ONE WORD, MANY WORLDS: THE MULTIVOCALITY OF "SUBSISTENCE"

Susanna Gartler
University of Vienna, Universitätsstrasse 7, 1010 Vienna, Austria; susanna.gartler@univie.ac.at

ABSTRACT

In Alaska, subsistence is at the center stage of a political debate about resource use and management among different sectors of society. In the German-speaking area, *subsistence* denotes unpaid activities in general and usually refers to small-scale agriculture and/or care and house labor. *Self*-provision is emphasized as a central characteristic. In English, however, the term refers to general provision, and especially the ways of acquiring food, or to satisfy basic needs. By being employed in multivocal discussions, subsistence has become a homonym, meaning different things depending on where and how it is employed. Even so, the uses overlap and correlate: most of the time, subsistence refers to provision by and for humans. Alaska Native ways of framing the term expand these notions to include animals and the immaterial world, making it a related albeit somewhat different concept. Such differences become apparent when comparing dissimilar uses and conceptualizations of the term. This article provides an overview of worldwide debates, a subject analysis of subsistence, and identifies four biases associated with the term: a *gender*, a *spatial*, an *ethnic,* and an *economistic* bias.

. . . not only does subsistence mean different things to different people but it also means different things to the same people at different times. (Hensel 1996:82)

What do hunting and fishing, washing dishes and ironing, small-scale agriculture and urban gardening (see Fig. 1), and theater groups and drum circles have in common? The answer is simple: they all have been framed at some point in history as subsistence.[1] The wide variety of meanings or quasi-homonymity of the term is intriguing and calls for a systematic analysis. Subsistence is not only a key term of economic anthropology; it is widely used in a range of publications spanning, amongst others, feminist economics, hunter-gatherer studies, and urban studies. Moreover, it plays a key role in discussions of indigenous lifestyles and economies in Alaska. Instead of focusing on policy aspects or subsistence practices, this article looks at the term itself and how it is used by different actors. A glance at the discursive space reveals several individual and collective entities employing the term, including international, Native, non-Native, and state organizations, billboards, T-shirts sporting the slogan "Alaska Subsistence" in large letters, and anthropological and legal texts. These actors are part of the field within which the "divergent and emotionally charged" (Vanek 2010:3) meanings of subsistence are negotiated.

In the 1980s, Native voices in Alaska claimed subsistence in accordance with their worldview to denote their way of life: "Subsistence to us . . . is our spiritual way of life,

Figure 1. Public garden in Nome, Alaska, May 2015. Photograph © Susanna Gartler.

our culture" (Gladys Derendoff in Huslia, cited in Berger 1985:48). Natcher explains how the scientific community understands the term:

> Today, as in the past, Aboriginal peoples from across the North harvest, process, distribute, and consume considerable volumes of wild foods annually. Collectively, these activities have come to be known as "subsistence" and together comprise an essential component of northern Aboriginal cultures (Thornton 1998). Subsistence has been defined as the local production and distribution of goods and services (Lonner 1980) where the objective is not total self-sufficiency nor capital accumulation but rather a continuous flow of goods and services (Sahlins 1971). Marks (1977) extends this definition by noting that subsistence, as a specialized mode of production and exchange, also entails the transmission of social norms and cultural values; or what Neale (1971) refers to as the psychic income or nonmonetary awards of wildlife harvesting. Participation in subsistence activities is fundament in maintaining the social vitality. (2009:85)

Kishigami (2000:172) identifies "sharing," "kinship and hunting partnerships," and "indigenous knowledge, worldviews and ethno-technology" as forming part of this socioeconomic system. Acknowledging the multivocality of terms in general, Hensel (1996:82) remarks, "There are always multiple meanings attached to any action or utterance," adding, "Like any other pervasive form of practice, the meaning of subsistence is highly context-dependent." He points to the role of Alaska (Native) subsistence for identity formation and social networks: "A father and a son checking their fishnet together may be validating their native identity and maintaining age-old ties with the land. . . . The father may also be serving as a gender role model for the son, and strengthening family ties" (Hensel 1996:82). Emphasizing the cultural significance for Alaska Natives throughout their contribution, Holen and his colleagues state:

> Subsistence in Alaska is a broad ranging category that refers to both a management regime and a way of life that is meaningful to residents of rural Alaskan communities. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence defines subsistence as the customary and traditional uses of wild resource for food, clothing, fuel, transportation, construction, art, crafts, sharing, and customary trade. In sum any wild resource for human use is considered subsistence. (2015:90)

Feminist scholars in the German-speaking area use the term subsistence to denote unpaid housework or small-scale agriculture in Third World countries (see, for example, Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies 1997; von Werlhof et al. 2001). Dahm and Scherhorn (2008) include informally organized self-help, child care, and artists groups in large urban centers.[2] This large scope of meanings tempts the author to think of *subsistences*, rather than subsistence in the singular form. Indeed, the term has many lives: not only can it denote a wide variety of activities, but those practices are evaluated in different ways by different actors at different times. Sahlins (2004 [1972]:2), for example, describes the majority view on foraging within the anthropological canon in the 1970s as such: "'Mere subsistence economy' . . . 'incessant quest for food' . . . 'absence of economic surplus' . . . so runs the fair average anthropological opinion of hunting and gathering." Under the heading "subsistence," he writes: "When Herskovits was writing his *Economic Anthropology* (1958), it was common anthropological practice to take the Bushmen or the native Australians as 'a classic illustration of a people whose economic resources are of the scantiest'" (Sahlins 2004 [1972]:14).

Methodologically, this paper aims to analyze such "materially heterogeneous relations . . . with semiotic tools" (Law 2009:144). The first part provides a subject analysis of the term, its history, and its semantic field; looks at dictionary definitions; and explains differences in German- and English-language use. The second part highlights the Alaskan debate to underline the special connotation of subsistence in the region. On a theoretical level, this article aims to provide tools for comparing different uses of the concept. Key findings already developed in the author's master's thesis include the identification of specific gender, spatial, ethnic, and economic biases associated with subsistence. Further, the author (Gartler 2013) developed five dimensions of meaning along which conflicting versions of the term can be categorized (see Table 1). An anthropological challenge of today is to think of other ways of describing and contextualizing ontologies and ways of seeing the world that may be radically different from what one knows from one's own experience (Blaser 2010; Viveiros de Castro and Skafish 2014; Viveiros de Castro and Wagner 2016). An important part of this endeavor is to think closely about the terms we deploy, to what means, and by whom. Since subsistence plays an important role not only in Alaskan discussions of indigenous ontologies, state relations, and resource management, but also within feminist debates

Table 1. Dimensions of meaning of subsistence.

Dimensions of Meaning	Poles	
Variability	Static	Dynamic
Categories of exclusion and inclusion	Restrictive	Broad
Disciplinarity	Minimalistic/fragmented	Inclusive
Im-/materiality	Material	Immaterial/symbolic
Situativity	Ahistorical	Contextual
	Short-term	Long-term
	Tempocentric	Transgenerational

about care and labor—as well as discussions surrounding forms of urban provisioning—it makes sense to examine it more closely and shed light on its idiosyncrasies.

METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

There are not many precedents for what this article attempts to do. Terms and concepts have of course been critically reviewed and appraised in a number of anthropological texts,[3] but the approach of this paper is innovative in that it places the concept itself at the center and shows how the term is shaping people's lives via its signification. One of the main challenges was to develop methods for this rather unusual endeavor. Actor-network theory, subject analysis, and grounded theory guided this analysis of the agency and scope of the term.[4] According to Law (2009), Actor-network theory is more a method than a theory and relies on the idea of radical relationality, meaning that all natural and social phenomena are a "continuously generated effect of the webs of relations within which they are located" (Law 2009:141). It studies the enactments of materially and discursively heterogeneous relations between all kinds of actors: objects, subjects, human beings, machines, animals, nature ideas, organizations, scales, sizes, geographical arrangements. Here, this list is expanded to include terms and concepts such as subsistence.

Law's fourth qualification of actor-network theory tells us that texts tell stories about particular relations and are themselves relational (Law 2009:142). Expanding on this notion, the author argues that since texts and speech are made up of words, the way the latter are put in relation to each other determines what kind of stories the former tell. Such a relational approach exposes debates surrounding subsistence as part of historically grown discursive assemblages of agentive actors. There is the term, and then there are its speakers and writers—all of whom exert agency to some extent. While it is commonly recognized that humans (as speakers and writers) exert agency, this is not so clear when it comes to a concept or word. The written or spoken word is agentive only via its signification—that is, the meaning that the term regularly conveys or is intended to convey. This paper thus combines the idea of relationality with the concept of multivocality. Multivocality can be employed when discussing the nature of texts and their meanings as well as terms. The concept stipulates that meaning is not static or fixed, and instead is constructed by actors who reside within particular ideological, historical, and social fields. Building on the concept of multivocality developed by Bakhtin (1981), Smith (2004:254) notes that any discourse on a particular subject will "contain multiple perspectives and voices." The way meaning is constructed is determined by the positionality of the actors who employ the term.[5]

At the same time, a critical stance towards the term's heterogeneity and pluralistic use is maintained. This is important also for the concept of polyvocality: stemming from postmodern and postcolonial thought, polyvocality is used to describe a situation where multiple voices represent multiple viewpoints and discourses coexisting without privileging one voice over the other. Raju (2009:265) contrasts this style to a "monovocal" style of narration "wherein the singular voice not only subsumes but also overrides and subordinates other voices . . . concealing . . . diverse and conflicting voices and realities." The concepts of poly- and monovocality deal with questions of representation and subalternity. In a way, the subsistence debate is monovocal, where one (purely economic) definition tries to override other, especially Alaska Native and feminist, understandings. Indigenous voices as well as feminist scholars and urban subsistence activists point out power asymmetries associated with the use of the term. This approach is a significant improvement to the rather dry tools of subject analysis, which are discussed in the following section, along with some information on the history of the term, an analysis of its dimensions of meaning, and a semantic field analysis.

SUBJECT ANALYSIS[6]

subsistence (n.)
early 15c., "existence, independence," from Late Latin subsistentia *"substance, reality," in Medieval Latin also "stability," from Latin* subsistens*, present participle of* subsistere *"stand still or firm" (see subsist). Latin* subsistentia *is a loan-translation of Greek* hypostasis *"foundation, substance, real nature, subject matter; that which settles at the bottom, sediment," literally "anything set under." (Etymonline—Online Etymology Dictionary 2017).*

The Latin word *subsist* means "to stand still," "to stay," "to resist," "to be based upon." In antique philosophy and theology, it depicts "the act of existing through one's own self." Thieme (2010:3ff.) considers Aristotle (384–322 BC) to be the first to have used the term. Following Aristotle, various scholars discussed the term in the first one and a half millennia of the Common Era—for example, Marius Victorinus (AD 281–363), Gilbert von Poiters (AD 1080–1145) and Thomas von Aquin (AD 1225–1274). More recently, between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, philosophers such as Descartes, Leibnitz, and Kant engaged subsistence in debates concerning "existence," substance," and "independence/autonomy" (Thieme 2010:7). The economic connotation emerged during the twentieth century, when the term started to be employed by the social sciences and humanities to stand for the "material basis of life" or "material existence" (Dudenverlag 2001:958). In Alaska today, subsistence is first and foremost a legal term (Fall 1990; Vanek 2010). Other scholars have dealt with subsistence *rights* (Angus 2001; Ingram 2009; Thieme 2012), and Scott (1976) discusses "subsistence ethic" as a "right to subsistence" (see Table 2).

While there are differences, German and English uses overlap. In German, *Subsistenz* is a foreign loan word and is part of a theoretical academic and philosophical discourse. Thus, its scope of meaning is in some ways broader than the English *subsistence*. In other ways, its scope is much narrower than in English, where the term is much more part of everyday language.[7] An analysis of numerous definitions in dictionaries, encyclopedias, and academic and literary texts points to the fact that in German, the autonomy of provision (self-provision) is highlighted.

Dictionaries have little to say about the subject. In English-language dictionaries, it usually denotes basic needs, especially food (Collin 2003; Jones 2001). The *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology* defines "basic subsistence" in a side note as "the provision of food, clothing, shelter" (Barnard and Spencer 2002:624). Even though the term has always been contested, according to Thieme (2010) sufficient overlap remains to justify its continued usage because, generally speaking, subsistence stands for *independent being* (*selbstständiges Für-Sich-Sein*). Variations in the meaning of subsistence can be understood in terms of five dimensions, which are discussed in the next section.

SEMANTIC FIELD AND FIVE DIMENSIONS OF MEANING

In order to understand differences between variations of subsistence, the author developed five dimensions of meanings: variability, categories of exclusion and inclusion, disciplinarity, im-/materiality, and situativity. Different versions of subsistence can be classified according to these dimensions and their corresponding poles (or somewhere along a continuum between these poles).

1. **Variability.** A static conceptualization correlates with romanticizing notions of "primitive" cultures and technologies and contains a technological bias—since technological innovation is generally linked to a dynamic modernity and not "retrogressive" subsistence.[8] Dynamic approaches highlight adaptability.
2. **Categories of inclusion and exclusion.** Restrictive definitions use self-sufficiency; they frame subsistence as a way of production devoid of market relations, with no surplus production as defining markers. Broader perspectives emphasize the role of exchange relations and overlap with the market.
3. **Disciplinarity.** Fragmented definitions underline economic aspects; others integrate social, cultural, political, and ecological features to some extent. Very inclusive definitions foreground the interaction and embeddedness of all these aspects.
4. **Im-/materiality.** Some sources (for example, many dictionary and encyclopedia definitions) emphasize material aspects such as material basic needs, the existential minimum, and material livelihood needs. Others include immaterial and symbolic aspects, such as the importance of stories and myths, spirituality, worldview, and relations to the environment, and/or define subsistence as a set of values.
5. **Situativity.** This function describes the temporal situativity of the use of the term. Three temporal perspectives can be distinguished: (1) ahistorical perspectives

versus ones that include the historical context; (2) perspectives that emphasize momentous, short-term survival versus long-term extended life as the primary goal; and (3) short-term tempocentric versus long-term transgenerational approaches.

These five dimensions of meaning allow a classification of variations of subsistence(s). Further, a systematization of the semantic field shows how different compounds of the term can be linked to various fields such as economy, culture, and rights (Table 2).

The next section takes a closer look at feminist debates and explains how the term is conceptualized when it comes to cities rather than rural areas.

THE FEMINIST DEBATE AND "URBAN SUBSISTENCE": THE GENDER AND SPATIAL BIAS

The material-Marxist *Bielefelder Subsistenzperspektive* engages subsistence to denote unpaid house and care labor, oftentimes (still) associated with femininity—such as child care, laundry, or house cleaning—as well as small-scale agricultural activities oriented towards autonomous provision and self-sufficiency. This approach highlights the unequal and gendered power relations that characterize the relationship between paid and unpaid work (see, for example, Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies 1997; von Werlhof et al. 2001). Whereas some ecofeminist authors tend to overemphasize the feminine nature of what they term subsistence, the perspective broadens our understanding of the relation between paid and unpaid work and ties together in one model (a) space (developed, developing, and underdeveloped countries; private and public); (b) time (history of colonialism and Western philosophy); and (c) gender (women's unpaid house and care labor). Anderson (2000:235) points out that the category subsistence plays a role in marginalizing fur-trapping and reindeer hunting "with respect to the national economy" in the North American Arctic—whereas in the former Soviet Union, hunters, fishermen and women, and reindeer herders held salaried positions. Being paid for subsistence activities is of course the exception rather than the rule, a fact that was intensely debated in the 1980s by the material-Marxist sociologists.

Hunt (2014:29) argues that "Processes and strategies of recognition are always pre-determined by political relations that reinforce state sovereignty and dominant power relations." This implies that even if hunting and fishing become recognized parts of indigenous economies and are valued as such, the political relations that predetermine them are biased in a gendered way towards masculine values and ideas. Therefore, only particular forms of "subsistence activities" that correspond to these values are recognized, ultimately reinforcing dominant views on gendered divisions of labor. Considering the example of Nunavut, Altamirano-Jiménez (2008:130f.) remarks that—for reasons that could be categorized as strategic essentialism—the image of the hunter was emphasized in indigenous struggles for self-representation: "Under the language of nationalism, Inuit tradition and culture were closely associated with the homeland and the hunter." She argues that this emphasis on "subsistence … under the nationalist language contributed to place women and women's activities in a less valued position." As a consequence, activities associated with femininity become rather undervalued, they are not seen as traditional, and their authenticity is questioned. According to her, the political discourse surrounding indigeneity and autonomy excludes such activities, and a masculine-nationalist, presumably neutral, point of view is adopted (Altamirano-Jiménez 2008:130f.).

By shedding light on such unequal gendered relations either between different forms of labor or within nation-building processes, feminist perspectives point towards the *gender* bias associated with certain types of subsistence. Note that this bias does not necessarily apply in the traditional Alaskan indigenous context. While there is a clear delineation in both Yup'ik and Dena'ina cultures between the roles and rights of men and women in their work and

Table 2. Systematization of the semantic field (s. stands for subsistence).

Values/culture	s. lifestyle, s. way of life, s. model, s. people, s. orientation, s. approach, s. notion
Economy	s. production, s. economy, s. realm
Agriculture	s. farms/farming, s. agriculture, s. crops, s. dairying
Rights	s. rights
Activities	s. practice, s. activity, s. work
Material basis of existence	s. wage, means of s., s. level, physiological s., s. use
Capability	s. capability

responsibilities (Holen 2011; see also, for example, chapter nine on "Men, Women, and Food: A Subsistence Way of Life" in Jolles 2002), the workload is traditionally shared on an egalitarian basis.

Dahm and Scherhorn (2008) in turn conducted extensive research in Berlin and Cologne, employing subsistence to denote activities such as urban gardening, thus contextualizing the term in postindustrialized large urban centers. By contrasting urban and rural "subsistence activities," the authors extend the meaning of the term to the provision of material and immaterial market-free goods and services. The role of the market is seen as subsidiary: in principle, "subsistence activities" are not for sale, but (in today's world) they (always) use marketed goods as support. According to Dahm and Scherhorn, subsistence always strives for independence of the monetarized sector, which may or may not entail a certain resistance towards the capitalist economy.[9] Dahm and Scherhorn extend the meaning of nonmonetary activities—or subsistence—in urban areas from pure provision of food, clothing, housing, and equipment to include the satisfaction of immaterial needs such as psychological self-help, child care, and so on. This is due to the fact that, according to the authors, in rural areas people's psychological needs are satisfied by the kin group and/or the community, whereas in cities and towns people rely on external structures to provide such services that cater to immaterial needs. Hence, due to infrastructural and organizational differences, provision in rural and urban areas must be organized in different ways, but the needs that are satisfied by "subsistence activities" are the same.[10] Applying the term to large urban conglomerations in Germany, concepts such as Bennholdt-Thomsen's (2003) "urban subsistence techniques" and Dahm and Scherhorn's (2008) "urban subsistence" deconstruct the connotation of subsistence with rurality: the *spatial* bias. Moreover, these approaches point towards another connotation: the understanding of subsistence as the economy of the others, or the *economistic bias* associated with the term.

ALASKA NATIVE VS. PURELY ECONOMIC OR "EUROPEAN" CONCEPTS: THE ECONOMISTIC BIAS

"The gulf between the native and nonnative definitions is profound" (Holthaus 2008:70).

In English-language use, subsistence is connected to notions of poverty and deprivation—what the author refers to as the economistic bias. The connotation becomes explicit when the *Dictionary of Economics* explains "subsistence level" and "wages" as: "The minimum level of consumption on which people can survive. . . . This is an ambiguous concept. . . . In any case subsistence level is well below what is regarded as a poverty line in modern societies. . . . In modern societies 'subsistence wages' is a term of abuse rather than a definite quantity" (Black 2002:451f.). Several authors point towards this negative connotation (Case 1998; Schweitzer et al. 2000; Wheeler and Thornton 2005). Former Gwich'in Grand Chief Clarence Alexander expressed his uneasiness with the term in an interview with Anderson (1998) for several reasons, including the negative connotation:

> Alexander: As long as you keep using the word subsistence I have a mental block. If you say "subsisting", the connotation of that word to me means that you are being a welfare recipient. It's interesting; you know it is a word we never ever heard growing up in school. I'd never seen it. But through my life somewhere along the line I heard about farmers in some part of the world being subsistence farmers. These farmers were being supplemented with tools or materials by the government in order to develop food for their livelihood. And I cannot figure out a way to fit that word into the world I come from. I don't think the word "subsistence" exists out here. I don't subsist. How can I? It is a word that was created to create animosity. . . . That is not what is going on here. There is no resource problem here. None. I was born into a heaven here! A heaven of its own! It's all there. (Clarence Alexander, quoted in Anderson 1998)

Kuokkanen (2011:218) underlines this statement: "For many, the term 'subsistence' carries negative connotations of primitive ways of life, a low standard of living, or 'eking out' a wretched existence in conditions of poverty. For others it refers to 'primitive' societies of the past or rural communities in the global South in need of so-called development." Natcher (2009:85) notes that the term *informal economy* has also been used to characterize subsistence activities. In fact, a review of the literature finds numerous terms that have been used to describe the harvesting activities of northern aboriginal peoples, including nonobserved, irregular, unofficial, hidden, shadow, nonstructured, and unorganized. However, by being characterized as unorganized or irregular, the subsistence economy has to some extent been stigmatized, with those participating in subsistence activities typified as nonprogressive, backward, and resistant to change (Reimer 2006)—images

that, in some circles, persist today. These characterizations have in turn invited ill-conceived policies derived from outdated theories of modernization that assume subsistence economies will be subsumed as development proceeds on national and global scales.

A number of World Bank publications exemplify this stigma. Seja (2013), for example, relates the term to low productivity while acknowledging a role for the economy of poorer countries: "In crude terms, subsistence entrepreneurs are solely concerned about their survival, and are tiny businesses and unlikely to grow or create new jobs. However, it needs to be said that they remain an important economic pillar, especially for developing countries" (Seja 2013). While acknowledging problems of such a definition in practice, Cadot et al. (2009:2)—in a paper published as part of a World Bank research program—equate "subsistence agriculture" with self-sufficiency:[11] "Conceptually, subsistence agriculture is easy to define, by analogy with self-sufficiency—a situation where the farm household neither sells nor buys, but consumes everything it produces and, consequently, only that." Schweitzer et al. (2000:6), amongst others, criticize this restrictive view: "This economic definition is in many ways inadequate in the contemporary world context. The vast majority of the world's population is involved at least to some degree in the cash economy. . . . Subsistence activities link people into a complex network of interactions, reciprocity and exchanges, some of which are culturally based and others of which are primarily economic in nature." Instead of self-sufficiency, they see subsistence (activities) as something inextricably linked to exchange of people, goods, ideas, etc., and explain how networks, rather than self-sufficiency or isolation, are a defining characteristic (see also Lee 2002).[12] Other World Bank publications include, for example, Suarez et al. (2008:3f.), who wish for "subsistence farmers" to gain monetary wealth: "For example, if they can implement sustainable, high-yield farming practices, farmers can increase production and accumulate wealth."

These examples serve to show variations in the use, valuation, and understanding of subsistence that ultimately stem from fundamentally different ways of seeing the world. The way Suarez et al. (2008) employ subsistence illustrates their desire to help farmers generate growth and accumulate wealth—and therefore at some point stop being "subsistence farmers" and become part of the capitalist economy. This is a rather static, restrictive, and ahistoric understanding of the term, focusing on material provision only and overcoming the supposedly lowest level of economic organization. This is not to say that the sociocultural values are always disregarded, as an undated annex regarding the "Economic Valuation of Subsistence Fisheries" shows: "Subsistence fisheries play vital roles in the lives of Pacific Island communities. Yet, because they are difficult to quantify, they are frequently underrated or absent from national statistics" (World Bank Group n.d.). This quote also speaks to the endeavors of state and supra-state organizations to quantify subsistence (or nonmonetary sectors of the economy) in order to be able to include it in national income data sets and validate it as an important part of value-generating activities.

The state of Alaska also puts efforts into quantifying "subsistence production and consumption" (Wheeler and Thornton 2005), and the importance of the same for rural communities' livelihoods is similarly underlined. But it further includes a cultural-historical perspective—connecting the term to the maintenance and thriving of a particular "Alaskan" and rural way of life: "Alaska's indigenous inhabitants have relied upon the traditional harvest of wild foods for thousands of years and have passed this way of life, its culture, and values down through generations. Subsistence has also become important to many non-Native Alaskans, particularly in rural Alaska" (U.S. Department of the Interior 2016).

Wheeler and Thornton (2005:71) remark that "Interestingly, while the broad anthropological understanding of subsistence generally reflects the Native view, the focus of much of the work . . . continues to be on economic aspects of subsistence." Since then, Alaskan and Arctic academic discussions continue to focus on the complex interrelationship between markets, foraging, and money—or paid and unpaid activities—as well as the adaptation of rural, indigenous "subsistence economies" to transformations: that is, their inclusion into the market economy and the persistence of so-called *mixed economies* (Burnsilver et al. 2016; Poppel and Kruse 2010). A whole range of publications now deals with other aspects too, such as contaminants in subsistence foods (e.g., Jewett and Duffy 2007), ecology, climate change, and traditional ecological knowledge (Ignatowski and Rosales 2013; Wilson 2014), as well as cultural aspects such as the importance of elders (Fienup-Riordan 2016), to name just a few.

An important contribution, which is of particular relevance here, is a thesis by Susan Vanek (2010), titled "Regulating Hunting: Subsistence and Governmentality in the Central Kuskokwim Region, Alaska." She discusses subsistence in the framework of governmentality,

state policies, and hunting practices, calling it a "central organizing template" in the Alaskan struggle for wild resources. She provides a plausible explanation for the centrality of the term: "The felt presence of the state in rural hunting has been increasing throughout the twentieth century and the prevalence of the word *subsistence* in these disputes is tied to its status as a legal term, dictating how individuals must identify their practices and thus themselves, at the expense of other identifications" (Vanek 2010:7). Referencing Raymond Williams (1976), Vanek characterizes subsistence as a "keyword," a word that binds "specific actions, interpretations, and forms of thought, marking sites of ideological struggle" (Vanek 2010:3).

While Vanek provides a plausible explanation for the prevalence of subsistence in Alaska due to the fact that it is *the* legal term to denote socioeconomic systems of foraging—embedded in a variety of regulations, policies, and laws—the question remains why it is being singled out to become the bearer of so much meaning in other discussions as well, such as feminist and development economics and urban studies. Sahlins (2004:x) might provide us with an underlying reason when he remarks that "Production is an onto-logic of people, places and things that brings to bear the entire cultural scheme on the most elementary material activities." Or, as Ingold (2000:41) puts it: "Minds cannot subsist without bodies to house them, and bodies cannot subsist unless continually engaged in material and energetic exchanges with components of the environment." Thus, the mode of production is an important source of informing what is perceived by people as that which *is*—that is, their onto-logic. Of course, production is far from being the sole factor determining ontology, and foragers, pastoralists, or capitalists across the world developed quite different cultural expressions, even if they share similar methods of production amongst themselves. But, following Sahlins' argument, it is still a foundational part of a particular way of seeing the world. In light of this, it makes sense that Alaska Natives singled out the term subsistence—next to the fact that it is used in a statewide debate regarding foraging rights of different sectors of society in which "subsistence users" and commercial users compete for fish and game.

Contrasting two perspectives, the economic and the Alaskan one, Vanek also points to the fact that, within the Alaskan perspective, the term is partly defined by what it does *not* designate: wastefulness and trophy hunting associated with sports hunting, for example (Vanek 2010:33f.). Although it is used as an emic self-definition, subsistence hunters label "themselves and their practices as unique" only through "contact with individuals with different hunting practices and understandings of both the resources and the land, primarily through state system of game management" (Vanek 2010:41). Wheeler and Thornton (2005) similarly differentiate the concept: "In contrast to Euro-American conceptions, Alaska Natives typically define subsistence in dynamic, broad, and holistic ways, as 'our culture,' 'our way of being,' or 'our life.'" The authors quote several Alaska Native leaders and their definitions of the term, for example, the late Iñupiaq leader Eileen MacLean: "Subsistence is not about poverty; it is about wealth. This wealth is expressed in the harvest and in the sharing and celebration that result from the harvest" (Eileen MacLean cited in Wheeler and Thornton 2005:71). The following statement made by Jonathan Solomon in Fort Yukon reflects how the term was first introduced under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act:

> When we talk about subsistence in the areas, we should be talking about Native culture and their land. I never heard the word subsistence until 1971 under the Native land claims act. Before that time, when I was brought up in the culture of my people, it's always been "our culture" and "our land." You cannot break out subsistence or the meaning of subsistence or try to identify it, and you can't break it out of the culture. The culture and the life of my Native people are the subsistence way of life. And that's what we always used, the subsistence way of life. It goes hand in hand with our own culture, our own language, and all our activities. (Cited in Berger 1985:52)

Today, subsistence in Alaska is oftentimes associated with the term *culture* as the quote above shows. John Active similarly connects the two concepts: "Today, Yup'ik elders shake their heads and say we Yupiit are losing our culture. Our subsistence lifestyle is our culture. Without subsistence we will not survive as a people. If our culture, our subsistence lifestyle should disappear, we will be no more" (Active 1998).[13] This shows the profound transformation subsistence has undergone from being understood as the lowest level of economic provision, or "mere survival," to what Alaska Natives frame as *their way of life*, thus becoming another word altogether. Instead of understanding subsistence as mere survival, Alaska Natives underline the importance of the preservation of their diverse (cultural) identities and ties to the land (see also Berger 1985:48ff. for an extensive list of statements and quotes in this regard). Indigenous groups and voices in Alaska thus insist

that subsistence is more than just material provision. This constitutes a dynamic, broad, and inclusive understanding of the term, including material as well as immaterial and symbolic dimensions. In terms of the five dimensions of meaning, it is also a contextual, long-term, and transgenerational understanding of the term.

The next section deals with more-than-human ways of understanding provision within the Alaska Native context, adding yet another nuance to this particular expression of subsistence.

THE ETHNIC BIAS: FROM "LIVING LIKE AN ANIMAL" TO COEXISTENCE AND RESPECT

"A man who spends his whole life following animals just to kill them to eat or moving from one berry patch to another, is really living just like an animal himself" (Braidwood 1957:87).

This quote exemplifies the derogatory attitude prevalent within the evolutionary perspective—or "salvage and acculturation approach" as Wheeler and Thornton (2005:71) describe it—towards what economic anthropology came to define as subsistence. It also shows how Braidwood, reflecting the dominant worldview at the time, understood the relationship between animals and humans: as a dichotomy, marked by the inferiority of the first to the latter. In contrast, Kofinas (1993) notes: "Animals continue to assume a prominent role in the mythology and ideology of Arctic and Sub-Arctic peoples. These intrinsic values underscore the role of subsistence in a rapidly changing, modern-day environment." John Active (1998) provides us with a clue of what is at stake here. He recounts a story his grandmother once told him:

> Once there was a little blackfish swimming up a stream. Every so often he would swim up to the surface and look around. The first time he had surfaced he saw a camp where people were living. The people there were very careless. . . . The little blackfish said to himself, "I'll not swim into this man's fish trap. He's too careless with his food. I don't want my bones stepped on underfoot." The blackfish swam on. . . . Soon blackfish came to another camp. . . . Blackfish noticed there were no bones or bits of food lying about and when the family ate, they ate very quietly being careful not to drop bits of food on the ground. . . . Blackfish was overjoyed. He swam about immediately looking for the man's fish trap and upon finding it, swam into it because he knew he would be eaten very carefully and his bones would not be strewn about on the ground. (Active 1998)

He then goes on to say: "To be a genuine Yup'ik, first and foremost, subsistence is our life" (Active 1998). Whereas the connection to "existence" is similar to the way subsistence was understood by early European philosophers, provision here is no longer solely by and for humans. Agency lies within the natural surroundings as well: for example, if the fish decides not to swim into the net, the humans will go hungry. Humans and nonhumans, or in this case animals, interact to ensure subsistence—or the continued "existence" of the world. Alaska Native definitions are thus markedly different from those used in encyclopedias or dictionaries, early anthropological understandings, economic textbooks, or by development agencies such as the World Bank. Indigenous voices and anthropological examinations contest the connotation of subsistence with poverty and an existential minimum, and denounce it as a colonial and ethnocentric construction based upon a monetary value system. They successfully coopted and instrumentalized the notion to describe a way of life that now includes an active role of nonhuman actors.

CONCLUSION

Hunt (2014:27) explains that in the process of "looking to Indigenous epistemologies for ways to get beyond the ontological limits of what is legible as western scholarship . . . a number of Indigenous scholars have pointed to stories, art, and metaphor as important transmitters of Indigenous knowledge." In Alaska, subsistence has to some extent become such a metaphor to take ownership, revive, and advance a certain way of life. In order to arrive at this point, the term had to undergo a chain of translations, wherein an English (or Latin) word with certain connotations in one (social) world gained currency in another, thereby acquiring a different meaning. This process can be understood as abrogation and appropriation: subsistence was first abrogated, meaning that its aesthetic, illusory standard of normative use and traditional meaning was refused. It was then reappropriated by Native American voices and instrumentalized to help their cause instead of the settler-colonial one (for a description of the process, see Ashcroft et al. 1989:38; Seiler 1996). In this scenario, forms of (understanding of) livelihood and provision become equated to "culture" or "a way of life." This particular translation cannot be understood solely as an

economic system, a certain way of obtaining food, or mere survival. It is central to cultural self-understanding, carries meaning within a political struggle for foraging rights and autonomous decision-making, and most importantly pertains to a different understanding of provision, including nonhuman agentive actors. Eventually, a polysemous homonym emerges—that is, several words that sound the same and have the same origin but have acquired different meanings in different contexts.[14]

Alaska Native (and non-Native) peoples are rooted in a subsistence lifestyle, and as everywhere around the world, they depend on the land for their food. At the same time, it is important to avoid certain determinisms inherent in such phrasing. Scholars who study migration to cities in the circumpolar Arctic emphasize, for example, that many people maintain active ties to their home communities and stay part of the food-sharing network across urban and rural boundaries—supporting the subsistence sector with monetary means (see, for example, Fienup-Riordan 2000). The same is true for other discussions: women are not in some way "tied" by their biology to the household and kitchen, and encouraging "subsistence farmers" in poor countries to sell their land base or to make higher profits may indeed improve their overall situation, yet also increase inequality. In any case, framing the value of unpaid activities as inferior to monetary provision means questioning identities, food security, and alternative ways of perceiving the world.

The purely economic connotation of subsistence is a product of the twentieth century, following philosophical discussions during nearly 2000 years during which the term was framed within mostly theological debates. Today, subsistence is often used to describe economic relations of indigenous communities. In Alaska, this reality is driven to a certain extreme due to the particular legal framework. But, in the course of time and having been appropriated by Native Alaska voices, subsistence came to signify something quite different than the *economy of the others.* The purely economic version of subsistence can be seen as part of the "ethnographic category mistake" Sahlins (2004:x) describes. He argues that economic anthropology separates the economic realm from the social and cultural realm in systems that do not make such a distinction.

This article juxtaposes different texts by different authors from different contexts and regions to gain an overview of the multivocality of subsistence. On a theoretical level, it seems that all those different understandings do not freely cross all the contextual borders described. When it comes to practical implications, common ground can be found in the fact that subsistence, employed as a term to denote a foraging way of life, predominantly female care, household labor, and self-provision in urban conglomerations, always pertains to unpaid activities. Framed as subsistences, these activities remain—through the discursive connotation of subsistence with poverty and deprivation—unequally valued in comparison to paid activities within a capitalist way of viewing the world based upon a monetary valuing scheme. The author believes that this lies at the heart of multiple social and economic challenges within indigenous communities, poor rural agricultural societies, and Western households alike. People who produce on the fringes of monetary exchange with the goal of self-provision are, generally speaking, more vulnerable to exclusion by the broader society than people who participate in monetary sectors of the economy. Therefore, how we understand and value subsistence(s) is of great significance in a broader societal sense. In the Alaskan context, for example, the current debate deals with the significance and value of culture in subsistence. Ultimately, these discussions—whether they deal with life in the Far North, a rural area in India, or a rich town in the middle of Europe—concern broader philosophical debates about poverty, distribution of land, climate change, resource depletion, and so on.

NOTES

1. Of course, such activities have been framed within other conceptual frameworks as well, such as social economy, reproductive sector, commons, or the nonmonetary sector. But, since this text deals only with the term *subsistence* itself, this is not of further concern.
2. For most of history, social and cultural anthropology primarily associated subsistence with rural agricultural and foraging activities. Inquiries started when the author came across the term *urban subsistence techniques* (Bennholdt-Thomsen 2003) and was puzzled by this association with urbanity and technology. Rural and urban in nature, the term is nowadays associated with foraging lifestyles of indigenous peoples, poor farmers, and women's labor. By emphasizing such differences, this article underlines the multivocality of subsistence while focusing primarily on the Alaska Native ways of reframing the term.

3. Examples would be Schweitzer (2000), which discusses the concept of hunter-gatherers in the context of Russian/Siberian anthropology, or Hill (1986), which deals with the notion of peasantry. Hill (1986:18f.) rejects the term subsistence altogether, by the way, due to its "vagueness and ambiguities."
4. Grounded theory is based mainly on inductive or "open" coding (Bernard 2006). It enabled the author to develop central analytical categories (themes) and to analyze the use and meanings of subsistence in theoretical models, encyclopedias, journals, academic articles, and other texts such as quotes by Alaska Native individuals—as well as to create theoretical models. Hermeneutically circling between texts, codes, and categories, the author identified biases associated with the categories gender, space, and ethnicity. Another useful tool was mind mapping, allowing the author to grasp complex relations, generating categories of analysis and naming differences. Mind maps also helped to find carriers of, criteria, overlaps, and annotations of difference. An important part of the research process was to confine the material. The author decided to reduce it to recent anthropologically relevant works and material that dealt specifically with the meaning of the term.
5. The author's voice is of course also only one among a multitude in debates surrounding subsistence, and a remote one at that when it comes to Alaska. As a female urbanite, feminist, and urban dweller, discussions of subsistence are close to the author's metaphorical doorstep, whereas one could say that she looks at Alaskan or Arctic indigenous subsistence from afar.
6. Subject analysis is one of the means of the humanities and social sciences to classify, define, and delineate the meaning of abstract terms (ZUM-Wiki 2008). It comprises a variety of methods, including etymological history and classification, extensional and intensional definitions, analysis of the semantic field, looking at definitions in dictionaries and encyclopedias, and analysis of the subject network.
7. Many people in the German-speaking context have difficulty pronouncing the word, let alone know what it means precisely. This is a fact the author came to understand while working on her thesis (Gartler 2013). Whenever the author spoke to other people about her subject of inquiry, she noticed that most had little idea of what it meant.
8. Lynge (1998), for example, criticizes the antitechnological bias that is associated with subsistence (see also Kofinas 1993). Due to misleading notions of authenticity and biased views of traditional livelihood, investment in technological innovations that could benefit rural, indigenous populations are sometimes impeded. Schneider (1982:169) explains further that the adaptive and innovative dimensions of hunter-gatherer subsistence are often disregarded in the European concept: "Attempts to define subsistence characteristically fail to account for the historical record, which reflects the important survival values of flexibility, innovation, and change."
9. In some cases, this independence has more of a symbolic than economic value; for example, when wealthy urban dwellers turn to growing their own potatoes in times of crisis. This will likely not provide any substantial help when all money is gone. Rather, this lifestyle turn towards do-it-yourself agriculture in large urban areas is indicative of a wish to regain a sense of control in times of unpredictability and economic downturn. Note that this is not the case for small-scale autonomous pursuits of self-provision, such as anarchist or other collectives, who try to develop structures of provision outside of the monetized world regardless of the state of the financial markets.
10. In extension of Dahm and Scherhorn's (2008) argument, the author argues that urban gardening and similar trends show that provision with agricultural goods is an important part tool of "urban subsistence."
11. Cadot et al. (2009) themselves admit that this criterion does not hold except for 10% of the studied cases. Self-sufficiency is, in any case, a very narrow definition.
12. Cadot et al. (2009:3) respond to this gap between the conceptual understanding and the practice of "subsistence agriculture" by pointing towards the fact that one should identify which markets exist in any kind of given situation.
13. Note that culture is, similar to subsistence, a contested term, oftentimes critiqued and not without its pitfalls—especially when it comes to the Western philosophical idea of a division between nature and culture (Ingold 2000:41f.), a dichotomy this author does not wish to perpetuate.
14. A more common example of a polysemous homonym would be the head (of an organization) and the head (of a body).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Gertrude Saxinger and my reviewers for their useful comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

Active, John
1998 Why Subsistence is a Matter of Cultural Survival: A Yup'ik Point of View. *Cultural Survival Quarterly Magazine* (online magazine) 22(3). Online at https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/why-subsistence-matter-cultural-survival-yupik-point-view

Altamirano-Jiménez, Isabel
2008 Nunavut. Whose Homeland, Whose Voices? *Canadian Woman Studies. Indigenous Women in Canada. The Voices of First Nations, Inuit and Métis Women. York University Publication* 26(3,4):128–134.

Anderson, David B.
1998 A View from the Yukon Flats: An Interview with Gwich'in Leader Clarence Alexander. *Cultural Survival Quarterly Magazine* (online magazine) 22(3). Online at https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/view-yukon-flats-interview-gwichin-leader-clarence

Anderson, David G.
2000 Tracking the "Wild Tungus" in Taimyr: Identity, Ecology and Mobile Economies in Arctic Siberia. In *Hunters and Gatherers in the Modern World: Conflict, Resistance, and Self-Determination*, edited by Peter P. Schweitzer, Megan Biesele, and Robert K. Hitchcock, pp. 223–243. Berghahn Books, New York.

Angus, Ian
2001 Subsistence as a Social Right: A Political Ideal for Socialism? *Studies in Political Economy* 65(1):117–135.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin
1989 *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. Routledge, London and New York.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M.
1981 *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, translators. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Barnard, Alan, and Jonathan Spencer
2002 *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. Routledge, London, New York.

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika
2003 Wovon leben unsere Städte wirklich? Subsistenzorientierung statt Geldorientierung. In *Subsistenz und Widerstand*, edited by Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nicholas Faraclas, and Claudia von Werlhof, pp. 242–254. Promedia Verlag, Wien.

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika, and Maria Mies
1997 *Eine Kuh für Hillary. Die Subsistenzperspektive*. Frauenoffensive, München.

Berger, Thomas R.
1985 *Village Journey: The Report of the Alaska Native Review Commission*. Inuit Circumpolar Conference, New York.

Bernard, Russell H.
2006 *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 4th edition. AltaMira Press, Lanham, MD.

Black, John
2002 *Dictionary of Economics*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Blaser, Mario
2010 *Storytelling Globalization from the Chaco and Beyond*. New Ecologies for the Twenty-first Century, series edited by Arturo Escobar and Dianne Rocheleau. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.

Braidwood, Robert J., ed.
1957 *Prehistoric Men*. Chicago Natural History Museum Popular Series: Anthropology, edited by Lillian A. Ross. 3rd edition. Chicago Natural History Museum Press, Chicago.

Burnsilver, Shauna, James Magdanz, Rhian Stotts, et al.
2016 Are Mixed Economies Persistent or Transitional? Evidence Using Social Networks from Arctic Alaska. *American Anthropologist* 118(1):121–129.

Cadot, Olivier, Laure Dutoit, and Marcelo Olarreaga
2009 *Barriers to Exit from Subsistence Agriculture.* World Bank Research Program Paper: The World Bank. Online at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRANETTRADE/Resources/239054-1239120299171/5998577-1244842549684/6205205-1259868742627/6620468-1259868766114/Sunk_Costs_in_Agriculture_Cadot_Dutoit_&_Olarreaga.pdf

Case, David
1998 Will Federal or State Management Afford Alaska Natives a More Effective Voice? *Cultural Survival Quarterly Magazine* (online magazine) 22(3). Online at https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/will-federal-or-state-management-afford-alaska-natives

Collin, P. H.
2003 *Dictionary of Economics.* Bloomsbury, London.

Dahm, Daniel, and Gerhard Scherhorn
2008 *Urbane Subsistenz: Die Zweite Quelle des Wohlstands*. Oekom Verlag, München.

Dudenverlag
2001 *Duden Fremdwörterbuch.* Dudenverlag, Mannheim/Leipzig/Wien/Zürich.

Etymonline—Online Etymology Dictionary
2017 Subsistence. Online at http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=subsistence&allowed_in_frame=0

Fall, James A.
1990 The Division of Subsistence of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game: An Overview of Its Research and Findings. *Arctic Anthropology* 27(2):68–92.

Fienup-Riordan, Ann
2000 *Hunting Tradition in a Changing World: Yup'ik Lives in Alaska Today*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ, and London.
2016 *Ciulinerunak Yuuyaqunak/Do Not Live Without an Elder: The Subsistence Way of Life in Southwest Alaska*. University of Alaska Press, Fairbanks.

Gartler, Susanna
2013 Subsistenz. Eine Anthropologische Begriffsanalyse. Master's thesis, Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna, Vienna. AV Akademiker Verlag, Saarbrücken.

Hensel, Chase
1996 *Telling Our Selves: Ethnicity and Discourse in Southwestern Alaska*. Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics. Oxford University Press, New York.

Hill, Polly
1986 *Development Economics on Trial: The Anthropological Case for a Prosecution*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/New York.

Holen, Davin
2011 "We All Drink This Water": The Contemporary Context of Salmon Fishing in Southwest Alaska. In *Humanizing Security in the Arctic*, edited by Michelle Daveluy, Francis Lévesque, and Jenanne Ferguson, pp. 187–202. CCI Press, Edmonton.

Holen, Davin, et al.
2015 Interdependency of Subsistence and Market Economies in the Arctic. In *The Economy of the North 2015*, edited by S. Glomsrød, G. Duhaime, and I. Aslaksen, pp. 89–126. Statistics Norway, Oslo, Kongsvinger.

Holthaus, Gary
2008 *Learning Native Wisdom: What Traditional Cultures Teach Us about Subsistence, Sustainability, and Spirituality*. University Press of Kentucky, Lexington.

Hunt, Sarah
2014 Ontologies of Indigeneity: The Politics of Embodying a Concept. *Cultural Geographies* 21(1):27–32.

Ignatowski, Jonathan A., and Jon Rosales
2013 Identifying the Exposure of Two Subsistence Villages in Alaska to Climate Change Using Traditional Ecological Knowledge. *Climatic Change* 121(2):285–299.

Ingold, Tim
2000 *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. Routledge, London and New York.

Ingram, David
2009 Of Sweatshops and Subsistence: Habermas on Human Rights. *Ethics and Global Politics* 2(3):193–217.

Jewett, Stephen C., and Lawrence K. Duffy
2007 Mercury in Fishes of Alaska, with Emphasis on Subsistence Species. *Science of the Total Environment* 387(1):3–27.

Jolles, Carol Zane
2002 *Faith, Food, and Family in a Yupik Whaling Community*. University of Washington Press, Seattle, WA.

Jones, R. J. Barry
2001 *Routledge Encyclopedia of International Political Economy.* Routledge, New York.

Kishigami, Nobuhiro
2000 Contemporary Inuit Food Sharing and Hunter Support Program of Nunavik Canada. *Senri Ethnological Studies* 53:171–192.

Kofinas, Gary
1993 Subsistence Hunting in a Global Economy. Contributions of Northern Wildlife Co-management to Community Economic Development. *Making Waves: A Newstetter for Community Economic*

Development Practitioners in Canada 4(3). Online at http://arcticcircle.uconn.edu/NatResources/subsistglobal.html

Kuokkanen, Rauna
2011 Indigenous Economies, Theories of Subsistence, and Women. Exploring the Social Economy Model for Indigenous Governance. *American Indian Quarterly* 35(2):217–240.

Law, John
2009 Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics. In *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, edited by Bryan S. Turner, pp. 141–158. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, UK.

Lee, Molly
2002 The Cooler Ring: Urban Alaska Native Women and the Subsistence Debate. *Arctic Anthropology* 39(1–2):3–9.

Lonner, Thomas D.
1980 *Subsistence as an Economic System in Alaska: Theoretical and Policy Implications.* Technical Paper no. 67, Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Anchorage.

Lynge, Finn
1998 *Subsistence Values and Ethics.* Paper presented to the General Assembly of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Nuuk, Greenland. Online at http://arcticcircle.uconn.edu/HistoryCulture/icc_lynge.htm

Marks, Stuart S.
1977 Hunting Behavior and Strategies of the Valley Bisa in Zambia. *Human Ecology* 5(1):1–36.

Natcher, David C.
2009 Subsistence and the Social Economy of Canada's Aboriginal North. *Northern Review* 30 (Spring 2009):83–98.

Neale, Walter, C.
1971 Monetization, Commercialization, Market Orientation, and Market Dependence. In *Studies in Economic Anthropology*, edited by G. Dalton, pp. 26–29. American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.

Poppel, Birger, and Jack Kruse
2010 The Importance of a Mixed Cash- and Harvest Herding Based Economy to Living in the Arctic: An Analysis on the Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic (SLiCA). In *Quality of Life in the New Millenium: Advances in Quality-of-Life Studies,Theory and Research.*, edited by Valerie Møller and Denis Huschka, pp. 27–42. Springer, Houten, Netherlands.

Raju, Saraswati
2009 Polyvocality. In *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, edited by Nigel Thrift, pp. 265–268. Elsevier, Oxford.

Reimer, Bill, editor
2006 Special Issue on the New Rural Economy. *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 1(2).

Sahlins, Marshal
1971 The intensity of domestic production in primitive societies: Social inflections of the Chayanov Slope. In *Studies in Economic Anthropology*, edited by G. Dalton, pp. 30–51. American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.
2004[1972] *Stone Age Economics*. Routledge, London and New York.

Schneider, William S.
1982 Subsistence in Alaska: A Look at the Issue Over Time. In *Alaska's Rural Development*, edited by P. Cornwall and G. McBeath, pp. 169–180. Westview Press, Boulder.

Schweitzer, Peter P.
2000 Silence and Other Misunderstandings: Russian Anthropology, Western Hunter-Gatherer Debates, and Siberian Peoples. In *Hunters and Gatherers in the Modern World: Conflict, Resistance, and Self-determination*, edited by Peter P. Schweitzer, Megan Biesele, and Robert K. Hitchcock, pp. 29–54. Berghahn Books, New York.

Schweitzer, Peter P., Megan Biesele, and Robert K. Hitchcock
2000 *Hunters and Gatherers in the Modern World: Conflict, Resistance, and Self-determination*. Berghahn Books, New York.

Scott, James C.
1976 *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Seiler, Tamara Palmer
1996 Multi-vocality and National Literature: Toward a Post-colonial and Multicultural Aesthetic. *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'Études canadiennes* 31(3):148.

Seja, Morte
2013 Placing Your Bets: Subsistence or Transformational Entrepreneurship. *The World Bank Blog - Private Sector Development*. Online at http://blogs.world-

bank.org/psd/placing-your-bets-subsistence-or-transformational-entrepreneurship

Smith, Andrea L.
2004 Heteroglossia, "Common Sense," and Social Memory. *American Ethnologist* 31(2):251–269.

Suarez, Pablo, James W. Hansen, Miguel Carriquiry, et al.
2008 *Integrating Seasonal Forecasts and Insurance for Adaptation Among Subsistence Farmers: The Case of Malawi*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series, no. 4651. Online at documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/893941468046487650/pdf/wps4651.pdf

Thieme, Sebastian
2010 *Subsistence: History, Meaning and Reconstruction of the Subsistence Term*. Munich Personal RePEc Archive Paper no. 24553. University of Leipzig. Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/24553/1/MPRA_paper_24553.pdf
2012 *Das Subsistenzrecht*. Metropolis Verlag, Marburg.

Thornton, Thomas F.
1998 Alaska Native Subsistence: A Matter of Cultural Survival. Cultural Survival Quarterly (online magazine) 22(3):29–34. Online at https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/alaska-native-subsistence-matter-cultural-survival

U.S. Department of the Interior
2016 FSMP Federal Subsistence Management Program. Online at https://www.doi.gov/subsistence

Vanek, Susan B.
2010 Regulating Hunting: Subsistence and Governmentality in the Central Kuskokwim Region, Alaska. Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo Batalha, and Peter Skafish
2014 *Cannibal Metaphysics: For a Post-structural Anthropology*. Translated by Peter Skafish. Univocal, Minneapolis.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo, and Roy Wagner
2016 *The Relative Native: Essays on Indigenous Conceptual Worlds*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

von Werlhof, Claudia, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, and Nicholas Faraclas
2001 *Subsistenz und Widerstand: Alternativen zur Globalisierung*. Promedia Verlag, Wien.

Wheeler, Polly, and Thomas F. Thornton
2005 Subsistence Research in Alaska: A Thirty-Year Retrospective. *Alaska Journal of Anthropology* 3(1):69–103.

Williams, Raymond
1976 *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Wilson, Nicole
2014 The Politics of Adaptation: Subsistence Livelihoods and Vulnerability to Climate Change in the Koyukon Athabascan Village of Ruby, Alaska. *Human Ecology* 42(1):87–101.

World Bank Group, The
n.d. Annex A. Economic Valuation of Subsistence Fisheries. Online at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPACIFICISLANDS/Resources/3-Annexes.pdf.

ZUM-Wiki
2008 Begriffsanalyse. Online at https://wiki.zum.de/wiki/Begriffsanalyse