
Does Development Work?

THE PRAXIS INTERVIEWS

How do we define development? Are development projects accomplishing their goals? What does the future of development look like? These are the questions with which development practitioners struggle on a daily basis, and their answers impact the lives of millions of people affected by development aid.

In order to get some perspective on these issues, the editorial board of PRAXIS approached four members of the Fletcher student community who have worked with or witnessed development. Their experiences, in Asia, Africa and the Americas, vary widely, as do their comments—ranging from optimistic to pessimistic, from global to specific. Nonetheless, certain common themes emerged—the importance of participation and education, the potential destructiveness of programs that don't engage the communities they serve, the role beneficiaries can play in directing development efforts, and the ability of well-planned aid projects to positively affect peoples' lives. The following interviews provide a snapshot portrait of development today.

Grounds for Optimism

Anuradha Harinarayan, an Indian national, worked in development in her country for about four years before starting her graduate studies. Her main area of expertise is nutrition, and during her years as a graduate student she has worked as a research assistant for the International Famine Center. An internship in Sudan further added to her experience in the field. While recognizing that development projects can carry potential dangers, Anuradha is nevertheless optimistic. "I have to, my whole career depends on being optimistic," she says. "If I give up, there is nothing left for me to do."

PRAXIS: How did you become involved with development?

AH: After my university degree, I went to New Delhi where I began working in a laboratory. Nutrition was my focus of study, but in India the emphasis is largely on laboratory work—unfortunately. Then I got a job with an organization called Population Services International, a social marketing association. We were starting the first social marketing product in child health—combating diarrhea, the second largest killer in India. This was my first exposure to the villages of India and I actually saw what poverty was all about. It opened my eyes. I got to see the poorest of the poorest.

The idea of going into the villages was, one, to find out how they were coping with diarrhea, and, two, to develop communication to make them change their practices. We were actually going to sell them our product below market price. The idea was that if they

The PRAXIS Editorial Board conducted the interviews that appear on the following pages.

buy something, whatever the price was, they would value it more and therefore be more committed to using it than if it were handed out free. This is the basis of social marketing. I was dealing with maternal and child health issues, since my background in nutrition fitted into that work. I worked with them for about two years, and then moved to USAID [United States Agency for International Development] and took a consultancy with them for about five months. They were starting a statewide project to deal with AIDS and were planning to use social marketing to sell condoms, so they wanted to use my expertise. You become an expert in this field very quickly. Amazingly, after only two years, I was called an expert (laughs).

So I went to another state where I tried to teach them how to fit the social marketing model into their statewide project, which was to push condoms to prevent AIDS. I was looking at a totally different product, totally different problems, but my skills fitted in. This was very interesting work, and I found I grew a lot, because I was completely independent and facing people who did not necessarily believe in social marketing. And then I learned that I had been accepted by Tufts School of Nutrition and the Fletcher School.

PRAXIS: What are your feelings about development after working in the field?

AH: I can't help but be optimistic. My whole career depends on optimism. If I give up, there is nothing left for me to do. Although some people working in development are cynical, life *is* improving. I don't know if that is entirely because of development projects, but I do think they contribute. I cannot say that every development project is bad and that development doesn't work. I can't because I have to believe in it, but also because many times a project can bring additional unaccounted benefits.

As an example, when I was working on the AIDS project, I had a lot of discussions with women in prostitution. In many parts of the world, prostitutes belong to a network. There is unity, and the women tend to speak together, and look after each other. Unfortunately, in that particular state of India, because of political pressure, these women were functioning underground. So it was very difficult to trace them—there was a whole process to get them to come to a group meeting. But even just coming together in a focus group, these women have gotten to know each other, and this in itself is of value. Although the goal of my work was simply to gather information, I had introduced these women to each other and they began forming a solidarity group. There are a number of such spin-offs.

PRAXIS: What about the criticism that development sometimes causes harm?

AH: Certainly, when you are there providing service, making decisions about who gets what, it does have potential for harm. Take the social marketing approach for example. What a great concept, it worked, people were buying the product and using it. But it was still not addressing the people who were poorest of all, as they were not able to provide

the little money they needed to be able to buy these products. If, again and again, projects only look at people above a certain level in poverty, obviously if you go back people will distrust you. I haven't had that happen to me personally, but maybe if I stayed with a project for ten years in the same community, then I might actually see some consequences from not having provided equal opportunity to all people.

PRAXIS: Are your peers also optimistic?

AH: No matter how much they criticize things, I think that those people that remain in development are optimistic. There is no reason to remain in the field if they don't think they can make a difference. There is a level of "Yes, I can make a change." Without that, I think they would have left. I know of people who worked with me in India who thought the idea of social marketing was rubbish. Those people appeared to be pessimists at that time. They were the ones who said: "No, we are not addressing the poor people. We are looking at those who can spend some minimum amounts. I don't want to be involved in this; I want to go and really work with the poorest in the community." So I've had colleagues that leave—but I still can't call them pessimistic, because they are still working in development; they just believe in other methods. Then there are others who think the entire NGO sector is ridiculous and want to move completely to privatization—because the private sector is clear; it has a market price for everything. Overall, the people around me are optimistic. That is why they are still there.

PRAXIS: So you have not had negative experiences in development?

AH: Well... at a feeding center in Sudan, there was a local woman who approached me, saying, "This is terrible; you don't provide us with anything; you don't take care of us." My reaction was to think: "Here I am, stuck in the middle of Sudan. My child is away from me; I am spending two months here." So I said, "Can't you be a little grateful for this?" She replied, "Why should I be grateful? You survive on people like us."

And this was coming from a woman in a feeding center in Sudan! It took me some time to get over it. I was upset with her. But she was telling the truth—for her. If I hear this from twenty people, I don't know how I will feel about development work fifteen years from now. This incident gave me a lot to think about. I realized I was expecting something. I think I am always going to expect to be recognized for trying to make a difference. I would be naive to think that everyone is going to be grateful.

PRAXIS: What are your thoughts on the future of development? Do you plan to work in development again yourself?

AH: Yes, I do. It is difficult, though, especially being a woman, to balance a family life with work. For instance, it is hard for me to imagine going to Sudan again. I cannot have my son with me there.

The future of development...I think what may help is that finally development and relief seem to be finding common ground. There is so much empirical data and policy analysis about development. And finally these same people are starting to look at why things are going wrong in relief, not in terms of conflict, but in terms of how interventions are run. What is wrong and what is right; looking at the long-term impact. I look to that field, the combination of development and relief, to grow in coming years.

Bound for Failure

B.K., who is African, has attended university in Africa, Europe, and the United States. He has several years work experience with the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCR) in Europe and Africa. B.K. requested that PRAXIS not identify him by name.

Although B.K. has seen some effective projects in the field, he is generally pessimistic about the direction of development, saying, "There seem to be so many more failures than successes."

PRAXIS: What is your background with development?

BK: Zimbabwe is a recipient of development aid and there have been development projects within some communities I've lived in there. And working for UNHCR, I had the opportunity to see a lot of places where development projects have been undertaken. UNHCR itself doesn't engage in development as such, but it works closely with other agencies in the UN system and in areas where many agencies and NGOs have got their projects.

PRAXIS: What effects of development projects did you see in Zimbabwe?

BK: Development projects—such as drilling for water—have been very important in the past few years because Zimbabwe experienced drought in the mid-1980s. As a result, people in rural areas were finding that life was no longer sustainable. Most of these people were subsistence farmers, so there's been increasing migration from the rural areas into the urban areas. The hope in providing water for drinking purposes and for agriculture is that people won't migrate as they've been doing...Without having done any analysis of any of these projects, I'd say there is still a lot of migration from the countryside into cities because life in the rural areas is still not sustainable. Even if you put water down, there are still a host of other problems associated with living under those conditions that haven't been tackled—there are still the issues of schools, of hospitals, of roads, of access to markets once they cut their crops down. It's difficult to assess how successful these projects have been.

PRAXIS: Can you tell us of any development projects you've seen in the field?

BK: In South Africa, I remember seeing a project by MSF [*Medecins Sans Frontières*, or Doctors Without Borders]—which is not really a development agency, but in South Africa it was doing many projects with various communities. They put a water system in a village. We [UNHCR] were working with Mozambican refugees who were repatriating from South Africa and these were some of the villages that had Mozambicans in them. We'd go into the villages to speak to the Mozambicans, trying to see if they wanted to go home or not.

MSF put pipes and piped water into this village. Then the organization ran out of money and the project stopped. Only half the village was covered. There was no provision for spare parts, so if any part broke down, that was it, it was broken, there was no fixing it. The community didn't have any money to replace it. Neither did it seem as though the community had been trained in how to maintain the water system.

What was left in place became a hazard—it was dangerous and unsanitary. There were pipes sticking out of the ground everywhere and people hadn't been making sure that the water was safe, or that there were no animals drinking around it. You think of the money that was spent in putting all these pipes into the ground. And then it doesn't work, and the people are gone and it's forgotten, completely forgotten. Give it another two, three years and the whole system would basically deteriorate and collapse. One asked, what was the point? Obviously the agency would have wanted it to work, but they didn't seem to put in the effort or the amount of money or the training of the population needed to actually make this thing sustainable.

MSF did bring in someone who was a specialist in terms of water and sanitation. He stayed about three months and left, without having completed the work or approved the pipes. I spoke to the director of the office in Johannesburg and he told me they were pulling out of the area, out of doing that sort of work, which they ultimately did. And that was the end of it.

PRAXIS: How did the community react to this project?

BK: I think many communities are used to this—development agencies come in, do something, it doesn't work, the people go back to their normal practices, and it's fine, that's just how things are. It's not really going to change that much of their lives, so they tolerate the invasion, if you want to call it that, for a while, and afterwards, whether the community wants them to go or not, they will still go. People are very tolerant of development agencies because they know that it's not going to last very long.

I suppose there are a lot of communities that have had this experience because development as a field has existed for a long time. And the theories in development seem to change their focus, to change their priorities, over time and there doesn't seem to be

that much continuity. I think partly because of that, I have this feeling that most of these efforts are bound for failure.

PRAXIS: Have you ever seen a development project that seemed successful?

BK: If you classify something like teaching as development—teaching English, or teaching sewing skills. In which case, yes. People have been taught various skills—for example, sewing for women who need an income-generating project. I’ve seen cases where the women ultimately go out, making crafts, and it gets many people out of extreme poverty, to a point where they are sustaining themselves and their families.

Once refugees are able to return to their country of origin, UNHCR, the UN in general, and NGOs, do implement projects so that the return of these people to their home country is permanent, and they don’t flee again back where they came from or internally within their own country. For example, in the north of Mozambique, refugees were returning, and a lot of them had learnt skills such as brickmaking, building, carpentry, and masonry while in camps in Zimbabwe. They were given grants as communities from Save the Children, I believe, to build hospitals, build schools, build infrastructure. The people who came back with the knowledge of how to build a house would teach other people in the area, and together they would build a clinic, and then the people who had learned those skills would move on to another village, and there they’d teach other people. So for me that was good. The skills which they were taught, which they learned while in exile, they were using to rebuild infrastructure that had been destroyed by war as well as passing on these skills to others in the community.

PRAXIS: What can make development projects successful?

BK: Education is important. And participation—for a project to work, you need the community to actually want it...I think often you’ll find that an agency’s got money, which it needs to use before the next budget cycle or it will lose it. So there’s imposition on the community to accept a project. But where there is a need, where the community itself perceives there is a need, then most likely the project is going to have a good chance of working. The community needs to believe they own it.

PRAXIS: What can make some development projects fail?

BK: It’s hard to make a generalization because some projects will work, in spite of everyone’s worst fears, and others will not work in spite of the fact that they’re well thought out, well conceived, well designed, and probably beneficial to the population.

There are many very intelligent people in these development agencies, but they may not be aware of the local situation. Some of the failures may be due to a lack of knowledge of that environment. Little things can prevent a project from working. The fact that the authority figure in that community just doesn’t like it may prevent your project from ever

getting off the ground. And then of course there are situations where the staff of an agency definitely doesn't have the experience to be doing that work.

I remember, when I was in Mozambique, looking at the roads in South Africa leading up to the border. Tarred roads, telephones, faxes, television...South Africa is very well developed, in terms of infrastructure. While where we were, in Mozambique, was an area that was basically devastated and depopulated, so that the roads had to be rebuilt from scratch, the water sources developed from scratch, after seventeen, eighteen years of war. We were repatriating people into this environment from a developed area. While I was there, I had a conversation with one of my colleagues, and I said, "Okay, look, we're repatriating these people, and at the same time UNDP, Save the Children, and various other agencies come in and put in clinics, et cetera. Where exactly do they want to end up? They want to take this population from its present situation to where? In terms of development, do they want it to develop to the state of Africa? To the state of America? To what? What's the goal?" I've never been clear on where development was headed. You talk about developing countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa—is the intention to get them all to be mini-Switzerlands? Or is there a point at which agencies are going to say, No, I think you've developed enough, this is where we stop now. I don't know. I'm not sure the agencies are very clear on it either (laughs).

PRAXIS: So, in your view, does development work?

BK: My overall feeling is, no. Development work has been ongoing for decades, and you see countries like the Sudan, which have been the recipients of development aid since before independence—they really have not progressed that far. It's a process that moves very slowly...so slowly that it's discouraging, which is probably why I answer, No. There seem to be so many more failures than successes.

Of course, there are very few development agencies that don't work in conjunction with the government. So whatever harm is caused is not only the responsibility of the agencies. This is in fact the government's failure. The first thing that must be done is probably a political reform. If NGOs are just following the dictates of the government, then they're not solely to blame for the bad consequences. But for most of these agencies, there is the option that they could just not intervene in that case, if they feel that what they do will cause harm.

Take the situation in which you put in water sources for nomadic peoples and their livestock, and they stop there instead of migrating seasonally as they used to do. Now, because of this, their environment is damaged more than it should have been had they continued their normal lifestyles. There is great harm that results from development work. Is it excusable? No. Because all these agencies must think, "What are the consequences of our actions?" And if something does go wrong, it's not as though it's an emergency in

which you were rushed. Development agencies have a lot of time to think and plan their projects, and harm that results from those projects...it's inexcusable.

A Changing Role for Development

Mohammed Hussein is a first-year student at Fletcher with an MA in Agricultural Economics from Khartoum University. He has worked with the International Labor Organization (ILO), the Sudanese Minister of Agriculture, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Khartoum office and UNICEF. His work with Operation Lifeline Sudan has received favorable attention from donors and beneficiaries in southern Sudan. He came to the Fletcher School to place his field experience into an academic context.

Mohammed is critical of past approaches taken by international organizations in Africa, but sees hope in the new focus on "social inclusion."

PRAXIS: How do you define development?

MH: As growth: social, family, and economic growth. I like "growth" better than "development"—"development" is a big word, but "growth" is better because that is where you have the hope. Optimally this growth doesn't cause any loss of resources.

In Sudan, most development work was done by the UN organizations: ILO, FAO, UNDP [United Nations Development Program]. My feeling is that there are great hopes placed on development projects by the beneficiaries, but in the end, those hopes fail. In a third-world country, most intervention comes through foreigners, and once an expatriate leaves the project, it collapses. The infrastructure—vehicles, et cetera—lasts only five years. The agencies don't plan well for the capacity-building of nationals. They did a lot of training of nationals, but without giving them tools. Theoretically, the Sudanese have strong skills, but when it comes to implementation...there's no sustainability.

PRAXIS: Is this changing?

MH: Yes, with the World Bank and their revision of how they measure poverty. They now consider that there has been too much social exclusion. People are getting richer, but many more are getting poor, mainly because they have not been included in "development." The Bank has spent enormous amounts in infrastructure, transport, water, health, and education, but not on the social factor. The World Bank and UNDP have been helping the elite, not the poor. The elite helps in sustainability...but the beneficiaries must be included in the development planning from the beginning. This will let them participate in the success, rather than having big hopes that get let down. Now, since 1996 or '97, the World Bank has started to include different sectors of the community in the development process. By 2000, I think that there will be a lot of changes...hopefully for the best.

In 1988, UNDP started the “bottom-up” approach to development but they still dealt with the bureaucratic system. Maybe the new thinking about social inclusion together with indigenous efforts will correct what the UNDP was doing. UNDP started a pilot program in Sudan they called “area development schemes” in the five different agro-climatic regions, and none of them achieved their goals. They never worked together with the community, they just looked for media coverage. FAO started farm research, and initially it was for three years...but real research needs more than three years to develop indigenous varieties with farmers. A major problem is to find financing for these projects. For example, the UNDP project—after five years, the donors said, “No, we have no money for you, we’ve never felt anything happening.”

In other areas, the UNDP has become a tool for the government to collect taxes from the rural community. The bureaucratic representatives in the area development schemes are expecting certain benefits from the government, and now have access to local populations. But if you are in poverty, you can’t pay taxes. For a farmer with three goats to pay taxes, he will have to sell one of the goats to pay for the second two, so you are increasing his poverty, not helping him at all. The UN should advise the government of what it’s doing wrong, that it’s hurting.

PRAXIS: What else should development agencies do?

MH: The damage caused by displacement—none of the development agencies are looking at it. All over the world, conflict is causing displacement. In the case of Sudan, when people are displaced to the north and central part of the country, they need resources, they need fuel to cook food, so they are depleting the trees. If we say that development investment requires many resources, and here we are losing a lot because of the war, the international community should participate in calming the war. Right now in Africa we have fifty-four conflicts, and poverty will only grow. Now we’ve lost a generation. They’ve left school, left home, so if they are not educated, have no resources, they will continue fighting and using drugs until society collapses.

Involving the People

Javier I. Kinney, a candidate for the Master of Arts in Law and Diplomacy, is a member of the Yurok tribe of Northern California. Javier spent the summer of 1998 working with indigenous communities in Venezuela (such as Pemon, Karina, Arawako, Akawaio, and Mapauri) affected by energy development and other economic activity. While there, he observed the effects of development on tribes in the Gran Sabana region. Javier notes the similarities between current and past approaches to development in the Americas and suggests an increased role for indigenous peoples in decision-making.

PRAXIS: What was your experience like in Venezuela?

JK: It was my first time outside of the United States and Mexico so it was a unique experience for me. I traveled with a delegation from the Seventh Generation Fund and a Washington-based organization named the Amazon Coalition. Our trip served two purposes—first, we were invited guests to the annual meeting of the National Council of Indigenous Peoples in Venezuela (CONIVE) in Caracas, and second, we traveled to the Imataca Forest in the south to see the effects of development. They are planning to put in a 450-mile powerline between the state of Bolivar in Venezuela and the state of Roraima in Brazil, so they can open the area up to mining, tourism, and oil exploration. There are many other plans, which people there don't even know about yet—it's like a cash sign waiting to happen. And the level of recognition of indigenous people in that area is non-existent. Their inclusion and participation is minimal. I really saw the negative effects of the encroachment of development. This is not new, the tactics, the way the government has dealt with indigenous peoples in Venezuela.

It's a personal experience. You read about it, you hear about it, you see movies about it. But when you're right there, it's a whole different scene. Here at school I've been able to speak with people from Venezuela and with individuals who have worked within the legal system. There's a saying: "Anything outside of Caracas is weeds and snakes." The picture that kept coming back to me was 150 years ago in California, when our people had to deal with this same sort of attitude. We've experienced what these people are experiencing now—violence, genocide, people attempting to displace us from our land and resources. The similarities are striking.

This past year, the Venezuelan Supreme Court opened up about 40 percent of the Imataka forest region to mining. The resulting contamination there is what affects indigenous peoples most. In my opinion, the drivers behind the development of this area are the mining companies as well as the government. You also have the Brazilian government bringing development, bringing this whole idea of wealth, of civilization, of helping people grow.

We went into one village where the people were getting sick because of mercury and cyanide in the water supply—it was in the rivers, in the fish, in the different animals that they hunted and ate. These companies were coming in and developing, but they were not giving any alternative medicines or supplies. The obvious disregard for indigenous peoples in that area is so blatant; there is no consultation or recognition.

This past summer, there was a blockade of the road that was bringing the construction crews to erect the power line—the blockade was to stop the construction process. The indigenous leaders were asking for participation and consultation in any projects in the area, legal title to land, and government accountability for the effects of any future development to their community.

The main problem is with the decision-making process. Who's deciding, "We're going to go after these resources, and this is how we're going to do it"? They need to ask, "Who are the people that are going to be directly affected by these projects? Are we including them in these decisions? Do they have adequate information? Are we looking at whether the underlying issues are being addressed here, such as misconceptions about conquest of the land, conquest of these people?" How is this being discussed? What kind of political conclusions are being drawn? One of the core issues is legal rights—70 percent of the people don't have legal title to the land. Within the political and legal systems, the institutions that deal with indigenous communities—that coordinate and facilitate development—are historically rooted in principles of inequality.

PRAXIS: How does this experience compare to your experience in the US?

JK: I'm a little bit biased to say this, but I haven't really been anywhere else in the world that is like where I'm from. We have rivers, we have mountains, we have lakes, fish, we have redwoods, oak trees, I mean, it's just—the Creator blessed our people. There are still parts of California that aren't fully developed. And that's one of our strengths.

The state of California has one of the biggest native populations, but its policy for indigenous peoples is almost nonexistent. When you really get down to it, cities in the US are getting bigger, they're getting more violent, and people don't want to live in them. Away from the urban centers, people want to bring up their children, to feel safe in their surroundings, and they're not finding that. In the United States, we're running out of room, and where are we going to go? We're going to go to the native lands that we have set aside for the people. There weren't supposed to be any indigenous people east of the Mississippi. Everything west of the Mississippi was supposed to be Indian land. But when you start having more non-Indians living on reservations than Indians themselves, that's when you have jurisdictional problems. More often than not, the underdeveloped lands that you have in the US are on reservations. But it's the same for indigenous people around the world.

I took this development economics course, and in the course we talked about capital; we talked about wages, labor. But we have these different models that we try to impose. If we increase taxes, then what's going to happen to wages and how is labor going to be affected?

Yet at the same time, you really have to step back and say, "Okay, who is going in and surveying the monetary system?" Is it the IMF? Is it the World Bank? Who is speaking with the people themselves or seeing exactly how they live? What is capital to them? Do they use money? Do they know what a dollar bill is? Some indigenous communities, they don't even want to know. They don't regard that as something that they need to know.

The standards need to be set. You need to take into account the communities, an understanding of what it means to be living how live, what they regard as important. Not to impose or to say, “We’re bringing these people civilization, we’re bringing these people education, we’re bringing them jobs, we’re bringing them opportunities.”

There are a number of classes at nearby schools about indigenous people. But I think there’s a choice of not recognizing in these schools the historical policy, the federal Indian law, the international indigenous movement. They talk about native resistance to neo-colonization, of the whole reawakening of who the Indian people are, understanding that they’re not from India. I guess that’s where the educational process comes into play. I think that whole redefinition is going to be a hard thing to do. But when you’re going to have developers, planners, surveyors going before tribal courts, because of tribal regulations of environmental policies, they’re going to have to think twice about what they’re doing and how they’re doing it, regarding Indians as not just what we see in movies, as people with feathers, yelling around, or mascots on the Redskin helmets. It’s confronting contemporary indigenous communities, and I think changing that consciousness will be a hard struggle.

The development in the area of the Gran Sabana that I visited is inevitable. I mean, there are going to be times when Venezuela and Colombia and Ecuador and Guyana, Chile and Argentina, are going to have these indigenous areas and they’re going to have to confront history. And again, you look at it in contemporary terms, and say, “This is how we dealt with this, this is how we’ve gone about relations with indigenous peoples.” Many people in the United States don’t want to be blamed for historical wrongs. But I see a continuance of the same policies being implemented, just under a different name and under different administrations. There has to be a change in this whole mentality. Who is development going to affect? How is it going to affect them?

Those affected need to be at the main table saying, “Over the next twenty years, this is what we want to do.” We need to have tribal leaders and communities involved in that decision-making process. Right now, you look around the table and all you see are forty- or fifty-year-old non-native men. The indigenous peoples, and people who are seventeen to twenty-five, aren’t involved in this process, and yet they’re the ones who are going to inherit these leadership positions, and who will have to deal with the results of these decisions. That’s one way you can look at it.

Efforts *are* being made. There are many indigenous organizations that are doing good work, contacting peoples and groups and having interactions that everybody’s learning from. It’s not that we’re running out of work in the development field.

PRAXIS: But there has to be a shift in the way it's done.

JK: Exactly. And I think there are already organizations that are saying exactly what I've been saying. In developing countries, whose land are we messing with? If we're going to put in a water development program or a dam, who's going to be flooded out? There have been cases in which development projects have caused violence to occur against indigenous people. I think this recurring violence that needs to be brought out in the development community. If these things are happening, let's get the information out about it.

PRAXIS: So how can developers improve their work?

JK: There must be institutional change. Indigenous perspectives and knowledge need to be included throughout the process—from planning to facilitation to implementation. Right now, we're just going in and saying, "Okay, we're going to develop this place. If anyone wants to say anything, they can come to our town meetings. If they don't, we'll assume they want it." This must be changed. It's the right of indigenous people to determine how and when development in their regions should be done. They need to be involved, from beginning to end.