Consuming Indigenous Space, Producing Canadian Place:
Mobilizing Nationalism towards Canada's National Parks

by

Ellyce Andrée Wright

A Master's Research Paper Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty of Sociology and Anthropology
at the University of Ottawa

Under the Supervision of Pr. Nathan Young, Ph.D
Reader Pr. Scott Simon, Ph.D

Abstract

This research paper explores the use of national park land for citizenship, rather than conservation purposes. Particular emphasis is given to how this uniquely affects Indigenous peoples in Canada, whose traditional lands are frequently affected by the establishment and management of these parks by the federal Parks Canada Agency. Using both critical (postcolonial) theory and constructionism (social constructionist camp of environmental sociology), this macro qualitative analysis focuses on how discourse is used to mobilize symbols, knowledge, and power by the Canadian nation-state, and how this nationalist-conservationist narrative further erase historic and contemporary appropriations of Indigenous territories.

Key Words

Space, place, identity, belonging, citizenship, nationalism, Canada, Aboriginal, Indigenous, environment, national parks, Parks Canada Agency, consumption, tourism, co-management, symbols, knowledge, power, conservation, ecology, protected areas, traditional ecological knowledge, western scientific knowledge, nature, wilderness, environment

Table of Contents

*"Our traditional law is to make sure that we hear the voices of not only today –
but those of our ancestors and their vision for the future." (Muktar Akumalik,
translated in Parks Canada Agency, 2013a:26)*

Dedication

To my children whom I hope to meet soon: May you realize your privilege as well as your place.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my supervisor, Nathan Young, PhD, for his insight, editing, and patience through the journey that was writing this production. I am also thankful for my reader, Scott Simon, PhD, for his timeliness and input into the proposal and final submission. Both Dr. Young and Dr. Simon were willing to oversee a rapid acceleration through this research paper, and without their support, this would not have been possible. I am also grateful to my partner, Patrick Leduc, and his seemingly unending patience at my excitement over the development of this research project. Finally, to Mary Ellen Donnan, PhD, my closest ally in Indigenous Studies in academia, who inspired my lifelong post-colonial critique. Support for this research was provided by the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies at the University of Ottawa through graduate scholarships. The responsibility for all statements herein is exclusively mine.

Conflict of Interest

The researcher reports no conflict of interest in the research, writing, and production of this study.

Notes on Terminology

Indigenous

In Canada, Indigenous peoples are both encompassed within 'Canadian' identity and simultaneously understood as having a separate 'Indigenous' identity. While it is undesirable and frankly impossible to "box Indigenous people neatly" (Sundar, 2000:81) into categories, this research paper adopts relatively non-standard vocabulary when referring to the people whom are indigenous to the territories which now compose the Canadian nation-state. For this reason, the reasoning behind the selection of the terms 'Indigenous' and 'Indigenous peoples' in the context of this research paper will be explained.

The Canadian government offers protection under the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (1982) to Aboriginal people, wherein status and non-status First Nations (previously 'Indian', referring to the rights and obligations delimited in the *Indian Act*, 1876), Inuit, and Métis are encompassed by this term. I have purposely avoided using the term Aboriginal because, while it is a term preferred by the Canadian government, many Indigenous peoples in Canada do not identify with this term. I am also apprehensive about this term on the basis of its use by the government, an apprehension which has elsewhere been expressed by Indigenous representatives speaking at a meeting of the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations (1996): "[w]e categorically reject any attempts that Governments define Indigenous Peoples" (paragraph 69). In addition, from an editorial perspective, I chose not to refer to specific groups which make up the term Aboriginal ('status and non-status First Nations, Inuit, and Métis') primarily because of the frequency with which I refer to these populations, which would result in redundancy in the writing and reading of this text.

I have chosen more broadly to respectfully make use of the terms 'Indigenous' and 'Indigenous peoples', despite the fact that the Canadian government usually reserves the use of this terminology to the international arena. When using the terms 'Indigenous' and 'Indigenous peoples', I am drawing from two internationally-recognized sources: United Nations Economic and Social Council (1982), and the International Labour Organisation (1989).

The United Nations Economic and Social Council (1982) offers the following definition:

> Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal system.

Relatedly, according to the International Labour Organisation (1989), the use of 'Indigenous' in their understanding covers:

> [T]ribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations; and peoples in independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries and who irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions.

The use of 'Indigenous' and 'Indigenous peoples' is to refer to those who are indigenous to the territory which is now the Canadian nation-state, using the understandings of these terms offered

at the international level. The goal is to ensure that the arguments made within this research paper are made without excluding, overlooking, or disrespecting people in the process. Most generally, the writing of this research paper is based in the foundational belief that Indigenous peoples should have the power to identify the preferred terminology used to describe them, and this may vary greatly between peoples and individuals. Finally, I prefer this terminology because of the trends and links which can be drawn between nation-state relations with Indigenous peoples in this country and beyond.

National park

According to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (hereafter IUCN) (1994), the "world's oldest and largest global environmental organization" (IUCN, 2014), a national park is a:

> Protected area managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation. Natural area of land and/or sea, designated to (a) protect the ecological integrity of one or more ecosystems for present and future generations, (b) exclude exploitation or occupation inimical to the purposes of designation of the area, and (c) provide a foundation for spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational, and visitor opportunities, all of which must be environmentally and culturally compatible (17).

National parks fall under Category II of IUCN's (1994) list of types of protected areas, necessitating the managing bodies of these areas to prioritize "ecosystem conservation and recreation" (Stolton, 2010:6; see also Dudley, 2008).

In Canada, Parks Canada Agency is the recognized federal governing body of national parks. Parks Canada Agency (1994) recognizes the above-mentioned IUCN (1994) definition, further adding that a national park in Canada:

> [I]s an area which has been identified as a natural area of Canadian significance, which has been acquired by Canada and designated by Parliament as a national park, and over which Parks Canada has been given administration and control under the authority of the National Parks Act. It is managed for the benefit, education and enjoyment of Canadians so as to leave it unimpaired for future generations.

Nation-state

For coherence, "nation-state" is the term which will be used to discuss recognized sovereign territories. In the context of this research paper, the Canadian nation-state, established in 1867, is primarily referenced. Nation-state is a complex and debated compound word, and the meaning of each word necessitates some explanation. The word state has political and geopolitical meaning, and in contemporary times "is the major political subdivision of the globe. As such, it is easily defined and […] conceptualized in quantitative terms" (Connor, 1978:379). Nation is somewhat more ambiguous, but the "simplest statement that can be made about a nation is that it is a body of people who feel that they are a nation" (Connor, 1978:397), and this generally related to culture, religion, language, and/or ethnicity.

In this way, the nation is a "self-defined" (Connor, 1978) "imagined community" (Anderson, 1983), frequently unrecognized or lacking decision-making power in comparison with states, which are recognized by other states, mutually legitimizing their existence. Building on this foundation, I further understand nation-state using the theoretical explanation offered by Nadasdy (2003), who conceptualized the nation-state as an ideological project, legitimized by institutions and processes, whose motives, agendas, and interests can be different, conflicting,

and contradicting. In this context, nationalism is understood as an expression of "loyalty towards the nation" (Connor, 1978:378), which in the Canadian context promotes loyalty towards a homogenous nation, by extension excluding Indigenous peoples who are within the geographical borders of the Canadian state. Finally, while it is commonplace to confuse nationalism with extremism or fanaticism (Connor, 1978), this is not the intention of the use of the word nationalism within this research paper.

Introduction

Most contemporary nation-states are the result of colonial expansion and conquest over Indigenous lands. From their conception, many nation-states have excluded the people whose lands they are founded upon, and the contemporary nation continues to be a force of "exclusion and division rather than unity" (Ashcroft, 2009:12).[1] These newly established nation-states used a variety of mechanisms to instill sentiments of heritage, nationalism and belonging amongst citizens (Anderson, 1983). One such mechanism was the establishment of national parks, as "European settlers […] pressed nature into the service of rising nationalism" (Dunlap, 2012:31). As LeBlanc and LeBlanc (2010) find, the "thought processes informing the creation of national parks are rooted in social constructs 'based on the premise that the only way to save nature (and especially species) is to forcefully exclude people from areas that are designated as wilderness'" (27). The removal of people from these lands in order to create public space has been particularly devastating for Indigenous peoples[2] globally (King, 2008), as well as more specifically in Canada (Bella, 1987).

Stevens (1997) notes that in a little over a century, national parks have become a "major global phenomenon" (13). What is interesting about this is that the American painter George Catlin, whose thoughts inspired the creation of the first national park, originally envisioned this space "containing man and beast, in all the wild and freshness of their nature's beauty" (Catlin, 1842:295). In fact, Catlin (1842) was convinced that in this idealized "magnificent park" (294), Indigenous residents of these areas were worthy of "preservation and protection" (292), by

---

[1] The research on the nation as a space of exclusion is well developed. For some examples, see: Lödén (2010), Marx (1998), and Wimmer (2002).

[2] Indigenous people are not the only populations to have been excluded from national park land; see also Bella (1987), Cochrane (1987), Fortin and Gagnon (1999), and Weaver (1996). However, as King (2008) explains, the creation of national parks, whether forced or consensual, uniquely affects and displaces Indigenous peoples, in particular their sacred sites and their organizational and management capacities.

government, no less! Years later, when Yellowstone Park was created in the United States, Indigenous peoples were prohibited access, and their rights to the land extinguished, all in the name of wilderness preservation. While the vision and management of national parks has changed over time, they have almost always been premised on the exclusion of Indigenous peoples (Dearden and Berg, 1993; Kopas, 2007).

This pattern has been demonstrated globally, as national parks created the wilderness and subsequently the need to protect it, barring access to Indigenous peoples who lived upon or used those same lands. Elsewhere referred to as the Western fortress-conservation model (Brockington, 2002; Ward, 1997), upon closer examination it becomes apparent that only certain populations are excluded, while others are encouraged to visit. For decades, Indigenous presence in national parks was limited to a tourist attraction (Weaver, 1996; Cardinal, 2008), and only in recent years has the sharing of decision-making and management become thinkable.

Recognition of Indigenous peoples as humans, and in addition, as citizens, often followed late after the establishment of the nation-state[3]. If Indigenous peoples are not recognized as people, then the spaces appropriated for national park purposes are conceivably uninhabited. In the establishment of national parks, "[w]hat were seen by many Canadians as large, unproductive expanses of public domain, were seen by [Indigenous] people and their supporters as land which the people had traditionally used and occupied" (Nelson, 1989:89). A fundamental problem arises when Indigenous peoples gain recognition as Canadian citizens: these spaces, whether reserve land or traditional territories, are no longer credibly untouched by humans. As Ruru (2012) explains, in a nation where law made colonial appropriation of space permissible, there are implications when contemporary law "recalibrates its orientation to space and belatedly recognizes Indigenous place" (iii).

---

[3] By way of example, Canada was founded in 1867, and Indigenous people only received the right to vote in 1960.

Research Problem

Since the creation of Yellowstone in 1872, the first national park in the United States, spaces around the world have been similarly appropriated from Indigenous communities for public use under the pretext of conservation[4]. The creation of national parks instills a myth of *terra nullius*[5] (Héritier, 2011; Culhane, 1998) wherein the territory[6] is treated as primitive (Nelson, 1989), empty, unoccupied, neutral (Fortin and Gagnon, 1999), pristine, and wild (Cronon, 1995). Currently, over one thousand national parks are established (Bella, 1986), and much of this accounts for over twelve percent of global land mass being under protection for conservation purposes (Dowie, 2009). As Dowie (2009) rightly points out, initially "such a degree of land conservation seems undeniably good, an enormous achievement […] But the record is less impressive when the social, economic, and cultural impact on local people is considered" (xx-xxi) (see also Wilkie, Morelli, Demmer, Starkey, Telfer, and Steil, 2006).

It is striking to note that approximately "half the land selected for protection by the global conservation establishment over the past century was either occupied or regularly used by

---

[4] Dilsaver and Wyckoff (2005), however, argue that the Yellowstone model which has gained so much scholarly attention should be taken with caution, because while it certainly was used as a template for the establishment of national parks, the "process took time and experimentation" (241).

[5] As Dent (2013) details, the "significance of the concept of *terra nullius*, no man's land, in Canadian legal and historical frameworks is pervasive. The roots of the contemporary Canadian wilderness myth, along with the origin of almost every Treaty dispute and land claims settlement in the country, lie in this antiquated legal tradition (Bell and Asch, 1997). The concept of *terra nullius* was developed during the 17th century as part of the continuing colonization of Indigenous territories by the imperial powers in Europe (Venne 1997). According to Bennett, "it followed that such territories would vest automatically in the first civilized power that chose to occupy them, regardless of the wishes or resistance of the Indigenous population" (quoted in Venne 1997: 185). English thinker John Locke was responsible for the initial ideas of *terra nullius*, developing it from the Roman concept of *res nullius* or "empty land" (Gosden 2004:27). Essentially the concept entailed that all unoccupied lands were common property until developed in some way (Gosden 2004). While no longer explicitly present in the Canadian public consciousness, the spectre of *terra nullius* continues to haunt Indigenous peoples in the form of the term *wilderness*" (60).

[6] In this sense, territory is not only meant in the geographical understand, but in the juridico-political understanding: "the area controlled by a certain kind of power" (Foucault, 2007a:176).

[I]ndigenous peoples. In the Americas that number is over 80 percent" (Dowie, 2009:xxi) (see also Brockington and Igoe, 2006). Indeed, as Stevens (1997) notes, the first protected areas which ever existed in the world were created by Indigenous peoples: certain territories were cordoned off to prevent over-consumption; different species were under- and over-harvested in order to maintain a balance; lands were purposely burned or watered to encourage new growth (see also Stolton, 2010). The transformation of communally-protected into legally-protected areas was, however, facilitated by the modern nation-state (see Worboys and Winkler, 2007) and "imposed on the original inhabitants by the colonial power" (Stolton, 2010:3). These areas are now often formed in part or completely into national parks or protected areas, those same "territories whose forests, grasslands, and other habitats, and the wildlife within them, have been used, managed, and conserved" (Stevens, 1997:9) by Indigenous peoples.

Furthermore, while the number of protected areas and national parks has been increasing globally[7] (Lockwood, Worboys, and Kothari, 2006), accelerated by an international conservationalist movement, so too has the level of degeneration of the natural world (Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, and West, 2003). In fact, in only the "last 50 years humans have transformed the planet more radically than at any other point in our history" (Stolton, 2010:2). Unfortunately, the professional literature surrounding and policies governing national parks at an international level imagined Indigenous peoples as incompatible with these spaces. Generally, what resulted was an attempt at preserving territory at the expense of the peoples whose lives were dependent upon the land[8]. By way of example, only in 1994, nearly 50 years

---

[7] Most theorists on the subject maintain that the majority of national parks which emerged after the establishment of the Yellowstone were inspired by this American model. It is most blatant when examining early national park laws and how similar they are to the American laws (see, amongst others, Lothian, 1977).

[8] It can also be argued that to a great degree, certain characteristics of the health of the land were also quite dependent upon the lives of local Indigenous peoples.

after the establishment of the IUCN, did the IUCN recognize the possibility of Indigenous

interactions with the land as a positive factor in conservation initiatives (IUCN, 1971; 1994).

North of the 49th parallel, there is the idea that Canada is a nation of nature and

wilderness and that this is central to Canadian identity (Loo, 2006; Parks Canada Agency, 2012a;

Richard, 2012). This predominates and is propagated in national symbols and popular culture,

both in this country and beyond (Atkinson, 2003; Thorpe and Rutherford, 2010). According to

Gross, Poor, Sipos, and Solymossy (2009), approximately one tenth of Canada is sectioned off

for the purposes of national parks. Similar to reserve land, national parks represent colonial

assumptions, historically and contemporarily supported "by the colonial state, that most of the

land they encountered […] was waste, waiting to be put to productive use: or, where Native

people obviously were using the land, that their uses were inefficient and therefore should be

replaced" (Harris, 2002:265). Indeed, these "assumptions, coupled with self-interest and a huge

imbalance of power, were sufficient to dispossess Native people of most of their land" (Harris,

2002:265)[9].

These lands, while purported for the conservation and protection of ecological integrity,

wilderness, and biological diversity, host around fifteen million visitors annually (Gross, Poor,

Sipos, and Solymossy, 2009). While the necessity of protected areas is not disputed in the

context of this research paper[10], a fundamental orientation of this research is that we should not

ignore the exacerbation of social justice problems due to conservation efforts (Wilshusen,

---

[9] It is important to note, however, that efforts to dispossess Canada's Indigenous peoples of their lands were met with great resistance. For related examples, Loo (2006) discusses the agency of Indigenous peoples who defended their rights to harvest the ceded lands; Ruru (2012) discusses the development in legal jurisprudence relating to land claims.

[10] In Fortwangler's (2003) words, "[p]rotected areas have provided real benefits to people, such as protected watersheds, safe harbors for wildlife, and protection from logging and mining interests. However, many protected area policies have ignored social justice and human rights, resulting in devastation or decreased quality of life for people living in the vicinity" (25). This exclusive management approach imposed by such policies is the focus of the critique of this research paper.

Brechin, Fortwangler, and West, 2003). If the research which demonstrates the environmental

damage[11] caused by tourists is taken into consideration (LeBlanc and LeBlanc, 2010), it becomes

clear that the removal of Indigenous peoples from territory that is now national park land has less

to do with conservation[12]. It has been argued that instead it is about preserving an imagined

uninhabited wilderness (Binnema and Niemi, 2006), and more largely for state economic (Bella,

1986) or political reasons. This imagined wilderness is paradoxical for two reasons: firstly, its

consumption by tourists, demonstrative of "a conflict between preservation and use" (Bella,

1987:1); and secondly, the mobilization of this space by the state for nationalist, rather than

conservationist purposes, allowing some to admire, value, and preserve the "natural heritage for

their offspring" (Nelson, 1989:84) while others are forcefully displaced.

Indeed, "national parks reflect a whole spectrum of ideas about nation, culture, and even

national origins" (Spence, 1999:7). In Canada, national parks are physical territories owned by

the Crown, publically represented as an effort to conserve the 'nature' and 'wilderness' within in

order to safeguard them for future generations. As Ruru (2012) elaborates, the "national park

label was used to transform the so-called 'wild' and 'empty' 'spaces' of these lands into 'places'

for recreation, tourism, and conservation" (4). This came at a great loss to the Indigenous peoples

who had long occupied and cared for these spaces, as most of the policies during the first century

---

[11] The Panel on the Ecological Integrity in Canada's National Parks (2000) published a significant report on this subject, explaining that the conservation efforts in Canadian national parks are insufficient.

[12] Elsewhere, Wilkie, Morelli, Demmer, Starkey, Telfer, and Steil (2006) present a more thorough account of the debate between conservation and social advocacy interest groups. Where "[c]onservationists argue that environmental regulations are essential to ensure the sustainability of the planet's biological systems and the health and welfare of people, and that protected areas are an indispensable tool in that regulatory toolbox. Social advocates contest establishment and management of protected areas, and they do so for three reasons. First, they argue that only initiatives related to poverty alleviation will lead to successful biodiversity conservation because only these initiatives address the root cause of environmental destruction. Second, protected areas take away the property and rights of local people and can be an unjust drag on their present and future welfare. Third, even if the parks do generate economic value, the distribution of these benefits is so skewed against poor rural people that the role of parks in local development is negligible and they neither justly compensate for lost property and rights nor contribute to poverty alleviation" (247). This further demonstrates the complexity of national parks (or, more largely, protected areas), situated at the intersection of ecosystems and human social systems.

of park management imagined national parks as without human inhabitation, only allowing for visitation. Therefore, Canadian national parks, founded upon national pride in an imagined conceptualization of pristine, uninhabited wilderness, exclude Indigenous peoples (Binnema and Niemi, 2006).

In contemporary times, nation-states are visibly attempting to redress their exclusion of Indigenous peoples by including them in decisions surrounding the management of national parks (Nadasdy, 2005), many of which are situated on historically Indigenous lands. However, while the decision-making power in the Canadian democratic nation rests solely at the nation-state level, reconciliation remains superficial. Veto power and de facto decision-making is left to the federal government (Héritier, 2011); while management is shared in name, it is rarely done in an equal or satisfactory (to all involved parties) manner (Timko and Satterfield, 2008b). Agreements about national park management made between the state and Indigenous communities largely reflect the priorities of the nation, whose powers supersede those of the Indigenous communities (Martin, 2006; Nadasdy, 2005). The local continues to be erased in order to nationalize nature (Thorpe and Rutherford, 2010), resulting in national parks decision-making oftentimes being motivated by larger nation-state interests, rather than ecological conservation (Adams and Hutton, 2007).

National parks instead represent a contemporary reassertion of nation-state management of historically Indigenous land, achieved by mobilizing a powerful set of symbols, imposing a dominant and accepted knowledge system, and asserting nation-state control. While the Crown already has ownership over most of the land in Canada[13], it is important to understand

---

[13] However, according to Parks Canada Agency (2011c), "[a]pproximately 68% of federal Crown lands are managed through a *cooperative* relationship between Aboriginal peoples and Parks Canada" (32). How cooperative these relationships are is one of the central focuses of this research paper; however, it this demonstrative of a loss of complete nation-state power over these lands, however minor.

nationalism as a process, rather than as a fixed reality. Reasserting national park space as a

fundamental element of Canada is an ongoing process[14] done using symbols, knowledge, and

power, in order to legitimize the continued management of these lands by the nation-state. In

Canada, contemporary negotiation and settlement of land claims (Aboriginal Affairs and

Northern Development Canada, 2013), acknowledgement of the inhumane treatment of

Indigenous peoples by the nation-state (Prime Minister of Canada, 2008), and growing

popularity of shared management agreements in national parks (Notzke, 1995; Langdon, Prosper,

and Gagnon, 2010) threatens the foundation of these sites, which are largely used for the

mobilization of nationalist sentiment (see also Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge, 2000).

Thus, in the light of the growing body of research in environmental sociology, as well as

the contemporary inclination of the Parks Canada Agency to partner with Indigenous

communities, undertaking this research is important and timely. This is because an examination

of the mobilization of symbols, knowledge, and power by the nation-state demonstrates multiple

levels of inequality which must be addressed before a sufficient sharing of power can be hoped

for and achieved. These concerns need to be addressed on a global scale, too, as international

bodies for environmental conservation (such as the IUCN) continue to advocate for the classic

model of nature conservation, which creates conditions under which Indigenous communities are

displaced (MacKay and Caruso, 2004; Kopas, 2007)[15]. As Brosius (2004) has stated, Indigenous

peoples represent "a challenge to many basic assumptions about conservation" (611); this

challenge needs further examination. Furthermore, as co-management and community-based

---

[14] Nation-state dominion over human subjects is best understood as a process, and amassing nationalism is one way of forming subjectivities: "Subject formation is a productive process; subjectivities are always *becoming*. […] This is an active engagement, where 'individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application' (Foucault, 1980:98)" (Rutherford, 2011:xiv).
[15] One popular example is the effort of the IUCN to significantly increase the amount of conservation, which will undoubtedly affect local populations.

conservation are increasingly being examined as models for ameliorating the problematic

relationships between nation-states and Indigenous peoples in regards to conservation in national

parks, the underlying problems[16] must first be addressed. Most importantly, as Stevenson (2004)

recognizes, co-management must first be decolonized before equitable sharing of decision-

making can be sought after.

Theoretical Framework

Environmental issues are "doubly complex" (Dryzek, 2005:9) because of their situation

at the "intersection of ecosystems and human social systems" (Dryzek, 2005:9). For the same

reason, national parks are doubly complex! A sociological analysis of environmental problems

by extension requires a separate analysis of the human social systems surrounding the issue.

There are a number of particularly well-suited theoretical frameworks for proceeding with

research in this area, which overlap in a significant way: discourse analysis (Cronon, 1995;

Dryzek, 2005), power analysis (Foucault 1980, 1991, 2010; Darier, 1999), and social

constructionism (Hacking, 2000; Hannigan, 1995; Liberatoire, 1995; Young, 2014).

In this research paper, I frame the issue of Canadian national parks using social

constructionism from the emerging field of environmental sociology (Dunlap and Catton, 1979;

Hannigan, 2006). The social constructionist view in environmental sociology perceives scientific

conclusions as socially-constructed claims to knowledge, and there exists a contemporary

"general acceptance amongst most sociologists that our understanding of nature is socially

---

[16] This is not to suggest that co-management is negative. Indeed, as Ruppert (2003) states, "living [Indigenous] culture offer cultural resource protection that goes far beyond the protection of archaeological sites or abandoned ruins. Through traditional resource collecting and the application of traditional knowledge related to this collecting activity, [Indigenous] peoples maintain their living cultural heritage as well as continue to affect and shape the environment around them. If land management agencies have an interest in understanding the histories of the lands and resources they manage, they would benefit by finding ways to incorporate [I]ndigenous management techniques into their own management regimes" (261-262). Acceptable co-management strategies has been widely discussed, important among the suggestions being the two-row wampum approach (MacKay and Caruso, 2004) and adaptive co-management (Armitage, Berkes, and Doubleday, 2007).

constructed" (Newton, 2007:20). Equally, knowledge is governed (Grundmann and Stehr, 2003) by nation-state institutions. What is known about environmental issues depends on the social processes by which it is communicated, and claims about knowledge are linked to control over resources (Baviskar, 2000). Indeed, "social and environmental conditions are deeply and inextricably linked" (Adams and Hutton, 2007:149). In the case of Canadian national parks, the need to protect the space comes from what Western scientific experts choose to communicate to the public.

Thus, what is known about environmental issues in national parks reflects the interests of the nation-state. The nation-state retains control over national park land vis-à-vis the federal Parks Canada Agency. Parks Canada Agency is an independent federal agency which has fallen under the responsibility of various federal departments, which demonstrates how consumption interests in national parks have greatly changed over time. Parks Canada Agency strategic goals for the period of 2012-2017 are to establish in Canadians,

> [A] strong sense of connection, through meaningful experiences, to their national parks, national historic sites and national marine conservation areas and these protected places are enjoyed in ways that leave them unimpaired for present and future generations (Parks Canada Agency, 2012a:11).

Underlying these claims is federal support for Canadians to consume, rather than to protect, the nature in national parks.

Theoretically, nature can be consumed both visually as well as tangibly. In the context of national parks, the consumption of nature and the environment has been studied from different angles, including: satisfaction of tourists (Germic, 2001; Meethan, Anderson, and Miles, 2006), motives of capitalist production (Cronon, 1983; Rutherford, 2011), natural resource exploitation

(Bella, 1987), hunting for a privileged few (Lothian, 1977), recreational activities (Atkinson, 2003; Vander Kloet, 2009), and the advancement of both environmentalist agendas (Summers, 2006) as well as political interests (Mazur, 1994). In case of this research paper, I am specifically referring to the consumption of nature for nation-building purposes. Similarly, Dickens (1992; 2004) has written about how nature has been utilized for citizenship and identity purposes, while Stegner (1983) has illustrated how a main function of national parks is to produce a consumable national image. Conservation and consumption in national parks are inextricably linked: these nation-building practices could only take place if (at least the aesthetic element of) environmental conservation was prioritized (see also Rutherford, 2011).

A foundational assumption of this research paper is that relations between the nation-state and Indigenous peoples in Canada are post-colonial in nature. Broadly, post-colonialism refers "to a range of critical anti-colonial perspectives that display an awareness of the ways in which five centuries of European colonialism continue to shape political ideas and practices, including those concerning the production of knowledge" (Chandra, nd:3) (see also Gandhi, 1998). The task of analyzing the politics of symbols, knowledge, and power is central to post-colonial studies (Césaire, 1955; Fanon, 1952, 1961; Memmi, 1965; Nkrumah, 1964; Said, 1979). Similar to action-based research, research that adopts a post-colonial theory lens:

> [D]emand[s] we work to excavate all that was lost - ancestral traditions, languages, history, culture and religion - and restore honor and status to that which was stolen in order to address what must be regained and re-learned, and how that will occur" (Parsons and Harding, 2011:4) (see also Tuhiwai Smith, 2012).

Indeed, colonialism continues to affect the lived experiences of Indigenous peoples around the world, and post-colonial theory brings this to the forefront. (see, amongst others, Krebs, 2013).

While postcolonial theorists have largely been critiqued by power theorists for lacking in empirical research (Legg, 2007), the interdisciplinary, interdiscursive nature of post-colonial theory (Kumar, 2011) has guided a range of contemporary research projects on Indigenous and local peoples in the areas of health (Nelson, MacDonald, and Abbott, 2012), medicine (Bivins, 2012), nursing (Browne, Smye, Varcoe, 2005), trauma (Elias, Mignone, Hall, Hong, Hart, and Sareen, 2012), education (Andreotti, 2011; Manathung, 2011), politics and governance (Ahluwalia, 2001), law (Ruru, 2012), development (Alcadipani, Khan, Gantman, Nkomo, and Islam, 2012), gender (Ochonu, 2011; Racine, 2011), immigration (Odern, 2008), geography (Lehtinen, 2012), and tourism (Diekmann and Hannam, 2012). Particularly noteworthy is the academic journal devoted to research employing post-colonial theory, *Interventions.*

A review of the existing research demonstrates the very human consequences of colonial conquest, in particular upon Indigenous peoples and their territories. As Harris (2002) asserts, "[a]ll colonial encounters involved dispossessing people of their land" (48) (see also Young, 2004). This is certainly the case in the establishment and maintenance of national parks, and little has changed despite the contemporary attractiveness of co-management agreements. As Stevenson (2004) boldly states, "it would be difficult to conceive of a more insidious form of cultural assimilation than co-management as currently practiced" (68), much of which has to do with "current systemic inequities in the Canadian co-management experience" (Stevenson, 2004:68). It is important to acknowledge that a theoretical foundation of nature protection and the creation of national parks "often emerges out of colonial and authoritarian rule as instruments of natural resources control" (Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, and West, 2003:5).

Still today, "governments and international conservation organizations continue to create parks by less than democratic means" (Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, and West, 2003:8). A

post-colonial critique is therefore appropriate, which is largely carried out through an examination of binaries and otherness, two central preoccupations of post-colonial critique. The mobilization of Eurocentric binaries[17] (Bhabha, 2004) in each chapter demonstrates the legacy of colonialism: symbolic binaries between symbols (what to protect at the expense of what else), knowledge (what knowledge is credited [Grundmann and Stehr, 2003], while othering alternative ways of knowing), and power (whose interests are legitimized [Dearden and Berg, 1993], and at whose expense). Furthermore, the use of space to create an Other is explored in each chapter (see Cave, 2005). In sum, "the absence of modern [Indigenous] voices within discussions of nature perpetuates the colonial rupture between culture and nature which emerged from the Enlightenment" (Johnson, Cant, Howitt, and Peters, 2007:118).

In response to Foucault's writings on geography, Riou (2007) maintains that "[s]pace is the place where history inscribes itself" (37). Because of the focus on power relations between nation-state and Indigenous peoples in Canada, post-colonial theory lends a specific and relevant interpretation of power relations in a post-settler/colonial society (Spivak, 1990). The significant and continuous impact of colonialism on certain populations requires that a post-colonial analysis of this issue be performed. Indeed, the "national park concept has become embedded in colonial ideas related to landscape, and these concepts have been endorsed in the law" (Ruru, 2012:4; see also Legg, 2007). Furthermore, as MacKay and Caruso (2004) demonstrate, while Indigenous peoples seek legal restitution over appropriated lands, "few examples of real restitution exist despite a strong basis for such in international human rights law" (15).

Thus, a post-colonial lens on the management of national parks by the state demonstrates the ways in which colonialism dispossessed Indigenous peoples from the land (Harris, 2004),

---

[17] In studies of nature in sociology, this is also referred to as metanarratives of dualism; see Newton (2007), Latour (1999), and Callon (1986).

calling for the creation of anti-colonial geographies (Johnson, Cant, Howitt, and Peters, 2007). In light of this research, I use post-colonial theory to demonstrate how acts of appropriation have been erased by the nation-state, because "[I]ndigenous peoples have been protecting and managing their own territories for thousands of years and have the right to continue to do so, alone or in collaborative partnerships, in accordance with their own laws and traditions" (MacKay and Caruso, 2004:15).

Methodology

This research paper is exploratory in nature and adopts documentary analysis as a qualitative research method (Bowen, 2009) with the aim of synthesizing, contributing to, and critiquing the available data on the subject of Indigenous peoples and national parks. Both primary and secondary sources were consulted. Secondary sources served as insight and inspiration for the concepts used in this research paper, as well as for relevant comparison. This involved a thorough reading of relevant books, scholarly websites, theses, dissertations, and journal articles, from the fields of sociology, anthropology, archaeology, history, geology, geography, political ecology, political geography, political science, post-colonial theory, and law. These secondary sources were retrieved through the University of Ottawa library. Finally, I consulted and make reference to various websites and reference sheets produced by the Parks Canada Agency (2002; 2007b; 2008b; 2010; 2011a; 2011b; 2012b), without performing any analyses of these documents.

Primary sources allow for a more original contribution into document interpretation. This is especially important given the focus on social construction and discourse analysis in the proposed research. The aim of analyzing primary sources is to gain access to relevant laws, policies, as well as the websites and speeches of politicians. These primary sources were all

retrieved using an Internet search, and are mostly from the Parks Canada Agency website.

Keywords for the search included "Parks Canada," "Parks Canada Agency," "Government of

Canada," "Canadian government," and "Canada national parks," in combination with

"collaborative management," "co-management," "shared management," and "decision-making,"

along with "Indigenous," "Aboriginal," "Native," and "local peoples". All research was carried

out in both the English and French languages.

Aside from the federal law which was retrieved from the Department of Justice Canada

(2014) online database of Canadian laws, the primary sources analyzed for the purposes of this

research paper in the end were all retrieved from the online library maintained on the Parks

Canada Agency website, despite the above-mentioned general Internet search. All documents on

the Parks Canada Agency online library were reviewed, but only 6 of the 47 (as of March 30

2014) were selected to be analyzed, because of the relevance of their subject. Various formats of

primary documents were analyzed. The national laws governing the national parks: *The Parks*

Canada Agency Act (Department of Justice Canada, 2014); policies and guidelines: *Parks*

Canada guiding principles and operating policies (Parks Canada Agency, 1994); *Principles and*

guidelines for ecological restoration in Canada's protected natural areas (Parks Canada

Agency, 2008a); *Guide to management planning* (Parks Canada Agency, 2008b); strategies and

plans: *Corporate plan 2012-2013/2016-2017* (Parks Canada Agency, 2012a); *2014-2015*

Departmental sustainable development strategy (Parks Canada Agency, 2013d); and reports:

*State of Canada's natural and historic places (*Parks Canada Agency, 2011c); *Action on the*

ground, volume 3 (Parks Canada Agency, 2013a). As much as possible, I sought to only analyze

recently-published documents in order to comment on the contemporary use of discourse.

However, some documents (Parks Canada Agency, 1994, and to some extent Parks Canada

Agency, 2006) still are widely referenced and highly important because they govern actions within and towards the national parks, and have not been recently updated.

Since this research is exploratory in nature, this analysis did not seek to provide an exhaustive analysis of the literature or the discourse used within it. As already explained, all 47 documents in the Parks Canada Agency online database were reviewed, but only 6 were analyzed. The exclusion of documents had a specific rationale, and sometimes overlapping or multiple rationales. Some reports were purposely excluded, on the basis of their perceived (ir)relevance to the topic of discussion (for example, Parks Canada Agency 2009b; 2009c; 2009d; 2011a; 2013c). In addition, it is frequently the case that government documents published within a relatively close timeframe use the same discourse, both in the implicit meaning and the explicit wording. This was the case for other documents, and as such several reports were purposely excluded because a pertinent analysis was already exhausted from another Parks Canada Agency document that was already analyzed (for example, Parks Canada Agency [2013a] and Parks Canada Agency [2008a] contained similar themes and use of discourse. Since Parks Canada Agency [2008a] is merely an earlier volume of Parks Canada Agency [2013a] and much of the information from the earlier volume is found in the later one, mentioning both of them would not have advanced any new arguments, so I simply included Parks Canada Agency [2013a] and excluded Parks Canada Agency [2008a] Using the same reasoning, I excluded Parks Canada Agency [2012c] because Parks Canada Agency [2013d] was merely a newer version of Parks Canada Agency [2012c]). Certain other documents were excluded due to the length and time restrictions of this research project (for example, Parks Canada Agency [2005; 2006; 2013d]). While relevant, these would have introduced new themes and reached beyond the scope of the desired project and realm of possibility given the constraints. Finally, I observed a *lack* of

mention of Indigenous peoples in several of documents (for example, 'Aboriginal' people were only mentioned five times in a document on cultural resource protection in Parks Canada Agency [2013b], less relevant, but still noteworthy, is the silencing in Parks Canada Agency [2007a; 2009b]), which led to the exclusion of these documents from my analysis. While silencing is worthy of attention, only a limited analysis of silencing can be carried out, and this was not the purpose of this research paper.

To a great extent, human knowledge is based in language. Laden in this language are assumptions, interpretations, and long-established histories; histories that emerged alongside the language. This language is a social construction of the priorities of the powerful, reflecting a particular set of concerns. Because of their societal position, certain people have better access to the processes of knowledge legitimization. This is often done through the use of discourse, and shapes the collective understanding of these issues (Foucault, 1980; Dryzek, 2005). "[S]ome interests are advanced, others suppressed" (Dryzek, 2005:9), and the use of discourse analysis allows for this to be studied. For this reason, I use discourse analysis in order to examine the social construction and discursive formation of symbols, knowledge, and power by the nation-state.

Discourse analysis primarily allows for an investigation into how the power of language can shape society and, in the case of national parks more specifically, legitimize "the misrecognition of arbitrariness" (Bourdieu, 1984:163). Indeed, as Spence (1999) offers, "cultural values and actions have always shaped the 'natural world'" (139). At the same time, discourse presents an important, potentially emancipatory possibility of resistance: "discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines it and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it" (Foucault, 1991:101).

In selecting these 6 primary sources, I looked for mentions of: Indigenous peoples ('Aboriginal', since these are publications by the Canadian government), nature and wilderness imagery, scientific knowledge and alternative ways of knowing, and finally, collaborative management. These were themes I had found in the literature reviewed for the research project, which peaked my curiosity and desire to see if I could find evidence of these themes in Parks Canada Agency documents. Once I eliminated the other 41 documents and decided on these 6 documents, I used Ruiz's (2009) methodological explanation of discourse analysis to carry out my analyses of these documents. Ruiz (2009) maintained that sociological discourse analysis contains three levels of analysis: textual, contextual, and interpretive, which is an "on-going circular process between these three levels." (56) In the first level, textual analysis (Ruiz, 2009), I began by coding and categorizing the discourse used in the documents under three themes: symbols, knowledge, and power. This necessitated a return to the secondary sources in order to analyze the situational context (level two, according to Ruiz [2009]) within which this discourse emerged and was acceptable. Finally, the discourse went through a process of interpretation, which as Ruiz (2009) rightly points out, is present throughout the first two levels as well: "although interpretation is the final level of analysis, and as such the culmination of the sociological analysis, analysis is conducted in a constant and bidirectional manner among these three levels." (37)

Because of the focus both on human and ecological systems, the temporal element of this research paper deals simultaneously with natural and social time (see also Newton, 2007; and Adam, 1990). The primary content analysis focuses on the most recent official Parks Canada Agency documents, which renewed their commitment to conservation, ecological integrity, co-management, and expansion in 2012. However, the analysis of secondary sources is situated

within a larger timeframe: since the creation of the world's first national parks at the end of the 19th century. As Marsh (2003) explains, we do not need to go far back into history to find a time when the supply and demand on the natural world "nearly balanced and compensated each other" (30). Indeed, while the proposed temporal dimension may seem long in academic terms, this is almost impossible to situate on a timeline of the existence of the natural world: "Planet Earth is billions of years old, and humans have been around for a fraction of that time; in a similar way, nation states are 3000 years old, but national parks are less than 150 years old" (Gross, Poor, Sipos, Solymossy, 2009:277)[18].

Parks Canada Agency is a federal organization and has been independent since 1998. National parks in Canada previously fell under the responsibility of the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Department of the Environment, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, and the Department of the Interior (Hildebrandt, 1995). It is thus fair to assume that the Agency reflects changing nation-state values. Certainly, the diversity of Indigenous peoples as well as national parks in Canada makes potential generalizations about Parks Canada Agency hazardous, and risks oversimplification (King, 2008). I intend to carry out a macro analysis of the historical and contemporary colonial patterns of Canadian federal institutions in national park management, specifically as it relates to Indigenous peoples. Furthermore, while it would certainly be difficult to arrive at a conclusion that colonialism is an explicit motive of the state, it undeniably guides their actions: Frideres (2011) argues that this is because colonialism is built into federal institutions.

---

[18] Lockwood, Worboys, and Kothari (2007) elaborate: "One of the greatest land-use and sea-use transformations occurred at the end of the 20th century and continues into the start of the 21st century. Nearly all nations on Earth contributed to the establishment of national parks and other protected areas, so that in just 40 years a few hundred formally declared protected areas have grown to more than 100,000 protected areas worldwide" (xxiv).

For this reason, I use post-colonial theory to understand nation-state action. Similarly, if the motive of the state in re-asserting their management over national parks (using symbols, knowledge, and power) is to mobilize nationalist sentiment, and nationalism is implicitly challenged by distinct Indigenous peoples[19], then we could arrive at the conclusion that nation-state motives towards Indigenous peoples are colonial. Thus, the motive is foundationally, rather than explicitly, guiding state relations with Indigenous peoples.

Research Questions

This research is guided by the following questions:

Question 1: How does the nation-state mobilize symbols about 'nature', 'wilderness', and 'environment' in order to amass nationalist sentiment in regards to national parks?

Question 2: How does the nation-state impose a dominant knowledge system in order to legitimize management strategies in national parks?

Question 3: How does this mobilization of symbols and imposition of knowledge subsequently reinforce contemporary management by the nation-state on historically Indigenous lands?

Question 4: How does this nationalist-conservationist narrative further erase historic and contemporary appropriations of Indigenous territories?

This research paper is divided into three chapters, with the first three research questions being the focus of each individual chapter. The fourth research question is more of an overarching question and as such will be attended to throughout the research paper.

Chapter 1: Symbols

Both in and beyond national parks, conservation is highly politicized, most observably in motivations, resistances, and outcomes (see Brechin, Wilshusen, Fortwangler, and West, 2003).

---

[19] Lefebvre (1991) furthers this in his theorization of settler nativisation, which occurs when immigrant settlers imagine themselves as Native, and in turn Indigenous peoples are viewed as alien, rendering them displaced. For this reason, Lefebvre (1991) views colonial space not as a site, but rather as a process (Nadasdy [2003] also makes a similar point).

This chapter discusses the emergence and mobilization of national symbols about wilderness, nature, and the environment. Building on the works of Cronon (1983, 1995), Loo (2006), Marsh (2003), Nash (1968), Nelson (1989), and Spence (1999), this research contests the national imagination of uninhabited territory, subsequently problematizing the foundation of the establishment of national parks in this image. As explicitly stated by Ruru (2012), "national parks are positioned as symbolic of our national identity and future" (13). Symbols of nature are nationalized in order to unify, create, and instill common nationalist sentiment. An analysis of recent Parks Canada Agency documents presents this quite clearly. How symbols are differently understood by Indigenous peoples is also be explored in this chapter; in particular, those regarding wilderness and nature (Nelson, 1989).

Concepts such 'wilderness', 'nature', and 'environment' are social constructs whose definitions have changed over time. They are what Cronon (1995) calls cultural inventions, advanced by Parks Canada Agency and embodied in the establishment of national parks. By the beginning of the 20th century, the idea of the national park and the related aforementioned concepts were firmly implanted into national and citizen imaginary (Lothian, 1977:33). The meanings that remain are "largely inherited from the past when [they] developed power to guide human actions" (Nelson, 1989:84). These concepts share more in common than this, however: they are all concerned with imagining the natural world in different ways. Still, it is important to remember that these concepts are not natural, but are instead "a product of the very history it seeks to deny" (Cronon, 1995:22).

More broadly, these constructs are problematic because they allow humans to see their actions as separate from their effects on the natural world. Lastly is the idea of the "totalitarianism of the eye" (Raffesin, 2007:132): what is visually appealing, that which has

inspired and mobilized romanticized feelings about the relationship between humans and the natural world, is in the case of national parks, rewarded through the establishment of boundaries delimiting its borders. [20]

The labeling of space as 'nature' allowed for its appropriation. Further, the term 'nature' has been both ambiguous and loaded, at once used to define 'us' and to enroll 'us' in a common belief (Newton, 2007). In Canadian national parks, 'nature' long represented a "want of fixedness" (Marsh, 2003:279), a desire to preserve an aesthetic (and later economic, see Parks Canada Agency, 2011a) value. The attempt to protect these territories only came later, when the appreciation of these same lands "led easily to sadness at its disappearance" (Nash, 1968:96), as nature's eager consumers noticed "[w]ith a considerable sense of shock [...] that many of the forces which had shaped their national character were disappearing" (Nash, 1968:145).

Similarly, 'wilderness'[21] was an imported idea from the imagination of national parks in the United States: this wilderness was 'found' by the white settlers in the United States, who conceptualized the idea "in the sense of a primeval, relatively untouched, awesome, and challenging land" (Nelson, 1989:84). This sought-after wilderness is only a recent invention[22]: Cronon (1995) describes how merely 250 years ago, this same wilderness was far from a positive connotation, insinuating qualifiers such as "'deserted,' 'savage,' 'desolate,' 'barren – in short, a

---

[20] Relatedly, Loo (2006) discusses this idealization of nature in a photo essay in her text. These photos graphically depict hunters, the "mainstays of the wildlife conservation movement" with at times hundreds of dead animals: So powerfully do the photos in this album of achievement communicate control and dominance that it's hard to see that they say anything else about people's – man's place and relationship to the natural world. Man against nature. Man over nature - literally".

[21] For a thorough description about the development of the concept of wilderness in the American mind, see Nash (1968).

[22] While it is maintained that it is an invention, it is still a salient one, especially in the United States. For more on this subject, see Marsh (2003), who used a macro historical approach to rediscover how the concept was used by humans in order to transform the natural world.

'waste'" (8). The concept of wilderness was especially relevant to the formation of the first

national parks, and dictated much of the management strategies in the early years.

An imagined wilderness allowed for the justification for expulsion of the Indigenous

peoples under the guise of a seemingly apolitical mission "to preserve and protect the wild"

(Nelson, 1989:85). Since there is no measure of wilderness, the concept allows for a rather

arbitrary exercise of power over appropriate land use: indeed, there "is no specific material

object that is wilderness […and] a universally acceptable definition of wilderness is elusive"

(Nash, 1968:1). This means that while Indigenous peoples were eventually granted access to

some of their traditional lands, many of their practices were prohibited, and only activities

deemed 'low-impact' were acceptable. Historically, it was generally believed that the "more

extensive land uses [by Indigenous peoples] such as they were, should give way – were bound to

give way – the intensive land uses associated with settlers and civilization" (Harris, 2002:46).

While it was largely recognized that Indigenous peoples had lived on these lands for generations,

conserving this space meant creating a place "where man himself is a visitor who does not

remain" (Nash, 1968:5). Symbols about nature/wilderness in Canada then are "understood as

pivotal to our national identity and ha[ve] been used to demarcate those imagined within and

outside of the nation" (Vander Kloet, 2009:235).

In the American case, Rutherford (2011) argues that what drove Americans to national

parks "was a nationalist impulse to 'see our own country'" (111). Likewise, as Denhez (1978)

explains, "few Canadians looked at the definition of 'environment' in a dictionary. Similar to

'nature' and 'wilderness', as far as the public consciousness was concerned, 'environment' was

always somewhere else" (18). For this reason, "different views of the land beyond the cities – the

resource hinterland, the wilderness, the native homeland, the bush – are currently in strong

contention on the rural scene in Canada" (Nelson, 1989:97). These areas, cordoned off from the overpopulation and pollution which demarcated industrializing Canada, were seen as a refuge. At the same time, the physical distance from these areas gives the impression of environmental conscientiousness. In the words of the Michel Dupuy who tabled the Parks Canada Agency's (1994) *Guiding Principles and Operational Policies,* "as a civilized society we have a fundamental stewardship responsibility to ensure that the record of our past, the rich diversity of wild spaces and species, the beauty and grandeur of our lands and seas, and the cultural character of our communities are not inadvertently lost over time".

Dupuy's (Parks Canada Agency, 1994) discourse about the aesthetic qualities of national parks is characteristic of the regulatory measures taken by the nation-state to preserve the ideal of the national park: "monitoring, shaping, and organizing how nature can exist and how it is perceived" (Rutherford, 2011:99). Since

> national parks acts as containers for all kinds of ideas about the nation, its character, and its nature, they are also highly regulated and disciplined spaces. Animals are supervised to maintain their health and prevent disease. Fire is suppressed, set, or monitored. People are regulated through backcountry camping permits, lists of prohibited activities, and rules about interactions with the wildlife. Vision is directed to particular sights and not others (Rutherford, 2011:99).

This quote demonstrates that narratives about conservation are frequently more concerned with consumption. With this is mind, it is important to examine what types of consumption are encouraged.

A "primitivistic idealization of a life closer to nature" (Nash, 1968:44) was only an acceptable sentiment if felt by certain populations[23]. Elite tourists (Cronon, 1995; Lawson, 1985) were allowed to enjoy these areas, and paradoxically their environmentally-unfriendly consumption was for the most part ignored. The role of the human was, aside from tourist, also maintained to be a sort of "co-worker with nature in the reconstruction of the damaged fabric which the negligence or the wantonness of former lodgers has been rendered untenantable" (Marsh, 2003:35). This discourse is still used by Parks Canada Agency today, as the organization seeks to use symbols of nature to enlist Canadians on a nationalist-conservationalist mission. Parks Canada Agency (2013a), for example, boasts of 36 projects led by their organization to "restore natural ecosystems" (1), concluding that this undertaking should "engage Canadians in these efforts" (23).

The very ideas of 'wilderness' and 'nature' are confusing in the Indigenous worldview, mainly because of a lack of separation between humans and the natural world they inhabit[24] (see, amongst others, Kipuri, 2009). This is further explored in the second section, which discusses the differences between Western and Indigenous worldviews and knowledge in this context. As Nelson (1989) explains, "[w]hat were seen by many Canadians as large, unproductive expanses of public domain, were seen by native people and their supporters as land which the people have traditionally used and occupied" (89). Indeed, as Cronon (1995) explains, the "myth of the wilderness as 'virgin,' uninhabited land had always been especially cruel when seen from the perspective of the Indians (sic) who had once called that land home" (15). Significantly, while

---

[23] Cronon (1996) refers to these populations as "elite tourists" (15). More broadly, whoever is permitted and can afford to fulfill the role of tourist in these Canadian national parks are the 'certain populations' to which I am referring.

[24] To some extent, Parks Canada Agency acknowledges this reality. An old website of theirs (Parks Canada Agency, 2008b) discusses the differences between Aboriginal and Western world views regarding "landscape" specifically, a word generally not employed by Parks Canada Agency.

the former Minister of Canadian Heritage Michel Dupuy had plenty to say about what the symbolic meaning of national parks contributed to Canadian identity, no recognition of what these lands might mean to Indigenous peoples in Canada was offered (Parks Canada Agency, 1994). This is tangible evidence that "the impacts of conservation programs favor some groups but more often dispossess others that depend most on access to and use of local natural resources" (Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, and West, 2003:17).

On the topic of space in Canada, Rutherford (2011) has questioned, "[h]ow could it be spatially white [or 'Canadian'] and Indigenous at the same time?" (101) Relatedly, Magoc (1999) has asked: "What does it mean to call a place that receives three million people a year 'virgin'?" (170) By both failing to make space for Indigenous peoples in the conceptualization of Canadian national identity, and unimaging the historic occupation of Indigenous peoples upon these lands, the nation-state acts in a symbolically violent manner (Bourdieu, 1984). Domination over Indigenous peoples is tacitly asserted in this way, whether it is the overt or conscious decision of individuals operating within the nation-state, or not. In addition, there is an element of what Rosaldo (1989) refers to as "imperialist nostalgia", which describes longing for what has been destroyed, rendering what destroyed it invisible. As Rutherford (2011) points out, "[i]n the case of nature tourism to national parks, […] the modern anxiety about the environmental crisis has produced this kind of mourning, where there is an attempt made to recapture a lost (but of course never actually existing) wilderness" (103).

Furthermore, as extensively noted by Marsh (2003), while the natural world affects humans, humans have also had a significant impact on the natural world[25]. Indeed, humans react,

---

[25] Marsh's (2003) lengthy work cites a variety of (mostly negative) human effects on the natural world, including, but not limited to: territorial decay; the transfer, modification, and extirpation of vegetation and animals; the depletion of forests; the poisoning, draining, and other negative effects on the world`s water sources; and finally, the

modify, and determine "the material structure of [their] early home" (Marsh, 2003:13). In the context of national parks and the conservation of 'nature' and 'wilderness' within them, what can be understood from this is the creation by humans of what is important. It is noted, in Marsh (2003) and elsewhere, that some species are actively protected, while others are ignored, resulting in either species domination or disappearance, whether intentionally or not. Finally, these concepts were, and continue to be, used to erase Indigenous presence and replace it with a colonial (now Canadian) one: in Ruru's (2012) words, "smothering of Indigenous place with colonial space" (86). Additionally, in recent publications, Parks Canada Agency (2011c) has been positioning their institution as a "steward of a network of national parks" (1), despite the role of steward being historically viewed as an Indigenous one[26] (Tsing, 2007).

In modern history, the natural world was viewed as a necessary conquest in the name of the nation (Nash, 1968). Contemporary nation-states still engage with this discourse, albeit arguably in a less destructive way[27]. Parks Canada Agency official discourse in documents and by representatives demonstrates the utilization of national parks as symbolic of national identity[28]. The most recent example of this is in the introductory comments of Parks Canada Agency's (2012) current corporate plan, where Peter Kent, the former Minister of the Environment and Minister responsible for Parks Canada Agency, explains his efforts to engage Canadian youth in order to "connect them to the very essence of being Canadian" (2). He further maintains that these parks "have inspired and nurtured the Canadian psyche" (2), making

---

movement of sands. All of this is within a larger framework of the climactic consequences of these human effects, and more largely, the projection of further changes to be made by humans.

[26] Granted, this role has actively been fought by certain Indigenous populations (see Tsing, 2007 for more). The intention is not to oversimplify Indigenous relations to the land, but instead to demonstrate the appropriation of this role by the nation-state.

[27] On this point, Nash (1968) makes a rather salient point: that while there was considerable Romantic enthusiasm for 'wilderness', it "never seriously challenged the aversion in the pioneer mind" (65). Thus, how we view the natural world may have changed, but our effects on it are still devastating.

[28] This was similarly done in the United States. See Nash's (1968) chapter on 'The *American* Wilderness' for more.

reference to both natural and cultural pride in Canadian heritage and more specifically, its "wild

places" (Parks Canada Agency, 2012a:3). As Lawrence (2002) argues,

> Canadian national identity is deeply rooted in the notion of Canada as a vast northern
> wilderness, the possession of which makes Canadians unique and 'pure' of character.
> Because of this, and in order for Canada to have a viable national identity, the histories of
> Indigenous nations, in all their diversity and longevity, must be erased (23).

In this way, both nation and citizens are constructed by nationalist discourses employing nature

and wilderness (Vander Kloet, 2009; see also Berger, 1966).

In the same report, Alan Latournelle, Chief Executive Officer of Parks Canada Agency,

shares in Kent's enthusiasm for the cultural events planned for the bicentennial of the War of

1812: "we will work with others who share our enthusiasm to increase awareness of the role that

our national historic sites played in the conflict that defined Canada" (3). This excerpt is

primarily problematic in that it engages with long-standing myths related to nature/wilderness

serving to build national identity. As Joyce (2006) writes, these narratives are "often fraught with

myth, and excludes the vast majority of people form its timeline" (29). Furthermore, it is

interesting to note that these details of these conflicts take up numerous paragraphs in the

introductory remarks by both officials, yet the sharing of management takes up but a sentence of

each of their concern. In addition, little is said about the conflicts which led to the establishment

of bordered nature: This is the "product of 'imperial eyes,' [where] the emptiness of these vast

landscapes perpetuates an angle of vision that overlooks the history of [I]ndigenous use as well

as the conflict, disease, and dispossession that emptied them of people" (Loo, 2006:1-2). Clearly,

"[m]ore than a response to ecological complexity, 'on-the-ground' conservation programs

comprise reactions to social complexity where decision-making is dominated by politics"

(Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, and West, 2003:10). The political preferences of the nation-

state are clear in this report. While they do reference the conflict of the War of 1812, there is no reference to the space as being a constant space of conflict between settler and Indigenous peoples, where both "invaders and invaded fought for control of land and resources" (Cronon, 1995:15).

During the European settlement in North America, people were viewed as incompatible with wilderness. Interestingly, this incompatibility included Indigenous peoples, whom the Europeans recognized as 'savages' and 'wild'. Discourse appears to have changed, as Parks Canada Agency is careful to include select sentences on the sharing of management in official documents. However, if shared management and the recently acquired rights of Indigenous peoples are to be upheld as valuable and believable, "then national parks are places that ought to symbolise transformative relationships, showcasing how respectful relations with Indigenous peoples can be created, and how colonialist ideals of space can be displaced" (Ruru, 2012:15). However, it is more customary to see the discourse surrounding these spaces as promoting a very homogenized nationalist agenda. Furthermore, and most importantly, the omission of how these lands came to and continue to be under Crown ownership is noteworthy, as Indigenous experiences are erased through a strategic nationalist-conservationist discourse.

National parks are explicitly framed by Parks Canada Agency as being representative of and contributive towards an imagined Canadian identity: "They depict a diversity of cultures and natural environments. They are national symbols, yet can be located in virtually any part of the country - urban, rural and remote. They are also tangible links not only with the past and the present but with the future" (Parks Canada Agency, 1994). The guiding principles and policies which have been determining action in national parks in Canada has yet to be updated since the early 1990s. There is a disturbing and notable lack of inclusion of Indigenous peoples and their

unique concerns in this document. Thus, while new action plans and other official documents are released by Parks Canada Agency, the very foundational principles are in need of an overhaul. Without this, a foundational nationalist agenda is apparent, where first the question of a homogenized Canadian identity is attended, and second to that, conservation is addressed, while the Indigenous peoples are absent (see Parks Canada Agency, 1994).

In conclusion to this section, "[t]he components of what we call 'nature' exist irrespective of human culture; but 'heritage' is a cultural construct – the 'things we want to keep'. Political processes determine what is accorded 'official' natural heritage status, a situation that inevitably disenfranchises some" (Kirkpatrick and Kiernan, 2007:421) (see also Lennon, 2007). It is apparent in recent Parks Canada Agency publications that the mobilization of nationalist sentiment in regards to 'nature' is primarily an effort to instill a common cultural respect for a shared Canadian heritage. Unfortunately, this comes at a great cost to Indigenous peoples in Canada, whose identities are increasingly recognized as heterogeneous, despite nation-state efforts to improve the situations of humans and the natural world. Furthermore, what emerges from the embracing of symbols about the natural world is what Cronon (1995) refers to as the central paradox:

> [W]ilderness embodies a dualistic vision in which the human is entirely outside the natural. If we allow ourselves to believe that nature, to be true, must also be wild, then our very presence in nature represents its fall. The place where we are is the place where nature is not. If this is so – if by definition wilderness leaves no place for human beings […] – then also by definition it can offer no solution to the environmental and other problems that confront us. To the extent that we celebrate wilderness as the measure with which we judge civilization, we reproduce the dualism that set humanity and nature at opposite poles. We thereby leave ourselves little hope of discovering what an ethical, sustainable, *honorable* human place in nature might actually look like (17).

As the following sections will demonstrate, it is in the interest of the nation-state to produce national park sites in order to "create nature in particular ways, but simultaneously erase the fact of its cultural production" (Rutherford, 2011:xi).

Knowledge

Around the same time that national parks were growing in popularity in the Americas, the valuing of scientific knowledge was also emerging (Nelson, 1989). For this reason, much of what is known about the protection and preservation of 'nature', 'wilderness', and the environment in and beyond national parks is founded upon and virtually inseparable from Western scientific knowledge: "Canadian parks are currently managed using a predominantly science-based management model" (Devin and Doberstein, 2004:66). The central goal of this section is to perform an "archaeology of knowledge" (Foucault, 1970; 2007a) by building upon Thomlinson and Crouch (2012) and Agrawal (1995) who discuss the friction (Tsing, 2004) between traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and Western scientific knowledge (WSK) (Callon, Lascoumes, and Barthes, 2009; Collins and Evans, 2002), and how this impacts the management of national parks. As Baviskar (2000) succinctly puts it, "the claims to superior knowledge are key to legitimizing claims to control natural resources" (115). In short, I will argue that the imposition of WSK as a dominant knowledge framework further legitimizes contemporary Crown management over national park lands.

Definitions of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) abound, and what is meant by this phrasing[29] is often contested and unclear. Ellen and Harris (2000) argues that it is important to recognize that the discourse we use is significant, because the words we use reflect the way we

---

[29] Other phrasing includes "'[I]ndigenous knowledge' (IK), '[I]ndigenous technical knowledge' (ITK), ethnoecology, 'local knowledge', 'folk knowledge', 'traditional knowledge', 'traditional environmental (or ecological) knowledge (TEK)', 'people's science' or 'rural people's knowledge'" (Ellen and Harris, 2000:2).

approach the subject. Generally, "there is arguably enough overlap between their meanings to recognize the existence of a shared inter-subjective understanding" (Ellen and Harris, 2000:2). In the context of this research paper, the following definition of TEK is adopted:

> [A] cumulative body of knowledge about the relationships living things (including people) have with each other and with their environment, that is handed down across generations through cultural transmission. TEK includes knowledge, practices, and beliefs that are more-or-less integrated with one another. It is dynamic and evolves as people build on their experiences and observations, experiment, learn from others, and adapt to changing environmental conditions over time. TEK is place-based and geographically specific, and is most often found among societies that have engaged in natural resource use in a particular place over a long time period, such as [I]ndigenous peoples (Charnley, Fischer, and Jones, 2007:15; see also Berkes, 2008).

Relatedly, TEK is oriented to understanding nature and humans as inseparable (see, amongst others, Kipuri, 2009).

Delegitimizing traditional ways of knowing and relating to the natural world is a project with colonial roots which continues to be carried out by the nation-state. As Devin and Doberstein (2004) discuss, the European colonizers who established national parks did not enter into a landscape void of people, nor of knowledge systems, but instead one that was inhabited by practitioners of traditional ecological knowledge. This second chapter examines how the nation-state imposes a dominant knowledge system in order to legitimize their management strategies in national parks. This is problematic at several levels. At the micro level, the use of WSK in the management of national parks may not be adequate enough to account for the life within these territories. At the meso level, the reluctance to validate a people's knowledge system can render the same people obsolete. Finally, at the macro level, when the powerful are in control of

knowledge, especially in such a sensitive and far-reaching situation as environmental knowledge,

what the masses know about environmental dangers is filtered and politically-motivated.

Newton (2007) maintains that "a reliance on scientific accounts may limit understanding

of the complex character of debates" (24). It is for the most part agreed upon in contemporary

sociology that "no science (social or otherwise) can be seen as a purely objective form of

knowledge" (Dickens, 1992:61). What we know about 'nature', especially the over-specialized

manner which characterizes WSK, is socially constructed, and is "formed, shared, and applied in

ways that are inherently political" (Adams and Hutton, 2007; see also Escobar, 1999; Fisher,

2000; Latour, 2004). The central problem therefore is not WSK, but how it is appropriated by the

powerful and used to advance the agendas of those who already hold dominion. The failure to

recognize other ways of knowing, including TEK, largely operates at the nation-state level

(Langdon, Prosper, and Gagnon, 2010). When TEK is recognized, it is frequently appropriated,

compartmentalized, and exploited (see Stevenson, 2004; Baviskar, 2000). When taken out of

context in such a way, TEK loses much of its meaning: "It is precisely the local embeddedness of

[TEK] which has made it successful" (Ellen and Harris, 2000:15).

This is not to suggest that the knowledge gained through WSK should be devalued; on

the contrary. WSK has been instrumental in advancing global efforts at protecting the known

remaining life forms on the planet, and at preserving the biological diversity in many of the

world's national parks. Environmental sociology, however, emphasizes that while the knowledge

acquired through the hard sciences is not to be discredited or made redundant, it is essential to

embrace new "epistemologies, concepts and perceptions" (Dickens, 1992:16). Thus, while this

section contrasts Western scientific knowledge with traditional ecological knowledge, it is

important to note that these two knowledge systems overlap. WSK and TEK are often presented

as complementary (Lejano, Tavares-Reager, and Berkes, 2013), and in the case of national parks, conservation biologists have been rosily painted as natural allies of Indigenous peoples (Redford and Stearman, 1993).

Despite that WSK is supposedly a superior form of knowledge, WSK has co-existed and even often helped to accelerate environmental damage, rather than ameliorate the situation. Holding WSK in the highest esteem has not only proven limitedly useful (Callon, Lascoumes, and Barthes, 2009), it has also significantly emptied other knowledge systems, including their ability to rectify contemporary environmental damage. While Parks Canada Agency (2013a) is quick to say that they "encourage knowledge-sharing" (7), scientific lessons are contrasted with practical ones. Furthermore, projects in national parks which are managed solely by Parks Canada Agency are normatively presented, while collaborations are explicitly presented. For example, in *Action on the Ground, Volume 3,* Parks Canada Agency (2013a) explains a variety of ways in which Parks Canada Agency has been restoring ecological integrity in national parks, using scientific conclusions. In only one instance – controlling abundant moose and deer populations in various parks - is the use of Indigenous knowledge referenced. This makes it clear which one controls the agenda, and which one acts as the occasional informant (see also King, 2008).

Nadasdy (2005) states that one of the most common complaints is "that traditional knowledge is never used as the sole basis for decision-making; instead, it is used only to confirm the knowledge produced by wildlife biologists and legitimate the decisions made by bureaucratic managers" (224). As Ellen and Harris (2000) argue, the seemingly untraversable gap between WSK and TEK is not so daunting: the discourse of WSK long ago absorbed many elements of TEK, and continues to draw upon local experiences (see also Loo, 2006). One tangible example

of this is how Parks Canada Agency (2013a) states they have recently "learned" to allow natural fires to burn, rather than suppressing them as they did for decades. This was understood by Indigenous peoples for centuries, and even used on purpose. However, no credit to the origin of this knowledge is given.

In the same way, TEK could absorb WSK, or a middle ground between the two could be conceptualized, so that neither is lost or subverted[30]. Only in a limited number of cases does Parks Canada Agency acknowledge the necessity for collaboration between knowledge systems, and that TEK and WSK can be complementary (see Parks Canada Agency, 2011b).[31] Instead, the most widespread consideration of Indigenous peoples in recent Parks Canada Agency publications is the duty to consult (Parks Canada Agency, 2006). Once again, this reinforces that TEK informs, rather than coexists equally with, WSK. When it is acknowledged that "knowledge is always bound up with tradition" (Sundar, 2000:84; see also Barnes, 1995), we can focus on something other than the dichotomy between the two ways of knowing. For example, in the case of national parks, the two forms of knowledge fundamentally value the protection of the natural world.

While WSK has undeniably only been able to comprehend and remedy environmental issues in a limited manner, TEK has long safeguarded the earth[32]. It is no coincidence that the majority of the lands sought after for supposed conservation through the establishment of a

---

[30] A central goal is to avoid the traditional subjugation of other forms of knowledge by WSK, as it has been the case (Foucault, 2007a). Rather than allowing WSK to assume a dominant role and adopt elements from other ways of knowing in order to empower its dominion, the creation of a middle ground or a Third Space (Bhabha, 2004) would allow for ways of knowing to come together and contribute to the formation of a knowledge system founded in mutual respect. The following section of this research paper discusses the use of co-management and similar agreements which attempt to bridge this divide.
[31] Similarly, few collaborations between WSK and TEK in the context of national parks are heralded as a success. There is international recognition surrounding one such agreement, the case of the Inuit partnerships in Torngat Mountains National Park (see Rowell, 2010).
[32] That being said, it is important to note, as Devin and Doberstein (2004) did, that "[n]ot all aspects of TEK are well suited to the needs of modern conservation, and some may in fact clash with park mandates" (56).

national park are those occupied by Indigenous peoples; for centuries, these lands and the plants

and animal within them were protected with care[33]. Elsewhere, this has been referred to as the

Rule of Indigenous Environments: "where there are [I]ndigenous peoples with a homeland there

are still biologically rich environments (Nietschmann, 1992:3). It is no coincidence that the

Biological 17, the most biologically diverse areas of the world, are those "inhabited by

[I]ndigenous people" (OHCHR, 2007:1). Furthermore, while the "balance between use and

protection" (Stolton, 2010:7) is fundamental to TEK, the management of national parks based in

WSK rarely takes this into consideration until years after their establishment (Stolton, 2010).

The rapid extinction of most of earth's diverse life is better understood as being

correlated to the settlement of Europeans, instead of their Indigenous antecedents[34]. Another

fundamental way that TEK contributes to WSK is in conceptualizing the relationship between

humans and the natural world. While WSK maintains a firm dichotomization between social

constructs such as 'wilderness' and 'nature' and man, other ways of knowing such as TEK view

these things in a more holistic way. Indeed, humans and the natural world are not mutually

exclusive; further, the imagination that the two are separate allows humanity to disconnect from

the environmental degradation which will undoubtedly culminate in great risk to humanity

---

[33] On this point, it is important to make a clarification to Marsh's (2003) text. Marsh (2003) mistakenly makes the claim that "purely untutored humanity" – he is referring to Indigenous peoples – "interferes comparatively little with the arrangements of nature" (39). Today, few would attempt to argue that humans of any origin have not interfered with the natural world. To correct Marsh (2003), I suggest understanding Indigenous people as interacting with the natural world, rather than interfering. For this reason, Indigenous peoples have been more successful in maintaining an embeddedness within and respect towards the natural world.

[34] Many academics set out to prove that Indigenous communities brought many populations of plants and animals to the brink of extinction (see Jackson and Johnson, 2001; and Diamond, 1986). The problem with this, Johannes (2002) raises, is that many Indigenous communities significantly depleted the natural world without necessarily bringing it to the point of extinction, and researchers often pull from an insignificant sample size (such as two marine mammals, in the case of Diamond [1986] in Johannes [2002]) to form "a general dismissal of the [...] wisdom of non-western societies" (Johannes, 2002:3). Furthermore, even if it is taken as truth that the practices of Indigenous people also contributed to rendering a small amount of landscapes barren or populations of animals extinct, "environmental problems in the pre-modern era were more localized than today" (Young, 2014:46).

(Beck, 1992). Still, "for all the imperfections of natural science, it still remains the principal method through which we 'know' nature" (Newton, 2007:21).

Because of the widespread acceptance of WSK, many people remain disturbed at the suggestions of many Indigenous peoples and advocates that "conservation [can] be done without models, management plans, or monitoring and evaluation" (Brosius, 2004:611). Maintaining that Indigenous peoples adopt wasteful, inappropriate, or delinquent management over the natural world reinforces such perceptions. As Ellen and Harris (2000) discuss, this reaction is commonplace and reflective of a colonial legacy: "The inherent ethnocentrism and elitism of late twentieth-century [WSK], therefore, has made it difficult for scientists themselves to accept that [Indigenous peoples] have any knowledge of worth, a culture of denial which has been justified by a methodological reductionism and evaluative process which systematically renders such knowledge 'unscientific'" (12). It is in consuming the aesthetic, symbolic creation of nature and wilderness in the national parks that the mass extinction and slaughter of animals which founded the Canadian nation-state can be forgotten; as Rutherford (2011) posits, "[t]o stand here is to make modernity's effect on environmental destruction seem distant and the ability to remedy it through more management seem all too possible" (x).

As much historically as today, from a scientific standpoint, tradition "was something to be overcome to be subverted rather than encouraged, its legitimacy questioned" (Ellen and Harris, 2000:11). The traditional practices of Indigenous peoples in national parks in Canada stand separate from the implementation of scientific action towards the national world in Parks Canada Agency documents. Presenting the actions of Indigenous peoples as traditional allows for them to be separated from scientifically-motivated "experts" (Parks Canada Agency, 2011b),

as well as imagined and silently accepted as illegitimate[35]. Similarly, while ecologically sustainable practices by Indigenous peoples in national parks are recognized in Parks Canada Agency (2008d), it is preceded by "cultural practices" (25), delimiting the cultural or traditional from the scientific.

Faced with the very visible aesthetic and biological degradation in national parks, Parks Canada Agency (2008d) recently published guidelines for the restoration of ecological integrity. Ecological integrity is defined in discourse common to WSK, implying a return to or preservation of "a condition that is determined to be characteristic of its natural region" (14; see also Canada National Parks Act, 2000) Interestingly, the opening discourse is as much about this as it is about preserving "opportunities for meaningful engagement and experiences that connect the public, communities, and visitors to these special places and help ensure their relevance in the future" (7). While the challenges of "incompatible land uses" (7) are recognized, it is the land use by Indigenous peoples which is put into question, while nation-state interests and the promotion of consumption in these areas is not. In fact, quite explicitly, the report explains the priorities of the committee which established both the definition of ecological restoration and ecological integrity: "protection, heritage appreciation, outdoor recreation, and tourism and the economy" (14). There are two central paradoxes within this report which make this problematic: firstly, this idea of protection without a definition; and secondly, that these priorities (especially the economy and protection, if indeed the report is referring to the protection of the natural world) are conceived as compatible.

As Sundar (2000) states, "the expression of [TEK] through the prism of certain programmes often has more to do with the aims and structures of the programme than with any

---

[35] Similarly, Indigenous peoples are often presented as "living traditions" (Rowell, 2010), positioning them as both a product of the past and situated in the present, with no spot in the future.

reservoir of local knowledge" (97). It is impossible to ignore that Parks Canada Agency has indeed included elements of TEK in their recent publications, albeit with little recognition of the struggle it took to have their way of knowing acknowledged. However, with Sundar's (2000) comment in mind, it is a plausible suggestion that the incorporation of TEK into official documents allows those who resist the dominion of WSK in national parks to be appeased. Indeed, the Parks Canada Agency (2008d) report reserves two pages in over one hundred for a limited discussion about Indigenous worldview and knowledge systems, with little about how this informs decision-making in national parks.

Similarly, Parks Canada Agency (2012a) presents a charter including mandate, role, and commitments. While the organization is committed "To celebrat[ing] the legacy of visionary Canadians whose passion and *knowledge* have inspired the character and values of our country" (2; my emphasis), their role is to serve as "partners, building on the rich *traditions* of our Aboriginal people, the strength of our diverse cultures and our commitments to the international community" (3). Thus, when Parks Canada Agency (2012a) speaks about knowledge, they refer to WSK at the foundation both of a colonial country and a neocolonial national park system; when Parks Canada Agency (2012a) speaks of Indigenous peoples, there is no mention of TEK or other ways of knowing, but instead the traditional element operating to displace and subvert their knowledge systems (see Ellen and Harris, 2000).

In summary, imposing decision-making based in knowledge obtained through WSK dismisses the legitimacy of TEK and those who practice it. Regardless of their way of knowing, most would agree that the natural world is being degraded, and that we as humans should be responsible for coming up with strategies to slow down this process. There is a fundamental divide, however, between WSK and TEK: while WSK "promotes preserving representative

portions of our world's ecosystems free of human interference" (Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, and West, 2003:13), TEK "sees sustainable use and controlled settlement ass a more equitable way of maintaining ecologically valuable landscapes" (Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, and West, 2003:13). This dichotomization is important to recognize, because as LeBlanc and LeBlanc (2010) detail in the case of national parks, how an environmental issue, and subsequently the management and protection surrounding the issue, are defined, understood, and practiced depend on the knowledge framework (see also Baviskar, 2000; and Worboys, Winkler, and Lockwood, 2006). Thus, the construction of what is legitimate knowledge serves to strengthen the nation-state (Foucault 1991;2003a in Rutherford 2011).

Power

This third section examines how the mobilization of symbols and the imposition of knowledge subsequently serve to reinforce contemporary management by the nation-state on historically Indigenous lands. The focus will be on the governing laws and policies[36] of Parks Canada Agency, which demonstrate a clear imbalance of power between the nation-state and Indigenous peoples. Power manifest in different ways, and in the context of this research paper I am looking for evidence of its expression through discourse in official texts. Indeed, while the earlier Parks Canada Agency laws and policies are foundational in establishing the viewpoint of the organization, the recent ones for the current economic period of 2012-2017 are the focus of the analysis, because, as Rutherford (2011) rightly points out, "[g]overning does not arise as a fully realized project, but is continuously in need of re-articulation and revision" (Rutherford,

---

[36] While the focus of this research paper is on the governing laws and policies of Parks Canada Agency specifically, the overarching national and international laws, as well as developed related jurisprudence, remains of utmost importance to examine (see Ruru, 2012). As Dearden and Berg (1993) maintain, looking at the relevant laws in particular demonstrates the rights (or lack thereof) gained by Indigenous people over these lands and/or their management. Indeed, while this is a sociological analysis, a legal framework is imperative, because "the power of the State is essentially represented in law" (Foucault, 2007b:155).

2011:xvi). Finally, several case studies will be highlighted in order to reinforce the central argument: this imbalance of power makes it impossible for partnerships or co-management agreements to exist.

As the first section demonstrated, "'nature' has strong political connotations" (Newton, 2007:8). What has been accepted as untouched wilderness and sites of nationalist sentiment building is actually significantly influenced by "concepts, policies, programs, and projects within and without national parks and other management areas" (Nelson, 1989:101). The Indigenous peoples who have embarked on co-management agreements are forced to employ such tools, which, as Stevenson (2004) states, "are not only foreign, but antithetical to Aboriginal values" (70). In fact, even the traditional model of conservation in national parks is exclusive of Indigenous peoples. Generally referred to as the "fortress conservation model", Brockington (2002) explains that fortress conservation is "[a]n approach that seeks to preserve wildlife and their habitat through forceful exclusion of local people who have traditionally relied on the environment in question for their livelihoods" (621). The model "i*s* based on three assumptions: 1) wilderness is 'asocial' and free from human impact and activity, 2) humans and nature are separate and humans are either uninvolved or dominant over nature, and 3) nature should be utilized by humans in whatever ways benefit them" (North Carolina State University, nd).

The fortress conservation model has in recent years been acknowledged as detrimental both to social and ecological health (see Brockington, 2002, amongst others), and as such is in contrast with more recent initiatives. In Canadian national parks, co-management arrangements have become a popular alternative to the fortress conservation model. Notzke (1995) explains that co-management:

broadly refers to the sharing of power and responsibility between government and local resource users. This is achieved by various levels of integration of local and state level management systems. In practice there is a wide spectrum of co-management arrangements, ranging from the tokenism of local participation in government research to local communities retaining substantial self-management power. Co-management regimes may be area-specific, or they may be focused on one particular species (187).

However, co-management is not without problems. While in theory the model can be perceived as quite progressive, others see it as only an emergence of new terminology, but no change in practice. Nadasdy (2005) explains that co-management is a retreat into, rather than an alternative to, centralized state management and bureaucracy. Under this organization of power, Indigenous peoples wish to participate in dictating what takes place in national park territories, they must "accept the rules and assumptions of the state management game" (225).

The nation-state very much retains power despite co-management arrangements with local Indigenous peoples. As Foucault (2007b) reminds us, society "is not a unitary body in which one power and one power only exercises itself, but in reality it is a juxtaposition, a liaising, a coordination, a hierarchy, too, of different powers which nonetheless retain their specificity" (156). Furthermore, "power also has a practice of spatial domination that is appropriate to its strategy" (Brabant, 2007:25). In this case, it is the dominion of national parks land by the Crown: "Her Majesty in right of Canada has clear title to or an unencumbered right of ownership in the lands to be included in the park" (Parks Canada Agency, 2000:3).

The mandate of Parks Canada Agency (2002; 2011b) is demonstrative of its power in deciding what is worthy of protection: "On behalf of the people of Canada, we protect and present nationally significant examples of Canada's natural and cultural heritage and foster public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment in ways that ensure their ecological and

commemorative integrity for present and future generations" (1). The process of rendering some sites worthy of the title of national significance while others are not is purposely unclear. In addition, while Parks Canada Agency (2006) has guidelines for accommodating and consulting with Indigenous peoples, it is generally after a site has been deemed significant.

A salient example is in the outline of the stages of consultation proposed by Parks Canada Agency (2006): in the first phase, 'Preparation', the first step is to "Identify the activity or decision"; "The process must information Aboriginal groups of the proposed activity or initiative and must also ensure that the Honour of the Crown is maintained at all times" (31). This is suggestive that the site has already been staked out by the nation-state for its worth, rather than originally identified in collaboration with Indigenous peoples. From an environmental conservation viewpoint, Dickens (1992) points out that "a better strategy is to start with locality and everyday experience and to develop strategies at the local level which are responsive to local social and ecological systems" (194).

Indeed, the legislative arrangements which govern Parks Canada Agency and Indigenous participation in co-management agreements constrain the extent to which management is even possible. In the *Parks Canada Agency Act* (Department of Justice Canada, 2014), it is clearly outlined that the Minister of Parks Canada Agency is primarily responsible for the "administration, management and control of parks". In an amendment to the *Act*, it is added that only in exceptional cases can local communities impact the management of national parks, which is otherwise the responsibility of Parks Canada Agency.

The purposes for the land use by Indigenous peoples are very clearly delimited. For example, in Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve, the Haida First Nation have been granted access to these lands for resource extraction and cultural activities; in Wood Buffalo National

Park, the Cree Band of Fort Chipewyan have permission to sit on an advisory board for the traditional hunting, trapping, and fishing; similarly, the Mi'kmaq, Inuit, Innu, and Labrador Métis in Gros Morne National Park and the Innu of the Ekuanitshit First Nation in Mingan Archipelago National Park Reserve are recognized as having a more active management role of the local showshoe hare population (Department of Justice Canada, 2014; Parks Canada Agency, 2009a; Parks Canada Agency, 2012b).

A limited number[37] of agreements between Parks Canada Agency and Indigenous peoples are listed in the *Parks Canada Agency Act* (Department of Justice Canada, 2014), further demonstrating how difficult it is to arrive at a legally-recognized situation of shared management. The *Act* lists these less as a recognition of the decision-making authority of Indigenous peoples, and more as a reminder that Parks Canada Agency has the authority to "make regulations respecting the exercise of traditional renewable resource harvesting activities" (Department of Justice Canada, 2014) in these listed areas. In addition to this, there are a several ethnographic studies (Nadasdy, 2005; Sadler, 1989; Stevenson, 2004) which demonstrate how unsatisfactory the sharing of management is in these spaces. Since such arrangements vary from relatively little participation to full management, there is substantial ambiguity. Nadasdy (2005), for example, discusses how the input of Indigenous peoples is frequently sought when there is a problem, such as in the case of the declining sheep population in Kluane National Park Reserve, when the Champagne, Aishihik, and Kluane First Nations were consulted. This type of consulting operates under the assumption that the Indigenous peoples are complacent or in

---

[37] In the *Canada National Parks Act* (Department of Justice Canada, 2014)*,* only agreements made for three national parks are specifically mentioned, but omitted are the names of the specific Indigenous peoples with whom the agreement with Parks Canada Agency were made. In addition, only three Indigenous group are specifically referenced in the *Act*, the Haida and the Cree (the context of which is explained above), and the Inuit, in the context of the rights they obtained through the *Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement Act* (Department of Justice Canada, 2005).

agreement with the current national jurisdiction over wildlife; re-thinking ownership over these spaces is not encouraged, and does not qualify as an "acceptable solution to the technical problem" (Nadasdy, 2005:222) of wildlife management.

The exertion of nation-state control over these lands is further made clear in the following statement by Parks Canada Agency (2012a): "Parks Canada manages national parks, national historic sites and national marine conservation areas on behalf of Canadians. Parks Canada is a proud steward of these heritage places and protects and presents them for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of Canadians" (5). A few things are noteworthy about the preceding statement. Firstly, the organization presents themselves as managers of national parks, despite their claims of co-management agreements and consultations with Aboriginal peoples. Secondly, that the Agency is meant to take into consideration the needs of Canadians, while it is ambiguous if Aboriginal peoples fit into their understanding of what it means to be Canadian. Finally, once again the appropriation of the title and duties of environmental steward is noticeable, which was generally associated with Indigenous peoples (Tsing, 2007).

While Parks Canada Agency (2008d; 2011c; 2012; 2013) frequently states that they practice co-management with local Indigenous communities, only two of over forty national parks in Canada are true models of best practices in co-management, where both nation-state and Aboriginal groups have demonstrated equitable decision-making over the years. Reports and studies on Ivvavik National Park (Notzke, 1995; Parks Canada Agency, 2007; Rennicke, 1994; Slocombe, 1993) and Torngat Mountains National Park (Dearden and Dempsey, 2004; LeBlanc and LeBlanc, 2010; Lemelin and Maher, 2009; Notzke, 1995; Parks Canada Agency, 2010)

consistently show positive outcomes for both Indigenous peoples and the nation-state because of the sharing of decision-making powers in national parks.

There is a substantial body of scholarship on what the ideal co-management agreement should look like. The idea of adaptive co-management (Armitage, Berkes, and Doubleday, 2007) is perhaps the most contemporary and accepted notion, which combines different facets of the co-management literature, emphasizing co-management as: power-sharing (Borrini-Feyerabend, Pimbert, Farvar, Kothari, and Renard, 2004); institution-building (Pomeroy and Berkes, 1997); trust building (Kendrick, 2003; Singleton, 1998); a process (Calsson and Berkes, 2005); social learning (Pahl-Wostl and Hare, 2004); problem-solving (Olsson, Folke, and Berkes, 2004); and governance (McCay and Jentoft, 1996; Folke, Hahn, Olsson, and Norberg, 2005). Undeniably, "differences in cultural values and institutional practices have given and may give rise to divergent views on approaches to achieving desired planning or management outcomes" (Canada Parks Council, 2011a:4). However, what occurs more often than not is a monopoly over decision-making by the nation-state, with Indigenous communities only consulted when the threat of legal action against the nation-state is greater than the benefit gained by the nation-state. Indeed, arrangements between Parks Canada Agency and Indigenous communities are more consultative, without the relinquishing or sharing of any power.

An overview of case studies (Canada Parks Council, 2011a) where Parks Canada Agency has cooperated with Indigenous communities demonstrates that Indigenous communities are invited to contribute in fragmented ways, and rarely in leadership roles capable of countering nation-state interests. Where there is more cooperation is "attributed to the legacy of land claim agreements that have, in several of the parks, formed a cooperative foundation upon which formal and informal relations have developed between the managing government agency and the

aboriginal people in the area where the park is located" (Halpenny, Bowman, Aubrey, and

Eagles, 2004:3). Regardless, it is clear that "not all subjectivities are available to all"

(Rutherford, 2011:xvi). As King (2008) argues, Canadian national park officials end up

determining how the territory will be managed in the majority of cases; meanwhile, those who

are perhaps most vested in these lands are relegated to the arena of consultants and contractors.

Martin (2006) analyzes the co-operative model of management in Wapusk National Park,

heralded as an internationally-recognized model of collaboration between nation-state and

Indigenous peoples. However, Martin (2006) finds that the project is not producing the expected

outcomes of increased participation and satisfaction of local Indigenous peoples, largely because

> Parks Canada's modus operandi, a national institution, reflects the state of relations
> between First Nations and the larger Canadian society. In order words, the inability of
> Parks Canada to fully share decision-making powers with the Aboriginals and integrate
> their traditional knowledge reflects the ambiguous attitude of Canadians towards its First
> Nations peoples (139).

Indeed, the capacity to share or transfer power is limited, explaining why Parks Canada Agency

prefers to use "collaborative management" instead of "co-management" (Parks Canada Agency,

2000). The terminology has been institutionalized (Nadasdy, 2005), and as Martin (2006) rightly

points out, this discourse "reflects a legal incapacity to transfer power to a third party" (147).

Counter to the popular proposition that co-management is a form of empowerment (see

Notzke, 1995, amongst others), it is important to note the amount of time and effort required by

co-management boards; while the nation-state may have the necessary resources, "[t]here is

some justifiable fear among First Nation people that co-management processes of this sort might

be preventing rather than fostering meaningful change by ensnaring participants in a tangle of

bureaucracy and endless meetings" (Nadasdy, 2005:224). Contrary to empowerment, this instead

allows for Indigenous peoples to be dominated, managed, and silenced. While this may not be the conscious intentions of nation-state actors, the negative effects are hard to ignore. What is produced is international recognition for agreements that are hardly reflective of tangible change: the image of the agreeable Canadian making unified decisions about caring for nature.

In summary, in Canadian national parks, co-management agreements have proven limitedly useful in balancing decision-making powers. As demonstrated above, this is largely because of the symbolic and knowledge commitments of the nation-state. A fundamental problem with co-management is its establishment by the nation-state; without acknowledging that institutions continue to impose colonial conditions upon Indigenous peoples in different ways, such agreements are symbolically violent (Bourdieu, 1984), the theoretical value idealized over the practice.

Discussion

This research paper has made four inter-related arguments: that the nation-state mobilizes symbols about nature, wilderness, and environment in order to amass nationalist sentiment in regards to national parks; that the nation-state has imposed a dominant knowledge system in order to legitimize management strategies in national parks; that this mobilization of symbols and imposition of knowledge subsequently reinforces contemporary management by the nation-state on historically Indigenous lands; and finally, that the framing of the conservationist narrative in nationalist terms further erases historic and contemporary appropriations of Indigenous territories. The intention of the concluding remarks which follow is to summarize the conclusions reached above, and suggest some areas where change is necessary if the goal is to make these spaces more inclusive and respectful of Canada's Indigenous peoples.

Symbols

Perhaps most challenging to change is the national consciousness regarding nature and wilderness, which has developed over time, largely facilitated by discourse. As Dickens (1992) explains, "equally important [is changing] the relationships and structures which created this consciousness in the first place and which could become the means by which a new consciousness develops" (Dickens, 1992:193). What is problematic about the nationalization of symbols about nature/wilderness is the way these narratives "have been infused with a strain of racial purity" (Gilbert, 2008; see also O'Brian and White, 2007). National parks need not mobilize symbols about empty nature/wilderness; promoting inclusion of Canada's Indigenous peoples is equally worthy of recognition and celebration, and would be reflective of a national identity in ways more deserving of citizen pride. As Ruru (2012) explains, national parks "can be symbols of the journey of coming to grips with our colonial past, recasting stories, and attempting to move forward together in respectful relationships. National parks have the power to shape our national identity so long as we accept and celebrate the cultural layering" (51). There is thus the opportunity to use the land to draw "a valuable connection between all disparate members of Canadian society" (Joyce, 2006:29), making possible "a much more inclusive re-imaging of this myth, in which we draw national identity from the land in all the variety of its meanings and uses" (Joyce, 2006:29).

Knowledge

The hierarchical way that Western scientific knowledge has been allowed to dictate contemporary responses to environmental issues has almost completely silenced alternative ways of knowing, including Traditional Ecological Knowledge. The acknowledgement of relevant forms of knowledge must be recognized in practice, rather than solely in theory. This would not

only remedy some collateral damage of colonialism, it may also better align the actions of the

Canadian nation-state with its image. As Evans (2005) explains,

> we are currently engaged in a way of life that works at odds against the fundamental unit
>
> of our Canadian identity, and the outcomes of these actions have begun to show
>
> themselves, not just within Canada, but on an international stage across the globe. […]
>
> "If Canadians continue to forsake our role as environmental stewards, we risk destroying
>
> not just our international ecological image, but also an essential element of our collective
>
> Canadian identity: the land we live upon, the air we breathe; our proud cities and the wild
>
> spaces in between (1-2).

Richard (2012) makes a similar point, maintaining that there are contradictions in Canadian

identity because of the fact that nature/wilderness is part of Canadian identity, but the actions of

Canadians do not reflect the valuation of nature/wilderness.

Power

There is a well-developed body of literature on models and best practices of shared

management of protected areas. However, as discussed above, research on co-management

agreements in Canada demonstrate how infrequently such negotiations satisfy the intentions of

all involved parties. Before the sharing of decision-making can be effective, the nation-state

needs to arrive at a post-colonial land policy (Harris, 2002), one which would constitutionally

recognize the historic occupants of territories now under the control of the Crown. As Martin

(2006) elaborates, the "joint management of a national park would mean that Parks Canada

would have overlapping jurisdictional interests and decision-making capabilities with another

party" (147). What is important is not changing the official discourse, but instead finding alternatives to how decisions are legitimized (Nadasdy, 2005).

Conclusion

Historically, the Canadian nation-state relied on nature/wilderness in its construction of national identity. As Richard (2012) explains,

> Canada is a clear example of the constructedness of nations. Canada's difficulty in constructing a sense of identity was also difficult because its 'problematic occupation of the country (Hjartarson, 2006:208). Creating an identity surrounding the natural world, then, becomes simpler as it did not need to address issues of colonization and plurality (6).

In addition, because of the more recent diversification of Canada's population, it is in the interest of the nation-state to continue mobilizing nationalist sentiment using pre-existing symbols. Angus (1997) describes how since the 20th century, the Canadian nation-state has socially constructed a popular "discourse whose main political intervention was oriented around the term 'identity'" (3). This encouraged nation-state imposition of protective measures, including the maintenance of borders separating peopled settlements from unpopulated spaces of nature/wilderness (Angus, 1997).

In the same way that we render species other than humans "Other" when they enter into "our" places (see Loo, 2006), Indigenous peoples have been rendered the "Other" because of the re-imagining of their historic spaces. "Places are important because they are both physical locations as well as locations with meanings attributed to them by a person or a group of people" (Joyce, 2006:29): national parks give Canadians a place in the same spaces that Indigenous peoples once called their place. As Mohanram (1999) explains, "imagining the nation is also about the strategic inclusion and exclusion of specific bodies" (in Vander Kloet, 233). As this

research paper has demonstrated, this project is led by the nation-state, and involves numerous steps: the social construction of "nature" and "wilderness", their value to Canadian identity, and subsequently the need to protect these spaces, which are free of human occupancy; the wielding of Western scientific knowledge to support these claims about the appropriate use of space; and finally, the management of such spaces by the nation-state.

The goal of this research paper was to investigate how the nation-state has used the idea of the national park to instill in Canadians a relative sense of identity, using symbols, knowledge, and power. To support this argument, I borrowed from the theoretical camps of social constructionism and post-colonial theory. I performed exploratory qualitative research and adopted documentary analysis of contemporary Parks Canada Agency publications which govern the use of space in Canada's national parks. I found evidence to support the argument that the use of national park land is for nationalism-building, rather than conservation purposes. Since Indigenous peoples in Canada are particularly affected by the nation-state's use of these territories, I gave particular attention to understanding how the nation-state's use of symbols, knowledge, and power delegitimizes the use, management, and ownership of these lands by Indigenous peoples.

This process serves to erase the historic occupation of these lands by Indigenous peoples, either homogenizing them into the Canadian whole, or rendering them irrelevant to the imagined conception of what it means to be Canadian. In this way, Indigenous space is erased to make room for Canadian place. Conceiving of nature/wilderness as a national space "further undermine[s] Indigenous people[s'] claims to and use of land" (Vander Kloet, 2009:234). It is important to acknowledge this process as a colonizing one which has a significant negative effect on Canada's Indigenous peoples: their presence is unimagined and erased, their knowledge is

discredited, and their efforts to manage the lands (when granted) are subverted. As Atkinson (2003) discusses, the "primary purpose of the national park movement since 1885 has been to ensure that beautiful regions remain Crown property in perpetuity" (235). Contemporary efforts to mobilize nationalist sentiment towards national parks are a reflection of the nation-state's desire to retain their claim to these territories.

Bibliography

Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada. (2013). *Negotiation news.* Retrieved on 13 December 2013 from [http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100030322/1100100030323].

Adam, B. (1990). *Time and social theory.* Cambridge: Polity Press. 192p.

Adams, W. M., and Hutton, J. (2007). People, parks and poverty: Political ecology and biodiversity conservation. *Conservation and society 5* (2), pp. 147-183.

Agrawal, A. (1995). Dismantling the divide between Indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and change 26*, pp. 413-439.

Ahluwalia, P. (2001). *Politics and post-colonial theory: African inflections.* London: Routledge. 164p.

Alcadipani, R., Khan, F. R., Gantman, E., Nkomo, S., and Islam, G. (2012). Can the subaltern eat? Anthropophagic culture as a Brazilian lens on post-colonial theory. *Organization 19* (2), pp. 159-180.

Anderson, B. R. O'G. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso Books. 160p.

Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education.* New York: Palgrove Macmillan. 304p.

Angus, I. (1997). *A border within: National identity, cultural plurality, and wilderness.* Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press. 257p.

Armitage, D., Berkes, F., and Doubleday, N. (2007). *Adaptive co-management: Collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. 360p.

Ashcroft, B. (2009). Beyond the nation: Post-colonial hope. *Journal of the European association of studies on Australia 1*, pp. 12-22. Retrieved on 12 December 2013 from [http://www.ub.edu/dpfilsa/jeasa1aashcroft.pdf].

Atkinson, K. (2003). Wilderness and the Canadian mind. *British journal of Canadian studies 16* (2), pp. 228-242.

Barnes, B. (1995). *The elements of social theory.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. 272p.

Baviskar, A. (2000). Claims to knowledge, claims to control: Environmental conflict in the great Himalayan national park, India. In R. Ellen, P. Parkes, and A. Bicker (Eds.), *Indigenous environmental knowledges and its transformations: Critical anthropological perspectives*, pp. 110-119. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers. 360p.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity.* New York: Sage Publications. 272p.

Bell, C., and Asch, M. (1997). Challenging assumptions: The impact of precedent in Aboriginal rights litigation. In M. Asch (Ed.), *Aboriginal and treaty rights in Canada: Essays on law, equality, and respect for difference*, pp. 38-74. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. 300p.

Bella, L. (1986). The politics of preservation: Creating national parks in Canada, and in the United States, England and Wales. *Planning perspectives 1*, pp. 189-206.

Bella, L. (1987). *Parks for profit.* Montreal: Harvest House. 260p.

Berger, C. (1966). The true north strong and free. In P. Russell (Ed.), *Nationalism in Canada*, pp. 3-26. Toronto: McGraw-Hill. 377p.

Berkes, F. (2008). *Sacred ecology: Traditional ecological knowledge and resource management.* Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis. 336p.

Berkes, F. (2004). Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation biology 18* (3), pp. 621-630.

Bhabha, H. K. (2004). *The location of culture, 2nd edition.* New York: Routledge. 440p.

Binnema, T., and Niemi, M. (2006). 'Let the line be drawn now': Wilderness, conservation, and the exclusion of Aboriginal people from Banff National Park in Canada. *Environmental history 11*, pp. 724-750.

Bivins, R. (2012). Coming 'home' to (post)colonial medicine: Treating tropical bodies in post-war Britain. *Social history of medicine 26* (1), pp. 1-20.

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Pimbert, M., Farvar, M. T., Kothari, A., and Renard, Y. (2004). *Sharing power: Learning-by-doing in co-management of natural resources throughout the world.* Teheran: Cenesta. 496p. Retrieved on 15 February 2014 from [http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/sharing_power.pdf].

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste.* Cambridge: Harvard University. 640p.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal 9* (2), pp. 27-40.

Brabant, J-M. (2007). Response to Foucault in Hérodote no. 6, 2 trimester 1977, 12-14. In J. W. Crampton and S. Elden (Eds.), *Space, knowledge and power: Foucault and geography*, pp. 25-28. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company. 377p.

Brechin, S. R., Wilshusen, P. R., Fortwangler, C. L., and West, P. C. (2003). *Contested nature: Promoting international biodiversity with social justice in the twenty-first century*. Albany: State University of New York Press. 321p.

Brockington, D. (2002). Fortress conservation: The preservation of the Mkomazi game reserve, Tanzania. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 196p.

Brockington, D., and Igoe, J. (2006). Eviction for conservation: A global overview. *Conservation and society 4* (3), pp. 424-470.

Brosius, J. P. (2004). Indigenous peoples and protected areas at the World Parks Congress. *Conservation biology 18* (3), pp. 609-612.

Browne, A. J., Smye, V. L., Varcoe, C. (2005). The relevance of postcolonial theoretical perspectives to Aboriginal health. *The Canadian journal of nursing research 37* (4), pp. 16-37.

Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* London: Routledge. 280p.

Callon, M., Lascoumes, P., and Barthes, Y. (2009). *Acting in an uncertain world: An essay on technical democracy.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press. 283p.

Catlin, G. (1842). *Letters and notes on the manners and customs of the North American Indians. Volume 1.* London: Wiley and Putnam. 264p.

Cardinal, N. (2008). The question of Aboriginal harvesting in Canada's national parks. *Le panoptique*, September 2008. Retrieved on 10 November 2013 from [http://www.lepanoptique.com/sections/environnement/the-question-of-aboriginal-harvesting-in-canada%E2%80%99s-national-parks/].

Cave, J. (2005). Conceptualising 'otherness' as a management framework for tourism enterprise. In C. Ryan and M. Aicken (Eds.), *Indigenous tourism: The commodification and management of culture*, pp. 261-280. London: Elsevier. 319p.

Césaire, A. (1955). *Discours sur le colonialisme.* Paris : Éditions présence africaine. 41p.

Chandra, U. (n.d.). *The case for a postcolonial approach to the study of politics.* Yale University. 19p. Retrieved on 10 December 2013 from [https://www.academia.edu/2364123/The_Case_for_a_Postcolonial_Approach_to_the_Study_of_Politics].

Collins, H., and Evans, R. (2002). The third wave of science studies: Studies of expertise and experience. *Social studies of science 32* (2), pp. 235-296.

Connor, W. (1978). A nation is a nation, is a state, is an ethnic group is a… *Ethnic and racial studies 1* (4), pp. 377-400.

Cronon, W. (1983). *Changes in the land: Indians, colonists, and the ecology of New England.* New York: Hill and Wang. 241p.

Cronon, W. (1995). The trouble with wilderness; Or, getting back to the wrong nature. *Environmental history 1* (1), pp. 7-28.

Culhane, D. (1998). *The pleasure of the Crown: Anthropology, law and First Nations.* Vancouver: Talonbooks. 416p.

Darier, E. (1999). Foucault and the environment: An introduction. In E. Darier (Ed.) *Discourses of the environment*, pp. 1-34. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Dearden, P., and Berg, L. D. (1993). Canada's national parks: A model of administrative penetration. In *Canadian geographer 37* (3), pp. 194-211.

Dearden, P., and Dempsey, J. (2004). Protected areas in Canada: Decade of change. *The Canadian geographer 48* (2), pp. 225-239.

Denhez, M. (1978). *Heritage fights back: Legal, financial and promotional aspects of Canada's efforts to save its architectural and historic sites.* Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside. 286p.

Department of Justice Canada. (2005). *Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement Act.* Retrieved on 10 April 2014 from [http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/L-4.3/].

Department of Justice Canada. (2014). *The Parks Canada Agency Act.* Retrieved on 27 March 2014 from [http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-14.01/].

Devin, S., and Doberstein, B. (2004). Traditional ecological knowledge in parks management: A Canadian perspective. *Environments 32* (1), pp. 47-69.

Diamond, J. M. (1986). Archaeology: The environmentalist myth. *Nature 324* (6092), p. 19.

Dickens, P. (1992). *Society and nature: Towards a green social theory.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 203p.

Dickens, P. (2004). *Society and nature: Changing our environment, changing ourselves*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 286p.

Dilsaver, L. M., and Wyckoff, W. (2005). The political geography of national parks. *Pacific historical review 74* (2), p. 237-266.

Diekmann, A., and Hannam, K. (2012). Touristic mobilities in India's slum spaces. *Annals of tourism research 39* (3), pp. 1315-1336.

Dowie, M. (2009). *Conservation refugees: The hundred-year conflict between global conservation and native peoples.* Cambridge: MIT Press. 341p.

Dryzek, J. S. (2005). Making sense of earth's politics: A discourse approach. In J. Dryzek (Ed.), *The politics of the earth: Environmental discourses,* pp. 3-23. New York: Oxford University Press. 256p.

Dudley, N. (2008). *Guidelines for applying protected area management categories.* IUCN: Gland. 106p. Retrieved on 10 February 2014 from [http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/paps-016.pdf].

Dunlap, R., and Catton, W. (1979). Environmental sociology. *Annual review of sociology 5*, pp. 243-273.

Dunlap, T. R. (2012). Beyond the parks, beyond the borders: Some of the places to take Tyrrell's perspective. *Journal of American studies 46*, pp. 31-36.

Elias, B., Mignone, J., Hall, M., Hong, S. P., Hart, L., Sareen, J. (2012). Trauma and suicide behaviour histories among a Canadian indigenous population: An empirical exploration of the potential role of Canada's residential school system. *Social science and medicine 74* (10), pp. 1560-1569.

Ellen, R., and Harris, H. (2000). Introduction. In R. Ellen, P. Parkes, and A. Bicker (Eds.), *Indigenous environmental knowledge and its transformations: Critical anthropological perspectives,* pp. 1-34. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers. 356p.

Escobar, A. (1999). After nature: Steps to an antiessentialist political ecology. *Current anthropology 40*, pp. 1-30.

Evans, C. (2005). What is Canada's environmental identity? *International institute for sustainable development commentary*. 2p.

Fanon, F. (1952). *Peau noire, masques blancs.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil. 222p.

Fanon, F. (1961). *Les damnés de la terre.* New York : Grove Press. 251p.

Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., and Norberg, J. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual review of environment and resources 30*, pp. 441-473.

Fortin, M.-J., and Gagnon, C. (1999). An assessment of social impacts of national parks on communities in Quebec, Canada. *Environmental conservation 26* (3), pp. 200-211.

Fortwangler, C. L. (2003). The winding road: Incorporating social justice and human rights into protected area policies. In S. R. Brechin, P. R. Wilshusen, C. L. Fortwangler, and P. C. West (Eds.), *Contested nature: Promoting international biodiversity with social justice in the twenty-first century*, pp. 25-40. Albany: State University of New York Press. 321p.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences.* New York: Pantheon Books. 416p.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977.* Brighton: Harvester. 288p.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality,* pp. 87-104. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf. 318p.

Foucault, M. (2007a). Questions on geography. In J. W. Crampton and S. Elden (Eds.), *Space, knowledge and power: Foucault and geography*, pp. 173-183. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company. 377p.

Foucault, M. (2007b). The meshes of power. In J. W. Crampton and S. Elden (Eds.), *Space, knowledge and power: Foucault and geography*, pp. 153-162. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company. 377p.

Frideres, J. S. (2011). *First Nations in the twenty-first century.* Ontario: Oxford University Press. 272p.

Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 192p.

Germic, S. A. (2001). *American green: Class, crisis, and the deployment of nature in Central Park, Yosemite, and Yellowstone.* Lanham: Lexington Books. 160p.

Gilbert, E. (2008). Beyond survival? Wilderness and Canadian national identity in the twenty-first century. *British journal of Canadian studies 21* (1), pp. 63-88.

Gosden, C. (2004) *Archaeology and colonialism: Cultural contact from 5000 BC to the present.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 186p.

Graham, B., Ashworth, G. J., and Tunbridge, J. E. (2000). *A geography of heritage: Power, culture, and economy.* New York: Hodder Arnold. 284p.

Gross, A. C., Poor, J., Sipos, Z., and Solymossy, E. (2009). The multiple mandates of national park systems. *Place branding and public diplomacy 5* (4), pp. 276-289.

Grundmann, R., and Stehr, N. (2003). Social control and knowledge in democratic societies. *Science and public policy 30* (3), pp. 183-188.

Hacking, I. (2000). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 272p.

Halpenny, E., Bowman, M. E., Aubrey, D., and Eagles, P. F. J. (2004). *Cooperative management in national parks*. Retrieved on 10 November 2013 from [http://www.ahs.uwaterloo.ca/~eagles/documents/Halpenny_et_al_2004_000.pdf].

Hannigan, J. (1995). *Environmental sociology: A social constructionist perspective.* New York: Routledge. 208p.

Hannigan, J. (2006). *Environmental sociology, 2nd edition.* New York: Routledge. 208p.

Harris, C. (2002). *Making native space: Colonialism, resistance, and reserves in British Columbia.* Vancouver: Vancouver University Press. 415p.

Harris, C. (2004). How did colonialism dispossess? Comments from an edge of empire. *Annals of the association of American geographers 94* (1), pp. 165-182.

Héritier, S. (2011). Parcs nationaux et populations locales dans l'ouest canadien : De l'exclusion à la participation. *Le géographie canadien 55* (2), pp. 158-179.

Hjartarson, P. (2006). 'Virgin land': The settler-invader subject, and cultural nationalism. In L. Dowler, J. Carubia, and B. Szczygiel (Eds.), *Gender and landscape: Renegotiating morality and space*, pp. 2-3-220. New York: Routledge. 292p.

International Labour Organization. (1989). *ILO 169.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C169].

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). (1971). *United Nations list of national parks and equivalent reserves.* Brussels: Hayes. 601p.

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). (1994). *1993 United Nations list of national parks and protected areas.* Gland: IUCN.

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). (2014). *What is IUCN?: About us.* Retrieved on 16 April 2014 from [http://www.iucn.org/about/].

Johannes, R.E. (2002). Did indigenous conservation ethics exist? *SPC traditional marine resource management and knowledge information bulletin 14* (1), pp. 3-7.

Johnson, J. T., Cant, G., Howitt, R., and Peters, E. (2007). Creating anti-colonial geographies: Embracing indigenous peoples' knowledges and rights. *Geographical research 45* (2), pp. 117-120.

Joyce, K. (2006). Finding Canada outside: Building national identity through place-based outdoor education. *Pathways: The Ontario journal of outdoor education,* pp. 29-31.

Kendrick, A. (2003). Caribou co-management in northern Canada: Fostering multiple ways of knowing. In F. Berks, J. Colding, and C. Folke (Eds.), *Navigating social-ecological systems: Building resilience for complexity and change*, pp. 241-267. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 416p.

King, M. A. (2008). Co-management or contracting? Agreements between Native American tribes and the U.S. national park service pursuant to the 1994 tribal self-governance act. In *Harvard environmental law review 31*, pp. 475-530.

Kipuri, N. (2009). Culture. In *State of the world's Indigenous peoples*. New York: United Nations. 250p.

Kirkpatrick, J., and Kiernan, K. (2007). Natural heritage management. In M. Lockwood, G. L. Worboys, and A. Kothari (Eds.), *Managing protected areas: A global guide*, pp. 421-447. London: Earthscan. 802p.

Kopas, P. S. (2007). *Taking the air: Ideas and change in Canada's national parks.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. 230p.

Krebs, A. T. (2013). *Producing the whitestream: Micropolitics and the persistence of colonialism in Canada.* PhD dissertation for the School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa. 341p.

Kumar, M. P. (2011). Postcolonialism: Interdisciplinary or interdiscursive? *Third world quarterly 32* (4), pp. 653-672.

Langdon, S., Prosper, R., and Gagnon, N. (2010). Two paths one direction: Parks Canada and Aboriginal peoples working together. *The George Wright forum 27* (2), pp. 222-233. Retrieved on 19 November 2013 from [http://www.georgewright.org/272langdon.pdf].

Latour, B. (1999). For David Bloor… and beyond: A reply to David Bloor's 'Anti-Latour'. *Studies in history and philosophy of science 30* (1), pp. 113-129.

Latour, B. (2004). *Politiques de la nature : Comment faire entrer les sciences en démocratie.* Paris : La Découverte. 382p.

Lawrence, B. (2002). Rewriting histories of the land: Colonization and indigenous resistance in Eastern Canada. In S. H. Razack (Ed.), *Race, space and the law: Unmapping a white settler society*, pp. 21-46. Toronto: Between the Lines. 320p.

Lawson, N. (1985). Where whitemen come to play: National parks and native people in the Canadian north. *Cultural survival quarterly 9* (1), pp. 54-56.

LeBlanc, J. M.-A., and LeBlanc, V. (2010). National parks and indigenous land management: Reshaping tourism in Africa, Australia, and Canada. *Ethnologies 32* (2), pp. 23-57.

LeFebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space.* Oxford: Blackwell. 454p.

Legg, S. (2007). Beyond the European province: Foucault and postcolonialism. In J. W. Crampton and S. Elden (Eds.), *Space, knowledge and power: Foucault and geography*, pp. 265-290. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company. 377p.

Lejano, R. P., Tavares-Reager, J., and Berkes, F. (2013). Climate and narrative: Environmental knowledge in everyday life. *Environmental science and policy 31*, pp. 61-70.

Lemelin, H., and Maher, P. (2009). Nanuk of the Torngats: Human-polar bear interactions in the Torngat mountains national park, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada. *Human dimensions of wildlife 14* (2), pp. 152-155.

Lennon, J. (2007). Cultural heritage management. In M. Lockwood, G. L. Worboys, and A. Kothari (Eds.), *Managing protected areas: A global guide*, pp. 448-496. London: Earthscan. 802p.

Lewis, E. (2008). Race, power, multipositionality. *Interventions 10* (3), pp. 340-358.

Liberatoire, A. (1995). The social construction of environmental problems. *Environmental policy in an international context 1* (1), pp. 59-83.

Lockwood, M., Worboys, G. L., and Kothari, A. (2006). *Managing protected areas: A global guide.* London: Earthscan. 802p.

Lödén, H. (2010). National identity, inclusion and exclusion. An empirical investigation. *Sens public, revue internationale,* pp. 1-19. Retrieved on 4 January 2014 from [http://sens-public.org/IMG/pdf/SensPublic_HLoden_Cultural_diversity_Multilinguism_and_Ethnic_minorities_in_Sweden.pdf].

Loo, T. M. (2006). *States of nature: Conserving Canada's wildlife in the twentieth century.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. 280p.

Lothian, W. F. (1977). *Histoire des parcs nationaux du Canada. Volume 1.* Ottawa : Parcs Canada. 129p.

MacKay, F., and Caruso, E. (2004). Indigenous lands or national parks? *Cultural survival quarterly 28* (1) pp.14-43. Retrieved on 11 November 2013 from

[http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/css501/images/Readings/css501Cultural%20Survival.pdf].

Magoc, C. J. (1999). *Yellowstone: The creation and selling of an American landscape, 1870-1903.* Albuqerque: University of New Mexico Press. 266p.

Manathung, C. (2011). Moments of transculturation and assimilation: Post-colonial explorations of supervision and culture. *Innovations in education and teaching international 48* (4), pp. 367-376

Marsh, G. P. (2003). *Man and nature.* Seattle: University of Washington Press. 472p.

Martin, T. (2006). Co-management of a national park: The Wapusk national park's experience. *Canadian studies 61*, pp. 139-147.

Marx, A. W. (1998). *Making race and nation: A comparison of the United States, South Africa, and Brazil.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 353p.

Mazur, L. A. (1994). Beyond the numbers: A reader on population, consumption, and the environment. Washington: Island Press. 444p.

McCay, B. J., and Jentoft, S. (1996). From the bottom up: Issues in fisheries management. *Society and natural resources 9*, pp. 237-250.

Meethan, K., Anderson, A., and Miles, S. (2006). Tourism consumption and representation: Narratives of place and self. Wallingford: CABI. 304p.

Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized.* Boston: Beacon Press. 208p.

Mohanram, R. (1999). *Black body: Women, colonialism, and space.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 270p.

Nadasdy, P. (2003). *Hunters and bureaucrats: Power, knowledge, and Aboriginal-state relations in the southwest Yukon.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. 328p.

Nadasdy, P. (2005). The anti-politics of TEK: The institutionalization of co-management discourse and practice. *Anthropologica 47* (2), pp. 215-232.

Nash, R. (1968). *Wilderness and the American mind.* New Haven: Yale University Press. 256p.

Nelson, A., MacDonald, D., and Abbott, R. (2012). A risky business? Health and physical activity from the perspectives of urban Australian Indigenous young people. *Health, risk and society 14* (4), pp. 325-340.

Nelson, J. G. (1989). Wilderness in Canada: Past, present, future. *Natural resources journal 29* (1), pp. 83-102.

Newton, T. (2007). *Nature and sociology.* London: Routledge. 212p.

Nietschmann, B. Q. (1992). *The interdependence of biological and cultural diversity.* Occasional Paper Number 21. Kenmore: Centre for World Indigenous Studies.

Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism: Philosophy and ideology for de-colonization and development with particular reference to the African revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press. 122p.

North Carolina State University. (nd). *Impacts of nature reserves on local people and cultures.* Retrieved on 4 January 2014 from [http://www4.ncsu.edu/~cjanders/#fortressconservation].

Notzke, G. (1995). A new perspective in Aboriginal natural resource management: Co-management. *Geoforum 26* (2), pp. 187-209.

O'Brian, J., and White, P. (2007). *Beyond wilderness: The group of seven, Canadian identity, and contemporary art.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. 400p.

Ochonu, M. (2011). Masculine anxieties, cultural politics, and debates over independent womanhood among Idoma male migrants in late colonial northern Nigeria. *Interventions 13* (2), pp. 278-298.

Odern, M. E. (2008). Subaltern immigrants. *Interventions 10* (3), pp. 359-380.

Olsson, O., Folke, C., and Berkes, F. (2004). Adaptive co-management for building resilience in social-ecological systems. *Environmental management 34* (1), pp. 75-90.

Pahl-Wostl, C., and Hare, M. (2004). Processes of social learning in integrated resources management. *Journal of community and applied social psychology 14*, pp. 193-206.

Panel on the Ecological Integrity of Canada's National Parks. (2000). *'Unimpaired for future generations'?: Conserving ecological integrity with Canada's national parks. Volume 1:*

A call to action. Government of Canada. 29p. Retrieved on 14 December 2013 from [http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/R62-323-2000-1E.pdf].

Parks Canada Agency. (1994). *Parks Canada guiding principles and operating policies.* Retrieved on 16 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/poli/princip/avant-fore.aspx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2002). *The parks Canada charter.* Our mandate, role, and commitments. 1p. Retrieved on 10 January 2014 from [www.pc.gc.ca/eng/agen/chart/~/media/agen/chart/pdf/chartr_e.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2005). *Code of ethics.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/guide/~/media/docs/pc/guide/code/pdf_e.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2006). *Research permitting overview for Parks Canada.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/guide/rech-srch/page8.aspx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2007a). *Exterior signage: Standards and guidelines.* 395p. Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/bib-lib/~/media/docs/bib-lib/pdfs/Exterior_Signage.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2007b). *Ivvavik national park of Canada: Management plan.* Retrieved on 21 February 2014 from [www.pc.gc.ca/~/media/pn-np/yt/ivvavik/pdfs/pd-mp_e.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2008a). *Action on the ground II: Working with Canadians to improve ecological integrity in Canada's national parks.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/v-g/ie-ei/at-ag/agir2-action2.aspx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2008b). *An approach to Aboriginal cultural landscapes.* Aboriginal world views. Retrieved on 20 February 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/r/pca-acl/sec1/index_e.asp].

Parks Canada Agency. (2008c). *Guidelines for management planning.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/bib-lib/~/media/docs/bib-lib/pdfs/pc_gmp2008_e.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2008d). *Principles and guidelines for ecological restoration in Canada's protected natural areas.* 108p. Retrieved on 1 February 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/np-pn/re-er/~/media/progs/np-pn/re-er/pag-pel/guide_e.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2009a). *Gros Morne National Park of Canada: Management plan.* Retrieved on 10 April 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/nl/grosmorne/~/media/pn-np/nl/grosmorne/pdf/GM_Mgt_Plan_9-9-2009-En.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2009b). *Guidelines for evaluating shipwrecks of national historic significance in Canada.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/guide/res/arch4_a.aspx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2009c). *Sharing the responsibility for safety.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/guide/securite-safety/safety-securite01.aspx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2009d). *You are in black bear country.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/v-g/oursnoir-blackbear/index.aspx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2010). *Torngat mountains national park of Canada: Management plan.* Retrieved on 21 February 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/nl/torngats/~/media/pn-np/nl/torngats/pdf/TMNPC%20Plan%20EN.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2011a). *Economic impact of Parks Canada.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/bib-lib/~/media/docs/bib-lib/pdfs/Final_Revised_Economic_Impact_of_Parks_Canada_English.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2011b). *Our mandate.* About Us: Parks Canada. Retrieved on 10 January 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/agen/index.aspx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2011c). *State of Canada's natural and historic places 2011.* Retrieved on 30 January 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/rpts/elnhc-scnhp/~/media/docs/pc/rpts/elnhc-scnhp/2011/pdf/elnhc-scnhp2011_e.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2012a). *Corporate plan 2012-2013/2016-2017.* 42p. Retrieved on 20 January 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/plans/plan2012-2013/~/media/docs/pc/plans/plan2012-2013/CorporatePlan_2012_eng.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2012b*). Working together: Our stories. Best practices and lessons learned in Aboriginal engagement*. Retrieved on 10 April 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/agen/aa/te-wt/chap03.aspx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2012c). *2013-2014 Departmental sustainable development strategy.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/bib-lib/docs2/~/media/docs/bib-lib/docs2/docs2i/DSDS%202013-14%20Website_Final.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2013a). *Action on the ground, volume 3.* 28p. Retrieved on 1 February 2014 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/np-pn/re-er/~/media/docs/v-g/ie-ei/at-ag/pdf/Action3.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2013b). *Cultural resource management policy.* Retrieved on 1 Decemberr 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/poli/grc-crm/~/media/docs/pc/poli/grc-crm/CRM-Policy-2013.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2013c). *Parks Canada attendance 2008-2009 to 2012-2013.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/attend/~/media/docs/pc/attend/ParksCanadaAttendance 2012-13_ENG.ashx].

Parks Canada Agency. (2013d). *2014-2015 Departmental sustainable development strategy.* Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/bib-lib/docs2/~/media/docs/pc/plans/rpp/rpp2014-2015/PDFs/DSDS-2014-15-for-RPP-En.ashx].

Parsons, J. B., and Harding, K. J. (2011). Post-colonial theory and action research. *Turkish online journal of qualitative inquiry 2* (2), pp. 1-6. Retrieved 4 January 2014 at [http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED537800.pdf].

Pomeroy, R. S., and Berkes, F. (1997). Two to tango: The role of government in fisheries co-management. *Marine policy 21*, pp. 465-480.

Prime Minister of Canada. (2008). Stephen Harper. *PM offers full apology on behalf of Canadians for the Indian residential school system.* Retrieved on 11 December 2013 from [http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2008/06/11/pm-offers-full-apology-behalf-canadians-indian- residential-schools-system].

Racine, L. (2011). The impact of race, gender, and class in postcolonialism feminist fieldworld: A retrospective critique of methodological dilemmas. *Aporia 3* (1), pp. 15-27.

Redford, K., and Stearman, A. (1993). Forest-dwelling native Amazonians and the conservation of biodiversity: Interests in common or in collision? *Conservation biology 7*, pp. 248-255.

Rennicke, J. (1994). The land of the 'bou. *Backpacker 22*(1), pp. 28-37.

Riou, M. (2007). Response to Foucault in Hérodote, no 6, 2 trimester 1977, 21-3. In J. W. Crampton and S. Elden (Eds.), *Space, knowledge and power: Foucault and geography*, pp. 35-39. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company. 377p.

Richard, G. (2012). Nature and national identity: Contradictions in a Canadian myth. *Capstone seminar series: Belonging in Canada, questions and challenges 2* (1), 19p. Retrieved on 10 February 2014 from [http://capstoneseminarseries.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/genevieve-richard1.pdf].

Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis.* Boston: Beacon Press. 288p.

Rowell, J. (2010). Case study 9.2: Inuit partnerships in the Torngat Mountains National Park, Canada. In S. Stolton and N. Dudley (Eds.), *Arguments for protected areas: Multiple benefits for conservation and use*, pp. 183-187. London: Earthscan. 273p.

Ruiz, J. (2009). Sociological discourse analysis: methods and logic. *Qualitative sociological researching 10* (2).

Ruppert, D. (2003). Building partnerships between American Indian tribes and the national park service. *Ecological restoration 21* (4), pp. 261-263.

Ruru, J. A. (2012). Settling Indigenous place: Reconciling legal fictions in governing Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand's national parks. PhD Dissertation for the Faculty of Law at the University of Victoria. Retrieved on 19 November 2013 from [http://dspace.library.uvic.ca:8080/bitstream/handle/1828/3965/Ruru_Jacinta_PhD_2012. pdf?sequence=6].

Rutherford, S. (2011). *Governing the wild: Ecotours of power.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 250p.

Sadler, B. (1989). National parks, wilderness preservation, and native peoples in Northern Canada. *Natural resources journal 29*, pp. 185-204.

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books. 432p.

Singleton, S. (1998). *Constructing cooperation: The evolution of institutions of comanagement.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 184p.

Slocombe, D. S. (1993). Implementing ecosystem-based management: Development of theory, practice and research for planning and managing a region. *BioScience 43*(9), pp. 612-625.

Spence, M. D. (1999). *Dispossessing the wilderness: Indian removal and the making of the national parks.* New York: Oxford University Press. 190p.

Spivak, G. C. (1990). *Can the subaltern speak?* 23p. Retrieved on 10 November 2013 from [http://www.mcgill.ca/files/crclaw-discourse/Can_the_subaltern_speak.pdf].

Stegner, W. (1983). The best idea we ever had. *Wilderness 46*, pp. 4-13.

Stevenson, M. G. (2004). Decolonizing co-management in Northern Canada. *Cultural survival quarterly,* Spring, pp. 68-71.

Stolton, S. (2010). Protected areas: Linking environment and well-being. In S. Stolton and N. Dudley (Eds.), *Arguments for protected areas: Multiple benefits for conservation and use*, pp. 1-12. London: Earthscan. 273p.

Summers, G. (2006). *Consuming nature: Environmentalism in the Fox River Valley, 1850-1950.* Kansas: University Press of Kansas. 256p.

Sundar, N. (2000). The construction and destruction of 'Indigenous' knowledge in Indian's joint forest management programme. In R. Ellen, P. Parkes, and A. Bicker (Eds.), *Indigenous environmental knowledge and its transformations: Critical anthropological perspectives,* pp. 79-100. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers. 356p.

Thomlinson, E., and Crouch, G. (2012). Aboriginal peoples, Parks Canada, and protected spaces: A case study in co-management at Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve. *Annals of leisure research 15* (1), pp. 69-86.

Thorpe, J., and Rutherford, S. (2010). National natures in a globalized world: Climate change, power and the erasure of the local. *The Dalhousie review 90* (1), pp. 127-139.

Timko, J. A., and Satterfield, T. (2008a). Seeking social equity in national parks: Experiments with evaluation in Canada and South Africa. *Conservation and society 6* (3), pp. 238-254.

Timko, J., and Satterfield, T. (2008b). Criteria and indicators for evaluating social equity and ecological integrity in national parks and protected areas. *Natural areas journal 28* (3), pp. 307-319.

Tsing, A. L. (2004). *Friction: An ethnography of global connection.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. 344p.

Tsing, A. L. (2007). Indigenous voice. In M. de la Cadena and O. Starn (Eds.), *Indigenous experience today,* pp. 33-68. New York: Berg. 415p.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* New York: Zed Books. 240p.

United Nations Economic and Social Council. (1982). *Study on the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations*. United Nations. Retrieved on 1 December 2013 from [http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/MCS_v_en.pdf].

United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations. (1996). *Discrimination against indigenous people.* Fourteenth session. Retrieved on 16 April 2014 from [http://www.unhchr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/0/f488deaaa4810a98802566ac00362df9?Opendocument].

Vander Kloet, M. (2009). A trip to the co-op: The production, consumption, and salvation of Canadian wilderness. *International journal of Canadian studies 39-40*, pp. 231-251.

Venne, S. (1997). Understanding treaty 6: An Indigenous perspective. In M. Asch (Ed.), *Aboriginal and treaty rights in Canada: Essays on law, equality, and respect for difference,* pp. 173-207. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. 300p.

Ward, S. (1997). The end of fortress conservation? *The southern Africa trumpet 2* (June). Retrieved on 2 January 2014 from [http://www.maninnature.com/Management/Conservation/WConservation1d.html].

Weaver, B. (1996). What to do with the mountain people? The darker side of the successful campaign to establish the great smoky mountains national park. In J. G. Cantrill and C. L. Oravec (Eds.), *The symbolic earth: Discourse and our creation of the environment 151*, pp. 159-160.

Wilkie, D. S., Morelli, G. A., Demmer, J., Starkey, M., Telfer, P., and Steil, M. (2006). Parks and people: Assessing the human welfare effects of establishing protected areas for biodiversity conservation. *Conservation biology 20* (1), pp. 247-249.

Wilshusen, P. R. (2003). Exploring the political contours of conservation: A conceptual view of power in practice. In S. R. Brechin, P. R. Wilshusen, C. L. Fortwangler, and P. C. West (Eds.), *Contested nature: Promoting international biodiversity with social justice in the twenty-first century*, pp. 41-58. Albany: State University of New York Press. 321p.

Wilshusen, P. R., Brechin, S. R., Fortwangler, C. L., and West, P. C. (2003). Contested nature: Conservation and development at the turn of the twenty-first century. In S. R. Brechin, P. R. Wilshusen, C. L. Fortwangler, and P. C. West (Eds.), *Contested nature: Promoting international biodiversity with social justice in the twenty-first century*, pp. 1-23. Albany: State University of New York Press. 321p.

Wimmer, A. (2002). *Nationalist exclusion and ethnic conflict: Shadows of modernity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 322p.

Worboys, G. L., and Winkler, C. (2007). Process of management. In M. Lockwood, G. L. Worboys, and A. Kothari (Eds.), *Managing protected areas: A global guide*, pp. 146-163. London: Earthscan. 802p.

Worboys, G. L., Winkler, C., and Lockwood, M. (2007). Threats to protected areas. In M. Lockwood, G. L. Worboys, and A. Kothari (Eds.), *Managing protected areas: A global guide*, pp. 223-261. London: Earthscan. 802p.

Young, N. (2014). *The great debate: social constructionism vs. environmental realism.* University of Ottawa. Forthcoming.

Young, R. J. C. (2004). *White mythologies: Writing history and the West.* London: Routledge. 304p.