

CHAPTER I

Traditional Indigenous Knowledge and Nature Protection Collaboration and Changing Paradigms

Rani-Henrik Andersson

University of Helsinki

Boyd Cothran

York University

Saara Kekki

University of Helsinki

“Nature” and the “protection of nature” are cultural concepts often thought to originate in Western or Euro-American societies. In contrast, most Indigenous societies do not routinely differentiate between the realms of humans and the immediate environment in which humans live. Indeed, many if not most Indigenous languages do not have specific words for what in English we refer to as “nature.”¹ When thinking about how to bridge cultural concepts

How to cite this book chapter:

Andersson, Rani-Henrik, Boyd Cothran and Saara Kekki. “Traditional Indigenous Knowledge and Nature Protection.” In *Bridging Cultural Concepts of Nature: Indigenous People and Protected Spaces of Nature*, edited by Rani-Henrik Andersson, Boyd Cothran and Saara Kekki, 1–25. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33134/AHEAD-1-1>.

in a global context, then, how ought we to define “nature”? What is the relationship between humans and nature, and what are our obligations and responsibilities toward the environment? How should societies manage so-called “natural resources” in light of these differences? Beginning in the early 2000s, a flurry of declarations, constitutional reforms, legislative acts, and legal decisions from around the world have forced government agencies, local Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, academics, and the courts to wrestle with how to bridge diverse and, at times, conflicting cultural concepts of nature. In 2008, for instance, through a national referendum, Ecuador changed its constitution to state that henceforth nature would possess the right “to exist, persist, maintain and regenerate its vital cycles.”² Two years later, Bolivia passed similar legislation stripping human persons of their dominion over the environment by removing their “possessory rights over nature.” In treating the natural world holistically as a living system, the new law ensured that the country’s vital rivers, lakes, and forests would be entitled to the same inherent rights as Bolivian citizens.³

From these initial steps, Aotearoa took a major leap, when the New Zealand Government enacted the Te Urewera Act of 2014. A national park since 1954, Te Urewera has also been home to the Tūhoe people for centuries. After fighting for many years for their rights to this preserved space of nature to be recognized, Te Urewera ceased to be a national park, ceased to be vested Crown land, and became, instead, “a legal entity” with “all the rights, powers, duties and liabilities of a legal person.”⁴ According to then Minister Chris Finlayson, the enactment was a positive step on the Crown’s behalf to “settle the historical claims of Tūhoe, who suffered some of the worst breaches by the Crown in the country’s history, involving large scale confiscation, brutal military campaigns targeting Tūhoe settlements, and unjust land purchases.”⁵ In a similar conciliatory tone, Te Awa Tupua, or the Whanganui River, was granted the rights of a person in 2017. For the Māori, Te Awa Tupua has always had its own identity, and, like so many other non-human entities in nature, it has been respected and acknowledged in ceremonies for centuries. And as a result of this historic

agreement, now, for the first time, a settler nation's government, operating through a Western legal system and worldviews, found a way to officially accept another way of understanding the world. Other, more local steps include the recognition of personhood by regional authorities of the Magpie River in Québec and the Klamath River in Northern California.⁶ Sometimes bridging cultural concepts of nature means a river can be a person.

Throughout much of modern history, and especially within colonial and neocolonial contexts, the worldviews of Indigenous peoples have been marginalized. This is true within a variety of legal, social, and cultural contexts, but it has been especially evident in discourses of nature preservation and conservation. Since the late 19th century, national parks and other protected spaces of nature have become iconic symbols of nature protection and are valuable sites for global cultural heritage.⁷ In fact, the United Nations has recognized many of these places as UNESCO World Heritage sites even as local governments have harnessed these preserved spaces of nature to promote their own nationalistic agendas. Yet, while national parks have and continue to serve as important sites of cultural heritage and nature protection, they are also critical sites for the creation and exercising of colonial power and authority. Often carved out of the traditional homelands of Indigenous peoples, national parks have come to represent tragic loci of cultural loss and social marginalization for many Indigenous peoples who previously inhabited these now bordered spaces of nature. Indeed, for generations, Indigenous peoples have suffered from dispossession, treaty violations, restrictions on their rights and ability to hunt and fish, and the loss of sacred places at the hands of national parks and other protected spaces of nature around the world.⁸

At the same time, policymakers from Kenya to the United States and from Brazil to Russia have marginalized Indigenous voices, perspectives, and concerns. This is particularly evident when decisions are made regarding the preservation and/or management of protected spaces of nature such as national parks, wilderness areas, and marine sanctuaries. For instance, in Finland's Malla Strict Nature Preserve, Sámi reindeer herders are forbidden

from pursuing their customary practices within the perimeters of the park because policymakers fear their activities would despoil the park's "pristine wilderness." The Sámi, of course, have herded reindeer within what is today the boundaries of the preserve for generations, creating, many would argue, the supposedly untouched wilderness conditions policymakers are now trying to manage. Nonetheless, the Finnish Forest Service—the bureau in charge of managing all national parks and nature preserves in the country—maintains that reindeer herding would introduce "unnatural" human activity into an environment untouched by human practices. Driven by their belief in a narrative of pristine wilderness, this policy has led, in practice, to a paradoxical situation where national parks and protected areas permit tourism, even mass tourism, but the original inhabitants—Indigenous peoples—are forbidden from using these designated areas as they have previously done for thousands of years.⁹

The net effect of this history of marginalization and dispossession is that many Indigenous communities today find themselves in tense, or even antagonistic, relationships with governments, especially the agencies tasked with protecting these cherished spaces of nature. Opposition and hostility rarely create room for cooperation and, as a result, many Indigenous peoples today find their voices, practices, and values relating to the natural world silenced at precisely the moment when we need them more than ever before. There have even been calls to return all national parks to Indigenous people.¹⁰

In recent years, Indigenous communities and practitioners, such as park rangers and educators, working alongside both Indigenous and non-Indigenous policymakers, park administrators, and NGOs, have found productive ways to engage with and in national parks and similar preserved spaces of nature. These initial attempts to understand and embrace Indigenous concepts of nature have, in a few cases, resulted in innovative and transformative approaches to co-management, co-interpretation, and accessibility for Indigenous community members and their perspectives. On Vancouver Island, Canada, for instance, the Nuu-Chah-Nulth

people have developed a multi-level cooperation agreement with the Pacific Rim National Park, where a joint “action plan” has been developed to ensure a fuller inclusion of tribal members in various forms in the park’s operations. Likewise, since 2010, the Haida, also in British Columbia, have co-managed Gwaii Haanas National Park together with Parks Canada.¹¹ Examples of successful co-management strategies can be found beyond Canada. For instance, since the mid-2000s, aboriginal Ngannawal rangers have guided visitors through Namadgi National Park in the Australian Capital Territory offering Aboriginal cultural education programs and activities to the public as part of a holistic attempt to broaden public understanding and appreciation of Aboriginal history in the region.¹² More recently, the Quileute Nation in Washington State has negotiated a land swap with the Olympic National Park so that the Quileute can build a new village safe from tsunamis and rising sea levels caused by climate change.¹³

These examples illustrate a growing trend toward this type of cooperation, but there is still a long way to go. In Northern Finland, the Sámi people still lack permission to herd reindeer in some protected nature areas. Similar restrictions exist in the United States and Canada, where natural resource extraction and use are prohibited in national parks. The rhetoric of “collaboration” and “co-management” are often deployed, but systemic change is not realized. This is particularly the case in developed and so-called progressive nations such as Canada and New Zealand. In other contexts, such as Central America, Latin America, and China, practical and intermediate steps must be taken before anything approaching a co-management strategy can be attempted. More often than not, co-management may be the goal, but many practical issues must be solved and many interests considered along the way. Time and again, researchers, policymakers, and community members have discovered that co-management can work on a general level, but in practice requires compromises and cooperation between many administrative agencies and must often address the needs of several Indigenous communities with varying interests. Different levels of collaboration cause co-management

to work well, for example, when it comes to hunting and fishing rights, but prove less effective in returning economic revenue or long-term planning to the Indigenous communities and individuals. It is also vital that any co-management strategy proceed upon a shared recognition of Indigenous peoples' rights, cultural practices, and ontologies, and not on the dominant society's ideas of what the Indigenous people want or need.

Co-management strategies, then, face a series of challenges. Nonetheless, examples of successful collaborations do exist and they can highlight both new opportunities and new challenges Indigenous communities and practitioners must encounter as they navigate the future of how to protect and live with these preserved spaces of nature. This shift toward Indigenous engagement with national parks provides scholars with new opportunities to investigate their role within nation-states and conservation movements even as these legal, administrative, and rhetorical tensions between Indigenous people, government agencies, environmentalist organizations, and academia continue to endure.

This book speaks to these opportunities by presenting seven historical and contemporary case studies to bring Indigenous concepts of nature and worldviews to the forefront of ongoing discussions on the environment, sustainability, nature protection, and Indigenous rights globally. While a diverse and interdisciplinary conversation has developed over the last few decades focused on environmental issues involving Indigenous peoples, nation-state actors, environmentalists, and various other groups, much of this scholarship has foregrounded histories of conflict and strife. These perspectives have certainly highlighted important issues and situated these conflicts productively within a longer historical perspective. But, as the contributions gathered in this volume suggest, this focus on conflict may have inadvertently solidified the view that relations between Indigenous communities, environmentalists, and state actors are always inevitably antagonistic. With this book, we do not shy away from the challenges, shortcomings, and indeed failures, but we hope to take a step toward changing the conversation. The legacy of conflict, dispossession, and

marginalization must not be forgotten, but it need not dictate our future. Only by examining carefully both the very real successes and the profound challenges facing collaborative efforts between Indigenous communities, state actors, and environmentalist organizations can we begin to repair and bridge these painful divides, and in the process begin to understand and respect our planet and its many peoples' diverse cultural concepts of nature.

The Legacy of Dispossession and Toward a New Paradigm

Indigenous peoples and preserved spaces of nature have been intertwined for centuries. In 1841, the artist George Catlin proposed that the United States government should preserve “in a magnificent park, where the world could see for ages to come, the native Indian in his classic attire, galloping his wild horse, with sinewy bow, and shield and lance, amid the fleeting herds of elks and buffaloes.” This “Nation’s Park,” as he called it, would stand as a monument to the continent’s “pristine beauty and wildness” for ages. Catlin’s idea came to naught. But it represents a 19th- (and even 20th-) century Euro-American mentality toward nature conservation and the rights and role of Indigenous peoples.¹⁴

Colonial societies have long ignored Indigenous perspectives and the legacies of this marginalization have been noted by scholars working in a variety of fields and disciplines for decades. At the heart of this particular mentality, however, lies the romantic stereotype of Indigenous peoples as being magically connected to nature. In recent years, this misconception has been thoroughly set aside. Instead of viewing Indigenous people as the embodiment of the Rousseauian ideal, scholars now embrace a more nuanced understanding and respect for what many call an “Indigenous way of being.” “Indians [i.e. indigenous people] do not talk about nature as some kind of concept or something ‘out there,’” world-renowned Lakota scholar Vine Deloria, Jr. noted. “They talk about the immediate environment in which they live. They do not embrace all trees or love every river or mountain.

What is important is the relationship you have with a particular tree or a particular mountain.”¹⁵ Relationships, then, rooted in kinship, are the key to understanding specific Indigenous meanings of nature. The meaning Indigenous people give to any specific place or environment can be sacred, practical, or both. But, on a fundamental level, Indigenous peoples do not separate themselves from nature and the environment; rather, they are part of them. For Indigenous peoples, time and place are linked through the connection to lands and waters, to places they hunt and fish, and where their ancestors have lived and been buried. It is not only the visible world, but also the invisible, spiritual world that manifests itself through and in nature.

This understanding of how Indigenous people conceive of their relationship with nature and the environment is fundamentally different from how non-Indigenous policymakers and environmentalists have approached the management of preserved spaces of nature. As a result, many such spaces in the United States and elsewhere were created through the dispossession of Indigenous people of vital lands, both sacred and practical. For instance, historian Theodore Catton, writing nearly 25 years ago, observed that white America’s conception of Indigenous peoples as living in harmony with a pristine wilderness jarred with the reality of many Indigenous peoples who used national park resources to live. According to Catton, the post-war debate over the existence of an “inhabited wilderness” resulted in the Alaskan National Interest Land Conservation Act of 1980, which affirmed Alaska Natives’ rights to use National Park Service (NPS) land for “customary and traditional” uses.¹⁶ While the idea of an “inhabited wilderness” seemed at the time unique to Alaska, it has inspired scholars to examine the disastrous role NPS has played in US Indigenous policy. At around the same time, Robert Keller and Michael Turek explored how American conceptions of “wilderness” as “uninhabited” conspired to displace Indigenous communities from their homes and livelihoods. By focusing on the antagonistic and contradictory relationship between Indigenous concerns and environmental policy, Keller and Turek reveal the

tragic ways in which tribal politics and NPS policies have influenced each other since the 1930s.¹⁷ Though less sweeping in breadth than Keller and Turek, Mark David Spence's *Dispossessing the Wilderness* considered the same theme by focusing on the Yosemite, Yellowstone, and Glacier National Parks to argue that the establishment of these national parks was made possible through Indian removal from an otherwise "pristine" and "uninhabited wilderness."¹⁸ Philip Burnham's scathing *Indian Country, God's Country* carried the dispossession narrative further by arguing that the systematic theft of Indigenous lands by the National Park Service had contributed in no small degree to the endemic social and economic malaise on reservations today.¹⁹ Finally, although less focused on the connections between the NPS and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Karl Jacoby's *Crimes against Nature* considers how conservationists used legal measures to restrict access to national park lands for lower-class Americans, including members of Indian tribes, who were once promised access to those very resources.²⁰

Building on these early studies, scholars working in a variety of disciplines have honed in on the complex and multifaceted processes—social, cultural, political, and economic—that have affected protected spaces of nature, highlighting the negative impacts these processes have had on Indigenous peoples. For instance, Stan Stevens' *Indigenous Peoples, National Parks, and Protected Areas: A New Paradigm Linking Conservation, Culture and Rights* remains a groundbreaking study that documents and classifies the numerous ways in which Indigenous peoples have *suffered* because of the creation of protected areas carved out of their traditional territories.²¹ Stevens develops the following taxonomy:

- (1) spatial and physical displacement that includes forced relocation and lack of access to traditional territories;
- (2) economic marginalization, including restrictions or bans on land and marine use, loss of livelihood, loss of access to food security, water, shelter etc., which together result in a lack of benefits from revenues derived from protected areas;

- (3) political marginalization stemming from the loss of territorial control and self-governance and the loss of authority over cultural sites; and
- (4) cultural marginalization as a result of the loss of shared life in homelands, loss of care for homelands, loss of access to cultural sites and resources, and the lack of respect for cultural practices, livelihoods, and customary laws and governance.²²

Stevens concludes that in creating protected spaces of nature, such as national parks, nation-states have built their management strategies on Western notions of wilderness preservation and excluded Indigenous worldviews.

Stevens' analysis has proven correct and provides a useful framework for describing, categorizing, and understanding the many negative consequences Indigenous communities have and continue to endure in the name of conservation movements. But, Indigenous communities, governmental policymakers and practitioners, such as park administrators, rangers, and educators, and even some NGOs have managed to find productive ways of working together to successfully manage preserved spaces of nature while still ensuring access and flexibility. Although not without its problems or limitations, this growing trend toward collaboration among Native peoples and governmental and non-governmental agencies tasked with the protection of nature provides an opportunity for scholars and community members to investigate the vital role Indigenous peoples can play within nation-states to conserve natural resources without negatively impacting their communities. Indeed, several recent scholarly studies have found that allowing or even encouraging Indigenous presence and participation in certain protected areas has boosted conservation efforts by introducing traditional Indigenous place-based knowledge into the discussion.²³ These vital and beneficial forms of Indigenous knowledge have often been ignored or lost when settler-colonial states developed their environmental policies and management practices.

Throughout this volume, then, we seek to balance the successes and problems of Indigenous/state/environmentalist collaborations.

Each author approaches their subject from a different vantage point, in their own way, detailing the many costs Indigenous people have been forced to bear in the name of protecting nature, while nonetheless focusing on examples of or models for successful collaborations between Indigenous people and protected spaces of nature. In some cases, the verdict is decidedly negative or decidedly positive, and in a few cases, incremental progress and best practices are identified, while strategies for addressing shortcomings are considered. But in each case, the goal is to move the conversation toward a new paradigm. Finally, in exploring these complex and vital issues, we have adopted a global perspective on these often local and national concerns in order to build bridges and strengthen our collective efforts to create a more just world for all.

An Interdisciplinary Approach to a Global Problem

This book seeks to engage a variety of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches to the issue of Indigenous peoples, and their participation in the co-management of preserved spaces of nature. As a work of Global Indigenous Studies, it draws on a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches from transnational and global studies to cultural and anthropological studies to environmental and conservation studies, and political ecology.

Global Indigeneity is a vibrant, emerging field of study. From its internationalist activist origins in the 1970s and 1980s, the field has developed rapidly in recent years.²⁴ The landmark 2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which encouraged the growth of comparative, international, and transnational studies on Indigenous communities, particularly in settler colonial nation-states, has served as both a political lightning rod and a call-to-arms for scholars in a variety of disciplines from around the world.²⁵ Much of the scholarship on Global Indigeneity has been explicitly comparative ever since.²⁶ The results have been impressive. Besides scores of monographs and edited volumes, scholars of Global Indigeneity have established new professional

organizations, annual conferences, and scholarly journals—even entire degree programs.²⁷

Much of this scholarly intensity has been driven by the urgency of the issues: cultural revitalization, reconciliation, and environmental justice and sustainability.²⁸ But while anthropologists, linguists, sociologists, and political scientists have embraced Global Indigeneity, historians have stood largely on the sidelines with a few notable exceptions. This book brings deeper historical perspective to the field of Global Indigeneity, especially the history of environmental management.²⁹ It intervenes in the established literature on Indigenous peoples and preserved spaces of nature such as national parks and wildlife preserves by complicating the historical narrative of Indigenous dispossession. It investigates the history of Indigenous involvement in these spaces long after legal dispossession. And it leverages collaborative and community-engaged research to reveal previously ignored histories of Indigenous survival and agency. Indeed, several of the authors in this collection are Indigenous community members and practitioners, and their contributions provide vital perspective on these complex issues.

This book also approaches the topic of nature conservation and protection from a cultural standpoint. The authors use current methodologies that highlight Indigenous agency and Indigenous theories about the nature of being and categories of existence known as ontologies. Understanding people's diverse perspectives, values, and objectives, and how people are constrained or enabled by social and cultural systems, will facilitate a more effective and equitable approach to understanding, for example, human-other-than-human relations. There is growing recognition that to solve environmental problems, we need to also understand their human and cultural dimensions. This book addresses this need by engaging a transnational team of interdisciplinary researchers who approach nature conservation through Indigenous ontologies that include human-other-than-human dimensions. We define knowledge of "human-other-than-human dimensions" broadly to include expertise in the social sciences (e.g., anthropology,

psychology, political science, economics), humanities, arts, and Indigenous traditional ecological knowledge. We seek to validate Indigenous understandings of nature and the ontological assumptions upon which they are based. And we embrace Indigenous conceptions of human–animal relations as a form of reciprocal exchange.³⁰ This necessarily brings a broad range of epistemologies and methodologies into conversation.

Traditional ecological knowledge has become an integral part of Indigenous studies that, as a field of science, has seen a tremendous rise in academia over the past two decades. It is a highly cross-disciplinary field bringing methods and theories ranging from political science to history and anthropology, from area and cultural studies to cultural heritage studies, or from religious studies to sustainability and environmental studies, to name a few. As a field, it highlights the importance of Indigenous agency and belonging. Whatever the approach may be, the overreaching theoretical premise comes from ethical Indigenous studies.³¹ This book also addresses methodological issues concerned with how to study Indigenous knowledge, or ethical questions, such as how to handle data or knowledge that is sacred or sensitive in some other way.³² Indigenous knowledges are not only expressed in a written form, but are in their traditional forms typically presented and reflected through diverse practices and ways of communication, and in lived history and places of relational significance, some of which are today under the jurisdiction and administration of national parks and other protected spaces of nature.³³

Bridging Cultural Concepts of Nature thus advances the recent turn toward global comparative work in Indigenous Studies. We embrace the United Nations Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues (UNPPFII) April 2019 acknowledgment that Indigenous traditional knowledge “must be protected,” and their assertion that it is crucially needed in order to meet the global goals for sustainable development by 2030.³⁴ While recognizing the continued problems of settler colonialism, this book focuses on the many comparative instances of Indigenous agency in maintaining culturally relevant practices of sustainability even

within the context of limited access to power in nation-states. This volume comes out of a series of conversations among academic researchers, community leaders, and government and non-governmental officials.

While our case studies address the issues at hand in a global context, we acknowledge that additional cases representing, for example, Africa or Asia could have been included here. There are many illustrative cases we could have included in this conversation. Along the southern coast of Kenya, the nine tribes of the Mijikenda people are deeply involved in the ecotourism industry surrounding the Sacred Mijikenda Kaya Forests, a complex of 30 sacred forests or *kaya*, which together form a UNESCO World Heritage Site. On the island of Hokkaidō in northern Japan, the Ainu have established a settlement known as Akan Ainu Kotan, where over 200 Ainu people live and work within the Akan Mashu National Park. Tens of thousands of visitors attend performances of their traditional songs and dances, rituals that have been registered as a UNESCO intangible cultural heritage of humanity.³⁵ Similarly, Russia has developed joint programs with the Udege people, an Indigenous people of the Russian Far East, and the Biki National Park to help to preserve the region's rich forests, a key carbon reservoir vital to climate protection, and also to create additional income for the local Udege people. However, the specific dynamics of the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations in parts of Africa and Asia are complex and different in form from most of those contained within this volume. This is not to suggest they are not important and could not contribute to the conversation here. But, for a single volume, based on the conversations held at the Bridging Cultural Concepts of Nature Conference in Helsinki in 2018, it is impossible to cover the entire globe.³⁶ We are confident that the case studies presented here offer important insights into the broader topic that can aid a fuller understanding in a global context, and point to new directions of research. And we sincerely hope that future works will be able to bring case studies and regional examples not covered here into this ongoing conversation.

Acting Locally, Thinking Globally, Together

In recent years, much has changed in the relationships between protected spaces of nature and Indigenous people globally. But while the Sámi of Scandinavia are working on their own collaborative models, the Chumash of California and the Anangu of Australia are also forging their own collaborations. More often than not, these Indigenous communities are doing so without really knowing about one another's efforts. Similar models/programs are being developed, but there are few forums, academic books, or networks that would bring these various collaborative models together. One inspiration for this volume was to help build bridges between communities and organizations working in isolation but toward a common goal.

To that end, this volume identifies current working models between Indigenous peoples and administrators of protected spaces of nature and investigates how these cooperations could be further strengthened and developed by including Indigenous ontologies, perspectives, and needs in the management of these selected spaces. We will highlight ways to achieve co-management as realized practice, not only as a theoretical ideal, and ultimately affect not only the discourses, but also the structures that govern nature protection today. By including Indigenous perspectives in programs of nature protection, this book has the potential to enhance cooperation and help develop more humane and inclusive policies and more sustainable practices in the management of national parks and similar protected spaces of nature. This is not to suggest that this book is without conflict. Indeed, persistent and deep conflicts continue to mar even sincere attempts at cooperation. By critiquing current efforts at co-management and bringing forth successful case studies, this book will help build capacity within Indigenous communities so that they may more effectively convey Indigenous practices, perspectives, and ontologies in developing working relations with government agencies. Overall, the conversations around the co-management of preserved spaces of nature is still one very much centered on conflicts.

But throughout this volume, the authors seek to highlight Indigenous agency and belonging to aid in (re)-indigenizing Indigenous homelands now under the administration of park services and similar institutions, while still recognizing the deep and persistent points of dispute, disagreement, and discord. Some authors focus more at the level of policy, while others investigate more practical approaches, such as the ways in which Indigenous peoples can be employed as managers, educators, and interpreters in protected spaces of nature. Ultimately, it is our hope that this approach will directly affect Indigenous communities by easing access to ancestral homelands and help to address questions such as sovereignty, equality, and indigeneity.

. . .

This book is comprised of three parts, each of which explores a distinct aspect of collaboration between Indigenous communities, government actors, and environmentalists. Part I, “Government Policy and Indigenous Agency,” addresses issues relating to Indigenous participation in the development, implementation, and oversight of governmental policy and regulations. We begin with “Personifying Indigenous Rights in Nature? Treaty Settlement and Co-Management in Te Urewera,” in which Māori scholar and environmental geographer Brad Coombes explores the co-management of the Te Urewera National Park. In the ten years following the Treaty settlements, Coombes has gathered much evidence that co-management is not always successful and presents a plethora of legal and moral questions. He further argues that additional problems may arise when Indigenous rights are linked with nature’s rights. Giving a river personhood is not necessarily what is in the best interests of Indigenous peoples in their attempts to reclaim lost lands. At worst, this development is only another form of expressing colonial powers and reframing traditional conservation practices in an effort to preserve the national parks ideal. From Aotearoa/New Zealand, we next turn to northern Scandinavia. In “Discourses of Decentralization: Local Participation and Sámi Space for Agency in Norwegian Protected

Area Management,” political scientist Elsa Reimerson analyzes a series of reforms developed in 2010 to guide Norway’s management of protected areas. The 2010 reforms developed new arenas of influence for the Indigenous Sámi over protected areas within their lands. In her chapter, Reimerson explores how discourses of decentralization and participation in nature conservation shape the space of agency for Indigenous peoples. The results demonstrate both the challenges and the opportunities inherent in developing successful co-management strategies. The discourses governing the reform, she contends, articulated the relationship between Sámi rights and protected areas in relation to a variety of different concepts, problematic representations, and proposed solutions, each with potentially different consequences for the ultimate goal of Sámi participation and influence over decision-making processes.

While Part I focuses more on specific policies, Part II, “Biocultural Diversities across Bordered Spaces,” highlights the many thorny and complex issues related to managing biodiversity across jurisdictional, administrative, and state and national borders. This second part opens with “People, Animals, Protected Places, and Archaeology: A Complex Collaboration in Belize, Central America,” in which archaeologists Meaghan Peuramaki-Brown and Shawn Morton discuss the interplay between archaeological research and the interactions between individuals, communities, and institutions that structure their archaeological work in Belize. The authors begin by discussing the history of the development of the Cockscomb Basin Wildlife Sanctuary, connected forest reserves, and the ongoing co-management of the region, which depend on productive relationships with adjacent Indigenous Maya communities. They frame these developments within the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and supplement historical records with informally gathered impressions from local rights-holders and stakeholders, as well as through their own experiences and observations. They conclude by suggesting best practices for co-management and community engagement—and propose areas for improvement.

In “Indigenous People, National Parks, and Biodiversity in the Maya Region” by Latin Americanist Harri Kettunen and Indigenous practitioner Antonio Cuxil introduce readers to recent developments in the vast Maya region, which encompasses areas in five countries, and their specific focus on the Selva Maya, a tropical forest region extending over Belize, northern Guatemala, and southeastern Mexico. Drawing on their years of experience in the region, the authors explain the political and economic context in which the national parks and nature preservers operate, and then discuss the opportunities—or the lack thereof—that the protected spaces provide for the Indigenous peoples as they strive to earn their living working in the ecotourism business.

Part II concludes with “Amazonia Beyond Borders: Indigenous Land Protection for an Indigenous Group in Voluntary Isolation” by Indigenous Studies scholar Pirjo Kristiina Virtanen and Indigenous spokesperson and researcher Lucas Artur Brasil Manchineri. In this chapter, they explore the land protection efforts by the Manxineru of Brazil, whose lands are affected by numerous actors: state agencies, enterprises, and transnational mega-extraction projects. The authors draw especially from the experiences and activities of the Manxineru to protect the land for the Yine Hosha Hajene (Mascho-Piro), a closely related Indigenous community the Manxineru consider to be their kin living in voluntary isolation, and whose traditional territory increasingly includes regions of the forest belonging to the Manxineru in the Brazilian–Peruvian border area. Unique to this case study is an example of a co-management effort between an Indigenous community and the relevant governmental agencies on behalf of another Indigenous community. The chapter presents the Manxineru as intermediaries who have developed key land protection practices, social networks of different actors as a go-between with the other Indigenous group, and authorities of the dominant society, as well as best practices for managing forest resource use, gathering economies, and hunting practices that rely on Indigenous knowledge and perspectives for the protection of ancestral land, beyond the borders of the state-set Indigenous reserves and protected areas.

The result, according to the authors, is that the Manxineru have managed to cope with differing economic interests and values, though the mosaic of different Indigenous areas and conservation still need the implementation of state protective activities by a variety of governmental actors.

Part III, “Re-Indigenizing Knowledge and Nature” provides a more intimate glimpse into Indigenous worldviews about nature, and individual and personal journeys of discovery as they relate to some of the world’s preserved spaces of nature. In their chapter, “Blackfeet Discourses about Dwelling-in-Place: Our Homeland, a National Park,” Communication Studies scholars Donal Carbaugh and Eean Grimshaw present to readers the spoken words of Blackfeet people who have discussed their homeland, its landscape, and all that it entails. In the process, the chapter seeks to help readers hear in those words the Blackfeet way of speaking about their land, introduce some of the cultural meanings of Blackfeet in that way of speaking about it, and offer an understanding of this way as a communal touchstone which is anchored in the discourse produced by Blackfeet participants as they speak about their homeland.

Sámi scholar Hanna Ellen Guttorm in “Becoming Earth: Rethinking and (Re-)Connecting with the Earth, Sámi Lands, and Relations” deploys a methodology of writing that embraces wondering and wandering on the Earth, in Sámi land(s) and Sámi/Finnish/global worlds. It is a way of thinking inspired by different Sámi concepts, like *eana* (Land/Earth), *siiddastallan* (having/living a *siida*, living in a sustainable relation between people, animals, and environment), *meahcci* (forest/mountain/waters), and *ruoktu* (home). After contemplating these Sámi concepts, she shares various ‘mystories,’ stories of her own and stories from the people with whom she has talked during her revitalizing journeys through Sámi land.

Finally, to conclude the volume, historian Joshua L. Reid (Snohomish) provides an erudite discussion of the historical trajectories that brought us to this moment of re-evaluation and then draws a series of generative and insightful connections

between the various pieces in this volume. Along the way, he offers a historiography of the ideals of nature protection versus conservation and compares the transnational movements for Indigenous rights. Highlighting the history of dispossession and the myth of Indigenous peoples as ecologists *par excellence*, Reid argues that these pernicious and persistent legacies and stereotypes, combined with the limitations of a Western, rights-based framework, continue to hinder efforts at a more egalitarian and even decolonized approach to the management of preserved spaces of nature. If settler nation-states and Indigenous communities are to forge a new path forward, Reid contends, it must be based not on a discourse on rights and participatory government, but on contemporary and historical Indigenous relationalities to their homelands.

Notes

- ¹ Joks, Østmo, and Law, “Verbing *meahcci*,” 305–21.
- ² Constitution Política de la República del Ecuador, article 71 cited in Gordon, “Environmental Personhood.”
- ³ Gordon, “Environmental Personhood,” 55.
- ⁴ Section 11 Te Urewera Act 2014.
- ⁵ Minister Chris Finlayson cited in Department of Conservation, “Tūhoe Claims Settlement.”
- ⁶ Lowrie, “Quebec River”; Smith, “Klamath River”; Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017.
- ⁷ This book is predominantly concerned with national parks, but also includes other protected spaces of nature such as World Heritage sites, marine sanctuaries, nature preserves, and historical sites.
- ⁸ Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature*; Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness*.
- ⁹ See, e.g., Magga and Ojanlatva, *Ealli biras*; Turi, *State Steering*. See also Paltto, “Role of Mass Media.”
- ¹⁰ Igoe, *Conservation and Globalization*; Mander and Tauli-Corpuz, *Paradigm Wars*; Treuer, “Return the National Parks.”
- ¹¹ Andersson, “Re-Indigenizing National Parks,” 65–82. See also Gwaii Haanas Gina, “Waadluxan KilGuhlGa.”
- ¹² Department of Territory and Municipal Services, “Namadgi National Park.”
- ¹³ For more on the Quileute and the Olympic National Park, see Keller and Turek, *American Indians & National Parks*, 117–19.

- ¹⁴ Catlin, *Letters and Notes*, 261–62. See also Hausdoerffer, “That Shocking Calamity,” 65–88.
- ¹⁵ Vine Deloria, Jr., as quoted in Scinta and Foehner, *Spirit & Reason*, 223–24.
- ¹⁶ Catton, *Inhabited Wilderness*.
- ¹⁷ Keller and Turek, *American Indians & National Parks*.
- ¹⁸ Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness*.
- ¹⁹ Burnham, *Indian Country, God’s Country*.
- ²⁰ Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature*.
- ²¹ Stevens, *Indigenous Peoples*. Other books that encourage including native perspectives are, e.g., Burnham, *Indian Country, God’s Country*; Keller and Turek, *American Indians & National Parks*; Nabokov and Loendorf, *Restoring a Presence*; Thompson, Kootenai Culture Committee & Pikuni Traditional Association, *People before the Park*.
- ²² Stevens, *Indigenous Peoples*, 38.
- ²³ See Cordero and Isha, *Chumash Ecosystem Services Assessment*, 1–20. This report has been used here with the permission of the authors. See also Nelson and Shilling, *Traditional Ecological Knowledge*; Ross et al., *Indigenous Peoples*.
- ²⁴ Merlan, “Indigeneity,” 303–33.
- ²⁵ United Nations, *General Assembly Adopts Declaration*.
- ²⁶ Maaka and Andersen, *Indigenous Experience*; Sissons, *First Peoples*; Sleeper-Smith, *Contesting Knowledge*.
- ²⁷ See, for instance, *Journal of Global Indigeneity*, 2015–present; *Alternative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 2005–present.
- ²⁸ On cultural revitalization, see Phipps, “Globalization,” 28–48; Wilson and Steward, *Global Indigenous Media*. On reconciliation, see Lightfoot, “Indigenous Rights Norms,” 84–104; Short, *Reconciliation and Colonial Power*. On environmental justice and sustainability, see Mander and Tauli-Corpuz, *Paradigm Wars*; Ross et al., *Indigenous Peoples*.
- ²⁹ Coates, *Global History of Indigenous Peoples*; Cothran, “Indian Field Days,” 194–223.
- ³⁰ Nadasdy, “Gift in the Animal,” 25–43.
- ³¹ For more on ethical Indigenous studies, see AIATSIS, *Guidelines for Ethical Research*; Raven, “Protocols”; Windchief and San Pedro, *Applying Indigenous Research Methods*.
- ³² Battiste, “Research Ethics,” 111–132; Raven, “Protocols,” 36–43.
- ³³ For more on Indigenous knowledge and nature, see Edington, *Indigenous Environmental Knowledge*; Gordon and Krech, *Indigenous Knowledge*.

- ³⁴ For the discussion on Indigenous traditional knowledge and sustainability goals at the UN Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues resolutions, see UN News, “Traditional Knowledge.”
- ³⁵ UNESCO, “Traditional Ainu Dance.”
- ³⁶ In 2018, with the support of the University of Helsinki Faculty of Arts Futures Fund and the University of Washington, 18 scholars and Indigenous practitioners convened at the Bridging Cultural Concepts of Nature symposium (<https://www.helsinki.fi/en/conferences/bridging-cultural-concepts-of-nature>). This book is the result of the conversations that began during the meeting.

Bibliography

- AIATSIS (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies). *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies*. Canberra, 2000.
- Andersson, Rani-Henrik. “Re-Indigenizing National Parks: Toward a Theoretical Model of Re-Indigenization.” *Dutkansaervi—Journal of Sami Studies* 13, no. 2 (2019): 65–82.
- Battiste, Marie. “Research Ethics for Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: Institutional and Researcher Responsibilities.” In *Ethical Futures in Qualitative Research: Decolonizing the Politics of Knowledge*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Michael D. Giardina, 111–132. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Burnham, Philip. *Indian Country, God’s Country: Native Americans and the National Parks*. New York: Island Press, 2000.
- Catlin, George. *Letters and Notes on the Manners, Customs, and Condition of the North American Indians*. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1841.
- Catton, Theodore. *Inhabited Wilderness: Indians, Eskimos, and National Parks in Alaska*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.
- Coates, Ken S. *A Global History of Indigenous Peoples: Struggle and Survival*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Cordero, Alicia, and Luhui Isha. *Chumash Ecosystem Services Assessment*, report by Alicia Cordero and Luhui Isha (Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council—Chumash Community Seats), Georgiana Sanchez, Sue Diaz, Martha Jaimes, Mena Moreno, Deborah Sanchez, Diane Valenzuela, Veronica Vasquez, and Jan Ward Olmstead (Chumash Women’s Elders Council).

- Cothran, Boyd. "Working the Indian Field Days: The Economy of Authenticity and the Question of Agency in Yosemite Valley, 1916–1929." *American Indian Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (Spring 2010): 194–223.
- Department of Conservation. "Tūhoe Claims Settlement and Te Urewera Bills Passed." 2014. <http://www.doc.govt.nz/news/media-releases/2014/Tuhoe-claims-settlement-and-te-urewera-bills-passed/>.
- Department of Territory and Municipal Services. "Namadgi National Park Revised Draft Plan of Management." Canberra, 2007.
- Edington, John. *Indigenous Environmental Knowledge: Reappraisal*. Springer: Cham, 2017.
- Gordon, David M., and Shepard Krech III, eds. *Indigenous Knowledge and the Environment in Africa and North America*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2002.
- Gordon, Gwendolyn. "Environmental Personhood." *Columbia Journal of Environmental Law* 43, no. 1 (2018): 49–91.
- Gwaii Haanas Gina. "Waadluxan KilGuhlGa Land-Sea-People Management Plan 2018." Parks Canada/Haida Nation, 2018.
- Hausdoerffer, John. "That Shocking Calamity: Revisiting George Catlin's Environmental Politics." In *Natural Protest: Essays on the History of American Environmentalism*, edited by Michael Egan and Jeff Crane, 65–88. New York, NY: Routledge, 2009.
- Igoe, Jim. *Conservation and Globalization: A Study of National Parks and Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 2003.
- Jacoby, Karl. *Crimes against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2003.
- Joks, Solveig, Liv Østmo, and John Law. "Verbing *meahcci*: Living Sámi Lands." *The Sociological Review Monographs* 68, no. 2 (2020): 305–21.
- Keller, Robert H., and Michael F. Turek. *American Indians & National Parks*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1999.
- Lightfoot, Sheryl R. "Emerging International Indigenous Rights Norms and 'Over-Compliance' in New Zealand and Canada." *Political Science* 62, no. 1 (June 1, 2010): 84–104.
- Lowrie, Morgan. "Quebec River Granted Legal Rights as Part of Global 'Personhood' Movement." *CBC News*, February 28, 2021. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/magpie-river-quebec-canada-personhood-1.5931067>.
- Maaka, Roger C. A., and Chris Andersen, eds. *The Indigenous Experience: Global Perspectives*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., 2006.

- Magga, Päivi, and Eija Ojanlatva. *Ealli biras—Elävä ympäristö [Living Environment]*. Saamelaismuseosäätiön julkaisuja 9, 2015.
- Mander, Jerry, and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, eds. *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Globalization*. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books, 2015.
- Merlan, Francesca. "Indigeneity: Global and Local." *Current Anthropology* 50, no. 3 (June 2009): 303–33.
- Nabokov, Peter, and Lawrence Loendorf. *Restoring a Presence: American Indians and Yellowstone National Park*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.
- Nadasdy, Paul. "The Gift in the Animal: The Ontology of Hunting and Human–Animal Sociality." *American Ethnologist* 34 (2007): 25–43.
- Nelson, Melissa K., and Daniel Shilling. *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Learning from Indigenous Practices for Environmental Sustainability*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Paltto, Aslak. "The Role of Mass Media in Conflicts: Sámi Reindeer Herders Balancing between Traditional Law and State Law in a Predator Dispute against Officials in Finland." Unpublished Master's Thesis in Indigenous Journalism, Sámi University of Applied Sciences, 2017.
- Phipps, Peter. "Globalization, Indigeneity and Performing Culture." *Local–Global: Identity, Security, Community* 6 (2009): 28–48.
- Raven, Margaret. "Protocols: Devices for Translating Moralities, Controlling Knowledge, Defining Actors in Indigenous Research, and Critical Ethical Reflection." *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, no. 2 (2010): 36–47.
- Ross, Anne, Kathleen Pickering Sherman, Jeffrey G. Snodgrass, Henry D. Delcore, and Richard Sherman. *Indigenous Peoples and the Collaborative Stewardship of Nature: Knowledge Binds and Institutional Conflicts*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Scinta, Sam, and Kristen Foehner (eds.). *Spirit and Reason: The Vine Deloria, Jr. Reader*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 1999.
- Short, Damien. *Reconciliation and Colonial Power: Indigenous Rights in Australia*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2016.
- Sissons, Jeffrey. *First Peoples: Indigenous Cultures and Their Futures*. London: Reaktion Books, 2005.
- Sleeper-Smith, Susan, ed. *Contesting Knowledge: Museums and Indigenous Perspectives*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.
- Smith, Anna V. "The Klamath River Now Has the Legal Rights of a Person." *High Country News*, September 24, 2019. <https://www.hcn.org>

- /issues/51.18/tribal-affairs-the-klamath-river-now-has-the-legal-rights-of-a-person?utm_source=wcnl&utm_medium=email.
- Spence, Mark David. *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Stevens, Stan. *Indigenous Peoples, National Parks, and Protected Areas: A New Paradigm Linking Conservation, Culture and Right*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2014.
- Thompson, Sally, and Kootenai Culture Committee & Pikuni Traditional Association. *People before the Park: The Kootenai and Blackfeet before Glacier National Park*. Helena, MT: Montana Historical Society Press, 2015.
- Treuer, David. "Return the National Parks to the Tribes: The Jewels of America's Landscape Should Belong to America's Original Peoples." *The Atlantic* May 2021. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2021/05/return-the-national-parks-to-the-tribes/618395/>.
- Turi, Ellen Inga. *State Steering and Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Reindeer-Herding Governance: Cases from Western Finnmark, Norway and Yamal, Russia*. Umeå: Umeå University Press, 2016.
- UN News. "Traditional Knowledge at 'Core' of Indigenous Heritage, and 'Must Be Protected,' Says UN Forum." *UN News*, April 22, 2019. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2019/04/1037051>.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). "Traditional Ainu Dance." <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-ainu-dance-00278#identification>.
- United Nations. *General Assembly Adopts Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, GA/10612, 61st General Assembly. New York: UN Department of Public Information, News and Media Division, 2007.
- Wilson, Pamela, and Michelle Steward, eds. *Global Indigenous Media: Cultures, Poetics, and Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008.
- Windchief, Sweeney, and Timothy San Pedro. *Applying Indigenous Research Methods: Storying with People and Communities*. New York: Routledge, 2019.