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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the extent to which there are differences between native and non-native environmental value systems in a particular case study. This case study focuses on the Wendaban Stewardship Authority, a co-management organization in Temagami, Ontario, whose membership is half native from the Teme-Augama Anishnabai and half non-native from the surrounding area.

This study examines perceptions of the local environment and the values placed on it by members of the stewardship authority. Each of the members of the authority was interviewed and asked to draw, from memory, a map of the stewardship area. This methodology is participatory in nature. The data are analyzed using "grounded theory" which allows for analytical categories to emerge from the data rather than being imposed from the outset.

The author concludes that there are many differences in the types of places that people considered important, and that these differences relate to culture. The main difference is in the degree of personality associated with the land. To the native group the land is where they lived and to the non-native group the land is a place to visit or to work. All the members of the authority, regardless of culture, are concerned about maintaining the quality of the environment in which they lived.
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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

As the consequences and side effects of rapid and largely unchecked resource exploitation become apparent, new solutions are being sought to prevent or to mitigate resulting problems. Much of Canada's economy is based on primary production and the exploitation of natural resources. Canadians have rapidly consumed resources, one outcome being the creation of wealth which has paid for education, health care systems and, in general, resulted in a high standard of living. The historic rate of resource exploitation, however, may be unsustainable.

To avert over-exploitation in Canada, state-wide resource management schemes have been implemented. Resource management is the practice of making various land and resource uses compatible (mining and vacationing, for example) and attempting to prevent resource extraction from causing irreversible damage to ecosystems. These goals are frequently not reached and so the resulting problems must be mitigated either directly through compensation to affected people or through attempts at ecological restoration and rehabilitation. The techniques used by resource managers are often nothing more than an ecological quick-fix. Across Canada, provincial resource ministries have some control over resource extraction rates and they have helped formulate contingency plans for environmental degradation.
However, there are suggestions that "Departments of land, forests, wildlife, mines, fisheries, agriculture and all the rest do only and exactly what they are supposed to do: facilitate the commercial exploitation of nature" (Livingston, 1990:111).

Another resource management problem emerges at this point. Management plans are usually top-down: they are rarely designed by people who live in the area to be managed. In other words, resource management tends to be a reactive process determined by people whose knowledge of an area, its people and its ecosystems may be thin at best. Such management is often based on abstract economic modelling which ignores issues of uncertainty or other "externalities" and on a weak awareness of local geographical factors.

Furthermore, adequate mitigation measures are often too expensive to implement. For example, the cost of growing tree seedlings and paying for their planting far outweighs the price paid for this service. When reforestation does take place, nature may have preceded the tree farmer and so planting new trees may be somewhat redundant.

There are also philosophical arguments with the view that people have the ability to manage the environment at all. The number of variables that need to be considered at one time may be unmanageable even with the assistance of powerful computing and monitoring technology. For example,
in Canada there has been the attempt to replant or re-seed about one-quarter of the harvested forests (Canada, 1985). One assessment of current Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources practice indicates that success rates of human-induced forest regeneration can be as low as 13 per cent (Benson et al., 1989). In general, one might question the ability of many management schemes to effectively accomplish what they set out to do.

Problems arise not only in the ability of organizations to manage biophysical resources acceptably, but most planning policies prove problematic when they inadequately address the local cultural context in which they are found (Leff, 1985). Also, a development-oriented bias often skews the perception of managers, with a focus on maximizing production without enough concern for conservation.

Much of Canada's resource exploitation takes place without enough consideration of the bio-physical impacts of extraction techniques or of social impact on the local inhabitants, undoubtedly because most of the country's natural resource base is found far from urban populations. This problem has developed for two main reasons: a) the majority of Canada's population is concentrated in the relatively urbanized south and therefore people rarely see the direct consequences of resource extraction in more remote areas; and b) Canada's remote areas are usually inhabited by aboriginal peoples who, until recently, have
had limited access to legal recourse and to participation in management decisions.

The questionable ability of blanket land-management schemes to actually 'manage' the environment has led to the search for alternative methods of management. One such alternative is the creation of co-management regimes throughout Canada's north (Berkes et al., 1991). Co-management is an organizational framework that allows for both indigenous and non-indigenous participation in land use planning. One philosophy behind these organizations is that land 'management' requires the knowledge and input of people who are active on the land in order to be effective (ibid.). These local-level institutions are emerging as native land claims begin to reach settlement.

As co-management becomes a reality in the Canadian north, the natives and non-natives who are beginning to comprise the planning councils are being exposed to alternative knowledge and value systems. Native Canadian knowledge systems differ in many ways from those of most other Canadian peoples. Their merit and validity have been documented countless times (Nowicki, 1985; Leff, 1985; Jacobs, 1988; Feit, 1988; Brody, 1988; Berkes et al., 1991).

To date, land management institutions in Canada have almost always considered scientifically generated information to be not only the most accurate but also the most useful. Perhaps, though, the application of knowledge
is more important than the knowledge itself. People's cultural experience and traditions probably influence the way they perceive problems and make decisions. What is beginning to happen in some parts of Canada is a connection of different knowledge systems within land management organizations. University and college trained government resource managers are going to have to work side by side with native peoples whose knowledge about the land comes from personal and cultural-historical community-based traditions, beliefs and attitudes rather than purely theoretical, scientific, legal or commercial experience.

The Wendaban Stewardship Authority in Temagami is one such example of co-management of resources. Temagami is located about 100km north of North Bay, Ontario (see Map 1). The Temagami forest marks the transition from Great Lakes-St. Lawrence ecozone to the northern boreal forest. This transition means that vegetation changes from hardwood and mixed pine forests in its southern reaches to the black spruce and jack pine stands which typify the boreal forest at its northern end.

At one time the Temagami region was bypassed by fur traders and treaty makers who concentrated on the more accessible places surrounding it. But over time as Lake Temagami and the people who live there, the Teme-Augama Anishnabai, became better known to the colonialists, more attention was gradually placed on the area. The Temagami
Map 1: Location of Temagami

area is home to the Teme-Augama Anishnabai people who have lived there for at least 6000 years. They have lived throughout the area and over time have developed self-regulating social arrangements and systems that govern their own use of the land. Since the colonial government took control of the land, the Teme-Augama Anishnabai have watched the land being degraded as more and more people have moved to the area and more and more of the land has been developed.

Temagami became an important recreational centre, attracting cottagers and many people looking for wilderness experiences. Concurrently, Temagami became a resource centre, its forest reserves and ore deposits attracting logging companies, mills, mines and people to work in them. Because of the wide range of vested interests in the area, a great deal of conflict has resulted from competition for differing types of land use and land ownership. The value of the timber and mining potential is highly prized by those industries and workers who are finding it increasingly difficult to survive in today's global economy. The recreational value of the Temagami hinterland is considered to be unparalleled in this part of Canada and so its recreational users and the people who make their living from the tourist industry are concerned about the consequences and side-effects of rapid resource development in the area.

To compound matters, overlapping government
jurisdictions play a role in the politics of the area. The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) has a strong presence in the area. In fact, the local office is probably the biggest single employer in Temagami. There are MNR offices in some of the surrounding urban centres, including North Bay, Kirkland Lake, Sudbury and Gogama, and the jurisdictional boundaries of these offices have changed many times. In addition, the Federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs is involved to some degree with the Teme-Augama Anishnabai reserve and recent legal actions regarding the treaties between Canada and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai. As well, the provincial government is negotiating with the Teme-Augama Anishnabai for decision-making authority regarding land use in the area.

There are also many local government interests, both at the municipal level as well as at the level of ad hoc citizen committees (like Temagami's Comprehensive Planning Council) that allow local people to get involved in the planning issues in their area. These committees usually make planning recommendations to government ministries, but do not have legal decision-making power.

Supporting all of these competing, cooperating and overlapping interests is the land itself, which can be degraded only so far and can only support so many people and remain intact. To date the consequences of the aforementioned land use competition have been twofold. The
health of the land has been gradually compromised and the rights of some groups of people, namely the Teme-Augama Anishnabai, have been largely ignored by the industrial and government powers.

**Historical Background**

The seeds of the current power struggles date back to 1877 when the then chief Tonene first asked that his people, the Teme-Augama Anishnabai, be taken into treaty with the Crown in order to ensure their rights and title to the land. At that time Tonene was concerned about encroaching timber "cruisers" staking claim to areas of forest and designating them for logging. The Robinson-Huron Treaty of 1850 did not include the Teme-Augama Anishnabai as the treaty-makers did not know that the Teme-Augama Anishnabai were a separate and distinct group of people.

Realizing their mistake, the Federal Government discussed including the Teme-Augama Anishnabai in a treaty, but by this time the Ontario Government had gained control over Crown lands in Confederation, and refused to negotiate with the band partly because of the rich timber potential of the area (Higham, 1991). The next century saw successive band chiefs attempting to confirm legal title over the lands the Teme-Augama Anishnabai traditionally inhabited. During this time many of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai's traditional land use practices (such as hunting, trapping and even wood
cutting) were restricted by Government wilderness management regulations and could only continue with Government-issued licenses. Finally, in 1973, following an announcement concerning the proposed resort development at Maple Mountain, a place of great spiritual significance to the Teme-Augama Anishnabai, Chief Gary Potts filed land cautions on 110 townships in the area, effectively preventing the sale and development of any lands within the caution boundaries. The Teme-Augama Anishnabai claim aboriginal title to their ancestral homeland, called n’Daki Menan (see Map 2). The boundaries of the caution correspond to the boundaries of n’Daki Menan.

After trying unsuccessfully to remove the cautions, the Provincial Government sued the Band and eventually the case went to the Supreme Court of Ontario, which decided in 1984 that Band did not have legal title to the land because some its members had received treaty payments of $4 per year from the Department of Indian Affairs, and because the Teme-Augama Anishnabai lived on the federally designated 1.6 square km reserve of Bear Island. Significantly, however, the Supreme Court also decided that the Provincial Government had not lived up to its obligations to the Band. In 1986 and 1989 the Provincial Government presented offers of settlement to the Band, neither of which was accepted since the Band maintained that were not party to the
Map 2: N'DakiMenan & Family Territories


Robinson-Huron Treaty.

In 1983 the Provincial Government created the Lady-Evelyn Smoothwater Park, permanently removing those lands from the Teme-Augama Anishnabai land claim. In 1988 the Provincial Government announced, without public consultation, the construction of logging roads into the Temagami hinterland. In effect, the Government chose to allow clearcutting in the heartland of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai before a land claim settlement could be reached. The section of land into which the roads were directed was the only area that had not been logged in the region and was therefore seen as essential to the local economy. This announcement was met with road blockades by both the Teme-Augama Anishnabai and by other concerned people. A large number of arrests were made and eventually the road construction was stopped.

The resulting stalemate was overcome in 1990 by Ontario and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai signing a Memorandum of Understanding in which both groups pledged to negotiate a Treaty of Co-existence, share responsibility for land and resource management in the Wakimika triangle area (the area for which the logging roads were destined), and to allow, in the interim, the Teme-Augama Anishnabai to examine and contribute to timber management plans for townships in n'Daki Menan.

In May of 1991, under an Addendum to the Memorandum of
Understanding, the Wendaban Stewardship Authority was established. This authority has been set up to share the stewardship of the four townships which are considered to be the heartland of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai homeland as well as some of the last stands of old growth red and white pine forest in Ontario (see Map 3). The authority is comprised of six people appointed by the Teme-Augama Anishnabai, six by the Government and a mutually selected chairperson. They operate on the consensus format traditionally used by Teme-Augama Anishnabai councils, and so decisions are not made until there is consensus among group members. This authority aims to introduce traditional native stewardship principles and values into the resource management planning of the four townships involved. The Teme-Augama Anishnabai believe that they have a sacred responsibility for the stewardship of n'Daki Menan, which includes ensuring that all life forms are sustained. The Wendaban Stewardship Authority is promoting holistic planning, including ecological integrity, forestry, wildlife habitat, aesthetics and human use in their proposals. The Wendaban Stewardship Authority are of the view that this is one of the few models anywhere of this type of co-existence between settler and indigenous people's governments and therefore has great potential for applications in land stewardship far beyond the Temagami area. If it is successful, it may pose an important alternative to current land management practices, especially
Map 3: Wendaban Stewardship Authority Jurisdiction

in areas where conflicting interests and environmental
degradation overlap.

Research Question

The area of Temagami has had a long history of
interaction between natives and non-natives largely because
it was historically accessible by canoe from the major
centres of Ottawa and Montreal; the metropolis of Toronto is
about 500 kilometres south. Over the last hundred years,
non-native resource exploitation has had a dramatic effect
on the local community (Hodgins and Benidickson, 1989). The
interaction between cultural groups has altered the way of
life of both the Teme-Augama Anishnabai Indians and non-
natives in the area. Temagami has not only been seen as a
resource centre but its aesthetic appeal has attracted
thousands of cottagers and canoeists from the south to visit
and travel in the seemingly pristine Temagami landscape.
Contact between natives and non-natives has therefore taken
place on many levels, be it through resource industries
encroaching on Indian lands, through informal neighbourly
association or through tourism.

Because the degree of contact has been so great between
native and non-native cultural groups, there have been
changes in traditional land use practices. Perhaps over time
some aspects of native environmental knowledge have been
eroded as fewer people make their living directly from the
land on which they live. The Wendaban Stewardship Authority now has jurisdiction over the four townships. This co-management regime seeks to provide for stewardship of the land "based on the respectful inter-action of 'science' and traditional knowledge" (Ross, n.d.). As knowledge is socially constructed (Kirby and McKenna, 1989), the differences between native and non-native environmental knowledge and value for the land will be brought into question, as the Stewardship Authority is made up of people from both groups. The essential question therefore is whether there are different value systems in the native and non-native communities. It is the contention of this thesis that indeed each group has certain cultural values that find expression in their respective knowledge bases. It is therefore expected that a comparison of native and non-native values will give some indication as to how people from each group approach the concept of land stewardship.

**Goals and Objectives**

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which there are differences between native and non-native environmental or land-based value systems, as revealed in a particular land use planning case. The specific research objectives were:

1) to determine which people in the Temagami area participate in land use planning in the Wendaban
Stewardship Authority and why and how they are selected.

2) to catalogue locations or areas within the Wendaban Stewardship Authority's jurisdiction which have particular significance to the participating groups of people.

3) to identify the reasons that those places are perceived as significant by the government appointees and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai.

4) to examine the degree to which cultural value systems appear related to personal or group associations with place.

5) to identify for the people themselves any differences in assumptions about the territory in question and about how these differences may need to be acknowledged and considered by members of the authority as they formulate their proposals for land management.

**Definition of the Study Area**

The Wendaban Stewardship Authority has jurisdiction over four townships in the Temagami area: Acadia, Shelburne, Canton and Delhi (see Map 3). Although the Authority has government support to control the access to resources only in this region, it also seeks to influence policy beyond its immediate borders into the area that covers n'Daki Menan, the traditional territories of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai.
This study concentrates on the four townships only, although the methodology is flexible enough to allow for comments on the larger region.

**Approach**

Indigenous knowledge is increasingly being recognized by non-indigenous society as a valid, although still often overlooked alternative to conventional scientific thought and process. In Canada, especially with the current political restructuring involving native sovereignty, native Canadian knowledge systems are likely to play a more important and central role in the resource management practices in much of the Canadian hinterland. However, there exists a system of land use planning and community development that is both organized and controlled by the dominant non-native society using their institutions and paternalistic decision-making bureaucracy. When and if native self-government becomes a reality and native participation in land use planning increases, these institutions and bureaucracies are going to have to allow for the contributions of first nation societies.

In resource co-management regimes, people from both native and non-native cultures are and will be cooperating in new ways. How can different cultural groups learn to accept other perspectives, especially when they may be hard to understand? There is the potential for preconceptions to
impair the process of interaction. By evaluating the environmental perceptions and values of both natives and non-natives, areas of similarities and differences should emerge that may serve as points of focus for improving dialogue and identifying and resolving areas of conflict. By fostering cross-cultural understanding, the process of co-management can only be improved.

Limitations

The members of the Wendaban Stewardship Authority act as the figureheads and orators of their respective organizations—the Provincial Government and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai. Some of the people who may contribute knowledge and ideas to the Authority will not sit on the board. By focusing this research only on Authority members, some of these contributors might have been missed. Also, because there are 12 people on the council, excluding the chair, the research sample size was relatively small.

Because permission from the Wendaban Stewardship Authority had to be sought before research could take place, the members who were interviewed might have been able to prepare for the interview ahead of time. Their responses, therefore, may have been rehearsed or planned in order to appear as if they knew more about the area in question than they did before becoming aware of the proposed study.

People might have had reservations about talking with
me, an outsider, especially as Teme-Augama Anishnabai/Provincial Government negotiations are in full swing. Because the Stewardship Authority is only in its early stages, outside evaluation may be looked upon as an unwanted, untimely interference. Despite these possible concerns, it is believed that useful insights have been gained that address the objectives identified above.

Outline
This study is organized in the following manner. Following this introductory chapter is the literature review which places this study in the context of some of the trends in land-use planning in Canada as well as recent literature dealing with this subject. The third chapter explains the research and analytical methodology of this study. The fourth chapter outlines the respondents' perceptions of the stewardship area, while the fifth chapter identifies associations between people or groups of people and the particular concerns and perspectives that they addressed in the interviews. The final chapter summarizes this study and sets out a series of conclusions about the nature of the research and its findings.
Chapter Two

APPROACHES TO THE LAND: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter outlines how Canadians generally and, in particular, Ontarians have looked after the land on which they live. Following a brief historical overview, which identifies some of the processes that have led to the current situation, there is an analysis of current land management and planning practices. Then a review is provided of the literature on the degradation of traditional resource use knowledge and on some prospective resource planning alternatives.

Historical Context

There were tens of thousands of people living on the North American continent at the time of John Cabot's arrival in 1497, with cultures as diverse as the lands upon which they lived (Symington, 1978). Different environmental situations require different cultural adaptations, and so in a land like North America one finds different cultures according to variations in geology, climate and vegetation; myriad cultural traditions evolved over centuries of adaptation, innovation, migration, and diffusion of ideas and tools. Culture is the principal means by which groups of people adapt to their environment (Fagan, 1986). Cultural diversity and biological diversity are inherently linked, although the actual relationship between culture and
environment remains unclear (Gadgil, 1987).

By the 1530s Jacques Cartier had reached Hochelaga (Montreal), and the 1590s marked Juan de Fuca's initial landing on the British Columbian coast. By the early 1600s European colonization of North America had begun in earnest (Horwood, 1978) and the spread of European diseases (typhus, smallpox, influenza, and tuberculosis) had begun to decimate indigenous populations (Symington, 1978). European population, recovering from the 14th Century bubonic plague, grew from about 80 million in 1500 to 140 million in the mid-1700s and as Worster (1988) argues, this population growth was a critical factor underpinning the European migration during the 1700s.

More people meant more crowded living conditions and fewer opportunities to make a living: the iron law of humanity. Consequently, surplus population began leaving the Old World for the New, leaving in droves and hordes, leaving by boats and ships of every dimension. The overwhelming majority headed for lands lying in the temperate latitudes, wherever the natives were few in number or were dying from introduced diseases or were militarily weak (Worster, 1988:9).

North and South America, South Africa and much later Australia and New Zealand were the most popular settler destinations. Until the 1760s, native cultures in North America had not been greatly influenced by the Europeans; the latter's expansionist policies focused on geopolitical manoeuvring among external powers rather than on interference with local cultures (Easterbrook, 1990). From
1760s to the 1820s, in contrast, the fur trade rivalry between the Hudson's Bay Company and the North West Company meant further European expansion, the building of new outposts and the continued outreach of missionaries (Opekokev, 1980).

Europeans' demand for land began to grow as increasing numbers of colonists arrived in North America. In Canada, colonial expansion was facilitated by treaty-making, the first being signed in Quebec in 1763 (Brody, 1981), whereas in the USA expansion was carried out primarily through military means (Brown, 1970). Treaty-making continued in Canada. The Robinson treaties of 1850 ceded much of northern Ontario to the British. The first of eleven numbered treaties was signed in 1871 covering what is now southern Manitoba. Land needed for the proposed Canadian Pacific Railway was acquired through Treaties 3–7; Treaty 8 allowed for passage to the Yukon gold fields; Treaty 9 provided transportation routes through northern Ontario; Treaty 10 allowed clear title to the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan (Canada, 1985b). From a legal perspective:

In the numbered treaties, the Indians surrendered all title to the lands covered by the treaties and, in turn, the federal government granted tracts of land to the Indians for reserves (Canada, 1985b: 3).

Once the Europeans had gained legal control over lands that were once inhabited by natives, agriculture, and resource industries expanded. Countless acres of forest were
cleared to make way for farms, and timber was retrieved from
the forest for the building of southern towns and cities.
The demand for timber resources accelerated in the early
1800s as Britain's naval and construction needs grew
(Easterbrook, 1990). European expansion was finally
consolidated by the construction of the Canadian Pacific
Railway in 1885 (Easterbrook, 1990). During the search for
alternate routes and during railway construction itself,
many places previously unknown to Europeans were opened up,
further facilitating expansion (Hodgins and Benidickson,
1989).

The early years of colonial expansion, exploration, and
exploitation of the North American landscape were especially
significant as they served to shape the attitudes of the
European immigrants. Canada was perceived as a vast
wilderness and the people already living here as "an
impediment to the objective that the white population had in
an era of peace and settlement" (Miller, 1989: 84). As
Livingston puts it, "The Canadian psyche...has been shaped
in considerable measure by a long tradition of resource
extraction" (1990:108).

Land Use Planning and Land Management

Before the Europeans arrived, the indigenous people had
established stewardship practices which had developed over
long periods through careful observation and adaptation
(Greenwood, 1980). Practical knowledge and social systems allowed indigenous people to live within the bounds of their environment (Brody, 1981). Resource use by people was in relative balance with natural systems.

With the arrival of Europeans land shifted from being lived on and used communally to being privately owned. Once people began to own land disputes arose over access to land by native populations and by non-natives looking for places to make a living. As farming and logging spread the need for regulation of ownership grew. Traditionally, governments have felt the need to regulate land use because of the fear of the 'Tragedy of the Commons'. This model states that open access to lands leads to over-exploitation of those very lands, as people maximize their personal benefits at the expense of both their neighbours and the land itself (Hardin, 1968). This model provides impetus to much state-run resource management as open access to both native and non-native land and resource users has been supplanted by limited access, state-regulated systems.

Government officers became responsible for planning the rights to access and the rights to use. The assumption was that through central planning mechanisms the use of land would become most efficient, and that problems could be avoided through regulation (Lambert, 1967). Government agencies were set up to do this very thing. For example, precursors to The Indian Act (like 'An Act for the Gradual
Civilization of the Indian Tribes in the Canadas' (Gradual Civilization Act) emerged in the 1830s to 1850s which defined who was to be considered an Indian and what rights those people had to land. Other legislation was also put in place which further excluded indigenous people from participating in resource use and allocation decisions. The Crown Timber Act, passed in 1849, provided the basis for a timber licensing system (MNR, 1985). A number of national parks were established (Richardson, 1989) because of the fear of vanishing wilderness areas and the need to protect some of those that remained (Sadler, 1989). Many current land use planning, conservation, urban planning and public health programs and practises can trace their origins to that period (Richardson, 1989).

In Canada, about 90 percent of the land is owned by the Crown (World Wildlife Fund, 1992). Jurisdiction is divided among federal, provincial and municipal governments, although resource planning is a provincial responsibility. In Ontario, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) play the most significant roles in planning, whereas federal ministries such as the Canadian Forestry Service and the Canadian Wildlife Service are involved mainly in co-ordination functions and research. The MNR develops Timber Management Plans that allocate harvesting rights, the amount that can be cut in any particular area in a given year (annual
allowable cut), the areas to be cut, and regenerative practices (MNR, 1985). Other forest values are included in regional planning. In Ontario, "Timber Management Plans are prepared and approved with 'sustained yield' as an underlying principle" (MNR, 1985: 86). This principle, broadly stated, means that forest depletion is supposed to be balanced with forest renewal. Sustained yield is based on complex modelling procedures which attempt to create standardized age categories of trees (MNR, 1984; Moulder, 1992). The purpose of these management plans is to provide a continuous and predictable supply of wood for Ontario's forest products industry (MNR, 1985).

To this end, MNR implements a number of programs including reforestation of harvested areas; pesticide application on insect infestations which damage timber stocks (Canada, 1991); forest fire suppression to protect human habitation and timber stocks (MNR, n.d.); access road construction to allow for movement of people, equipment and timber in and out of the bush (MNR, 1985; Dunster, 1988; WWF, 1992); and monitoring of compliance with Timber Management Plans (MNR, 1985).

Beyond management planning, environmental quality is protected through environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedures. Every province has its own EIA process designed to inhibit development from causing undue environmental stress (Couch, 1985; Plewes and Whitney, 1977).
One main concern with this type of resource planning is that decision-making is concentrated in the hands of specialized resource planners at the district and provincial levels, many of whose abilities are confined by their position in the decision-making hierarchy. Provincial planning prescriptions are not always suited to local realities. What works in one place may not necessarily be suitable in another unique or distinct context (Jacobs, 1988). Although timber management planning addresses questions of resource supply, it concentrates on a limited number of land uses and on a limited set of forest values (Dunster, 1990). This is partly due to the nature of state-level systems which are characterized by highly bureaucratic hierarchical decision-making in which policy momentum and sheer organization size limit the ability of plans to adapt to changing local environments and social situations (Berkes, et al., 1991; McDonald, 1988). In this type of system one finds a separation between resource managers and resource users, legal enforcement of regulations and land ownership, and a strict reliance on science as the sole knowledge base for decision-making, although most decisions, being politically driven, do not reflect "rational" science (Berkes, et al., 1991).

This situation partly stems from the urbanization of Canadian society which has experienced "an overall shift in economic and political domination, with respect to system
orientation, demands upon it, and the locus of decision making" (Troughton, 1991: 62). This process has assisted the creation of an inequitable relationship between core regions (urban government and business capitals) and the periphery (towns, villages and rural areas). These core regions are instrumental in the inception of policies and development plans for the periphery. Centralized decision making has served in many cases to remove powers from the people in the rural and less wealthy areas and in doing so has exacerbated, accelerated, catalyzed and contributed to many problems in the areas where it was meant to help. Development seems to be becoming a process in which planning is done for rather than by people; the people and places with money, technology, education and power attempt to make decisions for the people and places without these attributes. The ability of people to make decisions on a community scale for the resources in their immediate area has been supplanted as corporations, federal and provincial governments determine resource extraction rates and policies (Ross and Usher, 1986).

What has in fact been created is a separation of land use planners from the land, which means that the control over resources is shifting away from people whose interest, survival and livelihood is long-term (Usher, 1987). Intricate interactions and adaptations of people to their environment, on a localized scale, have been overlooked in
the movement towards the perceived efficiency of professional management systems.

Two main consequences of centralized decision making are gradually becoming apparent: traditional systems of resource use and stewardship have suffered from neglect; the health of the land has been compromised.

**Erosion of Traditional Systems**

The separation of native people from their lands has taken place for a wide range of reasons. The treaty and reserve systems and attempts at forced cultural assimilation of First Nation peoples by colonials pulled many natives away from their traditional lifestyles and from the lands on which they traditionally lived. Where indigenous people once lived throughout what today is called Canada, they are now concentrated in numerous small isolated communities and reserves all across Canada's "hinterland" (Brody, 1981). Consequently, their long-developed systems of knowledge and close interaction with their environment are threatened (Linden, 1991).

Numerous studies have analyzed the value and scientific relevance of indigenous knowledge (Bell, 1979; Belshaw, 1979; Richards, 1979; Brokensha and Riley, 1980; Alverson, 1984; Rhoades, 1989). What is of concern here is not the intrinsic value of the knowledge itself, but the value placed on it by external policy formulators. The link
between capability (knowledgable interaction with one's environment) and the ability to put this knowledge to work is in question. For example, whether or not a farmer plants a crop variety that is best suited to its local environment is not as relevant, in this discussion, as is the ability of the farmer to make the choice in the first place. The ability of people or communities to make choices is as important as their capability to make the right choice. Mitchell expresses the need to "ensure that appropriate interests have an opportunity to participate in establishing both ends and means for resource management and development" (1991:272). Current land management practices in Canada seem to be missing this essential component.

This question is central to the relationships between governmental bodies and aboriginal communities in Canada, where "decisions previously made in rural areas, in relation to economic and social activity...now originate in urban places" (Troughton, 1991:62). Urban legislators, therefore, determine native access to and control over local resources. This relationship between the aboriginal population and the federal government has "distanced Indian people from provincial policy making, including natural resource management" (Wagner, 1991:24). Instead of people managing or caring for the land on which they live, this role has been placed in the hands of specialized resource managers and planners. To date their role has largely been that of
facilitating resource exploitation rather than ensuring the sustainability of communities of people in resource areas or of extraction and use of resources (Ross and Usher, 1986; Livingston, 1990; B.C. Round Table, 1991). The indigenous and traditional knowledge systems which had evolved into relatively sustainable approaches to land use through processes of adaptation, experimentation and interaction with an environment over very long periods of time have often been ignored or bypassed in this refocusing of economic priorities and decision-making hierarchies (Feit, 1988).

By concentrating decision-making and planning in the hands of the government and corporate elite, the knowledge and stewardship systems of those people most affected by resource development are gradually eroded. This pattern is repeated all around the world where indigenous cultures are threatened by more powerful and dominant groups (Linden, 1991). It is worth examining the relationship between the development-from-above process and the denigration of traditional knowledge. Nine major points are noted as follows:

1. **Capitalist/colonial penetration** into subsistence economies has led to changes in modes of production. Export-oriented production has pulled many people away from subsistence and traditional practices (Adedeji, 1988). In many places, traditional agricultural techniques have fallen
into disuse and have been usurped by monocrop export production methods (Howes, 1979). Wage labour has also replaced self-sufficiency.

2. Variation in access and control of knowledge is another problem intrinsic in the devaluation of certain types of traditional knowledge (Stamp, 1989). For example, creation and entrenchment of classes, with increasing industrialization and concentration of resource ownership, have widened the gap between rich and poor (Chazan, et al., 1988). The consolidation of a bureaucratic middle class has led to reinforcement of "modern" knowledge in conjunction with the purposeful degradation of traditional knowledge. Cultural and sexual discrimination and even education systems can serve the function of preserving hierarchy.

3. Traditional knowledge has often come into conflict with Western science (Nandy, 1981). Government officials visiting rural areas have not always seen the value in methods and techniques designed by local inhabitants. Consequently, "many scientists and policy makers...saw traditional methods as an obstacle to be eradicated" (Wolf, 1986:24). In addition, the transfer of value-laden technology to rural areas replaces traditional tools. Policies aimed at mechanizing and modernizing production techniques "exacerbate the problem: they displace [people] from their livelihood without providing them with new sources of productive work and income" (Goulet, 1983:611).
Appropriateness of technology transfer has to do not only with its suitability to local environmental conditions, but also to the local cultural and social context (Brooks, 1980; Montgomery, 1980).

4. **Assimilation** of indigenous populations into larger ethnic groups can lead to a loss of cultural identity and relegation of cultural values and beliefs (Bowles, et al., 1972; Miller, 1989). Also, ruling classes may "impose a self-defined national identity and project it abroad as representative of the entire population" (Preiswerk, 1981:86).

5. The **homogenization** hypothesis states that with increasing globalization of popular culture comes decreasing cultural diversity. This situation is compounded by the development of new audiovisual and communication technologies. Loss of identity and sense of place can potentially lead to a relinquishing of cultural values and knowledge (Arizpe, 1989).

6. **Dependency on inputs** such as cash, welfare, medicine, teachers, and technology may also lead to knowledge degradation as people come to rely on external support rather than their own abilities and skills (White, 1983).

7. **Environmental degradation** directly caused by the rapid exploitation of natural resources and indirectly caused by global market price fluctuations for resources has
led to changing survival practices, and hence approaches to resource use (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987).

8. *Poverty* often eliminates the option to choose between optimal and essential. People may have to take what is offered them "because they have nothing else to fall back on" (Arizpe, 1989:8).

9. *Imposed development strategies*, be they from international sources or from domestic national governments, are often unsuitable for "recipient" environments, or are not culturally sensitive (Leff, 1985). Lack of effective popular participation in many cases leads to the creation of new intra-regional rivalries and social fragmentation. Also, government development plans are often used as tools of oppression or for maintaining the existing power relationships. Generally, it may be put forward that any top-down strategies that do not adequately consider local conditions and people will either cause or catalyze social change, one of the consequences of which may be loss of knowledge (Kapp, 1983).

The above processes and forces that degrade both traditional knowledge and the ability of people to use this knowledge show that there are significant obstacles to maintenance, enhancement and adaptation of traditional knowledge for self-reliant purposes. Arizpe points out that,
the present conditions of the international system are making people...poorer in knowledge and, what is perhaps even worse, poorer in the confidence with which they continue to create knowledge (1989:8).

Global distribution of the capacity to create knowledge is becoming skewed. The developed, wealthy countries and regions of the world are not only on the forefront of scientific experimentation, but through their international actions seem to be devaluing and degrading other knowledge systems. "Ecological destruction, cultural discrimination, government insensitivity and public disregard for local and traditional knowledge is destroying a wealth that took millennia to build up" (Arizpe, 1989:9). Cultural identity and resilience is a factor in the speed at which this process happens.

J. Miller sums up the Canadian experience quite well:

Directed cultural change...was the assertion of the ideas and values of the more dominant party in the relationship over the dependent one; it involved deliberate and systematic attempts by the dominant to change the culture of the weaker; and it subjected the more vulnerable of the two parties not just to the rules and sanctions of their own society but also to the taboos and requirements of the more powerful group. It was, in short, coercion...[by] the missionary, the schoolteacher, and the bureaucrat who thought they knew better than the indigenous peoples what was good for them (1989:96).

Degradation of Land

"Government agencies have no official mandate for
nature's interest... [as nature] has no ideological legitimacy in the industrial growth society" (Livingston, 1990: 111). Much of the current popular environmental focus stems from the increasing recognition that the quality of Canada's environment is deteriorating rapidly. People are being made aware of environmental degradation through the actions of many environmental activist groups. This issue is also coming to the fore as the health risks from living or working in polluted environments become more apparent (Environmental Protection, 1989). Indeed, many people in cities feel the need to buy bottled water because they consider the water from their taps unsafe to drink, just as the air in many places is considered unsafe to breathe. Organic (without the use of chemical pesticides and fertilizers) farming has also re-emerged as people search for unpolluted sources of food (Stead, 1993).

One of the main problems in assessing the current state of Canada's environment is that apart from scattered specialized studies there does not seem to be a readily accessible information base from which to make judgements. Recently, the federal government under the auspices of the new 'Green Plan' published The State of Canada's Environment — 1991, the second of two studies aimed at monitoring environmental change in Canada (Elkin, 1990). There are many indications of change for the worse from countless localities. Cumulative records of human-induced
environmental change exist, but we do not know what impact our land can sustain nor for how long because we lack historical examples. Current rates of change are, as far as we know, new. But, it is becoming obvious, especially to many resource-based communities, that the rates at which resources have been extracted to date cannot continue for long (Hearnden, 1988). There are already many ghost towns, where communities have come and gone depending on the availability of resources. Many communities that depend on forests have begun to acknowledge that they will be faced with shortages of merchantable timber some time within the next ten years. Some estimates predict three to five years left of harvesting certain tree species at current rates (Moulder, 1992).

Forest depletion rates are becoming critical across Canada. It is beyond the scope of this study to accurately depict the present day state of Canada's environment, but suffice it say that the current rates of forest depletion, the common clear cut harvesting methods and resource management planning practises are not sustainable (Baskerville, 1988; Boyle, 1991; Swift, 1991).

**Alternatives**

The rate of change of all aspects of Canadian environments warrants reassessment of current development paradigms, whether they be development of resources,
development of communities, or development of people. A common thread running between many development alternatives is the need for the participation of people in the choices made for and about their communities. Some of these labelled alternatives are as follows:

- participatory development (Knapp and Caldbeck, 1990; McCall, 1988; Lisk, 1985; Rahman, 1984);
- integrated resource management (Crerar, 1991; Dunster, 1990; Bird, 1990);
- community development (Ross and Usher, 1986);
- co-operative resource management (Berkes et al., 1991; Usher, 1991; Feit, 1988);
- sustainable development (WCED, 1987; Environment Canada, 1990; Rees, 1989);
- indigenous systems (Usher, 1987; Berkes, 1984; Berkes and Pocock, 1983);
- self-reliance (Mulvihill and Jacobs, 1991; Preiswerk, 1981; Galtung, 1980);
- aboriginal self-determination (Kuptana, 1992; Wagner, 1991);
- community and social forestry (Fletcher and M‘Gonigle, 1991; Arnold, 1987);
- integrated community planning (Wolfe, 1988);
- adaptive resource management (McDonald, 1988);
- integrated development (Lang, 1988);
- sustainable rural development (Troughton, 1990).
The ability of people to participate in meaningful ways has much to do with who controls power, knowledge and land (Stamp, 1989). Many current institutions are so large and inflexible that their policies and programs often miss local realities because the people formulating them either do not inhabit or understand the communities for which the plans are drawn. Participation therefore, implies a decentralization of decision making, with a move from dependency to self-reliance, power hierarchy to empowerment and a move away from external expert interference (B.C. Round Table, 1991; Knapp and Caldbeck, 1990; Ross and Usher, 1986). In a sense, people are seen as experts of their own situation, rather than merely as objects in need of assistance. As Denis Goulet puts it, the most basic need is the freedom to determine what your own needs are (1992).

Participation in decision-making can take various forms depending on where and why it is used. Arnstein (1969) developed a "Ladder of Citizen Participation" which ranks degrees of participation from manipulation to consultation to citizen control. She proposes that participation can be used by planners as a way to manipulate citizens by allowing them to think that their ideas are being included in plans, where in actuality, their participation is included only as an exercise to placate them. At the other end of the spectrum is complete self-determination capability and decision-making control, in which people and communities not
only have the ability to make decisions and carry out actions but are also given enough room to do so.

Implicit in this level of participation is avoiding dependent core-periphery relations by making, in a sense, every area a "core" in which self-satisfaction is produced through personal or community efforts (Galtung, 1980). This satisfaction can be related directly to basic material needs (Preiswerk, 1981) or to the inclusion of non-material needs such as equity, social justice, basic human rights and freedoms and even cultural sustainability (Lisk, 1985).

Local-level or user-regulated management systems are decentralized, informal, flexible and "tend to be consensus-based and enforced through social sanctions" (Berkes, et al., 1991:12). There also tends to be more communal property rights while the "connection between the land and the group lies in knowledge" (Usher, 1987:6). Indeed, an emerging body of literature from Canada and beyond asserts that resources and lands held in common (as communal property) are often better cared for than many of the lands that are privately owned, government owned or completely open to uninhibited access (Ciriacy-Wantrup and Bishop, 1975; Godwin and Shepard, 1979; Cox, 1985; Marchak, 1988/1989; Berkes, 1989; Berkes, et al., 1989; Bromley, 1989; Berkes and Feeny, 1990; Feeny, et al., 1990; Lawry, 1990; Ostrom, 1990) . The advocates of private ownership (Demsetz, 1967; Baden and Stroup, 1977; Smith, 1981; Welch, 1983) and government
management (Canadian Institute of Forestry, 1989) often ignore the tendency of groups of people to develop self-regulating social linkages and systems if they have the power to make decisions and knowledge of both their local environment and of the consequences of their actions. These social systems take the form of culture, which adapts to both changing societal needs and changing environmental conditions. The inherent flexibility in traditional management practices is important especially as the act of management itself may alter relations and cause unknown environmental and social changes that may happen too quickly or unpredictably for current systems to cope with (McDonald, 1987). Adaptive mechanisms are therefore essential in cases of unpredictability and the uncertainty of ecosystem change. So management moves from a prescribed set of activities to a flexible tool of experimentation. Herein lies the benefits of common property systems. They allow for local determination of need and local means for satisfying these needs based on local realities, and using local knowledge and local values. This concept diverges from the more general, across-the-board prescriptions and strategies typically formulated and imposed by outsiders.

Actions and activities at the local level, while allowing for participation and accurate representation of local realities, do not exist in isolation from the wider world, and so cannot be looked at outside the larger
context. This is especially true considering the nature of trans-boundary effects of resource depletion and migration of pollutants as well as of wildlife. In some cases, practical knowledge, especially in the face of rapid transformations of the bio-physical and socio-cultural environments, should include an articulation of not only knowledge systems, but of both local and regional scale approaches to resource use and management.

There are a number of provincial initiatives addressing these concerns, tying them in with the aforementioned issues of participation, decentralization and institutional evolution. They range from the Sewell Commission on Planning and Development Reform in Ontario, to the Old Growth Forest Policy and Scientific Committee, to a Class Environmental Assessment Timber Management Project, to four MNR Community Forest Pilot Projects, to the Strategic Plan for Ontario Fisheries, to a provincial wildlife strategy and a biodiversity strategy, to the MNR's Forest Policy Panel and to government/aboriginal land claims negotiations. Although each of these seems to be a progressive step, they are operating both consecutively and in isolation from each other, and all are following completely separate mandates (Euler, 1992). Because there is no link among them, one would question their eventual effectiveness.

But perhaps the most significant potential change in political power hierarchies in Canada is that of the shift
towards self-government by the First Nations of Canada (Wagner, 1991; Kuptana, 1992). Individual aboriginal communities are also taking steps to move towards the self-regulating systems that they once had in place, away from the federal government control. Apart from strict self-government, current negotiations between the federal government and First Nation organizations are attempting to sort through the backlog of outstanding treaty claims. There are approximately 500 unresolved cases across Canada, in which native bands have yet to receive compensation for lands that were removed from reserves (Wagner, 1991). "As aboriginal land claims are settled, there will be considerable redistribution of resource management authority since land claims agreements have included provisions for increasing greater local control over resources" (Berkes, et al., 1991:12). This alternative would consider people as having the skills, the knowledge, the technology and the values to develop themselves along lines best suited to their own socio-cultural and natural environments.
Chapter Three

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Since the objective of this research was to inquire about the nature of people's environmental values, it was felt that direct questions like "what are your values?" might be too ambiguous for the respondents to answer. It was also felt that people's values would be inherent in the things they said and in the topics they chose to talk about. For this reason, data collection concentrated on allowing participants to talk about their environment. The respondents were asked to draw maps of the stewardship area as a point of reference for this discussion. It was thought that during the map drawing process, places and issues of interest to the respondents would emerge, and that in a discussion about those maps, perceptions and values would become apparent. This component of the data collection was purely qualitative.

Semi-structured, open-ended interviews were used, involving a two-step process: the drawing of maps and then a discussion of those maps. The interviews were taped or field notes were kept if individuals were not comfortable with the tape recorder. The format of the interviews allowed for discussion of ideas brought out by map making; as the maps were drawn "points of interest" for each respondent were marked and questions about those points were asked.
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Questions arose about their perceptions of a wide range of issues including the conditions of particular places, the nature of respondents' experiences in those places, the degree of human use and impact on the land, and hopes and aspirations for future land use.

Kirby and McKenna (1989) call the ideas and bias brought to the interview by the interviewer "conceptual baggage" and they believe that this baggage should be brought into the open. By explicitly recognizing some of the biases of the researcher, I feel that the process of data collection will be more valid. I am an urbanite from Southern Ontario who neither lives nor works in the area in which this study took place. Although one of my parents is from the north, my experience in the north has largely been that of a vacationer. I feel that I have some romantic notions about life in the bush because of my experiences as a canoeist and camper. I have great respect for people who are able to be truly self-reliant and live directly from the land. Traditional native systems of land use therefore hold some personal appeal. I also have great concerns about the direction that our consumption-oriented society is taking us. I am biased against resources being developed at current rates. I do not make my living from that development, nor am I very familiar with many resource extraction areas.
The Study Population

The population chosen for this study was the twelve member Wendaban Stewardship Authority. The chair of the Authority was omitted because his role on the Authority is seen more as facilitating meetings rather than providing input into decision-making. The Authority is comprised of six provincially appointed members and six members from the Teme-Augama Anishnabai band. During my stay in Temagami there was a change in membership; two of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives were changed. However, I interviewed one of the "older" representatives while he was still a member. I was not able to make contact with the other person who left the Authority. So my population consisted of thirteen people, one of whom resigned from the Wendaban Stewardship Authority about a week after he was interviewed.

It is acknowledged that the sample size is small but it is accepted that the people interviewed represent a privileged group, in the sense that they have been identified as having knowledge, insight, and wisdom that makes them particularly suitable to be members of the Authority. For this reason, they alone were interviewed.

Pre-tests

The data collection methodology was pre-tested five times with people in southern Ontario. Each time,
respondents were asked to draw maps either of particular areas that they were quite familiar with or about which they had limited knowledge. The pre-tests helped determine how best to explain the purpose of the experiment, what types of materials to use, and whether or not the methods would elicit usable data. Originally, small paper (20cm x 27cm"), was used for mapping, as well as multiple coloured pencils. The paper size seemed to inhibit mapping creativity, however, so it was increased to 25cm x 50cm for the main study.

During the early pre-tests, questions about the maps were first asked after the maps had been completed. This presented a problem, as many issues and questions the author had in mind as the map was drawn were either forgotten or were out of context by the time I posed my questions. This problem prompted me to ask questions during the mapping procedure, while the data were fresh in the minds of the respondent.

Step One: Regional Orientation

The author became acquainted with the Temagami area and the issues in the community during three separate visits prior to the data collection period. The first visit was as a canoeist, exploring the Wendaban Stewardship area for 10 days. The second visit was as a volunteer with an old growth forest survey team from the Department of Environmental
Biology at the University of Guelph. The third visit was with Dr. Don Richardson of the Department of Rural Extension Studies at the University of Guelph, videotaping Teme-Augama Anishnabai elders talking about their histories. Through these brief contacts with some of the people and parts of the geography of the Temagami area, I met a number of people working for the Wendaban Stewardship Authority and made initial contacts which were later used when formal application was made to conduct research in the area.

**Step Two: Gaining Co-operation with the WSA**

As noted, this study was designed to focus on the perceptions of members of the Wendaban Stewardship Authority. A letter was written to the chair of the Authority to inquire about research application procedures. Then, following the suggestions provided by the secretary of the Authority, a thesis proposal and covering letter explaining the length of time to be spent in the area, any impacts on the land and any proposed trips into the stewardship region were sent for review by the Wendaban Stewardship Authority. Following the review, the author’s *curriculum vitae* was requested and thereafter permission to do the research was granted.

**Step Three: Selection Process of the WSA Members**

The chair of the Authority was interviewed in North
Bay. The meeting focused on determining why each of the WSA members had been chosen to be members of the Authority. This was done in order to fulfil the first objective of the study. The interview lasted about an hour and a half. The chair was also asked about access to any written material on the Wendaban Stewardship Authority and its mandate.

**Step Four: Interviews with the WSA Members**

At a Stewardship meeting in Temagami, the author provided the Wendaban Stewardship Authority with background about himself and the research project and answered questions that the members had. At the same time some tentative interview times were set up with some of the Authority members. At this meeting, two of the WSA members told the author that they would like to have a final chance to look over the thesis before it was submitted to Carleton University. It was agreed that the study would be sent to the WSA members for a final check before submission so that the people interviewed could check to see that they were not misrepresented and so that the validity of the study itself would ensured. It was thought that this final check would serve to bring an outside analysis of the local situation back to the community from which the information came and in doing so would prevent the typical research problem of one-way information flow. Only one of the WSA members chose to respond to the author. A small change in wording was
requested by this authority member and that change was made. This step also addresses the fifth objective of this study.

The objective of the first part of the interview/discussion process was to explain to each person being interviewed who the author was and why this study was being done. Then the interview format was explained and the respondent was asked about the use of the tape recorder.

The collection of data involved the use of a two-part technique designed to elicit individual perceptions of land and explanations of those perceptions. It was thought that through explanation of territory that was at least somewhat familiar to the Authority members, environmental values and the identification of personally or culturally significant places would emerge. The identification of these values and places was designed in order to fulfil the third, fourth and fifth objectives of the study. Different visualization techniques such as transect mapping have been used by Chambers (1991) and Jiggins (1991). Transect mapping involves actual footwork on the land and explanation of the environment walked by the local person. In this method, various perspectives on land use and how the person drawing the transect relates to that land emerge. Similar perspectives can be acquired using mental mapping techniques in which people are asked to draw an area from memory. This technique has been used by geographers studying perception
of urban environments and neighbourhoods (Ladd, 1970; Knight, 1983; Williams, 1986) and is becoming more common in rural landscape evaluation (Chambers, 1991; FAO, 1992). Often mental mapping analysis deals with the types of symbols used and even a comparison to accurately scaled maps. Transect mapping is usually accompanied by an explanatory component by the local person. In this study, the techniques were merged, so that mental maps were drawn incorporating explanations by the mapper.

All the people on the Wendaban Stewardship Authority who were interviewed were asked to draw from memory a map of the area under stewardship jurisdiction. They were given no prior indication that this was to be the format of the interview, and so could not prepare beforehand either by looking at existing maps or talking with others. A large piece of paper, approximately 50cm x 25cm, was used so that there would be plenty of room for drawing. Smaller sized paper, as noted above, was found to be inadequate in pre-tests of the method. No indication of scale or degree of detail was asked for by the interviewer as it was thought that complete “artistic freedom” would allow people to draw the stewardship area based entirely on their own perceptions. Respondents were told this if they inquired about how the interviewer wanted the maps to be drawn.

As the map was being drawn, the interviewer would ask the map drawer about certain features on the map as they
were initially placed on the paper. Forthcoming explanations were either recorded on tape or written down by hand. Some respondents did not want to be taped. As explanations were given, points of interest were brought into the open for discussion. Often map drawing would be briefly postponed as discussion and questions about reasons for placing certain features and more detailed explanations were sought. Since the maps differed one from the other due to the particular knowledge and perception of each map drawer, the map features and ensuing discussions varied topically from one person to the next.

The discussions were completely open-ended. They had no topical bounds and were continued until the author or the respondent felt that it was time to get onto the next topic. A number of features or issues arose that needed clarification so questions would be asked of the respondents during this phase of the interview. These questions, though, depended on the specific map being drawn as well as on interview dynamics and so differed greatly from one interview to the next. Some examples of typical question are as follows: "Who's cabin is that?", "Where does that road go to?", "When did you notice the deer disappearing?". These questions followed directly from topics introduced by the respondent. Although all the discussions focused on the area and the concerns people had about it, all interviews were very different. The interviews differed both topically and
in length.

After each break for discussion, map drawing was continued until the area was drawn to the satisfaction of the map drawer. Questioning and discussion of the maps and their features continued throughout the interview. Interviews ranged from about one to three hours in length. Each person interviewed was asked not to mention the interview techniques to any other members of the Authority so that other participants would not know about the mapping exercise beforehand.

The maps and the discussions provided means for gathering data on selected people's perceptions of the Wendaban area. The semi-structured interview technique permitted the gathering of information that may otherwise have been difficult to obtain. After all of the interviews had been completed, the author was left with eleven maps, twelve cassette tapes with recorded discussions, and a series of notes taken during interviews when the tape recorder was not used. Each of the cassettes was transcribed into written form and these notes were then typed out, leaving the researcher with thirteen interview transcriptions which included comments by both the author and the respondent.

**Step Five: Data Analysis**

Grounded theory is one means by which qualitative data
can be encoded (Kirby and McKenna, 1987). This theory allows for analytical categories to emerge from the set of data rather than being imposed from the outset (Knight, 1987). To this end, the author read and reread the interviews until common themes among the interviews began to emerge. These themes were quite general at first. For example, two main themes within which most of the data seemed to fit were descriptions of the land and new planning directions in planning for the area.

Once these two themes had been found the data were reread several more times to check if the themes were broad enough to cover most of what was told to the author. During this process a number of more focused categories began to emerge which addressed some people's comments more specifically. These categories included knowledge of the area, descriptions of particular facets of the landscape like water systems or forests and ideas about managing the land and comments about potential development of or on the land. After coming up with this list of categories the data were reread again to see if the categories chosen covered most of what respondents discussed. The categories had to be reworked three or four times before a final set was found. The list of categories that was finally chosen follows:

- **Theme 1, Descriptions of the Land**: locations mapped and described, description inclusions, observed changes, sources of knowledge and information.
- Theme 2, Future Directions: decision-making authority, land management, development.

Under the categories of description inclusions four subcategories (water systems, forests, wildlife, humans) were used to further break down the data. Under the category of observed changes, two subcategories (community, ecosystem) were used to do the same thing. Figure 1, in Chapter Four, schematically outlines this categorical and topical format.

Each respondent’s data was given a code, including "R" for respondent and either from A to G for the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives or from 1 to 6 for the government representatives. The data were then divided into comments and ideas that related to each of the seven subcategories. For every category, each respondent’s interview was examined in order to find any comments or ideas that were relevant to that category. If anything relevant was found, it was then written down in the analysis section. If more than one person talked about the same idea then both were given credit. The code was placed behind every quote or paraphrased idea in order to identify and to group people’s perceptions. It must be noted that divisions of response into native and non-native groups is an a priori division. Responses could have been grouped according to age, to gender or even to response similarities.

In many cases only some of the people interviewed
addressed the topical categories which subsequently became obvious to the author. Because somebody did not address a certain issue does not mean that they have no thoughts about that issue. The following data analysis can thus only report what people told the interviewer; it does not necessarily represent all that people thought or know about the area and the issues involved.

Each of the topical categories focused on individual or specific attributes of the land and its people. It must be explained that this division of the land into pieces is an arbitrary division for analytical purposes. In retrospect, allowing for categories of people's perceptions of the overall system would have been beneficial as some consideration of how these specific attributes fit together is at least as important as consideration of the individual attributes themselves. The data analysis follows in the next chapter.
Chapter Four

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter outlines the respondents' perceptions about the stewardship area. The purpose of this chapter is to catalogue the range of response from the interviews which should, in turn, satisfy the second objective of the study. The presentation of the data in this chapter is arranged topically rather than by respondent. The next chapter, Chapter Five, deals with the data on a person by person basis.

The first objective of the study was to determine which people would be participating in land use planning in the area and why they had been chosen. The chair of the Authority was interviewed and asked these questions. His response came in the form of a list of the WSA members. He also explained that the Teme-Augama Anishnabai chose their own representatives and that it was not known how the government representatives had been picked.

The data were categorized following the methods described in the methodology chapter. There are two main themes: descriptions of the land, and future directions for the WSA. Each of these two broad themes was further subdivided into topical areas that allowed for detailed analysis of the respondent's views and perceptions. The following chart (Figure 1) schematically breaks down the themes, categories, and subcategories. This chart will
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outline how the data analysis is presented in this chapter.

**Theme 1: Land Descriptions**

**Locations Mapped and Described**

Only eleven maps were produced from the thirteen interviews since two of the respondents (R1, R2) did not feel comfortable drawing maps of the area. Because the mapping exercise dealt with the area under Wendaban Stewardship Authority [WSA] jurisdiction, all maps but two (RE and RG) include the township boundaries. Eleven of the respondents talked about the shape of the area to be managed by the WSA and its boundaries. Some people (RB, D, F, 2, 4, 5, 6) talked about how the Teme-Augama Anishnabai family territories were much more appropriate than township boundaries for the WSA's management mandate because they were based on watersheds, rather than square lines: "its hard to manage half a lake; the minute that trout swims to the other side it is in a new jurisdiction" (R5). Some people (RA, C, E, F, G) talked about the boundaries not in terms of their relationship with land management so much as to human use (primarily historical) of the area. For example, I was told that "this was my father's trapping ground; they never went by these square things before" (RC), and "my problem is not so much in knowing the country, but knowing where these township lines fit" (RF), and "I never went up to Wakimika too much because it was a
different family territory until the ministry took it over and put in different boundaries" (RG). Three respondents (R2, 3, F), including one person who did not talk about the boundaries per se, mentioned that the overall size of the area was not large enough, since "the area is too small to be self-supporting and the shape isn't sensible" (R2).

On all the maps of the stewardship area, details were included that ranged beyond the four township boundaries. For example, the section of Lake Obabika, of which only a part falls within WSA jurisdiction, was extended beyond the boundaries on all but two maps (RC, 3) (excluding those maps in which the township lines were not drawn). Although most people focused on drawing places within the stewardship area, three maps in particular highlighted details beyond the stewardship boundaries. One map (RA) showed the area south and west of Delhi township, including some features in Delhi; the person who drew this map talked about how the family's lands came into the southern part of the WSA's area and so the area drawn corresponds to where early childhood had been spent. Another (R3) focused on the north west corner of the stewardship area (Acadia township) and the areas adjacent to this corner (Selby Township). The person who drew this map talked about travelling into the stewardship area from the north along the Liskeard Lumber Road and working in the Selby/Acadia township area. A third person (RF) drew an extensive and highly detailed map of the
northern part of Lake Temagami and the areas within the stewardship area that were close to this part of the lake. During discussion, this person talked about working and travelling throughout the area he had drawn, and noted that certain places that are currently within the stewardship area were outside the territory he covered regularly. The rest of the maps were of areas within the four townships. Most maps focused on places about which the respondents talked. One person (R4) who talked about the old growth areas used them as the focal point for her map. Another person (RC) who talked about living on Diamond Lake included most detail on the area around that lake. And one respondent (RG), who had trapped and travelled in the Obabika Lake area, also had most map detail of that particular area.

*What is Included in Descriptions*

Descriptions of the area have been broken down into two main sections: the first is features of or on the land; this includes the waterways, forests, landscape, and wildlife. The second section deals with descriptions that allude to or make specific reference to human use of the land; this includes division of the land into family territories, specific individuals or groups of people using the land, human-made features on the landscape, and how the land is used for people's livelihood. Some features like clearcuts fall in the grey area between human use, landscape
description and another section which deals with changes on the land. It must be noted that the division of the land into separate categories like wildlife, forests, and people is an arbitrary separation for analytical purposes.

**Water System Description**

All of the map drawers sketched in approximate locations of the major bodies of water within the stewardship area, those being Diamond Lake, Lake Temagami, Lake Obabika, Lake Wakimika. One map (R5) included only lakes Temagami and Obabika. Bob’s Lake and some of the other smaller lakes were also included in most maps (that is, all except R3,4,5). The Wakimika River was drawn on all but two maps (R3,5). Some of the maps showed very detailed representations of the waterways (RA,C,D,E,F,G).

Most of the features on the maps were associated with water systems. Roads, cabins, traplines, pockets of different forest types and other features were usually drawn in relation to bodies of water. For example, one cabin that is found on five of the maps (RA,C,D,E,G) was included after the nearby river and lake were drawn. The water ways seemed to be the first features traced onto the maps other than the stewardship boundaries. Some of the maps (RA,B,D,E,F,G,4,5,6) included water bodies outside the stewardship area that were joined to water systems within.

The larger watershed context within which the WSA water
systems fit was described by two of the respondents. For example, "Obabika river hits the Sturgeon which goes to lake Nipissing which goes into the French River which feeds the Great Lakes. Or [the water] goes down the Montreal River to the Ottawa River, all starting from the height of land and the James Bay divide where the treaty went to" (RA), or "rivers and lakes are all connected" (RE).

The waterways were described in terms of having recreational value primarily for canoers (RB,4,6), for sport fishing (RF,1,3,5), or for snowmobiles (RB,C,F,5). Some people (RA,C,D,F,G) talked about them as routes along which people could travel in both summer and winter. Waterways were described in relation to other activities such as damming rivers for sending logs downstream (RD,G), netting fish to feed dogs (RA), or for use by people (RA,C,F,G).

Forest Descriptions

The condition of the forests in various areas was described by many of the respondents. Some of the people talked about the species of trees found in the area, "they are mostly Great Lakes-St. Lawrence and transition — that’s the difference with Acadia from Shelburne, Delalhi and Canton because it’s mostly jackpine and boreal" (R3), or "the first thing I noticed was the trees where the lumber camp had been. The seeds must have come in with the hay [for the logging horses]" (RA). Others also talked about the pockets
of red and white pine (RB) and the big spruce and pine area the logging companies wanted access to (RD).

Many people talked about the forest not in terms of what trees were there, but rather in terms of what places and areas had been cleared of their trees. One person said "its all been clearcut and there is nothing left" (RB). Others echoed this sentiment, as with: "over here its cut out really bad"(RC), "once all the trees were gone people began to notice" (RD), "Acadia is the one that has been logged the most...Shelburne has all been cut over except areas of high rock" (R3), "the trees are all gone below [Obabika River bridge]" (RE), "Canton is deforested...go through the Liskeard Lumber Road and its all clearcut pretty much" (R4), and "where I was hunting I see that all the trees are gone" (RF). Cut areas appeared on six of the maps (RB,C,D,E,3,4). They were used in some cases to differentiate between regions within the stewardship area. For example, areas that were clearcut were marked as were areas that were select cut as well as places that had not been cut, in effect classifying the land in three groups.

A few of the respondents mentioned the reforested or "rege[neration]" sites: "Acadia township is mostly jackpine, all tree plantations up there, an economic forest, in here red and white pine have been planted...all six feet apart just like God planned it" (RB), and "[in] Acadia...there are quite a few regen sites" (R3).
Many of the WSA representatives made specific reference to areas that are considered to be classified as old growth. The old growth areas around Lake Obabika and lake Wakimika appeared on four maps (RB,D,4,6). Others, (RE,G) sketched in the same places but did not classify them as old growth but rather as a pine and spruce area. Four of the WSA members called the uncut pine area around Obabika and Wakimika old growth areas (RB,3,4,6). They described it as "unique" (R3), and that it is "one of the last biggest old growth sites in North America" (RB). The other two people who talked about old growth used it as a central reference point within the stewardship area, "this is where the old growth is, the Wakimika triangle, it used to be like this everywhere but this is what is left and its not a very big area. There's a bunch around here but they've cut all around here, we only have the north end of Obabika in our area and it doesn't include the whole watershed" (R4).

Wildlife Descriptions

The stewardship land was also described in terms of the wildlife living there. Many respondents made reference to various animal species, such as moose (RA,C,D,F,G,3,5). They were mentioned in reference to hunting (RC,D,F,G,3,4,5), and to fluctuating animal populations (RA,C,E,F).

Many of the people talked about the beaver populations.
Four people told the interviewer about how they had trapped the animals (RA,C,F,G), two talked about how the beaver populations expanded too rapidly when people were not trapping them (R3,5). One person mentioned beavers only in relation to a lack of poplar forage for them (RD). People referred to deer populations in the area (RC,F,3), wolf populations (RB,E), partridge (RG), and fur bearing animals like mink, otter, muskrat (RC,F,G) lynx (RE), marten (RF), fox, and rabbit (RG). Other animals mentioned were ducks (RA,E), loons, crows (RA), and frogs (RE).

The majority of the WSA representatives talked about the fish that could be found in the lakes and rivers of the stewardship area (RA,B,C,D,F,G,1,3,5). Some of the respondents pointed out differences in lakes and corresponding differences in fish species (RA,D,F,G). For example, "I used to go in here for pike...into Diamond Lake you get bass, pickerel and Pike...trout in that deeper section...lake Temagami never that good for pickerel...too clear, shallow lakes have more plant life so they are darker, more suspended particles, country is flat around a shallow lake" (RF).

Some people talked about animals in terms of food (RA,C,D,E,F,G,5), such as "if I was going into the bush now I would take pork chops. When we used to go we would just take sugar flower and tea just the basics never any meat. We would set snares in here and get rabbits or partridge, we
would have to check the snares daily or the foxes would get them, we always had rabbit or beaver or moose, fish was plentiful as well, could get some whenever you wanted" (RG), and "lyx is good eating, hind legs are very good, they taste like pork or chicken" (RE).

Human Use of the Land

All descriptions of the WSA area included some reference to human use of the area. These references ranged from direct use such as living or trapping to indirect allusions to human use such as the mention of a portage or campsite. This section will outline how people have used the land according to the members of the WSA.

Several respondents talked about historical divisions of the land into family territories, as a system where different family groups had rights, recognized by other families, to live within the area considered to be their families’ territory. These territories were based on watersheds and therefore related directly to the topography of the land. All of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives mentioned the family territories and which families had historical jurisdiction over which areas. Some of the people on the WSA were part of the families whose territory overlapped the WSA region, namely Moores=Rita O’Sullivan, Resabos=Peter MacMillan, Cats=Janey Becker and Misabis=Alec Matias. One person (RA) also talked about
having certain places removed from the family's territory when the provincial government implemented the townships as a way to organize land planning. The existence of the family territories was also mentioned by some of the government representatives (R2,4,6).

Some people described the landscape in terms of specific families as well as specific people who lived there or used certain areas. For example, one person said, "as a kid we only knew the Masabis, the Turners and the Beckers...Cat's land was to the far east and Misabis in the central part...Becker's had Ashton township...people lived in Cleary Township on the Sturgeon river then moved to Armagh" (RA); "Dave Knudson has a camp on this island...the Becker and the Misabi families trapped back here for generation" (RB); "My father's ground was over here. We used to visit the Misabis over here where they lived...Arden Moore still goes back there in the winter and does some trapping...Pete Misabi Lived here...Paul Dunks had a camp here....Everybody lived in the bush before they had to go to school" (RC); "One family used this. Here's Walter Beckers' cabin and Walter's trapline...Woody and Walter have a boat at Obabika inlet...this portage was probably used only in the winter time by old people...George Peshabo who traps at Whitefish used to walk all the way across to Pinetorch...Cat family used to camp by Sharp Rock and trap" (RD); "a lot of their traditional hunting grounds are in there and its part
of their family territories, people like Misabi and I don’t know who else, so it belongs to them" (R4); "Arden did trap here a couple years ago...had a cabin in there some where...Bruce Hodgin’s place is there...Mac Mackenzie the trapper has a cabin down there, Doug’s brother...Elky’s people trapped in Wakimika Lake area, Alec Matias from the Misabi family" (RF); "most of the skidoo trails are probably old trapping trails, like Beckers who trap in there now" (R5); and "it was his [Misabi’s] trap line...we had a cabin in here...Misabi traditional land goes form Obabika portage up to Florence Lake...there’s a trapping area Joe Paul used...the guys from Appelby College come in there" (RG).

Many references were made to use of the land by people in general, rather then with reference to specific individuals or groups. Logging roads appeared on all but two maps (RA,5), and many people mentioned road access to the WSA area (RB,C,D,E,F,G,1,3,4,5,6). Roads in the WSA were mentioned in terms of logging access (B,3,4,6), as links to other communities (RC,G,3,4), as snowmobile trails in winter (RB,C,5) and as catalysts of change (RD,E,4,6).

Many of the respondents also made references to portages (RA,C,D,E,F,G,5), to trails (RC,G,5), to cabins (RA,C,D,E,F,G) where people lived or stayed occasionally, to campsites (RD,F), to camps where people worked either hunting, fishing, logging (RA,B,C,D,F,G,1,2,3,5), to long-abandoned camps (RA,C,E,G) and to other archaeological sites
of cultural significance (RA,C,D,E,G).

Some of the respondents made reference to the types of income generating activities people used the area for. They ranged from logging (RA,B,C,D,E,F,G,1,2,3,4,5,6), mining (R1,2,3,5), trapping (RA,B,E,F,G,3,5), general tourism and recreation (RB,F,G,2,3,5), guiding (RF), working in hunting and fishing camps and operations (RB,C,F,G,1,2,3,4,5,6), canoeing (RB,E,F,G,1,4,6), outfitting (RF,5) and property caretaking (RG). Reference was also made to employment in some of the surrounding towns that relied on the bush for its sources of raw materials. People talked about mills (R3,4), value-added industry (R1,3,4). Some people talked about research work either directly for the WSA (RE,4) or for academic interests further afield (RE,4,6).

**Observed Changes**

All of the people interviewed talked about the changes that they have observed. These changes related to their own communities and economies, to changing characteristics of the land and to changes in peoples attitudes. This section on observed changes will therefore use these three categories to outline what changes people described and were concerned with.

**Community Change**

Changes in communities were topics of concern to many
of the respondents. One person expressed concern about the degradation of economic opportunities and corresponding lack of employment opportunities. She said "there are no working mines and little industry, the industries have died...Temiskaming is the second worst place in the province for social risk factors: teenage mums, alcohol abuse, poverty and domestic violence" (R2). Another person said there "used to be 10,000 people here. It was Elk City then with the biggest Hudson's Bay trading post in the province. Then silver mining and the gold rush in Matachewan, Elk Lake was the hub of it all. Then after the mining petered out and the fire went through in the 20s or 30s it started to dwindle and logging took over...they are just pulling out [the rail lines] now...once you lose something like that you will never get it back" (R3). Another person talked about the state of the forest industry in the area "the industry and the market have shut down pretty much...they have seen that there's nothing left and the mills are shutting down all over the place even after the environmentalists left" (R4). Another talked about the looming changes in communities across the north, "the days are coming when they won't have the resources...like take Elliot Lake with the Uranium mines, all of a sudden the two mines shut down and they are making it a senior citizens community...these one horse towns like Temagami are going to have to change to survive" (R5).
Some of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives talked about changes in their communities as well. One person talked about how the provincial government had changed administrative boundaries from family territories to townships and in doing so removed sections of land from the area her family traditionally used, "piece of family territory was off limits to the family" (RA). Another person said, "we used to live pretty good back then" (RC). Another respondent talked about employment that he used to have, "guiding shifted...the wages a guide would make is probably less then what unemployment insurance would pay" (RF). The same person talked about cultural changes in his community, "I'd like to get further out [in the bush], Woody wants to do that too, but I don't really think we can do that as a people any more, we have been conditioned to the 20th Century and the ways of computers" (RF). Another person also mentioned cultural changes when talking about his native language, "there's only a handful of us left who can speak it or understand it" (RG).

Ecosystem Change

The majority of the respondents also made reference to changes in the health and state of the ecosystems in the area. Many people expressed concern about how the land had been treated and what has happened to it over the last few decades. People noticed all sorts of negative effects of
resource use in the immediate and surrounding area. For example, people said, "big changes in the river beds, they caved in cause they cut too close. River gets wider and shallower, less shade destroys spawning grounds...no animals in Delhi...moose used to deliver babies up on an island in Whitefish but people live there now...water has changed, there’s a slime on the bottom of the lake that’s new" (RA). Concern about the changes in the health of the land was a common theme throughout many interviews, "what logging has done has changed the face of those four townships forever...its all been clearcut and there’s nothing left, a lot of the trees and animals are gone...the whole surface area has changed since logging came in there" (RB). By another person’s account: "no trees on either side, the river was shocked, not much water flowing, dried up the river partly...over here its cut out really bad...down near here there are no more trees...there’s hardly anything there" (RC). One person said "everything has been pretty much destroyed around it [the old growth area] and there’s not even a corridor for wildlife" (R4). Another person talked about visiting places where he used to hunt, "the parts that I’m familiar with like where I was hunting I notice that the trees are all gone" (RF).

Two people talked about changes in the natural flow patterns of the water systems, "Lake Temagami would drain three ways...now only drains at Cross Lake" (RD), "Lake
"Emagami flushes slower than usual, Lady Evelyn is flooded... can see dead trees that used to be standing on dry land... Diamond is higher than it used to be... the road has flooded much of the land behind it, they don't know what they are doing, they stick culverts often in the wrong place above the water line... it's all interconnected, the roads change drainage patterns... loosing lots of water, lots of streams have dried up, I've seen them, all caked mud ground moisture lost cause of cutting. We are loosing our water because of clear cutting, its changing microclimate and soil temperature" (RE).

Some people talked specifically about changes in wildlife populations. I was told that "wildlife is scarce in some area where its clearcut" (RG) and that "the main cuts were clearcuts and that does have a big effect on the wildlife, everything has to move out" (R5), and two people (RC, F) indicated that the deer had all disappeared although this was not considered to be human induced by either person. Other changes noticed in wildlife are that there are a lot of lone wolves (RB, E) and that people "used to trap lynx but there hasn't been one trapped in the last seven years" (RE). Another respondent mentioned an area where she had trapped saying that now there were "no longer any muskrats and beaver there" (RA).

There was some concern about pollution from both local as well distant sources. One person said, "people with
cottages throwing stuff into the lake like stoves and fridges" (RA). Two people talked about acid rain (RD,E) coming to the area once the stack was built higher in Sudbury. One of these people also said that depending on the direction of the wind, the Temagami area either got the polluted fallout from Sudbury or Noranda (RD).

**Attitude Change**

Three people talked about how people's attitudes have been changing as they become more knowledgable about resource depletion and use issues. I was told that "there is a real awareness that these resources are finite resources and people are communicating and working together to solve problems, very positive, conflict has died down" (R4). Another person said that the biggest changes he has observed were in peoples' attitudes, "new generation coming into the area and giving the people there a rude awakening...if it was left to the generation that was in there you would have your Red Squirrel Road, you would have your clearcut and a trout population in dire straights...new generation puts a higher value on the resources" (R5). Three people talked about how people's attitudes and positions in the WSA itself have shifted as they learn more about other people's perspectives (RB,3,5).
Balance Change

One broad category of change that people referred to was balance. One person said, "the whole chain has been broken, they took the trees and the ground dried up, the water was effected and the animals, its all a circle...first of all there is nothing to hold the soil, the roots die and the trees die, it dries out, the land dries out because there is nothing to hold the moisture, then when it rains the water washes away with silt, and you know that affects the fish and there is nothing for the animals to feed on so there is no game" (RB). Another person said, "we won't see the effects yet...haven't been through the cycle, we don't know about the long term health of the land...its all interconnected...you don't know if places that haven't been touched have been affected by other places, just don't know!" (RE). Another person's summary of human effects on the land was "there's no balance left" (R4).

Sources of Knowledge and Information

Sources of knowledge about the area seemed to take two main forms, either first-hand experience from time spent in the area or second-hand information relayed through other people who had spent time there. The amount of time spent on the land varied from two people (K1,2) who had never been there to three others (RA,C,G) who had lived in the WSA area during certain times of their lives. Three of the native
representatives lived within the stewardship area or very close to it when they were growing up. They talked about those experiences, "I grew up here ... went back there when I was about 18 and trapped with my uncle" (RC), and "used to go into the bush in October and come out in May" (RG). Each of these people talked about knowing the land because they had trapped in and around various places and had travelled throughout the area, sometimes going to and from Bear Island.

The other natives representatives lived close to the area on Bear Island and/or had travelled throughout what is now under WSA jurisdiction. They told me things like: "I've been to all these places, canoeing, walking, driving or flying" (RE), "I walked all this country... and I fished all the waters" (RF).

Five people told me about having been through the area on canoe trips (RB,D,G,4,6). One respondent (R3) had worked periodically in the north west part of the stewardship area. Another had worked at various camps as a fishing and hunting guide and had seen much of the area during daily work related activities (RF). Three people talked about having driven snowmobiles through the area in winter (RB,C,5).

A number of the Temé-Augama Anishnabai representatives talked about hearing stories or being told about the land by their parents, relatives and the elders in their community (RB,D,E,F,G). I was told that older people were a major
source of information about the land by four people (RD, E, F, G): "You got a lot of stories from the old timers" (RF), and "I get information from the elders" (RE) and "he showed me a lot of things in the WSA area like native writings, rock painting, graves and the conjuring rock" (RG).

The government representatives got their information from a wide variety of sources. Two people (R1, 3) said they gain information from business in which they were involved plus the public, whereas another said through media and community meetings (R2). Three respondents talked about learning through being involved on various planning councils around the area (R2, 3, 5). Another person said information came from people in the MNR as well as academic papers and informal conversations with people from Bear Island (R6). All of the government members mentioned that they considered the other people on the WSA to be extremely valuable sources of information.

**Theme 2: Future Directions**

**Decision-Making Authority**

Many of the respondents felt that the "lands have been raped to date" (R1) and that "mistakes [were] made in the past" (R3). The Ministry of Natural Resources was often
blamed for mismanaging the land (RB,C,2,4,5,6). Two examples of such concern are, "the Teme-Augama Anishnabai have been using this land for generations and the MNR fucked it up" (RB) and "my problem with the MNR is that they manage for profit more than they do for the resource" (R5).

Some people felt that land-use decisions had been thrust upon them by people who lived outside the area (R3,E,2,3); "people feel they are getting screwed by the south" (R2). There was a sense of a lack of local power and control over the area, "we don't want what has happened to us to happen again...the southern Ontario kick in your face...you [southerners] want us to die and get out of your hair and leave this thing a playground" (R3).

Current government interference was seen as an obstacle by some of the WSA members (R3,4,5,6), "if we had just been left alone it would have been fine, but the M...a has interfered" (R4), "the group is in paralysis now because the government has mismanaged the group and no one really knows what to do" (R6). Even so a majority of the respondents felt that the WSA co-management concept was working well (RA,B,E,1,2,3,4,5,6). Some people were of the opinion that the region's land use problems could only be solved in a group of this sort comprising a wide range of interests working together rather than against each other (RA,1,2,5). "People working together is a real good thing. With two cultures we get lots of good information and ideas. Everyone
wants to protect the land" (RA), "the only way to hash it out is in a group like this...middle ground has to be reached...we have to work together in order to survive" (R1); and "common goals with other members, we want what's best for our families" (R2).

The issue of native rights and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai land claim was addressed by some of the people (RB,D,E,1,3,4,6). The interviewer was told that the WSA concept was a compromise deal for lands that should be owned and cared for by the Teme-Augama Anishnabai (RB). Others said that the land claims need to be fully resolved before the WSA can complete its mandate (R1,6).

Two people talked specifically about the need for local participation in decision-making (R3,4). One said "you have got to live it to really understand it...everything that happens to this community affects us, we all make our homes here and have an investment here...the vested interest is there. Its your livelihood, your future, your kids future. The TAA says you are only here for a certain time and are borrowing the land from your children...you don't live there and the people who do should make the decisions...they have to live with the decision they make" (R3). Another person said "It's a good thing that it [decision-making power] has come back to the community and the community is making the decisions...people are communicating and working together to solve problems...conflict has died down and people are
talking" (R4).

Management

Part of the mandate of the WSA is to plan for the use of resources in the future in the area. They are grappling with questions about how to best manage the lands over which they have jurisdiction. The question of what management means was addressed by many of the respondents. Opinions were wide ranging.

Some of the respondents saw management as a way to protect the old forest regions (RB,1,4,6) and the water quality (A,E,F). Others talked about protecting animal populations (RA,4): "somebody has got to protect them as they can’t speak for themselves. Need yards and birthing places or they will all move away" (RA).

Some people saw management as human intervention in the forests to insure future timber supply through such methods as artificial regeneration, stand tending and select harvesting (R1,3,5). Some felt that management meant balancing cutting and regeneration (R2,3). One of these three people said "if you don’t look after the resource you are going to be out of business" (R5). Animal species could be managed through trapping or hunting (R3,5). Certain species like beavers which have been managed through trapping in the past are growing too fast and need to be controlled because they do too much damage to human
constructions when they are left on their own (R3). "We have to find a way to manage that species and protectionism or conservation isn't the way, it's destroying everything around it" (R3).

Human intervention was seen as essential in some cases because forest fires were extinguished and so places that would have regenerated naturally through fire succession needed human stimulus; "by not having a fire and clearcutting you are doing the same thing, regenerating the forest" (R5). Beaver populations needed help because fire did not regenerate their food sources, and so select cutting in some areas could supply the tree species needed by the beavers (R5). Thinning or select cutting could also reduce fire hazards (R5).

Another person talked about trying to decide whether or not human intervention was needed in the bush to maintain or enhance ecosystems (R4). She said that at one time she had thought that it was not necessary but now she was undecided about what role people should play.

Another person's emphasis was on looking at what happens in the natural world and understanding it. She said that we "need to maintain 100 per cent of what is needed for the land to function...a priori of land not people...start with the natural ecosystems...you don't have to manage forests, they are fine - it's the friggin people and what they do" (RE).
Some people talked about management of the area in terms of finding out who the users are, how often they use the land, and what impact they are having (RB,G,4). Management in this case implied monitoring human use, especially snowmobilers, canoeists, and people fishing and hunting. One person said certain activities like ice fishing should be banned on some lakes periodically to let populations recover, just as either moose bulls or cows should be given a rest from hunting pressures (RG).

One person said proper management was needed to be in harmony with nature (R1). Another respondent echoed this sentiment: "we need to live in harmony with nature. We are as big a part of nature as anybody" (R5).

Some people talked about using land in more sensitive manners (R6), being more site specific with land use decisions (RE,3), and caring for sites better (RG).

Suitable indicators of ecosystem health, such as water quality and animal frequency and diversity, were considered essential in order to have a better understanding about the effects of human land use (RA,E,F). Others also spoke about the need for research in order to find out about the state of the land (RE,F,G,1,4).

Development

Almost all of the people interviewed expressed the opinion that forest harvesting could continue, but that
there needed to be changes in the harvesting methods (RA, B, D, E, G, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6). People talked about low impact and careful lumbering (RD, 6), select cutting (RA, B, G, 1, 3, 5), shelterbelt cutting (RB, 5), logging only in winter (RE), logging using horses rather than skidders (RD, E), and sustainable forestry that "doesn't concentrate only on timber values, but on all values" (R3). Everyone was concerned about the impact of clear cutting.

Economics were of great concern to many people. The availability of jobs was mentioned as being critical to the survival of the communities in the area (R1, 2, 3): "people have to survive, we need to provide for wife and kids" (R1). The author was also told that there needs to be a "more equitable share in jobs...to support the most number of people with the least damage" (R2). The need to diversify the local economy was also put forward (R5).

Some of the respondents talked about the need to generate income from the stewardship area (RB, 1, 2, 3), "we have to generate income in some fashion to become self-sufficient...what is the best way to come up with cash?...need a money base. Big business is needed for money and jobs, can't rely on the government" (R1). Others said that the WSA was limited by its budget (R5, 6). Some of the WSA members stressed the need for self-sufficiency (R1, 2, 4) and having "a place that can support itself" (R2).

A number of suggestions were made in reference to
improving the local economy by using the stewardship area for tourism (RB, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5), potentially for mining (R1, 3), for lumbering (R1, 3), charging stumpage fees (RB) and increasing value-added industry in the area (R4). One person said that tourism would not support the area by itself (R2). Another said that research was needed to find out what kind of damage would be done by mining and lumbering (R1).

Two respondents talked about the limits to development on the land, "you can only take so much out of there for so long" (RF) and the "land will only produce so much. You can make it do more with fertilizer and genetic engineering but you undermine systems by imposing artificial means" (RE).
Chapter Five
DISCUSSION OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter identifies associations between people or groups of people and the particular concerns and perspectives that they expressed and in doing so addresses the second, third and fourth objectives of the study. This chapter gives structure to what the respondents told the author, but even so allows them to speak for themselves because final interpretations of this data are not made until the final chapter.

The data analyzed in the previous chapter were broken down into thematic categories. In this chapter the same categorical organization is used to discuss the results. The data for both the descriptions of the land and the future directions have been displayed in two charts (Tables 1 and 2 respectively) to assist in identifying trends and associations. The left side of the table consists of those categories, subcategories and topics that people identified. Respondents are listed along the top of the chart according to the code they were given in the last chapter.
### Theme 1: Descriptions of the Land

#### Table 1: Thematic Categories and Respondents' Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMATIC CATEGORIES</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locations Mapped</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map produced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township boundaries</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred TAA boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries as land use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area too small</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details outside WSA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus outside WSA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways drawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways in high detail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways outside WSA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational values: canoeing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation values: fishing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation values: snowmobiling</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food source</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforested areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Old Growth' mapped</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Old Growth' concern</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluctuating populations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver trapping</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beavers increasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal species:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) deer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) wolf</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) partridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEMATIC CATEGORIES</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R B</td>
<td>R C</td>
<td>R D</td>
<td>R E</td>
<td>R F</td>
<td>R G</td>
<td>R 1</td>
<td>R 2</td>
<td>R 3</td>
<td>R 4</td>
<td>R 5</td>
<td>R 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) mink, otter, muskrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) lynx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) marten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) rabbit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) ducks</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) loon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) other birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) amphibians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes &amp; fish species</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife as food source</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Use logging roads drawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads as: a) logging access</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) links to other towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) snowmobile trails</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) catalysts of change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific people</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portages</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Camps</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological sites</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc &amp; activities: a) logging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) trapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) general tourism &amp; recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) guiding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) work in camps</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) canoeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEMATIC CATEGORIES</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) outfitting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) caretaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) mills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) value-added industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) research for WSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) academic research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) problems in communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) cultural change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) ecological change</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) water system health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) wildlife populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) balance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Knowledge Source         |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| a) living in WSA         | x  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| b) living locally        | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| c) canoeing              | x  |    | x  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| d) working               |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | x  | x  |    |    |    |
| e) snowmobiling          | x  | x  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| f) business              |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| g) community meetings    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | x  |
| h) planning councils     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | x  |
| i) academics             |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | x  |
| j) old people in community|    | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |    |    |    |    |    |

RA-RG= Temagami-Aguamiishkabir representatives, R1-R6= Government representatives

**Locations Mapped**

Because mapping the WSA territory was the starting point of most of the interview discussions, the ideas and perceptions of two of the respondents (R1, R2) are not fully
represented in this study because they did not produce maps. This, in turn, may skew a comparison between the native and non-native WSA representatives because the majority of the comparisons will now be made from a ratio of seven natives to four non-natives instead of seven to six. But the fact that two maps were not drawn may indicate some lack of intimate association with the WSA area. Neither of those two people was able to draw maps of the area partly because, as they told the interviewer, they were not very familiar with its features. As they themselves speculated, they were probably chosen for membership in the WSA not for their knowledge of the land, but for other interests and ideas that they could bring to the process.

Many of the respondents, both native and non-native, made the point that the township boundaries were inappropriate, and that the Teme-Augama Anishnabai family territorial boundaries divided the land much more appropriately for management reasons because they related directly to the topography of the land. A number of the native representatives discussed specific families and their corresponding territorial boundaries. This discussion was based primarily on historical use, and dealt with the boundaries as dividing use of the land (such as trapping and hunting) among different family groups.

Most of the maps included details beyond the boundaries of the WSA. In some cases, details such as roads and water
systems that were outside the WSA area were particularly informative as they showed which areas in the region some people were most familiar with. Three people, including both natives and non-natives, focused on areas outside the WSA boundaries because they knew those areas better, based on their previous experience. Reduced copies of the maps are included in the appendix.

Description Inclusions

All of the maps included some detail of the water systems in the area. Most people who drew maps used the waterways as the basic reference point for other features that they included. This was probably because many of the respondents had travelled into the area by boat. One of the maps drawn by a government representative focused on the Liskeard Lumber Road, probably because this person had access to the area along this route and had worked along that corridor.

The maps with the greatest detail of the water systems in the area were drawn by the native representatives. By and large, the native maps included a much greater degree of detail of the waterways than did those maps drawn by the government representatives. These same people also frequently discussed the water systems as travel routes. The high degree of detail in drawing the waterways and corresponding knowledge probably comes from having travelled
by water to various places throughout the region. Other than recreation use, such as canoeing, only the natives discussed using the water systems for travel.

A few of both the native and non-native representatives mentioned the recreational capacity of the WSA area in reference to the waterways. More of the government representatives mentioned sport fishing and more of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai mentioned snowmobiling. This finding could be attributed to the fact that many of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives live in the immediate area all year round and rely on snowmobiles for personal transport and recreation during some of the winter months. People from both sides talked about the area's potential for canoeing, probably because this form of recreation has a high profile owing to the large numbers of people it brings into the area each summer.

Waterways were also mentioned as a source of food by some of the native participants. Although fishing was mentioned by both native and government representatives, using the fish as a food source was discussed only by natives.

With regard to forests, although seven of the people who made specific reference to the forests talked about the areas that had been cleared, native people mentioned the cleared areas more often. Reforested places were mentioned by one person from each side. The old growth areas were
mapped by more natives than by non-natives, but were discussed as an issue of concern by more of the non-natives. This could be because the natives have a better knowledge of the location of places in the area while the non-native group is more attuned to the political and environmental issues that have brought their region some attention. These different foci are consistent with the different interests in the demonstrations and roadblocks of 1988: the Teme-Augama Anishnabai road block prevented logging in the heartland of their homeland while the non-native blockade focused on saving old growth stands. The areas around Lake Obabika that had old trees were defined as old growth only by the non-natives.

Regarding wildlife, both natives and non-natives talked about various animal species in terms of hunting them for food or sport. More natives mentioned the fluctuating animal populations and the perceived relationship between these fluctuations and human activity such as clear cutting. This concern was not limited to the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives, as one of the government representatives made similar reference.

A much wider range of animals was described by the Teme-Augama Anishnabai people than by the Government representatives. More of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives were aware of certain species because they and their families had trapped them. Some of the Teme-Augama
Anishnabai were more aware of the corresponding differences in fish species and particular lakes and rivers. Also, more of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives perceived wildlife as sources of food.

Two of the non-native members were concerned about the negative effects of an increasing beaver population. They linked this rise in beavers to decrease in trapping. In effect these people saw the problem arising when humans become separated from the natural systems and no longer manage particular harmful species.

Specific human uses of the land were mentioned by all but one of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives. Although two of the government people also referred to specific individuals or groups using the land, the Teme-Augama Anishnabai members talked more consistently about specific people and their activities. They seemed to know a great many people who had lived or worked or travelled throughout the area. They always made reference to people's family territories, to trapping grounds and to places where people lived. Because most of the people who had lived on and used the land were native, the government representatives were not as aware of their identities and their activities.

Other than pointing out actual people, all of the WSA members made reference to indications of human use. Road access into the stewardship area was a big concern to many
of the WSA representatives. Logging roads appeared on all but two of the drawn maps. The respondents talked about the roads in terms of access for logging, links to other communities, access for management, access for recreation, snowmobile trails, a focal point for community cohesion and action and because they brought logging and tourists into the area as catalysts of change. There seemed to be no pattern to points of view, as opinions were wide ranging; people who talked about the roads referred to them in many different contexts.

Other map features that indicated the use of the land by people were cabins (mentioned only by six of the natives), portages (six natives to one non-native), trails (2-1), campsites (2-0), camps (6-4), abandoned camps (4-0) and archaeological sites (5-0). Other than logging roads and clearcuts, camps were the only other human feature that were typically mentioned by non-native representatives. More of the native contingent than the non-native group were familiar with the portages and trails. Exclusively, the natives expressed knowledge of cabins, campsites, abandoned camps and archaeological sites (such as grave sites and rock paintings). Knowledge of the area, in an historical context, was clearly better understood by natives than by non-natives.

Some income-generating activities, such as logging and tourism related activities (working in camps and canoeing),
were identified fairly equally by both the Teme-Augama Anishnabai and government representatives. Mining was considered by some of the non-native group, whereas trapping was described more frequently by natives. Employment in neighbouring communities that relied on the natural resources from areas like the WSA, such as milling and value-added industrial labour, was discussed by only three of the government people.

**Observed Changes**

Views concerning the types of changes observed seemed to differ between the native and non-native representatives. The author was told about increasing social problems in the non-native communities in the region. Social indicators such as unemployment rates, teenage pregnancy, violence and abuse were said to be rising partly because of the lack of economic opportunity, the closing down of mills and mines and the cautionary restrictions on land development. Some of the government people also talked about changes in attitudes, both their own and those of people in their communities. A few of the respondents reported that people in the surrounding communities were beginning to work together to solve problems rather than against each other, as had been the case for many years.

Although cultural changes were noticed by two of the natives, few of the natives talked about their own
community. Most of the changes observed by the native respondents were ecological in nature, such as water becoming murky, fewer lynx being trapped in recent years, or changing tree species compositions of the bush. Although a few concerns were expressed about the detrimental effects of clear-cutting by some of the non-natives, a number of the native representatives explained more specifically the consequences of those logging practices that they had observed. These included decreasing water quality and quantity and wildlife populations as well as more general concerns about the basic health of the land. The adverse effects of pollution were also mentioned by three of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai people.

Sources of Knowledge

Sources of knowledge about the area and about the issues dealt with by the WSA, such as controlling access to the four townships and developing a management plan, varied from person to person. Three of the native representatives had lived in what is now the stewardship area and the rest had lived immediately adjacent to it. Most of the people on the WSA lived in the surrounding region and so knowledge came from first hand experience. One person had recently moved away from the area and another lived on Lake Teme-Augama Anishnabai for a few months. Many of the WSA representatives had canoed through the area and had worked
close by.

Some of the government representatives talked about becoming informed through their businesses, through community meetings, through planning councils like the WSA and through some academic sources, such as Bruce Hodgins and Jamie Benidickson’s *The Temagami Experience* (1989) and Matt Bray and Ashley Thomson’s *Temagami: A Debate on Wilderness* (1990). Many of the native representatives talked about learning from the old people in their community, and hearing stories from elders and parents about the land and the people who had lived on it.

**Theme 2: Future Directions**

**Table Two: Thematic Categories and Respondents’ Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMATIC CATEGORIES</th>
<th>R 1</th>
<th>R 2</th>
<th>R 3</th>
<th>R 4</th>
<th>R 5</th>
<th>R 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistakes in past</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNR blamed</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions from outside</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-management working</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land claim concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for local decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) forests</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) water</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man. as human intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man. as monitoring people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Decision-Making**

There was a consensus among the WSA representatives that management mistakes had been made in the past. The Ministry of Natural resources was blamed by six of the WSA members for contributing to many of the current problems. There was also some concern that too many decisions had been made outside the area and then imposed on the locals. More of the government representatives made reference to these historical issues and the reasons for the current state of affairs. Similarly, more of the government people than natives expressed frustration about the current interference
from the provincial government in the functioning of the WSA, as well as the need for more locally based decision-making, although two of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives described the slow process of negotiations between their band and the Provincial Government.

There was also general agreement that the co-management concept was working quite well and that middle ground had been reached. According to WSA members who had been involved in the road blockades, people who had once stared angrily across the Red Squirrel Road blockade at each other were now working together and learning and understanding each other's points of view. Seven people from both the Teme-Augama Anishnabai and the Government side stressed the need for resolution of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai land claim issue.

Management

Some of the WSA members saw management as a means of protecting threatened parts of the local ecosystems. More of the government representatives wanted to protect the old growth areas, while more of the native representatives were concerned with protecting the water quality. Protecting animal populations was also mentioned by one person from each side.

To four of the members, management was not so much protection of the bush from people as human intervention in natural systems. These four government representatives
discussed using management as a tool to come back into harmony with nature, and at the same time ensuring resources for future use.

Two of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai and one non-native defined management as intervention in human activities on the land such as polluting or clear cutting rather than interfering with the ecological processes of the land itself. Three of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai stressed the need for indicators of environmental change that could be used to adequately monitor the health of the land. To this end research was seen as an essential component of land management by five of the WSA representatives.

Development

The majority of the WSA representatives believe that logging can continue in the area, but only if logging techniques and methods are changed. Most of the WSA members were concerned about the impacts of clear-cutting but thought that by changing practices to low-impact logging of some type lumbering could continue, preferably at reduced rates. Some changing practices that the WSA representatives advocated were shelterbelt cutting, select cutting, winter logging and log hauling by horse rather then by skidder.

The economic situation in the area was of special concern to a number of the government representatives. Three of them expressed the need for employment in the surrounding
communities, generating income from the WSA and the need to be self-sufficient and self-supporting rather than relying on the government for support. These same government people mentioned using the area for tourism, and potentially for mining and logging. One of the native representatives proposed collecting stumpage fees for WSA income. Another two of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai identified the limits to development in the area. They said that the land could sustain only so much development and that the maximum level has probably already been reached.
Chapter Six
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

As the problems of resource depletion, ecological degradation, loss of traditional employment opportunities, and social disruption begin to reach critical levels in many of Canada's resource-based communities, the search for solutions becomes more essential. The problems that communities such as Temagami face are exceedingly complex and so simple solutions do not readily present themselves. The fundamental questions of how the land should be used and who should make this decision have been compounded by a wide range of conflicting vested interest, governmental overlap, a native band asserting its officially ignored rights, and a land base that has been compromised by people either unaware of or unconcerned about the consequences of continuous, intense resource exploitation. Until recently land-use decision-making control has been concentrated in the hands of a few specialized representatives of the Provincial Government. But their decisions have been shown to represent only a select group of people who live and work in the Temagami area. Because the decisions that have been made in the area do not adequately address many of the difficult issues facing the community and the surrounding region, new steps have been taken to allow for more local involvement in
decision-making so that the people who live in the area can work out amongst themselves how best to plan for the area in which they live. The Wendaban Stewardship Authority is one such example of local people from many different backgrounds working together towards compromise rather than towards conflict and a continuation of the contentious issues their communities are facing. This council is comprised of six people from the Teme-Augama Anishnabai band, six other members representing the Provincial Government and a mutually selected chairperson.

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent of differences in the environmental value systems of the two groups involved in the WSA, the Teme-Augama Anishnabai and the government representatives. The assumption was that there are differences and that different cultural groups perceive their surroundings in distinct ways according to a wide range of cultural factors. The objectives of the study were:

1) to determine which people in the Temagami area will participate in land use planning in the Wendaban Stewardship Authority and why and how they are selected.

2) to catalogue locations or areas within the Wendaban Stewardship Authority's jurisdiction which have particular significance to the participating groups of people.
3) to identify the reasons that those places are perceived as significant by the government appointees and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai.

4) to examine the degree to which cultural value systems appear related to personal or group associations with place.

5) to identify for the people themselves any differences in assumptions about the territory in question and about how these differences may need to be acknowledged and considered by members of the Authority as they formulate their proposals for land management.

Using a mental mapping procedure, each of the members of the Wendaban Stewardship Authority was interviewed with the intent that through mapping the area from memory they would discuss their own personal interpretations of the Temagami landscape. Thirteen WSA members were interviewed and eleven maps were produced. The process of map drawing acted as a means of facilitating discussion. These discussions ranged topically and in length depending largely on the respondent's interests and concerns. The interviewer asked questions about the topics introduced by the respondent rather than attempting to extract information about which the interviewer was already familiar. The author feels that this method reduced overtly biasing the types of issues and concerns people in the WSA wanted to talk about,
and hence reduces bias in the data. The primary data were a series of maps and taped discussions.

The data were broken down into topical categories that emerged from repeated evaluation of the concerns and issues the respondents had brought up in the interviews. A wide range of topical categories emerged from the data; these categories were then used to determine what patterns existed in people’s responses.

The main findings of the study were:

1) Most of the WSA members found the boundaries of the stewardship area to be inappropriate. The area was considered too small and the township boundaries were deemed as arbitrary.

2) All of the maps drawn focused to some degree on the waterways. The government people talked about the recreational capacity of these waterways while the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives, who drew the water systems in much more detail, talked about the water systems as travel routes, sources of food and fish spawning places.

3) The Teme-Augama Anishnabai talked about a wide range of animal species and were aware of fluctuations in population levels. People from both groups talked about hunting and using wildlife as food.

4) Many of the TAA representatives were aware of specific individuals living in places around the Authority.
Similarly, the TAA people indicated a much wider range of human use in the area then did the government representatives.

5) All of the WSA members made reference to the high number of logging roads in the area.

6) Regarding the types of changes people noticed, the government representatives were especially aware of social changes within their own communities, while the TAA people were more conscious of ecological changes in the area.

7) The Teme-Augama Anishnabai people learned about the area because they lived close to it and it was an integral part of the culture and history. The government people, on the other hand, became informed about the area through their businesses, through local planning councils and through recreational visits.

8) At least half of the WSA members thought that the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources had contributed to the current problems in the area.

9) There was a general agreement that the WSA was working quite well, but that the provincial government was still acting as an obstacle to the local-decision making process.

10) Regarding land management activities, more of the government people saw the need to protect the old growth forests while more of the native people were
concerned with protecting water quality.

11) Four of the government people saw management as human intervention in natural systems. One government and two Teme-Augama Anishnabai people saw land management as intervention in human activities on the land.

12) Half of the WSA members thought that there was a need for further research in the area before final management decisions were made.

13) Most of the WSA members believe that logging can continue in the area if the techniques and methods are changed.

14) Almost all of the WSA members were concerned with the effects of clear cutting.

15) Three of the government representatives expressed the need for employment opportunities in their communities and explained why it was important that the local area be self-supporting.

16) Two of the native representatives talked about the limits to development in the area, explaining that the maximum level has already been reached, if not surpassed.

Conclusions

Several conclusions emerge from this study. The first study objective was to determine which people in the Temagami area will participate in land use planning in the
Wendaban Stewardship Authority and why and how they are selected. Half the members of the Stewardship Authority were chosen to represent the Teme-Augama Anishnabai and the other half to represent the Provincial Government. There are contrasting reports as to why the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives who originally sat on the Authority were chosen. This group has begun to change as the WSA tries to include a person from each family whose traditional lands lie within WSA jurisdiction. The four members whose families had traditionally used the land in the WSA region are Rita O'Sullivan (Moore family), Peter MacMillan (Peshabo family), Janey Becker (Cat family) and Alec Matias (Misabi family).

The government representatives, including the chairman, were not aware of why they had been chosen to sit on the Authority. It seems as if they were picked to represent a wide range of interests from the surrounding communities such as logging, organized labour, canoe tripping, the local environmental movement, community and social services and the tourism business. Many of the people chosen have been quite active in the land use debates in Temagami in the last few years and so their names were relatively well known. This group of people appears to represent a reasonable cross-section of local non-indigenous interests.

The second objective was to catalogue locations or areas within the Wendaban Stewardship Authority's jurisdiction which have particular significance to the
participating groups of people. There were differences in the types of places that people considered important. Some specific places had significance to Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives. Wildlife birthing and fish spawning areas were regarded as essential places for maintaining healthy wildlife populations. Deforestation and, in some cases, cottage development were considered threats to these places. Sites where people live (such as Walter Becker's cabin) and have lived in the past (archaeological sites) were especially significant. They indicated traditional use of the land by the Teme-Augama Anishnabai. Some of the archaeological sites were said to be threatened by people who, passing through the area, tried to take souvenirs home with them (chipping off pieces of rock paintings, for example). Places of spiritual relevance, including the Old Man and Old Lady rocks on Lake Obabika, the Conjuring Rock, and Maple Mountain (outside the WSA jurisdiction), were pointed out as being vital to the Teme-Augama Anishnabai culture. The waterways, in general, were considered to be the fundamental features of the land.

The government representatives expressed most particular interest in the areas of old growth forest around Lake Obabika. Two of the government people talked about the importance of certain waterways, especially those typically used for canoe tripping. The road networks within the area were also considered to be important by both groups as they
indicated the degree of human use of the land. They provided access to people for all sorts of activity, much of which led to changes in the landscape. Although the roads were not appreciated by all of the WSA members, they were recognized as significant features of the landscape. In general, the government representatives were not as aware of the specifics of particular places as were the Teme-Augama Anishnabai representatives. Although there were specific places mentioned, people in both groups considered the wider area as a whole, including the Authority, to be of great importance.

Third, the study set out to identify the reasons why certain places are perceived as significant by the government appointees and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai. The particular places mentioned above (such as the old growth forest areas, or specific traplines) were of significance to each of the groups because of differing experience on the land and hence differing awareness. These differences in types of experience are largely cultural and have much to do with personal proximity to the stewardship area.

The birthing and spawning areas were of such high significance because they are the places or areas which replenish the ecosystems in the area. Because the populations of many species of wildlife were considered to be threatened by resource development, the places where nature was replenished were regarded as having immeasurable
value. The value of the waterways ties into this concept because the general resilience of the land was said to have much to do with the quality of the water. In this way the health of the watersystems was an indicator of the health of the land around it.

Archaeological and spiritual sites were probably held in such esteem by the natives because they indicated a rich history of land use by a people who are gradually rediscovering their traditional roots. The sites where people used to live show the people of today what they have in common with some of their ancestors. In such a way, people's attachment to the land is given historical context. The Teme-Augama Anishnabai's long struggle for land rights has involved the cataloguing of archaeological and spiritual sites. This process has meant that people from this band are becoming more aware of places within their homeland that are both relevant and vital to the continuation of their culture. Therefore damage to these sites by tourists and developers can in some ways be equated with damage to their own people and culture.

The reasons for holistic significance of the area are multiple. First, most people found the administrative boundaries to be arbitrary. Because the township lines do not correspond with actual landscape features, the significance of one township or even group of townships over another could also be considered arbitrary.
Also, as it was explained to the researcher by some of the native representatives and one of the government people, one place is intrinsically linked to another. For example, changes in water levels in one lake will affect the ecology beyond that lake alone because that lake is systematically linked to other rivers, lakes and the land around them. Similarly, the quality of wildlife habitat in an area of old growth forest is entirely affected by the degree of cutting around that patch of forest. In other words, specific places are linked through countless means to all other places and to people in the area, and so considering one place outside the context of the whole is somewhat meaningless.

In a similar vein, the Teme-Augama Anishnabai people are attempting to negotiate with the provincial government for the right to jurisdiction over a large piece of land consisting of their traditional territories, N'Daki Menan. The WSA area is just a small portion of this larger piece and so its significance must be considered in relation to the larger land claim. In retrospect, it would probably have been valuable to have people draw maps that included but did not focus solely on the WSA area, so that this area could be placed in a wider spatial context. Just the same, the WSA area is an integral section of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai heartland, as it is one of the last areas without road access and hence has not been entirely cut over.

Because the WSA area does not have full road access,
its ecological significance is quite different from that of many of the surrounding areas. Although much of the land within the WSA boundaries has been logged, has had its natural water systems altered by dams and roads, and has been developed for cottaging and recreation, the stewardship area has one of the last remaining areas of its size of reasonably intact and undeveloped forest ecosystems. The significance of such a place in a region largely altered by resource development and population expansion is hard to measure.

The fourth study objective was to examine the degree to which cultural value systems appear related to personal or group associations with place. This study proposed a cross-cultural comparison of values between the Teme-Augama Anishnabai and the government representatives assuming that they were or could be associated with two distinct cultural groups. While the Teme-Augama Anishnabai members share a particular culture, the government representatives have diverse cultural associations. Each of the Government representatives lives in a different community and their cultural ties seem to be as much tied with their livelihood and the places where they live as with their ethnic background. It was found therefore that cultural comparison between two assumed groups was not as straightforward as initially presumed because there were not two distinct groups. In fact, there seemed to be one native cultural
group and two different factions with the non-native group, one leaning towards preservation and conservation and another favouring a development and conservation-oriented approach to land-use planning.

Although each of the native members had his or her own distinct views and opinions, they seemed to be a more cohesive group because of their affiliation to the Teme-Augama Anishnabai band. This affiliation is rooted in culture, in experience and in place, as most of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai members live in the immediate vicinity of the stewardship area. Differences in land-based values were observed both between the natives and the non-natives and amongst the WSA on an individual by individual basis.

The main difference between native and non-native views was in the degree of personality associated with the land. For the Teme-Augama Anishnabai people, the land was where they lived. Because it was their home it was full of countless known and recognized places. They knew the history of the area, how to get to and around the area and which specific people were connected with particular places. The numerous accounts of people living and working in particular places in the bush reflected the personality of the land. It seemed as if the land was, in fact, a large neighbourhood with which the people who lived there were intimately familiar.

Where the Teme-Augama Anishnabai lived on the land in
the area the government representatives visited the area. Because they lived in the communities around the region, their bush experience (especially within the Stewardship area) happened in times when they chose to visit for work, for recreation or for WSA-sponsored excursions. Their neighbourhoods were in the local communities and so, in general, the land to them was more a resource used for recreation or employment than it was a home. The government representatives were more aware of the changing employment situations where they lived, who lived in what town or city, the changing social dynamics of their communities and how the ability to make use of the land affected all of those characteristics, especially in their own towns.

Although the two groups did have differing associations with the land, their concerns and indeed their values were often quite similar. As one person put it, "We all live here by choice and hope we can continue to do so. We have to live for tomorrow and today". All of the WSA members were concerned about maintaining the quality of the area in which they lived for their families, for future generations and for themselves. They also all recognized a relationship between the quality of the natural surroundings and the health of their own communities. Although differing associations with place were evident, everyone was conscious that people need to make a living from the land. Variations in opinion did occur on an individual-by-individual basis on
the degree of resource development the land could sustain and on the optimal mix of land uses. It was hoped that through further study and time the group would reach a deeper understanding of these limits. Both native and non-native representatives expressed the sentiment that development had to take place within boundaries set by nature rather than by people. No one wanted to pollute or compromise the health of their own home environment.

The final objective of the study was to identify for the people themselves any differences in assumptions about the territory in question and about how these differences may need to be acknowledged and considered by members of the Authority as they formulate their proposals for land management. During the interview process it became quite apparent that the members of the WSA probably did not need anyone coming from outside to identify their own differences and similarities. The WSA functions on compromise and consensus which means that varying points of view and hence people’s values are included in the regular operation of the Authority. The researcher learned that the WSA members were well aware of their varying backgrounds and perceptions of the land and that, in fact, they used these differences to their advantage.

The Research Process

This last observation leads to a number of questions
about the nature and value of the research itself. Does the research, even though it was clothed in a participatory framework, assist anyone but the researcher? What in fact is the value of this type of study to anyone (such as the WSA) beyond the student looking for an interesting and current topic of study? The research involved studying a group of people taking action in their own community. While I learned about a particular distant community, I found that the study has given me some insight into my own community and some ideas about action that I can take there.

Implications

Some implications of this study need to be addressed. The situation in Temagami could be perceived as a microcosm of many of the complex problems that are beginning to affect Canadian communities across the country. At what scale on the spectrum from local-level to state-level decision-making are solutions to community and regional problems best addressed? It must be remembered that the search for improvements in the methods used to make land-use decisions is a process and changes over time. Therefore the optimal mix of state and local-level involvement in decision-making will itself change as it should. This requirement means that a high degree of flexibility must be built in to these administrative structures, so that they can adapt to changing local conditions.
Local and provincial-level action can be mutually supporting in some circumstances. People from Temagami and people from across the province assisted each other in preventing the previously unlogged portion of the Temagami hinterland from having its resources developed. The issues of resource management, employment and ecological health in Temagami do not just relate to the locality but to the whole region and so involvement from outside is warranted where it does not impose a prescribed set of values but instead contributes to the decisions made in the local area.

Because a decision-making process is carried out on a local level does not necessarily mean that it will function smoothly. Local politics can serve to be as big a deterrent to effective action as they do on a larger scale. But state-level prescriptions implemented by bureaucrats at the local level have not produced satisfactory results and so local-level solutions are being sought and indeed realized. In the process of changing decision-making structures, people are beginning to work together with others in their community to create some kind of shared land ethic and hopefully to solve some of the problems their communities face.
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