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Introduction: Native Peoples and the Spirit of Giving

Since the early 1990s, some Native American communities have experienced rapid social and economic changes. Many Indian tribes and Alaska Native communities resumed self-governance and control of their resources: a course of events accompanied by a resurgence in and commitment to traditional beliefs and customs.

Traditional acts of giving are integral to the daily lives of Native people. They are generally seen as exchanges. Acts of giving can include informal monetary gifts, gifts of time, services, ideas, and other items. Within an understanding of the collective capacity to honor the whole of life, Native American traditions give rise to Native American philanthropy. As described in the following poem, Native philanthropy represents a spirit of reciprocity.

The Indian Giver

Let there be no purpose in giving save reciprocity.
For to a people whose spirituality lies within Life's wholeness
Who share the gifts of the sky and the mountains and the seas and the forests
Who exchange abundance in the circle of animal brethren
Giving is not a matter of pure altruism and benevolence
But a mutual responsibility
To make the world a better place.

Let there be no purpose in receiving save reciprocity.
For a society whose belief in humanity lies within the interdependence of people
Who hold to the deeply universal good of community values and
Where children are the generation of our People
Giving is seen in the entirety of receiving.
Let the reciprocity of giving lie in a deepening of the Circle of Life. 
For as with Life where
The root needs to receive in order for the plant to give fruit
It can be seen that in the honor of giving
As in the honor of receiving
Good is only realized by the contributions of both.

by Rebecca Adamson, 1991
Units 1 & 2. Traditions of Giving

A Culture of Giving

*I honor you by giving – you honor me by receiving*

Many Native people have understood these words not as a formal decree, but as a daily understanding of their experiences expressed in spiritually-based ceremonies and familial activities, as well as governance systems, political processes, and other means of engagement. These beliefs and customs remain today.

Native communities express their generosity regardless of their social or economic condition. One trait common to many Native communities is the important place held by exchanges, in which givers are respected as much as receivers are honored. Giving is a form of sharing. The focus is on the exchange and on the relationship of the giver and receiver.

Culture plays a key role in Native philanthropy. Many traditions of giving and receiving have long existed in Native communities; some in the form of rituals (potlatches, giveaways, and feasts), others familial and informal, or governmental and more progressive in nature. Gift giving is a part of the rites performed for birth, puberty, marriage, death, and other major ceremonies. The differences in giving and giving ceremonies reflect the vast array of separate nations.

Traditional Native and non-Native approaches to giving differ in some very basic ways. Modesty and anonymity are generally hallmarks of Native cultures. Furthermore, within some Native communities, affluence or wealth is not necessarily measured by net worth, but rather in spiritual or natural terms. Whereas Euro-American interests may often be based on personal property rights, competitive market economies, wealth accumulation, and consumerism, many Native societies rely on communal ownership and economies of abundance, redistribution of wealth, and the spiritual connection to nature and beyond.
The Wisdom of the Giveaway

The Native worldview of giving away one's wealth as a benefit to others has historically helped not only to maintain harmony and economic balance, but has exemplified Native respect for nature and the commitment to future generations. It also contrasts with the traditional Euro-American emphasis on individual ownership and wealth accumulation.⁴

Concepts of Giving

More than 200 different languages exist among the 2.3 million Native Americans and Alaska Natives. There are many terms and meanings for generosity in Native cultures. Some terms denote care for others, some pass on messages that permeate the act of giving, but all highlight the sharing and honoring of people to nature. The following are examples of words which refer to some aspect of generosity in different indigenous cultures.⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Euro-American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obligation and Honor</td>
<td>Responsibility and Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosity</td>
<td>Affluence/Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/Equal exchange</td>
<td>Hierarchical relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giveaway</td>
<td>Grantmaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular lifeway</td>
<td>Linear lifeway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY DIFFERENCES OF GIVING**

- **aa ni tsé bá kées** (Navajo)
- **Ab da ne bi** (Eastern Cherokee)
- **Baawaailuuoo** (Crow)
- **Gondouwe** (Oneida of Wisconsin)
- **Gunuitug** (Yupik Eskimo)
- **hotoeboaste** (Cheyenne)
- **iikimmapi’ii** (Blackfeet)
- **kwiti-xest** (Salish)
- **Mah-sagi** (Hidatsa)
- **Maw-Maw/Weyab-Skab-sit/Mab-che-toe** (Menominee)
- **mobo kul boolaanb** (Koyukon; Doyon area of AK)
- **Naki-sabnes-bu** (Arikara)
- **Nicomo** (Narragansett)
- **qa upyi’ti** (Kootenai)
- **tsrou-cu-wé** (Keres; Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico)
- **Wancantognaka** (Lakota)
- **zbaaweni** (Ojibway)
Each term reflects variations on a particular type and essence of generosity. Indeed, unlike English, "where there is one word for generosity and another for sharing," Native languages include several terms for each, as in the example of distinct Crow words for material and emotional generosity. Where there is no written language, the spirit of generosity is expressed and preserved in story, action, and image. Giving practices also reflect regional and local characteristics. For instance, a respected member of an Oklahoma tribe speaks of giving as a natural process which must be accomplished before one dies so as not to weaken the spirit, while an Alaska Native community member emphasizes the culture of giving away wealth upon or just after accumulation, for example, through a potlatch.

Some Native communities look to their spiritual teachings to inform their giving. For example, some tribes look to the four directions as a guide for life and to the seventh generation for perspective on the past, present, and future. These social activities actively and publicly emphasize giving to and within the community.

Among Native cultures, the concepts of generosity and relatedness incorporate the honor of giving and receiving, yet in some Native communities, the idea of Euro-American philanthropy is associated specifically with "fundraising or grants" from sources both public and, more recently, private. Similarly, philanthropy, as a term, is sometimes understood as synonymous with receiving, rather than giving. Such an association of philanthropy with receiving may be due to the sense of dependence long fostered by federal and state governmental programs, and the mixed message sent by linking entitlement with grants under such programs.

The distinction between Native and Euro-American concepts of giving is underscored by the fact that among more traditional Native grantmakers and scholars are those who differentiate the language used in Euro-American philanthropy from that found in Native communities. Such distinctions have been identified by Dagmar Thorpe, a Sac and Fox traditionalist, as follows.
Another distinction between Native and non-Native giving derives from the integration in Native communities of voluntary service and the sharing that characterizes communal life, much of it guided by tribal leadership. Tribal leaders play a critical role in fostering philanthropic activities, which are often linked with tribal or individual survival. Many tribes, through their leadership, view philanthropic activities as investments in their own communities; others see giving as part of an ethical code of survival. Such concepts are closely linked to the land as a basis of tribal community, and of the responsibility of preservation for future generations. According to a linguist from the Blackfeet tribe, "giving and receiving are regulatory means of maintaining social order."11

Tribal concepts of giving are often described in terms of the circle of life. The circle is a bonding experience. Giving bonds one to the group and within the group, because the individual provides gifts that allow the group to prosper, and the group provides gifts that allow the individual to prosper. Giving is a way of building new relationships, while maintaining and reinforcing old ones. The circle-of-life belief system is one of interconnections, or inter-relationships, where the key value is one of recognizing the reciprocal nature of relationships.12

A History of Giving

Successive historical periods have posed new challenges to the giving practices and needs of different Native communities. The history of indigenous peoples in relationship to the United States government over the past 220 years includes periods of transition identified as the reservation era, the New Deal, termination, and self-determination. Each period has brought dramatic social, political, and economic changes to tribal communities.

During the late 19th century, the federal government enacted policies that sought to assimilate and acculturate Native communities into the dominant society. In 1887, for instance, Congress passed the General Allotment Act (Dawes Act), which divided communally-owned tribal lands into individually-owned parcels or "allotments." Once distributed among individual tribal members, remaining lands were sold as surplus to homesteaders and others. By 1934, the federal government had allotted more than 100 reservations, resulting in the loss of more than two-thirds of tribally-held lands.13
The 1930s marked a period in which federal policy sought to protect and enhance the rights of Indian Nations. However, this period was short-lived as these policies were undermined during the 1950s. In 1953, Congress passed a resolution terminating the historical relation between the federal government and Indian tribes, resulting in the abdication of the trust responsibility and obligations of the federal government toward Indian tribes, and the loss of tribal status as recognized sovereign nations. During this period, the federal government encouraged the relocation of tribal members from the reservation to urban centers (e.g., San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver, Minneapolis, etc.) by providing economic incentives.

Relocation of Native individuals and families away from their respective tribes to cities and towns accelerated the changing notion of community, which increasingly took on a pan-Indian character. Building on earlier movements, Native people developed voluntary groups and self-help associations in their new communities, continuing and adapting customs of sharing and exchanges. These customs included many forms of giving steeped in tradition, not law and institutions. The adaptation of nonprofit organizations, or less formalized associational structures, served to increase the fiscal and programmatic capacities among some urban Native groups as early as the 1950s. They also provided opportunities for Natives and non-Natives to work together on giving initiatives to meet the needs of the community in a culturally appropriate way.

The destructive policies of the 1950s were followed by the era of self-determination, one which has recognized the sovereignty of tribal governments. While legal and legislative actions continue to affect the ability of tribes to exercise their sovereign powers, new opportunities have also been created. In 1987, a Supreme Court decision affirming the right of Indian tribes to conduct gaming on tribal lands resulted in the 1988 Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) which was enacted to set guidelines for tribal gaming activities. Allowable uses for gaming profits under IGRA included funding tribal government operations, support for the general welfare needs of the tribe and its members, and economic development.

The advent of economic prosperity among some tribes has resulted in the evolution of creative forms of self-help and entrepreneurship. By combining traditions of giving, Native people have adopted some institutional forms of philanthropy and blended them with unique culturally relevant structures and processes. Blending cultures and structures have resulted in philanthropic efforts in the areas of health, education and
housing. In some cases, including that of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation of Connecticut, upwards of $150 million has been given for Native and non-Native cultural events and nonprofit organizations.\(^6\)

**Recommended Readings**


Giving and Receiving

Reasons for Giving

Native Americans give for a variety of reasons. A recent sampling of Native donors by the Council on Foundations indicates that, in general, Native people prefer to give to community and familial activities. Many Native donors (individuals and organizations) respond to emergencies, tend to be culturally driven, and are concerned about broad issues that have a local impact. They generally support Native-initiated or Native-controlled efforts, but also non-Native organizations that focus on or influence indigenous issues.

Most Native people also give as a communal obligation. For example, members of a New Mexico Pueblo tribe pledge themselves to be of service to their villages and make every effort to be members in good standing of the community by contributing to public work through volunteerism and money.17

Many Native people, particularly those in more traditional communities, view giving as inseparable from their way of life, and they understand giving as an acknowledgment and thanksgiving to the Creator for the blessings bestowed upon them.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMONG THE MAJOR REASONS FOR GIVING IN NATIVE AMERICA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• to share and reciprocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to ensure an equitable distribution of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to honor those who existed in the past, present, and future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to recognize immediate needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to perpetuate a certain tradition or cultural expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to memorialize family, kin, friend, or other loved ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to maintain social order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to gain access to rituals, or to perpetuate them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to attain tax benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For some tribes, giving is most often anonymous or private, because giving is an engagement in a broad reciprocity, not for the sake of prestige or altruism, but for a relationship to the Creator and to the community. Giving is viewed in personal and flexible terms or as a means of “helping out” and “honoring relationships” rather than as charity.

Native donors are unique in that their giving tends to be holistic, offering technical assistance, workshops, and guidance, as well as fostering contact with recipients. Native donors tend to develop relationships with the recipients in order to create an understanding of and connection to a project. Sometimes gifts are offered in the name of those the donors wish to honor. This custom is referred to as Otu'han in the Lakota language which literally translates as “giveaway.” Items such as shawls, quilts, household goods, and other gifts are collected over a period of time to be given away during powwows or other celebrations. This custom, whether it goes by the name of the “giveaway” or the “potlatch,” is still in use today.

The Recipients of Gifts

Even though forms and patterns of giving differ among tribes and their members, some of the common interest areas among Native people are:

- education (scholarships for schools, mentoring, internships, etc.),
- cultural preservation,
- economic development,
- youth,
- elderly services (burials, memorials, etc.),
- arts and crafts,
- healthcare,
- rehabilitation services (i.e., drug and alcohol addiction counseling),
- emergencies and disasters.

Support for youth and related activities comes from the belief that children are the “leaders of tomorrow,” essential to preserving Native heritage and culture. Concern for the elderly draws on a deeply-rooted respect for elders and their connection to the past, present, and future. The arts, which are central to traditional forms of communication and cultural expression, are another area to receive gifts. Finally, economic development is essential in rapidly changing Native communities, and allows individuals to participate in the tribe’s independence and growth.

Characteristics of Native Giving...
- preference for anonymous, need-based gifts;
- responsive to personal appeals through family or community relations;
- preference to support individuals and groups well-known to donor;
- interest in participating in decision making by serving on a board, on committees, and partaking in events;
- adherence to a “give and receive model” whereby when an individual gives, the gift will come back some time in the future.
Native communities also respond to emergencies and disasters such as floods, hurricanes, tornados, and blizzards. According to a 1998 United Way survey, the majority of donations from Native people (ninety-five percent) are made in response to appeals for direct emergency assistance, and help for children, the disabled, and the elderly.

Giving to traditional spiritual activities is an important area of giving often not accounted for in formal surveys or financial records. In this area, giving is very personal and informal, and often centers on ceremonial activities (feasts, powwows, honorings, potlatches, giveaways, etc.). In some Native communities, strong ties to organized religion exist. However, giving is usually in the form of individual pledges. Some organized religions require a tribal member to give as a religious mandate.

Whatever the reasons for giving, and as the discussion in these units indicate the reasons are numerous, Native Americans have long been generous givers. As historian John Grim explains:

> Native people were inclined to give before the Spanish Christian missionaries built their church in the Pueblo plaza of Acoma; an ancient belief system inculcated philanthropic activity for the communal good.

### Sources of Revenue and Assets for Giving

A major source of revenue for philanthropic activities is through entrepreneurial ventures. In the late 1980s, with the initiation of gaming, commercial enterprises began to fuel local reservation economies. Gaming has helped certain tribes rebuild and diversify tribal economies, contributing to the establishment of new enterprises in printing, cattle farming, housing and community centers, hotels, spa and retail centers, restaurants, golf courses, convention centers, and more. New wealth among the more successful tribes has prompted creative forms of self-help and philanthropic activity. Some ventures include the formation of capital sources through Native American banks, as well as leveraged support through Native foundations.

In terms of consumer dollars, Native communities contributed an estimated $10 billion in 1997 from gaming and other commercial activities, and in some states, most notably New Mexico and Arizona, Native communities generated an average of 16 percent of the state
income. In some areas of the country, such as Connecticut, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Mississippi, Native businesses are rapidly becoming major employers and active participants in community affairs.

The impact of successful enterprises are also measured in terms of their contributions to the community. In addition to helping to create more than 220 businesses, for example, an Indian tribe in New York with a successful casino gives generously to a variety of community projects. Their support includes an $8 million donation for new water lines, a $450,000 gift to the school district, and $300,000 in general support to the town. Other Indian tribes have sought to match gaming profits with grants from federal or state governments in an effort to ensure that revenues continue to bring a return to their community even if gaming does not continue to expand.

Among the many tribal gifts for education, youth, and projects for the elderly are: Prairie Island Dakota Community of Minnesota made a $100,000 donation to Augsburg College for the purpose of establishing an American Indian Support Program; the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde of Oregon made a $900,000 gift to their tribal foundation endowing a fellowship for the purpose of sending a Native American to Washington DC to work on policy issues; and the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians gave $10,000 to the University of California-Riverside for Native American scholarships. Other gifts include the creation of a childcare facility, senior citizen program, and an elders investment fund, by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation in Oregon.

Those tribes with financial resources, which have begun to amass wealth, distribute funds to their members. Personal consumption and tribal needs absorb much of the wealth, and some wealth has been diverted to other philanthropic activities. It is important to note, however, that economic vitality is one of the great imbalances among tribes. Native America is as diverse in its economics and social systems as it is in geography and culture. Some tribes gained prosperity by geography, establishing enterprises in areas near commercial centers. Others in more remote areas have fewer opportunities for accessing financial resources.

**Status of Native American Philanthropy**

Recent accounts of Native American giving indicate that the number of Native grantmakers (i.e. tribal foundations and Native nonprofit organizations) is on the rise. According to a report in 1996 by Native
Americans in Philanthropy, Native donor institutions grew in number from three to thirty-two between 1973 and 1996; and donations extended beyond human and social services to giving in order to sustain economic development, cultural preservation, environmental protection, and assorted other projects.30

The increase in Native donors through nonprofits, tribal foundations, and tribal enterprise has not, however, brought about an equal increase in public awareness of the trend toward philanthropic investments among individual tribal members. The lack of awareness may be due to a variety of cultural and social factors (e.g. giving is anonymous, or through ceremonial activities). As more Native people attain educational and professional opportunities, their donor potential and interest in expanding culturally appropriate philanthropic vehicles may increase. Additionally, through the continued success of tribal enterprise (gaming, resorts, energy), tribal members will have access to, and knowledge of, opportunities to participate in institutional philanthropy.

Growth in Native business ventures could also have a potentially large impact on Native American donor patterns. There has been a 93 percent increase in the number of businesses owned by Native Americans and Alaska Natives between 1987 and 1992 (from 52,980 to 102,234), with more than 80 percent of such firms being sole proprietorships. Native businesses have generated over $8 billion in revenue, an increase of more than 115 percent, over the same period.31 But this promising economic picture does not represent the whole of Native America. The diversity of cultures, resources, and environments among the 557 federally-recognized tribal nations in the United States is accompanied by a diversity of economic conditions. For instance, only a few gaming tribes generate significant revenues annually.

| The Top Five Revenue-Generating Tribally Owned Casinos in 1998 Were:32 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Foxwoods                   | $1 billion      | Mashantucket Pequot, CT |
| Mohegan Sun                | $670 mil        | Mohegan Tribe of Indians, CT |
| Soaring Eagle              | $350 mil        | Saginaw Chippewa, MI |
| Mystic Lake                | $300 mil        | Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux, MN |
| Oneida                     | $260 mil        | Oneida, WI |

Of the estimated 2.3 million Native Americans (living on and off the reservation), the most profitable gaming tribes as a whole represent well under one percent of the country’s Native population.
The economic disparity among tribes is reflected clearly in the fact that population size does not necessarily correlate to revenue generation.

| Population of the Top 5 Gaming Tribes (Living on and off the Reservation): |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Mashantucket Pequot           | 529 members   |
| Mohegan Tribe                 | 1,300         |
| Saginaw Chippewa              | 4,000         |
| Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux    | 300           |
| Oneida Nation                 | 13,000        |

Note, for example, that the tribes with the highest per capita in revenue-generation are not the largest in population. In fact the total tribal membership of the top five gaming tribes is only slightly over 19,000.

| Top 10 Tribes as Self-Identified from U.S. Census (Living on and off the Reservation): |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Cherokee                      | 308,000 (all bands) |
| Navajo                         | 219,000          |
| Chippewa                      | 104,000 (all bands combined) |
| Sioux                          | 103,000 (all bands combined) |
| Choctaw                        | 82,000           |
| Pueblo                         | 53,000 (all communities) |
| Apache                         | 50,000 (all)     |
| Iroquois                       | 49,000           |
| Lumbee                         | 48,000 (State recognized) |
| Creek                          | 44,000           |

As reflected in the tables above, a relatively small number of tribes and their members have the resources to give on a large scale. Regardless of population size and economic status, Native people of all income levels give generously. This is true, even though over 50 percent of reservation-based Native Americans live in poverty and, nationally, the average annual income for a Native American is well below the national poverty level. By expanding Native philanthropic networks, it may be possible to reverse some of the poverty across Native America. Clearly, Native people today have compelling incentives to protect their financial resources, act as agents of economic change, and influence generally held perceptions of Native people as recipients of funds. Those incentives lie within their respective cultures, traditions, and communities. As more Native people gain control of their resources, their communities will prosper.
A key to continued economic growth is education. The growth of tribally-controlled colleges and the creation of the American Indian Science and Engineering Society, the American Indian Graduate Center, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, and Native American programs at universities, is an indication of increasing Native participation in higher education. Graduation rates of Native students are also on the rise. At present there are very few Native American people employed in the non-native philanthropic sector; higher education will enable Native people to compete on a more equal basis in the larger society to gain access to the skills and tools necessary for entry into professions and into the philanthropic arena.

Recommended Readings


Native communities have strong and deeply-rooted traditions of giving through informal and formal acts of generosity; the institutions and practices of Euro-American philanthropy and related investment opportunities are not deeply embedded. With the infusion of new wealth, tribes and their members will need to protect and maximize their assets both for their individual and tribal well-being, and also as a way to create a culturally-relevant giving model for all of Native America. Philanthropic investments, though often overlooked, are a means to reach these objectives. Modern forms of institutionalized giving may provide a mechanism for Native communities to build capacity, restore their cultures, and express their Native identities.

Native people give throughout their lives, yet many do so without awareness of the financial and legal benefits of federal, state, and tribal charitable investment laws. They also do so without publicity in the broader society. Modesty and anonymity are hallmarks of Native cultures, and so public coverage may run counter to Native beliefs. Within Indian tribes, affluence or wealth is not only measured by net worth, but also in terms of human, spiritual, or natural resources capital. Much of individual Native philanthropic activity is often local and community-based, and often takes forms other than monetary contributions.

There is no lack of stories about poverty and dependence on government in Native communities. Most news reports describe Native peoples as recipients, rather than givers. However, there is also a parallel picture of accelerating economies in some Native communities, propelling them into a new era of relative prosperity accompanied by a leadership role in the philanthropic efforts in their broader communities.

Common Forms of Native Giving

The many common forms of giving among Native American communities include: informal personal giving; public philanthropic organizations (tribal foundations, nontribal funds, and service associations);
tribal giving programs (enterprise, governmental, and intertribal consortia); workplace giving programs; community foundation funds; and private foundations. In some cases, endowments have been established as a longer-term form of giving. There exist many vehicles for institutional giving by and within Native communities, and an increasing number of tribal members are considering or have already made significant philanthropic gifts.

Specific Giving Vehicles

Individual Giving Options

Giving patterns suggest that both the vehicle and recipient of gifts by individuals may differ based on whether the donor has derived wealth through tribal or individual means, and whether or not the donor is reservation-based. Regardless of an individual's relationship to the reservation or the source of his or her wealth, however, most Native American donors have not, as yet, established personal or individual foundations; gifts tend to be informal and response-oriented. If individual gifts are large, they may also be motivated, at least in part, by tax incentives.

Gifts can also reflect concern for the larger Native community. For instance, Native folk singer Buffy Saint Marie founded the Nihewan Foundation, a private foundation, to provide Native youth with scholarships. By dedicating a percentage of her entertainment earnings to the foundation, Ms. Saint Marie established a means of providing for Native students in need.

Individual donor gifts often take the form of both time and committed dollars. Native American people give back to their reservation or community to make a difference in the lives of their people. Their gifts vary widely, but as with many other communities, giving increases, often significantly, when an individual is involved directly in a particular organization or cause, or knows the people involved.

In-kind contributions are also important, and are highly valued symbols of support among Native people. This is evident in the example of noted Native artist Sam English, who donated a painting to a benefit in honor of Wilma Mankiller, former Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma. Proceeds from the posters produced from the painting went towards a foundation endowment; in this way the artist offered his work to Native causes as a fundraising strategy.
Native Nonprofits & Tribal Philanthropic Organizations

Nonprofit organizations are another important vehicle for Native philanthropy. In recent times, reservation-based and other nonprofit organizations have been created to provide support for community needs. Initially, in many cases, funds for these nonprofits have been raised from state and federal governments, and more recently from tribal and private sources. Several organizations have evolved from service-provision operating institutions to regranting organizations and community development programs. Whatever their formal, legal classification, most, like The Hopi Foundation, First Nations Development Institute, and the Haskell Foundation, as well as the Cow Creek/Seven Feathers Foundation (Oregon) and the Chickasaw Foundation (Oklahoma) are community-, issue- or institution-based organizations.  

Many of the nonprofit, tribally incorporated funds are new, most having been developed since the 1980s. These include regranting funds, service organizations, community foundations, tribal foundations, and tribal college foundations, in addition to work place or alternative giving programs. Many of these funds provide support for scholarships, technical assistance, the development of assets (human, economic, and environmental), and capacity building, as well as cultural preservation.

The regranting of funds has for the most part developed from the need to provide a source of culturally relevant and accessible funding for grassroots organizations, as well as for tribes in more remote areas. Although they differ in focus and interests, existing regranting organizations are committed not only to remaining flexible and interactive, but also to using philanthropy to foster change or empower creativity.

Two such funds are First Nations Development Institute and The Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development. First Nations Development Institute, founded in 1980, established the Eagle Staff Fund in 1994: awarding 194 grants totalling over $7.1 million. Through grants, loans, and technical assistance that incorporate cultural values, First Nations helps address community needs through self-determination. The Seventh Generation Fund, begun in 1984, has an accumulated endowment of over $360,000, and is an intermediary fund dedicated to promoting and maintaining the uniqueness of Native people and nations. It offers training, grants, as well as management and technical support, while seeking to educate the non-Native community about Native traditions and cultures.
Tribally-based foundations are on the increase and represent an emerging grantmaking vehicle. They vary in size, structure and tax designation. Qualifying for tax exemption under section 501 (c) (3), many tribal foundations have been organized as nonprofit corporations under state law—so as to avoid potential conflict with tribal governments, or to attract private funding. In more recent years tribal nonprofit organizations have been incorporated under tribal law. In a general information letter issued in 1998 at the request of First Nations Development Institute, the IRS clarified that section 501 (c) (3) status can be attained by nonprofits incorporated under tribal as well as state law.\(^4\)

In addition, some tribes are choosing to use Section 7871 of the IRS tax code as a means of creating tribal foundations. The foundation must be structured as an “integral part” of the tribal government or of a political subdivision of one or more tribal governments. This necessarily involves a closer relationship between one or more tribal governments and the tribal foundation itself. Creating a tribal foundation that utilizes Section 7871 can assure donors that their contributions are tax deductible and private foundations that their grants are considered qualifying distributions.

Over the last decade, Native funds within community foundations have also increased. According to a Council on Foundations study, as of mid-1998, sixteen community foundations (housing thirty-three individual funds) held funds that were Native-initiated, Native-advised or Native-focused.\(^5\) For example, in Montana, New Mexico, Minnesota, and North Carolina, Native American communities have established a variety of funds which reflect their unique regional and cultural practices. Just one example, among many, is a community foundation in North Carolina which developed a relationship with a local tribe in which eight separate funds were established. Having a collective endowed value of $280,000, as of 1998, the foundation made small grants for a variety of local needs—from a kidney dialysis unit to the building of a traditional garden and picnic space in a local nursing home. The tribe’s commitment to education and elders has also meant support for scholarship and cemetery funds.\(^6\) Partnerships between community foundations and Indian tribes can involve some challenges stemming in part from differences in culture and communications, as well as from legal issues.
Tribal Giving Activities

On a tribal level, several vehicles other than tribal foundations serve as institutional conduits for giving. Since Indian tribes are responsible as nations for the welfare of their people and the condition of their territory, their giving has traditionally been community based. Tribal enterprises with the greatest economic resources tend to give on a scale ranging from $100,000 to $10 million. These tribal enterprises have also given more to national and international organizations, while elder councils have preferred giving to community/kin or relationship-based efforts. As discussed above (see Units 3 & 4), tribes generally give internally to education, health, and other services which benefit their members. Externally, contributions made outside the tribal community are made for a variety of reasons, including community, economic and political purposes.

Tribal enterprises are just beginning to develop partnerships with nonprofit organizations and to institute matching funding for projects and causes. Increasingly, they are making in-kind gifts and sponsoring various public or community events. Those tribes in a position to make substantial or regular donations fund a diverse portfolio that includes education, urban Indian affairs, programs or facilities for youth and elders, rehabilitation services, natural resources, arts, state and county projects, and national policy and legislative groups. Examples of donations are wide ranging: from $5,000 given by the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians to the University of Detroit's Mercy Indian Law Center for research on tribal legal issues, to a 20,000 square-foot facility for the Boys and Girls Club donated by the Tulalip Tribes of Washington state; from the more than $4 million given by the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians to various groups for the protection of tribal sovereignty, to the $7.6 million provided by the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe of Michigan in support of state roads, schools, fire and mental health services. Such donations represent a small fraction of the overall giving that occurs on a daily basis within Native communities across the United States.

Giving by tribes through their governmental units is another important philanthropic vehicle. Such governmental giving may be made through the tribal council, the council of elders, or the business council, or it may involve marketing or public relations offices. These giving activities tend to be relatively unstructured and reflect the values of the particular council, board or collective. A tribe is most likely to participate in giving
if a tribal chief, governor or chairperson is particularly inclined toward philanthropy. Tribal government giving is generally highly responsive to the needs or political concerns of the tribal members they represent.54

**Workplace Giving Programs**

Workplace giving has long been a means of giving for Native Americans as it has for others in the United States. However, unique to Native communities is the emergence of specifically tribal United Ways. Navajo Way, for example, was formed in the mid-1980s as a tribal affiliate of United Way of America. While similarly structured, Navajo Way is considered a combined vehicle for corporate, foundation, and individual support through both grants and personal contributions. Since its beginning, Navajo people have supported Navajo Way in its efforts to provide funding, technical assistance, and development for nonprofit organizations that serve their reservation. Navajo Way is responsive to its community's needs in ways that are culturally appropriate—grants are ongoing, for example, contributions are results-oriented and based on personal referrals, and, faced with limited local employment, giving is not limited to the workplace. At the same time that Navajo Way operates through committees and consensus and emphasizes “The Navajo Way” (a lifeway based on the four directions), it also works in partnership with other non-Native United Ways in neighboring areas to reach out to tribal members and nonprofits beyond its immediate area.55

**Endowments**

The Euro-American legal and fiscal concept of long-term endowments is sometimes unfamiliar to tribes who do not have a long history of institutional philanthropy and who traditionally have had to provide for the immediate needs of their members. Other conceptual and actual forms of endowments, however, have long been present in Native societies, particularly relating to the stewardship of natural resources and the care taken in planting seeds, the harvesting of plants, and the raising or use of animals for food.

Native communities are considering asset management strategies for attaining greater individual and tribal independence. Research conducted by the Council on Foundations has indicated that almost a quarter of the Native funds in their study are endowed to some extent, with assets ranging from $50,000 to $6 million in organizations such as
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The Hopi Foundation, the Native American Rights Fund, and the Two Feathers Fund of the St. Paul Foundation, among others.  

**Intertribal Consortia**

Giving through intertribal consortia is a relatively new vehicle attracting increasing support, especially where a large tribal presence coexists with a concentration of wealth from tribal, other commercial enterprise, or the settlement of claims. Intertribal networks tend, for example, to be service oriented and have boards comprised of tribal leaders, each with their own constituencies. They often are founded with Native financial and organizational support, and expand to include non-Native resources. One such example is the Michigan Native American Foundation, which helps to develop innovative programs for youth and elders, to encourage leadership development, as well as to distribute funds to tribes and Native organizations in and around Sault Ste. Marie. In the mid-1990s, W.K. Kellogg posed an endowment-building challenge to the Intertribal Council of Michigan; seven tribal governments originally joined to meet the match, joined by three others in 1998. The Michigan Native American Foundation was formed; but without the aid of full-time staff, and only a modest endowment, its resources as of 1999 allowed for only nominal grants to be made for special needs.

**Alaska Native Foundations**

In 1971, national legislation established 12 Alaska Native corporations within traditional Native regions of the state, as well as one for non-resident Alaska Natives. Institutional philanthropy is relatively new among Alaska Natives. Some Alaska Native corporations formed foundations with the support of their corporate sponsors. These foundations were generally formed in connection with regional corporations, but can also trace their roots to the participation of Native populations with local mainstream charities.

Although these foundations were originally intended to attract external funding for their programs in Native communities, many foundation officials have come to realize that such resources are not readily available in many of Alaska’s more remote regions. In such cases, regional corporate sponsors have continued to provide or raise private funds to endow their foundations. In addition, the foundations have expanded their original focus on health and social services by adding cultural preservation and other community interests.
The corporate sponsors of these foundations tend to work closely with tribal communities. In one Alaska Native community, for example, a foundation was formed under the tribe's corporate bylaws (the product of the 1971 Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, which required village or regional corporations to consider the social welfare of their members). The foundation which resulted has an endowment that grew from $500,000 to $10 million between 1987 and 1997. In several other cases, Alaska Native regional corporations expanded their programs beyond nonprofit foundations to include their own corporate giving programs. These programs have tended to focus on broad community activities, including gifts to support cultural heritage organizations, the Boy Scouts, and the Salvation Army, among others.

**Tribal Colleges**

Tribal colleges are another example of endowment building in Native communities. Over half of the tribal colleges have endowments similar in structure to those of their mainstream counterparts, but limited in size and fundraising capabilities. There are currently thirty tribal colleges in the United States, for example, but only a few are economically stable. In cases where economic resources allow a tribe to make substantial contributions to higher education, like the Menominee of Wisconsin who contributed upwards of $2 million to establish the College of the Menominee Nation, the amounts available remain far short of what is needed to ensure the viability of the institution.

Matching grants under Title III of the Higher Education Act and the Tribally Controlled Community Colleges Act, both federally administered, have encouraged the establishment of endowments as part of their matching grants programs. Yet with endowments ranging from less than $1 million to under $10 million, they remain inadequate to the needs of the institutions. Nevertheless, tribal college foundations are increasing and, together with endowments and grantmaking programs, reflect growing interest in, and potential for, meeting the long-term needs of Native higher education.

**Native Service Organizations**

Native service organizations are similarly working to build endowments, and are seeking support from a variety of sources including both tribal and non-Native contributors. Endowment building is, by definition, a long-term undertaking that requires organizational capacity and
maturity. At present, most Native organizations, lacking adequate skill and capital, use endowment income mainly for operations and programs, as well as the unanticipated needs of their constituents and members. Native organizations, which tend to focus on program support, will have to extend their reach for endowments beyond their personal connections. In addition, foundations and other Native nonprofit organizations will need to change a widely-held perception equating endowments with large gifts and one-time allocations, both of which are relatively hard to come by, particularly in Native America. For instance, smaller, longer-term contributions to build endowments over ten years may be more akin to the current giving patterns of Indian people. Education and new experiences will be needed if endowment building within Native institutions is to continue to take root and grow.

Whether by sophisticated endowments, basic philanthropic organizations, or the many other vehicles for giving reviewed in this curriculum, Native involvement in philanthropy will provide Native people with the opportunity to:

• enhance cultural awareness and understanding of different indigenous traditions and practices;
• leverage new resources for community building in Native communities;
• illustrate the values inherent in Native American creativity and generosity; and
• promote greater self-determination and independence.

By combining traditions of giving, Native people are adapting some institutional forms of philanthropy, and blending them with unique culturally relevant structures and processes. As with many Native American asset-building efforts, Native people “walk between two worlds,”61 taking what they need, and leaving the rest; using the “tools” of Euro-American philanthropic structures to strengthen Native culture, society, and values.
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Further Information

Organizational Contacts

American Indian Business Leaders
Gallagher Business Building
Suite 257
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812-0001
406-243-0211
http://www.umt.edu/trio/aibl/hpaibl.htm

American Indian College Fund
1111 Osage Street
Building D, Suite 205A
Denver, CO 80204-3400
303-426-8900
http://www.collegefund.org/students.htm

Arizona Community Foundation
2122 East Highland, Suite 400
Phoenix, AZ 85016
602-381-1400 or 800-222-8221
FAX 602-381-1575
http://www.azfoundation.com

Center for the Study of Philanthropy
The Graduate School and University Center
The City University of New York
365 Fifth Ave., Room 5116
New York, NY 10016-4309
212-817-2010
http://www.philanthropy.org

Council on Foundations
1828 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-466-6512
http://www.cof.org
First Nations Development Institute
The Stores Building
11917 Main Street
Fredericksburg, VA 22408
540-371-5615
http://www.firstnations.org

The Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017
http://www.fordfound.org

Forum of Regional Association of Grantmakers
1828 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-466-6752
http://www.rag.org

Hopi Foundation
P.O. Box 705
Hotevilla, AZ 86030
520-734-2380
http://www.hopifoundation.org

Indiana University
Center on Philanthropy
550 West North Street
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317-274-4200
http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu

Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.
2214 North Central Avenue, Suite 100
Phoenix, AZ 85004
602-258-4822
http://www.itcaonline.com

W.K. Kellogg Foundation
One Michigan Avenue East
Battle Creek, MI 49017-4058
http://www.wkkf.org
National Charities Information Bureau
19 Union Square West
New York, NY 10003
212-929-6300
http://www.give.org

National Center for Family Philanthropy
1220 19th Street, NW, Suite 804
Washington, DC 20036
202-293-3424
http://www.ncfp.org

National Committee on Planned Giving
310 Alabama Street
Suite 210
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-269-6274
http://www.ncpg.org

National Indian Gaming Association (NIGA)
224 Second Street SE
Washington, DC 20003
202-546-7711, 800-286-6442
http://www.indiangaming.org

Native American Rights Fund
1506 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80203
303-447-8760
http://www.narf.org

Native Americans in Philanthropy
PO Drawer 1429
Lumberton, NC 28359
910-618-9749
http://www.nativephilanthropy.org

The David and Lucille Packard Foundation
300 Second Street
Los Altos, CA 94022
http://www.packfound.org
Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development
P.O. Box 4569
Arcata, CA 95518
707-825-7640
http://www.honorearth.com/sgf

Two Feathers Fund
of the Saint Paul Foundation
600 Norwest Center
Saint Paul, MN 55101
651-224-5463
http://twofeathers.org
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Adamson examines funding dynamics of foundations. She asserts that grant categories are not developed in conjunction with a cross-section of a community’s resources, principles, and social relationships, particularly in Native communities. She cites the Eagle Staff Fund, a grantmaking fund of the First Nations Development Institute, as a response to the needs and interests of Native communities. This fund, according to Adamson, not only allows the process of grantmaking to be more reflective of traditional means of decision making, but also empowers the spirit of giving as a “means of helping out”.


The historic trends in Native American philanthropy, as well as the systemic barriers and the cultural obstacles to effective Native American grantmaking are discussed in this article. Adamson chronicles the Native American philanthropic eras (missionary, chief making, political leadership, issues and rights, institutional and self-sufficiency) that have preceded the current status of Indian giving.


In this article, the author addresses the belief that gaming enterprises have made the Native American population rich. Ambler maintains that fewer than one hundred tribes have benefitted from gaming enterprises. According to the author,
those who have been successful have been charitable and those in the community who have benefitted will do more if given the opportunity.


In this article, the author explores the barriers that have rendered traditional institutional philanthropy ineffective in Native America. She discusses the emergence of collaborative arrangements between foundations and Indian organizations as one way to eliminate barriers to successful economic and social growth. Ambler cites information gathered from five Indian organizations: First Nations Development Institute, Seventh Generation Fund, American Indian College Fund, Michigan Native American Foundation, and the Montana Community Foundation Project on the Blackfeet Reservation.


Marjane Ambler evaluates the pressure that new-found gaming wealth has placed upon the traditional view of generosity in Native America. She notes that monies from gaming are generally used for education and social needs of the tribes—i.e., public libraries and drug abuse facilities. Ambler concludes that Indian communities are considering more structured philanthropic endeavors such as creating tribal foundations and employee-giving programs.


This article offers an historical overview of Native American organizational development and fundraising, funding trends, and the future of philanthropy in Native communities. Chapman chronicles the rise and fall of Native American organizations, identifies Native-related causes that have been supported through the years, including self-determination, civil rights, education, and highlights particular tribes and organizations
with giving programs or endowments that support needs in Native communities.


This report is an in-depth analysis of the emerging field of Native philanthropy. Based on a survey of Native-run foundations and organizations that have grantmaking programs, Ewen and Wollock identify a growing number of entities with an interest in developing Native giving programs. The report describes the distribution of gaming revenues and grant allocations by subject area, and correlates giving to the wide-ranging needs in Native America.


This article outlines the giving philosophy of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation. With a general theme of generosity and self-sufficiency, the Mashantucket Pequots have given millions to raise the consciousness and to celebrate the unique heritage of Native peoples. This commitment has been carried out through grants to many organizations and causes, including the Smithsonian's National Museum of the Native American and the Special Olympics World Games. According to Barbara Hartwell, a former Tribal Council member of the Pequots, the tribe is in the process of creating more formalized funding guidelines and procedures for a national grantmaking program. The article concludes with a description of the Pequots' current funding process through the Tribal Elders Business Committee and the Tribal Council and the suggestion that other tribes considering a grant program should do so by infusing it with their own tribal values and vision.

This article describes the use of the Indian Tribal Governmental Tax Status Act (ITGTSA) as a means for tribes to receive tax deductions for contributions and bequests in the same way as a public charity. However, according to this article, most foundations are not as accustomed to dealing with Native tribes as they are with 501(c)(3) organizations. The main confusion seems to be that Native tribes establish their tax exempt status by submitting a request for a Revenue Ruling from the IRS. The article concludes by suggesting that Native tribes should be prepared to explain their standing as a tax exempt charitable entity under the ITGTSA so that a foundation can better understand the similarities between 501(c)(3) status and Native American tribal charitable organizations or governmental subdivisions.


The establishment of the Two Feathers Fund at the St. Paul Foundation in Minnesota is the focus of this article. Through a series of discussions with leaders of four minority groups, the St. Paul Foundation developed the Diversity Endowment Funds providing long-term funding to four minority groups. Each fund is responsible for minority recruitment, community outreach and input, building trust relationships, fundraising and grantmaking. The funds are intended to provide minorities with access to the philanthropic community.


In his thesis, Harmon examines the cultural and structural underpinnings of the American fundraising process, contrasting it with the social and economic norms of Native communities. Harmon asserts that American fundraising is a product of, and dependent on, the cultural norms of the Euro-American segment
of society and that these norms create obstacles for many Native American communities. Harmon suggests that traditional social systems may interfere with long-term collective fundraising. The difference, Harmon believes, lies in American fundraising's emphasis upon organization, information, causes, cases, campaigns, participation, legal obligations and ethics, while Native Americans focus on honor, sharing, ritualized reciprocity, community, and responsibility toward future generations. The ways in which Native people adapt the American model of fundraising to meet their needs are also discussed in this paper.


This overview of Indian tribes, their governance, values, unique identities and decision-making processes, is based on Harris and Wasilewski's experiences from years of work with tribal leaders and members. The authors examine: the core tribal values (being a good relative, inclusive sharing, individual contributions to the community, and non-coercive leadership); the family systems network; tribal governance work (societal regression, chronic anxiety, extinction, differentiation); and the complexities of perceptions of Indian tribes (transforming into nation-state societies, indigenous identities, relationship to non-Native peoples). The authors also discuss the unique elements of tribal communities, particularly tribal member responsibilities, ceremonial practices, the essence of economic development, the style and structure of tribal decision-making systems and the common values of giving and receiving in tribal communities (giving is not a form of charity).


This anthology of personal accounts of men and women of varied tribal affiliations chronicles the experiences and traditions of Native American families, sharing (or potlatches), education, resource development, childrearing, governmental operations, language, and other day-to-day activities of Native people on and off the reservation.

This overview of the value systems of Indian tribes stretches from the beginning of European contact to modern times. Kidwell suggests that gift giving was always a reciprocal exchange. As part of the exchange, gift giving ensures the circulation of resources among members of a group. The distribution of goods was the norm. Indian tribes often distributed possessions of deceased persons to the community and personal property was not generally inherited, but communally owned. Although many Indian tribes were deeply affected by European colonization, most indigenous communities retained their values of reciprocity and exchange, particularly in the Northwest Coast with potlatches, or other areas where they have giveaways or feasts.


In this article, Kidwell examines the origins of the term “Indian Giver” from the tradition of gift giving to its modern pejorative connotation of “to give in order to get back.” Kidwell sheds light on the importance of generosity and sharing in the Native tribal culture. By outlining some of the key expressions of exchange, notably, the giveaway and potlatch, she asserts that Native Americans were traditionally suspicious of the accumulation of wealth and sought to disperse or destroy personal property upon the death of its owner or to redistribute it to those in need. Modern variations of these traditions were broken down as a result of European colonization and the disintegration of the family. Some age-old practices have carried on, particularly in the Plains and the Northwest coastal tribes. These practices illustrate the differing forms of philanthropy in Native America, from a reciprocity that ensures the giver social recognition and acknowledges the receiver as a person of wealth, to an entire community enjoying a gift for supporting the accomplishments of an individual.

In this exploration of the role of women in Native communities of Canada and the United States, LaDuke asserts that women are central to traditional ways of life, to indigenous economic power, and to the resistance of so many Native peoples to large-scale development projects. In addition, women tend to be ardent defenders of their communities and their traditional economic structures. In this vein, women have sought to maintain the agricultural, harvesting, and spiritual institutions of their communities. As part of this resistance to change, many women have preferred their subsistence economies, that are, minobimaatisiwin, a way of life. LaDuke suggests that it is the women who retain authority over traditional modes of exchange, family and community values, such as potlatches, giveaways and ceremonies that display respect for generosity much of which is undermined by progressive development activities.


This report provides an overview of foundation grantmaking to Native American organizations between 1991-1993. It reviews current statistics for, and patterns of giving to, Native Americans in the United States. The report contains some general recommendations and findings, including: approximately two-thirds of one percent of all foundation grant dollars were awarded to Native Americans between 1991 and 1993; the average grant size for Native Americans was $64,000 between 1991 and 1993; and the geographic disparity of grant awards is wide—nearly all grant money was awarded to organizations in only twenty states. The author recommended an increase in philanthropic funding to Native concerns and Native-controlled groups, along with further research to clarify the patterns of giving to Native issues and projects.

This historical assessment of the development of Native American voluntary associations within the context of American history suggests that Native peoples are increasingly utilizing organizational mechanisms inherent in their group structure as a form of association. Initially, nontribal Native organizations consisted of benevolent bodies managed by whites to promote peace and inculcate an Anglo-Saxon value system. From these organizations came more activist groups led by Native people to provide a range of resources and services to the broader Native American community. Over time, the roles and functions of these more activist organizations changed as the larger society evolved from a nation that venerated a common unified tradition to one that acknowledged the importance of cultural diversity. La Potin notes that over time such changes have caused much discontent.


This study guide synthesizes knowledge about fundraising into a coherent learning tool that is targeted for the Native American audience. Sections of the guide correspond to a five-day course that builds on the original curriculum of the Fund Raising School at Indiana University, which was conceived by Henry Russo, Lyle Cook, and Joseph Mixer. The writers of this guide, Debra Harry and Ron Wells, provide information on the philanthropic traditions in the United States and in Native America, the context for Native development, fundraising cycle, organizational readiness and models of nonprofit entities.

This manual provides legal and administrative information on the giving and fundraising practices of Indian tribes. Current laws (tribal, state, and federal) and regulations are examined regarding exempt organizations, compliance and governance issues affecting the development of charitable vehicles (tribal and non-tribally based) in Native America. The manual includes an overview of the unique traditions of indigenous giving and receiving, offers profiles of funding options and suggests ways to enhance existing charitable activities.


The authors describe the traditional economic and cultural aspects of giving in Native American life. Giving and other redistribution of wealth practices were always an integral part of the tribal system. Explored in this article are: the cultural relevance of giveaways, current giving patterns, the role of tribal governments in meeting community needs through institutional giving, and the establishment of Native American giving programs and foundations. A model for Native giving that allows tribes to control and track their giving through a community based or reservation based foundation is also provided.


This report summarizes the issues addressed at the American Indian Research and Policy Institute’s 1994 Forum. The discussion includes viewpoints from four partners in philanthropy: tribes/casinos; Native American organizations; state and local policymakers; and foundations. Issues addressed include philanthropy as understood in Native America, pluralism and philanthropy, the emerging role of casinos and misinformation regarding the legal and sovereign status of Native American casinos.

This article profiles Rebecca Adamson, the founder of First Nations Development Institute, and describes the focus, mission, and program activities of First Nations Development Institute. Ms. Adamson contends that economic development is one way to self-determination and independence in Native America.


This is a discussion of the challenges of new wealth in Native communities. Along with upgraded accounting, financial, personnel and other infrastructure systems, Stevenson suggests that Indian tribes develop an investment strategy to safeguard their financial resources. Such an investment plan might include assessing the community’s needs and developing a program plan with a budget to meet those needs. Each tribe will need to decide the composition of its investment equities, bonds, Treasury securities, stocks, etc. and assess potential risks. Also provided is an overview of the investment process, from managers and different policies to adapting strategies to tribal communities.


In this analysis of the fundraising process as seen through the eyes of Native peoples, Thorpe suggests that foundations, churches, corporations, and individual donors become confused when considering grantmaking for Native American projects. It is particularly difficult for Native people to convey their message because they are unique in their social, cultural, governmental, spiritual, and economic systems. Thorpe asserts that most funds that flow into Indian reservations are federal and that most private funds have gone to large, national Indian organizations. Most Native American people are not trained in grantsmanship, fundraising, and strategic planning. In addition, grantmakers tend to view Native American proposals as a funding classification, rather than working across many grantmaking
priorities. The Seventh Generation Fund which honors the traditional values of sharing, community participation, and a sense of responsibility to the future of all Indians is described as an example of a culturally relevant Native grantmaking organization. In conclusion, Thorpe suggests that many challenges lie ahead for Native philanthropy, particularly the problem of undercapitalization of private resources to rebuild Native American communities.


This book outlines the needs and challenges of maintaining and passing on traditional Native cultures. Thorpe argues that the continuation of Native ways of life depends on the renewal of the Native world-views distinct in traditional culture, spirituality, economics, and government, and she suggests that philanthropic support is critical to revitalizing Native communities and providing the stimulus for growth and prosperity. These points are illustrated through descriptions of projects, organizations, and foundations that encourage Native traditions.


This book traces contributions made by Native Americans to the current system in the U.S. of government, medicine, agriculture, and ecology. Weatherford asserts that Indians created a sophisticated urban trading economy when they unearthed large quantities of gold and silver. In the area of food distribution, the Indians were purveyors of sustenance for other Americans, providing foods they discovered such as potatoes, chocolate, chillies and other spices that revolutionized cuisines of Europe and Asia. More than 60 percent of the world’s food was first harvested by the Indians of the Americas and shared with those around them. Weatherford concludes that the cultural, social, and political practices of Indians transformed life beyond their own domains.

This book examines how Native People transformed foreigners into “Americans” and grafted European society onto an ancient heritage. Weatherford states that it is the ancient heritage of Indian tribes that has allowed trade, language and culture to evolve into the modern society. Thus, Native Americans have played an enormous role in transforming cultures through their way of life, their attitudes and values, the types of food eaten and clothes worn, and the institutions established in their communities. Taken together, the Native ways have not only been preserved, they have been woven into American economic, political, and social life.


Wells explores the ways, means, and meanings of philanthropic giving across more than a dozen indigenous cultures in North America. Through a series of interviews, Wells captures the voices of individuals from thirteen Native communities, portrayed through the style of a traditional “Talking Circle,” a process to gain truth of the Native experience. In this small volume, Wells discusses the “truth of the Native experience with regard to giving.”


This book describes the economic development history of four tribes: the Passamaquoddy of Maine, the Ak-Chin of Arizona, the Mississippi Choctaw, and the Warm Springs Confederation of Oregon. White traces the emergence of commercial activities in these tribes and examines how such activities made a difference in the lives of Native Americans. He focuses on the four tribes in order to illustrate how Indian self-determination helped to solve social and health problems, economic concerns, as well as issues concerning the convergence of tradition and society. The author also describes fundraising and partnership strategies—mainly governmental—and internal charitable distributions.
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Contributors

REBECCA L. ADAMSON

Rebecca Adamson, a Cherokee, is Founder and President of First Nations Development Institute. She has worked directly with grassroots tribal communities, and nationally as an advocate of local tribal issues for over 24 years. Her work established a new field of values-driven development which created: the first reservation-based micro-loan fund in the United States; the first tribal investment model; a national movement for reservation land reform; and legislation that established new standards of accountability regarding federal trust responsibility for Native Americans.

Ms. Adamson holds a Masters in Science in Economic Development from New Hampshire College in Manchester, New Hampshire, where she also teaches a graduate course on Indigenous Economics within the Community Economic Development Program. Ms. Adamson is on the Board of Directors for the Calvert Social Investment Fund, the Corporation for Enterprise Development, and the Council on Foundations, among others. She was a founding member of Native Americans in Philanthropy. She has served on the President's Council on Sustainable Development/Sustainable Communities Task Force, as an advisor to the International Labor Organization for International Indigenous Rights, and as a consultant for the OECD to Australia on Aboriginal development. Her many honors include the 1996 Robert W. Scrivner Award from the Council on Foundations for creative and effective grantmaking, and the National Center for American Indian Enterprise Development's 1996 Jay Silverheels Award. She was named by Ms. Magazine as one of their seven 'Women of the Year' (1997), and in 1998 was named a Social Entrepreneur of the Year by Who Cares magazine. She serves on the Editorial Board of Native Americas magazine and is a writer for a regular column on Alternative Economics for Indian Country Today newspaper.
MINDY L. BERRY

Mindy Berry is a senior consultant with The Alford Group, a consulting firm that offers strategic organizational and fund development advice to the nonprofit sector. Prior to the Alford Group, she headed her own firm, Berry & Associates, which provided consulting and project management services to the Council on Foundations, large and small foundations, educational institutions and think tanks. Before that, Ms. Berry served in two federal government posts in the Bush Administration—as an Intergovernmental Affairs Officer in the Office of the Secretary of Labor, and as Senior Policy Analyst in the Office of the Chairman at the National Endowment for the Arts. Her experience in the public and nonprofit sectors includes research, teaching, and Board service in such organizations as INDEPENDENT SECTOR, Georgetown University, the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Washington Child Development Council, among others. Ms. Berry holds a Masters Degree in Public Policy, with a concentration in economics from Georgetown University, and has carried out academic work in international law and economics at the London School of Economics and Political Science (England). She has undertaken a series of projects on Native American issues for the Council on Foundations, and most recently is author of “Native-American Philanthropy: Expanding Social Participation and Self-Determination” in Cultures of Caring: Philanthropy in Diverse American Communities, pp. 29-105 (Washington, DC: Council on Foundations, 1999).
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NOTES
Center for the Study of Philanthropy

Founded in September 1986 at The Graduate School and University Center of The City University of New York, Center for the Study of Philanthropy focuses attention on giving, voluntarism, and nonprofit entrepreneurship by individual donors, foundations, and corporations in the United States and around the world.

The focus of the Center’s work is to broaden the pool of scholars engaged in the study of giving and voluntarism, to increase the opportunities for collaboration with practitioners in the field, and to enhance public awareness of philanthropic trends through a varied format of seminars, symposia, conferences, courses, research projects, awards, and publications.

First Nations Development Institute

Founded in 1980, First Nations Development Institute is a nonprofit organization committed to helping Native Americans develop the capacity to control, manage, and expand Tribal assets.

Through programs which strengthen Native American human and financial capital, First Nations mobilizes culturally appropriate economic development that begins with Native communities. Creative grantmaking supports social reform, cultural viability, and entrepreneurial activities. First Nations’ Native Assets Research Center engages in economic and policy research that enhances tribal control of community assets. NARC’s work includes Strengthening Native American Philanthropy, an initiative which promotes control of tribal assets through the creation of tribal and family foundations, Native-initiated community foundations, and endowments.