

Introduction

Prioritizing Indigenous Perspectives and Voices in Collaborative Governance

Michèle Companion and Jason D. Rivera



INTRODUCTION

Around the globe, Indigenous groups (terminology will be discussed below) have been actively engaged in negotiations and collaborations with neighboring groups and ruling powers since time immemorial, first contact, and colonization. Indigenous sovereign entities are guided by their own unique government structures and cultures, which influence interaction and engagement with other Nations, Tribes, or bands, government agencies and entities, Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), and other organizations. Positive collaborations are vital, as governance structures are intertwined with economic development, public health, education, cultural survival, social welfare, climate adaptation, disaster risk reduction and response, and natural resources access, development, protection, and distribution.

However, these negotiations have historically been structured by unequal power dynamics, language differences, presumptions of shared understandings of meanings and context, and significant contrasts in political will to enhance intercultural communication. Historical and continued abuses of power, legacies of settler colonization, discrimination, neglect, and other manifestations of structural violence have contributed to socially, culturally, politically, and economically inequitable circumstances that make collaboration between entities challenging. The World Bank (2023) estimates that

there are at least 476 million Indigenous Peoples, or roughly six percent of the global population, that are engaged in a fight to be recognized in international law and constitutionally by the colonial societies that have been imposed upon them.

Scholars (Echo-Hawk 2012; Ficklin et al. 2022; Monchalin et al. 2019; Nielsen and Jarratt-Snider 2020; Tsosie 2010) have noted that the primary functions of law at the level of the nation state have been to appropriate traditional lands and resources for the benefit of colonizing forces through the redefinition of Indigenous political sovereignty. For example, in the United States, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (301 U.S. 1 (1831)) declared that Indigenous Nations were “domestic dependent nations,” overriding the government-to-government treaty-making and negotiation status enjoyed by fully sovereign nations. This minimized relationship was that of a ward to its guardian, thereby providing the federal government with a plenary power that has been used to dispossess millions of acres of treaty-guaranteed land without Tribal Nation consent and to enact legislation that further divests Tribal Nations of their sovereignty. This structural violence and colonial domination is embedded into the principles of Federal Indian Law, which continue to define federally recognized Tribal Nations as colonized entities and, therefore, less than fully sovereign, with powers that are constrained by the overriding sovereignty of the United States and the individual rights of its citizens.

It is critical that colonization be recognized as a continuing and evolving process rather than as a discrete historical event. As Monchalin et al. (2019, 213) remind us, “colonialism is indisputably a form of structural violence that is deeply interwoven in the social, political, and economic fabric of society ... Thus, colonial violence has been built directly into the structure of societal institutions.” Racism and stereotypes are the tools through which colonization is maintained. Therefore, we can think of decolonization as “the undoing of such a narrative in reclamation of sovereignty. It dismantles these pervasive structures and the imbalanced power hierarchies that are inherent and ingrained in this Western system. It revitalizes, reclaims, and honors Indigenous knowledge and Indigenous ways” (Ficklin et al. 2022, 54).

Redhorse Bennet (2022, 7–8) emphasizes that decolonized perspectives center “our concerns and world views ... from our own perspectives and for our own purposes.” Therefore, this volume will utilize a decolonizing perspective. To do so, we will borrow from Nielsen and Jarratt-Snider (2023, 4) and employ a de facto sovereignty approach that emphasizes strength and resilience rather than focusing on the colonized “deficit model,” which

reinforces the stereotypes and colonially based myths about Indigenous Peoples, their communities, and their capabilities.

This empowerment orientation is vital for the discussions and examples of Indigenous collaborative governance which follow this introduction. Ethical and equitable governance are the core pillars of public administration as a discipline (Frederickson 1990, 2015), as Rivera notes in his chapter. However, there is very limited formal attention provided to Indigenous collaboration and governance within public administration's associated academic journals (Aufrecht 1999; Ortiz 2002). A reason for this academic neglect stems from Western ethnocentric cultural notions embedded within the discipline itself that devalue lessons gleaned from these collaborations (Aufrecht 1999). This is a problem from a functional and pragmatic perspective; this lack of understanding and investigation limits successful collaborations between and among Indigenous governance structures, broader states, and national governments (Bays and Fouberg 2002; Bruyneel 2007; Harvard Project 2008; Hicks 2007; von der Porten 2012).

Beyond disciplinary foci, our analysis of books published in the last ten years that are specifically dedicated to intergovernmental relations with a focus on Indigenous experiences found a very limited number of volumes (e.g., Alcantra and Nelles 2017; Flaherty 2019; Smith et al. 2023; Walle 2018; Webster and Bauerkemper 2022; Wilkins 2015). This indicates significant gaps in the available literature. Our volume can help to redress this silencing by presenting positive examples of Indigenous empowerment through collaborative governance. We frame collaborative governance from a more encompassing perspective, which includes changes in how external organizations are expanding their conceptions of governance and collaboration and altering their internal cultures to more effectively work with Indigenous organizations and embrace Indigenous perspectives (e.g., Baer et al., Olonilua and Aliu, and Pateman, this volume).

Addressing these silences falls in line with the current shift in the discipline of public administration and at national/federal and state governance levels. There is expanding emphasis on using critical, interpretive, inclusive, and social constructionist approaches to research as a means of informing socially equitable practices (Althaus 2020; Leach and Rivera 2021; Rivera and Leach 2022). These advances relate to more recent governance paradigms such as New Public Management (NPM) and New Public Service (NPS). Both are theorized to produce more equitable social outcomes by providing broader and more varied segments of the public with access to the development of policies. However, the success of these governance approaches in achieving socially equitable outcomes or situations varies.

NPM seeks to maximize productive and allocative efficiencies in governing that better reflect the demands of the constituent population (Nagel 1997; Osborne and Gaebler 1992). Under NPM, anyone is supposed to be able to participate in the policy development decisions. In reality, however, the most powerful and organized suppress and minimize the voice of “others” (Rivera and Nickels 2018). Moreover, when communication occurs between stakeholders, it does so along asymmetrical power dynamics and is typically unidirectional (Catlaw and Stout 2016; Fung 2006). Therefore, Rivera and Nickels (2018) argue that, although NPM is intended to enhance equity through more holistic participation of stakeholders, in practice it tends to maintain the status quo in relation to power dynamics. When pertaining to Indigenous governance, NPM continues to reinforce the deficit model that this volume explicitly rejects.

Alternatively, NPS attempts to overcome the flaws in NPM by focusing on serving the public through institutions that work for broad community interests to, theoretically, produce socially equitable results (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000; Rivera and Knox 2023). NPS is based on theories of democratic citizenship, interpretive theory, critical theory, and postmodernism as a means of enhancing government organizations in ways that are specifically tied to the needs and concerns of the public, as opposed to the implementation of authority and control models (King and Zanetti 2005). As such, NPS requires holistic inclusion in the development of policies that affect populations. This requires full, engaged, and prioritized collaboration with Indigenous entities and governance structures, reflecting a *de facto* sovereignty model.

When working from a NPS paradigm, collaboration between stakeholders helps to enhance both short- and long-term policy development, interorganizational relationships, and community relations (see Berg this volume; Olonilua and Aliu this volume). This makes the implementation of policies and programs more sustainable (Denhardt and Denhardt 2015; Rivera and Nickels 2018; Thompson and Rivera 2024). As such, this more recent governance approach provides an opportunity to reinvigorate a focus on and give voice to Indigenous experiences as a means of educating policymakers and academic practitioners and informing policies and intergovernmental relations, as demonstrated in this volume.

In addition to redressing the silencing of Indigenous experiences, this volume also represents a broad forum in which to highlight global Indigenous perspectives regarding collaborating with other Indigenous Nations/entities, non-Indigenous governments, NGOs, and/or local community-based organizations. The chapters explore constraints and opportunities, along with providing insights regarding best practice models for enhancing future

collaborations. Some case studies also demonstrate ways in which organizations external to Indigenous groups have altered (e.g., Pateman this volume) or could alter (e.g., Baer et al. this volume) their collaboration approaches to encompass Indigenous perspectives and values. Not all attempts at exercising sovereignty to foster greater collaboration and inclusiveness in the policymaking and governance processes have been successful, however. Millaleo's chapter on attempts to officialize the Mapuche language in Chile highlights the struggles when there is a lack of governance collaboration, emphasizing the importance of engaging allies to make incremental advances. Similarly, Waluyo, Fuady, and Sulaeman's chapter highlights tensions between Indigenous governance systems that are based in sacred wisdom and those that are derived from a more secular foundation.

The research presented highlights a range of methodological approaches, research designs, theoretical orientations, and perspectives from academic disciplines and practitioners that are aimed at presenting Indigenous-driven and engaged experiences as a means of enhancing current and future community interactions in the pursuit of social equity. Consequently, this volume is intended to provide readings for practitioners, policymakers, students, community leaders, and other individuals involved in the development of collaborative government relationships with Indigenous communities. Before we can position this literature in an international development and governance context, however, we must first discuss the importance of terminology.

TERMINOLOGY

For chapters focused on the United States, the term "Native American" is currently the most common racial and ethnic identifier used to refer to Indigenous Peoples or members, tribes, bands, nations, pueblos, rancherias, communities, and villages who have inhabited land on the North American continent prior to the arrival of Europeans. It replaces the historically inaccurate and confusing designation "Indian," which was common after Christopher Columbus's geographic misadventure. "Indian" appears in the earliest federal documents of both the United States and Canada, including the United States Constitution (Article I, §§ 2, 8) and the Canadian Indian Act (1876). It is therefore still a prominent term in federal policy, legal statutes, Supreme Court case decisions, and official reports in both countries. It is also used to discuss entire collections of laws and policies (e.g., Federal Indian Law, referenced above), standing as a legacy of colonization and representing continuity of structural violence. As Andersson

(2020) notes, labels are tools of colonization that reinforce and replicate inferior status. Thus, it is important to recognize that the term “Indian” has become embedded in North American pop-culture through place names, organizational names, films, books, songs, and myths, highlighting the subordination of Indigenous Peoples in the United States and Canada.

“Native American” also encompasses the previously commonly used terms “American Indian,” “Alaska Native,” and “Native Hawaiian.” This terminology still exists in legislation, legal statutes, government reports, scholarly publications, and organizational names. However, “Native American” has become increasingly problematic, as a broader white nationalist movement has coopted the term to refer to non-Indigenous, United States-born, white men who are pushing a pro-gun and anti-immigrant agenda. As the actor Charlton Heston, of Scottish ancestry, famously stated when promoting the National Rifle Association, “I’m pissed off when Indians say they’re Native Americans! *I’m* a Native American, for chrisakes!” (quoted in Hornblower 1998).

The terms “Tribal government” or “Tribal Nation” are used in relation to all federally recognized political authorities that possess a trust relationship with the United States and are therefore subject to United States Federal Indian Law (e.g., Berg this volume), as well as to those who have state-level recognition (Tsosie 2010). Many US government agencies and their personnel still heavily use the term “Tribal Nation” when referring to sovereign Indigenous communities with federal recognition (see Olonilua and Aliu this volume). Additional terminology has been imposed by colonizing governments and societies. Many of these are in common use in countries around the world. For example, “First Nation” is commonly used in Canada (see Pateman this volume) and Australia (see Smith this volume). Other commonly used terms include “Tribal,” “Aboriginal,” and “Native.”

It should be noted that none of these terms are universally accepted or preferable (Echo-Hawk 2012; Yellow Bird 1999). They all carry unequal power dynamics and controversy, as they are representative of imposed and diminished status (Andersson 2020). Colonizers reduced the incredible array of individual cultures they encountered into a single homogenized category that represented “Other.” For example, in Canada, there were over 614 First Nation organized groups at the time of the implementation of the Indian Act (1876). In the United States, there are currently 574 distinct federally recognized Tribal Nations, bands, pueblos, rancherias, communities, and villages and many more that do not have federal status (see Maddox and Tyson this volume). Aggregated “other” categories represent racism and are manifestations of structural violence, because they deliberately ignore and discount the uniqueness of global communities, languages, religious beliefs,

cultures, and heritages. It is vital to acknowledge that Indigenous Peoples inhabit wide-ranging geographic areas that help to inform their scientific perspectives, religions, agricultural practices, cultures, clothing, foods, and creation stories. Thus, wherever possible, the authors conform to the convention of using culturally distinct and community-preferred names.

“Indigenous” is a general descriptor that refers to the non-European or non-colonizer populations around the globe who have resided on their lands or can trace their ancestors to their lands since time immemorial. As Nielsen and Jarratt-Snider (2020, 7) note, this “includes people of part-Indigenous ancestry and people who live away from ancestral lands.” Drawing from Yellow Bird (1999, 2), the terms “Indigenous Peoples” or “Indigenous” are capitalized as proper nouns in this volume to “signify the cultural heterogeneity and political sovereignty of these groups.” This is also true for “Tribal.” The labels “Indian,” “American Indian,” or “Native American” are used only in the context of direct quotes or reference to historical documents or policies. They may also be present in the international laws and policies discussed in the next section.

INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INDIGENOUS GOVERNANCE

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

The United Nations has recognized the longstanding economic, social, and political marginalization of Indigenous Peoples and the need to address the pathologies associated with colonization, starting with the declaration of the Decade of Indigenous Peoples in 2004 and the resulting United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2007 (United Nations General Assembly 2007). The Declaration recognizes that Indigenous knowledges, cultures, and traditional practices make essential contributions to equitable development and the proper management of ecosystems, a vital issue in the face of current climate challenges (see Berg; Maddox and Tyson; Olonilua and Aliu this volume). Article 37(1) affirms the recognition of the validity of and enforcement of treaties. Article 37(2) declares: “[n]othing in this Declaration may be interpreted as diminishing or eliminating the rights of indigenous peoples contained in treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements.” It should be noted that the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand voted against it (Nagy 2017). Tsosie (2010) reminds us, however, that these countries are still bound by their membership in the United Nations to observe the human rights norms contained within the Declaration. She observes that UNDRIP

“serves as a statement of principle on the shared consensus of world nations that indigenous peoples have specific rights that should be honored and respected by the nation-states” (191).

UNDRIP (2007) states that “Indigenous Peoples have the right to self-determination.” This is framed throughout the document in a manner that is consistent with broader international human rights laws (Henderson 2019). Along these lines, Articles 1, 3, 4, 5, 20, and 34 reiterate the right to self-determination. Koot (2023, 316) argues that “‘self-determination’ is based on the universal human right of all people to be equal in their opportunities to control their own destinies. Most Indigenous groups interpret this characteristic as an important way to increase control over their own lives.” The framing of the language and content is consistent with the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (United States General Assembly 1966a) as well as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (United States General Assembly 1966b). UNDRIP presents self-determination as an enabling right (Echo-Hawk 2012; Henderson 2019; Nielsen and Jarratt-Snyder 2020, 2023; Tsosie 2010). As Henderson (2019, 24) notes, “It exemplifies the indivisibility of human rights in its enabling extensions to Indigenous law, governance and land as well as knowledge governance to culture, and technological and economic development.”

Along these lines, Article 13 affirms that Indigenous Peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop, and transmit to future generations their histories, languages (see Millaleo; Reid et al. this volume), and oral traditions, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places, and persons (see Pateman this volume). This encompasses the right to survival (see Companion this volume) and to incorporate sacred wisdom into governance structures (Waluyo et al. this volume). It embraces respecting and privileging Indigenous knowledge systems and Traditional Ecological Knowledge (see Chakrabarty and Kaur 2021; Companion and Rivera this volume; Derbile, Atanga, and Abdulai 2022; Eimer 2020; Maddox and Tyson this volume) and data sovereignty, which focuses on the right to control the collection, application, and ownership of their own data (see Companion and Rivera this volume; Smith this volume). As The First Nations Information Governance Centre (2019, 58) points out, “Data sovereignty is a crucial step toward realizing full self-government of First Nations.” Their work and that of the United States Indigenous Data Sovereignty Network tie data sovereignty to the broader human rights frameworks established in the International Covenants from 1966.

Article 14 of the Declaration addresses educational rights, including the right of Indigenous Peoples to establish and control their educational systems and institutions, provide education in their languages, and to do so in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning (see Baer et al.; Millaleo; Pateman; Reid et al. this volume). This is vital for stemming the loss of and ensuring the cultural continuity of traditional languages. This is related to broader issues of sovereignty and cultural survival and is intimately linked to being treated with dignity and respect by external entities and populations. Thus, preservation and elevation of language is an important step in the process of decolonization.

Additionally, Article 29 states that Indigenous Peoples have the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources (see Maddox and Tyson this volume; Webster this volume). Article 31 further establishes that Indigenous Peoples have the right to maintain, control, and protect their cultures and knowledge systems. In conjunction with one another, these Articles speak to the essence of data sovereignty (see Companion and Rivera this volume; Smith this volume), the right to utilize Indigenous knowledge systems (see Companion and Rivera this volume), and the right to effectively govern their communities for the protection, maintenance, and continuance of their peoples and lands (see Berg; Companion; Maddox and Tyson; Rivera; Webster this volume). These are core elements of sovereignty. Tsosie (2010, 210) reminds us that the process of exercising that sovereignty “requires contemporary Native governments to exercise their autonomy to choose effective policies to govern themselves in the exercise of self-determination.”

United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Collaborative governance is a critical component of the overarching United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs 2015). This agenda is comprised of seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UNDESA 2015) that provide guidance for addressing inequalities, reducing poverty, and addressing climate change. These goals impact Indigenous Peoples and require their full inclusion and input for successful implementation and meaningful and long-lasting outcomes. Renwick et al. (2020) note that the SDGs demonstrate an international commitment to Indigenous empowerment because they build on the UNDRIP (2007).

All SDGs (see table 0.1) are relevant for collaborative Indigenous governance and are incorporated in the content of this volume, directly and indirectly. Without sovereignty, self-determination, and collaborative governance, there can be no poverty alleviation (SDG 1). Food security (SDG 2), good health and well-being (SDG 3), and responsible production and consumption (SDG 12) are interrelated and tied to Traditional Indigenous

Table 0.1. United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
(UNDESA 2015)

Sustainable Development Goals
Goal 1: End Poverty in All Its Forms Everywhere
Goal 2: End Hunger, Achieve Food Security and Improve Nutrition and Promote Sustainable Agriculture
Goal 3: Ensure Healthy Lives and Promote Well-Being for All at All Ages
Goal 4: Ensure Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education and Promote Lifelong Learning Opportunities for All
Goal 5: Achieve Gender Equality and Empower All Women and Girls
Goal 6: Enhance Availability and Sustainable Management of Water and Sanitation for All
Goal 7: Ensure Access to Affordable, Reliable, Sustainable and Modern Energy for All
Goal 8: Promote Sustained, Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth, Full and Productive Employment and Decent Work for All
Goal 9: Build Resilient Infrastructure, Promote Inclusive and Sustainable Industrialization, and Foster Innovation
Goal 10: Reduce Inequality within and among Countries
Goal 11: Make Cities and Human Settlements Inclusive, Safe, Resilient and Sustainable
Goal 12: Ensure Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns
Goal 13: Take Urgent Action to Combat Climate Change and Its Impacts
Goal 14: Conserve and Sustainably Use the Oceans, Seas, and Marine Resources for Sustainable Development
Goal 15: Protect, Restore, and Promote Sustainable Use of Terrestrial Ecosystems, Sustainably Manage Forests, Combat Desertification, and Halt and Reverse Land Degradation and Halt Biodiversity Loss
Goal 16: Promote Peaceful and Inclusive Societies for Sustainable Development, Provide Access to Justice for All and Build Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Institutions at All Levels
Goal 17: Strengthen the Means of Implementation and Revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development

The electronic open access publication of ‘Indigenous Experiences with Collaborative Governance: Moving Toward Equitable Partnerships’, edited by Michèle Companion and Jason D. Rivera has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license as a part of the Berghahn Open Migration and Development Studies initiative. [https:// doi.org/10.3167/9781836951698](https://doi.org/10.3167/9781836951698). Not for resale.

Knowledge (see Companion and Rivera) and sacred wisdom (see Waluyo et al.). Quality education (SDG 4) is the focus of Baer et al.'s chapter on access to student internships at the higher educational level. The connection between access to quality education and culturally appropriate teaching methods and language is addressed in Millaleo's, Pateman's, and Reid et al.'s chapters. Gender equality (SDG 5) and reduced inequalities (SDG 10) are addressed in Companion's chapter on Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. SDGs that focus on sustainable cities and communities (SDG 11), climate adaptation (SDG 13), and life on land (SDG 15) are the bailiwick of the United States Federal Emergency Managements Agency. Olonilua and Aliu present discussions of collaborations between the agency and several Northwest Native American nations. Both Webster's and Berg's chapters address conflict resolution mechanisms necessary to engage in collaborative governance to address economic development and land management issues that intertwine with SDGs 6 (clean water and sanitation), 7 (affordable and clean energy), 8 (access to work and economic growth), and 11 (sustainable cities and communities). Smith's work on data sovereignty specifically relates to SDG 9 (industry, innovation, and infrastructure). Finally, Maddox and Tyson's chapter integrates concepts relevant to climate action (SDG 13), as well as life below water (SDG 14).

Every chapter in this volume addresses SDG 10, which references reducing inequalities within and between countries, SDG 16 (promoting peaceful and inclusive societies), and SDG 17 (strengthen means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development) either directly or indirectly. Collaborative governance, the focus of Rivera's chapter, is required to achieve these sustainable development goals. The SDGs cannot be achieved at a national or international level if Indigenous Peoples are marginalized and excluded from active and equal contributions to policy planning and implementation. Case studies in this volume also present examples or best practice models that can be replicated and scaled up from the local to the regional, state, national, and international levels.

It should be noted, however, that the SDGs are not without criticism. Folorunso (2021, 1712) emphasizes the narrow framing of paths of sustainability that fail to understand and address deeper dimensions of poverty from a cultural perspective, which includes ethical, moral, social, and spiritual poverty. Nagy (2017, 318) is concerned about merely superficial compliance with the instrument rather than a deeper commitment and adherence to the substance of the rules and norms and "spirit of the treaty." She expresses concern that the United States and Canada typically only deal with weaker forms of compliance pressure, such as naming and shaming, which impact international reputations. Consequently, chapters in this

volume address issues of power equity in policy collaboration and inclusion of Indigenous perspectives and methodologies at all levels of governance and public administration.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS VOLUME

Scholars (Alcantra and Nelles 2017; Echo-Hawk 2012; Flaherty 2019; Henderson 2019; Nielsen and Jarratt-Snider 2020; Tsosie 2010; Webster and Bauerkemper 2022; Wilkins 2015) have noted that the impact of international law has been to “redefine the social and cultural structures of Native people by regulating their rights to education, health, economic independence, and institutional development” (Tsosie 2010, 199). Historically, these laws and policies have embraced the spirit and implemented the intentions of colonial domination, resulting in the dispossession of traditional lands. Collaborative governance seeks to redress the negative impacts through empowerment of Indigenous communities. As noted above, the framework of this volume promotes a positive sovereignty model rather than a traditional and colonialist deficit one.

To highlight elements of sovereignty and realms of collaboration, the volume is broken down into three sections. The first section provides an overview of macrostructural and overarching issues that impact social equity and Indigenous empowerment. Rivera’s chapter focuses on opportunities and challenges for Indigenous communities from an international and public administration disciplinary perspective. He presents a review of recent literature, which identifies important theoretical perspectives. He also identifies gaps in broader academic literature. The absence of Indigenous voices and perspectives in these spaces indicates that much more work needs to be done to create an inclusive academic and policy environment that results in great social equity (SDG 10).

Companion and Rivera’s chapter follows with a discussion of best practice models for developing research partnerships with global Indigenous communities for policy development and academic work. Any programming under the auspices of any of the SDGs cannot be properly collaborative unless Indigenous knowledge systems are elevated and respected. They present an overview of Traditional Ecological Knowledge-based Participatory Action Research (PAR) along with case studies that demonstrate successfully implemented best practice models. The chapter is followed by Smith’s work on incorporating Indigenous principles into digital self-governance. Smith provides an overview of data sovereignty challenges, followed by a successful model in Australia.

The second section focuses on the need for expanding sovereignty to address national/federal-level issues that affect collaborative governance. The individual chapters within this section present a variety of topical issues that highlight facets of sovereignty. All the chapters present case studies that demonstrate some aspects of successful collaborative governance models. However, they also demonstrate that there are missed opportunities to advance social equity through greater expansion of sovereignty. For example, Waluyo et al.'s examination of Tribal governance in one specific community in Indonesia frames the challenges and opportunities for incorporating sacred wisdom and customs into public administration models. They discuss positive outcomes as well as pitfalls and pushback from higher-order government agencies, providing broader insights into the impact of traditional belief structures on collaborations with secular governments.

Companion provides an overview of colonial cultural and institutional legacies that generated laws restricting the exercise of sovereignty and the protection of Indigenous Relatives on Indigenous lands in the United States and Canada. She places the crisis of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls firmly in the failure of settler colonizer courts and policies. However, she ends the chapter with case studies of beneficial collaborations between Tribal governments, federal and state agencies, and other organizations that can serve as models to address this crisis.

Millaleo's chapter follows, focusing on the ability to maintain Indigenous language in the face of colonizer imposition of their own language as dominant. Millaleo describes attempts to officialize the language of the Mapuche people in Chile through language reclamation movements. These have had some successes at the municipal level. However, there has been broader resistance to these movements at the national level. This chapter demonstrates the struggles to achieve SDGs when there is a lack of collaborative governance and broader government support for attaining these goals.

Olonilua and Aliu focus their work on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in the United States. Their chapter examines factors that have contributed to successful collaborative governance initiatives between FEMA and several Tribal Nations in the Northwest around hazard mitigation. They argue that the lessons learned in these cases can be applied to interactions between Indigenous groups and government agencies to achieve better outcomes for all parties and enhance community safety.

Finally, Baer et al. examine institutions of higher education in the United States as a means of advancing social equity. Specifically, they focus on Indigenous undergraduate internship programs as a mechanism of empowerment for Indigenous students. They argue that Indigenous values must be incorporated into internship program designs to expand their availability

to and utility for Indigenous students. This will help to decolonize higher education and prioritize Indigenous perspectives. They present a case study of a successful model that could be adopted across educational institutions, which emphasizes inclusiveness of Indigenous stakeholders, trust building, and the pursuance of collaborative relationships to achieve better experiences for students involved in these internships.

The last major section of the book focuses on more state-, provincial-, municipal-, and local-level case studies. Webster introduces readers to the tumultuous relationship between the Oneida Reservation and the Village of Hobart in the United States. The Village has used litigation to try to regulate the Oneida Nation, repudiate its sovereignty, and relegate its government to the position of a common landowner, subject to municipal authority. Despite this, Oneida Nation enjoys positive intergovernmental relationships with other local governments. Webster's chapter depicts the problems that occur when collaborative governance is lacking. The chapter outlines lessons learned through Oneida Nation's exercise of sovereign status and use of the courts, but also offers guidelines for working toward positive relationships and greater collaborative governance opportunities.

Reid et al. use a case study model to examine allyship construction with the Kaingáng People of Sub-Amazonian Brazil, for whom this is a key part of a wider anticolonialist strategy. The Kaingáng are actively working to build a wide network of allies and advocates who can support them in their fight for land, autonomy, and dignity. This chapter assesses the ways in which the Kaingáng shape relationships with their allies, building them into constructive partners who work with, not on top of, the community.

Pateman's chapter also embraces the idea of community allies in the form of local librarians. His work focuses on decolonizing the Thunder Bay Public Library in Canada through collaborations with local Indigenous communities and organizations. The result was the creation of Indigenous Knowledge Centres and the hiring of Indigenous staff. These programming efforts were design to responded to Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action and to reduce racism in the community. The program helped to improve cultural competence at the institutional level. Pateman's case study presents a model that is amenable to replication and being scaled up. At the same time, the chapter provides a discussion of resistance to change that must be considered.

The final two topical chapters in the volume focus on interactions between Indigenous communities, county, and state-level entities. Berg uses Culturally Responsive Evaluation to conduct surveys and interviews with Tribal and local government leaders in the state of Minnesota, United States. He examines which factors are essential in promoting intergovernmental

cooperation and achieving agreements, observing that those Tribal, municipal, and county leaders that invested in trust building, mutual respect, and developing interpersonal ties (social capital) were more successful in achieving agreement. Moreover, meaningful communication, intergovernmental working groups, and understanding the cultures, history, and laws of the other were also important elements to promoting cooperation and achieving intergovernmental agreement.

Maddox and Tyson examine the impacts of climate change and entrenched issues of environmental justice characterizing the Long Island Sound watershed in the state of Connecticut, United States. They argue that the development of sustainable, just, collaborative approaches for hazard mitigation and climate adaptation require that state, municipal, and community institutions develop protocols to engage with historically marginalized communities, including the Pequot Tribal Nations, from a position of decolonization. They present community-based workshops co-created by Pequot Tribal Nation and historically marginalized communities that are designed to build communication and collaboration between all levels of stakeholders to facilitate positive outcomes that respect and enhance Indigenous sovereignty and improve socially equitable outcomes in the community. Finally, we conclude this volume with a discussion of the broader implications of these collected works for Indigenous-driven collaborative governance and extensions of sovereignty.

Through the exploration of global cases, this volume highlights ways in which Indigenous Peoples and their communities engage in collaborative intergovernmental relationships with other Indigenous and/or non-Indigenous governments. Several chapters take a broader look at how governmental agencies have been impacted and have changed their policy development and implementation because of such collaborative efforts. Other chapters examine struggles to achieve collaborative relationships. Collectively, the chapters demonstrate that, although there have been a host of examples that illustrate negative experiences, barriers, and limitations, this is not a monolithic experience. Through the exercise of sovereignty and respect for self-determination, rooted in international declarations, and changes that come from Truth and Reconciliation processes, collaborative relationships have manifested in ways that have benefited not only Indigenous communities, but the broader societies in which they are situated.

Michèle Companion Ph.D. is a Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. Michèle is a disaster specialist, working as a humanitarian aid response coordinator specializing in food

and livelihood security. She has served as a consultant for US and international humanitarian aid organizations, engaging in all phases of disaster risk reduction, preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery. She works with Indigenous populations around the globe on issues of food security, food sovereignty, cultural survival, livelihood preservation, and access to traditional foods and medicines, especially in the face of climate change. She conducts training on blending Traditional Ecological Knowledge and site mapping techniques to empower communities. She is the President of the International Research Committee on Disasters, secretary and board member of the Lowlander Center, and Chair of the International Coordinating Committee for the Natural Hazard Mitigation Association. In addition to numerous publications, she is the co-editor of *Responses to Disasters and Climate Change: Understanding Vulnerability and Fostering Resilience* (2017, CRC Press), editor of *Disaster's Impact on Livelihood and Cultural Survival: Losses, Opportunities, and Mitigation* (2015, CRC Press), and co-editor of *Street Food: Culture, Economy, Health, and Governance* (2014, Earthscan). These volumes purposefully highlight the work of and with Indigenous communities.

Jason D. Rivera Ph.D. is Chair and Professor of Public Management at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Jason's research focuses on the intersection of public administration, emergency management, and social equity, in particular the experiences of historically marginalized communities and the public sector and nonprofit organizations that are intended to serve them. Jason has engaged in funded and unfunded research across the United States, The Gambia, and El Salvador. He has completed national assessments of emergency management systems, focusing on interorganizational and intergovernmental coordination and collaboration in The Gambia and El Salvador. In recognition of the quality of his research, Jason has won The Stanford M. Lyman Distinguished Book Award (2008), the State University of New York (SUNY) Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Scholarship and Creativity (2020), and The William Petak Award (2017, 2019, and 2024). He is also the current Chair of the Section on Emergency and Crisis Management (SECM) in the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) and a member of the Diversity and Social Equity Committee at the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs and Administration (NASPAA).

REFERENCES

Alcantara, C. and J. Nelles. 2017. *A Quiet Evolution: The Emergence of Indigenous-Local Intergovernmental Partnerships in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

The electronic open access publication of 'Indigenous Experiences with Collaborative Governance: Moving Toward Equitable Partnerships', edited by Michèle Companion and Jason D. Rivera has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license as a part of the Berghahn Open Migration and Development Studies initiative. <https://doi.org/10.3167/9781836951698>. Not for resale.

- Althaus, C. 2020. "Different Paradigms of Evidence and Knowledge: Recognizing, Honouring, and Celebrating Indigenous Ways of Knowing and Being." *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 79(2): 187–201.
- Andersson, D. 2020. "Indigenous Place-Names in (Post)colonial Contexts: The Case of Ubmeje in Northern Sweden." *Scandinavian Studies* 92(1): 104–126.
- Aufrecht, S. E. 1999. "Native American Governance in American Public Administration Literature." *American Review of Public Administration* 29(4): 370–390.
- Bays, B. A. and E. H. Foubert. 2002. *The Tribes and the States: Geographies of Intergovernmental Interaction*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bruyneel, K. 2007. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.–Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Catlaw, T. J. and M. Stout. 2016. "Governing Small-Town America Today: The Promise and Dilemma of Dense Networks." *Public Administration Review* 76(2): 225–229.
- Chakrabarty, S. P. and E. Kaur. 2021. "A Primer to Traditional Knowledge Protection in India: The Road Ahead." *Liverpool Law Review* 42: 401–427.
- Denhardt, J. V. and R. B. Denhardt. 2015. "New Public Service." *Public Administration Review* 75(5): 664–672.
- . 2000. "The New Public Service: Serving Rather Than Steering." *Public Administration Review* 60(6): 549–559.
- Derbile, E. K., R. A. Atanga, and I. A. Abdulai. 2022. "Re-visiting Sustainable Development: Sustainability and Wellbeing from the Perspectives of Indigenous People in Rural Ghana." *Local Environment* 27(3): 327–341.
- Echo-Hawk, W. R. 2012. *In the Courts of the Conqueror: The 10 Worst Indian Law Cases Ever Decided*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Eimer, T. R. 2020. "What if the Subaltern Speaks? Traditional Knowledge Policies in Brazil and India." *Third World Quarterly* 41(1): 96–112.
- Ficklin, E., M. Tehee, R. M. Killgore, D. Isaacs, S. Mack, and T. Ellington. 2022. "Fighting for our Sisters: Community Advocacy and Action for Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls." *Journal of Social Issues* 78(2): 53–78.
- Flaherty, A. 2019. *States, American Indian Nations, and Intergovernmental Politics: Sovereignty, Conflict and the Uncertainty of Taxes*. New York: Routledge.
- Folorunso, C. A. 2021. "Globalization, Cultural Heritage Management and the Sustainable Development Goals in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Nigeria." *Heritage* 4(3): 1703–1715.
- Frederickson, H. G. 2015. *Social Equity and Public Administration: Origins, Developments, and Applications*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- . 1990. "Public Administration and Social Equity." *Public Administration Review* 50(2): 228–237.
- Fung, A. 2006. "Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance." *Public Administration Review* 66(Special Issue): 66–75.
- Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. 2008. *The State of Native Nations: Conditions under U.S. Policies of Self-Determination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Henderson, J. S. Y. 2019. "UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Treaty Federalism in Canada." *Review of Constitutional Studies* 24(1): 17–41.

- Hicks, S. I. 2007. "Intergovernmental Relationships: Expressions of Tribal Sovereignty." In *Rebuilding Native Nations: Strategies for Governance and Development*, edited by M. Jorgensen, 246–271. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Hornblower, M. 1998. "Have Gun Will Travel: But Can Heston's Celebrity and Rhetoric Revive the N.R.A.?" Retrieved 3 May 2024 from <https://edition.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/1998/06/29/time/gun.heston.html>.
- King, C. S. and L. Zanetti. 2005. *Transformational Public Service: Portraits of Theory in Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Koot, S. 2023. "Articulations of Inferiority: From Pre-colonial to Post-colonial Paternalism in Tourism and Development among the Indigenous Bushmen of Southern Africa." *History and Anthropology* 34(2): 303–322.
- Leach, K. and J. D. Rivera. 2021. "Dismantling Power Asymmetries in Disaster and Emergency Management Research: Another Argument for the Application of Critical Theory." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 13(4): 337–355.
- Monchalin, L., O. Marques, C. Reasons, and P. Arora. 2019. "Homicide and Indigenous Peoples in North America: A Structural Analysis." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 46: 212–218.
- Nagel, J. H. 1997. "Radically Reinventing Government: Editor's Introduction." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 16(3): 349–356.
- Nagy, R. 2017. "Can Reconciliation Be Compelled? Transnational Advocacy and the Indigenous–Canada Relationship." *Peace & Change* 42(3): 313–341.
- Nielsen, M. O. and K. Jarratt-Snyder. 2023. *Indigenous Justice and Gender*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- . 2020. *Traditional, National, and International Law and Indigenous Communities*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Ortiz, J. 2002. "Tribal Governance and Public Administration." *Administration & Society* 34(5): 459–481.
- Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Redhorse Bennett, C. 2022. *Our Fight Has Just Begun: Hate Crimes and Justice in Native America*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Renwick, N., D. R. Reid, J. A. Santos, and L. Piovezana. 2020. "Indigenous People and the Sustainable Development Goals in Brazil: A Study of the Kaingang People." *Journal of Developing Societies* 36(4): 390–414.
- Rivera, J. D. and C. C. Knox. 2023. "Bureaucratic Discretion, Social Equity, and the Administrative Legitimacy Dilemma: Complications of the New Public Service." *Public Administration Review* 83(1): 65–77.
- Rivera, J. D. and K. A. Leach. 2022. "The Time Has Come: Broadly Integrating Critical Race Theory as an Analytic Lens in Public and Nonprofit Management." *Public Integrity* 25(3): 257–261.
- Rivera, J. D. and A. E. Nickels. 2018. "Introduction: Democratizing Community Development Policy and Administration." In *Community Development and Public Administration Theory: Promoting Democratic Principles to Improve Communities*, edited by A. E. Nickels and J. D. Rivera, 1–24. New York: Routledge.

- Smith, D., A. Wighton, S. Cornell, and A. Delaney. 2023. *Developing Governance and Governing Development: International Case Studies of Indigenous Futures*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- The First Nations Information Governance Centre. 2019. "First Nations Data Sovereignty in Canada." *Statistical Journal of the IAOS* 35(1): 47–69.
- Thompson, D. P. and J. D. Rivera. 2024. "A Sustainable Post-conflict Stabilization Framework: Applying Lessons from Afghanistan." *International Journal of Public Administration* 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2024.2341424>.
- Tsosie, R. 2010. "Indigenous Women and International Human Rights Law: The Challenges of Colonialism, Cultural Survival, and Self-determination." *UCLA Journal of International Law and Foreign Affairs* 15(1): 187–238.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2015. "Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development." Retrieved 23 March 2023 from <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>.
- . n.d. "Sustainable Development: The 17 Goals." Retrieved 13 March 2023 from <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2007. "United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." Retrieved 26 October 2023 from www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf.
- . 1966a. "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights." Retrieved 2 September 2023 from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>.
- . 1966b. "International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights." Retrieved 2 September 2023 from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-economic-social-and-cultural-rights>.
- von der Porten, S. 2012. "Canadian Indigenous Governance Literature: A Review." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 8(1): 1–14.
- Walle, A. 2018. *Indigenous and Ethnic Empowerment: Parity, Equity and Strategy*. New York: Routledge.
- Webster, R. M. and J. Bauerkemper. 2022. *Tribal Administration Handbook*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Wilkins, A. 2015. *Fostering State–Tribal Collaboration: An Indian Law Primer*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- World Bank Group. 2023. "Indigenous Peoples." Retrieved 5 May 2024 from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/indigenouspeoples>.
- Yellow Bird, M. 1999. "What We Want to Be Called: Indigenous Peoples' Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Identity Labels." *American Indian Quarterly* 23(2): 1–21.