TRANSFORMING PARKS AND PROTECTED AREAS

POLICY AND GOVERNANCE IN A CHANGING WORLD

EDITED BY KEVIN S. HANNA, DOUGLAS A. CLARK AND D. SCOTT SLOCOMBE

Transforming Parks and Protected Areas

Policy and governance in a changing world

Edited by Kevin S. Hanna, Douglas A. Clark,
and D. Scott Slocombe

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

NEW YORK AND LONDON

Chapter 10

Indigenous peoples and protected heritage areas:

acknowledging cultural pluralism

David Neufeld

'Just smell that breeze,' Dad said as we rounded a little grove. He inhaled deeply and I did the same. The warm air was both sweet and sharp: a delightful mixture of wild honeysuckle, roses, wild sweet peas, green grass, sap, tall slough plants, rich brown earth, and the yeasty odour of the silver wolf-willows. 'It's fair wonderful, isn't it?' Dad said as we jogged along again. 'Just like God's own garden.' We came to the top of a little rise and Dad let Nelly stop. Darkie stopped too, and we sat there for a while and looked at the beauty around us: at the poplars and willows both silver and green, and at the roses, wild mint, and harebells that were everywhere.

'Take a good look at it, Mary,' Dad said quietly. 'You'll never see it this way again.'

I did as I was told. I looked at the tall grass and the peavine and the soft green silk of the wild barley, but the sad note in Dad's voice puzzled me. How could the prairie change? I wondered. I did not realize then what an instrument of change a plough is.

The trees and willows are gone now, grubbed out and burned, and the roses and wild mint have been ploughed under. Wheat now grows where the chook-cherries and the violets bloomed. The wind is still sweet, but there is no wildness in it and it no longer seems to have wandered a great way over grass and trees and flowers. It now smells of dry straw and bread. The keen wild fragrance the wind knew in those days has gone forever.

(Heimstra, 1955)

Introduction

Mary Heimstra's (1955) pang of loss is one of the primary impetuses behind publicly protected heritage areas (PHA) in North America. In Saskatchewan, where Heimstra's family settled in 1904, it was the children of the original settlers who sharply felt this loss. As they reached the end of their active life, they undertook the rituals of their age - burying parents and remembering their own initiation to the place they learned to call home. And they, and their children, took action to remember and honour their home and its creators. The family picnic sites, berry picking patches, community rodeo grounds, swimming holes, the beaches on the fish-stocked reservoirs created by the federal Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act (PFRA), these remnants of 'God's own garden' and those human-created contributions to it, were made into regional parks. Unguided by any national or even provincial organization, local communities identified these special places that spoke to the achievements of their pioneer forebears - the transformation of a wild place to a productive home. The children and grandchildren made sure there were places of memory and reflection on their good life.

These regional parks[1] were also to preserve tiny pieces of that original natural world their parents entered as newcomers. Partly to allow a nostalgic glimpse of the land before its

transformation and partly to allow every visitor the sensation of being a pioneer, the park experience included a chance to be the first one in this wild place, to be in a time before time. Palliser Regional Park in south-central Saskatchewan, named after the leader of a British scientific expedition which first reported on the area, includes a 'buffalo rubbing stone' as part of its heritage display. It is said to be a piece of a much larger transformer rock, a physical manifestation of the sacred Plains Cree oral tradition. Recognized as an indigenous spiritual item, and thus a monument to the long ago past, the stone lay in the valley to be flooded by the Lake Diefenbaker reservoir in the mid-1960s. Plans to remove the rock up to the new lake shore as a monument ultimately resulted in its being blown to pieces. One large fragment of rock, not likely part of the original, was then removed to the park (Herriot, 2000: 69ff). In many ways the purposes of Palliser Regional Park and others across Saskatchewan reflect the culturally entrenched values and interests expressed in PHAs across Canada. At the same time they also illustrate the tragically limited understanding of Indigenous peoples typical of the policies and governance shaping management of these PHAs.

This chapter forwards the idea that the PHAs of Canada, and by association, those developed and supported by the west around the world, are culturally entrenched tools of State power. They are designed to strengthen the State through fostering citizen identity with the State and to gain citizen acknowledgment of the State's responsibility to represent them in the world. A review of some of Parks Canada's experiences with Indigenous peoples related to the management of PHAs highlights challenges raised by First Nations and notes the resulting policy responses from Parks Canada. Finally, the chapter considers the present forms of recognition that PHAs extend to Indigenous peoples and suggests the consideration of significant revisions to our notions of governance to ensure that both policy and the context for policy application are conducive to the desire to more effectively and meaningfully address the interests forwarded by Indigenous peoples.

Constructing the nation-state

From our preface we can understand that the network of PHAs in Canada is an elaborate set of cultural constructions reflecting the interests, values and aspirations of the people, and their governments, who created and maintain them. Although the larger systems of PHAs, managed by the Canadian, provincial and territorial governments, are now largely understood as representative elements of the various ecosystems that make up Canada and the history of its settlement, this understanding is founded upon the mainstream societal values reaching back to the origins of parks and protected areas.

Modern protected areas have their origin in North America. Alfred Runte, historian of the American national parks, suggests that the idea for national parks rose as part of the process of building the republic. Although nominally free of the social hierarchy and wars of the old world, the settler societies of the new world shared the desire for, and faced the same challenges in creating, a modern nation state. The nation-state, a political entity representing ethnic or cultural groups, as the primary element in the international order evolved in Europe from the mid-seventeenth century. German political philosophers forwarded a set of rational criteria defining the nation-state - common language, race, and shared traditions, emphasizing the cultural unity of the nation. Ernest Renan, a French Orientalist, challenged this rigid focus on culture. From the more culturally diverse background of France he forwarded instead a definition of the nation-state built upon the idea of a 'willfulness to live together' expressed through continuing consent, common memories, and the will to exploit a common inheritance (Wikipedia, n.d. Webber, 1976: 112). This latter idea also more accurately reflected the values of the diverse immigrant populations making up the nation-states of the new world. The founders of the American states developed governing structures to ensure continuing consent. However, the

challenge of establishing common memories and identifying a common inheritance proved more difficult. In Europe these memories and inheritances were written into the landscape as venerable cathedrals, ancient centres of learning, ruined castles, and a shared history of place. Americans originally felt at a loss in their lack of equivalent cultural achievement. What they had in abundance however, was nature. Nature offered the shared experience of the frontier and the common interest in the material transformation of wilderness into farms and cities - into civilization.

And so the settlers turned to nature as the foundation of nation building. While the rationalist elements of the Enlightenment predominated in this process of absorbing nature the Romantic response to the open frontier also played a role in developing a national feeling among citizens. The emotive responses to wilderness and the home they carved from its wildness shaped both the Euro-American cultural views of nature and the social character of nation building through the nineteenth century. In the fine arts the appreciation of the sublime - the fearful majesty and power of the natural forces shaping human life - inspired music, literature, and painting about place. The more ordered discipline of history was similarly shaped by the frontier, imaging it as a beacon of freedom drawing settlers westward. The sciences, acting through the western explorations that noted and measured the continent, also contributed to the sense of a common future of development and prosperity. Finally the idea of progress, the idea that time had both a direction and a destination, underlying the expression of the frontier experience, also incorporated a universalist notion of the perfect state of man. There was a belief in the perfectability of human society through material wealth. These visceral and intellectual responses to nature were the foundational elements of nation building in the United States and Canada - the impressing of individuals with their shared experience and common future as marks of their citizenship of a nation. National parks and, later, historic sites thus became powerful tools in the business of constructing the State.

This approach from the European intellectual tradition of the Enlightenment culminated in a Modernity seeking the emancipation of man, through passage to his highest and best form - western European civilization - and the control of nature, by bringing the resources of the State into the ordered and efficient service of man. The consequences of this reduction of nature to a platform for human agency was the complete separation of culture from nature. The consequences of this bifurcated universalist approach to the world were especially hard on the indigenous peoples of North America.

Both Canada and the United States have worked diligently through the past two centuries to construct themselves as modern nation-states. The governments of both countries drew upon many different resources to create a citizen community that would identify with their new nations. This process, coloured by both the romanticism of the arts and the rational appropriation of nature for development, included such elements as a common public education, national military service, standard weights and measures, transport and commerce linkages, and a shared vision of a national community (Webber, 1976).

These ideas were formalized into distinct intellectual frameworks that both justified the State and forwarded a shared national vision of a future. In the United States, nature was incorporated into the State through Frederick Jackson Turner's Frontier thesis. According to Turner the power and vitality of the American republic grew from the vastness of the continental United States and the opportunities rising from the 'free lands' beyond the frontier. Turner developed his ideas in the late nineteenth century during the intellectual crisis spawned when the frontier was officially closed, that is, development had consumed all of the open free lands. National parks were thus established to preserve elements of this primal force in the creation of America. Ted Catton, historian of national parks, suggests that Denali National Park in Alaska was, in part, established to commemorate the time of the pioneers, in fact to preserve the opportunity of experiencing the frontier in its raw state. Thus the national park is a geographical relic of the land settlement process that made the American republic (Catton, 1997: 105).

In Canada, historical interpretation of the development of Canada similarly relied upon the State's expansion across the continent. Harold Innis' sophisticated economic development model sought to justify the existence of Canada, emphasizing both the trans-Atlantic cultural ties to Britain and France and the nation's difference from the United States. His case rested upon the 'natural' boundaries of Canada, that is, the network of transport and commercial linkages expanding from the St. Lawrence River valley and integrating them into a nation. The resulting Laurentian thesis was the unchallenged framework for understanding Canada as a nation well into 1960s. Canadian historic sites reflect these interests through the preservation of military forts from the French and English wars, fur trade posts, and sites related to the expansion of settlement and economic and administrative development, that is, the process of nation building. National parks, likewise, played an important role in constructing the idea of the State (Neufeld, 2002).

The natural wonders, especially the spectacular examples in the west that formed the first national parks in both countries, were the sublime emotive elements reminding visitors, and the viewers of the many art works of these places, of the power of the Christian God that created the world and provided the new world to the newcomers for their use. The national parks and the slightly later historic sites became the manifest symbols of God's blessing of the newcomers' settlement and development project. The western Christian significance of this revelation as a foundation for the State meant there was broad public support for the preservation of the prominent elements of this original pre-Columbian, prelapsarian really, landscape for the spiritual renewal of its citizens. In the same way, historic sites were recognized as mythic markers of the successful transformation of God's largesse into productive land and stable, well-provided for communities. This transformation similarly represented the highest order of a rational world. The application of reason, through science and technology, led to an obvious improvement in the material welfare of mankind. The dual goals of the Enlightenment - the conquest of nature and the emancipation of man - were both represented by the PHAs and, through them, integrated into the character of the State itself. All of this was based upon a belief in progress, that is, the idea that through the application of reason, that distinctive element of humanity, the world can be made a better place.

The implications of the idea of progress in the modern world, and for the management and direction of PHAs, are significant. The assumption that time has a direction fosters a belief, particular to the West, in the gradual but incremental increase of knowledge, an increase leading to the improvement of the human condition. The corollary of this path through time was destination, that is, an assumption of an eventual convergence of the diversity of humanity into a single, well-adjusted pattern. The diversity of cultures, opinions and thoughts about the past and the future were simply personal opinions or antiquated superstitions individuals decided to adopt in their ignorance. John Gray, Professor of European Thought at the London School of Economics, cautions:

> We have inherited the faith that as the world becomes more modern it will become more reasonable, more enlightened and more balanced. We expect that, as modern habits of thinking advance across the world, people everywhere will become more like us - or at least as we imagine ourselves to be.
>
> (Gray, 2004: 17)

Edward Said, the Arabic critic of Western colonialism, notes that such a denial of other histories is an imperial tool to gain control over, and attribute meaning to, a foreign region. This creation of a past gives control over the present, that is, it creates a friendly cultural space; a friendly cultural space that is cemented in citizens' minds and made sacred by the identification and establishment of PHAs. Thus, by denying Indigenous peoples their histories, PHAs are a potent expression of a belief system creating and maintaining a

vision of the new world as empty land to be developed, a vision noting Indigenous peoples only in contrast to the strength and vigour of newcomers, a vision regularizing this state of affairs as the norm for its citizens. Under this belief system Indigenous peoples in the present were effectively rendered invisible (Said, 1978: 66, 108-9).

With this thought in mind we can approach a different, perhaps broader, understanding of the roles played by PHAs in Canada. PHAs were, and continue to be, created as part of the State-building process, reflecting its needs and fulfilling its purposes. The Canadian State accomplishes this by using national parks and historical commemorations to establish a national cultural space. Such a national cultural space highlights values, it establishes the boundaries of the national community and it articulates a modernist vision of the ideal future. This space is an expression of cultural power, it reminds us of who we are and what we value. And it misrepresents all people in the region who resist inclusion in the identified cultural boundaries.

As the PHAs in Canada are clearly culturally entrenched entities, it follows that the policies directing their management and the governance shaping their purpose are expressions of the same modernist vision of the State and its purposes. That is, both policy and governance of PHAs are integrated into a comprehensive cultural narrative which, by recognizing only one culture, makes all culture irrelevant to order and purpose. Identity and values differing from the mainstream are simply choices practised by individuals that do not affect the gradual accumulation of knowledge leading humanity to a final convergence of order. This belief in progress denies any legitimacy to other perspectives on the world, effectively baring them from a role in society. This belief, currently challenged as outlined below, is the basis for the colonization of the world by the West. The addressing of this belief is a requirement for the decolonization of our Western understanding of landscape and place and the revision of the policies and governance guiding PHAs.

Contacts with Indigenous Peoples

During the 1960s and 1970s, changing appreciations of social justice within the larger society supported the removal of barriers to political and legal activism amongst Indigenous peoples dissatisfied with their position in Canadian society. At the same time the complexities of environmental issues and the limits of related scientific knowledge were becoming more obvious. These social and environmental pressures affected Parks Canada and served to enhance the profile of Indigenous peoples in the strategic thinking of the organization's leadership. In 1985 the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (HSMBC), the federal body mandated to sanction places, events, and persons of national historic significance, acknowledged the cultural imbalance of the country's national historic sites and recommended consultations with First Nations to determine their interest in the national commemoration of their history.[2] Within National Parks, the Panel for Ecological Integrity, a ministerial advisory committee struck in 1998, explored the possibilities of Indigenous 'naturalized knowledge' seemingly offering a complementary indigenous approach to understanding the intricacies of eco-systems (Parks Canada Agency, 2000). The subsequent engagement of Indigenous peoples has challenged the cultural assumptions underlying the social and cultural purposes of PHAs in Canada and sparked a reconsideration of the policies and governance models guiding their management.

Parks Canada began direct consultations with indigenous peoples in 1986. The primary objective of these and subsequent consultations was to more meaningfully include Indigenous peoples within Canada through appropriate forms of cultural recognition, that is, to identify, protect, and communicate their history and cultural values within a state programme of PHAs. The consultations were part of a broader public response to social justice issues raised by Indigenous groups through social activism, legal challenges, and public consultations from the 1960s onwards. This engagement of indigenous peoples

continues to significantly challenge and alter Parks Canada's understanding of its roles and programmes both within its mandated responsibilities and as an agent of a state government.

The Parks Canada consultations and subsequent activities with Indigenous peoples over the last 20 years have raised two interrelated questions that continue to complicate cooperative work between national government PHA programs and the recently re-acknowledged sovereign Indigenous governments. The first relates to the practice of PHA management: what policies are needed to meaningfully and respectfully understand and include Indigenous cultural narratives within the existing culturally entrenched PHA system? The second tackles the larger issue of revisiting our understanding of the governance of existing PHAs: what are the changing responsibilities of the State to its citizens, both as individuals and as members of distinct and recognizable nations within Canada?

I started work with Parks Canada in 1986. Among my first assignments was to the team preparing the first management plan for Chilkoot Trail National Historic Site. The Chilkoot Trail is a passage connecting two distinct ecosystems - the mild Pacific coast rain-forest of south-east Alaska and, separated by the rugged Coastal Mountains of north-western Canada, the drier but much colder boreal forest of the Yukon interior. Its long use as an Indigenous trading route is still visible in the family lineages joining communities. However, in the 1960s the trail was identified as a National Historic Site for its use during the Klondike gold rush of the late 1890s. Tens of thousands of gold-hungry Stampeders, mostly adventurous young men, moved across the trail leaving behind a colourful relict landscape of building remains and piles of abandoned tin cans and broken bottles.

Commemorating the Chilkoot Trail was part of a larger effort to recognize the gold rush as an important event in Canada's history. Following the Laurentian thesis, history began with the onset of regional Euro-American settlement and development, the incorporation of a far-flung corner of the country into the Laurentian network, and its economic contributions to the State's centre. Implicit in the commemorations of the gold rush was the recognition of the importance of the economic development of northern Canada. The celebration of the first large-scale exploitation of northern resources thus not only recognized the pioneers of the gold rush, it also gave a stamp of broad public approval to the mining and transportation improvements that opened the northern frontier regions to industrial development in the 1950s and 1960s (Neufeld, 2001).

This vision of economic development and settlement as progress had significant implications for Parks Canada's initial understanding of the historic role of the Carcross-Tagish First Nation along the Chilkoot Trail.[3] The three interpretive themes identified for this National Historic Site in the early 1980s were:

- life on the trail, including the experience of the Stampeders taken from their remains on the trail;
- transportation technology, noting the evolutionary progress of freight movement into the north; and
- national sovereignty, or the role of Canada's Mounted Police in extending social order and establishing the political boundary between Canada and the United States.

Cultural research by archaeologists and historians initially addressed the material culture on the trail and the rich lore found in the personal diaries and letters of Stampeders, later the operation of horse packing companies, aerial tramways, and, the railway were examined and, finally, the differences between stolid Canadian Victorian social values and the Wild West of the American republic were highlighted. This Laurentian analysis provided a clear and understandable story, at least to mainstream Canadians. The Indigenous people of the region, however, had only a limited role in this story. They were recognized in a transportation sub-theme as human pack animals, and thus effectively

acted as a base line emphasizing the white man's more technologically advanced modes of transportation.

As a result of the government's attention to Indigenous activism in the mid-1980s, however, Parks Canada attempted to make the national story more inclusive. The 'Indian side' of the Chilkoot Trail story was identified as a research priority. Historical research, especially in archival photo collections, offered some limited access to the Indigenous experience during the gold rush. However, it was soon clear that the primary source would be the stories and memories of the local First Nation people.

Negotiations for a community oral history project occurred within a context of volatile land claims politics that inevitably shaped the project's outcome. Identification of the significance of the Chilkoot as a historic site in 1969 pre-dated the federal government's acknowledgment of Indigenous claims and initially no consideration was given to Indigenous interests in the land set aside for the historic site. Parks Canada's first contacts with the Carcross-Tagish First Nation about an oral history project in 1986 followed the initiation of Yukon First Nation claim negotiations. Thus the project became linked to the community's demand for recognition of their government and the return of traditional lands. Recognizing the possibility of misunderstanding, Parks Canada established clear expectations with the First Nation for the oral history project. The project was to obtain the 'Indian side' of the story for presentation at the National Historic Site. Research design and control over products would remain with Parks Canada.

Not surprisingly, the Chilkoot Trail Oral History Project did not fulfil Parks Canada's initial expectations. The attempt simply to throw light on the previously unexplored 'Indian side' of the presumed national story was a failure. The Carcross-Tagish were quick to challenge the project's assumptions about the past. In one instance, after an extended set of interviews, the project anthropologist and a First Nation Elder were relaxing on a lake shore. The anthropologist found a stone hammer nearby and showed it to the Elder as proof of the Indigenous presence in the region. The Elder briefly examined the stone and then casually threw it back in the bushes, saying 'What have I been telling you all week?'[4] As the project progressed, we watched the First Nation similarly discard the Parks Canada notion of the project's objectives. It became clear there was no 'Indian side' of the Chilkoot Trail gold rush story; the stampede was seen simply as an annoying but brief interruption of their ongoing lives. Community oral tradition and continuing land use practices instead forwarded a distinctly different historical narrative describing their long use of the area and their connection to it as 'home.' These activities conveyed a significant message to Parks Canada about how the Carcross-Tagish used their traditional territory, parts of which were now absorbed into the Chilkoot Trail National Historic Site, to sustain their cultural identity. The First Nation also used the project to make powerful statements about their connection to this territory, thus returning to the main issues they wished to raise with the federal government - their distinct and different vision of the future and their desire to be free to fulfil it.

The Carcross-Tagish effectively used the oral history project as a platform to challenge a national understanding of the cultural significance of the Chilkoot Trail. The efforts to document the 'Indian side' of the gold rush story proved to be a dead end. Implicit in the counter-narrative offered by the Carcross-Tagish during the project was a direct challenge to the authority of western knowledge and related management practices. The community questioned the 'truth' presented by academic perspectives on Canadian history. They challenged the authority and power of the government agencies relying on this history to manage 'their' lands. The Yukon First Nation's understanding of the past suggested alternative explanations of the world. The Carcross-Tagish challenged the assumed distribution of the social power inherent in the Western understanding of the past and they articulated a different vision of how the world was made. They challenged Parks Canada to consider another way of understanding who we are and where we are going as joint or parallel societies.

These results and other early consultations with Indigenous peoples across Canada highlighted the complexity of the conversation. To a great extent the Parks Canada expectation was to invite Indigenous people into the national story, thus correcting an earlier oversight. This approach was quickly found unacceptable to Indigenous peoples, however, and First Nations resisted attempts to include them in this way. In response, Parks Canada began developing new approaches to acknowledge the different ways Indigenous peoples understood and articulated their relationships to place and to the State.

Parks Canada's difficulties associated with this set of perplexing parallel narratives were ones shared by other government departments and the Canadian public at large. These questions, highlighted by Indigenous protests, political and legal actions, prompted the State to consider how to more fully recognize Indigenous people as citizens. In commemorating the national story, the HSMBC began discussions to address 'the challenge of designating subjects related to Aboriginal Peoples' history which do not conform to the traditional definition of national significance' (HSMBC, 1998). These latter concerns began to be addressed when the HSMBC accepted the concept of 'Aboriginal cultural landscape' in 1999 as a framework for the national recognition of Indigenous culture.

The development of new tools for cultural recognition allowed Parks Canada to more positively engage with Indigenous peoples. National PHAs were a modernist expression of a progressive narrative, the successful material transformation of empty wild land to a domesticated productive condition. Land was deemed a commodity whose effective stewardship was expressed in tangible forms such as buildings, transportation systems and crops. Land was understood as a platform for the exercise of human agency (Ingold, 2000: 149). The commemoration of the Indigenous past founded on this presumption limited acknowledgment to the materiality of archaeological sites and stories of European explorers' helpers. Through the 1960s the HSMBC discussed the commemoration of the Indian peoples of Canada, eventually suggesting a statue for each tribe noting its location and their time of highest achievement be erected at the Montreal World Exhibition site, EXPO 67. The project, forwarding the Euro-Canadian created past for Indigenous peoples, foundered on the difficulties of inventorying the different tribes of Canada and their achievements. Indigenous peoples were represented at the fair by the far more controversial Indian Pavilion.[5]

Thirty years later the Aboriginal cultural landscape concept opened the door for a new way of understanding both place and the past. Defined as

> a place valued by an Aboriginal group (or groups) because of their long and complex relationship with that land [an Aboriginal cultural landscape] expresses their unity with the natural and spiritual environment. It embodies their traditional knowledge of spirits, places, land uses and ecology. Material remains of the association may be prominent, but will often be minimal or absent.[6]

Rather than considering the tangible proofs of transformation, the concept encourages the consideration of the intangible knowledge and skill sets, faith practices and beliefs arising from relations amongst beings, both human and non-human, and place.

One of the first cultural commemorations of an Aboriginal cultural landscape was forwarded by the Gwichya Gwich'in of Tsiigehtchic, Northwest Territories. Nagwichoonjik National Historic Site, a 175-kilometre stretch of the Mackenzie River, was put forward to have their distinctive relationship to place acknowledged and understood by their children and visitors. While tangible elements of these relationships exist, such as fish camps, hunting trails, and resource sites, it was the intangibles, traditional knowledge, land use practices, language, and oral tradition[7], that were deemed equally important. Thus, it was not the exploitation of resources, with the consequent transformation of land into a commodity that was emphasized, it was the web of ongoing connection that was presented

as the concrete expression of the Gwichya Gwich'in cultural values and their continuing life in the present.

At the same time Parks Canada sought to address the erosion of national park eco-system health through a broader appreciation of both regional and cultural factors affecting the health of the land and animals in national parks. The concept of ecological integrity, the healthy functioning of an eco-system within natural bounds, was identified as the goal of national park management, setting aside an older model based on an inviolate park boundary. This shift in mandate opened new possibilities in PHA management policies. A national panel on the ecological integrity of national parks reporting in February 2000 noted the importance of engaging Indigenous peoples in the management of national parks within their traditional lands. With an emphasis on the shared vision to protect these 'sacred places' there was also the hope that these examples would inspire other Canadians to acknowledge Indigenous peoples in Canada (Parks Canada, 2000: Vol. 1, p. 15).

Significant elements in the Ecological Integrity Panel's report included a new emphasis on the importance of the 'naturalized knowledge'[8] in the management of national parks. This direction, perhaps recognizing clause 8 (j) of the 1992 International Convention on Biodiversity[9], acknowledged the (possibility of a) special relationship between indigenous peoples and place. These elements of the Panel's report consequently shaped our work in the description of what ecological integrity looks like for Kluane National Park and Reserve in south-west Yukon. This description was collated by the Park ecologist with submissions from biology colleagues, cultural researchers, and members of the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations. The resulting Ecological Integrity Statement was one of the first to explicitly identify the presence of Indigenous peoples, and their special relationship to place, as a necessary precondition for the health of a national park ecosystem (Box 10.1). The challenge now is to figure out how this combination or integration of the Aboriginal cultural landscape idea with the Western biological construct of ecological integrity can address the different cultural perceptions brought to management by both First Nation and the State. In 2004 Parks Canada provided $1.3 million to fund a five year project, 'Healing Broken Connections' at Kluane National Park, to address this question.

As a result of these policy changes First Nations have become more comfortable that Parks Canada might recognize the existence of parallel paths in land management. However, this recognition is only the start of a complex learning process still underway. The acceptance of new policy tools, such as ecological integrity and the concept of the Aboriginal cultural landscape, indicate the possible direction of management change. It also creates new opportunities for working together with Indigenous peoples to search for changes that are both meaningful and effective in addressing the interests and concerns of Indigenous peoples.

As important as the revision and application of evolving policy is, these only gain currency and effectiveness when the cultural milieu of their application is altered by new understandings of governance. Governance is the determination of the roles of the state and its responsibilities to its citizens. Governance establishes the context for policy application. Changes in governance are a way of recognizing the cultural biases of the State's original formulation and its adaptation ensure the utility of the State to all members of the State. Canada has acknowledged its multicultural nature since the 1960s. The idea of the country as a cultural mosaic still resonates with many citizens. But in many ways the cultural mosaic does not challenge the culturally entrenched nature of the State and its purpose. While multiculturalism, set within the original rubric of the nation-state, promotes tolerance of cultural diversity, it offers neither validation nor recognition of cultural identity as a group activity. The consideration of this issue calls upon a rethinking of the State and its relationship and responsibilities to its members.

**Box 10.1 Excerpt from the Ecological Integrity Statement
for Kluane National Park and Reserve
(Public Release Draft Version of 05/12/2000)**

Theme #2: Cultural Reintegration

The Southern Tutchone have had a long-standing relationship with the greater Kluane ecosystem, having sustained healthy animal and plant populations through their harvesting and other cultural activities for thousands of years. The park forms part of their *cultural landscape...*

These deep rooted connections between aboriginal people and place have been recognized as important elements in achieving and maintaining ecological integrity (cl. 38, UNESCO *World Heritage Convention* Operational Guidelines (1996)). The health and vibrancy of the Southern Tutchone relationships to their cultural landscape and its expression as traditional knowledge are integral elements of the park's ecological integrity.

The gradual and eventually final exclusion of aboriginal people from a part of their traditional cultural landscape through this century has eroded the cultural connections between the Southern Tutchone and the lands now in the national park (Lotenberg, G. 1998. *Recognizing Diversity: An Historical Context for Co-managing Wildlife in the Kluane Region, 1890-present.* Mss., Parks Canada, Whitehorse, Yukon. 66 pp.). The weakening of these long-term linkages has significantly impaired the ecological integrity of KNP&R. It also has had negative consequences on Southern Tutchone culture. Without use of the park, knowledge of park lands and resources and their people's history in this area could not be passed on through community members, thereby limiting Southern Tutchone traditional knowledge. The health and vibrancy of regional traditional knowledge has suffered from this deterioration of the connections between aboriginal people and their cultural landscape.

The sustainable relationship the Southern Tutchone have had with this part of their cultural landscape needs to be re-established and fostered. Activities that enhance and pass on Southern Tutchone traditional knowledge within the local First Nations communities must also be encouraged. The key actions designed to achieve these ends will strengthen the regional aboriginal cultural landscape and the contribution of traditional knowledge to ecosystem management.

Strategic Goal

To recognize the aboriginal cultural landscape as both an integral part of the Kluane region ecosystem and through the expression of Southern Tutchone traditional knowledge, a significant contributor to ecosystem management.

Objectives

* To re-establish KNP&R as part of the Southern Tutchone cultural landscape
* To integrate the concept of cultural landscape into our understanding of the ecological integrity of the Kluane region, and First Nations' traditional knowledge in ecosystem management
* To support activities that enhance and pass on Southern Tutchone traditional knowledge, especially land-based aspects of Southern Tutchone traditional

knowledge, within local First Nations communities

- To support educational programs for members of local First Nations that focus on their history and heritage in the park area, and the management of the cultural resources
- To promote an understanding among Park staff, First Nations members, local residents and visitors to the park of the long-standing relationship of Champagne and Aishihik First Nations and Kluane First Nation with the Southern Tutchone cultural landscape

Key Actions

Action: Help members of local First Nations get to know and re-establish a sustainable relationship with park lands, i.e., renew ties with this part of the Southern Tutchone cultural landscape.

- Education and training programs designed to assist members of local First Nations in learning about the Southern Tutchone cultural relationships with plant and animal communities in the park have been implemented.
- Education programs that involve linking younger First Nation members with Elders to learn Southern Tutchone traditional knowledge have been implemented.
- Members of local First Nations are carrying out sustainable traditional harvesting activities within park boundaries.

Action: Improve understanding of the contribution of traditional knowledge and the aboriginal cultural landscape in the maintenance of ecological integrity.

- First Nations staff and membership understand the role of the aboriginal cultural landscape in contributing to the ecological integrity of the region, and the effects of harvesting activities.
- Park staff support local First Nations in offering cultural programs which contribute to ecological integrity.

Action: Improve the understanding of the Southern Tutchone cultural landscape.

- Park staff and First Nations have worked together to understand the character, qualities and values attributed to the Southern Tutchone cultural landscape.
- An inventory of First Nations' heritage features, such as trails, campsites, caches, cabins, wildlife harvesting areas and gathering sites within the park is completed.
- Aboriginal place names for features in the park have been documented and researched.
- Information regarding the Southern Tutchone cultural landscape within KNP&R has been appropriately secured for future reference and is shared between local First Nations and Parks Canada.

Action: Acknowledge and respect First Nations' cultural heritage in all aspects of park management.

- Traditional knowledge is used in setting management priorities and designing programs.
- First Nation cultural presence in the landscape is acknowledged through the use of aboriginal placenames.

Action: Encourage the development and delivery of educational and training programs that focus on the First Nations cultural legacy in the park.

- Public understanding and support for First Nations presence within the park has been achieved.
- The history and culture of First Nations' in the park and surrounding area is being effectively communicated through appropriate media channels.
- First Nations are interpreting their traditional cultural landscape.
- The character, qualities and values of the Southern Tutchone cultural landscape as represented by the lands in KNP&R is communicated to the different groups with an interest in this matter.

Revising the understanding of the State and culture

A review of the international conventions addressing the question of cultural diversity over that last 60 years offers some insights into the nature of the changes in governance needed to make policies and practice more effective in addressing the interests of Indigenous peoples. These agreements also trace a trajectory of changing thought among States about culture and identity. The negotiation and acceptance of international agreements addressing human diversity have been influenced by four major, generally chronological, factors in the post-Second World War period (UNESCO, 2004). Immediately after the war there was a search for tools to promote and preserve peace. During the de-colonization period of the 1950s to the mid-1970s, newly independent nations were recognized as equal partners in the world community. Growing out of the economic difficulties faced by these new countries there was recognition of the links between culture and development. Finally, bringing us to the present, are agreements acknowledging linkages between culture and democracy, noting the 'need for tolerance not only between societies, but within them as well' (UNESCO, 2004: 3-4). These agreements indicate a growing global awareness of the significance of culture in intra-state governance, a factor highlighting amongst other things, the relations between Indigenous peoples and PHAs.

In the waning days of the Second World War, planning for the United Nations (UN) was already underway among Allied governments. Although nation-states were to remain sovereign in this new international order, there was a shared desire to avoid the terrors of future wars driven by economic, racial, and political distinctions, and a recognition that peace was the necessary foundation for freedom (Bailey, n.d.). UN working groups quickly identified education and knowledge as the key to this peace. The work unfolded as a programme emphasizing the common humanity of the people of the world and resulted in the 1948 acceptance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).

An agreement with a noble purpose - the perfectability of a universal civilization - the Declaration is framed within modernist notions of the centrality of the individual. In the effort to prepare common ground for international understanding of shared humanity the UDHR confirms the ephemerality of culture, thus denying cultural identity as a significant factor in society. The document assumes that all people are not only equal but, at their core, the same. And in recognition of the sensitivity of nation-states to any infringements upon their sovereignty, the UDHR recognizes a citizen's duties to his or her government (Article 21). However, the only social organization above the individual recognized in the UDHR is the family. (Article 16) The possibility of distinctions between peoples, that is by cultural identity, are recognized, but only as free associations exercised by individuals (Article 27). The nation state remains the sole arbiter of identity.

The UDHR develops a modernist vision of humanity as a collection of individuals with basic rights. The recognition of these rights regulates relations among individuals rather than understanding society as collections of communities seeking good for their members.

Differences between individuals are erased and the rights described are those of the liberal Western materialist vision of the world. John Gray suggests that:

> the Enlightenment project embodies a distinctive philosophical anthropology, for which cultural difference is an inessential, and ... a transitory incident in human affairs.... distinctive cultural identities are seen as chosen lifestyles, whose proper place is in private life, or the sphere of voluntary association... [C]ultural difference is seen through the distorting lens of *choice*, as an epiphenomenon of personal life-plans, preferences and conceptions of the good.
>
> (Gray, 1995: 124)

This denial of culture as a state responsibility is the foundation for the continued refusal to acknowledge Indigenous peoples as having different interests in the State. The UDHR was the attitude, and the opportunity, that limited and then allowed the Indigenous voice to be heard.

The creation of new States through the third quarter of the twentieth century effectively de-frocked the European empires. However, these new nations, despite their often revolutionary liberation, posed little threat to the pervasive modernist notion of state citizenship as an individual, as opposed to a group, privilege. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966/1976) provides insights into how these new nations and new nationalities were absorbed into the international system. The Covenant recognized the equality of the new States, but did so in terms of the Western progressive economic development model, already the foundation shaping the cultural purposes of US and Canadian PHAs. This fact was reinforced by their subsequent neocolonial relationship to international financial organizations. Further, the Covenant is largely a rewrite of the UDHR with an international committee established to report on how successfully the new countries were in fulfilling the individual rights of their citizens, that is, how successfully they were assimilating modernist values of individual over community. Although innately hostile to valuation of culture, the recognition of new countries also spurred a broader understanding of multiple cultures in the world.

This broader understanding is reflected in the evolving expressions of the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. The international recognition of the legacy of cultural and natural heritage around the world was a commitment by nation states to understand and protect the cultural legacies within their boundaries. Although the original criteria under the Convention privileged Western science and aesthetics, the designations flowing from other parts of the world soon demonstrated the diversity of human works and peoples' different valuations of their place in the world. The designations became not only statements of national pride in an international forum but also markers of States' commitment to recognition of cultural diversity.[10]

Changes continued to be made as non-Western attitudes increasingly introduced nuances of cultural difference into the international discourse on culture and nature. One of the earliest examples is the 1992 International Convention on Biodiversity. The Convention, in its acknowledgement of the role Indigenous and local communities played in maintaining biodiversity, and relying upon it for their livelihood, recognized the distinct connections between some people and place. The playing out of this recognition continues to be contested. In 1998 the Indigenous working group of the Convention highlighted the divisions that still existed between their cultural perspective and the modernist structures of the international field. In an appeal to the parties of the Convention the working group noted:

> [R]eports to this [working group] point out that SBSTTA [the scientific committee] is highly political and not entirely scientific. These reports also point out that the reductionist method of western scientists do not adequately serve the holistic,

biosphere approach to bio-diversity. Mr. Chairman, SBSTTA appears not to see the forest for the trees. The Indigenous and traditional perspective, that all life is related appears to be incomprehensible to SBSTTA.

<div align="right">(United Nations, 1998)</div>

This presentation symbolizes the challenges to the assumption of objective, value-free approaches to the environment and the past. It is representative of the many voices forwarding culturally centred narratives of meaning that have long been unheard through the heavy veil of Western cultural domination of the international cultural discourse.

In 2001 the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity advanced this argument recognizing the intra-state responsibility to identify and foster cultural diversity. These documents indicate a changing role for nation-states with regard to cultural heritage at the end of the twentieth century. The original intent of the nation-state was the expression of a single people's will and identity. In the early days of the twenty-first century these conventions and declarations highlight the State's responsibility to act as a regional steward of the diversity of human cultural expression. Contemporary discussions in Canada about the 2006 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage[11] - an articulation of alternatives to the Western narratives of progress and materialism - reflect the difficulties States have in absorbing this significant change in the relations between and within States. James Tully (1995: 42-43) suggests that the identification of other levels of social organization within the State - Indigenous peoples, cultural minorities, gender - represents a radical transformation in constitutionalism, of the same order as the introduction of human-based principles over divine guidance through kings.

For some 300 years the modern liberal constitutional model of equal States and equal citizens has been developed in the West to govern human affairs. It has proved a flexible and adaptable system, absorbing change through contact and exchange with others, but also imposing its own values in its extension around the world. However, cultural resurgence in the post-imperial world has eroded the previously solid foundations of modernism and new demands are being made upon the previous order of the world. John Gray suggests there are multiple, and sometimes incommensurable, values present in human thought. Sometimes radical choices, that is, choices that do not support the idea of the inevitable progress in human affairs through the application of reason, need to be made. These choices arise out of the contact between these different cultural valuations of life in the world. This '[value-pluralism] renders the Enlightenment conception of the historical progress of the species meaningless or incoherent.' Gray concludes his appeal for a post-Enlightenment world with the Heidegger's *Gelassenheit* noting we must 'wean ourselves from willing and open ourselves to letting things be, . . . however, it is not openness to 'Being' that is needed, but instead an openness to beings, to things of the earth, in all their contingency and mortality' (Gray, 1995: 69, 182).

Governance and cultural pluralism

Perspectives on time and place - history and environment - are developed by communities to bring a sense of order, membership, and purpose or meaning to their activities. The resulting worldview is the foundation for what we know as culture. Culture legitimizes the existence of a group to its members. It establishes governing institutions and guiding policies to advance the objectives of the group by coordinating activities and, through the projection of interests, neighbours.

At cultural contact points different worldviews try to make themselves understood and have their communities acknowledged. Where there is a large power differential between contacting cultures, the more powerful may deny the authority, the existence, of the less powerful and attempt to simply absorb or incorporate them into their worldview. By imposing

their models of governance and ruling on the other, the more powerful establish a colonial regime with the concomitant denial and oppression of the other's worldview. In Canada the Western settler culture has, for at least a century and a half, imposed its worldview upon the Indigenous peoples resident here. To escape this colonial situation, with its costs for both the oppressed and the oppressor, this understanding of cultural imperialism needs to be consciously acknowledged and addressed (Alfred, 2005: 266).

In Canada, one of the primary contact points between Western and Indigenous cultures is land, especially those areas that are regarded as sacred or special by either or both cultures. Diverse perspectives on time and place meet here. The designation and management of state PHAs are places where Western culture clearly outlines its interests yet they are also places where place is respected and there is growing interest in the possibilities of using traditional knowledge in co-management with Indigenous peoples. For their part, Indigenous peoples in Canada struggle to make their cultural perspective understood in the management of PHAs which are part of their traditional territories. However, this conversation is neither easy nor straightforward.

To facilitate a fuller understanding of the Indigenous view, Canadians need to recognize that their PHAs are not neutral or objective examples of the environment in which they live. To come to this understanding, however, requires Canadians to acknowledge the effects of the national narrative, popularly still expressed through the Laurentian thesis. The Laurentian thesis was born of a distinct set of political and intellectual conditions that have shaped the entire warp and weave of contemporary Canadian social, political, and environmental, that is, cultural, understanding of Canada. Innis, his students, their students, and their students' students have sat as members of the HSMBC which identifies places of national significance. They have been the frontline staff, the managers, the administrators of Parks Canada, myself among them, and the bulk of the Canadian educated population. Although Parks Canada's responsibilities are broadly defined as protecting, presenting, celebrating, and serving Canadians using 'nationally significant examples of Canada's natural and cultural heritage' ,the policies and governance of the agency arise from the fabric of the pervasive unified national perspective. It is no simple matter to accommodate alternative or parallel narratives. To come to see PHAs, these special places, as particularly articulate expressions of their own cultural understanding of place and time is a start. Canadians can begin to free themselves of the colonial attitudes that have not allowed them to hear Indigenous voices or accept the existence and value of Indigenous cultural approaches to the world.

The root of the difficulties in reconciling Indigenous cultures as distinct from the unified national narrative appears to be the recognition of the existence of the different ways that cultures frame their worldview. John Gray's notion of 'value-pluralism, that ultimate human values are objective but irreducibly diverse, that they are conflicting and often uncombinable, and that sometimes when they come into conflict with one another they are incommensurable; that is, they are not comparable by any rational measure' (Banville, 2004), suggests the need for a recognition and acceptance of these multiple meanings. Rather than attempting to compare or integrate 'by any rational measure', perhaps we need to communicate differences and respect alternative visions of the future. For Parks Canada this means a broadened understanding of the roles played by PHAs.

The recognition of diversity and multiculturalism, however, does not address the deep-seated concerns of Indigenous peoples over their relationship to, or participation in, Canada. The notion of national identity as a bounded set of meanings has denied participation by others. As the country incorporates the other it must also accept a more complex, less linear story. The modernist notion of a unified nation-state progressing along a path to a perfect form has been shattered over the last century (Eksteins, 1999: 15-16). The recognition of many peoples, of many nations, within States, completely undermines earlier narratives that so diligently constructed a vision of a homogenous nation with a single identity and single vision of the future.

Canada has moved to address this transformation of the realities of the State. In the 1960s, multiculturalism, the recognition of many cultures, changed the national sense of identity and broadened the country's membership to effectively include all newcomers within the boundaries of the national community and its progressive narrative of development. However, for First Nations, this was inadequate. They not only want to be recognized as people, they want to be acknowledged as cultures with different conceptions of the future. As a country, Canadians now face, with some apprehension, cultural pluralism – not only many cultures, but also many futures. James Tully (1995:116) suggests that the acceptance of cultural pluralism means a State with distinct cultural groupings constantly negotiating with each other on the basis of mutual recognition, respecting the continuity of group traditions with governance rising from mutual consent. A culturally pluralistic Canada will be a State built not on exclusive cultural identities but, rather, on dynamic relationships that bind together different cultural groups.

These dynamic relationships do not refer to the individual battles waged in the acknowledgment of value-pluralism but, rather, indicate the continuing tension that will exist between different cultural communities. Gray (1995: 29) suggests that:

> Toleration is a virtue appropriate to people who acknowledge their imperfectability. . . . Rather than pursuing a delusive utopia in which all ways of life are given equal (and possibly unmerited) respect, they are content if they can manage to rub along together. In this they are recognizing a profound truth,... that freedom presupposes peace.... We are most likely to enjoy an enduring liberty if we moderate our demands on each other and learn to put up with our differences. We will then compromise when we cannot agree, and reach a settlement – always provisional, never final – rather than stand on our (in any case imaginary) human rights. Oddly enough, we will find that it is by tolerating our differences that we come to discover how much we have in common. It is in the give and take of politics, rather than the adjudications of the courts, that toleration is practised and the common life renewed.[12]

Joanne Barnaby, for a long time the Director of the Dene Cultural Institute, recently reflected upon the obligations for both government and cultural groups in a culturally pluralistic State.

> Being strong like two men... means that people need to draw from the strength of their culture and history to maintain a strong identity based on [their values], while also developing the capacity to interact and live effectively with other cultures and draw from their knowledge systems and their skills and abilities.... It is the governments' responsibility to foster values-based debate and to ensure that the policies that they establish reflect the values of the North. The people's' responsibility is active participation, openness, honesty, sharing values, open debate about choices.
>
> (Tesar, 2006)

Acknowledgements

In the region of Kluane National Park and Reserve in the south-west Yukon I must acknowledge the citizens and staff of the Champagne and Aishihik First Nation and Kluane First Nation for their interest and review of my work. I am especially indebted to Sarah Gaunt, who always brought intelligence and diligence to our work, Lawrence Joe, Craig McKinnon, Diane Strand and Gerald Dickson whose dedication to their heritage ensures that the Southern Tutchone voice will always be heard.

The work on Nagwichoonjik National Historic Site was led by the capable and engaging staff of the Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute. The opportunity to work with Alestine Andre and Ingrid Kritsch and other members of the community of Tsiigehtchic was always a great pleasure.

Parks Canada provides a supportive environment for thoughtful reflection upon its work. My many colleagues within the Agency have always been interested in reviewing, and often challenging, my work to make it better. In this regard I especially note Bob Coutts, Tom Elliot, Robert Lewis, Duane West, Anne Landry, Patricia Kell, Leslie Maitland and David Henry. Conversations with Miche Genest of Canadian Heritage were likewise stimulating.

In the academy, the erudite work and thoughtful personal communications of Dr. Doug Moggach of the University of Ottawa, Dr. Julie Cruikshank and Dr. Patrick Moore, both of the University of British Columbia, Dr. Paul Nadasdy, University of Wisconsin – Madison, Dr. Laura Peers, Oxford University and Dr. Michael Bravo, University of Cambridge, have always been appreciated. Parks Canada, Clare Hall, and the Scott Polar Research Institute, the latter both and congenial and stimulating elements of Cambridge University, are also gratefully acknowledged for their support in the preparation of this piece.

Notes

[1] The Saskatchewan Regional Parks Association, established in 1962 as an umbrella organization, presently includes over 100 regional parks. URL: www.parkitthere.ca/regional_parks.php. Accessed 21 November 2006.

[2.] The Board agreed that the Program should move forward on... the commemoration of native history themes in the North... adopt a go-slow approach as considerable ill-will might be created if our efforts were tied too closely to the current government-wide... negotiations respecting native land claims in the North. It was emphasized that... meetings with native organizations might well be worthwhile... to... clarify the role of the Board and the Program with respect to the commemoration of native history, it was recognized that caution should be exercised in this regard, if any such meetings were to prove beneficial... The Cultural Pluralism Committee to examine possible strategies... to smooth the way for discussions amongst members of the Board, the Parks Service and northern natives respecting these matters.'

(HSMBC, *Minutes*, November, 1985. Parks Canada Intranet)

[3.] The author was a core team member on the Chilkoot Trail planning team from 1986 - 1988 and subsequently managed cultural research for the national historic site until the late 1990s. This narrative draws from this personal experience.

[4.] Sheila Greer, personal communication.

[5.] 'The Indians of Canada pavilion resembled a giant 100 foot high teepee. Inside the Indians introduced their exhibit with an accusation addressed to their countrymen. *You*

have stolen our native land, our culture, our soul... and yet, our traditions deserve to be appreciated, and those derived from an age-old harmony with nature even merited being adopted by you.'

<div align="right">(Stanton, J. (1997) Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo 67, URL:
www.naid.sppsr.ucla.edu/expo67/map-docs/indianscanada.htm, Accessed Feb. 2006.)</div>

[6.] This definition from Susan Buggey, *An Approach to the History of Aboriginal Peoples Through Commemoration of Cultural Landscapes*, available at http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/r/pca-acl/index_e.asp. This was accepted by the HSMBC in July, 1999.

[7.] *Nagwichoonjik National Historic Site, Commemorative Integrity Statement*, Draft 14 April 2004. Copy on file with author.

[8.] 'A naturalized knowledge system (also known to many non-Aboriginal people as 'traditional ecological knowledge') comprises four basic phases that roughly parallel an individual's growth throughout life:

- innate knowledge with which one is born;
- intuitive knowledge about how and why things "are";
- empirical knowledge that is collected by experience and which might contest intuitive knowledge;
- harmonious or spiritual knowledge realized when conflict between empirical knowledge and intuitive knowledge is reconciled and better understanding is achieved.

Like naturalized knowledge, Western science is "a way of knowing." Using this knowledge system, people grope for better understanding of the world by testing intuitive knowledge (current, best understanding about why things "are") with observations (new empirical information). The two often have to be reconciled, and are sometimes harmonized with previous knowledge. Western science is often represented by its fiercest proponents as more rigorous — and thus producing better knowledge — than other ways of knowing.

Both systems use the assimilation of new knowledge to improve understanding of the world — that is, learning. By recognizing this similarity, instead of emphasizing differences, Western and Aboriginal cultures may agree upon the shared goal of learning to improve responsibility for the natural world.'

<div align="right">(from Parks Canada, 2000, Vol. II, p. 4-3)</div>

The definition carefully notes the individual's knowledge and avoids the existence of culturally-based knowledge sets.

[9.] '8.(j) Subject to its national legislation, respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices.'

<div align="right">(from http://www.biodiv.org/convention/articles.shtml.)</div>

[10]. 1972 Convention definitions:

• cultural heritage is *monuments*, archaeology, fine arts and architecture; *groups of buildings*, architecture or place in landscape; both from the perspective of history, art or

science or *sites*, works of man or combined works of nature and man from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.
• natural heritage is *natural features* from the aesthetic or scientific point of view; *areas* that are physical formations or habitat for threatened animals from science or conservation; *natural sites* from view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

[11] Ratified by 47 countries to April, 2006. The ratifying countries include 16 from Europe, 9 from Asia, 9 from Africa, 7 from Latin America and 6 Arab states. Interestingly not a single settler society - United States, Canada, Argentina, Chile, Australia or New Zealand - has yet signed on to this convention.

[12] Consider Raz's statement:
'Conflict is endemic. . . . Tension is an inevitable concomitant of accepting the truth of value pluralism. And it is a tension without stability, without a definite resting-point of reconciliation of the two perspectives, the one recognizing the validity of competing values and the one hostile to them. There is no point of equilibrium, no single balance which is forever correct and could prevail to bring the two perspectives together. One is forever moving from one to the other from time to time.'

<div align="right">(Raz 1994:165.)</div>

Literature cited

Alfred, Taiaiake (2005). *Wasáse: indigenous pathways of action and freedom*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Bailey, Peter (nd). The creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. URL: www.universalrights.net/main/creation.htm. Retrieved September 2006.

Banville, John (April 9, 2004). Review of John Gray, *Heresies: Against Progress and Other Illusions, Manchester Guardian,*.

Catton, T. (1997). *Inhabited Wilderness: Indians, Eskimos and National Parks in Alaska*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Eksteins, M. (1999). *Walking Since Daybreak*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.

Gray, J.(1995). *Enlightenment's Wake: politics and culture at the close of the modern age.* London: Routledge.

—— (2004). Heresies Against Progress and other Illusions. London, Granta Books.

Heimstra, Mary (1955). Gully Farm in K. Mitchell (ed.) (1997), *Horizon: writings of the Canadian Prairie,* p.106. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Herriot, T. (2000). *River in a Dry Land: a prairie passage*. Toronto: Stoddard.

HSMBC (Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada) (1998). *Minutes*, Parks Canada Intranet.

Ingold, Tim (2000). *The Perception of the Environment: essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London, Routledge.

Latour, Bruno (1993). *We Have Never Been Modern.* New York: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.

Neufeld, D. (2001). Parks Canada and the commemoration of the North: history and heritage. In K. Abel and K. Coates (eds), *Northern Visions: new perspectives on the north in Canadian history,* pp. 45–79. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.

—— (2002). The commemoration of northern Aboriginal peoples by the Canadian government, *The George Wright Forum* 19 (3), 22-33.

—— (in press). Parks Canada, the commemoration of Canada, and northern Aboriginal oral history, *Oral History and Public Memories*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Parks Canada Agency (2000). *"Unimpaired for Future Generations"? Protecting Ecological Integrity with Canada's National Parks: Report of the Panel on the Ecological Integrity of Canada's National Parks, Vol. I "A Call to Action", Vol. II "Setting a New Direction for Canada's National Parks"*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services.

Raz, J. (1994). Multi-culturalism: A Liberal Perspective in J. Raz, *Ethics in the Public Domain: essays in the morality of law and politics*, pp.170-192. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Runte, A. (1997). *National Parks: the American experience*. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska University Press.

Said E. (1978). *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon.

Tesar, C. (2006). Joanne Barnaby on 'Preserving, Revitalizing and Promoting Culture and Identity'. *Northern Perspectives* 30 (1), 5-6 (Winter). Also available at: www.carc.org/northern_perspectives.php#2006.

Tully, J. (1995). *Strange Multiplicity: constitutionalism in an age of diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UNESCO, Division of Cultural Policies and Intercultural Dialogue (September 2004) *UNESCO and the Issue of Cultural Diversity: Review and Strategy, 1946-2004*.

United Nations. (1998). *Fourth Conference of the Parties, Convention on Biodiversity, Bratislava, Slovakia, May 11, 1998*: Oral Intervention, International Indian Treaty Council, Agenda item 10, Implementation of Article 8(j) 'Working for the Rights and Recognition of Indigenous Peoples'.

Webber, E. (1976). *Peasants into Frenchmen: the modernization of rural France, 1870-1914*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Wikipedia,(nd) *Ernest Renan*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ernest_Renan Accessed 21 November 2006.