Australian National University

Exploring Economic Prosperity for Aboriginal Peoples in New South Wales: Review of the literature

Report to Aboriginal Affairs NSW

Dr Annick Thomassin, Maggie Elmitt, Dr Mandy Yap and Dr Kirrily Jordan.

Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Australian National University.

18 September 2020

Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research

Research School of Social Sciences

College of Arts and Social Sciences

+61 2 6125 3512

annick.thomassin@anu.edu.au

Contents

Acknowledgement

Executive Summary

Introduction

- This report presents the findings of a desk-based review of literature exploring the concepts of prosperity, economic development and wellbeing – including as they relate to First Peoples in Australia and overseas. The review is not exhaustive, but canvasses the current field of inquiry in these areas and provides background for further research.

Aims

- The report is organised around three sets of questions:
  1. How has economic prosperity, economic development and wellbeing been defined and constructed by different disciplines, governments and Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, and how do these concepts interact and intersect?
  2. How have these concepts been used in Indigenous policy debates and frameworks?
  3. What has been the impact of these perspectives on the discourses and narratives about Aboriginal peoples, and the ways in which government policy approaches to economic development are framed?

Methodology

- The literature review search strategy included seven databases and 15 search terms. It resulted in over 200 papers being reviewed, including academic and grey literature. At least a third of these were written or co-written by Indigenous authors.

1.1 Economic development – origins, definitions and understandings

- A dominant conceptualisation of economic development emerged in the 1930s in the United States centred on measures of national accounts such Gross Domestic Product (GDP). From the 1950s, the United Nations and other international organisations promoted this 'economic growth' perspective with the aim of reducing poverty.
- Since the 1970s there has been growing recognition that the planet could not support the sustained economic growth required by this dominant development model. A shift has occurred towards considering social, cultural, ecological and intergenerational dimensions alongside GDP.
- For First Peoples 'development' has often been problematic, with the dominant development models widely criticised for privileging non-Indigenous ideas of progress and perpetuating colonial processes and power relations.
- Concepts such as 'life projects' and 'hybrid economies' are significant alternatives to this model. 'Life projects' allude to the possibility of Indigenous peoples 'defining the

direction they want to take in life, on the basis of their awareness and knowledge of their own place in the world' (Blaser, 2004, p. 30).

1.1.1 Economic development in policy frameworks

- Approaches to including First Peoples' economic development in policy frameworks are many and varied. Some, such as the Australian Government's Indigenous Economic Development Strategy 2011–2018, have been 'top-down' and criticised as perpetuating colonial power relations.

- Co-designed and Indigenous-led approaches have tended to be more holistic. The key principles and engagement strategy of the City of Sydney's 2016 *Eora Journey: Economic Development Plan* sought to move beyond the problems with colonial models of development.

- In New Zealand, *He kai kei aku ringa* suggests that economic development for Māori will result from economic self-determination and respecting Māori aspirations, preferences and norms.

1.2 Wellbeing – origins, definitions and understandings

- Since the 1970s, there has been a growing interest in wellbeing as an alternative to GDP in measuring 'progress.' Conceptions of wellbeing tend to be multidimensional, including both material and non-material dimensions as well as subjective assessments of one's life and emotions.

- The Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has been setting much of the agenda on wellbeing internationally since 2011 through its Better Life Initiative. Australia has led much of the work on measuring wellbeing around the world with the Australian Bureau of Statistics being the first national statistics organisation to measure wellbeing worldwide.

- Indigenous scholars and communities internationally have made substantial contributions to challenging mainstream conceptions of wellbeing. Indigenous understandings of wellbeing put the collective, environment/Mother Earth and relationality at their core, and emphasise self-determination.

1.2.1 Wellbeing in policy frameworks

- The NSW Coalition of Aboriginal Regional Alliances (NCARA) have recommended holistic wellbeing as a key future focus. A key motivation is the need for a more comprehensive implementation of conceptions of wellbeing to include social, cultural and community aspects alongside economic wellbeing and the wellbeing of the mind, body and spirit.

- The Australian Government Productivity Commission highlights wellbeing as a central focus in their Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage reports. These reports complement the monitoring of COAG Closing the Gap targets. Their focus on

mainstream statistics has been subjected to similar criticisms as those directed at the Closing the Gap agenda.

- The *New Zealand Living Standards Framework* (LSF) has 12 domains of wellbeing which overlap significantly with those of the OECD Better Life Initiative. For that reason, the LSF has been criticised as perpetuating the dominant views on progress measurement. Te Puni Kōkiri and NZ Treasury have proposed a Māori perspective on the LSF to derive seven wellbeing outcomes centred at the whānau (family) level.

- The UN's International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) has proposed eight themes as being related to Indigenous wellbeing internationally: traditional knowledge and practices; land and territories; health of the ecosystem; health; rights; leadership; and self-determination on matters affecting their wellbeing.

1.3   Prosperity – origins, definitions and understandings

- The term prosperity can have multiple meanings that are historically and culturally contingent. In Western cultures it has a strong association with material wealth and affluence.

- Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars have called for a rejection of this narrow understanding of prosperity, recasting it to also include 'non-financial' domains such as ecological and intergenerational sustainability, the quality of relationships and reciprocity, autonomy, and a sense of meaning and purpose is necessary.

- A significant theme in the literature highlights the ways in which First Peoples thrived and were prosperous pre-colonisation.

- Contemporary references to First Peoples' prosperity are varied, ranging from calls for the better integration of First Peoples in the mainstream market economy to a more holistic perspective which places greater emphasis on cultural and spiritual dimensions embedded in deep and balanced relationships between peoples, economy and the environment.

- What emerges from the literature is a complex picture pointing to larger questions of values and meaning, such as 'what is an economy?', and 'what, and who, is an economy for?'

1.3.1 Prosperity in policy frameworks

- In Australia, 'prosperity' has been employed across several jurisdictions as a frame for policies associated with First Peoples. However, few of these frameworks explicitly define prosperity, and many focus predominantly on mainstream economic measures such as employment, education and entrepreneurship.

- One exception is the City of Sydney's *Eora Journey: Economic Development Plan* which aims to assist First Peoples to 'achieve prosperity on their terms' (Moore in City of Sydney, 2016, p. 2). Community engagement sessions found that prosperity is 'not solely about amassing individual wealth,' but also includes community wellbeing,

shared wealth, improved choice, greater independence, self-determination, good health and happiness.

- The NSW Government's 2016 Aboriginal Economic Prosperity Framework (AEPF) established 'economic prosperity' as a key priority under *OCHRE*. However, it offers a rather a narrow vision of prosperity as 'wealth creation for Aboriginal people through increased employment and enterprise development' (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2016a, p. 1).

- The Council of Australian Governments' efforts to 'Refresh' the Closing the Gap framework initially adopted the concept of prosperity. This was criticised by the Lowitja Institute (2018) as too narrowly focused on monetary connotations. The new National Agreement on Closing the Gap, released in July 2020, does not reference prosperity but does refer to both development and wellbeing.

- The ways in which 'prosperity' has been used, and resisted, in developing these frameworks point to the multiple meanings of the term. If the desire is to challenge the status quo, First Peoples' leadership is critical in defining the broad vision for prosperity and its practical application in the policies, programs and measurement tools that are rolled out.

1.4   Interconnections between the concepts

- There are several ways in which the terms prosperity, economic development and wellbeing can relate to each other, depending on how they are defined and used by authors. These fall roughly into three categories: economic prosperity and wellbeing as *outcomes* of economic development; the interchangeable use of these terms; and the deliberate contrasting of prosperity and wellbeing.

- While wellbeing and prosperity can both be seen as outcomes of some form of 'development' process, in practice the choice whether to use wellbeing or prosperity may come down to personal preference. It is perhaps less important than the indicators used, the ways in which they are defined, and who they are defined by.

- Since many authors do not explicitly define what they mean by these terms, how they might see them in relation to each other is often impossible to discern.

2   A spectrum model of perspectives on First Peoples' prosperity

- Our analysis of the literature shows a range of perspectives on First Peoples' prosperity which are usefully located on a spectrum.

- We propose four conceptual categories: a market-based perspective on First Peoples' prosperity; a perspective which focuses on First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship; an economic diversity perspective; and a relational and holistic perspective. These four perspectives are fluid, broad and overlapping.

- Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples' standpoints are represented across the whole spectrum, but state-led approaches tend to focus on the market-based

perspective and First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship. Indigenous-led and informed approaches tend more towards the holistic end of the spectrum.

2.1 Market-based perspective

- The market-based position on the spectrum speaks strongly to mainstream economic measures such as wealth creation and economic growth, with a focus on improving First Peoples' material living standards. Participation in the market economy is understood as providing First Peoples' with freedom, autonomy and opportunity to choose lives they have reason to value.
- The market-based approach is often underpinned by strong assumptions that Indigenous Peoples need to change their behaviours, systems and governance structures to capitalise on market opportunities.
- First Peoples' lands, knowledges and resources tend to be seen as assets to be commercially leveraged. Some contributors to this perspective also present self-determination as a likely benefit of achieving economic prosperity.

2.2 First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship

- This perspective remains focussed on market-based outcomes such as individual wealth creation, entrepreneurship, and access to capital. However, it differs from the market-based perspective in its emphasis on First Peoples' business and entrepreneurship. It also places greater importance on self-determination, and First Peoples taking ownership of the changes needed to succeed.
- There is a tendency to frame communal and/or inalienable title to land as a significant hurdle to unlocking the economic potential of Indigenous territories and, therefore, as detrimental to Indigenous development and prosperity. However, some authors in this perspective also point to the centrality of communal and inalienable titles to land as central to First Peoples' cultures, and the possibilities of building strong Indigenous economies and polities based on communal titles and collective enterprises.
- The entrepreneurial ethos evident here blends market participation with contemporary Indigenous values, cultures and kinship.

2.3 Economic diversity

- In contrast to the two previous perspectives which tend not to question the centrality of the market, this perspective suggests mainstream market economies can be reshaped to adapt to Indigenous cultures.
- Culture and self-determination are understood as the foundation on which development and prosperity are imagined and enacted, rather than their outcomes of prosperity.

- First Peoples' agency, knowledges and aspirations are seen as central to shaping their futures by pursuing their own visions of development. Land rights and land ownership remain important dimensions in the pursuit of diverse life projects.

- There is a focus on diverse and hybrid economic strategies which interlace commercial economic participation with non-market, not-for-profit, customary, and alternative economic activities and priorities.

2.4   Relational and holistic prosperity

- First Peoples' philosophies, knowledge systems, and relationalities become the core foundation and guiding principles on how prosperity is defined and can be achieved. This perspective draws on millennia of cultural knowledge from First Peoples and pushes further the thinking around what an economy is and what purposes it should serve.

- Understandings of prosperity emerging are relational and embedded in kinship, and include responsibilities, reciprocity and respect for 'all-our-relations' (LaDuke, 1999).

- At this end of the spectrum, economic prosperity cannot be separated from social, cultural, spiritual and political prosperity. The emphasis is on First Peoples regaining control of their lives, lands and cultures and having the capacity to define the economic system for themselves. This perspective is therefore associated with more radical place-based agendas and visions of economic development which resonate with the emerging projects of Indigenous resurgence.

3   Policy debates across the spectrum model

- The market-based prosperity and First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspectives tend to support policy positions that strongly focus on the individual and are centred on improving outcomes against mainstream socioeconomic indicators.

- On the other hand, the pluralism of approaches among the economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives means that associated policy proscriptions are very broad.

- The key policy debates we have identified across this spectrum engage with themes of self-determination, land holdings, governance, improvement of indicators and ground-up policy development.

3.1   Self-determination

- The market-based and First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspectives tend to consider self-determination and autonomy as an *outcome* of economic development or prosperity.

- The economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives treat self-determination as *foundational.* That is, it is seen as necessary in order to pursue prosperity or appropriate development.

- In most nation-states, the Indigenous self-determination and sovereignty referred to here necessitates an important shift in First Peoples-state relationships – in which non-Indigenous governments agree to relinquish or share power with Indigenous leadership and institutions.

3.2   Land holdings

- In the market-based perspective, several papers emphasise First Peoples' land holdings and associated resources as important assets that can be capitalised on for economic development or prosperity. Inalienable forms of land title are often seen as restricting the ability of First Peoples to realise their economic potential.
- At the other end of the spectrum, approaches within the economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives see so-called 'land holdings' not as assets but rather as the 'lifeblood' on which First Peoples survive.

3.3.   Governance

- Within the market-based and First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspectives the literature tends to identify problems with First Peoples' governance structures as a 'handbrake' on economic development or prosperity. Indigenous institutions are often represented as requiring capacity development and accountability measures moulded on non-Indigenous governance structures to provide increased certainty to lenders and investors.
- The economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives highlight the tensions between First Peoples' and Western models of governance and speak to the need to respect Indigenous models of governance and change the governance practices of states.

3.4   Improving indicators

- Mainstream socio-economic indicators are likely to at least partially capture aspects of economic development, prosperity and wellbeing that are important to First Peoples. Literature in the relational and holistic prosperity perspective often emphasises the need to develop sets of indicators that are anchored in Indigenous worldviews and that account for the diversity of Indigenous realities, perspectives and aspirations.
- Substantial work to develop such indicators is being undertaken by Indigenous scholars (e.g. Walter & Anderson, 2013; Kukutai & Walter, 2017). Efforts by First Peoples communities on the ground have also been driving change in this space (e.g. the Yawuru community wellbeing project, Yap & Yu, 2016).

3.5   Ground-up policy development and co-design

- While some of the perspectives we have grouped under the market-based approaches are promoted by First Peoples (e.g. Pearson 2005a, 2005b, 2010), these approaches tend to be state-led.

- In the economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives there is much greater emphasis on the need for community-based and participatory development practices that ensure First Peoples have a leading role in policy development and co-design.

- Policy design and implementation can be seen as important spaces of Indigenous resurgence, where self-determination and sovereignty are enacted such that creative diverse or hybrid economies can be performed.

- The institutions and environment in which co-design partnerships occur matters greatly (Escobar, 2018), in particular so that co-design processes do not work to uphold the legitimacy of settler-colonial systems and the power relations that underlie them.

4   Impacts on discourses and narratives

- The varied perspectives on First Peoples' economic development, wellbeing and prosperity speak to long-standing debates that both draw on, and tend to reinforce, particular narratives about Indigenous Peoples.

- We identify these narratives broadly as those related to First Peoples' deficits and strengths; and those related to ideas about equality versus difference, both of which have implications for government approaches to policy-making.

4.1   Narratives of deficits and strengths

- Much of the state's response to First Peoples over the last 230 years in Australia has been deeply embedded in 'deficit thinking.' Framing policy through this lens whilst ignoring structural and institutional causes of socio-economic inequalities and attempted assimilation has significant negative consequences including stereotyping, reinforcing disparities, justifying inappropriate government interventions, and limiting trust in First Peoples' institutions.

- There have been growing calls over the last two decades to frame policies and programs relating to First Peoples as strengths-based. Strength-based approaches seek to offer 'a different language and set of solutions to overcoming an issue' based on notions of strength, resilience and 'opportunities that facilitate growth and thriving' (Fogarty, Lovell *et al*., 2018, p. vi).

- However, strength-based approaches are not without their limitations. Many development projects that are described as strengths-based or ground-up community development initiatives continue to be moulded by bureaucratic and Western perspectives that are informed by deficit thinking – and that fail to grapple with structural issues such as the deep impacts of colonisation, racism and related

intergenerational traumas. Such perspectives have repeatedly limited the actualisation of development alternatives that are guided and driven by First Peoples.

4.2 Narratives of equality and difference

- Another way of understanding the impact of approaches to economic development, wellbeing and prosperity on discourses about First Peoples is through the notions of equality and difference. Equality refers to statistical equality based on standard Western socio-economic measures, while difference refers to the maintenance of culturally-informed differences in aspirations and life projects that may see divergence on some socio-economic indicators.

- Many policy approaches that relate to First Peoples have prioritised some version of equality on mainstream statistical measures, with these measures tending to reflect and constitute the dominant cultural framework 'in ways largely invisible to their producers and users,' creating the 'known reality' about what the problems are and how to fix them (Walter & Anderson, 2011, p. 9).

- Substantial recent work has been done to develop First Peoples' quantitative methodologies that produce statistical data by and for First Peoples and portray reality from First Peoples' perspectives.

- The four perspectives in the spectrum model of First Peoples' prosperity reflect different positions in the equality and difference debate. For example, the market-based perspective tends to focus on incorporating First Peoples into mainstream economic practices and institutions.

- The economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives underscore First Peoples' self-determination and life projects and emphasise ground-up policy-making that supports First Peoples' visions and aspirations for their futures. Non-Indigenous cultures, institutions and economic practices are seen as in need of challenge and reform.

Conclusion

- Across the literature we have reviewed, the terms economic development, wellbeing and prosperity are used in very different ways.

- These varied definitions mean that adopting the concepts of First Peoples' economic development, wellbeing and prosperity may – or may not – offer alternatives to the status quo. This is not to say that their use is without consequence: different uses of these terms produce particular discourses that can profoundly shape the relationships between Indigenous polities, the state and diverse publics. They also influence the content of policy frameworks and their very real impacts on First Peoples' lives and institutions.

- What emerges as being most important is how the concepts are defined and operationalised in policy. Framing public policy in language like prosperity or

wellbeing is most likely to signal a genuine transformation of colonial power relations where the terms are defined by and for First Peoples to accord with their values, aspirations and priorities.

- Despite substantial conceptual development about the need for Indigenous-driven policy frameworks, there have been few attempts to develop a policy-relevant Indigenous informed approach to Indigenous prosperity from the ground up. Such a process could open up a range of potential economic futures that aim to build material affluence while investing in the diversity of First Peoples' visions, values and aspirations across NSW.

Introduction

In the last two decades the term 'prosperity' has been increasingly adopted in Australian and international literature concerned with First Peoples economic futures and associated policy frameworks. The concept of prosperity is of course not new. The Latin roots of the word relate to 'doing well' (Oxford Dictionary, 2020; see also Cassiers, 2015, p. 1). In mainstream modern usage, it has become increasingly associated with debates about appropriate measures for both economic development and human progress, particularly since the 1970s. As will be discussed later, the term is historically and culturally contingent and, as such, it holds multiple and at times conflicting meanings.

In Australia, references to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander prosperity have notably been made by influential Bagaarrmugu and Guggu Yalanji legal scholar Noel Pearson since the mid-2000s, as well as being used by prominent Aboriginal scholars, business people and public servants including Marcia Langton, Danny Lester and Warren Mundine. The term prosperity has also been used in a range of government and private sector strategies that focus on Indigenous economic and social outcomes. For example, the Council of Australian Governments' (COAG)[1] initial efforts to 'refresh' the Closing the Gap framework adopted the pursuit of prosperity as one goal (e.g. see Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PMC), 2019). The New South Wales (NSW) Government's approach to 'Growing NSW's First Economy' is framed as promoting the 'economic prosperity of Aboriginal people and communities in NSW' (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2016a).

In these frameworks, and in a number of approaches relating to First Peoples internationally (including in Canada, Aotearoa New Zealand and the USA), ideas about 'prosperity' have most often been associated with greater participation in – and returns from – market economies. However, a survey of academic and grey literature from Australia and overseas suggests that, while it is rarely defined explicitly in policy debates, 'prosperity' can also mean much more than this – extending to encompass rights such as self-determination and domains including kinship, reciprocity, intergenerational equity, environmental justice and spirituality.

It is for this reason that the Aboriginal Affairs Research Agenda 2018-2023 identified the need for further exploration of what prosperity means for 'different Aboriginal people, communities and organisations in New South Wales, as well as appropriate strategies and measures to realise it' (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2017, p. 11). This report is a first step in that direction. Commissioned by Aboriginal Affairs NSW, it presents the findings of a desk-based review of literature exploring the concept of prosperity – including as it relates to, and has been defined by, Indigenous Peoples in Australia and overseas. As a point of comparison, it also addresses the term's intersections with the concepts of economic development and

---

[1] COAG has ceased to exist in May 2020 and replaced by a new National Federation Reform Council (NFRC) and National Cabinet (see https://www.pmc.gov.au/news-centre/government/coag-becomes-national-cabinet).

wellbeing. As discussed below, the three terms 'prosperity,' 'economic development' and 'wellbeing' are all part of the discursive formation that has been deployed in various ways to influence possible Indigenous Peoples-settler state relations and Indigenous futures – economic and beyond. While this review of the literature aims to be comprehensive, it is not exhaustive. Rather, it canvasses the current field of inquiry in these areas and provides background for further research with Aboriginal communities that will ask what prosperity means for them. Initially to be piloted as a case study in the Illawarra region, these next steps reflect the commitment of Aboriginal Affairs NSW to self-determination, power-sharing and co-production of policy design and program goals.

Aims

This report provides an overview of the concept of prosperity and its relationship to notions of economic development and wellbeing. It is organised around three questions:

1. How have economic prosperity, economic development and wellbeing been defined and constructed by different disciplines, governments and Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, and how do these concepts interact and intersect?
2. How have these concepts been used in Indigenous policy debates and frameworks?
3. What has been the impact of these perspectives on the discourses and narratives about Aboriginal peoples, and the ways in which government policy approaches to economic development are framed?

As noted above, the concept of prosperity as a framework for Indigenous policy is open to a range of interpretations and perspectives, with several competing and complementary trends emerging from the literature reviewed. Each interpretation could potentially pave the way to very different futures for Indigenous organisations, communities and individuals. The next section briefly outlines the methodology used for the literature review, before the report turns to address the three organising questions.

Methodology

The research team first identified keywords to source relevant literature in online social science and government databases. Keywords included Indigenous, Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander(s), First Peoples, First Nations, Māori, Prosperity, Economic Prosperity, Wellbeing, Economic Development, Aboriginal Economic Prosperity Framework, Indigenous Entrepreneurship, Indigenous Policy, Land Rights and Native Title. Search terms were combinations of these keywords. The databases searched were AIATSIS, JSTOR, Web of Knowledge, Informit, Anthropological Index Online, Parliament of Australia database, US Department of Commerce Research Library, and Google search engines. To place some bounds on the large volume of literature found, we limited the scope to the

period 2005-2020. Some particularly relevant earlier sources were identified through references cited in reviewed papers.

Over 250 papers were initially identified for this review including academic and grey literature and, when relevant, websites, opinion pieces and news items. Of the 285 references canvassed in this report, at least one third was written by Indigenous authors. This is a lower bound estimate as many of the reports related to Indigenous-specific frameworks or published by Indigenous organisations are also likely to be led or co-authored by Indigenous authors as well as informed by Indigenous communities.[1]

Qualitative analysis of the literature was supported by the use of NVivo to help track key themes and considerations important for better understanding notions of prosperity, economic development and wellbeing, including their interactions and their applications in Indigenous policy debates.

In this report we use the terms Indigenous and First Peoples interchangeably, reflecting our reliance on international literature where both terms are prominent. We use the term Aboriginal where this is relevant to the material at hand – e.g. in referring to Aboriginal peoples of NSW or Canada. We note that there are complexities around all of these terms that we have not resolved here. While we capitalise Indigenous in line with Australian guidelines, the term is often not capitalised in the international literature and this is reflected in some citations we used. Finally, we note that none of the four authors of this report identify as Indigenous. We intend the report to be a background resource for further work which will engage Indigenous researchers and, through detailed case study, foreground the perspectives and voices of Aboriginal peoples in NSW.

1. Meanings of Terms

Question 1: How have economic prosperity, economic development and wellbeing been defined and constructed by different disciplines and Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples? How do these concepts interact and intersect?

In this section, we address our first set of questions. We provide a brief summary of the uses and definitions of the terms 'economic development,' 'wellbeing' and 'prosperity' by Indigenous and non-Indigenous authors and their intersections. We illustrate this discussion with the uses of these terms in a number of existing policy frameworks that operate at state, national and global levels. In Section 2 we then extend this analysis into a more thorough engagement with the concept of prosperity, noting that it has been used from multiple

---

[1] The Indigeneity of authors is not always publicly identified. Several of the papers reviewed were co-written by Indigenous and non-Indigenous authors.

perspectives that range from concerns with market participation to broader social, cultural and economic outcomes. The latter perspectives broaden notions of even *economic* prosperity well beyond the material, suggesting that well-functioning economies also attend to ostensibly 'non-material' domains like relationships and reciprocity, intergenerational and ecological sustainability, autonomy, meaning and purpose.

1.1 Economic development – origins, definitions and understandings

For First Peoples worldwide the term 'development' has often been problematic. It can evoke possibilities for freedom, self-sufficiency, self-determination and wealth creation. Yet it has also been heavily implicated in projects of ongoing colonisation and applied in ways that have caused misunderstanding, mistrust, impoverishment and widespread dispossession of land and resources (Bicker & Sillitoe, 2003; Gegeo, 1998; Nelson, 2019; Sillitoe, 1998; Sillitoe *et al.*, 2002).

As a concept, development appeared at least as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century with the emergence of industrial societies (Bessarab & Forrest, 2017). A dominant and persistent conceptualisation of economic development emerged in the 1930s in the United States. This centred on measures of national accounts (initially Gross National Product, GNP, and later Gross Domestic Product, GDP), and demanded a continual increase in production and economic growth (Alexander, 2015; Arndt, 1981; Corlet Walker & Jackson, 2019; Raworth, 2017). Populations were seen to be better off when national economies were growing, and it was therefore thought that nations should emulate 'the features that characterized the "advanced" societies of the time – high levels of industrialization and urbanization … rapid growth of material production and living standards, and widespread adoption of modern education and cultural values' (Escobar, 1995, p.270).

American economic historian Walt Rostow argued that all countries must proceed through a series of stages of growth as they transitioned from 'underdevelopment' to development in a linear fashion (Rostow, 1960). Similar ideas were adopted by the United Nations and other international organisations from the 1950s. They promoted a range of programs aimed at reducing poverty and improving development of 'underdeveloped' societies with an overriding focus on economic growth as the goal. These programs operated on the assumption that limiting government intervention in 'free markets' would increase productivity and therefore reduce poverty – for example, through reducing budget deficits and trade barriers, and privatising state enterprises (Sparr, 1994; see also Rodwan Abouharb & Cingranelli, 2007; Summers & Pritchett, 1993;).

From the 1970s, however, it became evident that such an approach to economic development was often ineffective at alleviating poverty, and that the planet could not support the persistent economic growth required by this model. Burgeoning critiques of development sought to include the perspectives of the so-called 'underdeveloped' in future

models, shift the goals away from a singular focus on GDP, and challenge unequal power relations that had allowed Western conceptualisations and institutions to dominate (Cornell & Kalt, 1990; Escobar, 1995; Raworth, 2017). Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1962) and *The Limits to Growth* by Donella Meadows and colleagues (1972) also showed the important ecological limits of the prevailing development model.

These critiques of the concept of development have led to a broadening of its scope, going beyond the singular consideration of economic growth to also include social, cultural, ecological and intergenerational dimensions (Corlet Walker & Jackson, 2019; Nederveen Pieterse, 1998). For example, the 1987 Brundtland Report linked development with the notions of justice and responsibilities between peoples and generations. It introduced the concept of sustainable development – that is, 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, ch.2.1). This has been followed by several international commitments to 'sustainable development' including through the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (2000–2015) and Sustainable Development Goals (2015–2030). The MDG goals for member states included targets across the eight domains of poverty, education, gender equality, health, environmental sustainability and internet usage. The SDGs add several more goals to seek to ensure sustainable consumption and production by 2030. Additional concerns in the SDGs include climate action, pollution and land degradation, as well as affordable energy and peace and justice (United Nations, 2015).

However, despite the increased focus on 'sustainability', the dominant model of development maintains the pursuit of economic growth as a core focus. While the language of development may now better reflect broader human and planetary needs, some still question whether any model premised on growth is the right frame (Helne & Hirvilammi, 2019; Jackson, 2005, 2017). Economist Kate Raworth (2017), for example, has noted the tendency to change the language without substantial change in policy direction. She suggests that the underlying model of development remains ill-equipped to deal with the real challenge of putting human and environmental values at the heart of an economic mindset regardless of whether growth is billed as 'sustainable,' 'inclusive' or 'lasting'.

It is important to note that similar debates are played out in approaches to 'economic development' for First Peoples. For example, the concept of development has been widely criticised for privileging non-Indigenous ideas of progress and potentially foreclosing First Nations' aspirations beyond the mainstream (e.g. Bicker & Sillitoe, 2003; Gegeo, 1998; Sillitoe *et al*., 2002). In Australia, this has been perhaps most evident in contested ideas about 'mainstream' versus alternative economic development, with the former emphasising market engagement and the latter positing broader definitions of Indigenous economies that include non-market spheres (Buchanan, 2014; Altman, 2001, 2005, 2009b; Thomassin, 2016).

These debates are also evident internationally (Bebbington, 1993; Blaser, 2004; Cerdán, 2013; Curry, 2003; de la Cuadra, 2015; Escobar, 1998; Gomes, 2012; Nash, 2003; Tebtebba Foundation, 2010). For example, recent frameworks for Māori economic development have been seen by some Māori scholars as still too constrained by Western values, prioritising market engagement but offering a lack of vision about 'authentic Māori values, worldviews and capabilities' (Dell *et al.,* 2018, p.60). The concept of 'life projects' (Blaser, 2004) is significant here. Life projects can be described as holistic, local and dynamic alternatives to economic development (Blaser *et al*., 2004). Emerging in the late 1990s, notably through the work of anthropologists David Gow (1997) and Arturo Escobar (1998), the notion alludes to the possibility of Indigenous peoples 'defining the direction they want to take in life, on the basis of their awareness and knowledge of their own place in the world' (Blaser, 2004, p.30).

1.1.1 Economic development in policy frameworks

Economic development has been a core preoccupation underpinning Indigenous policy-making in many countries, including Australia, Canada, Aotearoa New Zealand, and the United States. While the number of Indigenous economic development frameworks is too large to report on individually in detail, this section highlights several approaches at the level of local, state and national governments—where some important distinctions emerge. Globally, the United Nations Permanent Forum of Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) also reports on Indigenous issues related to economic and social development. Additional frameworks that relate to economic development, wellbeing and prosperity are briefly summarised in Appendix 1.

Several local governments have developed plans that consider the economic development of Aboriginal communities and businesses, including the City of Sydney through its 2016 *Eora Journey: Economic Development Plan*. We highlight this plan because of its key principles and engagement strategy that have sought to move beyond the problems with colonial models of development discussed in Section 1.1. The key principles of the plan emphasise that it supports the aspirations of Sydney's diverse Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population, and is framed in the language of self-determination (City of Sydney, 2016, p. 5). That is, the plan intends to: expand economic participation and opportunities by enabling greater self-determination; recognise the diversity of aspiration among individuals and communities; remain dynamic and responsive to changing needs and opportunities; create business opportunities in delivering activities under the plan, not simply as a result of the activities; and support a partnership model by co-ordinating between all partners (individuals, communities, government agencies and not-for-profit organisations).

This was based on a 'thorough and consultative' engagement strategy (the Eora Journey Prosperity Talk) which drew on expertise from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elders, students, entrepreneurs, workers, artists, public servants, community leaders and community organisations (Goodwin & Brown in City of Sydney, 2016, p. 3). The plan centres

on 4 key themes including: support and capacity building for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander business owners and prospective entrepreneurs; maximising employment outcomes (e.g. through support for job-readiness and career pathways); enhancing access to and benefits from tertiary education (e.g. by promoting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander success stories and supporting networks between students); and growing entrepreneurship and employment in key sectors of the economy (i.e. finance, professional services, tourism, retail, and creative and digital industries).[2] A measurement framework for the plan sets out eighteen variables across these domains that will be taken as indicators of success (City of Sydney, 2016, p. 54).

At the state government level, the NSW Legislative Council's Standing Committee on State Development conducted an inquiry into economic development in Aboriginal communities in 2015–17. Across the fifty publicly available submissions the key domains that emerged were Indigenous enterprise; Indigenous business; entrepreneurship; employment; education; the capacity of Local Aboriginal Land Councils; natural resource management; and the use of land and water assets (including the resolution of land claims and improvements to land claims and planning processes). It should be noted, though, that these domains were shaped by the inquiry's terms of reference.

Several submissions from Aboriginal organisations highlighted the central importance of self-determination and recalibrated relationships between Government and Aboriginal communities as pre-conditions for development. For example, Owen Trembath (2015, p. 4), then CEO of Jubullum Local Aboriginal Land Council, argued that most economic development programs proposed for Aboriginal people and communities to date have been 'essentially non-Aboriginal economic models that are unsuccessfully imposed on Aboriginal economic systems.' The NSW Aboriginal Land Council argued that sustainable economic development necessitates a rights-based community development approach founded on the substantive empowerment of Aboriginal Peoples (NSWALC, 2016, p. 4). For these reasons, the Standing Committee on State Development's first recommendation was that the NSW Government recalibrate its relationship with Aboriginal communities 'to empower individuals and encourage economic sustainability and prosperity,' including 'developing a framework to ensure standards of good faith, and standards of meaningful engagement, with Aboriginal communities' (Standing Committee on State Development, 2016, p. x).

The NSW Government's response to this inquiry is framed by its *OCHRE* plan,[3] which rests on several core beliefs including that 'government should do things *with* Aboriginal communities, not for or to Aboriginal communities;' and that 'the strongest communities are those that drive solutions' (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2013). In its response to the inquiry, the government reiterated its commitment to 'put negotiation at the centre of all dealings' with

---

[2] For a discussion on the role of 'digital inclusion' for Indigenous economic development and prosperity see Rigney (2017, p. 190).
[3] *OCHRE* stands for Opportunity, Choice, Healing, Responsibility, and Empowerment.

Aboriginal communities in NSW, and invest in government and community capacity to work in partnership including through its Local Decision Making strategy (NSW Government, 2017, p. 4). Central to its approach to economic development is its Aboriginal Economic Prosperity Framework. While this will be discussed more fully in Section 1.3.1, it is significant to note that it was developed through 'targeted consultation' with 'key Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal stakeholders' (NSW Government, 2017, p. 5) rather than the 'thorough and consultative' engagement strategy of the Eora Journey Prosperity Talk.

Federally, the Commonwealth Government's Indigenous Economic Development Strategy 2011–2018 aimed to 'put jobs and real economic activity at the centre of our efforts to close the gap on Indigenous disadvantage' (Macklin in Arbib, Evans & Macklin, 2011). The strategy's key priorities aligned with the Council of Australian Governments' Closing the Gap targets, including objectives in education; employment; welfare reform; housing and home ownership; health; infrastructure; Indigenous leadership; and Indigenous business and entrepreneurship. While the strategy recognised the unique and 'rich traditional and cultural knowledge' of Australia's First Peoples, it focused only on how these could be used as 'valuable economic assets' rather than their broader value to First Peoples and their diverse life projects (Australian Government Department of Families Housing Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA), 2010, p. 14). As such, the strategy was subject to similar critiques as the Closing the Gap agenda which, before its recent 'refresh,' was heavily criticised for being top-down and giving insufficient recognition to First Peoples' aspirations (Altman, 2009a; Pholi *et al*., 2009).

Internationally, a key example of an Indigenous-led economic development strategy is *He kai kei aku ringa:* The Crown-Māori Economic Growth Partnership (Māori Economic Development Panel, 2012a). *He kai kei aku ringa* is translated by the Māori Economic Development Panel as 'self-generating well-being,' or 'providing food with ones' own hands'[4] (Māori Economic Development Panel, 2012b, p. 15). It focuses on the economic futures of Māori, and suggests that prosperity will result from economic self-determination and the combined efforts of Māori *whānau* (extended family), enterprises and collectives (including *iwi* or tribes, Māori trusts and incorporations) working with government and the private sector to meet a range of objectives – such as lifting Māori educational and skill levels, increasing Māori participation in the workforce, establishing long-term Crown-Māori partnerships and leveraging Māori comparative advantages and the Māori asset base (Māori Economic Development Panel, 2012c).

He kai kei aku ringa notes the importance of respecting Māori aspirations, preferences and norms (Māori Economic Development Panel, 2012b, p. 5). The discussion document also states that the goal of the strategy is not simply financial gain, but also the flourishing of

---

[4] Literally, 'to provide the food you need with your own hands – or in today's world, to be responsible for the resources and capability you need to grow and develop' (Māori Economic Development Panel, 2012a, p. 6).

kaupapa Māori (Māori principles)[5] (Māori Economic Development Panel, 2012b, p. 13). Nonetheless, Māori scholars Kiri Dell (Ngati Porou), Nimbus Staniland (Ngāti Awa, Ngai Tūhoe) and Amber Nicholson (Ngāruahine) (2018) have critiqued *He kai kei aku ringa*, suggesting that its proscription for 'more jobs, better education and Māori-Crown partnerships' sits firmly within the 'Anglo-Western' status quo and exposes a lack of visioning about preferred futures based on 'authentic Māori values, worldviews and capabilities' (Dell *et. al.,* 2018, p. 60).

From their perspective, this risks 'perpetuating actions and behaviours common in the capitalist colonial system' and 'cannot create the kaupapa-driven transformational change that Māori claim to aspire to' (Dell *et. al.,* 2018, p. 60). In particular, Dell and colleagues suggest that *He kai kei aku ringa* does not adequately recognise the place of *mana* in a future economy – this is a 'quality, energy or consciousness in the world which can be harnessed and expressed in human activities through acts of generosity and wisdom' (Royal in Dell *et. al.,* 2018, p. 54). Principles of an economy of mana might include, for example, decision-making for the collective good and intergenerational benefit; economic interactions that maintain a sense of belonging and connection; and a recognition that the 'entire world is a kinship network of all living things' (Dell *et. al.,* 2018, p. 56). This demonstrates the important point that the appropriate pathways towards Māori-led 'economic development' are highly diverse among Māori. Dell and colleagues (2018, p. 60) suggest that this highlights the need for a substantial 'visioning' process to engage a wide variety of Māori Peoples in public workshops, focus groups and design sessions 'to reach some Māori consensus on images for an economic future.'

At the global level, the UNPFII considers economic and social development among its broad remit. Several articles in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) speak directly to economic development,[6] and give substantial weight to First Peoples' calls for Indigenous-led development. In 2017, the UNPFII held a special session on 'Sustainable Development in the Territories of Indigenous Peoples.' This took a holistic approach to issues of development, reiterating that for First Peoples sustainable development is inextricably linked to multiple dimensions including self-determination, interdependence, sharing resources, conservation for future generations, holistic health and the profound spiritual, cultural, social, economic and political relationships First Peoples

---

[5] Including the values of *tino rangatiratanga* (self-determination, ownership, active control); *whanaungatanga* (an ethic of belonging and kinship, including in business culture); *kaitiakitanga* (guardianship of natural resources); and *kōtahitanga* (Māori unity and shared sense of belonging).

[6] This includes Article 3: Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely deter- mine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development; Article 23: Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for exercising their right to development. In particular, indigenous peoples have the right to be actively involved in developing and determining health, housing and other economic and social programmes affecting them and, as far as possible, to administer such programmes through their own institutions; and Article 32: Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for the development or use of their lands or territories and other resources.

have with their lands and territories (United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 2018).

1.2 Wellbeing – origins, definitions and understandings

The pursuit of wellbeing as a worthwhile goal is first recorded during the times of the ancient Greek philosophers with the likes of Aristotle and Epicurus asking what brings about a good life, what enables a person to flourish and what is a life well-lived (Austin, 2016). In contemporary times, several key developments have led to the emergence of wellbeing as a way of conceptualising progress beyond the focus on economic growth. Seminal work by economist Richard Easterlin (1974) demonstrated the lack of clear association between rising GDP per capita and increases in subjective wellbeing. This finding prompted a rapid growth in 'happiness research' and contributed to the popularity of wellbeing as an alternative to GDP in measuring 'progress.' At the same time, international interest in the concept of wellbeing was spurred on by the critiques of 'development' that are outlined in Section 1.1.

Like the other key concepts in this paper, interest in wellbeing is multi-disciplinary. It is evident in philosophy, theology, psychology, anthropology, economics and sociology (Bache & Reardon, 2016; Diener & Seligman, 2004; Frey & Stutzer, 2002; Graham, 2012; Haybron, 2015; Mathews & Izquierdo, 2009; Thin, 2009; Tiberius, 2006). Whilst the term wellbeing is often used synonymously with happiness, health and quality of life, it has subtle and distinct ideological differences that stem from its disciplinary and philosophical underpinnings (Yap & Yu, 2019). In general, wellbeing approaches move deliberately beyond measures of wealth and economic growth and identify the need for more holistic policy agendas (e.g. Queensland Productivity Commission, 2017). Some of the earliest contemporary definitions of wellbeing were presented by political scientist Doh Chull Shin and Dan M. Johnson (1978) who described wellbeing as a global assessment of a person's quality of life according to their own chosen criteria. As such, conceptions of wellbeing tend to be multidimensional, including both material and non-material dimensions as well as subjective assessments of one's life and emotions (Adler & Seligman, 2016; Bache & Reardon, 2016; McGillivray & Clarke, 2006; OECD, 2015; Sen, 1987; Stiglitz *et al.*, 2009; White & Blackmore, 2016). The suite of wellbeing indicators developed in many different contexts range from those focussed primarily on individuals to those that also focus on communities, nations and the responsibilities of governments.

The global pursuit of 'wellbeing' has been taken up by several international organisations. For example, the 2007 Istanbul Declaration[7] affirmed a commitment to measuring and fostering the progress of societies in all dimensions with the ultimate goal of improving policy-making, democracy and citizens' wellbeing (OECD, 2018). Since 2011 the

---

[7] Ratified by the OECD, European Commission, Organisation of the Islamic Conference, United Nations, UN Development Programme and World Bank.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has set much of the international agenda on wellbeing through the Better Life Initiative. This assesses wellbeing across 11 dimensions including income and wealth, work and job quality, housing, health, knowledge and skills, environmental quality, subjective wellbeing, safety, work-life balance, social connections and civic engagement.

The United Nations' Millennium Development Goals and Sustainable Development Goals have also contributed to the longstanding interest in conceptualising and measuring wellbeing, although they are framed as addressing human development (Pink *et al.,* 2014, p. 165). Sustainable Development Goal 3 speaks specifically to the importance of wellbeing—though the targets and indicators represented through this goal are narrow in scope and focus primarily on physical health outcomes, health financing and access to medications (United Nations, n.d.).

Australia has led much of the work on measuring wellbeing around the world with the Australian Bureau of Statistics being the first national statistics organisation to measure wellbeing worldwide (Drabsch, 2012, p. 24). Other key developments in Australia include the Australian Treasury's Wellbeing Framework developed in the early 2000s to guide policymaking in Australia and the Australian Unity Wellbeing Index established in 2001 and still ongoing (Cummins *et al.,* 2003). The Treasury Wellbeing Framework adopts a capability approach[8] (following the seminal work of economist Amartya Sen) whereas the Australian Unity Wellbeing Index focuses on the sub-area of subjective wellbeing.

In Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand models of Indigenous wellbeing have primarily emerged from the health field, emphasising holistic views of health to incorporate spiritual, social, emotional, cultural and physical aspects of life (Durie, 2006; Ganesharajah, 2009; Jones *et al.,* 2018; Nguyen & Cairney, 2013). A particular focus in the Australian literature is on the relationship between connection to culture and Country and health and wellbeing for Indigenous Peoples (Altman & Kerins, 2012; Ganesharajah, 2009; Greiner *et al.,* 2005; Grieves, 2006). Several scholars have also employed the capability approach to explore Indigenous health and wellbeing in Australia (Panzironi, 2009, 2012; Sangha *et al.,* 2015; Vaughan, 2010; Yap & Yu, 2016a). In a systematic review of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander wellbeing literature in Australia, Undumbi social psychologist Tamara Butler and colleagues (2019) identified nine broad interconnected wellbeing dimensions. They include autonomy, empowerment and recognition; physical health; family and community; culture,

---

[8] The capability approach has been enormously influential across the wellbeing and development literature and posits that wellbeing can be understood in terms of peoples' capabilities, or their opportunities to do and be what they have reason to value (Sen, 1985; Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2000; Nussbaum, 2003). The capability approach is concerned with the distinction between capabilities and functionings. Functionings can be described as achievements. Capabilities are the ability to achieve and are therefore concerned with notions of freedom and the real opportunities to live the life one has reason to value – as well as the structures that promote or hinder their pursuit of wellbeing (Sen, 1999; see also Alkire, 2002; Alkire, 2015; Clark, 2005; Deneulin, 2008; Robeyns, 2005; Stewart, 2005).

spirituality and identity; Country; basic needs; work, roles and responsibilities; education; and mental health.

Indigenous scholars and communities internationally have made substantial contributions to challenging mainstream conceptions of wellbeing (e.g. Durie, 2006; Merino, 2016; Watene, 2016). For example, Sir Mason Durie (Rangitāne, Ngāti Kauwhata, Ngāti Raukawa) developed a multi-level framework for understanding Māori wellbeing which replaced universal measures of wellbeing with 'Māori specific measures … attuned to Māori realities and to Māori worldviews' (Durie, 2006, pp. 2–3). In Australia, Warraimaay historian Vicki Grieves' (2006) work with 'Aboriginal experts on their own wellbeing' (p. 1) revealed 'a holistic, interdependent basis for the provision of wellbeing through a relationship with the natural environment' (pp. 15–16).

Indigenous concepts of wellbeing tend to highlight additional dimensions that are absent in the mainstream models commonly adopted by governments and global institutions. For example, mainstream models are often individualistic, human-centric and embedded in colonial perspectives, placing a particular emphasis on an individual's health and material wellbeing. In contrast, Indigenous conceptualisations of wellbeing are much more likely to place the collective, environment/Mother Earth, spirituality and relationality at their core. In Latin America, expressions such as *sumak kawsay* and *buen vivir* (which translates to 'living well' with Mother Earth) have emerged as Indigenous worldviews of the 'good life' (Merino, 2016; Waldmüller, 2014). In Australia, Yawuru woman Eunice Yu has worked with economist Mandy Yap to document community perspectives on *mabu liyan* and develop a 'Yawuru Wellbeing Index' in line with Yawuru's aspirations*. Mabu liyan* underpins Yawuru's sense of relational wellbeing, living in connection with Country, culture, others and oneself (Yap & Yu, 2016b).[9] In 'Kanyini' produced by Tjilpa (special teaching Uncle) Bob Randall of the Yankunytjatjara Nation with Australian documentary filmmaker Melanie Hogan (2006), *kanyini* was described as connectedness to four concepts – *tjukurrpa* (one's belief systems), *kurunpa* (one's spirituality), *ngura* (one's land) and *waltyja* (one's family). The centrality of connectedness to all four concepts in making one feel whole is clearly described when Tjilpa Bob Randall states 'If one's kanyini is taken away, if one's life, essence, purpose is taken away, one becomes nothing, a living dead, a corpse in space'. Indigenous understandings of wellbeing also often highlight the importance of recognition, empowerment and self-determination.

While there are overlaps in the dimensions of wellbeing highlighted by Indigenous authors and mainstream frameworks such as the OECD Better Life Initiative and Australia's Closing the Gap targets, it is important to note there are distinctions even within these common aspects. For example, while 'employment' and 'work' might be noted as key indicators

---

[9] Other concepts such as *Fa'asamoa* in Samoa, and Hawaiian models of ecological wellbeing, are focused on a collective orientation of wellbeing, and through the collective, how the individual is shaped by the ecological environment in which they participate (Kingfisher, 2013; McGregor *et al*., 2003).

across Indigenous and non-Indigenous frameworks, notions of meaningful work for First Peoples may include cultural responsibilities and customary activities, not just work in the formal economy. In addition, conceptions of environment for Indigenous wellbeing extend beyond just achieving things like improved air quality to also include the spiritual and cultural wellbeing that stems from environmental stewardship and responsibilities as peoples belonging to Country.

1.2.1 Wellbeing in policy frameworks

Policy frameworks that adopt the term wellbeing are numerous and varied. In Australia, early use of the concept was concentrated in the health sector through the National Aboriginal Health Strategy (1989).[10] It later became more pronounced in policies informing natural resource management, conservation and cultural heritage initiatives, and economic development (Batten and Stanford, 2012; Butler *et al*, 2019; Carrington & Young, 2011; Grieves, 2007; Northern Australian Indigenous Land and Sea Management Alliance, 2014).

Federally, the Australian Government Productivity Commission highlights wellbeing as a central focus in their Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage reports (SCRGSP, 2016). These reports complemented the monitoring of the 2008-2018 Closing the Gap targets with measures drawn from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Wellbeing framework (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2010), the Statistics New Zealand Māori Wellbeing framework (Statistics New Zealand, 2002) and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Performance Framework (Australian Health Ministers Advisory Council, 2015). In addition to the Closing the Gap targets, key domains in these reports include governance and leadership, Indigenous language use, recognition of Indigenous cultures and aspects of trust and discrimination. While the reports collate substantial data on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander circumstances, the focus on Closing the Gap and mainstream statistics as a means to improve Indigenous wellbeing has been problematic and therefore subjected to similar criticisms as those directed at the Closing the Gap agenda (Jordan *et al*., 2010; Yu, 2011).

Indigenous wellbeing has also been a key focus in policy frameworks at the state level, particularly in New South Wales. For example, the NSW Government committed to improve the social, economic, cultural and emotional wellbeing of Aboriginal peoples in New South Wales through their initiative *Two Ways Together-Partnership: A new way of doing business with Aboriginal people* which was in place between 2003 and 2012 (NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs, 2003). More recently, in response to the *OCHRE* Stage 1 evaluation, the NSW Coalition of Aboriginal Regional Alliances (NCARA) recommended holistic wellbeing as a key future focus, citing the *National Strategic Framework for Aboriginal and Torres*

---

[10] The National Aboriginal Health Strategy (1989) defines Aboriginal health as 'not just the physical well-being of an individual but refers to the social, emotional and cultural well-being of the whole Community in which each individual is able to achieve their full potential as a human being, thereby bringing about the total well-being of their Community

Strait Islander Peoples Mental Health and Social and Emotional Wellbeing 2017-2013, the *Canadian Index of Wellbeing* framework and the *Australian National Development Index* as examples to consider. A key thread across all these frameworks is the need for a more comprehensive implementation of conceptions of wellbeing – to include social, cultural, community aspects alongside economic wellbeing and the wellbeing of the mind, body and spirit (NSW Coalition of Aboriginal Regional Alliances NCARA, 2018). The Western Australian *Commitment to Aboriginal Youth Wellbeing* is an example of a wellbeing policy which resonates with Indigenous philosophies and worldviews (Department of Premier and Cabinet, 2020).

In Aotearoa New Zealand, wellbeing is part of the policy lexicon for Māori related strategies and initiatives. The *New Zealand Living Standards Framework* (LSF) for the whole of population, developed by New Zealand Treasury, has 12 domains of wellbeing covering overarching natural, human, social and physical capitals. The domains of the LSF overlap to a great extent with those of the OECD Better Life Initiative. For that reason, the LSF has been criticised as reflecting and perpetuating the dominant and patriarchal views on progress measurement (Waring in Daziel, 2020). It has also inadequately reflected Te Ao Māori (Māori worldviews). Te Puni Kōkiri (the Ministry of Māori Development), in collaboration with NZ Treasury, have proposed a Māori perspective on the LSF, applying an Indigenous lens to the four capitals outlined above to derive seven wellbeing outcomes centred at the whānau (family) level (Te Puni Kōkiri & Treasury, 2019).

Globally, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) held a series of regional workshops on Indigenous Peoples' Wellbeing and Sustainability in 2006. Bringing together First Peoples' expertise from CANZUS states (Canada, Australia, Aotearoa NZ and the United States) and the Russian Federation, they tabled a preliminary list of core themes and indicators of Indigenous People's wellbeing (United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues 2006). These included 'Indigenous Rights to and Perspectives on Development' and 'Identity, lands and ways of living.'[11] The UN's International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) have also highlighted the relationship between Indigenous territories and natural resources and Indigenous livelihoods, spirituality and wellbeing (IIFB, 2014, p. 1). They proposed eight themes as being related to Indigenous wellbeing internationally: traditional knowledge and practices; land and territories; health of the ecosystem; health; rights; leadership; and self-determination on matters affecting their wellbeing (Tebtebba, 2008).

1.3 Prosperity – origins, definitions and understandings

As noted in the Introduction, one of the key aims of this report is to explore the notion of prosperity in order to understand how it may, or may not, be useful to design and implement policies that are better aligned with First Peoples' needs, realities and aspirations. A

---

[11] See Appendix 1 for more detail.

complexity here is that the term prosperity—like 'wellbeing' and 'economic development'—can have multiple meanings that are historically and culturally contingent. In this section we note that, just like wellbeing and economic development, 'prosperity' can have both narrow and more holistic interpretations with the latter gaining increasing traction in recent years.

A particular understanding of prosperity, which emphasises capital accumulation, emerged in post-WWII United States when increased production and growth were described as being a key to prosperity (Escobar, 2011). This view of prosperity mirrors the 'colonial' approach to economic development and growth outlined in Section 1.1. From this standpoint, being prosperous meant emulating features that were associated with so-called 'advanced' societies—such as urbanisation, high levels of industrialisation, widespread adoption of Western education and a particular set of living standards framed around material affluence. In Western cultures, 'prosperity' has retained this strong association with material wealth (see Jackson, 2017; Méda, 2015a; Sardar, 2007). Across the academic and grey literature it is often associated with notions of financial success and wealth accumulation,[12] and is sometimes used interchangeably with notions of economic development or economic growth (e.g. Rodrik, 2003; Supply Nation & First Australians Capital 2018; White, 2009).

However, scholar and cultural critic Ziauddin Sardar (2007, p. 1) notes that different cultures, as 'communities of interpretation,' generate diverse ideas about what constitutes 'genuine prosperity.' To examine prosperity is, therefore, 'tantamount to investigating the soul of society' (Sardar, 2007, p. 2). As well as material affluence, broader definitions of prosperity also encompass notions such as flourishing, being successful, having abundance and experiencing wellness and joy (Cassiers, 2015, p. 1). Reflecting on insights from fields as diverse as psychology, economic history, religion and the 'wisdom traditions,' ecological economist Tim Jackson (2017, p. 48) suggests that while all perspectives on prosperity accept that it 'has some material dimensions,' understanding prosperity as simply material 'opulence' is particularly problematic given the potential costs of unbridled economic growth. Just as development's focus on growth has been tempered by recognising the need for broader measures of progress, Jackson recasts prosperity 'in terms of the capabilities that people have to flourish' (Jackson, 2017, p. 66; see also Jackson 2005, 2010). This widens the notion of prosperity to include 'non-financial' domains such as ecological and intergenerational sustainability, the quality of relationships and reciprocity, autonomy, and a sense of meaning and purpose.

This more holistic approach to prosperity has gained increasing attention in recent years. For example, sociologist Dominique Méda (2015b, p. xv), defines prosperity widely as 'living well' – consisting not simply 'in an abundance of material goods, but also in the possession, use and enjoyment of other kinds of goods, activities and ways of beings.' Several approaches identify the importance of relationships in a prosperous society – both to each

---

[12] Some approaches to material prosperity move beyond wealth accumulation to also include income and wealth redistribution (e.g. Susnjak *et al.*, 2019).

other and to the environment (Fritz & Koch, 2016; Hacker & Loewentheil, 2012; Pociovălişteanu *et al.*, 2010). Sardar (2007, p. 6) describes this as 'symbiosis,' suggesting that prosperity 'can only be conceived as a condition that includes obligations and responsibilities to others, indeed to the whole of the natural as well as the social world.'

In the literature on Indigenous prosperity, a significant theme relates to the ways in which First Peoples thrived and were prosperous pre-colonisation. Indigenous Nations' oral histories, as well as some documentation by Europeans, tell of abundance in their relationships with the land, fisheries, hunting practices, agricultural systems, trade partnerships, skills and knowledges (see Aboriginal Affairs NSW 2016a; Bodkin-Andrews *et al.*, 2017; Dell *et al.*, 2018; Deloria Jr., 2016, 2018; Gammage, 2012; Goodyear-Ka'opua, 2009; Kickett-Tucker *et al.*, 2017; Pascoe, 2014; Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996). For instance, in 'The story of the Burra'gorang', D'hawaral authors Gawaian Bodkin-Andrews, Aunty Frances Bodkin, Uncle Gavin Andrews and Uncle Ross Evans (2017, p. 20) write that 'It is known that many of our ancestors lived in times of great prosperity and peace, when the lands provided for The Peoples in abundance, and in return The Peoples cared for the lands, and cared for each other.'

References to contemporary prosperity for First Peoples are highly varied, and its meaning tends to be implicit in much of the literature rather than clearly defined. In the Australian context, phrases such as 'economic prosperity and independence' (Indigenous Business Australia, 2019, p. 10), 'Aboriginal prosperity' (Lester, 2016), 'sustainable prosperity' (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2017), 'cultural prosperity' (Pearson, 2016) and 'economic and social prosperity' (Local Decision Making Regional Chairpersons Group, 2016) are often used without clarification of the intended meaning.

Nevertheless, some clear patterns in usage do emerge. In some cases, the term is used to refer to the better integration of First Peoples in the mainstream market economy (e.g. Anderson and Parker, 2008; Flanagan, 2019a, 2019b; Jacobs, 2017; Mundine, 2018; Pearson 2005a, 2005b, 2010; Supply Nation & First Australians Capital 2018; Westpac Group & Urbis Group, 2014). For example, in his article 'Working towards peace and prosperity' Guugu Yimithirr lawyer and activist Noel Pearson (2005b) suggests that the key challenge in this task is to break what he sees as 'the vicious cycle of disadvantage and dysfunction' in Cape York Aboriginal communities by engagement with the 'real economy.' Although Pearson does not explicitly define the real economy, he associates it principally with employment in the mainstream labour market, individual responsibility, transferable property rights and home ownership. While Pearson does recognise the importance of Indigenous cultures, several Indigenous scholars adopt a more holistic perspective of prosperity which places greater emphasis on cultural and spiritual dimensions embedded in deep and balanced relationships between peoples, economy and the environment (e.g. Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, 2009; Wuttunee, 2004; Dell *et al.,* 2018). Other references to prosperity made by Indigenous scholars and organisations are framed around both individual

responsibility and the everyday actions Indigenous polities needed to perform to ensure their collective prosperity and wellbeing (Bessarab & Forrest, 2017; Salway Black, 1994; Wunan Foundation Inc., 2015).

In short, we find that perspectives on prosperity are as diverse among Indigenous Peoples as they are among non-Indigenous peoples, and change through time. What emerges from the literature is a complex picture pointing to larger questions of values and meaning, such as 'what is an economy?', and 'what, and who, is an economy for?' As a heuristic device, we suggest that the diversity of perspectives we have reviewed can be best understood as a spectrum – from a mainstream economic perspective which focuses on market-based dimensions and material standards of living, to a more holistic perspective. This spectrum model is elucidated in more detail in Section 2.

1.3.1 Prosperity in policy frameworks

In Australia, 'prosperity' has been employed across several jurisdictions, from municipal to federal, as a frame for policies focused on improving the socioeconomic conditions of Indigenous Australians. However, few of these frameworks explicitly define prosperity, and many focus predominantly on mainstream economic measures such as employment, education and entrepreneurship.

One exception appears to be the City of Sydney which presents the aims of its *Eora Journey: Economic Development Plan* as 'assisting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities achieve prosperity on their terms' (Moore in City of Sydney, 2016, p. 2). The co-chairs of the City's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Advisory Panel, Yuin/Wiradjuri woman Cass Goodwin and Kamilaroi/Ngarabal man Warren Brown, noted that the community engagement sessions that informed the plan included 'deep discussions about the meaning of prosperity and economic opportunity to our communities' (Goodwin & Brown in City of Sydney, 2016, p.3). These discussions revealed that prosperity is a 'central aspiration' for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in the local government area and has 'multiple forms,' meaning different things to different people (City of Sydney, 2016, p. 4). Overall, prosperity 'was not solely about amassing individual wealth,' but also included community wellbeing, shared wealth, improved choice, greater independence, self-determination, good health and happiness (City of Sydney, 2016, p. 18).

At the state level, the NSW Government's 2016 Aboriginal Economic Prosperity Framework (AEPF) established 'economic prosperity' as a key priority under *OCHRE* (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2016a). The AEPF was central to the NSW Government's response to the Standing Committee on State Development's inquiry into economic development in Aboriginal communities discussed in Section 1.1.1. Then Director of Policy and Reform at Aboriginal Affairs NSW, Kuku Yalanji and Tagalaka woman Haylene Grogan, noted that one of the key principles informing development of the framework was 'the right of our First Peoples to determine their own economic future' (Grogan, 2018, p. S49). This suggests a commitment

to the self-determination highlighted by many submissions to the inquiry as a necessary condition for improved outcomes, as well as a broad framing of economic prosperity to reflect the diverse aspirations of Aboriginal communities and peoples in NSW.

Such an approach was strongly supported by the NSW Ombudsman and Deputy Ombudsman (Aboriginal Programs), with the latter position being held by prominent Aboriginal man Danny Lester. In their special report to NSW Parliament 'Fostering economic development for Aboriginal people in NSW,' they argued that the AEPF would need to represent 'a significant shift' in how government works for and with Aboriginal people in NSW, with Aboriginal people necessarily at the centre of decision making (NSW Ombudsman, 2016, p. 5). The resulting AEPF, however, appears somewhat limited from this perspective. It offers a narrow interpretation of prosperity as a 'simple' vision of 'wealth creation for Aboriginal people through increased employment and enterprise development' (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2016a, p. 1). Its three target areas do include 'economic agency' alongside 'jobs and employment' and 'education and skills.' But economic agency, as defined here, does not specifically suggest that Aboriginal people will be central to decision-making. Rather, economic agency includes Aboriginal economic participation in regional and district building infrastructure plans, support for Aboriginal owned and operated small and medium enterprises, and a target for Aboriginal households moving from social housing into private rental and/or home ownership (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2016a, p. 2).

The focus on self-determination is more evident in other elements of the *OCHRE* framework including the Local Decision Making (LDM) strategy, which ultimately aims to enable the 'staged devolution of decision-making and accountability' to the regional level through Aboriginal Regional Alliances (see Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2016b, p. 5). Since the launch of the AEPF, key activities under the framework have included conversations with the LDM Aboriginal Regional Alliances on industry-based agreements, social impact investment and implementing the NSW Governments' Aboriginal Procurement Policy (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2018, p. 21).

Nationally, the Council of Australian Governments' efforts to 'Refresh' the Closing the Gap framework initially adopted the concept of prosperity. The Refresh discussion paper employed a particular definition of the term, stating that: 'It refers to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples having the economic empowerment to be the decision-makers over issues that impact their lives, and to seize opportunities for themselves, their families and communities' (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2018, p. 4). Following the release of the Refresh discussion paper the Lowitja Institute (2018, p. 2) argued for removing the word 'prosperity,' saying that since the concept of prosperity has 'strong monetary connotations,' it suggested too narrow a focus on economic development. Instead, they recommended a more multi-dimensional approach so that the language appealed 'to all relevant sectors,' and evoked 'the strengths upon which our communities will continue to

build, not only materially, but also physically and spiritually' (The Lowitja Institute, 2018, p. 2).

The new National Agreement on Closing the Gap, released in July 2020, is billed by the Australian Government as developed in 'genuine partnership' between the government and the Coalition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peak Organisations (Coalition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peak Organisations & Council of Australian Governments, 2020).[13] It does not retain reference to prosperity, but does refer to both development and wellbeing. The agreement's priorities include supporting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and organisations to 'drive their own development' (p. 13). Outcome areas also include social and emotional wellbeing and cultural wellbeing 'in areas of languages; cultural practices; land and waters; and access to culturally relevant communications' (p. 33–34).

The ways in which 'prosperity' has been used, and resisted, in developing these policy - frameworks at local, state and federal levels again point to the multiple meanings of the term. A further complication relates to how it is operationalised and translated from policy frameworks into policies and programs. Best intentions to use a broad concept of 'prosperity' that is grounded in First Peoples' perspectives and driven by First Peoples' aspirations can quickly become 'more of the same' when brought into dominant colonial bureaucracies and institutions. In this context, while there are different views among First Peoples' about the appropriateness of using terms such as 'prosperity' in Indigenous policy frameworks, there is a common strong emphasis on the importance of process—with Indigenous leadership seen as critical in defining both the broad vision for change and its practical application in the policies, programs and measurement tools that are rolled out.

1.4 Interconnections between the concepts

While the previous sections have outlined some of the various definitions of 'prosperity,' 'economic development' and 'wellbeing,' and the ways in which they have informed a range of policy frameworks, this section discusses the complex interconnections between these terms. There are several ways in which the terms can relate to each other, depending on how they are defined and used by authors. These fall roughly into three categories: economic prosperity and wellbeing as *outcomes* of economic development; the interchangeable use of these terms; and the deliberate contrasting of prosperity and wellbeing. We note that since many authors do not explicitly define what they mean by these terms, how they might see them in relation to each other is often impossible to discern.

---

[13] For initial commentary on this agreement see the perspectives of Munanjahli academic Dr Chelsea Bond (2020) and Euahlayi scholar Bhiamie Williamson (Markham & Williamson, 2020).

Across the literature we have reviewed, it is common to see economic prosperity or wellbeing presented as *outcomes* of economic development – whether development is narrowly defined as centred on growth or more broadly defined as 'sustainable' or 'alternative' development. This is evident, for example, in Indigenous Business Australia's Corporate Plan 2019–2020. Here, the organisation's focus is described as 'facilitating the economic prosperity of Indigenous Australians by promoting development through self-management and self-sufficiency' (Indigenous Business Australia, 2019, p. 14). A similar interpretation is implied in the NSW Government's *Aboriginal Economic Prosperity Framework*, which suggests that the 'economic pillars' of employment, education and economic agency will help to promote prosperity (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2016). The City of Sydney's *Eora Journey Economic Development Plan* also represents prosperity as its outcome (City of Sydney, 2016).

Presenting prosperity as an outcome of development is also common internationally. In their vision of sustainable development, the authors of the Brundtland Report aimed to facilitate a future that was 'more prosperous, more just, and more secure' (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, ch.1.7). Similarly, the UN's SDGs are framed as a strategic 'plan of action for people, planet and prosperity' (United Nations, 2015). There may, however, be somewhat of a tension here. For example, although these approaches posit that continued economic growth can lead to increased prosperity for more of the world's population under conditions of greater equality, this would necessarily entail a redistribution of wealth that is likely to be interpreted by some people as a challenge to their prosperity. In these approaches that present prosperity as an outcome of development, the question of whether it can lead to increased prosperity *for all* is not addressed. As mentioned above, wellbeing has also been presented as a potential *outcome* of economic development in the international literature. This is notably exemplified by the OECD Report titled *Indigenous economic development and well-being in a place-based context*, which links the improvement of Indigenous community wellbeing with the need to empower these communities to 'break dependency relations' by enabling the development of 'community assets, new businesses and employment' (McDonald *et al.*, 2019, p. 14).

In some of the literature we canvassed, the terms prosperity and wellbeing are used interchangeably. For example, they are sometimes used as almost equivalent concepts where they are both understood in terms of Sen's notion of capabilities (e.g. Jackson, 2017), or in reports where definitions of both remain uninterrogated and the concepts are used rather loosely (e.g. Westpac Group & Urbis Group, 2014, p. 57). Across the literature, holistic and relational understandings of prosperity tend to resonate very strongly with broad conceptualisations of wellbeing—including the wellbeing of First Peoples. If there is a 'contrast' to wellbeing here, it may be that prosperity often retains an emphasis on material affluence, whereas some narrower wellbeing approaches place a heavier accent on the dimensions of 'health and wellbeing' or 'social and emotional wellbeing.'

On occasion, particular authors deliberately contrast prosperity and wellbeing to justify their preference for one concept over the other. For example, in her book *Redefining Prosperity,* economist Isabelle Cassiers (2015, p. 2) suggests that she prefers the term prosperity because it designates the issues as *social*, while wellbeing can be understood as bearing more on the individual. However, this is clearly not the case for many of the approaches to First Peoples' wellbeing identified in this paper. In the Australian context, the recent discussion paper for the Closing the Gap 'Refresh' process also expressed a preference for the concept of 'prosperity' over 'wellbeing.' In this case it was because the refresh was 'about moving beyond wellbeing to flourishing and thriving' (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2018, p.4). Such reasoning may suggest a perception of wellbeing through the lens of subjective/hedonic wellbeing (happiness and life satisfaction), and is at odds with much of the contemporary scholarship on wellbeing which sees flourishing and thriving as key indicators of wellbeing achievement (e.g. Ryan and Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989; Seligman, 2012). In practice, it also suggests that the choice to use 'wellbeing' or 'prosperity' may come down to personal preference and is perhaps less important than the indicators used, the ways in which they are defined, and who they are defined by.

2. A spectrum model of perspectives on First Peoples' prosperity

In this section we further analyse the different understandings of Indigenous prosperity that we have found in the literature by proposing a spectrum model. We identify four broad and overlapping conceptual categories: a market-based (mainstream) perspective on First Peoples prosperity; a perspective which focuses on First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship; an economic diversity perspective; and a relational and holistic perspective (Figure 1). While this necessarily oversimplifies the various perspectives, generally market-based prosperity can be said to be closest conceptually to classical economic development approaches – i.e. those most focused on mainstream measures of economic growth. Many of the references to First Peoples' prosperity in the literature include a strong focus on market-based measures. Yet, and as demonstrated by our spectrum, the concept is also used very broadly to express conditions that are much more relational and spiritual, in ways that resonate with many Indigenous conceptions of wellbeing. Beyond the focus on wealth and the market, these alternative 'prosperity' perspectives begin to emerge at the First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship position on the spectrum and are more fully expressed at the relational and holistic prosperity position.

By locating these categories across a spectrum, we are not implying the existence of a linear progression between its parts. Rather, this spectrum illustrates the coalescence of ideas around particular understandings of economic development, wellbeing and prosperity. The four perspectives we identify are fluid and overlapping. When positioning literature across the spectrum, we are conscious that it may not sit neatly within a discrete category. However,

we note that government frameworks tend to be located more in the market-based perspective and First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspectives. Indigenous-led or informed initiatives predominantly sit within the range from First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship through to the relational and holistic perspective, although they are represented across the whole spectrum.

Market-Based	First Peoples' Capital & Entrepreneurship	Economic Diversity	Relational & Holistic Prosperity
• Centrality of the private sector (Indigenous or not) • Transferable land titles • Focus on material prosperity, economic growth, profit • Emphasis on employment, education, home ownership • Independence from income support • Safe environment for investors • Building First Peoples' capabilities and business acumen • Mainstream economic measures	• Similar to market-based Prosperity with more focus on First Peoples' entrepreneurship • Development of Indigenous corporations • Land assets as basis to build wealth (commodification of Indigenous land) • Economic autonomy linked to self-determination • Empowerment and cultural survival linked to market economic strategy • Home ownership	• Indigenous corporations understood as part of an ecosystem • Diverse/hybrid economies • Indigenous corporations supporting other sectors (not for profit, subsistence, cultural) • Self-determination emphasised more strongly • Sustainability	• Prosperity built on First Peoples' worldviews • Balanced relationship with the environment • Importance of spirituality • Centrality of First Peoples' law and philosophies • Relationships, community and reciprocity • Concerns a whole way of life • 'Person-in-community' foundations for the economy • Considerations for future generations (e.g. 7 Generations)

Figure 1: A spectrum model of economic prosperity perspectives

2.1 Market-based perspective

The market-based position on the spectrum speaks strongly to mainstream economic measures such as wealth creation (material and financial) and economic growth, with a focus on improving First Peoples' material living standards (e.g. Australian Government, 2019; Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2016). The core concern of these approaches is to increase First Peoples' engagement with the market economy, including involvement in employment, enterprise, education and training, and the opportunities they afford (Australian Government, 2019, 2020; Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet,

2019; FaHCSIA, 2010, Government of Western Australia, 2012; Pearson 2005a, 2005b; Westpac Group & Urbis, 2014).

Participation in the market economy is understood as providing First Peoples' with freedom,[14] autonomy and opportunity to choose lives they have reason to value, with an expected flow of economic benefits to families, communities and wider society (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2019; Pearson, 2005a; Westpac Group & Urbis, 2014). According to the Centre for Independent Studies' policy analyst Charles Jacobs, prosperity – achieved through participation in the market economy – is 'the single biggest driver for bringing indigenous [sic] people level with the remainder of Australia' (2018, n.p.).

While this perspective of prosperity includes some Indigenous voices calling for greater participation of First Peoples in market economies (e.g. Pearson 2005a, 2010; Mundine, 2018), it is also heavily influenced by Western neoliberal perspectives and frameworks. For example, success in this perspective tends to be understood in conventional market terms (such as access to capital and markets, number of employees, profit of Indigenous enterprises, and rates of participation in mainstream education) (FaHCSIA, 2010; Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2019; Westpac Group & Urbis, 2014).

The market-based approach is often underpinned by strong assumptions that First Peoples need to change their behaviours, systems and governance structures to capitalise on market opportunities (Coates *et al*., 2019; Sautet 2008, 2018; see also Altman, 2004; Altman & Kerins, 2012; Petray & Gertz, 2018; Walden, 2016 for a critique of this assumption). For example, a narrative dominating this perspective concerns the need to break the cycle of 'welfare dependence' (Pearson, 2005a, 2010; Flanagan, 2019a, 2019b; Mundine, 2018). Australian, Canadian and American authors (predominantly, but not exclusively non-Indigenous) have argued that there are negative impacts from government subsidies and transfers to individuals (including compensation) in that they tend to induce a state of 'passivity' in recipients and undermine incentives to take responsibility (e.g. Pearson, 2005a, 2010; Flanagan & Beauregard, 2013). From this perspective, restructuring economic incentives (such as by limiting access to social security payments) will encourage people into paid employment and inspire them to develop the capabilities they need to prosper (Pearson, 2005b, p.2; see also Pearson, 2005a). Here, capabilities and prosperity become interlinked with notions of personal responsibility and the 'freedom' engendered by the accumulation of financial capital. Very little is said, however, about the role of historical and ongoing colonisation in contributing to perceived 'welfare dependence' – including unpaid and stolen wages, intergenerational trauma and the large-scale dispossession of land and resources.

Some of the literature in this perspective suggests that aspects of Indigenous traditions (such as traditional governance structures) may be ill-suited, and even detrimental, to

---

[14] See Bulloch & Fogarty, 2016, for a critical discussion on the freedom associated with participation in mainstream markets.

achieving prosperity (Sautet, 2008). However, for the most part, it highlights the economic potential of First Peoples' traditions, knowledges and lands. These tend to be described as advantageous assets or resources available to be leveraged commercially by Indigenous entrepreneurs (Sautet, 2008; Westpac Group & Urbis, 2014; see also Dodson & Smith, 2013; Collins & Norman, 2018). This has sometimes been presented as a form of modernisation of First Peoples' cultures (Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, 2005).

Some contributors to this market-based perspective also argue that improving First Peoples' access to economic resources may, in fact, increase opportunities for cultural participation and genuine self-determination by reducing reliance on governments and increasing Indigenous autonomy (Pearson, 2005b; Coates *et al.*, 2019). Self-determination and the ongoing practice of culture are therefore presented as likely benefits of achieving economic prosperity.

2.2 First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship

The First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspective shares several commonalities with the market-based perspective discussed above, but also has some key differences. It remains largely focussed on market-based outcomes, but departs from the previous perspective due to its emphasis on the economic potential of Indigenous business and its employment effects, rather than a general focus on employment in the mainstream labour market. It also tends to give greater consideration to land rights, self-determination, empowerment and culture. A key focus is on Indigenous Peoples taking ownership of the changes needed to succeed (e.g. Wunan Foundation Inc., 2015, p. 38).

A prominent dimension of the First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspective concerns the capacity for First Peoples to draw economic benefits from the use and development of their lands and resources – e.g. through the establishment of businesses, engagement in extractive industries, home ownership and access to capital and loans (e.g. Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, 2005; Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2016; KPMG, 2016; Mundine, 2017; NSWALC, 2016a; NSW Ombudsman, 2016). There is a tendency in some of the literature to frame communal and/or inalienable title to land as a significant hurdle to unlocking the economic potential of Indigenous territories and, therefore, as detrimental to Indigenous development and prosperity (Mundine, 2005; see also Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, 2005 for a discussion of these issues). For example, Bundjalung businessman, author and political strategist Nyunggai Warren Mundine (2017) writes that 'Native title holders have rights in respect of land but don't have freehold title over it. […] They get a seat at the table, influence and the attention of developers and other business interests. Handled the right way, this can open doors to great opportunities.' On the other hand, some authors point to the centrality of communal titles to land in First Peoples' cultures

(e.g. Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, 2005, p. 185). Others point to the possibilities of building strong Indigenous economies and polities based on communal titles and collective enterprises as well as individual Indigenous entrepreneurship (e.g. Collins & Norman, 2018; Jordan *et al.* forthcoming).

The entrepreneurial ethos central to this perspective is one that blends entrepreneurship and contemporary Indigenous values, cultures and kinship (Mika *et al.*, 2017). Empowered Communities, for example, suggests that entrepreneurship enhances Indigenous peoples' capacity to walk in 'both worlds'[15] and provides a way to enable contemporary expressions of culture and traditions (Wunan Foundation Inc., 2015). Political historian Heidi Norman, a descendant of the Gomeroi people, and her colleague Jock Collins, highlight that First Peoples' enterprises are more likely to employ Indigenous peoples (see also Hunter, 2015). They also note that employment creation can have a multiplier effect by inspiring a greater culture of employment, social contribution and innovation. At the same time, it can increase transgenerational teaching and the number of role models for young people (Collins & Norman, 2018). Some authors, including Koori (Gai-Mariagal and Wiradjuri) scholar Dennis Foley, suggest that Indigenous entrepreneurs may eschew a singular focus on profit to try to meet several other priorities: meeting the basic needs of extended family; overcoming 'oppressive racism' within the mainstream workplace; and achieving greater self-determination (Foley, 2004, p. 268). They may also privilege 'cultural values, community investment, and concern for the environment ahead of profit' (CCAB, 2016, p. 14). Hence, while this position on the spectrum remains strongly focused on participation in market economies, it emphasises the relationships between a prosperous Indigenous business sector and the capacity to support First Peoples' cultures, communities and control of their own affairs.

2.3 Economic diversity

Literature that we have grouped in the economic diversity perspective tends to place more emphasis on multiple dimensions of prosperity and wellbeing and alternative economic opportunities beyond the mainstream. Reflections on complex questions such as 'what is an economy' – and, more specifically, what could 'Indigenous economies' be – begin to emerge here. In contrast to the two previous perspectives – which tend not to question the centrality of the market – this third perspective seeks to understand whether mainstream market economies can be reshaped to adapt to Indigenous cultures, rather than the reverse. It seeks to prioritise Indigenous peoples and organisations, aspirations and life projects over mainstream market understandings (Blaser, 2004; Collins & Norman, 2018; Escobar, 1998; Gibson-Graham, 2006; Norman, 2018; Thomassin, 2016).

---

[15] This can present twice the work for First Peoples, and a lot more barriers (e.g. see White, 2015 on the similar situation faced by African-Americans).

This leads to further explorations of the meaning of concepts such as 'work' and 'enterprise' – with non-dominant understandings often emphasised. For instance, literature in this perspective tends to recognise customary activities outside the market as work, and elevate the value of social enterprise even when this is not profit-generating. The focus shifts from individuals towards Indigenous polities. Culture and self-determination are understood as the foundation on which development and prosperity are imagined and enacted (e.g. Blaser *et al.*, 2004). From this perspective, First Peoples' agency, leadership, values and aspirations are seen as central to shaping their futures by pursuing their own visions of development and resisting 'the narrative of an all-powerful capitalism that transforms non-capitalist socioeconomic forms' (Collins and Norman, 2018, p. 152). In this context, the primary focus on individual entrepreneurs and private enterprises is dislodged in favour of an emphasis on community-owned enterprises, social enterprises and cooperatives. Further, as Māori political scientist Maria Bargh (2011) suggests, the role of First Peoples' enterprises within the broader community is reconsidered to acknowledge their interrelationship with other sectors in the economy.

This perspective is further characterised by a focus on making visible the varied and hybrid economic strategies of many First Peoples which are informed by their diverse values and realities. For example, within the Native American context the Oneida Farms and Agricultural Center was established by a small Oneida community to return to 'cultural roots in a modern, sustainable way.' This has included renewing their traditional farming and sustainable land management practices while also addressing their members' cultural and material wellbeing (HPAIED, 2008, p. 1).

Land rights and land ownership remain important dimensions of the economic diversity perspective and are critical in the development of diverse life projects (Altman, 2004; Collins & Norman, 2018; Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, 2009; HPAIED, 2008; Norman, 2017, Jordan *et al.* forthcoming). Anthropologist Jon Altman has emphasised the importance of land rights and native title as enablers for the customary sector. Heidi Norman (2016, 2017) demonstrates how Aboriginal polities in New South Wales have entered into agreement making and local and regional alliances to create a new interface between the self-determining Aboriginal polity and the state. She suggests that expected substantial land returns to Aboriginal Peoples will increasingly place them as central actors in development, planning and conservation. This has the potential to validate their own approaches to nation-building and leverage their native title rights and land rights to realise economic benefits. In some cases, they may 'become economically sovereign' (Norman, 2017, p. 245). Political economist Kirrily Jordan, human geographer Francis Markham and Jon Altman emphasise that this potential also exists in urban areas where 'smaller parcels of land […] are also held by Indigenous people under communal or private titles and there are many examples of enterprises in these regions that draw on Indigenous cultures and traditions' (forthcoming, p. 23).

First Peoples' social relations are also given increased importance in the economic diversity perspective. As Collins and Norman (2018) discuss, Indigenous cultures often emphasise communality rather than individual wealth acquisition. They note that while this could be characterised as anti-entrepreneurial, that would be crude and misleading as communality can both constrain and enable entrepreneurship. Similarly, Bargh (2011) draws on the complex reality of Māori corporations to show that they are not simply co-opted, colonised, or assimilated entities. Rather, Māori corporations often participate in the market economy with their own diverse non-market, not-for-profit, customary, and alternative economic activities and priorities (see also Dell *et al.*, 2018).

In sum, the economic diversity perspective suggests that strong culture, communities and economic prosperity are inextricably linked for First Peoples. Strategies to achieve development, wellbeing and prosperity from this perspective are Indigenous-led. They open a range of possible futures that are socially and culturally embedded, informed by past and contemporary realities, and necessarily place-based.

2.4 Relational and holistic prosperity

In the relational and holistic prosperity position on our spectrum, First Peoples' philosophies, knowledge systems, and relationalities become the core foundation and guiding principles through which prosperity is defined and can be achieved. This perspective, which draws on millennia of cultural knowledge from First Peoples around the world, pushes further the thinking around what an economy is and what purposes it should serve.

Understandings of prosperity emerging at this end of the spectrum can be described as embedded in kinship, with sharing and caring responsibilities encompassing what Ojibwe environmentalist, economist, and writer Winona LaDuke (1999) describes as 'all-our-relations'. These relations include responsibilities, reciprocity and respect for the Earth, the individuals, families, communities and all living (and non-living) beings past, present, and future. An example of this, from Canada and the United States, is the Haudenosaunee principle of 'seven generations' (Salway Black, 1994; Wuttunee, 2004; McLester, 2017; Dell *et al.*, 2018). This intergenerational principle implies that prosperity must consider our interdependency and the impacts of our choices and behaviours on others, the natural world and those who are yet to come (see also Jackson, 2017; McLester, 2017).

Many holistic conceptions of prosperity are grounded in what is often termed an 'ethos of care'. This refers to a way of being in the world that is embodied and rejects the separation between the 'human' and 'non-human' (de la Bellacasa, 2010, 2017). This way of being sees everything as interconnected and recognises receiving resources from the environment, for example in the form of food, 'as a privilege that comes with concurrent reciprocal responsibilities' (Muller *et al.*, 2019, 403). In some of the literature, it is significant that these relationships are sacred. Citing Hawai'ian scholars Kealiikanakaoleohaililani and Giardina (2016), Muller and her colleagues write that 'it is only when places and human and non-

human beings are embraced as an interconnected network of sacred relationships that ethical, respectful, and sustainable outcomes can be realised' (Muller *et al.*, 2019, 403).

The notions of balance (Salway Black, 1994; Wuttunee, 2004) or equilibrium (Dell *et al.*, 2018) as well as reciprocity, are key to this perspective. That is, the balance between individuals and communities, and between extractive economic activities and nature's wellbeing are all important.[16] For example, there is often a focus on the collective and community, but the individual tends to be represented as playing an important role as a 'person-in-community' (Daly & Cobbs in Wuttunee, 2004), who is responsible to be the best they can for the greater good (Salway Black, 1994). While the economic diversity perspective grapples with the tensions between engagement with mainstream economies and a range of other economic sectors, the relational and holistic prosperity perspective goes further by emphasising strongly the need to balance ecological, physical, emotional, mental and spiritual wellbeing (Wuttunee, 2004).

At this end of the spectrum, economic prosperity cannot be separated from social, cultural, spiritual and political prosperity. Generally, as Native Studies scholar Wanda Wuttunee (Red Pheasant First Nation, Canada) argues, economic 'growth for its own sake is not valued' (2004, p.23). Rather, the emphasis is on First Peoples regaining control of their lives, land and cultures and having the capacity to define the economic system for themselves. This echoes American environmentalist and entrepreneur Paul Hawken's argument that '[w]e have the capacity and ability to create a remarkably different economy, one that can restore ecosystems and protect the environment while bringing forth innovation, prosperity, meaningful work, and true security' (Quoted in Wuttunee, 2004, p.8).

The relational and holistic prosperity perspective is therefore associated with more radical place-based agendas and visions of economic development than the previous three approaches. These agendas resonate with the emerging projects of Indigenous resurgence. Such resurgence 'ultimately entails community reclamation, restoration, and regeneration of local cultural practices, and embracing a daily existence conditioned by place-based cultural practices' (Corntassel & Bryce, 2012, p. 157). As noted in Section 1.1.1., Ngati Porou scholar Kiri Dell and colleagues (2018) have explored the radical potential of an 'economy of mana.' In this concept, they see possibilities for a 'prospering economic future' for Māori that is not constrained by the ideas and institutions that exist in the capitalist and colonialist mainstream (Dell *et al.*, 2018, p. 60). Similarly, in Canada, Wuttunee (2004, p. 13) explores a new economic model based around a potential economic paradigm shift that embeds the principle of 'living with the land' rather than off the land – including a conception of the economy aligned with life cycles.

In Australia, holistic conceptualisations of prosperity, development and wellbeing that support Indigenous resurgence can be seen in the Ngarindjeri Nation's approach to

---

[16] Whether these extractive activities are commercial, subsistence, customary, or ceremonial.

'environmental management, cultural heritage management, water management and town planning' (Hemming *et al.*, 2019, p. 223). This approach is embedded in Yannaruni, which is roughly translated as 'acting or speaking lawfully as Country' (Hemming et al., 2019, p. 222). Associate Professor Steve Hemming (Jumbunna Institute for Indigenous Education & Research) and his colleagues (2019, p. 222) write that 'Yannarumi conveys the Ngarrindjeri conceptualisation of existence as bound to the ecological conditions that provide, define and sustain life: Ngarrindjeri cannot be considered as separate from the interconnected lifeworld that is Ngarrindjeri Ruwe-Ruwar (lands, waters, body, spirit and all living things)'. Through Yannaruni, the Ngarindjeri 'attempt to speak sovereignly, as Country, in order to protect Yarluwar-Ruwe [sea Country] and its interconnected life forms, including the cultural life of the Ngarrindjeri nation' (p. 223). In many ways, Yannarumi reflects an ethos of care, or a way of being in the world, that ensures 'both individual and systemic wellbeing' and also realises 'a collective yearning for the conditions that safeguard the flourishing of life' (p. 224).

3. Policy debates across the spectrum model

Question 2: How have these concepts been used in Indigenous policy debates?

In this section we discuss key policy debates that emerge across the four broad perspectives on prosperity outlined in Section 2. In general, the market-based Prosperity and First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspectives tend to support policy positions that strongly focus on the individual and are centred on improving outcomes against mainstream socioeconomic indicators. On the other hand, the very pluralism of approaches among the economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives means that associated policy proscriptions are incredibly broad. The key policy debates we have identified across the spectrum model engage with themes of self-determination, land holdings, governance, improvement of indicators and ground-up policy development.

3.1 Self-determination

Self-determination features prominently in much of the literature we reviewed across the spectrum model. However, it is considered rather differently depending on the position on the spectrum. The market-based and First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspectives tend to consider self-determination and autonomy as an *outcome* of economic development or prosperity (Coates *et al.*, 2019; Flanagan & Beauregard, 2013; Pearson, 2005a, 2000b). In their joint submission to the House of Representative's Inquiry on *Pathways and Participation Opportunities for Indigenous Australians in Employment and Business*, four Commonwealth institutions (including the National Indigenous Australians Agency) emphasise this position clearly, making explicit links between employment and

business as a producer of prosperity which then enables self-determination for individuals, families and communities (Australian Government, 2020).

On the other hand, the economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives treat self-determination as *foundational.* That is, it is seen as necessary in order to pursue prosperity or appropriate development (e.g. Petray & Gertz, 2018; see also Blaser, 2004; Cornell & Kalt, 2005; Simpson, 2011). This perspective maintains that Indigenous polities are best placed to make decisions for themselves, and that self-determination cannot be an outcome of economic prosperity so long as economic prosperity is defined in accordance with, and relies on, the hegemony of colonial economic, political and social systems.[17]

As a foundational factor, self-determination facilitates First Peoples' communities holding deep and strategic discussions around their aspirations and life projects, asking questions such as 'what kind of society are we trying to build?' (Cornell & Kalt, 2005, p. 4). First Peoples have consistently voiced their intentions to engage with economic realities on their own terms and in manners that are relevant to them, and their contemporary cultures and values (see Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2016, 2017; Altman, 2019; Cornell & Kalt, 2005; St-Germain *et al*., 2007; Murdi Paaki, 2016; Petray & Gertz, 2018; Trembath, 2015). For example, anthropologist and sociologist Theresa Petray and Gugu Badhun and Ngadjon-ji PhD scholar Janine Gertz challenge the idea that Indigenous peoples' willingness to engage with the market economy can automatically be interpreted as acceptance of the neoliberal economic paradigm, or as validation of the classical model of economic development (Petray & Gertz, 2018; see also Altman, 2007; Bargh, 2011, Buchannan, 2014; Thomassin, 2016).

Importantly, in the American context Cornell and Kalt (2005) also note the need to accept that First Peoples' tribal governments may trial ideas and fail – something that government bodies have allowed themselves consistently. In most nation-states, the Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination referred to here necessitates an important shift in First Peoples-state relationships – in which non-Indigenous governments agree to relinquish or share power with Indigenous leadership and institutions.

3.2 Land holdings

Policy positions on Indigenous land holdings also vary greatly across the spectrum. Several papers we have positioned in the market-based perspective emphasise First Peoples' land holdings and associated resources as important assets that can be capitalised on for economic development or prosperity. Land tenure is often raised as a key issue in this regard, with some of the grey literature in particular suggesting that forms of limited title held under land rights and native title legislation restrict the ability of First Peoples to leverage

---

[17] In their discussion of Lawyer's Raphael Lemkin's (1944) early account of genocide, historian Ann Curthoys and philosopher and historian John Docker (2001) argue that the imposition of economic, social and political systems, when it destroys the economic foundations of a group and makes that group dependent on being like the oppressors or devoted to the cause of the oppressors, can be considered genocidal.

land holdings in order to realise their economic potential (Standing committee on State Development, 2016; Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2016).

Access and title to land remains a concern throughout the spectrum. For example, in the First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship and economic diversity perspectives, Professor Heidi Norman, and economist Jock Collins, explore policies and programs which might 'tap the entrepreneurial potential of the Indigenous land estate in Australia to significantly increase Indigenous economic engagement' (Collins & Norman, 2018, p. 150). However, here the conceptualisation of land and ownership moves beyond seeing land as a commercial asset to become more broadly associated with issues of First Peoples' control of their lands, resources and lives. Economic engagement, then, is seen as socially and culturally embedded, and entrepreneurship is understood as a way for people to pursue place-based economic futures shaped by their own notions of development independent of imposed colonial notions (Collins & Norman, 2018).

In the relational and holistic prosperity perspectives, the separation between people and so-called 'land holdings' is broken down. This is evident, for example, in the concept of Yannarumi, 'speaking or acting lawfully as Country', which reflects the ways in which Ngarrindjeri existence is taken to be inextricably connected to the 'lifeworld that is Ngarrindjeri Ruwe-Ruwar (lands, waters, body, spirit and all living things)' (Hemming *et al*., 2019, p. 222). At this end of the spectrum, 'land holdings' are not conceptualised as assets that can be capitalised on, but rather as the 'lifeblood' on which Nations survive (Hemming *et al*., 2019). Such conceptualisations reflect Indigenous Peoples' sovereign rights to land, water and other resources, and to strategically pursue priorities set by their own communities. Ngarrindjeri Professor Daryle Rigney writes that strong, sovereign approaches to the enjoyment, use and protection of natural resources, which reflect these Indigenous conceptualisations of the natural environment can be understood as 'practical exercise[s] of de facto Indigenous sovereignty—irrespective of a constitutional recognition of de jure Indigenous sovereignty by a non-Indigenous system of law' (Rigney *et al*. 2015, pp.343–344).

3.3. Governance

Governance is also an area where policy debates play out along our spectrum model. Within the market-based perspective the literature tends to identify problems with First Peoples' governance structures as a 'handbrake' on economic development or prosperity. For example, Indigenous institutions are often represented as requiring capacity development and improved accountability measures – moulded on non-Indigenous governance structures – to provide increased certainty to lenders and investors (Anderson & Parker, 2008; Jacobs, 2018; Flanagan & Beauregard, 2013).

Literature we have positioned within the relational and holistic prosperity perspective tends to highlight the tensions between First Peoples' and Western models of governance. It also

speaks to the need to support First Peoples' philosophies and knowledge systems as the foundation of First Peoples' governance, and for the governance practices of states to respect and adapt to Indigenous models. For example, Kanien'kehá:ka (Mohawk) author, educator and activist Taiaiake Alfred (2001) cautions against the possibility of co-optation when Indigenous institutions emulate state-like bureaucratic models. He alludes to the ways in which this can shape and limit First Peoples' possibilities for thinking and enacting their sovereignty.

3.4 Improving indicators

Literature within the market-based and First Peoples' capital and entrepreneurship perspectives tends to prioritise improved outcomes against mainstream socioeconomic measures. These often include employment, income, education, business ownership, and land and home ownership. They sometimes also encompass measures of social and emotional wellbeing (e.g. KPMG, 2016; Pearson, 2005a; Commonwealth of Australia, 2014; SCRGSP, 2016; NIAA, 2020). The dominant policy discourse here centres on the right of First Peoples to share in the economic prosperity and growth of the nations that they are citizens of, and on recognition that economic development for First Peoples is also beneficial for the prosperity of all citizens (FaHCSIA, 2010; Government of Western Australia, 2015; Commonwealth of Australia 2014, Standing Committee on State Development, 2016; Supply Nation, 2016; PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2018).

Mainstream indicators are likely to at least partially capture aspects of economic development, prosperity and wellbeing that are important to First Peoples. However, substantial work by Indigenous authors such as Palawa sociologist Maggie Walter (e.g. Walter & Anderson, 2013), Oglala Lakota activist Sherry Salway Black (1994) and Native Studies Professor Wanda Wuttunee (Red Pheasant First Nation) (2004) have pointed out the need for statistical indicators beyond market-based measures that value Indigenous strengths and cultures. Similar calls for indicators that service the needs of First Peoples have been made by the Coalition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peak Organisations in the recent Refresh of the Closing the Gap framework (Coalition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peak Organisations & Council of Australian Governments, 2020).

Literature in the relational and holistic prosperity perspective often emphasises the need to develop sets of indicators that are anchored in Indigenous worldviews and that account for the diversity of Indigenous realities, perspectives and aspirations. To be useful to First Peoples' communities and institutions such indicators need to reflect the range of culturally important priorities of First Peoples beyond market and mainstream measures, and move away from statistical comparisons that suggest a Western 'norm.' For many purposes, data may also need to be disaggregated at the level of specific Indigenous polities (e.g. see Walter & Anderson, 2013; Kukutai & Walter, 2017; Yu, 2011). More importantly, we need to move away from developing indicators and measuring framework that serve primarily to compare Indigenous and non-Indigenous. Efforts by First Peoples communities on the

ground to design such indicators have been driving change in this space (e.g. the Yawuru community wellbeing project, Yap & Yu, 2016b).

3.5 Ground-up policy development and co-design

A further policy debate that plays out in the literature across the spectrum concerns top-down versus ground-up policy development and co-design. While some of the perspectives we have grouped under the market-based approaches are promoted by First Peoples (e.g. Pearson, 2005a, 2005b, 2010), these approaches tend to be conceived as state-led. The broad narrative here is guided by a top-down approach where, despite occasional evidence of collaboration, the policy solutions are often imposed from outside on First Peoples' communities.

In the economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives there is much greater emphasis on the need for community-based and participatory development practices that ensure First Peoples have a leading role in policy development and co-design. Supporting community initiatives is seen as necessary to gain a better understanding of the kinds of societies First Peoples wish to (re)build, and of how First Peoples wish to restore their communities, govern themselves and control their assets (Petray & Gertz, 2018; see also Blaser, 2004, Cornell & Kalt, 2005 Simpson, 2011). Policy design and implementation can be seen as important spaces of Indigenous resurgence, where self-determination and sovereignty are enacted such that creative diverse or hybrid economies can be performed (Alfred & Corntassel, 2014; Bargh 2011, Coulthard, 2014; Corntassel, 2012; Corntassel & Bryce, 2012; Gibson-Graham, 2006; Thomassin, forthcoming). There are many First Peoples who have invaluable expertise for this type of work.

Significantly, the development of ground-up approaches to policy-making requires moving beyond community consultations to allow for partnerships based on genuine, sustained and trustful relationships that enable the right conditions for working towards shared goals (Walden, 2016). The institutions and environment in which co-design partnerships occur matters greatly (Escobar, 2018), in particular so that co-design processes do not work to simply uphold the legitimacy of settler-colonial systems and the power relations that underlie them. As prominent Goenpul scholar Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2006, p. 389) has argued, settlers' subjectivity continuously 'circumscribes the political possibility of Indigenous sovereignty.' In line with the literature on Indigenous resurgence and efflorescence (Roche *et al*., 2018), genuine co-design would necessarily involve challenging any underlying assumption that the ultimate decision-making power resides with the state, and ensuring that the validity and legitimacy of Indigenous perspectives do not depend on them being recognised by settler-colonial governments.

4. Impacts on discourses and narratives

Question 3: What has been the impact of these perspectives on the discourses and narratives about Aboriginal peoples, and the ways in which government policy approaches to economic development are framed?

The varied perspectives on First Peoples' economic development, wellbeing and prosperity that have been identified in this review speak to long-standing debates that both draw on, and tend to reinforce, particular narratives about Indigenous Peoples. In this section we identify these narratives broadly as those related to First Peoples' deficits and strengths; and those related to ideas about equality versus difference. Both of these narratives have implications for government approaches to policy-making and speak particularly to the importance of ground-up policy-making and self-determination discussed in Section 3 above.

4.1 Narratives of deficits and strengths

In Australia, it is now widely accepted that much of the state's response to First Peoples over the last 230 years has been deeply embedded in 'deficit thinking.' For much of this period, dominant European thought has been informed by racist assumptions about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander inferiority and deficiency (Fforde *et al*., 2013, p.164; Gorringe, 2011). While this colonial ideology has often been explicit, it has also been implicit in policies and programs that define an 'Indigenous problem' through the use of statistical measures which are 'standardised against the norms of mainstream Australians' (Aboriginal Affairs NSW, 2017, p.8). In this way, policy and reporting frameworks designed by governments to improve the lives of First Peoples have often contributed instead to a discourse that has defined Indigenous peoples by what settler colonisers presume they lack.

Framing policy uncritically in this way encourages a focus on supposed deficits among First Peoples – the idea that they are themselves to blame for 'not living up to the standard' of the majority population – while ignoring historic and ongoing structural and institutional causes of socio-economic inequalities and attempted assimilation (e.g. Bamblett, 2015; Fforde *et al*., 2013; Fogarty, Bulloch *et al*., 2018; Gorringe *et al*., 2011; Murphy, 2000; Walter & Anderson, 2013). Cressida Fforde's work with Wiradjuri researcher Lawrence Bamblett, Wongaibon epidemiologist Ray Lovett, Mithaka researcher Scott Gorringe and anthropologist Bill Fogarty, highlights the ways in which this deficit thinking 'is interwoven with notions of 'authenticity', which in turn adhere to models of identity still embedded within the race paradigm, suffering from all of its constraints but perniciously benefiting from all of its tenacity' (Fforde *et al*., 2013, p.162). This has significant negative consequences, including stereotyping, reinforcing disparities, justifying inappropriate government

interventions, and limiting trust in First Peoples' institutions. This has also been exacerbated by a widespread exclusion of First Peoples from relevant research design and processes.

Critiques of deficit approaches closely reflect the criticisms of international models of economic development outlined in Section 1.1. For example, a significant theme within that literature is the rejection of a 'needs-based, problem-solving paradigm' that has emphasised supposed deficits to be remedied and ignored communities' own wisdom and capacity to solve problems (Mathie & Cunningham, 2005, p.175). In international development literature, an alternative focus has emphasised community strengths. For example, Asset-Based Community Development is a well-developed approach that starts by identifying, mapping and investing in a community's existing assets, strengths and aspirations (Burkett, 2011; Garven *et al.*, 2016; Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993; Mathie & Cunningham, 2003, 2005; Moser, 2006). Asset-based approaches are closely linked to Amartya Sen's work on capabilities. That is, assets are defined not simply as resources, but rather as what gives people 'the capability to be and act' – the basis of their power to 'reproduce, challenge or change the rules that govern the control, use and transformation of resources' (Moser, 2006, p.8). Such approaches aim to support empowerment and positive change by focusing, in part, on the 'inherent strengths of the people in the community and what they bring to make their communities better' (Garcia, 2020, p.67).

Similarly, in policy-making that relates to First Peoples there have been growing calls over the last two decades to frame policies and programs as strengths-based. These calls have come from Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (see Armstrong *et al.,* 2012; Brough *et al.*, 2004; Fogarty, Lovell *et al.*, 2018; Gooda, 2009, 2010, 2011; Gorringe *et al.*, 2011; Tsey *et al.*, 2007). For example, in 2009, Mithaka man Scott Gorringe worked with Bunuba Elder Joe Ross and scholar Cressida Fforde to document the perspectives of several Aboriginal people on how to move away from the language of deficits into an alternative conservation about strengths (Gorringe *et al.*, 2011). Mick Gooda, a descendant of the Gangulu People and former Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commissioner, has advocated strongly for strength-based approaches, suggesting that these support individuals, family units and communities to build on their capabilities and participate directly in policy-making processes that affect them (Gooda, 2010).

While deficit models have tended to reinforce problematic notions of First Peoples' failure, strengths-based approaches seek 'to move away from the traditional problem-based paradigm,' offering 'a different language and set of solutions to overcoming an issue' based on notions of strength, resilience and 'opportunities that facilitate growth and thriving' (Fogarty, Lovell *et al.*, 2018, p. vi). Fogarty and colleagues note, though, that understandings of what constitutes strengths-based approaches are often 'ill-defined and slippery' (Fogarty, Lovell *et al.*, 2018, p. 5). They caution that because strengths-based approaches may represent 'part of the same "discursive formation" that produces and reproduces deficit,' there is a danger that 'simply advocating strengths-based ways of operating as a corollary

to deficit, without carefully considering whether or not the approach is also an active producer of deficit,' may be counterproductive (Fogarty, Lovell *et al.*, 2018, p. 5).

That is, the loose employment of such concepts means that it is quite possible to pay lip-service to 'strengths' without any reflection on the structural conditions that produce and sustain inequalities, and the broader discursive systems that rely on and perpetuate deficit thinking. This is instructive in reflecting on policy frameworks related to First Peoples. For example, recent years have seen a range of apparently 'positive' concepts employed by different government agencies as they try to grapple with the problems of deficit discourse. As we have noted, these include wellbeing and prosperity, as well as empowerment and economic autonomy. However, these terms are often used without being clearly defined (see Jordan & Biddle, 2017, p. 57).

This means that many development projects that are described as strengths-based or ground-up community development initiatives continue to be moulded by bureaucratic and Western perspectives that are informed by deficit thinking. The work of several Indigenous scholars suggests that such approaches may therefore fail to grapple with structural issues including the deep impacts of colonisation (Kelly *et al.*, 2017), racism (Paradies, 2017) and related intergenerational traumas (Kickett-Tucker & Hansen, 2017). Aboriginal researchers Juli Coffin (traditional ties to Nyangumarta) and Charmaine Greene (Wajarri-Badimaya) identify (2017, p. 75) that such approaches have repeatedly limited the actualisation of development alternatives that are guided and driven by First Peoples' standpoints, knowledge systems, sociality, values and visions.

This suggests that although adopting an apparently strengths-based concept may be necessary to counter deficit thinking, it is not sufficient. As is the case with Asset-Based Community Development, for example, employing participatory processes that deliberately upend the power dynamics of structural inequalities and outside interventions, and that work with community to identify strengths, assets and aspirations, may be key. Similarly, it may be prudent to identify differences between 'self-help' and 'advocacy' models among strength-based approaches. Here, self-help may profess to empower and support people to take 'personal and social responsibility' to respond to their livelihood needs, while advocacy seeks to challenge structural inequalities – such as by enabling 'communities to engage with the state concerning their rights and responsibilities' (Willetts *et al.*, 2014, p. 355).

Kanaka Maoli scholar and educator Noelani Goodyear-Ka'opua's (2009, p. 60) perspective on Indigenous political mobilisation may take this approach even further – focusing not on seeking rights and entitlements from dominant states, but on a combination of 'individual, family and community responsibilities' and systemic changes to regenerate 'local and regional indigenous economies' and recognise 'the interconnection of social, spiritual, environmental and political aspects of self-determination.' It should be noted that strengths-based approaches cannot do all the work of tackling deeply embedded structural challenges.

Nonetheless, they can impact power imbalances where they elevate the influence of community voices and invest in the power of local institutions, polities and visions.

4.2 Narratives of equality and difference

Another way of understanding the impact of approaches to economic development, wellbeing and prosperity on discourses about First Peoples is through the notions of equality and difference. Here, equality refers to statistical equality based on standard Western socio-economic measures, while difference refers to the maintenance of culturally-informed differences in aspirations and life projects that may see divergences on some socio-economic indicators. Several critiques of policies that relate to First Peoples have hinged on the idea that one or other of these objectives has been unduly prioritised (e.g. Altman, 2009a; Altman & Rowse, 2005; Altman & Sanders, 1991; Kowal, 2006, 2008; Sanders, 2009; Taylor, 2008; Jordan *et al.*, 2010, Pholi *et al.*, 2009). Equally important is that what is assumed or implied by these concepts in policy debates may be fundamentally disconnected from First Peoples' aspirations, life projects and definitions.

There is clearly overlap here with debates about deficit discourse. For example, the concerns with a singular focus on statistical equality stem from the dominance of measurement models that unconsciously reinscribe a power relation – in which First Peoples can be seen as deficient in comparison to the non-Indigenous 'norm.' This means that culturally-informed preferences to embrace different livelihoods and life projects – such as devoting significant time to non-market activities like hunting or fishing, or preferencing communal over private ownership – can sometimes be painted as deviant or dysfunctional (e.g. see Altman, 2009b). At the same time, the significant caring responsibilities of First Peoples, and many forms of reciprocity, tend to be overlooked.

As Maggie Walter and Michif (Métis) scholar Chris Anderson remind us, statistics are not only 'powerful persuaders,' they are also situated in a cultural framework (Walter & Anderson, 2013, p. 1). Methodological decisions about what data are collected and how they are interpreted are most often shaped by non-Indigenous understandings, and in turn create the 'known reality' about what the problems are and how to fix them. Several Indigenous scholars have pointed out that, in this way, the use of statistics tends to both reflect and constitute the dominant cultural framework 'in ways largely invisible to their producers and users' (Walter & Anderson, 2013, p. 9; see also Salway Black, 1994; Wuttunee, 2004). This is not to say that all policy based on seeking to address statistical inequalities is problematic. Substantial recent work has been done by First Peoples to develop quantitative methodologies that produce statistical data by and for First Peoples and portray reality from First Peoples' perspectives. These methodologies can accommodate differences in aspirations and life projects (e.g. Walter & Anderson, 2013; Kukutai & Walter, 2017).

Broadly, the four perspectives in our spectrum model of economic prosperity tend to reflect different positions in the equality and difference debate. For example, as we have noted in

Section 3.4, the market-based perspective tends to focus on incorporating First Peoples into mainstream economic practices and institutions, framing proposed interventions around addressing statistical inequalities on indicators such as income, home ownership and wealth. While there is a clear concern here with equality, there is often less room for differences in First Peoples' aspirations to live in ways that are alternative to the dominant Western models of development. Some approaches in this perspective have therefore been associated with the critiques of deficit discourse outlined above, in that they have reinforced notions that First Peoples should live according to mainstream Western norms (on this point see Altman, 2007; Campbell, 2019; Bielefeld, 2016).

At the other end of our spectrum of approaches, the economic diversity and relational and holistic prosperity perspectives also speak to debates around equality and difference, as well as deficit discourse. For example, their tendency to underscore First Peoples' self-determination and life projects put the onus on investing in Indigenous visions and aspirations for their futures. This sits comfortably with a focus on difference as well as strengths-based approaches to policy-making where these facilitate genuine structural change. These approaches also have the potential to reframe government policy approaches to economic development to be the most transformational, redefining most fully what 'progress' means, emphasising ground-up policy-making and opening up conversations about the kinds of economic practices that best support First Peoples' priorities. Here, if there is an equality, it is defined by and for First Peoples and borne out of mutual adaptation of Indigenous and non-Indigenous systems. In this way, non-Indigenous cultures, institutions and economic practices are also necessarily reformed as a result.

Conclusion

Efforts to broaden notions of 'progress' in the international development field have been closely mirrored in debates about Indigenous policy. In particular, concerns about policy frameworks that have privileged Western ideas of progress and portrayed First Peoples as 'deficient' on mainstream indicators have become subject to widespread criticism. In some cases, dominant notions of economic development have given way to alternative concepts – such as wellbeing or prosperity – that may be more amenable to holistic definitions that better accommodate First Peoples' aspirations beyond the mainstream.

However, in our review of the literature we have found that these three terms – economic development, wellbeing and prosperity – are all multivalent. They are sometimes used interchangeably, which at times appear to conflate outcomes and process, and often without explicit definition. Most importantly, different authors tend to use them in very different ways. For example, while economic development is perhaps more associated with mainstream models focused on market-participation, a number of academic studies and policy frameworks retain the concept of economic development – or variations such as sustainable development – to describe much broader approaches that seek to reflect First Peoples'

priorities and worldviews (e.g. Gibson-Graham, 2006; HPAIED, 2008; Altman, 2009; Petray & Gertz, 2018).

Similarly, while concepts of wellbeing often stem from intentions to acknowledge holistic measures of progress, their applications vary widely – from standardised indicators of social and emotional wellbeing (ABS, 2010; Gee *et al.,* 2014) to tailored indicator frameworks determined through detailed participatory research with communities (e.g. Greiner *et al.,* 2005; Grieves, 2007; Yap and Yu, 2016; Cairney *et al*., 2017). The same diversity of approaches is true of those discussing prosperity. Although the notion of prosperity tends to be associated with market-based conceptualisations that focus on income and wealth (e.g. Westpac & Urbis, 2014; Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2019; Flanagan & Beauregard, 2013), it also has application in more holistic approaches where prosperity is understood as reflecting broader social, cultural and spiritual values (e.g. Blaser, 2004; Cassiers, 2015; Dell *et al.,* 2018; Jackson, 2017; Méda, 2015). In the international literature, this wider version of prosperity is gaining traction.

These varied definitions mean that the adoption of concepts of economic development, wellbeing and prosperity in policy-making related to First Peoples may – or may not – offer alternatives to the status quo. This is not to say that their use is without consequence: different uses of these terms produce particular discourses that can profoundly shape the relationships between First Peoples' polities, the state and diverse publics. They can also influence the content of policy frameworks and their very real impacts on First Peoples' lives and institutions.

One inference is that the term being used is much less important than how it is defined. For example, it is clear from the preceding discussions that economic development, wellbeing and prosperity can be defined and operationalised both through top-down decision-making and ground-up, community-driven action. From this perspective, framing public policy in language like prosperity or wellbeing is most likely to signal a genuinely strengths-based approach where the adopted definitions and indicators are defined by First Peoples to accord with their values, aspirations and priorities.

In the context of the NSW Government's adoption of *OCHRE*, and its commitment to an Aboriginal Economic Prosperity Framework that supports the right of NSW First Peoples to determine their own economic futures, key questions include 'who decides' what prosperity means and 'how'? What kind of institutions and structures need to be created to support the kind of prosperity, development or wellbeing First Peoples envision and aspire to? Trends towards processes of resurgence, self-governance and self-determination suggest that defining the contours of these visions must involve 'more substantive discussions regarding the reclamation of indigenous territories, livelihoods, natural resources, and the regeneration of community languages and culturally based practices,' as Tsalagi (Cherokee) political scientist Jeff Corntassel argues (2008, p. 107).

Our research suggests that, despite substantial conceptual development about the need for Indigenous-driven policy frameworks, there have been few attempts to develop a policy-relevant and Indigenous-led approach to First Peoples' prosperity from the ground up. At the state level, such a process could open a range of potential economic futures that aim to build appropriate material affluence while recognising and investing in the diversity of First Peoples' visions, values and aspirations across NSW. It might also go some way to addressing two fundamental issues in First Peoples-state relations. First, the need to move beyond 'band-aid' and 'piecemeal' responses to policy issues and instead promote multi-faceted approaches and structural changes in power relations (Behrendt, 2001, pp. 859–860). And, second, the common concern among First Peoples (e.g. Moreton-Robinson, 2006) that settlers' subjectivity continues to limit the political possibility of Indigenous sovereignty.

References

Aboriginal Affairs NSW (2013) *OCHRE: Opportunity, Choice, Healing, Responsibility, and Empowerment. NSW Government Plan for Aboriginal affairs: education, employment & accountability*, Aboriginal Affairs NSW, NSW Department of Education.

Aboriginal Affairs NSW (2016a) *OCHRE, Growing NSW's first economy, Aboriginal Affairs NSW*. Sydney: Aboriginal Affairs NSW, NSW Department of Education.

Aboriginal Affairs NSW (2016b) *Aboriginal Community Local Decision Making: Policy and Operational Framework*, Aboriginal Affairs NSW, NSW Department of Education.

Aboriginal Affairs NSW (2017) *Transforming the relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the NSW Government: Aboriginal Affairs NSW research agenda 2018–2023*. Sydney: Aboriginal Affairs NSW, NSW Department of Education.

Aboriginal Affairs NSW (2018) *OCHRE: Five Years On. Making OCHRE Stronger: The NSW Government's interim response to Stage 1 of the independent evaluation of OCHRE*, Aboriginal Affairs NSW, Sydney.

Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner (2005) *Native Title Report 2005.* Report No. 4/2005. Sydney: Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

Adler, A., and Seligman, M. E. (2016) Using wellbeing for public policy: Theory, measurement, and recommendations. *International Journal of Wellbeing,* 6(1): 1–35.

Alexander, S. (2015) *Prosperous Descent: Crisis as opportunity in an age of limits*. Melbourne: Simplicity Institute.

Alfred, T. (2001) From sovereignty to freedom: towards an Indigenous political discourse Indigenous Affairs*. IWGIA*, 3(1): 22–34.

Alfred, T., & Corntassel, J. (2014) Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism. *Government and Opposition,* 40(4): 597–614.

Alkire, S. (2002) *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alkire, S. (2015) *The Capability Approach and Well-Being Measurement for Public Policy*. OPHI Working Paper 94, Oxford University.

Altman, J.C. (2001) *Sustainable development options on Aboriginal land: the hybrid economy in the 21st century*. Discussion Paper 226. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Altman, J.C. (2004). *Economic Futures on Aboriginal Lands Economic Futures on Aboriginal Land in Remote and Very Remote Australia: Hybrid Economies and Joint Ventures*. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Altman, J.C. (2005) Economic futures on Aboriginal land in remote and very remote Australia: hybrid economies and joint ventures, in D. Austin-Broos & G. Macdonald (eds.), *Culture, economy and governance in Aboriginal Australia* (pp. 121–134). Sydney: University of Sydney Press.

Altman, J.C. (2007) *Neo-Paternalism and the Destruction of CDEP*. CAEPR Topical Issue No.14/2007. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Altman, J.C. (2009a) *Beyond closing the gap: Valuing diversity in Indigenous Australia*. CAEPR Working Paper 54/2009. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Altman, J.C. (2009b) The hybrid economy and anthropological engagements with policy discourse: a brief reflection. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 20(3): 318–29.

Altman, J.C., and Kerins, S. (2012) *People on Country: Vital Landscapes, Indigenous Futures*. Sydney: The Federation Press.

Altman, J. (2019) Remote Indigenous Australia's ecological economies give us something to build on. *The Conversation.* (8 November).

Altman, J.C. & Rowse, T. (2005) 'Indigenous affairs', in P. Saunders & J. Walter (eds.), *Ideas and Influence: Social Science and Public Policy in Australia* (pp.159–177). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Altman, J.C. & Sanders, W.G. (1991) Government initiatives for Aboriginal employment: Equity, equality and policy realism, in J.C. Altman (ed.), *Aboriginal Employment Equity by the Year 2000*. CAEPR Research Monograph 2. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Anderson, T.L. & Parker, D.P. (2008) Economic development lessons from and for North American Indian economies. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics,* 53(1): 105–127.

Arbib, M., Evans, C. & Macklin, J. (2011) *Indigenous Economic Development Strategy*, Media Release, 19 October.

Armstrong S., Buckley S, Lonsdale M, Milgate G, Bennetts Kneebone L, Cook L and Skelton F. (2012) *Starting school: A strengths-based approach towards Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children*, A report prepared by the Australian Council for Educational Research, for the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Australian Council for Educational Research.

Arndt, H.W. (1981) Economic Development: A Semantic History. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 29(3): 457–466.

Austin, A. (2016) On Well-Being and Public Policy: Are We Capable of Questioning the Hegemony of Happiness? *Social Indicators Research*, 127: 123–138.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2010) *Framework for measuring wellbeing: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*. Catalogue No. 4703.0. Canberra: ABS.

Australian Government (The Hon Ken Wyatt AM MP) (2019) *Aboriginal Economic Development Forum*, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet Retrieved from on 14 September 2020 https://ministers.pmc.gov.au/wyatt/2019/aboriginal-economic-development-forum.

Australian Government (2020) Joint Submission No 8 *to House of Representatives Standing Committee on Indigenous Affairs Inquiry into Pathways and Participation Opportunities for Indigenous Australians in Employment and Business*.

Australian Government Department of Families Housing Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) (2010) Indigenous Economic Development Strategy 2011–2018, FaHCSIA, Canberra.

Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council (2015) *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Performance Framework 2014 Report*. Canberra: AHMAC.

Bache, I., and Reardon, L. (2016) *The Politics and Policy of Wellbeing: Understanding the Rise and Significance of a New Agenda.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Bamblett L. (2015) Aboriginal advantage: an insider look at an Aboriginal community, Parliamentary Library National Reconciliation Week Lecture 2015, Canberra, 27 May.

Bargh, M. (2011) Moving on from the Developmental View of Humanity. *Alternatives, 36*(1): 79–85.

Bargh, M. (2018) Māori Political and Economic Recognition in a Diverse Economy, in M. Bargh, D. Howard-Wagner, & I. Altamirano-Jiménez (eds.), *The Neoliberal State, Recognition and Indigenous Rights* (pp. 293–308). Canberra: ANU Press.

Batten, B. and Stanford, K. (2012) Strengthening Aboriginal Community Wellbeing, Cosmopolitan Civil Societies Journal, 4(3). Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://doi.org/10.5130/ccs.v4i3.2574.

Bebbington, A. (1993) Modernisation from Below: An alternative indigenous development? *Economic Geography,* 69: 274–292.

Bessarab, D. & Forrest, S. (2017) Anggaba jina nimoonggoon: Whose knowledge is that? Aboriginal perspective of community development, in C. Kickett-Tucker, D. Bessarab, J. Coffin & M. Wright (eds.) *Mia Mia Aboriginal Community Development: Fostering Cultural Security* (pp. 1–18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bicker, A., Sillitoe, P., & Pottier, J. (2003) *Negotiating local knowledge: Power and identity in development*. London: Pluto Press.

Bielefeld, S. (2016) Neoliberalism and the return of the guardian state: Micromanaging Indigenous peoples in a new chapter of colonial governance, in W. Sanders (ed.) *Engaging Indigenous Economy: Debating diverse approaches* (pp.155–170). Canberra: ANU Press.

Blaser, M. (2004) Life Projects: Indigenous Peoples' Agency and Development, in M. Blaser, H.A. Feit, & G. McRae (eds.), *In the Way of Development: Indigenous Peoples, Life Projects and Globalization* (pp. 26–44). London: Zed Book/IDRC.

Bodkin-Andrews, G., Bodkin, F., Andrews, G. (2017) Aboriginal identity, world views, research and the story of Burra'gorang, in Kickett-Tucker, C., Bessarab, D., Coffin, J. & Wright, M. (eds.) Mia Mia Aboriginal Community Development: Fostering Cultural Security (pp. 9–36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bond, C. (2020) 'The 'new' Closing the Gap is about buzzwords, not genuine change for Indigenous Australia,' The Conversation, 31 July.

Brough, M., Bond, C. & Hunt, J. (2004) Strong in the City: towards a strength-based approach in Indigenous health promotion. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia* 15(3): 215–20.

Buchanan, G. (2014) Hybrid Economy Research in Remote Indigenous Australia: Seeing and Supporting the Customary in Community Food Economies. *Local Environment,* 19(1): 10–32.

Bulloch H. & Fogarty W. (2016) Freeing the 'Aboriginal Individual': Deconstructing 'Development as Freedom' in Remote Indigenous Australia. *Social Analysis,* 60(3): 76–94.

Burkett, I. (2011) Appreciating assets: a new report from the International Association for Community Development (IACD). *Community Development Journal,* 46(4): 573–578.

Butler, T., Anderson, K., Garvey, G., Cunningham, J., Ratcliffe, K., Tong, A., Whop, L., Cass, A., Dickson, M. and Howard, K. (2019) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's domains of wellbeing: a comprehensive literature review, Social Science and Medicine, 233:138-157. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.06.004

Campbell, F. (2019) Deficit discourse – the 'regime of truth' preceding the Cape York Welfare Reform. *Griffith Law Review*, 28: 1–23.

Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business (CCAB) (2016) *Promise and Prosperity the 2016 Aboriginal Business Survey*. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://www.ccab.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/CCAB-PP-Report-V2-SQ-Pages.pdf.

Cairney, S., Abbott, T., Quinn, S., Yamaguchi, J., Wilson, B. & Wakerman, J. (2017) Interplay Wellbeing Framework: A collaborative methodology 'bringing together stories and numbers' to quantify Aboriginal cultural values in remote Australia. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 16(68).

Carson, R. (1962) *Silent Spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Carrington, B. & Young, P. (2011) *Aboriginal Heritage and Wellbeing*, Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (NSW), Sydney South. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/nswcultureheritage/AboriginalHeritageWellbeing.htm.

Cassiers, I. (2015) Introduction, in I. Cassiers (ed.), *Redefining Prosperity* (pp.1–5). London and New York: Routledge.

Cerdán, P. (2013) Post-development and BuenVivir: An approach to development from Latin-America. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 10: 15–24.

City of Sydney (2016) *Eora Journey Economic Development Plan*. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/256951/12036-Eora-Journey-Economic-Action-Plan-FA1-Web-Ready.pdf.

Clark, D. (2005) *The Capability Approach: Its Development, Critiques and Recent Advances*. GPRG Economics Series Working Papers 32, Global Poverty Research Group.

Coalition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peak Organisations & Council of Australian Governments (2020) National Agreement on Closing the Gap, July 2020.

Coates, K., Holroyd, C., & Pierre, S. (2019) Natural Resources and Aboriginal Autonomy, in W. Nikolakis, S. Cornell, & H. Nelson (eds.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Governance* (pp. 228–268). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Coffin, J. & Green, C. (2017) Decolonising Australian community development tools, in C. Kickett-Tucker, D. Bessarab, J. Coffin & M. Wright (eds.), *Mia Mia Aboriginal Community Development: Fostering Cultural Security* (pp. 73–90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, J. & Norman, H. (2018) Indigenous Entrepreneurship and Indigenous Employment in Australia. *Journal of Australian Political Economy,* 82: 149–170.

Corlet Walker, C. & Jackson, T. (2019) *Measuring Prosperity – Navigating the options*. CUSP Working Paper No.20. Guildford: Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity.

Cornell, S., & Kalt J.P. (1990) Pathways from Poverty: Economic Development and Institution-Building on American Indian Reservations. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 14(1): 89–125.

Cornell, S., Kalt, J.P. (2005) Two Approaches to Economic Development on American Indian Reservations: One Works, the Other Doesn't, in M. Jorgensen and S. Cornell (eds.) *Resources for Nation Building: Governance, Development, and the Future of American Indian Nations.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Corntassel, J., & Bryce, C. (2012) Practicing Sustainable Self-Determination: Indigenous Approaches to Cultural Restoration and Revitalization. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 8(11): 151–162.

Corntassel, J. (2012) Re-envisioning resurgence: Indigenous pathways to decolonization and sustainable self-determination. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society,* 1(1): 86–101.

Coulthard, G.S. (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cummins, R.A., Eckersley, R., Pallant, J., Van Vugt, J. & Misajon, R. (2003) Developing a national index of subjective wellbeing: The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index. *Social Indicators Research*, 64: 159–190.

Curry, G.N. (2003) Moving Beyond Postdevelopment: Facilitating Indigenous alternatives for 'Development'. *Economic Geography*, 79(4): 405–423.

Curthoys, A. & Docker, J. (2001) Introduction - Genocide: Definitions, Questions, Settler-colonies, in A. Curthoys and J. Docker (eds.) *'Genocide'? Aboriginal History*, 25: 1–15.

Dalziel, P. (2020) 'New Zealand books on wellbeing: a review essay', *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences* Online: DOI: 10.1080/1177083X.2020.1745248

de la Bellacasa, M.P. (2010) Ethical doings in naturecultures. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 13(2):151–69.

de la Bellacasa, M.P. (2017) *Matters of Care: Speculative Ethics in More Than Human Worlds*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

de la Cuadra, F. (2015) Indigenous people, socio-environmental conflict and post-development in Latin America. *Ambiente & Sociedade* 18(2): 23–40.

Dell, K., Staniland, N. & Nicholson, A. (2018) Economy of Mana. *Mai Journal*, 7(1): 51–65.

Deloria Jr, V. (2016) *Indians of the Pacific Northwest: From the Coming of the White Man to the Present Day.* Golden: Fulcrum Publishing.

Deloria Jr, V. (2018) *Custer Died for your Sins*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Deneulin, S. (2008) Beyond individual Freedom and Agency: Structures of living together in the Capability Approach, in F. Comim, M. Qizilbash, and S. Alkire (eds.), *Capability Approach – Concepts, Measures and Applications* (pp. 105–124). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (2017) *Promoting the Economic Interests of Indigenous Australian Businesses Overseas: A charter*. Canberra: Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Department of Premier and Cabinet (2020) *Commitment to Aboriginal Youth Wellbeing*. Perth: Government of Western Australia.

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (2016) Submission No 32 to NSW Legislative Council. Standing Committee on State Development, *Inquiry into Economic Development in Aboriginal Communities* (18 March 2016).

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (2018) *Closing the Gap: The next phase: public discussion paper*. Canberra: Australian Government, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (2019) *Closing the Gap Report 2019*. Canberra: Australian Government, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Diener, E., & Seligman, M.E.P. (2004) Beyond Money: Toward an Economy of Well-Being. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5(1): 1–31.

Durie, M. (2006) *Measuring Māori Wellbeing*. New Zealand Treasury Guest lecture Series (1 August 2006), pp. 1–16.

Dodson, M. & Smith, D. (2003) *Governance for sustainable development: Strategic issues and principles for Indigenous Australian communities*. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Drabsch, T. (2012) *Measuring wellbeing.* Briefing Paper No 4/2012. Sydney: NSW Parliamentary Research Services.

Easterlin, R. (1974) "Does Economic Growth Improve the Human Lot?" Some Empirical Evidence, in Nations and Households", in P. David and M. Reder, (eds.), *Economic Growth: Essays in Honor of Moses Abramovitz.* New York: Academic Press, pp. 98–125.

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Escobar, A. (1998) Whose Knowledge, Whose Nature? Biodiversity, Conservation, and the Political Ecology of Social Movements. Journal of Political Ecology, 5: 53–82.

Escobar, A. (2011) Development and the Anthropology of modernity, in Harding, S. (ed.) The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader (pp.269–289), Durham and London: Duke University Press

Escobar, A. (2018) Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds. United Kingdom: Duke University Press.

Fforde, C., Bamblett, L., Lovett, R., Gorringe, S. & Fogarty, B. (2013). Discourse, Deficit and Identity: Aboriginality, the Race Paradigm and the Language of Representation in Contemporary Australia. *Media International Australia*, 149: 162–173.

Flanagan, T. & Beauregard, K. (2013) *The Wealth of First Nations: An exploratory Study*. Fraser Institute Centre for Aboriginal Policy Studies.

Flanagan, T. (2019a, June 19) Small number of First Nations thwarting opportunity for many more First Nations. *Globe & Mail*.

Flanagan, T. (2019b, December 18) Struggling First Nations share common characteristics. *Globe & Mail.*

Fogarty, W., Bulloch, H., McDonnell, S. & Davis, M. (2018) *Deficit Discourse and Indigenous Health: How narrative framings of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are reproduced in policy*. Melbourne: The Lowitja Institute.

Fogarty, W., Lovell, M., Langenberg, J. & Heron, M. (2018) *Deficit Discourse and Strengths-based Approaches: Changing the narrative of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health and wellbeing.* Melbourne: The Lowitja Institute.

Foley, D. (2004) *Understanding Indigenous Entrepreneurship: A Case Study Analysis* (PhD thesis). University of Queensland.

Forrest, A. (2014) *Creating Parity: The Forrest Review*. Canberra: Australian Government, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Frey, B., & Stutzer, A. (2002) The economics of happiness. *World Economics*, 3(1): 1–17.

Fritz, M. & Koch, M. (2016) Economic Development and Prosperity Patterns Around the World: Structural challenges for a global steady-state economy. *Global Environmental Change*, 38: 41-48.

Gammage, B. (2012) *The Biggest Estate on Earth: How Aborigines Made Australia*. Allen & Unwin.

Ganesharajah, C. (2009) *Indigenous health and wellbeing: the importance of Country*. Native Title Research Report 1, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Canberra

Garcia, I. (2020) Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD): Core principles, in R. Phillips, E. Trevan and P. Kraeger (eds.), *Research Handbook on Community Development* (pp. 67-75), Gloucestershire and Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Garven, F., McClean, J. & Pattoni, L. (2016) *Asset-Based Approaches: Their rise, role and reality*, London: Dunedin Academic Press.

Gee, G., Dudgeon, P., Schultz, C., Hart, A. & Kelly, K. (2014) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander social and emotional wellbeing, in P. Dudgeon, H. Milroy and R. Walker (eds.), *Working together: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander mental health and wellbeing principles and practice*, Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Gegeo, D.W. (1998) Indigenous knowledge and empowerment: Rural development examined from within. *Contemporary Pacific 10*(2): 289–315.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006) *A Postcapitalist Politics,* University of Minnesota Press.

Gomes, A. (2012) Alter-Native 'Development': Indigenous forms of social ecology. *Third World Quarterly*, 33: 1059–1073.

Gooda, M. (2009). 'Navigating away from the discourse of disadvantage', paper presented at Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) National Indigenous Studies Conference, AIATSIS, Canberra.

Gooda, M. (2010) Social Justice and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples access to services, Speech to the QCOSS Regional Conference: Building a Better Future, 12 August. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://humanrights.gov.au/about/news/speeches/social-justice-and-aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-peoples-access

Gooda, M. (2011) *Social Justice Report 2011*. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, Sydney: Australian Human Rights Commission.

Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, N. (2009) Rebuilding the 'Auwai: Connecting Ecology, Economy and Education in Hawaiian Schools. *AlterNative,* 5(2): 47–77.

Gorringe, S. (2011) Honouring Our Strengths - Moving Forward. *Education in Rural Australia*, 21(1): 21–37.

Gorringe, S., Ross, J. & Fforde, C. (2011) *Will the Real Aborigine Please Stand Up?: Strategies for breaking the stereotypes and changing the conversation*. AIATSIS Research Discussion Paper 28, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Canberra.

Government of Canada (2009) *Federal Framework for Aboriginal Economic Development.* Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-INTER-HQ/STAGING/texte-text/ffaed1_1100100033502_eng.pdf

Government of Western Australia (2012) *Western Australia Aboriginal Economic Participation Strategy (2012-2016).* Department of Indigenous Affairs, Perth. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://walga.asn.au/getattachment/Policy-Advice-and-Advocacy/Community-Development/Aboriginal-Communities/Aboriginal-economic-participation_strategy-2012-2016.pdf.aspx?lang=en-AU

Gow, D. D. (1997) Can the Subaltern Plan? Ethnicity and Development in Cauca, Colombia. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development,* 26(3/4): 243–292.

Graham, C. (2012) *The Pursuit of Happiness: An Economy of Well- Being.* Washinton DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Greiner, R., Larson, S., Herr, A., & Bligh, V. (2005). *Wellbeing of Nywaigi Traditional Owners: The contribution of country to wellbeing and the role of natural resource management.* CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems, Townsville.

Grieves, V. (2007) *Indigenous well-being: A framework for governments' Aboriginal cultural heritage activities.* NSW Department of Environment and Conservation, Sydney.

Grogan, H. (2018) Taking a rightful place in our own country': Bring First Peoples' voice into government policy, *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77(S1): S47–S51. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12358

Hacker, J.S. and Loewentheil, N. (2012) *Prosperity Economics: Building an economy for all*, Hacker and Loewentheil, Creative Commons.

Haybron, D.M. (2015) Mental State Approaches to Well-Being, in M.D. Adler and M. Fleurbaey (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Well-Being and Public Policy* (pp. 347–378). Oxford University Press.

Helne, T. & Hirvilammi, T. (2019) Having, Doing, Loving, Being: Sustainable well-being for a post-growth society, in E. Chertkovskaya, A. Paulsson and S. Barca (eds.) *Towards a Political Economy of Degrowth* (pp.225–242). London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hemming, S, Rigney, D., Bignall, S., Berg S. & Rigney, G. (2019) Indigenous nation building for environmental futures: Murrundi flows through Ngarrindjeri country. *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management*, 26(3): 216–235.

Hēnare, M. (2014). The economy of mana, in D. Cooke, C. Hill, P. Baskett, an R. Irwin (eds.), *Beyond the free market: Rebuilding a just society in New Zealand* (pp. 65–69). Auckland: Dunmore.

HPAIED (2008) *Honoring Nations Report: Oneida Farms/Agriculture Center (ONFAC) – 2005 Honoree.* The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Hunter B. (2015) Whose business is it to employ Indigenous workers? *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 26(4): 631–651. doi:10.1177/1035304615598526

Indigenous Business Australia (2019) *IBA Corporate Plan 2019–2020*, Indigenous Business Australia, Sydney.

International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity- IIFB (2014). International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, COP 12- Korea, Working Group 2: Agenda Item 26, Ecosystem Restoration & Conservation.

Jackson, T. (2005) *Prosperity without Growth? The transition to a sustainable economy*. London: Sustainable Development Commission.

Jackson, T. & Tucker, A. (2010) Prosperity without Growth: Planning for a sustainable economy. *Pacific Ecologist*, 19: 10–18.

Jackson, T. (2017) *Prosperity without Growth: Foundations for an economy of tomorrow* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Jacobs, C. (2018) Indigenous prosperity is key to Closing the Gap, *The Australian: Opinion and Commentary* (30 July). Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from

https://www.cis.org.au/commentary/articles/indigenous-prosperity-is-key-to-closing-the-gap/

Jones, R., Thurber, K.A., Chapman, J., D'Este, C., Dunbar, T., Wenitong, M., Eades, S.J., Strelein, L., Davey, M., Du, W., Olsen, A., Smylie, J.K., Banks, E. & Lovett, R. (2018) Study protocol: *our cultures count*, the Mayi Kuwayu study, a national longitudinal study of Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander wellbeing. *BMJ Open*, 8(6): 1–7.

Jordan, K. & Biddle, N. (2017) Economic Prosperity, in Aboriginal Affairs NSW, *Transforming the relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the NSW Government: Aboriginal Affairs NSW research agenda 2018-2023* (pp. 53–81). Sydney: NSW Department of Education.

Jordan, K., Bulloch, H. & Buchanan, G. (2010) Statistical equality and cultural difference in Indigenous wellbeing frameworks: A new expression of an enduring debate. *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 45(3): 333–362.

Jordan, K., Markham, F. & Altman, J.C. (forthcoming) Linking Indigenous Communities with Regional Development: Australia Overview. *CAEPR Commissioned Report.*

Kealiikanakaoleohaililani, K. & Giardina, C.P. (2016) Embracing the sacred: an indigenous framework for tomorrow's sustainability science. *Sustainability Science*, 11(1): 57–67.

Kelly, L., Kickett-Tucker, C. & Bessarab, D. (2017) Ways in which postmodernism can inform Aboriginal community development, C. Kickett-Tucker, D. Bessarab, J. Coffin & M. Wright (eds.) *Mia Mia Aboriginal Community Development: Fostering Cultural Security*, (pp. 91–109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Khan, A.J. and Ahmad, H. (2017) *Prosperity and Instability: An Evaluation of Legatum Prosperity Index*. Annual Proceedings of Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Papers and Proceedings (pp. 407–431).

Kickett-Tucker, C., Bessarab, D., Coffin, J. & Wright, M. (eds.) (2017) *Mia Mia Aboriginal Community Development: Fostering Cultural Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kickett-Tucker, C., & Hansen, J. (2017) Ngalang moort: Family as the building block of community development. In Kickett-Tucker, C., Bessarab, D., Coffin, J. & Wright, M. (eds.) *Mia Mia Aboriginal Community Development: Fostering Cultural Security*, (pp. 199–216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kingfisher, C. (2013) Happiness: Notes on History, Culture and Governance, Health. *Culture and Society*, 5(1): 67–82.

Kowal, E. (2006) Moving Towards the Mean: Dilemmas of Assimilation and Improvement, in T. Lea, E. Kowal & G. Cowlishaw (eds) *Moving Anthropology: Critical Indigenous Studies* (pp. 65-78). Darwin: Charles Darwin University Press.

Kowal, E. (2008) The politics of the gap: Indigenous Australians, liberal multiculturalism and the end of the self-determination era. *American Anthropologist,* 110(3): 338–48.

KPMG (2016) *Igniting the Indigenous Economy*, KPMG. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://assets.kpmg/content/dam/kpmg/au/pdf/2016/igniting-indigenous-economy-australia.pdf.

Kretzmann, J. and McKnight, J. (1993) *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.

Kukutai, T. & Walter, M. (2017) 'Indigenous Statistics,' in P. Liamputtong (ed) *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*, Springer, Singapore, pp 1–16.

LaDuke, W. (1999) *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life.* South End Press.

Legatum Institute (2007) *The 2007 Legatum Prosperity Index: a global assessment of Wealth and Wellbeing*. London: Legatum Institute.

Legatum Institute (2019) *The Legatum Prosperity Index: A tool for transformation, 2019*. London: Legatum Institute.

Lemkin, R. (1944) *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lester, D. (2016, 3 March) Economic prosperity is crucial to improving social outcomes for Aboriginal people. *IndigenousX*.

Local Decision Making Regional Chairpersons Group (2016) *Submission: Inquiry into Economic Development in Aboriginal Communities*. NSW Legislative Council Standing Committee on State Development Inquiry into Economic Development in Aboriginal Communities.

Māori Economic Development Panel (2012a) *He kai kei aku ringa*: *The Crown-Māori Economic Growth Partnership Strategy to 2040*, Te Puni Kōkiri, Wellington NZ.

Māori Economic Development Panel (2012b) *He kai kei aku ringa*: *The Crown-Māori Economic Growth Partnership Discussion Document*, Te Puni Kōkiri, Wellington NZ.

Māori Economic Development Panel (2012c) *He kai kei aku ringa*: *The Crown-Māori Economic Growth Partnership Action Plan 2012-2017*, Te Puni Kōkiri, Wellington NZ.

Markham, F. & Williamson, B. (2020) We have 16 new Closing the Gap targets. Will governments now do what's needed to meet them? *The Conversation* (30 July).

Mathews, G. & Izquierdo, C. (2009) *Pursuits of Happiness: Well-Being in Anthropological Perspective*. London and New York: Berghahn.

Mathie, A. & Cunningham, G. (2003) From clients to citizens: Asset-based community development as a strategy for community-driven development. *Development in Practice*, 13(5): 474–486.

Mathie, A. & Cunningham, G. (2005) Who is Driving Development? Reflections on the Transformative Potential of Asset-based Community Development. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 26(1): 175–186.

McDonald, C., A. Moreno-Monroy & Springare, L. (2019) Indigenous economic development and well-being in a place-based context*, OECD Regional Development Working Papers*, No. 2019/01, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/bf4514b6-en.

McGillivray, M., and Clarke, M. (2006) Human well-being: Concepts and measures, in M. McGillivray and M. Clarke (eds.), *Understanding human well-being* (pp.3–16) New York: United Nations University Press.

McGregor, D., Morelli, P., Matsuoka, J., Rodenhurst, R., Kong, N., & Spencer, M. (2003) An Ecological Model of Native Hawaiian Well-being. *Pacific Health Dialogue*, 10(2), 106–128.

McLester, R. (Deganadus) (2017) Seven Generation, *Academic Algonquin*. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PI-QMcXrMsY.

Meadows, D., Meadows, D., Randers, J. and Behrens, W. (1972) the Limits to Growth. New York: Universe Books.

Méda, D. (2015a) Can Prosperity be Disentangled from Growth?, in I. Cassiers (ed.) *Redefining Prosperity* (pp.6–21). London and New York: Routledge.

Méda, D. (2015b) 'Preface' in I. Cassiers (ed.) *Redefining Prosperity* (pp. xiv–xx). London and New York: Routledge.

Merino, R. (2016) An alternative to 'alternative development'? Buen vivir and human development in Andean countries. *Oxford Development Studies*, 44(3): 271–286.

Mika, J.P., Warren, L., Foley, D., & Palmer, F.R. (2017) Perspectives on indigenous entrepreneurship, innovation and enterprise. *Journal of Management and Organization,* 23 (6): 767–773.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2015) *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Moser, C.O.N. (2007) *Asset-based Approaches to Poverty Reduction in a Globalized Context: An introduction to asset accumulation policy and summary of workshop findings*. Working Paper 1, The Brookings Institution, Washington.

Muller, S., Hemming, S. & Rigney, D. (2019) Indigenous sovereignties: relational ontologies and environmental management. *Geographical Research*, 57(4): 399–410.

Mundine, N.W. (2017) Mabo–25 Years On. *James Cook University Law Review*, 14: 41–46.

Mundine, N.W. (2018) Economic prosperity is not the enemy of conservation. *Financial Review.*

Murphy, L. (2000) *Who's Afraid of the Dark? Australia's Administration in Aboriginal Affairs* (Master of Public Administration dissertation). University of Queensland.

Nash, J. (2003) Indigenous Development Alternatives. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, 32(1): pp.57-98.

National Indigenous Australians Agency (2020) *Closing the Gap in Partnership.* Canberra: Australian Government, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://closingthegap.niaa.gov.au/.

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (1998) My Paradigm or Yours? Alternative Development, Post-Development, Reflexive Development. *Development and Change, International Institute of Social Studies,* 29(2): 343–373.

Nelson, R. (2019). *Beyond Dependency: Economic Development, Capacity Building, and Generational Sustainability for Indigenous People in Canada*. SAGE Open. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019879137.

NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs (2003) *Two ways together: New South Wales Aboriginal Affairs Plan,* 2003–2012.

Nguyen, O., & Cairney, S. (2013) *Literature review of the interplay between education, employment, health and wellbeing for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in remote areas*. Adelaide: Ninti One Limited.

Norman, H. (2016) Coal Mining and Coal Seam Gas on Gomeroi country: Sacred lands, economic futures and shifting alliances. *Energy Policy*, 99: 242–251.

Norman, H. (2017) Return of public lands to Aboriginal control/ownership, *Transforming the relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the NSW Government: Aboriginal Affairs NSW research agenda 2018-2023* (pp. 15–31). Sydney: Aboriginal Affairs NSW, NSW Department of Education.

NSWALC (2016) Submission 43 to NSW Legislative Council Standing Committee on State Development, *Inquiry into Economic Development in Aboriginal Communities* (9 August 2016).

NSW Coalition of Aboriginal Regional Alliances. (2018) *A Step Closer: A Report with Recommendations from NCARA to the New South Wales Government following Stage One of the OCHRE Evaluation*.

NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs (2005) *Two Ways Together: the NSW Aboriginal Affairs Plan 2003–2012*. Sydney: NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

NSW Government (2017). Growing NSW's First Economy: Our Response. The NSW Government Response to the Standing Committee on State Development's Inquiry and Report into economic development in Aboriginal communities in NSW, NSW Government, Sydney.

NSW Obudsman (2016) *Submission 19 to* NSW Legislative Council Standing Committee on State Development, *Inquiry into Economic Development in Aboriginal Communities* (12 February 2016).

NSW Ombudsman (2016) *Fostering economic development for Aboriginal people in NSW: A Special Report to Parliament under s.31 of the Ombudsman Act 1974*, Ombudsman NSW, Sydney.

Nussbaum, M. (2003) Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice. *Feminist Economics*, 9(2-3): 33–59.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2000) *Women and Human Development: the Capabilities Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OECD. (2015) *How's life? 2015: Measuring Well-being*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD (2018). OECD 2nd World Forum 2007: Measuring and Fostering the Progress of Societies, 27-30 June. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from http://www.oecd.org/site/worldforum06/.

Oxford University Press. (n.d.) Prosperity. Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved on 9 June 2020 from https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/153041?redirectedFrom=prosperity#eid.

Panzironi, F. (2012) The Indigenous capability – right to health and Australia's Close the Gap Indigenous health policy, in F. Panzironi and K. Gelber (eds.), *Capability Approach: Development practice and public policy in the Asia Pacific region* (pp. 68–83). London: Routledge.

Paradies, Y. (2017) Overcoming racism as a barrier to community development, in C. Kickett-Tucker, D. Bessarab, J. Coffin & M. Wright (eds.) *Mia Mia Aboriginal Community Development: Fostering Cultural Security* (pp. 169–185). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pascoe, B. (2014) *Dark emu: Black seeds: agriculture or accident?* Broome: Magabala Books.

Pearson, N. (2005a, 25 October) *Welfare Reform and Economic Development for Indigenous Communities*. Lecture, CIS Occasional Paper 100. Sydney: Centre for Independent Studies. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://www.cis.org.au/app/uploads/2015/07/op100.pdf.

Pearson, N. (2005b, 25 October) *Working Towards Peace and Prosperity*. Speech to the Centre for Independent Studies, Sydney.

Pearson, N. (2010, November 4) *Pathways to Prosperity for Indigenous People*. Speech to the NZ Business Roundtable, Auckland. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://nzinitiative.org.nz/reports-and-media/reports/pathways-to-prosperity-for-indigenous-people-the-2010-sir-ronald-trotter-lecture/.

Pearson, N. (2016) Foreword, in D. Freeman and S. Morris (eds.), *The Forgotten People: liberal and conservative approaches to recognising Indigenous peoples* (pp. 7–13). Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Petray, T.L. & Gertz, J. (2018) Building an economy and building a nation: Gugu Badhun self-determination as prefigurative resistance. *Global Media Journal*, 12(1).

Pholi, K., Black, D. & Richards, C. (2009) Is 'Close the Gap' a useful approach to improving the health and wellbeing of Indigenous Australians? *Australian Review of Public Affairs*, 9(2): 1–13.

Pink, B., Taylor, S., & Wetzler, H. (2014) Measuring Progress: The International Context, in A. Podger and D. Trewin (eds.), *Measuring and Promoting Wellbeing: How Important is Economic Growth?* (pp. 163–189). Canberra: ANU Press.

Pociovălişteanu, D., Badea, L. & Octavian Sorici, C. (2010) Approaches of Prosperity in the Globalization Era. *Annals of University of Craiova - Economic Sciences Series*, 1(38): 143–151.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers (2018) *The contribution of the Indigenous business sector to Australia's economy.* PriceWaterhouseCoopers. Retrieved from https://www.pwc.com.au/indigenous-consulting/assets/the-contribution-of-the-indigenous-business-sector-apr18.pdf

Queensland Productivity Commission (2017) *Final report: Service delivery in remote and discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.*

Randall, B. & Hogan, M. (2006) *Kanyini*, Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from http://www.kanyini.com/.

Raworth, K. (2017) *Doughnut economics: seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Hartford: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Rigney, D., S. Bignall, & Hemming. S. (2015) Negotiating Indigenous modernity. Kungun Ngarrindjeri Yunnan—listen to Ngarrindjeri speak. *Alternative*, 11(4): 334–349.

Rigney, L.I. (2017) Aboriginal community development and digital inclusion: Hope, haves and have-nots, in C. Kickett-Tucker, D. Bessarab, J. Coffin & M. Wright (eds.), *Mia Mia Aboriginal Community Development: Fostering Cultural Security* (pp. 186–198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robeyns, I. (2005) The Capability Approach: a theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development*, 6(1): 93-117.

Roche, G., Kroik, A K. & Maruyama, H. (eds.) (2018) *Indigenous Efflorescence: Beyond Revitalisation in Sapmi and Ainu Mosir.* Canberra: ANU Press.

Rodrik, D. (ed.) (2003) *In Search of Prosperity: Analytic frameworks on economic growth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rodwan Abouharb, M. & Cingranelli, D. (2007) *Human Rights and Structural Adjustment*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rostow, W. (1960) *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996) Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Volume One: Looking Forward Looking Back. Ottawa: Canada Communication Group.

Ryan, R., and Deci, E. (2001) 'On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being,' *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 141–166.

Ryff, C. (1989) 'Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being,' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 57, No.6, pp.1069–1081.

Salway Black, S. (1994) *Redefining Success in Community Development: A New Approach for Determining and Measuring the Impact of Development.* The Richard Schramm Paper on Community Development. Medford: Lincoln Filene Center for Community Partnerships, Tufts University.

Sardar, Z. (2007) *Prosperity: A transmodern analysis*, Sustainable Development Commission, London.

Sanders, W.G. (2009) *Ideology, Evidence and Competing Principles in Australian Indigenous Affairs: From Brough to Rudd via Pearson and the NTER*. CAEPR Discussion Paper 289/2009. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Sangha, K., Le Brocque, A., Costanza, R. and Cadet-James, Y. (2015) Application of capability approach to assess the role of ecosystem services in the well-being of Indigenous Australians, *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 4: 445–458.

Sautet, F. (2008) *Once Were Iwi? A Brief Institutional Analysis of Maori Tribal Organisations Through Time.* Working Paper 3. Wellington: New Zealand Business Roundtable.

Seligman, M.E.P. (2012) *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*: Simon and Schuster, New York.

Sen, A. (1985) Wellbeing, Agency and Freedom. *Journal of Philosophy*, 82: 169–221.

Sen, A. (1987) *Tanner Lectures in Human Values: The Standard of Living.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sen, A. (1999) *Development As Freedom*. New York: Knopf.

Shin, D. C., and Johnson, D. M. (1978) Avowed happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of life, *Social Indicators Research*, pp. 475–492.

Sillitoe, P. (1998) 'The development of indigenous knowledge: a new applied anthropology,' *Current Anthropology,* Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 223–30.

Sillitoe, P., Bicker, A. & Pottier, J. (2002) *Participating in Development : Approaches to Indigenous Knowledge.* London & New York: Routledge.

Simpson, L. (2011) *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Press.

Sparr, P. (1994) What is Structural Adjustment, in P. Sparr (ed.) *Mortgaging Women's Lives: Feminist critiques of structural adjustment*. London & New Jersey: Zed Books.

Standing Committee on State Development (2016). Economic development in Aboriginal communities, Standing Committee on State Development, Sydney.

Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision - SCRGSP (2016) *Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators 2016*. Canberra: Productivity Commission.

St. Germain, G., & Sibbeston, N. (2007) *Sharing Canada's Prosperity – A Hand Up, Not a Handout. Special study on the involvement of Aboriginal communities and businesses in economic development activities in Canada.* Ottawa: Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples.

Statistics New Zealand (2002) *Towards a Māori Statistics Framework: A discussion document*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.

Stewart, F. (2005) Groups and capabilities. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 6: 182–204.

Stiglitz, J.E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J.P. (2009) Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. *Sustainable Development*, 12: 292-292.

Summers, L.H. & Pritchett, L.H. (1993) The Strucural-Adjustment Debate. *The American Economic Review*, 83(2): 383–389.

Supply Nation (2016) Submission 49 *to* NSW Legislative Council Standing Committee on State Development, *Inquiry into Economic Development in Aboriginal Communities* (5 August 2016).

Supply Nation & First Australians Capital (2018) *Indigenous Business Growth: Working together to realise potential.* Sydney: Supply Nation.

Susnjak, T., Schumacher, C., Ali, A., Brook, A., Geertsema, P., Matthewson, J., Owens, R., & Smith, J. (2019) *Towards a Global Index of Shared Prosperity: A case study on New Zealand*. Working Paper. Auckland: Knowledge Exchange Hub, Massey University.

Taylor, J. (2008) Indigenous Peoples and indicators of well-being: Australian perspectives on United Nations global frameworks. *Social Indicators Research*, 87(1): 111–26.

Tebtebba Foundation (2010) *Towards an Alternative Development Paradigm: Indigenous People's Self-determined Development*. Philippines: Tebtebba Foundation.

Tebtebba. (2008). *Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples: A Resource Book* Phillipines Tebtebba Foundation.

Te Puni Kokiri and The Treasury (2019) *An Indigenous Approach to the Living Standards Framework*. NZ Treasury Discussion Paper 19/01. Wellington: NZ Treasury.

The Lowitja Institute, Submission to the Council of Australia Government on the Future of Closing the Gap (30 April 2018).

Thin, N. (2009) Why Anthropology Can Ill Afford to Ignore Well-Being, in G. Mathews and C. Izquierdo (eds.), *Pursuits of Happiness: Well-Being in Anthropological Perspective* (pp. 23–44). London and New York: Berghahn.

Thomassin, A. (2016) Hybrid economies as life projects? An example from the Torres Strait, in W. Sanders (ed.), *Engaging Indigenous Economy: Debating diverse approaches* (pp. 95–110). Canberra: ANU Press.

Thomassin, A. (2019) *Ina Ngalmun Lagau Malu (This Part of the Sea Belongs to Us): Sea Rights and Politics of Co-management in Zenadh Kes (Torres Strait),* Unpublished PhD Thesis. (PhD), McGill University, Montreal.

Thomassin, A. (Forthcoming) The Everyday Performance of Indigenous Sovereignties.

Tiberius, V. (2006) Well-Being: Psychological Research for Philosophers. *Philosophy Compass*, 1(5): 493–505.

Trembath, O. (2015) Submission No 9 to the Standing Committee on State Development, Parliament of New South Wales, Inquiry into Economic Development in Aboriginal Communities (11 October).

Tsey, K., Wilson, A., Haswell-Elkins, M., Whiteside, M., McCalman, J. & Cadet-James, Y. (2007) Empowerment-based research methods: a 10-year approach to enhancing Indigenous social and emotional wellbeing. *Australasian Psychiatry* 15(sup1): S34–S38.

United Nations (no date). Sustainable Development Goals, Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/.

United Nations (2015) *Transforming our World: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. Resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, 25 September 2015, A/RES/70/1.

United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (2006) *Report of the meeting of Indigenous Peoples and Indicators of well- being*, The Technical Workshop on Indigenous Peoples and Indicators of Well-Being, Ottawa, 22–23 March.

United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (2018) Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Seventeenth session, International Expert Group Meeting on the theme 'Sustainable Development in the Territories of Indigenous Peoples,' New York, 26–27 April. E/C.19/2018/7

Westpac Group & Urbis (2014) *Enabling prosperity: Success factors for Indigenous Economic Development*. Westpac Group, Sydney.

Vaughan, D. (2011) The importance of capabilities in the sustainability of information and communications technology programs: the case of remote Indigenous Australian communities, *Ethics and Information Technology*, 13(2): 131–150.

Walden, I. (2016) *Talking back to policy: Aboriginal participation in policy making* (PhD Thesis). University of New South Wales, Sydney.

Waldmüller, J. (2014) Buen Vivir, Sumak Kawsay, Good Living: An Introduction and Overview. *Alternautas*, 1(1): 17–28.

Walter, M. & Anderson, C. (2013) *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology.* Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Watene, K. (2016) Valuing nature: Māori philosophy and the capability approach. *Oxford Development Studies*, 44(3): 287–296.

White, C. (2009) *Understanding Economic Development: A global transition from poverty to prosperity?* Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

White, G.B. (2015) 'Black Workers Really Do Need to Be Twice as Good,' *The Atlantic*, 7 October.

White, S., and Blackmore, C. (eds.) (2016) *Culture of wellbeing: Method, Place and Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Willetts, J., Asker, S., Carrard, N. & Winterford, K. (2014) The practice of a strengths-based approach to community development in Solomon Islands. *Development Studies Research*, 1(1): 354–367.

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future [The Brundtland Report]. World Commission on Environment and Development, Oxford University Press.

Wunan Foundation Inc. (2015) *Empowered Communities: Empowered Peoples Design Report*. Retrieved on 14 September 2020 from https://empoweredcommunities.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/EC-Report.pdf.

Wuttunee, W. (2004) *Living Rhythms: Lessons in Aboriginal Resilience and Vision*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Yap, M., and Yu, E. (2016a) Operationalising the capability approach: developing culturally relevant indicators of indigenous wellbeing – an Australian example. *Oxford Development Studies*, 44(3): 315–331.

Yap, M., and Yu, E. (2016b) *Community Wellbeing From the Ground-Up: A Yawuru Example*. BCEC Report 3.

Yap, M and Yu, E (2019) Mabu liyan: the Yawuru way, in *Routledge Handbook on Indigenous Wellbeing* (eds) Matthew Manning and Christopher Flemming, Routledge.

Yu, P. (2011) Aboriginal Development - Making Data Work. *ABS Conference: Census Beyond the Count*. City: Melbourne.

Appendix 1. Policy and Measurement Frameworks

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
Eora Journey Economic Development plan[18]	2016	Economic development	Local	Yes	City of Sydney, Australia	Themes • Create an economic hub • Maximise employment outcomes • Enhance access to and benefits from tertiary education • Grow key sectors in the economy (finance, professional services, tourism, retail, creative and digital business)
Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation Economic Development Strategy 2017-2022[19]	2017	Economic development	Local	Yes	Victoria, Australia	Objectives • Economic opportunities • Grow our business • Support small business • Jobs for our people
Regional Plan for the Murdi Paaki Region[20]	2016	Economic development Wellbeing	Local	Yes	New South Wales, Australia	Strategic areas • Heritage and culture • Regional resourcing and capability • Democracy, leadership and citizenship • Economic development • Law and Justice • Early childhood and school education • Housing and infrastructure • Wellbeing

---

[18] https://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/256951/12036-Eora-Journey-Economic-Action-Plan-FA1-Web-Ready.pdf
[19] https://www.gunaikurnai.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/GLaWAC_Economic-Development-Strategy_112017-Low-Res.pdf
[20] http://www.mpra.com.au/uploads/documents/mpra_regional_plan_fin_mps.pdf

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
NSW Aboriginal Land Council Economic Development Policy[21]	2014	Economic development	State	Yes	New South Wales, Australia	Strategic priorities • Securing and managing our land • Improving our governance and sustainability • Driving our economic development • Supporting our people • Protecting and promoting our culture, heritage and the environment
Growing NSW's First Economy[22]		Economic development	State	Yes	New South Wales, Australia	Priorities • Driving public sector diversity • Creating jobs and supporting businesses • Improving Aboriginal education outcomes • Boosting apprenticeships • Building infrastructure • Making NSW the easiest state to start a business • Creating sustainable social housing
Victorian Aboriginal Economic Strategy 2013-2020[23]	2013	Economic development	State	Yes	Victoria, Australia	Goals • Building foundations and aspirations for jobs and business throughout life (education, training, VET) • More job opportunities across the economy • Grow aboriginal enterprise and investment

---

[21] https://alc.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/2014-nswalc-economic-development-policy.pdf
[22] *https://www.aboriginalaffairs.nsw.gov.au/pdfs/AEPF-4ppv3.pdf*
[23] https://www.aboriginalvictoria.vic.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-10/Victorian-Aboriginal-Economic-Strategy-2013-2020.pdf

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Economic participation framework[24]	2013	Economic development	State	Yes	Queensland, Australia	Priority areas • Individual responsibility and opportunity • Unlocking economic potential • Contributing to the economy
Aboriginal Economic participation Strategy (2012-2016)[25]	2016	Economic development	State	Yes	Western Australia, Australia	Themes • Respond to Aboriginal aspirations • Unlock the potential • Grow economic participation • Create sustainable wealth • Work in partnership
Indigenous economic development strategy 2011-2018[26]	2011	Economic development	National	Yes	Australia	Priorities • Strengthens foundations to create an environment that supports economic development • Invest in education • Encourage participation and improve access to skills development and jobs • Support the growth of Indigenous business and entrepreneurship • Assist individuals and communities to achieve financial security and independence by increasing their ability to identify, build and make most of economic assets
He kai kei aku ringa: The Crown-Maori Economic Growth Partnership (Strategy to 2040)[27]	2012	Economic development	National	Yes	Aotearoa New Zealand	Goals • Greater educational participation and performance • Skilled and successful workforce

[24] https://www.cabinet.qld.gov.au/documents/2013/dec/econparticipationfwork/Attachments/Framework.PDF

[25] https://www.pdc.wa.gov.au/application/files/1215/1304/4899/Aboriginal_Economic_Participation_Strategy.pdf

[26] https://www.ilo.org/dyn/youthpol/en/equest.fileutils.dochandle?p_uploaded_file_id=500

[27] https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/a-matou-mohiotanga/business-and-economics/he-kai-kei-aku-ringa-the-crownmaori-economic-growt

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
						• Increased financial literacy and savings • Government, in partnership with Māori, enables growth • Active discussions about development of natural resources • Māori Inc as a driver of economic growth
Federal Framework for Economic Development (Government of Canada)[28]	2009	Economic development	National	check	Canada	Strategic priorities • Strengthening aboriginal entrepreneurship • Developing aboriginal human capital • Enhancing the value of aboriginal assets • Forging new and effective partnerships
Everyone Together: Aboriginal Affairs Strategy 2019-2029[29]	2020	Economic development Wellbeing	State	Yes	Northern Territory, Australia	Focus areas • Truth and healing • Languages and cultures • Land and sea • Children and families • Housing and essential infrastructure • Health • Education • Safety • Justice • Jobs and Economy

---

[28] https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-INTER-HQ/STAGING/texte-text/ffaed1_1100100033502_eng.pdf
[29] https://dcm.nt.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/799219/everyone-together-aa-strategy.pdf

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
South Australian Government Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan	2019	Economic development Wellbeing	State	Yes	South Australia, Australia	• Creating opportunities for Aboriginal jobs and businesses • Improving the quality and delivery of services to Aboriginal South Australians • Building strong and capable aboriginal communities
Victorian Aboriginal Affairs Framework 2018-2023[30]	2018	Wellbeing	State	Yes	Victoria, Australia	Domains • Children, family and home • Learning skills • Opportunity and prosperity • Health and wellbeing • Justice and safety • Culture and country
Commitment to Aboriginal Youth Wellbeing[31]	2020	Wellbeing	State	Yes	Western Australia, Australia	Focus area • Cultural Wellbeing • Health • Community • Youth
Measuring progress in Queensland Remote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities[32]	2020	Wellbeing	State	Yes	Remote communities in Queensland, Australia	Domains • Education, learning and skills • Customary, voluntary and paid work • Income and economic resources • Housing infrastructure and resources • Law and justice • Citizenship and governance • Culture, heritage and leisure

---

[30] https://www.aboriginalvictoria.vic.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-09/VAAF%20FINAL.pdf
[31] https://www.wa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2020-03/Commitment%20to%20Aboriginal%20Youth%20Wellbeing.pdf
[32] https://apo.org.au/node/303463

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
Interplay wellbeing Project[33]	2017	Wellbeing	National	Yes	Four communities in remote Australia	Domains • Work • Empowerment • Education • Health • Community • Culture
Australia National Development Index[34]	-	Wellbeing	National	No	Australia	Domains • Indigenous wellbeing • Health • Justice, fairness and human rights • Environment and sustainability • Education, knowledge and creativity • Economic life and prosperity • Governance and democracy • Culture, recreation and leisure • Community and regional life • Children and young people's wellbeing • Subjective wellbeing and life satisfaction • Work and work-life balance
Canadian Index of Wellbeing[35]	2011	Wellbeing	National	No	Canada	Domains • Democratic engagement • Community vitality • Leisure and culture • Time use • Education • Living standards • Healthy population

[33] https://old.crc-rep.com/wellbeingframework/
[34] http://www.andi.org.au/
[35] https://uwaterloo.ca/canadian-index-wellbeing/

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
						• Environment
OECD Better Life Initiative[36]	2011	Wellbeing	International	No	OECD Countries	Domains • Income and wealth • Work and job quality • Housing • Health • Knowledge and skills • Environmental quality • Subjective wellbeing • Safety • Work-life balance • Social connections • Civic engagement
Te Whare Tapa Whā (The Four walls of the House)[37]	1984	Wellbeing	National	Yes	Aotearoa New Zealand	Elements • Te Taha Hinengaro (mental and emotional wellbeing) • Te Taha Wairua (spiritual wellbeing) • Te Taha Tinana (physical wellbeing) • Te Taha Whānau (family wellbeing)
New Zealand Living Standards Framework[38]	2018	Wellbeing	National	No	Aotearoa New Zealand	Domains • Civic engagement and governance • Health • Cultural identity • Environment • Housing • Income and consumption • Jobs and earnings

---

[36] https://www.oecd.org/statistics/better-life-initiative.htm

[37] https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/populations/maori-health/maori-health-models/maori-health-models-te-whare-tapa-wha

[38] https://treasury.govt.nz/information-and-services/nz-economy/higher-living-standards/our-living-standards-framework

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
						• Knowledge and skills • Time use • Safety and security • Social connections • Subjective wellbeing
Kimihia He Oranga: Tairāwhiti Māori Economic Development Report[39]	2017	Wellbeing Economic development	National	Yes	Aotearoa New Zealand	Themes • Building capability • Cultural competence • Education and training • Collaboration • Whānau development • Self-development • Infrastructure development
Arctic and Northern Policy Framework (Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada)	2019	Wellbeing Economic development	National	No	Arctic and Northern Canada	Goals • Canadian Arctic and northern Indigenous peoples are resilient and healthy • Strengthened infrastructure that closes gaps with other regions of Canada • Strong, sustainable, diversified and inclusive local and regional economies • Knowledge and understanding guides decision-making • Canadian Arctic and northern ecosystems are healthy and resilient • The rules-based international order in the Arctic responds effectively to new challenges and opportunities

---

[39] https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/mo-te-puni-kokiri/our-stories-and-media/tairawhiti-maori-economic-development-report

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
						• The Canadian Arctic and North and its people are safe, secure and well-defended. • Reconciliation supports self-determination and nurtures mutually respectful relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples
UNFPII Wellbeing[40]	2006	Wellbeing	International	Yes	International	Themes and sub-themes Identity, Land and ways of Living • Maintenance and development of Traditional Knowledge, Traditional Cultural expressions and practices • Use and intergenerational transmission of indigenous languages • Support of, and access to, bilingual, mother tongue, and culturally appropriate education • Ownership, access, use, permanent sovereignty of lands, territories, natural resources, waters • Health of communities • Health of ecosystems • Patterns of migration Indigenous Rights to and Perspectives on Development • Indigenous governance and management systems • Free, prior, informed consent, full participation and Self-determination in all matters affecting indigenous peoples' well-being

---

[40] https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/unpfii-sessions-2/fifth-session-of-unpfii.html

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
						• Degree of implementation/compliance with international standards and agreements relating to indigenous peoples' rights: Nation-to-Nation Treaties between states and indigenous peoples, ILO 169, UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and relevant UN human rights and other instruments; recommendations by relevant international monitoring bodies • Government funding for indigenous peoples' programs and services
Auckland Plan 2050[41]	2018	Wellbeing Prosperity	National	No	Aotearoa New Zealand	Key outcomes • Belonging and participation • Māori identity and wellbeing • Homes and places • Transport and access • Environment and cultural heritage • Opportunity and Prosperity (labour productivity, wages, employment in advanced industries, zoned industrial land, unemployment, internet usage, educational achievement of young people)

---

[41] https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-strategies/auckland-plan/about-the-auckland-plan/docsprintdocuments/auckland-plan-2050-print-document.pdf

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
Christchurch Prosperity Framework- Addressing challenges and realising potential 2018-2028[42]	2018	Prosperity	Regional	No	Aotearoa New Zealand	- Improved perception and confidence - Grow value and Scale - Inclusive and Sustainable
Westpac Enabling Indigenous Prosperity[43]	2014	Economic prosperity	National	Yes	Australia	Contributing factors - Governance, institutions and government policy, - Human capital - Infrastructure - Agglomeration and geography - Access to market
The quest for Prosperity: Shaping Australia's Future[44]	2017	Prosperity	National	No	Australia	Pillars - Economic quality - Business environment - Governance - Safety and security - Personal freedom - Social capital - Education - Health - Natural Environment
Northern Territory Economic Development Strategy	2016	Prosperity Economic development	State	No	Northern Territory, Australia	Economic enablers - Land and water - Infrastructure - Domestic energy - Human capital - Investment - Supportive governments

---

[42] This report notes that the prosperity frameworks focus on economic wellbeing within a wider framework of wellbeing through the Christchurch City Council's Community Outcomes Framework. The Christchurch Community Outcomes include strong communities, liveable cities, prosperous economy and healthy environment.

[43] https://www.westpac.com.au/docs/pdf/aw/Enabling_Prosperity_Success_Factors_for_Indigenous_Economic_Development.pdf

[44] https://li.com/reports/the-quest-for-prosperity-shaping-australias-future-2/

Name of framework	Year	Concept	Level	Indigenous specific/centred	Location/Country	Proposed domains/themes/strategic priorities/goals
United Nations Sustainable Development Goals[45]	2015	Development Wellbeing Prosperity	International	No	Global	Goals • No poverty • Zero hunger • Good health and wellbeing • Quality education • Gender quality • Clean water and sanitation • Affordable and clean energy • Decent work and economic growth • Industry, innovation and infrastructure • Reduced inequalities • Sustainable cities and communities • Responsible consumption and production • Climate action • Life below water • Life on land • Peace and justice, strong institutions • Partnership for the goals

---

[45] http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html