural, spiritual, and physical wellbeing.

These factors appear to be recognized by the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, and Puyallup as threatening to their current way of life and also the way in which the Tribes envision their future and therefore, they have redefined the symbol of Mount Rainier as what Richard Clemmer-Smith calls a cultural charter. As he defines it within the context of marginalized Indigenous communities, a cultural charter is “…any physical object, class of objects, or objectified concept that symbolized the ethnic touchstone of community” as a cultural charter (1976:3).

In addition to content analysis and interview data, the reassignment/redefining of the symbolism behind Mount Rainier is exemplified in the physical use of the symbol of Mount Rainier in some newly revitalized Nisqually Tribal practices. Restructured in 2011, the tribal garden logo and vision plan were re-imagined and included was the creation a new logo for the newly established Nisqually Community Garden (taken from Nisqually Tribal Newsletter, August 2011; Figure 17).
It seems likely that the inclusion of Mount Rainier in the center of the new Nisqually Community Garden logo was intentional. There is a reason for the use of certain symbols and as was discussed earlier, just as Appadurai theorizes that principles are translated over time with dispersion into new contexts, temporal translations similarly affect symbols as changes in context occur.

Is it too soon to call it Revitalization?

Prior to entering the field, literature appeared to reveal that there was a regionally united effort among the Tribes of the Puget Sound to revive traditional plant resource harvesting. What this research exposed is that in reality, the reviving of traditional plant resource harvesting within the Nisqually Tribe and within the Puget Sound in general is not yet to the point of revitalization as is defined by A. F. Wallace. A revitalization
movement “is defined as a deliberate, organized, conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture” and importantly includes a process where all factors “are shifted into a new Gestalt abruptly and simultaneously in intent; and frequently within a few years the new plan is put into effect by the participants in the movement” (1956:265).

Currently among the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually, there are only individuals and families focused on reintroducing traditional plant resource harvesting practices to large groups of individuals. Following the structure of Wallace’s definition, there is no discernable leadership uniting the individual harvesting efforts and furthermore, no group “mazeway” reformulation. All three of the cases of traditional harvesting are critically lacking intra-tribal support, infrastructure, and inter-tribal organization and planning.

Thus, I can conclude from this evidence that the overall efforts of traditional harvesting in the Puget Sound are not representative of a revitalization movement, but of what I believe is resource sovereignty. While both these dynamics focus on cultural longevity and survival, revitalization movements tend to remain focused on positive change within the Tribal realm of influence. On the other hand, resource sovereignty has similar but larger goal of positive change for Indigenous groups on a political and governmental scale. This is not to say that revitalization efforts of other cultural activities are not occurring within the Puget Sound Tribes. Only that the very basic activity of culturally relevant plant harvesting is one with a larger purpose.
The Tribes regard the efforts as having further positive results such as were mentioned earlier including a strengthening of cultural identity, mitigation of health ailments, and an increase in individual and tribal self-determination and sovereignty.

Research Implications

The following implications of the research results will be addressed with a multiscalar approach beginning with a discussion of potential impacts on the Medicine Creek Treaty Tribes hereby referred to as the small scale level.

Small Scale

This research illuminated the variety of collaborative efforts that were and continue to be pursued by the majority of the Medicine Creek Treaty Tribes who historically utilized the resources of Mount Rainier and the associated foothills. Furthermore, it was revealed that since the first overt resource struggle in the 1970s over salmon, collaboration appears to be the first method pursued in maintaining treaty ordained resource rights over that of litigation. Critically, due to the fact that collaborative efforts are pursued by each Tribe in their own fashion, the increase of power and control that historically has come from inter-tribal collaboration is currently lacking in the resource struggle over traditional plant resources. On the small scale, this research has the potential to reiterate the power of inter-tribal collaboration and how it can contribute in the process of securing treaty allocated resource rights.
Large Scale

It is possible that this research indicates a trend in resource management strategies and unsustainable commercial practices. Therefore, a large scale implication of this trend could reveal that in the near future the only available places Tribes will have the opportunity to continue the harvest of culturally and medicinally important plant resources will exist in the National Parks.

If in the future this proves to be the case then, according to MORA Superintendent Allen Oberon, any potential method of collaboration would need to determine exactly “what’s allowed and how it occurs” and it would need to be “…negotiated on a Park by Park basis” due to the great variety of tribal relationships with land under the management of the NPS (interview, August 14, 2013). Oberon understands the next step of collaboration as involving:

some flexibility on a local level to do what makes sense there and there needs to be an agreement between the Tribes and the Park Service to be able to actually monitor and ensure that what is occurring there is something that everyone feels is appropriate. Then again, that it isn’t having that adverse impact that people are concerned about. So we need to know what’s going on and you need to work together, but I think we can do that. I’d like to see the proposed rule [CFR change], it provides a framework for us to be able to move forward. [Allen Oberon, August 14, 2013].

Research Limitations

While the collaborative effort with Western resource management entities currently appears to be a successful way of preserving access to and longevity of traditionally utilized resources, there is a potential negative consequence. One must be
wary of the dangers that lay in the shadows of such actions such as if the original intent of collaborative programs is forgotten by the Tribe as a whole. Although that being said, I believe the Tribes are more than capable of reiterating and renewing the original reasons for collaborative agreements which focus on preservation of natural resources for cultural, practical, and symbolic means. I doubt that such a case of cultural amnesia would occur over an issue that was so fiercely fought, but the danger of amnesia is a reality as time progresses and the generational gap between program adoption increases.

Finally, it is crucial to understand that because this research is based upon emic and etic perceptions of what constitute Indigenous and Western worldviews and furthermore due to the ever changing nature of worldviews and incorporated knowledge systems, the applicability of this analysis is limited to current context and time in which this research took place.

**Coming Full Circle**

The goal of this investigation was to record and analyze why the Tribes with historical resource connections to Mount Rainier value sovereignty over their traditionally utilized plant resources. A question originally posited to investigate this hypothesis addressed whether or not the current effort to access plant resources in MORA was a reemergence of similar resource control issues addressed with salmon and later, shellfish. The original project plan was to collect enough Indigenous first-hand accounts addressing salmon and shellfish in the two past periods of resource struggle in order to
conduct a comparative content analysis with current tribal perceptions of the importance of plant resources. This was in an attempt to understand if current perceptions were inspired by past struggles over other culturally relevant resources. In response to the limited ability of researchers such as myself to interview and collect all information available, my two month fieldwork period failed to uncover any accounts of Indian voice regarding the salmon and shellfish struggles in which to compare to current Indian perceptions through content analysis. This does not mean such accounts do not exist, but only that I did not discover them over the course of this research.

An analysis of this question through consultant interviews alone revealed that the struggles themselves appear to be similar, but plant resources are different in that they represent less of a food source and an economic driver as they were in the struggles for salmon and shellfish. Although the current issue involving plant resources is complicated due to the fact that hunting, primarily utilized as a food source, is commonly addressed in tandem with plant resources. Plant resources on their own appear to represent the larger developmental process of a hybrid Indigenous Resource Worldview and resource sovereignty.

This investigation revealed that the Nisqually Indian Tribe, and possibly the Muckleshoot and Puyallup Indian Tribes, regard the importance of the plant resources in MORA as resulting from the increasingly detrimental state of the same resources outside of the Park. As unsustainable and over-consumptive harvesting practices have depleted the surrogate resource collecting locations utilized by the Tribes since the Organic Act,
the Tribes have sought greater control over culturally relevant plant resources. They have attempted to do so through the various forms of collaborative agreements mentioned previously.

Due to the addressing of plant resources and hunting within the same clause of the 1854 Medicine Creek Treaty, these resources are generally discussed and litigated simultaneously. Therefore, since collaborative resource management of hunting resources have recently been brought to court in the case *Skokomish v. Goldmark*, undoubtedly the rights of the Tribes to control and manage culturally relevant plant resources will be decided in the process as well.

Considering that litigation on the topic of treaty allocated tribal hunting and plant gathering rights have just begun, future researchers will have the opportunity to analyze the results of this research. Specifically, there will be the potential to address how the result of the current litigation changes Tribal terrestrial resource management and Tribal treaty rights within the NPS. Finally, of further personal interest would be if a future researcher could determine whether the concepts of a hybrid Indigenous worldview and resource sovereignty are truly useful in analyzing the proposed relationship between collaborative resource management and Tribal cultural longevity.
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Appendix A

Indigenous Resource Worldview (IW) key words:

1. Creator/creation
2. Gathering / get together / meeting
3. Treaty / Medicine Creek / Point Elliot
4. Protect / ed / watch over / care for
5. Elder / s
6. Serve
7. Continue / uity
8. Listen
10. Children / youth / younger / future / generation / upcoming year / years to come
11. Taught / teach / pass on / knowledge / educate
12. Learn / watch
13. Native / Indian / tribe
14. Survive / al
15. Right / s
16. Fight / struggle
17. Custom / s / accustomed / practice / cultural
18. Ritual / ceremony / celebration / festival
19. History / ic
20. Memory / story / remember
21. Site
22. Relationship / connection
23. Strength / en
24. Culture / identity / community / communal
25. Sovereignty
26. Tradition / al / heritage
27. Respect / honor / appreciate / praise
28. Natural (in quality) / nature / circle of life / nurture / love
29. World / earth
30. Home / land
31. Sacred
32. Place
33. Spirit / ual / spiritual health / offering / blessing / pray / er / song / touch / nourish
34. Being / s
35. Well-being / life / living / alive / heal / th / y
36. Way / s
37. Vision
38. Food / feast / feed
39. Wealth / plenty / tiful
40. Medicine
41. Return / welcome back / come back / gift ing / restore ation
42. Understanding
43. Food sovereignty
44. Value / s / significance
45. Mountain / tacobet / Mount Tahoma / Mount Rainier
46. Grounded / rooted
47. Empower / ment
48. Harvest
49. Grateful / thank / s
50. Purpose
51. Balance
52. Gathering
53. On-reservation / rez / Nisqually reservation
54. Subsistence
55. Cooperate / ive / collaborate / ive / coordinate / comanage / organize / work with / support / agreement / consult / negotiate

Western Resource Worldview (WW) key words:

1. Religious / religion
2. Conservation / sustain / able / land use
3. Environment / habitat / wildlife
4. Self-determination / self-governance / self-supporting / self-sufficient / regain control over / power
5. National / federal
6. State / city
7. Ecology / ical / biology / ical / nutrient / cious
8. Natural / resource
9. Worth / value / able / income / money / price / wealth / budget / financial / cost / pay / grant / funding
10. Limit / take / catch / caught / population / number / quantity / amount / count / run / inventory / data / information / release
11. Economy / commercial / business / industry / sell / sold / market
12. Trial / proceeding / process / hearing / court / attorney / lawsuit / claim / title / action / decision
13. Indigenous
14. Political / government / legislative / judicial / governor / commission / committee / project / program / legal
15. Permit / license
16. Assess
17. Goal / objective / target
18. Promote / develop
19. Quality / pollution / degradation / toxin / s / poison / impact / mitigation / monitor / condition / status / measure / research / study / survey / ing
20. Issue / s / problem
22. Improve / enhance / ment / regain / recover / y / benefit
23. Employment / training
24. Allocate / access
25. Society
26. Property