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Abstract
With capitalism’s introduction, Karuk people have experienced radical declines in the productivity of Klamath River salmon fisheries, dire impoverishment, and a new order of threats in the form of hunger and diet related diseases. We use interview, survey, medical and archival data to describe how capitalism has been an unsustainable system in the case of the Karuk because it is organized around market extraction and destroys cultural knowledge and behaviors that served to keep fish harvests sustainable. Using world-systems theory, we propose a fifth frontier exists, that of health. Despite the impacts of 150 years of direct genocide, Karuk people continue to survive and are revitalizing culture and community, which supports the idea that capitalist incorporation is not fully complete but partial. Karuk resistance and revitalization is epitomized in the campaign to remove four dams on the Klamath River and thereby 'Bring the Salmon Home' to the upper basin.
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Introduction
A steady influx of media images highlighting conflict and instability throughout the world, on the one hand, heighten the fears of what tomorrow brings and, on the other hand, arouse hopes for significant social change on a global scale. Present-day events, from the emergence of left leaning political leaders across Latin America to the collapse of World Trade Organization meetings in 2006, suggest we may be encountering an historical rupture from global capitalism – and moving instead to non-market structuring of social relations. Even the
economy’s overseers acknowledge the rising difficulty in sustaining public confidence in the system. Ben Bernanke, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, recently warned, ‘If we do not place some limits on the downside risks to individuals affected by economic change, the public at large might become less willing to accept the dynamism that is so essential to economic progress’ (Ydstie, 2007). At the heart of such events are questions about the long term ecological sustainability of capitalism, and its relationship to culture, values, political participation and human well-being.

Given such events, Immanuel Wallerstein contends the world system has passed through programs of ‘developmentalism’ and ‘globalization’, but is in the midst of restructuring that can either head toward a path with a more exploitive set of power relations, or a path that would undermine the capitalist world system (Wallerstein, 2005). These divergent paths reflect in one instance ‘the spirit of Davos … split between those whose vision of the future involves an unrelenting harshness of strategy and institution-building and those who insist that such a vision would create an untenable system’ (2005: 1275). In another instance the alternative path reflects ‘the relatively democratic and egalitarian’ spirit of Porto Alegre, organized most clearly in the alliances of the World Social Forum (WSF) (2005: 1275).

Progressive theorists and activists alike are seeking new insights and ways to exist more harmoniously to avert environmental and social crises. Indigenous communities in particular have challenged corporations and global capitalist structures in their efforts to maintain subsistence and cultural practices in the face of environmental degradation (see e.g. Gedicks, 1993; LaDuke, 1999, 2005). Examples include the case of the Amungme and Kamoro peoples against the US mining corporation Freeport McMoRan Copper & Gold in the Timika area of Papua, Indonesia (Abrash, 2001); Dayak resistance to deforestation in the Malaysian state of Sarawak (Keck and Sikkink, 1998); the Supreme Court brief filed by Alaska native groups in the 2006 case against the US Environmental Protection Agency for failure to regulate climate emissions; as well as the recent teach-in (November 2006) in New York City, ‘Indigenous Peoples’ Resistance to Economic Globalization: A Celebration of Victories, Rights and Cultures’ organized by the International Forum on Globalization (IFG) and the Tebtebba Foundation (Democracy Now, 2006). These actions only scratch the surface of worldwide movements centered on reviving sustainable practices. Perhaps its unsustainability explains the surge to seek (or from the indigenous perspective, sustain) alternatives to capitalism from the vantage point of this system’s invisible members (cf. Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies, 1999; Gibson-Graham, 2006; Hall and Fenelon, 2004; LaDuke, 1999, 2005; Shiva, 1989; Wallerstein, 2005; Waring, 1999).

The Collision of Capitalism and the Karuk World

Since time immemorial the Karuk people of northern California have managed and depended directly on the Klamath bioregion’s land and rivers for their food, livelihoods, and overall health and well-being. Karuk cultural and religious traditions are inseparable from economic relations of subsistence with nature. They have sustainably managed their Klamath River fishery through the use of ceremony and harvest techniques in coordination with neighboring tribes for tens of thousands of years. Until the mid-1800s the Karuk and
neighboring Yurok and Hoopa tribes are considered to have been the wealthiest of all Indian people in California, a fact that was directly attributed to the Klamath River’s year round abundance of salmon.

The complex social organization of the tribe contrasts sharply with the fundamental processes of the world-system of capitalism. With the introduction of capitalism, Karuk people have experienced radical declines in the productivity of Klamath River salmon fisheries, dire impoverishment, and a new order of threats in the form of hunger and diet related diseases. Today Karuk tribal members are among the poorest Californians: median income for Karuk families is $13,000 and 90% of tribal members in the county live below the poverty line. With the loss of traditional foods, the rates of diet related diseases in the Karuk population have skyrocketed.

We use interview, survey, medical and archival data to describe the collision between Karuk culture and capitalism during the periods of pre-contact, incorporation and resistance. We describe how capitalism has been an unsustainable system in the case of the Karuk because it is both organized around market extraction, and destroys the very forms of cultural knowledge and behaviors that served to keep fish harvests sustainable. We use the framework of world-systems theory, in particular the concepts of incorporation and frontiers (or boundaries). Following current developments in world-systems research on incorporation (cf. Bush, 2005), our examination of Karuk success in challenging capitalist incorporation indicates this process has been partial. We illustrate the unsustainable nature of capitalism for Karuk people using examples from the collision along economic, cultural, and political frontiers. We add to the schema of frontiers (summarized in Hall and Fenelon, 2004) a fifth frontier of health.

Despite the impacts of 150 years of direct genocide on life, land and cultural identity, Karuk tribal members continue not only to survive, but are revitalizing culture and community through recovering traditional cultural management. Such resistance and revitalization is epitomized in the campaign to remove four dams on the Klamath River and thereby ‘Bring the Salmon Home’ to the upper basin. The tribe’s efforts to restore salmon to the Klamath River and thereby thrive independent of the capitalist world-system offer a rich source of knowledge in endeavors to build alternative, environmentally sustainable social systems. Among the important lessons is the importance of culturally embedded relationships between values, moral codes and the economic structure. Our examination thus also points to the broader significance of indigenous resistance to capitalism, which highlights the partial nature of incorporation. Furthermore, resistance from the peripheries in the North highlights how capitalism is a product of human invention rather than an outcome of a ‘natural’ process. We discuss how this example of Karuk resistance and resilience can empower observers to actively shape the direction and content of an alternative world-system.

Theorizing Karuk Resistance to Capitalist Incorporation

We use the concept of incorporation developed in world-systems theory (Wallerstein, 1974) to describe the process whereby non-capitalist systems are absorbed by the European capitalist world-system (Chase-Dunn and Hall, 1993; Dunaway, 1996a, 1996b; Hall, 1986,
Examples of non-capitalist systems may be indigenous or peasant systems that have existed for several generations outside capitalist arrangements (Dunaway, 1996b). Incorporation begins with the intrusion of representatives from the capitalist world-system and unfolds as the once external system is brought into the capitalist system through colonization.

Alvin So (1984) found that in its original conception incorporation was too narrowly associated with only economic transformation, and broadened his analysis to include political incorporation. This was part of a general movement in world-systems research to account for incorporation’s temporal and spatial unevenness observed over time between such units as nation-states (So and Chiu, 2000) and regions (Çizakça, 1985; So, 1984). A large number of analyses have treated incorporation as a thing of the past (cf. Çizakça, 1985; Dunaway, 1996a; Kasaba, 1987; Phillips, 1987), as though global society has ‘come [to] a point where the “last” zone external to the world-economy has been incorporated’ (Hopkins and Wallerstein, 1987: 775). Hall (1986: 391) was critical of the fact that research had focused predominantly on the process of incorporation on state societies, and paid little attention to its effects on non-state societies. Shifting focus to local factors, Hall built upon Arrighi’s (1979) distinction between ‘nominal’ and ‘effective’ incorporation, bringing into clearer focus a wider variety of social changes, pertinent variables and processes (Chase-Dunn and Hall, 1993; Hall, 1986: 392). This framework thus accounts for varying degrees of incorporation, the strength of states, local conditions, and the ‘location within, on, or beyond the frontier of state control’ (Hall, 1986: 398). The work of Caleb Bush (2005) builds upon Hall’s efforts to reconceptualize incorporation, but Bush argues that even Hall’s more nuanced work tends to see incorporation as gaining strength and eventually reaching an end by completely absorbing once external arenas. Critical of approaches that consider incorporation as a process already begun and completed in a distant past, Bush argues, ‘The fact that many indigenous peoples worldwide still hold land in common and refuse to view land as an exploitable resource may provide the best indication of the partial nature of incorporation, or “how the world-system expands”.’ (2005: 104)

If it is possible for incorporation to be partial, then the efforts of people to both resist (cf. Dunaway, 1996a, 1996b) and be innovative (Meyer, 1994) can find equal importance in explaining the dynamic nature of two systems colliding within, on, or beyond the frontier. It can, likewise, shift research away from the tendency to portray incorporated societies as static and as powerless, naive victims (Bush, 2005; Carlson, 2001, 2002; Meyer, 1994). We find that this movement in world-systems theory to consider incorporation as partial is useful in understanding Karuk challenges to capitalist incorporation, and reveals the potency of their actions.

We use a reformulated concept of partial incorporation to capture three aspects of Karuk experience that highlight the unsustainable nature of capitalist processes. The time proceeding from the 1850s to the present can be characterized as the ongoing period of capitalist world-system attempts at incorporating the Karuk. For indigenous systems in North America, colonization enabled capitalist elites to – in more and less successful ways – dominate and standardize indigenous populations culturally, politically, and economically so as to
unify territories under a single authority (cf. Clark, 2002: 415–16; Deloria, 1969; Dunaway, 1996a, 1996b; Meyer, 1994). Thus, efforts to colonize, to seize resources and to dominate economic, political, and cultural spheres are all part of the long-term historical process of capitalist incorporation, the ultimate outcome tending toward commodifying everything (especially land and resources available as its possession) (Dunaway, 1996a, 1996b; Hall and Fenelon, 2004).

The concept of partial incorporation offers both a broad vantage point for understanding the process and consequences of global capitalist expansion, and a useful means for recognizing resistance against, and some reversal of, this expansion. Incorporation is understood as a collision of systems (Dunaway, 1996b), a process in which natives and colonizers can interact co-operatively, but most often interact with underlying tension.

Since incorporation is depicted as a collision between two systems, it necessarily implies there are points at which these systems meet concretely. The concept of frontiers refers to these constantly shifting sites at which the collision of systems takes place. In the process of interaction 'boundaries are formed and transformed' and the people of incorporated areas 'resist and react against [incorporation’s] effects to the degree possible' (Hall, 2000: 240–41). Hall and Fenelon (2004) argue that the specific and diverse contexts of indigenous systems must be reflected when observing the process of incorporation. The varied situations of indigenous groups require multidimensional analysis that gives consideration to four frontiers (or boundaries) of the capitalist world-system: economic, political, military, and cultural (Carlson, 2001; Chase-Dunn and Hall, 1997; Hall and Fenelon, 2004). It is along these frontiers that friction is most intense, and the exploitive nature of the capitalist world-system is most transparent (Dunaway, 1996a, 1996b, 2000; Hall, 2000). For example, Wilma Dunaway (1996b) describes how in the economic frontier Cherokees became increasingly dependent on European trade goods as their economy restructured from a system of subsistence (predicated on limited growth) to an export-oriented market economy specializing in hunting slaves, deerskin and marketable herbs. According to her (1996b: 460):

As commercial hunting expanded, the Cherokees became less sufficient in agriculture … Only twenty-five years after external trade had begun, elders taught a new generation of young Cherokees to utilize imported tools, making them unable to live independently of the Europeans. Commercial hunting, population declines, and frequent warfare lowered production in those indigenous activities that were essential to the autonomous survival of the villages.

Recognizing this growing dependency, the British tried to suppress local efforts of resistance by controlling the supply of goods. However, British control was not absolute since terms of trade also misaligned with traditional customs, which considered non-economic contributions of individuals involved in the exchange (1996b: 466). Consequently, even in conditions of import dependence, terms of trade were contested.

As we will illustrate, in the case of the Karuk, their ability to carry out cultural practices from ceremonies to customs surrounding management of traditional foods is compromised by exhaustion of resources under non-Indian market driven management.
Wallerstein writes: ‘[B]oth the ability to guarantee the endless accumulation of capital, and the political structures that have kept the dangerous classes in line are collapsing simultaneously ... It is only when the existing system is weakened in terms of its own logic that the push from below can possibly be effective’ (Wallerstein, 2005: 1269). The effects of capitalist practices such as the process of dispossessing indigenous people from land and resources through colonization (cf. Clark, 2002; Kuletz, 1998) highlight the unsustainable logic and practices of the system.

The tensions at these economic, cultural, political, and health boundaries reveal the exploitive nature of the capitalist world-system, since Karuk people have witnessed in a relatively short amount of time the near total collapse of one of the most productive salmon fisheries in North America, the impoverishment of tribal people, and a new order of threats to Karuk lives in the form of hunger and new diet related diseases. We use the concepts of partial capitalist incorporation and its frontiers, including health, in structuring this essay. In the first segment of our essay we present data on Karuk cultural and economic practices as they existed for some 10,000 years prior to contact with capitalism. Through highly evolved systems of cultural rights and religious ceremonies, Karuk people coordinated their harvest of fisheries to ensure the stability and longevity of their stocks. The second segment of this essay discusses some of the negative consequences of capitalist incorporation for Karuk people over the past 150 years. We illustrate how the state's control of land and resources diminishes Karuk political and economic rights and results in criminalizing Karuk cultural and economic practices. Being denied access to traditional foods and customary resource management practices has contributed to dramatic increases in obesity, type II diabetes and mental health problems within the tribe. This leads us to suggest a fifth frontier – health – in examining capitalist incorporation. In spite of such dire conditions, segment three shows the Karuk are progressively revitalizing their culture and resisting global capitalism. We document this resistance in the form of actions to regain traditional cultural management and access to traditional foods. These efforts are epitomized in efforts to remove four dams on the Klamath River and ‘Bring the Salmon Home’ to the upper river basin. We conclude that Karuk revitalization and resistance, while not always articulated as a direct challenge to the ‘capitalist world-system’ per se, offers insight into the unsustainable nature of capitalism and the extent of indigenous resistance to the prevailing system.

Data and Methods

This research was conducted on site in the Karuk ancestral territory from 2004 to 2006 in studies commissioned in connection with the re-licensing of five dams on the Klamath River (Norgaard, 2005). The original research aim was to assess impacts of the dams and declining salmon populations on the Karuk Tribe's health, culture and economy. Data collected for these purposes are combined with data on resistance efforts and re-analyzed here in the context of theory on global capitalism. The information presented is compiled from five main sources: archival material, Karuk medical records, in-depth interviews
with Karuk tribal members, the 2005 Karuk Health and Fish Consumption Survey and participant observation.

This data set was first compiled to evaluate suspected links between denied access to traditional foods, changes in tribal diets and the emergence of diet related diseases. Archival material from anthropology and other sources on culture, diet and fish consumption levels was reviewed. Data on income, employment, unemployment and poverty rates were obtained from the US Census (US Bureau of the Census, 2001), the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Karuk Tribal Census.

To evaluate the prevalence of diet related diseases, medical data on current rates of diabetes, heart conditions, high blood pressure, and obesity were obtained from the Happy Camp Tribal Office. Limitations of official medical records include inaccuracies in the data system and the fact that historical data in particular are not considered valid. Furthermore, an unknown number of tribal members are undiagnosed, use private insurance, or do not use the medical system. To augment medical data, and for comparison with fish consumption data, ‘self-reported’ prevalence of health conditions including diabetes, heart disease, high blood pressure and overweight/obesity were gathered in the Karuk Health and Fish Consumption Survey in the spring of 2005, of which more is discussed below.

In-depth interviews were used to gather detailed information from tribal members regarding health, diet, food access and consumption, and economic conditions. Information was also gathered on family history and health conditions over time. In-depth interviews were conducted with 18 individuals who served as ‘key informants’. Interviewees were selected to represent women and men, a range of ages (30 to mid-70s), and to represent diverse relations within the community (members of Tribal Council and Staff, as well as people who had no relationship to the tribal organization). Karuk people were traditionally organized by family, that is, families were associated with regions of the river, and had particular rights and responsibilities within the community (e.g. fishing, conducting specific ceremonies). As this organization persists today, interviewees were drawn from multiple families throughout ancestral territory to capture variation in these forms of experience and knowledge.

While interviews provided the opportunity for in-depth information, a survey was conducted to provide a wider view of community experience. The 2005 Karuk Health and Fish Consumption Survey contained 61 questions designed to evaluate the range of economic, health and cultural impacts for tribal members resulting from the decline in quality of the Klamath River system. Open and closed ended questions on the consumption and harvesting of traditional foods were developed in response to interview data. Personal and family history information on medical conditions was included, as well as information on age of death of family members. Disease rates from medical and self-report survey data generally correspond, suggesting accuracy in findings. The survey was distributed to adult tribal members within the ancestral territory. There are many challenges particular to conducting a survey in rural, impoverished native communities. Not only is there some measure of mistrust of academic researchers, some questions on hunting and fishing were viewed as sensitive information since traditional rights to these practices are not recognized by the state. Furthermore, individuals were difficult to track
down, either because they were homeless, or had multiple temporary residences with family or friends. A number of individuals were unavailable because they were seasonally out of the area or in jail. The survey had a response rate of 38%, a total of 90 questionnaires. This is a relatively high response rate for such a community, still we are unable to know the views of those who did not respond. Given the above assessment and community demographics, we speculate that many of those who did not respond were more traditional, and had less income than those who did respond. On the whole, the survey allowed for the collection of valuable quantitative data regarding economic patterns, health conditions and fish consumption that has been long absent in the broader discussion of tribal impacts of riverine health (Norgaard, 2005).

Data also came from direct observation of the community during the course of fieldwork (e.g. informal conversation). Furthermore, during 2004 and 2005 one of the authors traveled with tribal members to various speaking engagements and political events in the USA and Scotland, presenting research findings as part of the tribal campaign to highlight health impacts of the dams. Data on the ‘Bring the Salmon Home’ campaign come from these participant observation activities, including interviews.

The desire to regain traditional management and remove the dams is widespread in Karuk country. Tribal Council members and Department of Natural Resource staff are key players in the campaigns for cultural revitalization and dam removal. While not every Karuk individual engages in this campaign against the dams, it is a deeply felt, widely supported movement for the community. For example, at the local Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hearing in January 2005, the room was filled with Karuks who devoted the day to speak against the dams. None spoke in favor. In other cases, dozens of tribal members took days off work and drove all night with their families to rallies and public hearings regionally. In nearly two years of fieldwork in the ancestral territory, the author on site only met one Karuk person who questioned the need to remove the dams.

Karuk Traditional Cultural Management before European Contact

The first spirit people from the center of the world netted the salmon. At Katamin was a spirit man. He made the salmon. He put them in a pool. When they got bigger he put them in the river to go downriver to the ocean. When they returned they were caught by a dipnet. They taught us how to fish. That’s why we do it this way. The first spirit people gave us the river and the salmon to survive. That’s why we Karuk are called the river people. (Vera Davis, Karuk elder5)

The Karuk Tribe resides along the Klamath River in northern California. Along with the Yurok and Hoopa, the Karuk are one of the three largest tribes in the state. Until recently, the Klamath River was the third largest salmon-producing river in the West; only the Columbia and the Sacramento Rivers produced more salmon (McEvoy, 1986). Until the mid-1800s the Yurok, Karuk, and Hoopa tribes are considered to have been the wealthiest of all Indian people in California, a fact that was directly attributed to the Klamath River’s
year round abundance of food resources, particularly the salmon (McEvoy, 1986). Because multiple runs occurred throughout the year, there was a reliable food source year round. Salmon species including Spring and Fall Chinook, Coho, Humpback, Sockeye, and Chum, as well as steelhead and several species of lamprey were abundant. Before European contact, Karuk people consumed over one pound of fish per person per day (Hewes, 1973). Longstanding cultural traditions existed for regulating and sharing fish and other resources both within the Karuk population and between neighboring tribes. Economic relations such as the exchange of goods, and fishing activity including the timing of fishing up and down the river, were based on subsistence provisioning and regulated by spiritual practices that allowed for fish escapement.

Through coordinated ceremonial regulation and custom, tribal fishery management for centuries sustained an annual harvest of salmon equal to the peak of the harvest achieved by white settlers in only one year (House, 1999; McEvoy, 1986: 23). Under tribal management weirs were built by Karuk at Red Cap Creek and by Yurok further down the Klamath River below Pecwan, but no one began harvesting fish until a priest and his assistants performed a 10-day ceremony to catch the first salmon of the year at Amikiatyum. According to Leaf Hillman, Vice Chairman and Ceremonial Leader, ‘Because the first fish [was] caught at Amikiatyum, they say the “fish medicine” was made there.’ After the first fish was caught, it was not consumed, but was ceremoniously offered on an altar. Only after this ceremony was completed were the tribes along the mid and lower Klamath River permitted to fish. According to Hillman, the ‘ceremony is the respect, up and down the river, for that system of management that allows for … adequate spawning or escapement … meeting the needs of the resource first, prior to thinking about the needs of your own folks.’ A similar ritual took place for the Fall Chinook run.

Rituals such as these fused together both religious meaning and economic practice. They limited harvests so all tribes were able to depend on salmon as a primary food source. The survival of the salmon and the people were phenomena that mutually reinforced the ideological premise for this system, since, if the salmon kept returning in bountiful numbers, then reverence to the salmon (as seen in the practice of limiting the harvest of salmon so they can reproduce) was rewarded. In the words of one anonymous fisherman:

We take their lives. It is because of our skill. So we have a responsibility to take care of their offspring, to use their meat, to live a good life.

The motivation for honoring the needs of the salmon as well as the needs of all other forms of life, animate and inanimate, is rooted in the creation story of the Karuk as told by Leaf Hillman.

At the beginning of time, the earth was a dark place. There was no light. There were spirit people who roamed this place, this dark, kind-of formless place. And then at the time (we call the great transformation) the Creator transformed all of those spirit people. He transformed some of them into the rocks and the trees, the water and the air, transformed some into fish, animals, insects. Some of those spirit people he transformed into human
beings. And this is how, from that time forward, that is what made us … So the rocks and the trees and the water and the air, the responsibility that I have, those are real relations. You’re related to them. They have spirit … They are alive. They are living. And so not only are they alive and living and they have a soul just like you, they have a common ancestor just like you, for we were once spirit people.

Thus, reciprocity is seen as an act enabling one’s people to survive and, because all things living have a ‘common ancestor’, acts of reciprocity are considered necessary for the collective good.

Such a system contrasts greatly with the prevailing practices and logic of the capitalist system, which relies upon perpetual capital accumulation. Capitalism differs not only in its form of economic relations to nature (that of accumulation to generate surplus value), but it also differs in that it has simultaneously usurped the regulative role typically relegated to culture and religion: its logic guides the norms and behaviors of its participants (Dobell, 1995; Loy, 1997). In Polanyi’s words (1957[1944]: 57), ‘Instead of economy being embedded in social relations, social relations are embedded in the economic system.’ Whereas Karuk economic activity is regulated by religion and culture, in the capitalist world-system the market is religion – it guides the norms and behavior of social actors (Dobell, 1995; Loy, 1997). Thus, when incorporation takes place, the conflict between the Karuk social system and capitalism is not only a conflict of economic interests but is a conflict arising from a process displacing moral codes of behavior.

The Effects of Capitalist Incorporation on the Karuk System of Subsistence

We describe the effects of capitalist incorporation on Karuk subsistence in three sections: the failure to recognize land occupancy and title, the criminalization of traditional management, and the declining traditional foods and effects of altered diet.

Lack of Recognition of Land Occupancy and Title

Major shifts in the Karuk lifeway began in the 1850s with the California gold rush. The arrival of miners, the military, and settlers in Karuk territory in 1850 was accompanied by direct genocide in which many people and much knowledge of traditional culture, foods, social and political structure were lost (Bell, 1991; Norton, 1979). At this time violent social dislocation, including the outright killing of three-quarters of the tribe, relocation of villages, and attempts to move people onto reservations all interfered with everyday social, cultural and food gathering activities (Bell, 1991; Norton, 1979). By the 1880s 70% of the Karuk population had been killed outright (Bell, 1991; Norton, 1979). Most of the survivors were moved to the Hoopa Valley Reservation or fled into the high mountains.

The lack of recognition of Karuk land occupancy and title began with the failure of the US Congress to ratify the 1851 treaty signed with the Karuk Tribe. As a result, the
Karuk Tribe of California has no reservation or fishing rights, and did not gain federal recognition until 1979. In 1887 the Dawes Act, or General Allotment Act, was passed which provided that small parcels of land be allotted to Karuk families. This law attempted to establish the European system of private ownership onto Indian lands. ‘Prior to the infusion of Europeans into the Upper Klamath River in 1850 ownership of land by individuals was not recognized. But the tribes, and individual people did own rights to hunt, fish, gather and manage particular portions of the surrounding landscape’ (Quinn, 2007a: 1). As a result of these different conceptions of land ‘ownership’, many Karuk sold their parcels into non-Indian hands for low prices. With the widening of State Highway 96 in the 1950s, parcel sizes further decreased as the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) transferred land to the state of California. By 2007, Karuk families owned only 35 of the 90 original parcels. Of the lands that were once occupied and managed by the Karuk, 98% (or 1,023,452 acres) are now under the management of the US Forest Service (Quinn, 2007b). Currently, the Karuk Tribe has virtually no land base. The tribe also lacks the base funding from the BIA that comes with a reservation.

In contrast to the coordinated tribal management that had allowed for escapement, European settlers set up canneries at the river mouth and harvested entire runs. This system led to immediate declines in overall fish volume taken from the river. Encroachment of non-Indians led to cultural disruptions from loss of life to disruption of food harvesting systems, a process resulting in loss of wealth, cultural knowledge, traditional diet and the emergence of diet related diseases. Although the role of smallpox in the colonization of American Indian people is well documented, less attention has been paid to the importance of diet related diseases due to denied access to traditional foods. Attempts to incorporate Karuk people into capitalist arrangements have not been a smooth, evolutionary progression, but rather a collision between two systems along economic, cultural, political, and health frontiers.

Criminalizing Traditional Management

During the 1970s the Federal Government denied Karuk people the right to continue their traditional fishing practices (Norton, 1979) by arresting and incarcerating them. Traditional Karuk fisherman Harold Tripp describes the pervasive sense of fear that many people felt during this period when tensions ran particularly high:

There wasn’t necessarily a lot of Indian people wantin’ to fish down there that time because people were scared. I remember my grandfather, we lived over here on the Salmon River, and you’d go almost all winter without seein’ a car and when he’d hear a car and he’d get all scared and like we always had deer meat or somethin’ like that and that’s the first thing he’d ‘It’s the game warden. It’s the game warden.’ And he’d start hidin’ everything and yeah … I thought it was crazy. Way out here in the mountains like that. A little-bitty thin road about one lane road in all directions and every time he heard a car, man, he thought it was a cop. So that was terrible, havin’ to live like that, you know.
Especially when that was the food you was supposed to be eatin’. Like a doctor, he told my grandmother one time, to eat deer meat. So we always did break the law and kill deer.

Karuk fishing rights have yet to be acknowledged by the US Government, although tribal members are now allowed to fish for ceremonial purposes at one site. That Karuk people fished for subsistence, or that one family fished for many people, has been invisible under the fishing management scheme of the state. Under Karuk custom not anyone – not even all men – are allowed to fish. Instead, the right to fish on a certain day at a certain place is passed down through family lineages. Equally important, those with rights to fish have the responsibility to provide fish for the community. In contrast, fisheries regulation by federal and state agencies set up around individual, recreational use rather than collective, subsistence use has led to setting a limit of two fish per person. As a result of this conflict between Karuk custom and state political frontiers, Karuk tribal members who have tried to fulfill their social and family responsibilities to provide fish to feed family members, or for ceremonies, have faced serious penalties and jail time.

The refusal to recognize Karuk fishing, hunting and gathering practices has ultimately resulted in the criminalization of simply being Karuk. As Leaf Hillman explains, government regulations force assimilation to the point of criminal indictment:

In order to maintain a traditional Karuk lifestyle today, you need to be an outlaw, a criminal, and you had better be a good one or you’ll likely end up spending a great portion of your life in prison. The fact of the matter is that it is a criminal act to practice a traditional lifestyle and to maintain traditional cultural practices necessary to manage important food resources or even to practice our religion. If we as Karuk people obey the ‘laws of nature’ and the mandates of our Creator, we are necessarily in violation of the white man’s laws. It is a criminal act to be a Karuk Indian in the 21st century.

In the Karuk Health and Fish Consumption Survey, individuals were asked whether members of their household had been questioned or harassed by game wardens while fishing for a number of aquatic food species. Out of all tribal members who participated in the survey, 32% reported they had experienced harassment. Figure 1 illustrates the sorts of activities for which such harassment took place (figure adapted from Norgaard, 2005: 30).

Many tribal members continue to carry out their traditional practices, as David Arwood, traditional Karuk fisherman, explains:

They say we’ve got to cut mushrooms in half before we can take them home and eat them. I said I’m not cutting my mushrooms in half. If they want to bust somebody, come find me any old time you want. I’m not going to sell my mushrooms. I’m not going to cut them in half. My ancestors never cut them in half. Why should I cut them in half?

But to be fined or have a family member imprisoned imposes a significant economic burden on families. This is a risk many are unwilling or unable to take. Of those reporting
harassment, 36% reported they had decreased their subsistence or ceremonial activities as a result of such contacts.

As shown in Figure 1 above, regulations operating within capitalist frameworks not only target fishing but also other cultural and subsistence economic practices such as hunting, mushroom gathering, and the collection of basketry materials. These regulations fail to honor the Karuk as original inhabitants, their inalienable right to subsistence harvesting and the sustainable nature of Karuk harvests. Karuk elder Vera Davis observed that in this regulatory system market-based activities are given at least equal priority as Karuk subsistence and she protests the imbalance and injustice of this view: ‘Now I don’t think that no one has a right to tell us when we can do it when you have people who pay hundreds of dollars to come in, kill the venison and get the horns. I don’t think that is fair because this is our livelihood’ (quoted in Salter, 2003: 32). These are examples of collisions along cultural and economic frontiers. Furthermore, regulations by the state organized on presumption of market-based activities threaten the ability of Karuk to carry out cultural and religious practices. Karuk customs are undermined when their economic rationale disappears.

Health as a Fifth Frontier: Declining Traditional Foods and the Effects of Altered Diet

State regulation of Karuk fishing is largely a response to sharp reductions in the salmon population in the Klamath watershed. Destruction of the Klamath salmon runs has occurred due to the commodification of salmon and energy, and the control of water resources. The past century has been characterized by extensive overfishing at the river mouth in the first decades of the 1900s, the construction of hydroelectric dams that now block access to the spawning upstream habitat of Spring Chinook salmon, and overfishing of ocean stocks. A series of six dams were constructed on the lower Klamath and tributaries from 1918 to the construction of Iron Gate, the lowest and most recent dam, in
1962. The series of dams from Iron Gate upriver block access of fish and other species to some 350 miles of spawning habitat in the ‘upper basin’. This reflects approximately 90% of the spawning grounds for Spring Chinook salmon (G & G Associates, 2003; National Academy of Sciences, 2004). Spring Chinook have been the most important food source for Karuk people and the salmon species, whose decline is most visibly linked to the construction of the dams. According to Harold Tripp, a traditional Karuk fisherman:

In the late 50s, early 60s there were numerous different types of salmon, and large like 50 pounds. I’ve seen salmon that weighed up to 70 pounds that people used to catch pretty regular but now you get a big fish, it’s maybe 30 pounds. There’s not the runs that there used to be. You had to be a pretty powerful fisherman even to catch them. At one time each fisherman would have a hole and they would get all the fish they needed. Nowadays we fish the whole river and we still don’t get enough fish.

Adding weight to Harold Tripp’s observations, in September 2002, over 68,000 adult salmon died in the Klamath River due to disease and low water flows – representing the largest adult fish kill in the USA.

Contrary to the arguments of neo-liberal economists, that link economic growth to improved social conditions (Dollar and Kraay, 2002), a high percentage of Karuk tribal members have experienced profound impoverishment, food insecurity and a new set of diet related diseases as capitalist practices have been introduced. In stark contrast to their pre-contact wealth, members of the Karuk tribe are now among the poorest people in California (US Bureau of the Census, 2000).

With the loss of the most important food source, Spring Chinook salmon in the 1970s, the Karuk people hold the dubious honor of experiencing one of the most recent and dramatic diet shifts of any native tribe in the USA. Many families continued to consume salmon up to three times per day until the runs decreased dramatically in the 1970s. Self-report data from the survey indicate the percentage of adult tribal members eating traditional foods once a week or more has dropped from 65% when they were teenagers to less than 25% in 2005. Due to the combination of the watershed’s diminishing productivity and the state regulation of Karuk food harvesting, the Karuk people today have experienced significant reduction of traditional foods in their diet. When obtainable, these former staples of their highly nutritious diet are available in quantities insufficient to even approach being primary food sources. Often the quality is compromised as well.

Many Karuk frame their situation as a case of denied access to traditional foods. Over 80% of households surveyed in 2005 indicated they were unable to gather adequate amounts of eel, salmon or sturgeon to fulfill their family needs. Most households that caught salmon, steelhead, eels, and sturgeon report catching 10 or fewer, and no household reported catching more than 50 eels, Fall or Spring Chinook salmon. Furthermore, 40% of tribal members report there are species of fish their family gathered which they no longer harvest. For most of these species the decline in harvest is quite recent.

Declining traditional food resources now forces the present Karuk population to buy more and more of their food in stores, rely on government commodities, or in too many
cases: go hungry. Ron Reed, a traditional Karuk fisherman, expresses the frustration people feel as they face the pressure to buy food. 

A healthy riverine system has a profound effect on the people on the river. I have six children. If every one of those kids went down and fished and caught a good healthy limit like it was back in the 80s, you could pretty much fill a freezer and have nice good fish all the way through the year. But now, without a healthy riverine system the economy down here on the lower river is pretty much devastated. All the fishing community is devastated by the unhealthy riverine system. Instead of having healthy food to eat – fish – we are relegated to eating commodity foods that the government gives out. That’s our subsidy: high starch foods, things that aren’t so healthy that the Karuk people are pretty much forced to eat.

The hunger and poor-quality diet the Karuk have inherited with capitalist world-system incorporation have led to rising health problems, as well. The loss of traditional food sources is now recognized as being directly responsible for a host of diet related illnesses among native Americans, including diabetes, obesity, heart disease, tuberculosis, hypertension, kidney troubles and strokes (cf. Joe and Young, 1993; Olson, 2001). Identified health consequences of altered diet for the Karuk people include rates of type II diabetes that are four times the US average. Rates of heart disease and hypertension also significantly exceed national averages (Norgaard, 2005). The estimated diabetes rate for the Karuk Tribe is 21%, nearly four times the US average. The estimated rate of heart disease for the Karuk Tribe is 39.6%, three times the US average. Despite the epidemic levels, diabetes has only recently appeared in the Karuk population. Most families report the first appearance of diabetes in the 1970s. Data from the 2005 Karuk Health and Fish Consumption Survey show that the loss of the most important food source, the Spring Chinook salmon run, is directly linked to the appearance of epidemic rates of diabetes in Karuk families.

Although damage to the food supply was not employed as an intentional tool of genocide against the Karuk people in the way the destruction of the buffalo was for the Plains Indians, the effects are very much the same. The loss of the salmon has had a profound effect on the physical health, economic circumstances and cultural practices of the Karuk. We therefore propose health as a fifth frontier or boundary upon which capitalism has collided with the Karuk lifeworld. Notably, the crisis in Karuk peoples’ health has provoked actions for assessing social conditions on the ancestral territory, and, as mentioned above, has been the impetus to support the research project from which our data are derived. There is some work on the importance of health in the collision of world-systems. The role of smallpox in the colonization of American Indian people is well documented, for example. But less attention has been paid to the importance of diet related diseases due to denied access to traditional foods. We contend that just as the four frontiers (economic, political, military, or cultural) discussed in Hall and Fenelon (2004: 167) reflect the multidimensional and coercive nature of incorporation, so too does a fifth frontier actualized in the physical health of humans and the environment. The experiences of Karuk people as salmon runs have rapidly deteriorated offer a strong case.
Put into context, it is estimated the Karuk, and the other tribes of the mid and lower Klamath River watershed, carefully developed a complex social system that sustained a balance between social relations and natural resources for over 10,000 years (Anderson, 2005). And before non-Indian contact they probably enjoyed wealth surpassing those levels for any other California tribe. Despite claims to the contrary, the story of capitalist incorporation over the past 150 years clearly suggests the world-system has a tremendous capacity to destroy life itself, rather than ‘advance’ society into a more prosperous future. As non-Indians settled Karuk territory, economic relations shifted from subsistence to market-oriented activities. Although a very few individual tribal members have achieved significant wealth, overall this shift in material relations was coupled with a steady advancement of state regulation of activities, which legalized encroachment, criminalized Karuk practices, and gave market activities (such as commercial fishing and recreation) as much importance as tribal livelihood. Vandana Shiva aptly argues the process of capitalist modernization and depriving indigenous populations has been legitimated by defining subsistence as ‘a low physical quality of life’ (1989: 10). Nowhere is the fallacy of this worldview clearer than in the distressing experiences of Karuk people. However, despite the dire circumstances portrayed above, the Karuk have not disappeared, nor have they given up attempts to live in a traditional manner. Instead they are strengthening their efforts in revitalizing their social system and in mobilizing to remove dams in order to ‘Bring the Salmon Home’.

Revitalization and Resistance to Global Capitalism

Today, despite direct genocide, forced relocation, economic hardship and the lack of a reservation, approximately one-third of the Karuk population continues to live in its ancestral territory. The region is remote with one highway, and few stores, schools, or employment opportunities. One telling fact is that it is a two-hour drive to the nearest stoplight from anywhere in the ancestral territory. Although the dams that have devastated their fishery were built to supply energy, tribal members living along some 40 miles of the ancestral territory beside the main highway are without electricity. Yet since 1979, when they gained federal recognition, the Karuk have experienced what Joane Nagel (1996) characterizes as a political, economic and ethnic renewal (Bell, 1991). Members are actively recovering cultural traditions, including language use, ceremonial practices and traditional basket weaving.

In the view of those tribal members living in the ancestral territory, restoration of Klamath River aquatic health is central to the ongoing struggle for cultural survival. The relationship between cultural health and ecosystem management is highlighted for example in the Mission Statement of the Karuk Tribal Council:

The mission of the Karuk Tribal Council is to promote the general welfare of all Karuk people, to establish equality and justice for our tribe, to restore and preserve Tribal traditions, customs, language and ancestral rights, and to secure to ourselves and our descendants the power to exercise the inherent rights of self governance. The Karuk Tribe
believes that eco-cultural resource management is a foundation for social infrastructure, vital to the perpetuation of our culture and the Klamath Basin as a whole. We seek to fully regain traditional management as a vehicle to enact the full potential of the Karuk people economically, politically, socially and culturally.

An important opportunity to restore traditional resources and management has emerged with the expiration of the operating license for the Klamath River Hydro Project in 2007. The dams are currently owned by PacificCorps (also known as Pacific Power). PacificCorps filed a new license application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. For several years, negotiations and meetings between the tribes, all interested parties and the company to set out the concerns and terms of the new license took place before filing the application. The degree of habitat lost behind the dams led tribal members and fisheries biologists to view this as the ‘restoration opportunity of their lifetimes’. The Karuk, along with three other tribes who live along the Klamath and tributaries, and many fishing and environmental groups sought dam removal. However, when the new license was submitted it was five feet high and contained virtually none of the health, cultural or ecological concerns the Karuk and other tribes shared. Not even fish ladders were proposed to enable salmon to get around the dams.

Up until this point the tribes had been unsuccessful in setting up meetings with leading figures in the company. But in June of 2004 some two dozen members of four tribes, the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Association and an environmental group, Friends of the River, took their campaign to PacificCorp’s parent company Scottish Power in Edinburgh, Scotland. In this highly successful campaign targeted around the shareholders’ meeting, tribal members highlighted the cultural values that were threatened by commodifying river resources.

In their comments to shareholders, news media and people on the street, tribal members made it clear this was not an issue of money. Instead, they described the loss of culture, health and spiritual life and used cultural representations to frame this conflict as a matter of human rights. Tribal members dressed in cultural regalia as a sign of respect and seriousness, as well as to illustrate the unique cultures that were threatened. While some tribal delegates entered the meeting, other members sang, chanted and played drums outside on the street. People outside carried signs that read ‘Salmon Feeds Our People’, ‘Salmon Is Our Culture’ and ‘Scottish Power Do the Right Thing’. A traditional salmon bake was held as a move to ‘share our culture with the people of Scotland’. In comments to the media tribal members highlighted the dams as a human rights issue. Ron Reed, Karuk fisherman and cultural biologist, described the purpose of his participation:

I’m very passionate about this. So that’s the reason I’ve come over here, across the great pond. To let them know. There’s human rights violations here. Our constitutional rights are being violated. We have a right to religion, we have a right to food, we have a right to our way of life. We’ll fight to the end.

In contrast to the capitalist conception of land, fish and river in terms of commodities or property that has solely economic value, tribal members described the spiritual and cultural bonds between themselves and these elements. As Mike Polmateer, a traditional Karuk
fisherman, described it: ‘Even … the condition it’s in right now, we still love that river and it’s the blood that flows through our veins.’ When asked why she had come, 22-year-old Karuk tribal member Molli White’s reply echoes the traditional management values of reciprocity and responsibility to community and other species described in the first portion of this essay:

The salmon have given themselves to us for all these years. We’re just trying to do something to give back to them. We want Scottish Power to take the dams down. Take Iron Gate dam down at the very least.

She said she had brought her son with her, ‘because I want to teach him to be able to appreciate and respect the salmon the way his father does, as my parents do and all the people before us. We’re here to ask Scottish Power to do the right thing and bring the salmon home.’ Through their discourse the tribes focused on salmon, not as a commodity, but as a healthy food source and a central element of culture. In the words of one Yurok man, ‘We feel that the dams have destroyed our culture, our fish. Our fish are our culture and in that way they are destroying our people.’

The tribes captivated the Scottish media with images from their point of view. On the day of the meeting they rallied outside, obtained permission to speak inside the meeting and secured a private meeting with CEO Ian Russell. These tactics gained a great deal of positive attention in the media and with passing bystanders. One man watching from the sidelines commented: ‘It’s really good to see people standing up and making alliances to resist big business which is just riding roughshod over everything, over people’s lives, traditions, needs and livelihoods and everything.’ Inside the shareholders’ meeting, the topic of the Klamath dams and the Indians on their doorstep was the main event and gained significantly more attention than any other topic. The tribes had managed not only to make the downside of capitalism in their neighborhood visible, but to turn the tables, requiring one of the largest power companies in the world to spend considerable time and energy defending itself to its shareholders on the inside and the media and Scottish public on the outside. This shows that their efforts of resistance have not been merely reactions, but strategic actions warranting response from a major player of the capitalist world-system. All this effort was over an energy source that generated less than 2% of the power of one of its smaller subsidiaries.

The group traveled to Scotland again in 2005, and in May of 2007 went to the head-quarters of the new owner Mid-American in Omaha, Nebraska. These actions generated a great deal of positive press in mainstream media outlets across the USA. With the visibility of their plight, public pressure against Scottish Power and PacifiCorps changed the terms of negotiation, giving the tribes political leverage entirely missing prior to launching the campaign. Thus, resistance to incorporation has been effective in keeping the process only partial, and appears even to be reversing the trend of absorption to some degree. With the political engine tending toward agreement with the Karuks’ position, the process of total economic and cultural loss is by no means complete.

Prior to the trips to Scotland the idea of dam removal was laughable. Few people even within the tribes believed such a goal was within reach. But tribal members identify this trip
as the step that ‘put dam decommissioning on the table’. And as of this writing there is a very real possibility that the tribes will get their wish and dams on the Klamath will be removed. Settlement talks between all parties except the power company reached agreement on terms for dam removal in November 2007. Now the challenge will be to bring the power company on board. Although there is no guarantee, many factors from the support of the California governor, statements by the US Fish and Wildlife Commission requiring fish passage as a condition of a new license, and several recent court cases tilt in favor of dam removal. But other factors, including the draft Environmental Impact Statement released by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which so far contains no option for dam removal and other logistical problems, work against them.

Regardless, the ‘Bring the Salmon Home’ campaign is an example of a political movement in which economically and politically marginalized people from within the USA have managed to use challenges to their culture, economy, livelihood and religion as the terms for their campaign’s legitimacy. Tribal members have been enormously successful in making multiple aspects of the negative side of the bright new world of capitalism strikingly visible.

**Conclusion**

Proponents claim capitalism is a system guiding individuals to the most efficient channels for producing and procuring goods. However, Karuk experience reveals the contradictory workings of capitalism. The experiences of Karuk tribal members reveal the arrival of capitalism, while presumably creating wealth for at least a few individuals, has on the whole come into direct conflict with traditional culture and lifeways, leading to material and moral impoverishment for the majority of those who remain on the land. The disappearance of the Spring Chinook, and the rise in poverty, hunger and diet related diseases are among the many ways Karuk people know the dominant system attempting to incorporate them is not sustainable materially or morally. Karuk experiences illustrate Elmar Altvater’s point regarding capitalism: ‘its very successes in growth and expansion have led to shortage in the vital quality of nature, which in turn undermines the principle of scarcity and thus of economic rationality itself’ (1993: 6). The destruction of life – both of salmon populations and the Karuk people – at the frontier of health has been the most tangible outcome of capitalist incorporation. Furthermore, through the collision of economic with cultural and political spheres, capitalism destroys the very forms of cultural knowledge and behaviors that served to keep fish harvests sustainable. It is for this reason that incorporation has remained partial and not reached an ‘end’.

Our case illustrates that the process of incorporation is not a one-way process of indigenous populations unquestioningly accepting the values and practices of capitalist colonizers (Dunaway, 1996a, 1996b; Hall and Fenelon, 2004; Meyer, 1994). Rather, members of non-capitalist systems face a situation in which they accept some elements of capitalist society, but remain suspicious of other aspects. For instance, our analysis of interviews and survey data reveals that even as Karuk people adapt many routines around capitalist arrangements, such as participation in the commercial economy, they continue
Karuk customs regarding many other activities such as appropriate hunting and fishing customs, even in the face of state intimidation. Constant interplay between social structure and human agency suggests that ‘the core never effect[s] complete control over [the] periphery’, thus, the capacity for non-capitalist resistance and change remain possible (Dunaway, 1996b: 465).

The lesson from Karuk experience also includes optimism, as cultural revitalization and efforts to ‘Bring the Salmon Home’ have met successes both within the Karuk Tribe and for collaborating non-Indian groups. Among the important lessons is how important the sustenance of Karuk religious moral codes are to strategic actions (as opposed to reactions) in demanding dam removal. Strong spiritual and emotional bonds to all life forms, and an instilled sense of responsibility to them, have served as counter-hegemonic tools. Raised with such beliefs, commodification is inherently a suspicious practice as it requires societies to choose to base themselves ‘on a motive only rarely acknowledged as valid in the history of human societies … namely, gain’ (Polanyi, 1957[1944]). This motive inherent to capitalism contradicts the values of reciprocity instilled and maintained in Karuk culture, moral codes and economic structure that were all developed over thousands of years in managing life and resources in the Klamath River watershed. Hence, Karuk people seek cultural revitalization through restoring ceremonies, since, through these ceremonies, the tribe’s values of responsibility, collectivity, and reciprocity are deemed relevant. As such, the experiences the Karuk share in this essay offer further evidence that any efforts toward change must come about not only in changing the economy from capitalism to something more ecologically sustainable, but that in order for this shift to occur culture, values and moral codes of behavior must likewise change. Leaf Hillman describes the role ceremony played in instilling Karuk values in him:

> It occurred to me when we did our ceremony that we didn’t have the ability to do it, not by ourselves … You can have all the rights you want, but in reality you can’t do it if other people don’t come and help … So I learned that you have a responsibility to everyone else.

The Karuk Tribe of California has identified environmental resources of key significance to tribal cultural survival – as well as how management practices by non-Indian agencies have impaired tribal resources. Specifically, the tribe has successfully exposed the connection between the degradation of these critical cultural resources and the associated impairments to tribal cultural and spiritual practices and overall health, from diet to socioeconomic well-being. Since capitalism has tended to cast the economy in the place of social regulator, social change is likely only effective if the economy is returned to its rightful place as subsumed by social relations. Social change not only comes about in changing the way economic actions are organized, but can only ‘stick’ if moral codes of behavior are altered simultaneously.

Resistance by Karuk actors from the periphery offers ‘proof that the logic of the dominant system is not “natural”, “normal”, “manifest”, or “inevitable”, but rather has been constructed by human beings, whether consciously or not’ (Hall and Fenelon, 2004: 173). If the capitalist system can be understood as ‘constructed by human beings’, then
the example of Karuk resistance and resilience can empower observers to mobilize in shaping an alternative world-system.
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Notes

1 It is clear, though, that Thomas Hall was grappling with indigenous societies’ abilities to resist and reverse the process of incorporation (cf. Hall, 1987: 6–8). Also, in Hall (1996: 440–454, 2000: 243–4) and Hall and Fenelon (2004: 167) reference is made to the potential for reversing some processes of incorporation.

2 Hall and Fenelon (2004: 169) briefly refer to ‘partial incorporation’ in their discussion of indigenous survival and resistance.

3 We acknowledge economic, political, and cultural spheres are not mutually exclusive categories, but are woven tightly together and mutually reinforce one another. Karuk struggles for cultural revitalization, for instance, are inseparable from efforts toward political power and economic independence.

4 Dr. Kari M. Norgaard conducted all field and survey research analyzed in this essay as post-doctoral work sponsored by the IGERT Program on Biological Invasions at the University of California at Davis and under contract for the Karuk Tribe of California.

5 Quoted in unpublished Dip Net Fishing Video from Karuk Tribe archives.

6 Quotations from Leaf Hillman (Karuk Spiritual Leader) taken from an interview conducted at the Karuk Department of Natural Resources Office, Orleans, CA on 13 December 2004.

7 All direct quotes are from author interviews unless otherwise specified.

8 Meyer (1994: 221–2) and Dunaway (1996a: 44–5, 2000), for instance, mention smallpox and other infectious disease epidemics in relation to loss of land, declining subsistence opportunities, and poor living conditions. Dunaway (2000: 202–3) ties incorporation to ecological degradation and diminishing the status of women’s work, which was largely tied to food cultivation and sustaining nutritional diet among the Cherokee.

9 The importance of diet related disease, in fact, is currently gaining attention from international organizations. The World Bank (Adeyi et al., 2007: 11–12) is finding that non-communicable disease (NCD) – such as diabetes and heart disease associated with poverty; changes in diet and exercise; and environmental health – is projected to surpass the role of communicable disease in mortality rates afflicting poor countries by 2015. Until now, this has been a unique health dynamic in high- and middle-income countries (2007: 5–6). Not surprisingly, concern tends to be justified using a cost-benefit analysis in which premature death as a result of NCDs is considered costly to the economy (Adeyi et al., 2007).
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