



Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations and sustainable forest management in Canada: The influence of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples

Deborah McGregor

Department of Geography and Aboriginal Studies Program, University of Toronto, Room 5063, Sidney Smith Hall (100 St. George Street), Toronto, Ontario M5S 3G3, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 21 October 2008

Received in revised form

1 September 2009

Accepted 10 September 2009

Available online 3 November 2009

Keywords:

Aboriginal peoples

Sustainable forest management

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples

Forest policy

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an overview of the emerging role of Aboriginal people in Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in Canada over the past decade. The 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) provided guidance and recommendations for improving Aboriginal peoples' position in Canadian society, beginning with strengthening understanding and building relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal parties. This paper explores the extent to which advances in Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relationships and Aboriginal forestry have been made as a result of RCAP's call for renewed relationships based on co-existence among nations. Such changes have begun to alter the context in which Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relationships exist with respect to SFM. While governments themselves have generally not demonstrated the leadership called for by RCAP in taking up these challenges, industry and other partners are demonstrating some improvements. A degree of progress has been achieved in terms of lands and resources, particularly with co-management-type arrangements, but a fundamental re-structuring needed to reflect nation-to-nation relationships has not yet occurred. Other factors related to increasing Aboriginal participation in SFM, such as the recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights, are also highlighted, along with suggestions for moving Aboriginal peoples' SFM agenda forward in the coming years.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In the summer of 1990, Mohawks living in Kanesatake, Quebec, erected a blockade to prevent the municipality of Oka from expanding a golf course on traditional Mohawk land. A Quebec police officer was killed when the Sûreté du Québec raided the barricade. The raid and shooting sparked a seventy-eight-day armed stand-off. (Gabriel, 1992, p. 165).

The "Oka Crisis", as it came to be known, involved not only the drama which extreme sustained tension produces, but also several more skirmishes and numerous other injuries (though no further deaths). It finally ended following the deployment of 2500 soldiers to the area and the decision by 100 Mohawk warriors, women and children to leave a Treatment Centre where they had been encamped for more than 3 weeks following the army's arrival (see Frideres, 1993, pp. 368–79, for a detailed chronology of events).

The racism and violence that epitomized the events at Oka (just west of Montreal, Quebec) shocked not only Canada as a nation, but the international community as well (representatives of which were called in to help intervene) (Goodleaf, 1995). What few

Canadians realized at the time was that the standoff was merely the culmination of nearly three centuries of conflict and fruitless negotiations regarding a dispute over traditional Mohawk lands. Canada was criticized for its mishandling of the situation, and was internationally embarrassed over its suddenly tarnished reputation as a vanguard of human rights (Goodleaf, 1995, p. 159). For Aboriginal people in Canada and no doubt around the world, the Oka crisis inspired a spiritual and political awakening as Aboriginal nations joined in solidarity to support the Mohawks of Kanesatake.

Unnerving as it was, Oka was not an isolated event. The decade leading up to the summer of 1990 was a time of much protest, involving political rallying and direct action by Aboriginal people throughout Canada in a movement towards greater self-determination. Despite this, it was the situation at Oka that finally caused many Canadians to reflect upon unresolved Aboriginal issues in this country, and to ask questions such as, "How could this crisis have occurred in Canada?". The upheaval the standoff caused in Canada, along with the international attention it received, served as catalysts for the establishment of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) in 1991. Brian Mulroney, Canada's Prime Minister at the time, set up RCAP to investigate and report on the Aboriginal situation throughout the country. The creation of RCAP represented a significant step in collaboration between Aboriginal and

E-mail address: d.mcgregor@utoronto.ca

non-Aboriginal people, in that they were to sit down together and develop a mutually agreeable future. The intent to improve collaboration was illustrated at the outset by the naming of the Commissioners, four of the seven of whom were Aboriginal, including respected leader George Erasmus, former Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations (AFN – the national body representing First Nations in Canada) (Dickason, 1997).

The primary question addressed by RCAP was, “What are the foundations of a fair and honourable relationship between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people of Canada?” (RCAP, 1996a, p. x). After five years and 178 days of public hearings, the resulting “...five-volume, 3,537-page report, when it finally appeared, was stunning in its magnitude...” (Dickason, 1997, p. 402). RCAP called for a fundamental change in the social and political order of Canada with respect to Aboriginal people. It stated the critical importance of realizing that, “...the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people is a central facet of Canada’s heritage” (Dickason, 1997, p. 402). Along with this, the primary conclusion RCAP reached was that, “The main policy direction [i.e. the assimilation of Aboriginal culture], pursued for more than 150 years, first by colonial then by Canadian governments, has been wrong” (RCAP, 1996a, p. x).

To bring about such a profound change in societal perspective, RCAP argued that Canada and Canadians needed to understand that Aboriginal peoples are *nations*, with all the rights and responsibilities that implies. As such, Aboriginal people must *not* be treated as simply “another stakeholder” in resource-related or other types of negotiations (Government of Canada, 2008; Smith, 1995). RCAP subsequently outlined a framework for resolving many of the outstanding Aboriginal issues in Canada. With respect to this, “...the commissioners identified four key issues: the need for a new relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, self-determination through self-government, economic self-sufficiency, and healing for Aboriginal peoples and communities” (Dickason, 1997, p. 402). RCAP’s scope was thus broad and inclusive of such aspects as co-management, access to resources, and ownership issues, all of which are highly relevant to the topic of Aboriginal people and sustainable forest management.

Both the extent and depth of RCAP’s consideration were of such magnitude that an undertaking of this nature is unlikely to be repeated in the foreseeable future. As such, the RCAP report remains a keystone document in Aboriginal policy, and one that has been referred to as a guide by numerous recent initiatives (see, for example, AFN, 2005; Government of Canada, 2004; Martin, 2005; PMO, 2005). Changes made thus far to forest policy across the country have undoubtedly begun to alter the context in which Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal relationships exist with respect to sustainable forest management (O’Flaherty et al., 2008; Wilson and Graham, 2005; Wyatt, 2008). In addition, Canada is currently undergoing legislative and policy changes in relation to Aboriginal people (see, for example, Aboriginal traditional knowledge recently included in the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, and the *Species At Risk Act*). Since it has now been well over a decade since RCAP was released, and almost two decades since the Oka crisis occurred, it is pertinent to ask whether these recent legislative and policy changes embody the principles of Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations that RCAP viewed as necessary. It is time to reflect upon the progress made towards implementing RCAP’s recommendations for a new relationship with Aboriginal peoples and communities.

The goal of this paper is therefore twofold: first, to present background information required in order to understand this evolving context; and second, to discuss the extent of advances in Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relationships and Aboriginal forestry made as a result of RCAP’s call for renewed relationships based on co-existence.

2. Background: the context for current Aboriginal issues in Canada

2.1. Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people: the evolving relationship

As clearly outlined by RCAP (1996a), a renewed nation-to-nation relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people with respect to sustainable forest management is required. Since the time of contact, Aboriginal people have consistently regarded their relationship with the newcomers as one of nations interacting. The call for a nation-to-nation relationship between Aboriginal peoples and Canadians is thus not new or unknown among federal and provincial governments. In fact, this type of relationship has existed in the past and for a period of time was a key characteristic of the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in North America. This was a time when it was clear to colonial powers that Aboriginal people were needed in order to settle these lands. The knowledge and technology that Aboriginal people possessed enabled the newcomers to survive here when the newcomers themselves lacked the capacity to do so. This period, however, represents just one of four stages which RCAP suggested describe Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal relations in Canada. These four stages are summarized as follows (RCAP, 1996a, pp. 5–18):

1. *Separate Worlds*: At this time Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people lived on separate continents and knew nothing of each other.
2. *Nation-to-Nation Relations*: Following years of first contact, fragile relations of peace, friendship, and rough equality were given the force of law in treaties.
3. *Displacement and Assimilation*: Power tilted to non-Aboriginal people and their governments. Aboriginal people were frequently moved from and denied access to much of their land and steps were taken to “civilize” them and teach them European ways.
4. *Renewal and Renegotiation*: This is a time of recovery for Aboriginal people and cultures, a time for critical review of the Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relationship, and a time for its regeneration and renewal.

The relationship of equity described in the second phase soon gave way to one of dominance and oppression. The resulting status quo in terms of relations among Aboriginal people, the Canadian state (and the institutions that represent it) and non-Aboriginal people in Canada is not appropriate or acceptable. Stage Four (presumably the current stage) calls for a re-evaluation of this relationship.

2.2. Aboriginal people and forests: systematic exclusion

A major component of the historically deteriorating relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in Canada has been the systematic exclusion of Aboriginal people from their lands. Rather than being a random side-effect of poor relations, this exclusion has occurred as a result of deliberate efforts to make way for European settlement and resource development interests (McGregor, 2006; NAFA, 1993; Rude and Deiter, 2004). The challenge now is to involve Aboriginal people in sustainable forest management, when the policies and tools of systematic exclusion remain and continue to frame the discourse on sustainable forest management in Canada. As Aboriginal Forester, Peggy Smith, of Lakehead University, writes, Aboriginal people want their relationships to the forest re-established:

Aboriginal people have a unique relationship with the land, a relationship that, although warped by European settlement and imposition of foreign institutions and rules of order, continues to this day. It is a relationship that provides the basis of economic, cultural and political activity in Aboriginal communities. Traditional forest-based economic activities of hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering are protected in many areas by Treaty. These activities are still very much a part of the Aboriginal way of life, especially in those few areas where access to natural resources has not been diminished by overuse and industrial exploitation. (Smith, 1995, p. 5).

The exclusion of Aboriginal people from their traditional lands and forests has resulted in large part from differences in European and Aboriginal world views (McGregor, 2000; Menzies, 2006). A fundamental aspect of Aboriginal world view is that the Earth is a conscious being (Booth and Jacobs, 1990; Deloria, 1999; Fitzner, 1998; Parsons and Prest, 2003; Turner, 2005). This world view is reflected in how Aboriginal people have related to and interacted with their forest environment for millennia. "Over thousands of years Aboriginal people developed a way of life and spirituality based on respect for the land and all living things; these practices are still very much alive" (Smith et al., 1995, p. 1-2). Upon contact, Europeans introduced and later imposed a fundamentally different view of the forest. "Wild" forests were seen as frightening, and it was thought that, "much of the forest was an enemy to be eradicated as quickly as possible". (Lambert and Pross, 1967, xiii).

Later, forests began to take on a more utilitarian value and were exploited on an increasing basis (Lambert and Pross, 1967). In the early years of colonization, this exploitation involved little in the way of management. Acquisition of land was an important policy objective of the colonial governments. Aboriginal people, like forests, were regarded as impediments to the path of such progress and were therefore systematically moved "out of the way" through treaties, policies and legislation (e.g. the *British North America (BNA) Act*, the *Indian Act*) of the British and later Canadian governments (Alfred, 1999).

As forests became increasingly valued for their timber, and as the necessity of forest conservation started to appear, the concept of forest management began to gain importance (see Beyers and Sandberg, 1998; Levy, 1994; Rayner and Howlett, 2007, for historical accounts of forest policy development in Canada and Ontario). Little changed in terms of how Aboriginal people were viewed, however, and the early colonial approach to Aboriginal relations of forging ahead and displacing Aboriginal people from their lands persisted. It was later deemed necessary to use treaties as a way to remove people from the path of "progress", which included the establishment of non-Native settlements and other developments (Lambert and Pross, 1967). As RCAP (1996a, 17) found, "the representatives of the Crown had come to see treaties merely as a tool for clearing Aboriginal people off desirable land." The dominant form of human interaction with the forest thus rapidly shifted from systems of Aboriginal stewardship to heavily timber-biased "management" as practiced by Europeans. The territories upon which Aboriginal people depended for their survival were wrested from their control. Phil Fontaine, current AFN Grand Chief notes:

All of us know only too well our pasts of political treachery, unfulfilled treaties with the Crown, dispossession from our ancestral territories by an aggressive and possessive colonizing society. We have witnessed other peoples encroaching on our lands, exploiting natural resources while we have suffered the multiple effects of poverty and powerlessness. (Fontaine, 1998, p. 17).

The benefits that contemporary First Nations derive from the forests are rooted in the past, yet continue to provide sustenance in

the present. Forests contribute substantially to Aboriginal community life in terms of economics (logging, trapping), cultural, spiritual and social activity (ceremonies) health (medicines), food sources (hunting, gathering, growing), shelter materials, fuel supply and recreational activity. This immediate connection to the land has received even more emphasis with the drive for Aboriginal self-determination and its dependence for success on access to natural resources. Control and management over forests is therefore at least as important now to First Nations as it was for thousands of years prior to contact.

It was the creation of the 1867 *BNA Act*, whose primary purpose was to outline the division of powers among the federal and provincial governments as they entered into confederation, which officially generated the jurisdictional "Catch 22" we see today with respect to resolving Aboriginal land issues. While jurisdiction over "Indians" and "lands reserved for Indians" remained in the hands of the federal government (see Erasmus and Sanders, 1992, for discussion), responsibility for the management of natural resources over the remaining "crown" lands was given to the provinces. Thus, most of the traditional territory that Aboriginal groups had enjoyed since time immemorial came under provincial jurisdiction (Bombay, 1994, pp. 3–27; Parsons and Prest, 2003; Wilson and Graham, 2005; Wyatt, 2008). This arrangement of confederation, achieved without the consent of Aboriginal people, has been a major source of problems ever since. Aboriginal groups have been effectively stripped of their authority and jurisdiction over the land upon which they relied.

Bombay (1994, p. 30) comments on this situation, referring to much-needed changes in the way forest lands are tenured across the country:

A major issue that has to be dealt with is the existing forest tenure systems in Canada. In 1993 NAFA conducted a study of existing forest tenure systems, where we examined the barriers ingrained in the process through which provincial governments manage and allocate forest resources. As we all know, most economically accessible crown forests in first nations traditional territories are already committed under long-term renewable licences.

Because of the renewable feature of most licences, such as forest management licences or FMA's, opportunities will remain unavailable unless provincial governments renegotiate the forest management agreements with the industry to require participation and partnerships with Aboriginal communities.

Although there are exceptions, the policy and legislative frameworks which govern Canada's forest industry continue to alienate and exclude Aboriginal people from forest management (Wilson and Graham, 2005). This involves restricting access to forest resources (e.g. harvesting timber) and limiting participation in decision-making such that Aboriginal cultural and traditional uses and values continue to be unaccounted for (NAFA, 1993). There has been, of course, considerable conflict over forest resources between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal society as a result (Notzke, 1994; Smith, 2007). Aboriginal assertions of rights and court decisions in their favor have recently led to a somewhat more favorable climate for Aboriginal involvement in decisions impacting their lands. Despite these small inroads into the current system, the state of Aboriginal forestry in Canada is unfortunately still characterized by exclusion.

2.3. The continued dominance of western forest management paradigms

While increasing dialogue and opportunities in the area of Aboriginal involvement in forest management are positive

developments, non-Aboriginal frameworks of understanding and implementing forest management continue to have a stranglehold on forestry throughout Canada.

The RCAP Commissioners (1996b) found in the course of their nationwide hearings that it is the theory as well as the practice of resource management that is problematic:

While many employees of resource management agencies know that Aboriginal people living on reserves continue to harvest on Crown lands, they are generally unaware that most do so in accordance with their own rules of common property. Nor are they aware that Aboriginal people generally consider state rules an unfortunate imposition. In part, this is a reflection of the way those agencies are structured. Authority is centralized and flows from the top down, and the environment is reduced to conceptually discrete components, such as forests, parks, fish and wildlife, that have traditionally been managed independently (although less so as governments commit to principles of sustainable development or holistic management).

This arrangement reflects long-standing government policy and practice as well as the way resource managers are trained as foresters, biologists, planners and technicians. Managers bring to their jobs the systems of knowledge and understanding that prevail in those disciplines, and those systems have become part and parcel of the corporate memory and institutional interests of resource management agencies. (p. 525).

Chapeskie's (1995) analysis concurs with that of RCAP. He observes that:

...the discourse of resource management employed by the dominant non-aboriginal society which invariably forms the context of co-management discussions between aboriginal groups and state agencies is plagued with ambiguity. The state largely controls the conceptual framework in which co-management negotiations take place... A significant corpus of research documenting the cultural distinctiveness and community-based character of aboriginal land use systems has had no more than a trace impact on discussions that have been established to resolve resource management conflicts in northwestern Ontario. (p. 27).

State systems of resource management are not neutral or objective; they are products of the world view, society and culture that produced them (Berneshawi, 1997; Chapeskie, 1995; Davidson-Hunt and O'Flaherty, 2007; Feit, 1998; Nadasy, 2006; RCAP, 1996a; Stevenson, 2005). LaDuke (1994, p. 146) points out that, "As no two societies or cultures are identical, there can be no such thing as a scientifically or technically neutral management regime that is equally applicable and acceptable to both." Chapeskie (1995, p. 12) argues this point as well, stating that:

When non-aboriginal Canadians use categories such as "wilderness" and "natural resources" to refer to the land and the "wealth" that it contains, they are not employing categories that transcend cultural boundaries. Rather, as they are used to describe Canadian landscapes, they embody a whole series of inferences concerning human relationships to this "undeveloped" land that have historically been the cultural domain of Euro-Canadians. By now this should go without saying. In fact, however, it has done little to alter the tendency of the relevant state institutions to assume that the Euro-Canadian technical paradigm of resource management possesses a superior intrinsic rationality and predictive capacity. Such power is assumed to endow this paradigm with a universal applicability that should transcend cultural boundaries.

Forest management decision-making processes, therefore, even when they aim to involve Aboriginal people and knowledge, are virtually uniformly structured according to basic Western paradigms. Chapeskie (1995, p. 18) confirms that, "Anishinaabe people find themselves in a position of having to accept that this discourse inevitably governs discussions concerning land use issues." Aboriginal people are therefore routinely faced with the dilemma of either attempting to present their concerns and recommendations so as to "fit" into Western structures (which frequently results at best in a loss of meaning, and at worst in having the information they share being used in ways which adversely affect those who shared it – e.g. see Roberts, 1996), or not having any say at all. Dominant systems are imposed and in some cases Aboriginal peoples have been forced to accept them to gain access to lands and resources (Stevenson, 1999, 2006). As Chapeskie (1995, p. 56) further observes, this "...colonizing nature of the western discourse of resource management poses a serious threat to the very fabric of aboriginal cultural diversity."

2.4. Aboriginal people in forest management: recognition of a unique role

Situations such as that described above are symptomatic of inequitable power relations, in this case between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people and organizations in Canada. One of RCAP's many contributions to understanding these issues has been to recognize what Aboriginal people have been stating since the arrival of Europeans: that Aboriginal people belong to their own Aboriginal nations, and any consultation between Canadian governments and Aboriginal peoples must occur on an equitable *nation-to-nation* basis. Formerly, it was assumed that Aboriginal concerns over resource use and other issues would be addressed (if Aboriginal issues were considered at all) in the course of mainstream public involvement. Aboriginal peoples were assumed by non-Aboriginal parties to be just another "interest group" or "stakeholder", much like anglers or hikers. On the contrary, Aboriginal people are unique in Canada, possessing unique rights that are constitutionally recognized and protected. These include rights to self-determination and self-government (Mercredi and Turpel, 1993). Although the situation is slowly changing, "...much remains to be done to translate this into forest management regimes and practices" (CCFM, 1998, p. 32).

Nevertheless, change is occurring, spurred on by factors such as:

- the extension to Aboriginal people of the general trend in forestry to include the public in forest management planning. Although it has been argued that Aboriginal people have previously been able to participate as part of mainstream processes, these have tended to be processes of exclusion from an Aboriginal point of view (EA Board, 1994).
- the rise within the last several decades of Indigenous and human rights movements. These have pushed for the inclusion of Indigenous people in the decision-making processes that impact their lives and lands, and created pressure in Canada to take Aboriginal concerns seriously. More recently, Canada has been a participant in international fora regarding the participation of Indigenous peoples in forest management (Higgins, 1998; NAFA, 1996; Smith, 1998).
- the shift in forestry paradigm both internationally and within Canada. Sustainable forestry is coming to replace sustained yield as the primary focus of progressive forest management initiatives. This is gradually encouraging forest practitioners to consider other perspectives and values in planning processes, including the unique perspectives of Aboriginal people (Beyers

and Sandberg, 1998; Merkel, 2007; Rayner and Howlett, 2007; Rowe, 1994).

- the national and international recognition that Aboriginal people have unique systems of knowledge which are closely aligned to many current notions of sustainability. This realization has captured the interest of many resource managers, including forestry professionals (Berkes, 1999, 1993; CCFM, 1998; Davidson-Hunt and O'Flaherty, 2007; Houde, 2007; Inglis, 1993; Stevenson, 2005).
- the existence of major unresolved issues in relation to Aboriginal peoples, such as constitutionally protected Aboriginal and treaty rights, Aboriginal self-government, and land claims. Recent court decisions combined with grassroots Aboriginal activism (direct action) have led resource managers to recognize the importance of these issues and to begin to address them through forest policy and management regimes (Bombay, 1996; CCFM, 1998; Hickey and Nelson, 2005; PFN and OMNR, 2006; Wilson and Graham, 2005).
- the overwhelming demand by Aboriginal people to be included in the forest management process (McGregor, 2000). Direct action, law suits, and court battles, many over the issue of exclusion, have resulted in significant gains for Aboriginal people in Canada (CFS, 1998; Notzke, 1994; Smith, 2007). This is perhaps the most significant factor in the trend to begin including Aboriginal people in forest management.

Although Aboriginal and treaty rights are still being interpreted in the courts under the influence of Canada's colonial legacy, it is increasingly expected that Aboriginal rights be recognized and accounted for in the resource management arena (Government of Canada, 2008). Aboriginal people are gradually finding more opportunities to express their unique status and take up their legitimate role as people with a special place in decision-making processes that impact their lives and lands. This special relationship is now beginning to be formally recognized in various areas of Canadian forest management planning (Bombay, 1992; Smith, 1998; Wilson and Graham, 2005; Wyatt, 2008).

3. The RCAP recommendations

The scope of RCAP's recommendations is broad, including discourse on world view, resource management frameworks, recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights, and self-determination. RCAP's main requirement for resolving outstanding Aboriginal issues in Canada is the renewal of the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples. Numerous specific recommendations (see, for example, RCAP, 1996b, pp. 630–633, and 641–642) are offered as well, however, and the implementation of these should assist in the achievement of this overall goal. What follows are some highlights from those RCAP recommendations which pertain most directly to Aboriginal participation in forest management.

With respect to forest resources and management, RCAP confirmed that Aboriginal people still derive much of their livelihood from the land. However, federal and provincial laws make it difficult to secure allocations of, or access to, natural resources on traditional territories located off-reserve. If Aboriginal people are to become actively and meaningfully involved in forest management and other endeavors related to self-determination, then their strength as nations must be rebuilt. This task of nation-building, which is highly dependent on access to natural resources, must be strongly supported by government, especially at the federal level.

Federal, provincial, and territorial governments, however, will be required to work together on many aspects of resolving Aboriginal issues. Because of jurisdictional issues such as those

created by the *BNA Act* and perpetuated by successive legislation including the 1982 *Constitution Act*, the federal government must urge provincial and territorial governments to recognize traditional Aboriginal activities on provincial, or "Crown", lands. Specifically, RCAP emphasized that Canada must uphold the "law of fiduciary duty" (RCAP, 1996a) by protecting the exercise of traditional Aboriginal activities on Crown lands. RCAP also called for federal and provincial governments to acknowledge and respect Aboriginal resource rights in the context of treaties.

RCAP recognized the positive nature of the ongoing paradigm change in forestry from maximum production to sustainable forest management, which should encourage increased Aboriginal involvement. However, Aboriginal input will only be meaningful, and the knowledge which yields such input can only be sustained, if Aboriginal people can continue to practice traditional activities on their traditional territories.

RCAP also recognized that participation in the forest sector shows great promise for increasing Aboriginal self-sufficiency. However, improving Aboriginal involvement will require re-structuring the relationships at both federal and provincial government levels and acknowledgment and respect of Aboriginal resource rights as agreed upon in treaties (AFN, 2007; NAFA, 2007). RCAP suggests partnerships and joint ventures as ways to increase Aboriginal participation, while also recognizing that is not enough to simply incorporate Aboriginal people's knowledge into existing systems of forest tenure and management. Rather, consideration must be given to developing culturally appropriate, mutually beneficial methods of involving Aboriginal values and knowledge (Traditional Ecological Knowledge, or TEK).

4. Canada's forest strategies

Beginning with the 1987 "National Forest Sector Strategy", Canada's official forest policy has reflected a gradual change in focus from sustained timber yield to sustainable forest management. Although Aboriginal issues are not mentioned in the strategy until its 1992 revision (following the establishment of RCAP), it is worthwhile to start by looking at the 1987 document and to track its development both during and following the work conducted by RCAP. Discussion follows as to what extent the development of these strategies mirrors the direction recommended by the Commissioners.

4.1. 1987: National Forest Sector Strategy

Canadian forest policy began to see some limited beginnings of a movement towards sustainability with the 1987 publication of "A National Forest Sector Strategy for Canada" (CCFM, 1987). This strategy introduced the need to recognize, "important attributes of the forest that are not usually associated with economic development, but are nevertheless essential to Canada's social and environmental well-being" (CCFM, 1987, p. 1). Although the focus was still largely on protecting the timber aspect of forestry, the new strategy also expressed a wish to, "increase the number and range of benefits that can be derived from the forest land base" (CCFM, 1987, p. 1). With a concentration on ecological aspects of non-timber values, the document drew upon World Conservation Strategy principles for sustainable development, such that, "Its objectives are designed to safeguard important ecological processes and the genetic diversity on which civilization depends, and to ensure that all utilization of natural resources can be sustained" (CCFM, 1987, p. 5). Although in practical terms the strategy was limited in scope and vision, it did lay the groundwork for consideration of non-timber values of the forest.

Despite the profile Aboriginal issues gained during the repatriation of the Constitution in 1982 and the subsequent recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights in Canada, Aboriginal issues were still not officially acknowledged as a significant factor in Canadian forest policy at this time. As such, there was no mention of Aboriginal people in the 1987 strategy. Supreme Court decisions would serve as major catalysts for correcting this omission, as evidenced by the subsequent strategy (Doyle-Bedwell and Cohen, 2001; IBA, 2006; Wilson and Graham, 2005). The establishment of the National Aboriginal Forestry Association in 1991 also served to promote more direct reference to Aboriginal peoples in subsequent national forest strategies.

4.2. 1992: National Forest Strategy

Under its new title, “Sustainable Forests: a Canadian Commitment”, the 1992 National Forest Strategy represents a significant departure from the previous document in that it makes specific reference to the participation of Aboriginal people. It claims that, “We have established new partnerships that reflect the importance of forests to Aboriginal people, maintained and enhanced cultural and spiritual values, and expanded economic opportunities” (CCFM, 1992, p. iii). Aboriginal aspects of the strategy are discussed again in Strategic Direction Number Seven: “Aboriginal People: a Unique Perspective”, which recognizes the importance of the holistic understanding Aboriginal people have of forests and its historical importance to survival. It is also recognized that Aboriginal interest in the forest is more than “traditional”. “The Canadian Constitution recognizes and affirms existing Aboriginal and treaty rights, and Supreme Court decisions have gone some distance in defining these rights” (CCFM, 1992, p. 39). Among other key points the strategy recognizes are that:

Aboriginal self-government, Aboriginal rights and treaty rights, and responsibilities of the Crown, should be respected and are important aspects to be considered in forest policy; Aboriginal people have an economic interest in the forest; increased access to forest resources is required to improve economic opportunities for Aboriginal people; and that increased cooperation between governments, Aboriginal communities, and forest companies is needed.

Strategic Direction Number 7 also contained a “Framework for Action” which included a call for the development of an “Aboriginal Forest Strategy” (undertaken and completed by the National Aboriginal Forestry Association). This framework aimed to, “...ensure the recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights in forest management”, partly by ensuring, “...that the development and application of legislation and policies governing the management of forest lands respect constitutional provisions for Aboriginal and treaty rights” (CCFM, 1992, p. 41).

A review by the National Aboriginal Forestry Association of the 1992 strategy’s success indicates a lack of implementation (Bombay, 1996). In particular, the strategy failed to assign responsibility for implementation to specific parties. Provincial governments also failed to make the link between Aboriginal and treaty rights and forest management policy (Bombay, 1996, pp. 3–4). Nevertheless, this strategy was viewed by many as a positive step given the previous lack of focus paid to the concerns of Aboriginal people (Rayner and Howlett, 2007). The strategy did have an impact on forestry practices in areas such as the consideration of Aboriginal values and the recognition that Aboriginal people are not “stakeholders”. Likely the most significant long-term benefit of the strategy has been the increased awareness of Aboriginal concerns,

in particular the recognition that Aboriginal and treaty rights must be accommodated through forest policy.

4.3. 1998: National Forest Strategy (1998–2003)

The 1992 National Forest Strategy was renewed in 1998 for another five years and was developed after the release of RCAP in 1996. It was closely linked to other national initiatives, notably *Gathering Strength*, the “Aboriginal Action Plan”, the Government of Canada’s policy response to the RCAP report (DIAND, 1997). Similar to its predecessor, the 1998 strategy includes “Strategic Direction Number Seven”, entitled “Aboriginal People: Issues of Relationship”, which is devoted entirely to the consideration of Aboriginal issues. In the 1998 strategy, however, the influence of the RCAP findings is evident. Specifically referring to RCAP, the strategy states that:

The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples has, therefore, recommended that interim measures be taken to use natural resources for Aboriginal economic and cultural development. The commission also recommends expanding the range of benefits derived from resource development in areas of traditional use and Treaty areas, in order to achieve a more equitable distribution of economic benefits from such activities. (CCFM, 1998, p. 32).

The scope of discussion in this strategy is generally broader, and includes for the first time a recognition of “Traditional Aboriginal Knowledge” (CCFM, 1998, p. 31) as having a potential role to play in sustainable forest management. Article 8j from the UN Convention on Biological Diversity is also specifically mentioned and Canadian obligations in relation to Aboriginal people are now defined to include adherence to international agreements.

In support of RCAP recommendations with respect to capacity-building in Aboriginal communities, the 1998 strategy proclaims that, “a new feature of forest management in Canada is the emergence of partnership arrangements between Aboriginal peoples and the private sector, as well as with federal, provincial and territorial governments” (p. 33). For Aboriginal people to effectively participate in sustainable forest management, they must have the capacity to do so. Effectively implemented, these partnership arrangements are one way in which this capacity can be arrived at.

As well as supporting the idea of increasing access to forest resources for both economic development and traditional activities, Aboriginal and treaty rights receive more focus in this strategy. The Framework for Action calls for “the involvement of Aboriginal peoples in forest management and decision making, consistent with Aboriginal and treaty rights” (CCFM, 1998, p. 34).

4.4. 2003: National Forest Strategy (2003–2008)

This strategy is the most comprehensive to date in terms of consideration of Aboriginal people and their interests in national forest policy. In the preamble to the strategy’s vision, it is stated that, “Aboriginal Peoples, based on their distinct historical and legal positions and their connection to the forest, ... want to actively participate in and benefit from forest-related policy and decision making processes” (CCFM, 2003, p. 3). It is also noted that, “an increasing amount of land is coming under Aboriginal jurisdiction as land issues are settled” (CCFM, 2003, p. 5). Court decisions are credited in part with steering change in this direction:

Aboriginal and treaty rights are primarily exercised in the forest and are constitutionally protected by the Constitution Act, 1982. Over the last 25 years, Canadian courts have affirmed Aboriginal and treaty rights. Thus, forest policy and forest management

practices have to reflect the constitutional protection afforded Aboriginal and treaty rights. The federal government also has a lead responsibility towards Aboriginal Peoples, including for Indians and lands reserved for Indians under section 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867. (CCFM, 2003, p. 5).

This represents a significant departure from previous understandings of the Canadian forest sector, in which Aboriginal interests were merely regarded (when they came to be regarded at all) as another in a long list of factors for consideration. The latest strategy now appropriately views Aboriginal people and interests as part of the fundamental “forest framework” of this country.

Replacing the “Strategic Directions” of the previous strategies is a series of 8 “Strategic Themes”, number 3 of which is labeled “Rights and Participation of Aboriginal Peoples”. The stated objective of Theme 3 is to, “Accommodate Aboriginal and treaty rights in the sustainable use of the forest recognizing the historical and legal position of Aboriginal Peoples and their fundamental connection to ecosystems” (CCFM, 2003, p. 12).

It is noted in Theme 3 that, while the courts and international conventions are working to provide some direction on the scope and implications of Aboriginal and treaty rights, Aboriginal people continue to experience challenges and barriers to participation due in part to inappropriate and ineffective policy frameworks. In the meantime, it is therefore stated in the strategy that, “Effective participation ... calls for innovative and bold institutional arrangements between governments and Aboriginal communities relating to forest management” (CCFM, 2003, p. 13). Much more so than previous efforts, this strategy makes a substantial attempt at ensuring effective implementation. The “action items” developed to guide the implementation of Theme 3 are similar to those of the action plan in the previous strategy. However, further emphasis is placed on the creation of institutional arrangements which will increase Aboriginal involvement in decision-making. Such arrangements will acknowledge ongoing processes such as land claims settlements, but also initiate processes that reflect government fiduciary responsibilities and the legal duty to consult. In addition, part of the implementation component of this strategy is the identification of “Forest Champions” to take the lead on implementing each of the strategy’s themes (CCFM, 2003, p. 24). The National Aboriginal Forestry Association has since been named the “Champion of Theme 3”, and has developed a set of indicators to monitor the success specifically of Theme 3’s implementation (NAFA, 2005; Rekmans, 2006).

4.5. A Vision for Canada’s Forests: Beyond 2008

In 2007, the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM), released *Canada’s Forest Strategy for 2008 and Beyond: a Discussion Paper* (CCFM, 2007). The Strategy proposed a vision and identified a number of issues, along with two key priorities, described as “Forest Sector Transformation and Climate Change” (CCFM, 2008a, p. 4). It also commits to a review of the Strategy every three years, along with a national workshop (p. 12). This Strategy includes Aboriginal peoples as key business partners in the Canadian forest sector, but is noticeably silent on the underlying fundamental issues of Aboriginal and treaty rights. The Strategy underwent an online public review where input was obtained from various interested parties. Although Aboriginal issues were identified and briefly discussed, the framing of Aboriginal issues was not well received by those public reviewers who did respond. This feedback on the Strategy was summarized in a report, *What was Heard: Analysis Feedback on Canada’s Forest Strategy for 2008 and Beyond: a Discussion Paper*. The input received was largely critical of how Aboriginal issues were addressed in the proposed strategy (CCFM,

2008b). Reviewers called for a separate section addressing Aboriginal-specific concerns and issues, as was contained in previous versions of the Strategy. All told, the end result is a national forest strategy that is undoubtedly the weakest since RCAP in terms of Aboriginal participation in the forest sector.

Despite such a setback in terms of national policy in relation to Aboriginal peoples and the forest sector, there are other signs that RCAP’s call for renewed relationships with Aboriginal peoples is occurring. Hickey and Nelson’s (2005) work, *Partnerships Between First Nations and the Forest Sector: a National Survey*, provides insights into processes of partnership formation. This work draws upon RCAP recommendations around the need for a partnership approach to addressing economic disparities between Aboriginal peoples and the rest of Canada (p. 6). The development of the forest sector offers an opportunity for First Nations to have a, “... greater say in how that development occurs” on their lands (p. 7). Wyatt’s (2008) review of Aboriginal forestry over the past thirty years chronicles such evolution of Aboriginal involvement in the forest sector. Wyatt observes that, “It is clear that Canadian forestry is evolving to provide a greater role for aboriginal peoples. Aboriginal rights are being defined and recognized, First Nations are taking their place in forest industries, and forest management increasingly takes their interests into account” (p. 176). In this respect it is not governments per se that are showing leadership in regards to the inclusion of Aboriginal peoples in forestry, but rather industry and other partners.

5. Implementing RCAP principles

5.1. Progress to date

It is a challenge to measure the extent to which RCAP’s principles have been implemented in national forest strategies, particularly as other factors such as court decisions also play a role (Wilson and Graham, 2005). However, it can be seen from the wording of the national strategies since 1998 that there have been a number of improvements which reflect at least to some degree the principles outlined in RCAP. From 1987, when there was no mention at all of Aboriginal people, the National Forest Strategy has evolved beyond merely recognizing Aboriginal people as another “interest group”, to the point where Aboriginal people are now viewed as a key component of the national forest framework. The 2003–2008 strategy is certainly the most assertive in its call for the inclusion of Aboriginal people in the forest sector.

Aboriginal peoples have also reflected upon how well RCAP’s recommendations have been implemented in Canada more broadly. In 2006, the Indigenous Bar Association of Canada (IBA) devoted its annual fall conference to the topic of RCAP (IBA, 2006). It was observed that although challenges remain in terms of implementing key recommendations, the focus on “nation-to-nation” relationships remains a key goal of Aboriginal peoples (IBA, 2006). Despite frustration over the degree to which RCAP has been able to influence Aboriginal public policy, it has nonetheless had significant influence in the courts, as, “over the past 10 years RCAP was referenced by the court in over 150 cases” (Stack in IBA, 2006, p. 8). In 2007, the Assembly of First Nations released *The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples at 10 Years: a Report Card*, and found that Canada failed to address core recommendations of RCAP, in particular the need to restructure relationships before positive outcomes can be achieved (AFN, 2007). Although some progress was noted in terms of land and resources, particularly in co-management-type arrangements, fundamental re-structuring has not occurred to reflect nation-to-nation relationships.

The National Aboriginal Forestry Association (NAFA) also reflected upon RCAP at their annual conference in 2006, with

a specific emphasis on forestry. In 1993, NAFA was an intervener in the RCAP process and made both an oral presentation and a written submission (NAFA, 1993). NAFA's submission focused on access to forest-land resources and recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights in the forest sector. The NAFA ten-year review was held in 2006 to "reaffirm the significance of RCAP and the importance of working together towards progress on closing the gap between Aboriginal Peoples and Canadians" (NAFA, 2007, p. vi). NAFA's assessment in relation to land and resources reveals a lack of consistency across various jurisdictions with respect to Aboriginal involvement in the forest sector, among other issues. David Nahwegahbow, an Indigenous legal scholar, pointed out that, "while [RCAP] has had an impact, it has not been as effective as it could have been", particularly in relation to policy (NAFA, 2007, p. 42). Nahwegahbow also observed that, "RCAP has not had a significant impact on government ... but it has had an impact on academics, lawyers and judges. Aboriginal people are winning many cases, and are generally making progress in the courts" (NAFA, 2007, p. 43).

RCAP's influence thus appears to be indirect, influencing the legal arena, which in turn influences the development of policy frameworks. However, RCAP remains "...a gigantic piece of unfinished business" containing a much-needed "...look at how to live together" (Abele in IBA, 2006, p. 13). The challenge continues to be one of determining how Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relationships should be shaped by the call for nation-to-nation relationships and the need to co-exist.

5.2. Co-existence as a framework for Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations in sustainable forest management

Missing from Canada's national forest strategies is a key RCAP-recommended component necessary to assure meaningful Aboriginal involvement in sustainable forest management: measures to promote the development of a "co-existence" relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples. The idea of co-existence, where both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultures continue to flourish side by side in a mutually supportive but non-integrated environment, requires further explanation.

On what terms will Aboriginal people flourish in a climate of renewal and renegotiation? The current approach to resource management, RCAP (1996b, p. 428) finds, "has not worked and cannot work. The Aboriginal principles of sharing and co-existence offer us the chance for a fresh start. Canadians have an opportunity to address the land question in the spirit of these principles."

Continued discord between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples is neither appropriate nor helpful to either side. A new relationship based on mutual reconciliation and peaceful co-existence is required. However, such a renewed relationship must be developed with the understanding that "...land is not a just a commodity; it is an inextricable part of Aboriginal identity, deeply rooted in moral and spiritual values" (RCAP, 1996b, p. 430). This new relationship must also recognize Aboriginal and treaty rights in a meaningful fashion – embracing them as an expression of Aboriginal relationships with the land.

The renewed relationship RCAP calls for is based on the ancient Indigenous philosophical view that sought "co-existence" between Nations (RCAP, 1993). It is founded on the belief that having separate world views need not be an undesirable thing, and developing a framework which would respect different world views would be a positive approach to take. One of the more well-known representations of this approach is the Two-Row Wampum (or "treaty belt") of the Haudenosaunee, displaying two rows of different coloured beads running side by side and separated by a third colour (Ransom and Ettenger, 2001). Although the concept of co-existence has been part of Aboriginal tradition for many centuries, it finds its

most prevalent expression in the treaties described by such representations (both prior to and after contact with Europeans). The concept of co-existence suggests that, "Together, side by side, we go down the river of life in peace and friendship and mutual co-existence" (Lyons, 1988, p. 20). The Two-Row Wampum serves as a model for renewing and reconciling a damaged relationship between two peoples. It is a model that can apply to any interaction between two nations. In the current situation involving sustainable use of resources in Canada (and throughout the world), in which the participation of Aboriginal people and their knowledge is sought, the Two-Row Wampum and the principles it symbolizes can be appropriately applied (McGregor, 2008; Stevenson, 2006). The principles of sharing and respect can apply to the intellectual tradition in the form of sharing knowledge. Such sharing of knowledge was evident in the times when treaties were made using the Two-Row Wampum. Indigenous knowledge was used almost exclusively in the early years in order for the Europeans to survive. Aboriginal people shared their knowledge readily and it was also readily accepted. There are numerous examples from this time which illustrate the principle that the Nations would come to the mutual aid of one another; again this applies to sharing knowledge.

At the current point in the history of humanity, Aboriginal knowledge is again needed to offer insights into sustainability and the contexts in which it finds meaning (e.g. spirituality). It is a time when Aboriginal knowledge is being called upon to come to the aid of other nations of people. What has not been achieved in recent years are the conditions needed to make such sharing a reality according to the principles of co-existence. Missing from the equation in particular are Aboriginal access to resources and the equitable (nation-to-nation) power relationships which implementing a co-existence approach would ensure.

RCAP has rightly condemned the policy of domination and displacement that has characterized Aboriginal policy in Canada for centuries and has called for a new relationship based on partnership and co-existence. Only through a shift in power relationships can Aboriginal people and their knowledge be effectively involved in moving towards sustainability. The model of co-existence is viewed as holding promise for resource management (Brubacher and McGregor, 1998; Chapeskie, 1995; McGregor, 2008, 2000; Ransom, 1999; Ransom and Ettenger, 2001; Stevenson, 2006). Co-existence is increasingly thought to represent a potentially critical bridge between sustainable forest management as it is conceptualized by mainstream Canada and by Aboriginal people. Brubacher and McGregor (1998) anticipate that the co-existence approach can serve as a starting point for renegotiating an old relationship in a contemporary context:

...a co-existence approach would promote a focus on formally acknowledging Aboriginal people as legitimate partners in resource management. It would ensure their rightful place in the development and implementation of management policies and decision making... By drawing upon principles which express the values and perspectives of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultures, there is potential for developing an effective co-existence model, one that bridges distinctions by building upon shared values. (pp. 18–19).

The co-existence approach does not devalue western or Indigenous resource management practices or the knowledge that informs them. It does not allow for the domination of one over the other. Rather, both systems are valued, and most importantly for Aboriginal people, their cultural survival is assured. The Aboriginal world view and all it has to offer will no longer be threatened, dominated or distorted; and society in general may benefit from innovative approaches to resolving impending environmental crises.

6. Conclusion: the will to change

Both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples share an interest in the lands and forests in Canada. For Aboriginal people, this “interest” is much more than just that. According to First Nations legal scholar, *Borrows (2005, p. 3)*, First Nations land, “...is crucial to their survival as peoples. Its loss haunts their dreams. Its continuing occupation and/or re-occupation inspires their visions. Aboriginal peoples regard their traditional lands as sacred: it is integral to their culture and identity. They want to continue living on territories that have sustained them for thousands of years.” The present stark reality, however, is that in general, “...the Crown now claims occupation of traditional Aboriginal lands” (*Borrows, 2005, p. 3*). What does this mean for the future of Aboriginal involvement in forestry?

The answer to this question remains unclear, but there is a growing number of researchers concerned with providing new insights. Although the co-existence approach to Aboriginal involvement in forestry, which calls for Aboriginal peoples to establish their own institutions for managing forests rather than integrating them into mainstream forestry, is but one framework for resolving ongoing issues, it is related to what other researchers see as a most positive outcome for Aboriginal people. *Parsons and Prest (2003)*, for example, refer to this model of independent Aboriginal undertaking simply as Aboriginal forestry, which they describe further as being potentially developed in one of, “...three categories: the western model of sustainable forest management, traditional knowledge systems, and the combination of both” (p. 780). While each category employs different operational methods, all three establish Aboriginal interests and values as primary.

For his part, *Wyatt (2008)*, in his review of Aboriginal participation in forestry, describes five distinct phases of Aboriginal participation in forestry: Forestry excluding First Nations; Forestry by First Nations, Forestry for First Nations, Forestry with First Nations and Aboriginal Forestry (see *Wyatt, 2008*, pages 176–177, for a more detailed description of each phase). In Wyatt’s assessment, Aboriginal forestry would enable, “First Nations to define the institutions and practices they wish to engage in or permit on their lands.” As well, “Aboriginal management systems and institutions would be central to land management, reflecting the various traditions and interests of each Nation. Both TK and western science would be required, acknowledging the distinct basis of each” (p. 178).

In Canada at present, the recognition and practice of Aboriginal forestry is varied and uneven. It requires broader level change in institutional arrangements and forest management systems (*Wyatt, 2008, p. 178*). Comprehensive claims and self-government agreements have contributed to institutional change in parts of Canada in the form of co-management systems, the creation of new institutions and new institutional arrangements (*Hickey and Nelson, 2005; Parsons and Prest, 2003; Wilson and Graham, 2005; Wyatt, 2008*). These processes represent important and significant developments, but are not without growing pains (*Nadasdy, 2006; Natcher and Davis, 2007*). The move towards more positive Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relationships in Canada as described by RCAP and this paper calls for a shift from a colonial relationship to that of a mutually beneficial one as described in the Two-Row Wampum approach. Such a shift in relationships requires western ideological and institutional forces to decolonize their relationships with Aboriginal peoples and support self-determination (*Borrows, 2005; McGregor, 2004; Natcher and Davis, 2007; Teillet, 2005*). Such a shift might not require additional years and years of discussion, if the political will to achieve resolution can be mobilized. As *Borrows (2005, p. 84)* points out, “Recognition and affirmation need not be contingent upon

negotiation when what is needed is the political will to acknowledge the lands and resources Aboriginal peoples already possess.” *Teillet (2005, p. 71)* highlights this point as a focus of the issue, stating that we are now in a time of opportunity, “...that will only be realized if the government players in the natural resources regulatory regime are willing to admit the need for substantive change.”

References

- Alfred, T., 1999. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: an Indigenous Manifesto*. Oxford University Press, Don Mills, ON, 174 pp.
- Assembly of First Nations, 2007. *Royal Commission on Aboriginal People at 10 Years: a Report Card*. Assembly of First Nations, Ottawa, ON. www.afn.ca, 20 pp.
- Assembly of First Nations (AFN), 2005. A first nations-federal crown political accord on the recognition and implementation of first nations governments. <http://www.afn.ca/article.asp?id> (accessed 03.12.05).
- Berkes, F., 1999. *Sacred Ecology: Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management*. Taylor and Francis, Philadelphia, PA, 209 pp.
- Berkes, F., 1993. Traditional ecological knowledge in perspective. In: Inglis, J. (Ed.), *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge and International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, ON, pp. 1–9.
- Berneshawi, S., 1997. Resource management and the Mi’maq nation. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 1997 (1), 115–148.
- Beyers, J., Sandberg, L., 1998. Canadian federal forest policy: present initiatives and historical constraints. In: Sandberg, L., Sorlin, S. (Eds.), *Sustainability the Challenge: People, Power and the Environment*. Black Rose Books, Montreal, PQ, pp. 99–107.
- Bombay, H., 1996. *Aboriginal Forestry – Significant Developments and Events*. National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON, 42 pp.
- Bombay, H., 1994. Presentation on Co-Management by the National Aboriginal Forestry Association to the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. [Printed from Hansard, Issue No. 30, Thursday, December 8, 1994. Minutes of Proceedings & Evidence of the Standing Committee.] Ottawa, ON, pp. 30:24–30:38.
- Bombay, H., 1992. *An Aboriginal Forest Strategy*. National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON, 18 pp.
- Booth, A., Jacobs, H., 1990. Ties that bind: Native American beliefs as a foundation for environmental consciousness. *Environmental Ethics* 12, 27–43.
- Borrows, J., 2005. *Crown Occupations of Land: a History & Comparison*. Office of the Attorney General, Government of Ontario. http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/inquiries/ippewash/policy_part/research/index.html, Prepared by the Ipperwash Inquiry, pp. 85.
- Brubacher, D., McGregor, D., 1998. *Aboriginal Forest-Related Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Canada*. Contribution for the 19th Session of the North American Forest Commission, Villahermosa, Mexico, November 16–20, 1998. National Aboriginal Forestry Association for the Canadian Forest Service, Ottawa, ON, 21 pp.
- CCFM, 2008a. *A Vision for Canada’s Forest 2008 and Beyond*. Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, Ottawa, ON, 15 pp.
- CCFM, 2008b. *What was Heard: Analysis Feedback on Canada’s Forest Strategy for 2008 and Beyond: a Discussion Paper*. Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, Ottawa, ON, 34 pp.
- CCFM, 2007. *Canada’s Forest Strategy for 2008 and Beyond: a Discussion Paper*. Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, Ottawa, ON, 26 pp.
- Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM), 2003. *National Forest Strategy 2003–2008: Sustainable Forests, a Canadian Commitment*. National Forest Strategy, Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, Ottawa, ON. <http://npsc.forest.ca/strategies/strategy5.html> (accessed 31.01.06). 25 pp.
- Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM), 1998. *National Forest Strategy 1998–2003: Sustainable Forests, a Canadian Commitment*. National Forest Strategy, Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, Ottawa, ON, 47 pp.
- Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM), 1992. *Sustainable Forests: a Canadian Commitment*. National Forest Strategy, Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, Hull, PQ, 51 pp.
- Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM), 1987. *A National Forest Sector Strategy for Canada*. Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, Ottawa, ON, 22 pp.
- Canadian Forest Service (CFS), 1998. *The State of Canada’s Forests: the People’s Forests 1997–1998*. Natural Resources Canada, Canadian Forest Service, Ottawa, ON, 109 pp.
- Chapeskie, A., 1995. *Land, Landscape, Culturescape: Aboriginal Relationships to Land and the Co-Management of Natural Resources*. A Report for the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Land, Resource and Environmental Regimes Project, Ottawa, ON.
- Davidson-Hunt, I., O’Flaherty, M., 2007. Researchers, indigenous peoples, and place-based learning communities. *Society and Natural Resources* 20, 291–305.
- Deloria, V., 1999. *Spirit and Reason: the Vine Deloria, Jr., Reader*. Fulcrum Publishing, Golden, CO, 384 pp.
- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND), 1997. *Gathering Strength – Canada’s Aboriginal Action Plan*. Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, ON, 36 pp.

- Dickason, O., 1997. *Canada's First Nations: a History of Founding Peoples from Earliest Times*, second ed. Oxford University Press, Toronto, ON, 574 pp.
- Doyle-Bedwell, P., Cohen, F., 2001. Aboriginal peoples in Canada: their role in shaping environmental trends in the twenty-first century. In: Parsons, E. (Ed.), *Governing the Environment: Persistent Challenges: Uncertain Innovations*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, ON, pp. 169–206.
- Environmental Assessment Board (EA Board), 1994. *Reasons for Decision and Decision: Class Environmental Assessment by the Ministry of Natural Resources for Timber Management on Crown Lands in Ontario*. EA Board. Ministry of the Environment. Queens Printer for Ontario, Toronto, ON, 561 pp.
- Erasmus, G., Sanders, J., 1992. Canadian history: an aboriginal perspective. In: Engelstad, D., Bird, J. (Eds.), *Nation to Nation: Aboriginal Sovereignty and the Future of Canada*. House of Anansi Press, Toronto, ON, pp. 3–11.
- Feit, H., 1998. Reflections on local knowledge and wildlife resource management: differences, dominance and decentralization. In: Dorais, L., Muller-Wille, L., Nagy, M. (Eds.), *Aboriginal Environmental Knowledge in the North: Definitions and Dimensions*. Groupe d'Etudes Inuit et Circumpolaires, Université Laval, Québec, PQ.
- Fitzner, L., 1998. The circle of life: affirming aboriginal philosophies in everyday living. In: McCance, D. (Ed.), *Life Ethics in World Religions*. Scholars Press, Atlanta, GA, pp. 22–40.
- Fontaine, P., 1998. Speaking Notes for National Chief Phil Fontaine. Assembly of First Nations. Presented at "Celebrating Partnerships", Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, September 15, 1998. National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON, 19 pp.
- Frideres, J., 1993. *Native Peoples in Canada: Contemporary Conflicts*, fourth ed. Prentice Hall Canada Inc., Scarborough, ON, 560 pp.
- Gabriel, E., 1992. Kanesatake: the summer of 1990. In: Engelstad, D., Bird, J. (Eds.), *Nation to Nation: Aboriginal Sovereignty and the Future of Canada*. House of Anansi Press, Concord, ON, pp. 165–172.
- Goodleaf, D., 1995. *Entering the War Zone: a Mohawk Perspective on Resisting Invasions*. Theytus Books, Penitiction, BC, 189 pp.
- Government of Canada, 2008. *Aboriginal Consultation and Accommodation: Interim Guidelines for Federal Officials to Fulfill Legal Duty to Consult*. Government of Canada Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada. www.anic-inac.gc.ca, 58 pp.
- Government of Canada, 2004. *Strengthening the Relationship: Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable*. Report on the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable, 19 April 2004, Ottawa, ON, 81 pp.
- Hickey, C., Nelson, M., 2005. *Partnerships Between First Nations and the Forest Sector: a National Survey*. Sustainable Forest Management Network, Edmonton, AB, 30 pp.
- Higgins, C., 1998. The role of traditional ecological knowledge in managing for biodiversity. *Forestry Chronicle* 74 (3), 323–326.
- Houde, N., 2007. The six faces of traditional ecological knowledge: challenges and opportunities for Canadian co-management arrangements. *Ecology and Society* 12 (2), 34.
- Indigenous Bar Association (IBA), 2006. *Making Aboriginal Policy: a Conference Ten Years after the Final Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. In: Indigenous Bar Association in Canada 18th Annual Fall Conference, October 2006, Saskatoon, SK. www.indigenousbar.ca
- Inglis, J. (Ed.), 1993. *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge and International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, ON, 142 pp.
- LaDuke, W., 1994. Traditional ecological knowledge and environmental futures. In: *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Politics*. Endangered Peoples: Indigenous Rights and the Environment. University Press of Colorado, Niwot, CO, pp. 127–148.
- Lambert, R., Pross, P., 1967. *Nature's Wealth: a Centennial History of the Public Management of Lands, Forests & Wildlife in Ontario 1763–1967*. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario – The Department of Lands and Forests, 630 pp.
- Levy, M., 1994. *The Policies and Politics of Forestry in Ontario*. [Unpublished Major Paper]. Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, Toronto, ON, 99 pp.
- Lyons, O., 1988. Land of the free/home of the brave. In: Barreiro, J. (Ed.), *Indian Roots of American Democracy: Cultural Encounter 1*. Special Constitution Bicentennial Edition of the Northeast Indian Quarterly, Covering vol. 4, no. 4, and vol. 5, no. 1. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, pp. 18–20.
- Martin, P., 2005. Address by Prime Minister Paul Martin at the First Ministers Meeting. Office of the Prime Minister, Ottawa, ON. <http://www.pm.gc.ca/eng/news.asp?id=659> pp. (accessed 31.01.06).
- McGregor, D., 2008. Linking traditional ecological knowledge and western science: aboriginal perspectives from the 2000 State of the Great Lakes Ecosystem Conference. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 27 (1), 139–158.
- McGregor, D., 2006. *Aboriginal involvement in Ontario sustainable forest management: moving toward collaboration*. *Recherches Amerindiennes au Québec* 36 (2/3), 61–70.
- McGregor, D., 2004. *Coming full circle: indigenous knowledge, environment and our future*. *American Indian Quarterly* 28 (3/4), 385–410.
- McGregor, D., 2000. *From Exclusion to Co-Existence: Aboriginal Participation in Ontario's Forest Management Planning*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, 254 pp.
- Menzies, C., 2006. *Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Natural Resource Management*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.
- Mercredi, O., Turpel, M., 1993. *In the Rapids: Navigating the Future of First Nations*. Penguin Books, Toronto, ON, 248 pp.
- Merkel, G., 2007. We are all connected: globalization and community sustainability in the boreal forest, an aboriginal perspective. *Forestry Chronicle* 83 (3), 362–366.
- Nadasdy, P., 2006. The case of the missing sheep: time, space and the politics of trust in co-management practice. In: Menzies, C. (Ed.), *Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Natural Resource Management*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE, pp. 127–152.
- Natcher, D., Davis, S., 2007. Rethinking devolution: challenges for aboriginal resource management in the Yukon territory. *Society and Natural Resources* 20 (3), 271–279.
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association (NAFA), 2007. *Looking Back, Looking Forward: RCAP in Review: Assessing Progress on Land and Resources Recommendations Made by Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples as they Pertain to First Nations*. National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON. www.nafa.org, 68 pp.
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association (NAFA), 2005. *National Forest Strategy Update*, September 6, 2005. <http://www.nafaforestry.org/docs/NFSupdate-06sep05.pdf> (accessed 03.12.05).
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association (NAFA), 1996. *International instruments supporting the rights of indigenous peoples and their role in forest management*. In: *NAFA Newsletter Fall/Winter 1996*. National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON, pp. 6–7.
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association (NAFA), 1993. *Forest Lands and Resources for Aboriginal People: an Intervention Submitted to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON, 39 pp.
- Notzke, C., 1994. *Aboriginal Peoples and Natural Resources in Canada*. Captus Press, York University, Toronto, ON, 337 pp.
- O'Flaherty, R., Davidson-Hunt, I., Manseau, M., 2008. Indigenous knowledge and values in planning for sustainable forestry: Pikangikum First Nation and the Whitefeather Forest Initiative. *Ecology and Society* 13 (1), 6–16.
- Parsons, R., Prest, G., 2003. *Aboriginal forestry in Canada*. *Forestry Chronicle* 79 (4), 779–784.
- Pikangikum First Nation and Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (PFN and OMNR), 2006. *Keeping the Land: a Land Use Strategy for the Whitefeather Forest and Adjacent Areas*. PFN/OMNR, Pikangikum, ON/Red Lake, ON, 98 pp.
- Prime Ministers Office (PMO), 2005. *Backgrounder: Federal Aboriginal Economic Development Programming*. Office of the Prime Minister, Ottawa, ON. http://www.pm.gc.ca/grfx/docs/info06_e.pdf (accessed 31.01.06).
- Ransom, J., 1999. *The waters*. In: *Haudenosaunee Environmental Task Force (Ed.), Words that Come Before All Else: Environmental Philosophies of the Haudenosaunee*. Native North American Traveling College, Cornwall Island, ON, pp. 25–43.
- Ransom, R., Ettenger, K., 2001. *Polishing the Kaswentha': a Haudenosaunee view of environmental cooperation*. *Environmental Science and Policy* 4, 219–228.
- Rayner, J., Howlett, M., 2007. *The national forest strategy in comparative perspective*. *Forestry Chronicle* 83 (5), 651–657.
- Rekmans, L., 2006. *Update on Implementation of the National Forest Strategy, Theme 3*. Newsletter, October 26, 2006. National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON, 2 pp.
- Roberts, K., 1996. *Circumpolar Aboriginal People and Co-Management Practice: Current Issues in Co-Management and Environmental Assessment [Conference Proceedings]*. Arctic Institute of North America and Joint Secretariat -Inuvialuit Renewable Resources Committees. Arctic Institute of North America, University of Calgary, AB, 172 pp.
- Rowe, S., 1994. *A new paradigm for forestry*. *Forestry Chronicle* 70 (5), 565–568.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), 1996a. *People to People, Nation to Nation: Highlights from the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Minister of Supply and Services, Ottawa, ON, 149 pp.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), 1996b. *Lands and resources*. In: *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Restructuring the Relationship*, vol. 2. Canada Communication Group – Publishing, Ottawa, ON, pp. 421–685.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1993b. *Partners in Confederation: Aboriginal Peoples, Self-Government, and the Constitution*. Minister of Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa, ON.
- Rude, D., Deiter, C., 2004. *From the Fur Trade to Free Trade: Forestry and First Nations Women in Canada*. Status of Women in Canada. Policy Research, Ottawa, ON, 51 pp.
- Smith, P., 2007. *Creating a New Stage for Sustainable Forest Management Through Co-Management with Aboriginal People in Ontario*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, ON, 358 pp.
- Smith, P., 1998. *Aboriginal and treaty rights and aboriginal participation: essential elements of sustainable forest management*. *Forestry Chronicle* 74 (3), 327–333.
- Smith, P., 1995. *Aboriginal Participation in Forest Management: Not Just Another Stakeholder*. NAFA Position Paper. National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON, 13 pp.
- Smith, P., Scott, G., Merkel, G., 1995. *Aboriginal Forest Land Management Guidelines: a Community Approach*. Prepared for the National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON.
- Stevenson, M., 2006. *The possibility of difference: rethinking co-management*. *Human Organization* 65 (2), 167–180.
- Stevenson, M., 2005. *Traditional Knowledge and Sustainable Forest Management*. Sustainable Forest Management Network, Edmonton, AB.

- Stevenson, M., 1999. What are we managing? Traditional systems of management and knowledge in cooperative and joint management. In: Veeman, T., Smith, D., Purdy, B., Salkie, F., Larkin, G., (Eds.), *Science and Practice: Sustaining the Boreal Forest*. Proceedings of the 1999 Sustainable Forest Management Network Conference. Sustainable Forest Management Network, Edmonton, AB, pp. 161–169.
- Teillet, J., 2005. The Role of the Natural Resources Regulatory Regime in Aboriginal Rights disputes in Ontario. Office of the Attorney General, Government of Ontario. http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/inquiries/ipperwash/policy_part/research/index.htm, Prepared for the Ipperwash Inquiry. 78 pp.
- Turner, N., 2005. *The Earth's Blanket: Traditional Teaching for Sustainable Living*. Douglas & McIntyre Ltd, Vancouver, BC.
- Wilson, J., Graham, J., 2005. *Relationships Between First Nations and Forest Industry: the Legal and Policy Context. A Report for the National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Forest Products Association of Canada, First Nations Forestry Program*. Institute on Governance, Ottawa, ON. 87 pp.
- Wyatt, S., 2008. First nations, forest lands, and “aboriginal” forestry in Canada; from exclusion to co-management and beyond. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 38, 171–180.