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Abstract

This research provides communication strategies for First Nations and forestry agencies in British Columbia. I have used a community-based, participatory, and case study approach to conduct an in-depth study of conflict resolution between Sts’ailes, a Coast Salish First Nation located near Vancouver, and the British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (hereinafter the Ministry of Forests).

This study identifies the cultural uses of forest resources among Sts’ailes people and communication challenges central to the conflict, and suggests strategies that can help to achieve meaningful communication and collaboration between First Nations people and forestry staff. The ultimate purpose of this study is to explore cultural values related to forest management among the Sts’ailes Nation and to explore the dynamics of their communication process, focusing on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, a sacred mountain located on Sts’ailes traditional land. This study asks how First Nations can make themselves heard when “speaking” about cultural values within the context of forest management. It describes Sts’ailes people’s ways of using and maintaining access to forestlands and resources. The cultural values of forest uses are important to the revitalization of the Sts’ailes way of life, cultural identity and well-being. Here, I focus on the case of a conflict over logging on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum and the resulting Policy Pilot Project (2008) to analyze the communication strategies used by both sides in the conflict. I demonstrate that both the Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests improved their communication strategies as they worked on the Policy Pilot Project together.

My study confirms the theoretical framework that was used to address the invisible values of forests, and suggests that being proactive, promoting social learning, and having a conflict resolution protocol can facilitate more reflexive communication. I suggest that by linking Indigenous knowledge, one type of knowledge system, to multi-level governance, more meaningful communication and collaboration can be achieved. The findings highlight the relevance of a collaborative approach to the field, and provide a valuable lesson in forest governance systems, not only for Canada, but also for other countries where there are differences between statutory rights and customary rights.
Preface

Part of an original manuscript is presented in this thesis in Chapter 4. The version that appears in Section 4.8, titled “Cultural uses of non-timber forest products among the Sts’ailes, British Columbia,” has been published in a peer-reviewed journal (Kim, I., Mohs, G., Trosper, R.L. Cultural uses of non-timber forest products among the Sts’ailes, British Columbia, Canada. Journal of Forest Policy and Economics 22 [2012] p 40-46). The published article was written by In Ae Kim, in collaboration with her supervisory advisor, Dr. Ronald L. Trosper, Professor of American Indian Studies at the University of Arizona, and M.A. Gordon Mohs, former Cultural Advisor of the Department of Aboriginal Rights and Title at Sts’ailes.
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Chapter 1  Introduction

The purpose of this study is to explore cultural values related to forest management among the Sts’ailes Nation of British Columbia and to explore the dynamics of their communication process, focusing on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, a sacred mountain located on Sts’ailes traditional land. There are no widely accepted methods for systematically quantifying cultural values, other than asking people about the values they assign to the service, but this limitation in current methods does not obviate the deeper conceptual problem. The problem of intrinsic value has been a central debate in ethics for nearly a century (Zimmerman, 2004). The cultural values attributed to a sacred mountain are not readily measureable because they are not generally recognized, or seen as important by others, are not represented in a manner recognized as legitimate, or are the result of a series of compounding impacts that are not easily connected to an original action (Turner, Gregory, Brooks, Failing, & Satterfield, 2008).

The sacred mountain at Sts’ailes contains diverse aspects of cultural values, including trees, wildlife, water, landscape, and ancestral spirits. An obvious result of logging is the removal of trees and plants from the land. However, the loss of identity of Sts’ailes people due to logging on their sacred mountain is not obvious to government agents unless Sts’ailes people explain it and the loss can be readily quantified or measured. While standing trees are visually recognizable, spiritual values are not, especially to those who are not familiar with the cultural practices associated with different places. A key question of the study is how First Nations can make themselves heard when “speaking” about cultural values within the context of forest management and governance. This question is critical because the role of First Nations has not been sufficiently researched in relation to forest management and ownership of forestlands under different regulatory bodies. This thesis hopes to ameliorate this gap in forest management knowledge. It also presents an account of how the Sts’ailes Nation improved their communication strategies and their organizational structure while conducting a Policy Pilot Project.

First, it is important to explore general issues of forest management of Indigenous territories in Canada before considering the specific case of Sts’ailes. Communication among stakeholders is necessary for the successful co-management of forest resources (Greskiw, 2006), especially when First Nations, government, industry and the public have different
perspectives about conservation issues and harvesting areas. How do stakeholders communicate or resolve a problem when different perspectives arise about the use of forest areas (Nadasdy, 2003)? Given the possibilities, what are First Nations doing in the area of forestry? What strategies, or combination of strategies, may assist Sts’ailes in achieving positive outcomes when they utilize the rules for consultation and accommodation articulated by the Supreme Court of Canada (Christie, 2006)?

This study will document how the Sts’ailes Nation has interacted with the relevant ministries of the Province of British Columbia on the issue of management of forestlands in their traditional territory. It will also discuss links between Indigenous knowledge and the multi-level governance of forests in these interactions. To address visible and invisible losses, Sts’ailes identified what values they place on forests, even though they do not have legal ownership of the forests in their traditional territory. This is an interesting aspect of Indigenous peoples’ rights to land in Canada, especially in British Columbia, where Indigenous peoples have traditional rights and traditional territories without accompanying legal rights. However, it is even more interesting to look at to what extent are their rights fully recognized, and how their ownership to territory is asserted.

In recent years, forest-related traditional knowledge has become the subject of much research and researchers have addressed the value and implications of traditional knowledge. This thesis discusses how traditional knowledge can enhance forest governance and forest management and provides a theoretical and empirical base for supporting the cultural values of forests. Recording Indigenous peoples’ use of forest products from traditional territories, including non-timber forest products (NTFPs), is a legitimate way to prove present or past rights of use and the presumption of title. Therefore, knowing that Sts’ailes people use NTFPs, and knowing where they practice cultural activities, affects forest practices in their traditional territories and brings identity back into the big picture (O’Flaherty et al., 2008). Sts’ailes spiritual practices include spiritual bathing, vision questing, and the “putting away” of spiritual regalia in secret locations in the forest. Forest operations, while offering economic benefits to others, often threaten the cultural and spiritual practices of First Nations. The Crown’s duty of consultation and accommodation has created the requirement that the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (hereinafter the Ministry of Forests) consults with and accommodates First Nations regarding forest operations, in
order to reduce the threats to their cultural and spiritual practices (Christie, 2006). The potential for communication breakdown exists within this process, since non-First Nations people mostly see forest values as economic and environmental, and not cultural and spiritual. The paradigm shifts from a perception of forest resources as economic products to forest resources having multiple cultural values. Today, illustrating the cultural aspects of a forest environment helps to understand their importance to the cultural survival of Indigenous people. Now that I have discussed the primary purpose of this study, I will turn to an introductory overview of the Sts’ailes people, forest management in the British Columbia and the research focus and scope, and add research reflection.

1.1 **Sts’ailes**

The Sts’ailes are a Halkomelem speaking group of Central Coast Salish. The Sts’ailes belong to the Upriver group, and on the Mainland, the name of the language is written *Halq’eméylem*. ‘Sts’ailes’ means “a beating heart” in *Halq’eméylem* and Sts’ailes was previously known as Chehalis (Suttles, 1990). The term Sts’ailes refers to either people or the land. In this thesis, I mainly refer to Sts’ailes in the context of a group of Sts’ailes people. The Chehalis Indian Band was their official administrative name until June 2011, when Sts’ailes requested that their name be changed back to the traditional name. In support of this name change, Sts’ailes Chief and Council passed a Band Council Resolution in November 2009 and National Affairs and Northern Development Canada acknowledged receipt of the name change in May 2011. Due to this name change and the preferences of Sts’ailes people, I will use the term Sts’ailes, rather than Chehalis, in this study.

---

1 Central Coast Salish refers to the speakers of five languages: Squamish, Halkomelem, Nooksack, Northern
The Sts’ailes Nation is located in the central Fraser Valley, about a two-hour drive east of the city of Vancouver. Although Sts’ailes is not far from the city, their traditional land is heavily forested, is teeming with rich natural resources and is surrounded by mountains. Lakes Chehalis and Harrison are located to the north, the Chehalis River is located to the west, and the Harrison River to the south. Sts’ailes is not far from Highway 7, the Lougheed Highway, but there is no paved through-road to another city or region. The Sts’ailes traditional territory includes fairly large and old village sites, and seasonal camps for fishing and hunting are scattered throughout (Ritchie, 2010). Sts’ailes is further described in a section on Sts’ailes (Section 3.2.2); also Chapter 4 describes Sts’ailes governance structure, culture, economy, forest management, and their connection to the land.

1.2 Forest management in British Columbia

Forest areas in Canada cover about 4 million hectares (Natural Resources Canada, 2012) and forestry is a major industry, contributing approximately 2% annually to the Gross
Domestic Product (Natural Resources Canada, 2012). Canada’s forest sector employs about 600,000 people, directly and indirectly, and 80% of First Nations people live in or near forest areas. In recent years, growing recognition of Indigenous rights to the land has resulted in greater First Nations’ participation in forest management decision-making.

Most of Canada’s forests are on publicly-owned Crown land. Seventy-seven percent of Canadian forests are under provincial and territorial jurisdiction, 16% are under federal jurisdiction, and 7% of the forests are privately owned. In the province of British Columbia (BC), 93% of forestland is claimed to be managed by the province. However, 198 First Nation communities live in or near these forests. Most of these communities have traditionally used forestlands since ancestral times. Precise information of ownership data and maps are not available in BC. The Province of BC and many Indigenous communities have never signed treaties, but many BC First Nations claim traditional rights to the land and forest resources, and overlapping issues of ownership and use of traditional territories exist among First Nation communities.

This overlapping land tenure hinders effective forest management in BC. As a result, First Nations’ rights to forestland remain unresolved and sustainable forest management cannot be easily accomplished. This conflict began when European immigrants moved to British Columbia. Recently, with growing awareness about Indigenous rights, the gap between perspectives held by First Nation communities and those of other Canadians has emerged as an issue to land claim cases.

Today, government agencies and First Nations try to find ways to co-operate when it comes to decisions regarding natural resource management. While co-management, community forestry agreements, and consultation with First Nations are echoed in BC’s forest management practices, existing forest management practices do not always satisfy the multiple stakeholders: First Nations, industry, and the public. One of the main causes of the difficulty comes from the land tenure issue. Statutory land ownership conflicts with traditional land tenure systems. The federal government oversees First Nation communities (reserves), while provincial governments oversee traditional territories that, in most cases,
have neither been addressed by treaties in BC nor have reserved rights under the protection of treaties (McKee, 2000).

Traditionally, forestlands in BC are the territories where First Nations people have lived, hunted, fished, and carried out their cultural practices and spirituality. The word “land,” to First Nations people, refers not only to the physical land, but also to its resources and even to the people. Today, First Nations people either reside on reserve lands, which maintain a no taxation status, or they choose to live in other locales. The survival of First Nations people living in an urban setting, within a competitive and capital-oriented society, depends on their level of adaptability and ability to compete in mainstream society. It has been pointed out that a higher level of formal education is crucial to First Nations for urban survival. Historically, the level of formal education of First Nations people has been considerably lower than the societal average, which has been detrimental to their adaptability in an urban setting. The discussion of First Nations people living in urban settings is different from discussions of First Nations people living on reserve lands. First Nations’ reserves were designated by the federal government, while most of the remaining lands in BC became Crown lands, owned by the provincial government. In BC, Aboriginal rights and titles acknowledge First Nations’ rights to traditional lands and resources, but generally do not support legal titles unless First Nations can prove the strength of a claim in court (Christie, 2006).

1.3 Research focus and scope

1.3.1 Study purpose and research questions

This study discusses the cultural values of forests and Indigenous peoples’ role in sustainable forest management. It adopts the theoretical perspective that science and society are related, that science is not independent from society (Latour, 2004), and that society and groups of people are always evolving.

First Nations people often feel they are overlooked by government when it comes to forest management and related land and resource issues. In managing forestlands, there are both visible and invisible values to be considered. When logging occurs, visible losses such as the destruction of trees, plants, and animals are unavoidable. Also unavoidable are invisible losses, such as those related to cultural and spiritual values associated with
This study goes beyond conventional economic issues, which are what the dominant society sees. Rather than rebut this economic theory, my thesis explores the concept of *invisible traditional values* of forests.

The current governance structure acknowledges Aboriginal rights and titles if there is a proven long-term use of the forest area. Government agencies must listen to First Nations who address concerns such as visible losses. However, the government rarely pays attention to First Nations’ claims addressing invisible losses unless bound by parliamentary rule or the legal system (Turner et al., 2008). The alternative for First Nations is to present their concerns in a strategic way, using their influence to focus on what is most important to them. Government agencies mainly operate using written rules and regulations when modifying government-guided plans or regulations. Sts’ailes operates within its own traditions and within the context of natural law. This unwritten natural law is often translated into English as customary law, although First Nation communities use a direct translation of traditional law: “‘Snowoyelh’ is… the natural Law [the] Creator provided to us, it is the ‘Law of Everything’” (Personal communication with former Chief William Charlie).

Written communication is a part of Sts’ailes contemporary culture; however, traditional values and teachings tend to be transmitted orally and through experiential learning, art, and ceremony. Because the invisible values of forests—the spiritual values—are often associated with these oral traditions, this is one area where government agencies and First Nations differ.

The overarching question for this study is: *How can Indigenous people, such as Sts’ailes, participate meaningfully in forest management?* From this initial question, related questions arise: 1) How does Sts’ailes use forestlands in the context of their culture?, 2) How does Sts’ailes articulate invisible losses and what are the communication barriers in addressing invisible losses?, and 3) How did Sts’ailes make themselves heard by the BC Ministry of Forests?

My specific research questions, therefore, are:

---

6 Natural law is translated as customary law and Mother Earth’s law. Here, I adopted the expression used by Sts’ailes.


8 The current name of the Ministry is the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations ([http://www.gov.bc.ca/for/](http://www.gov.bc.ca/for/)). However, this study was conducted before the name change of the Ministry of Forests and Range. Therefore, I use the term Ministry of Forests.
1. How does Sts’ailes use the forest in the context of their culture?
   a. What are the cultural uses of non-timber forest resources?

2. Do communication barriers exist between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests?
   a. Are there challenges in communication between Sts’ailes and the Ministry regarding forest management and, if so, what are they?
   b. How have Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests incorporated the cultural values associated with the sacred mountain into forest management?

3. How can Sts’ailes be heard by the Ministry of Forests?
   a. What could facilitate communication between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests?
   b. What are the communication strategies used in the process?

1.3.2 **Thesis Structure**

This thesis is comprised of seven chapters. This chapter (Chapter 1) presents an introduction, briefly describes the community of Sts’ailes, the purpose of the study and research questions, and provides an outline of the thesis. Chapter 1 also provides critical reflections (see section 1.4) that arose during the research process. During the research, many people questioned why I was doing this research, given that I was neither a representative of Indigenous peoples nor a Canadian. I discuss “doing science together” and the concept of democracy of knowledge (Fortmann, 2008) as a way to address that question. These reflections are part of the process of *unpacking* my values and they provide insight for other researchers who want to do research with Indigenous peoples in the fields of forestry and natural resource management.

Chapter 2 contains a literature review regarding two main topics: the Coast Salish and communication. The first topic focuses on the Coast Salish people, the impacts of colonialism, and recent efforts to revitalize traditional culture and assert Indigenous’ rights to the land. The second topic focuses on communication: what communication issues have arisen with special attention to communication barriers, and what conditions facilitate communication, with examples of successful and unsuccessful efforts. The earlier research findings support and give rise to the research theoretical framework, methodology, and research questions.
In Chapter 3, I present the theoretical framework and research methodology used in my thesis. The theoretical framework provides a conceptual and analytical tool for my study. The rationale for using a single case study is described, as are methods of data collection, procedures for analysis, communication of results, and procedures for ensuring ethical research.

Chapter 4 provides an in-depth look at Sts’ailes culture, and their cultural uses of non-timber forest resources. This chapter provides a brief history of the people, villages, culture, and resource uses. It also explores today’s context of cultural uses of non-timber forest resources.

In Chapter 5, I describe how Sts’ailes communicated the cultural values of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum to the Ministry of Forests. The theoretical approach described in Chapter 3 is applied to Chapter 5. Chapter 6 deals with the benefits of linking the theory of “the commons” to other knowledge systems. Linking polycentric governance and knowledge systems contributes to an understanding of what facilitates communication in particular situations.

In Chapter 7, I highlight the significant findings of this study, and discuss the study’s contributions to the field. This thesis opens a channel to advance the discipline of forestry and the practice of collaborative forestry.

1.4 Research reflection

The separation of value and fact has been a common practice in science (Latour, 2004). When scientists analyze data, which is a mix of values and facts, they often exclude value-oriented questions and findings. However, it is questionable whether value can be truly separated from fact. As a result of this separation, communication between researchers and Indigenous communities sometimes becomes constrained.

I begin this section by reflecting on where my study began and my perceptions as a forestry researcher. Researchers tend to frame their research questions based on specific criteria, possibilities of funding and publication, their research interests, requests of certain groups, etc. Although research topics are decided based on different criteria, the interpretation and approach of specific research is affected by each researcher’s world view. Some people might argue that research is value free. However, discourse has recently
increased suggesting that the boundary between value and fact is ambiguous, in a similar way that the difference between society and science is ambiguous. Rather, reflecting upon a researcher’s own bias seems to help with comprehending a perspective of knowledge.

As a researcher, it is critical to describe where I come from and how I conducted this particular research. In the Indigenous community of Sts’ailes, I was an outsider in both nationality and language. At the same time, I did my best to understand the perspective of Sts’ailes people toward forests. I became a sympathetic outsider who shared a similar culture in Korea, and sought to understand Sts’ailes’ society. As a result, the community accepted my family and me, even though we all understood I would eventually depart.

When Indigenous peoples complain that many researchers never come back after their research is done, it becomes clear that some researchers make promises that are not honoured. As I was not from the community of Sts’ailes, I could not promise I would stay in the community forever. Rather than making that promise, I tried to communicate the possibility of returning and learning through the interactions of research. Although this may seem disappointing in some ways, our interactions can lead to mutual growth and to the recognition that individuals and societies evolve and change.

I have done research in Korea since 1999, Indonesia since 2003, and Canada since 2006. Conducting community-based research stimulated my research interests, especially in other communities and other countries. Doing research with First Nations people, I found similarities between First Nations’ culture and traditional Korean culture, including the fact that both cultures are family- and group-oriented, share a belief in the importance of elders, and strive to incorporate their traditional wisdom into mainstream society. I also noticed a similar history of colonialism and assimilation in both cultures. Canadian society is currently comprised of different First Nations, descendants of Europeans, and many immigrants of different multicultural backgrounds. Meanwhile, Korea is perceived as a homogeneous society. Yet Korea (North and South Korea) was occupied by Japan through the 1905 Eulsa Treaty and annexed through the Japan-Korea Annexation Treaty of 1910. During the Japanese occupation period (1910-1945), the culture of Korea was threatened by Japanese migration, land confiscation, and assimilation policies and education (Eckert et al. 1990). The use of Korean language and names was banned and people were forced to change their names to Japanese names and speak Japanese. In elementary and secondary schools, my
grandparents’ generations spoke only Japanese and were punished by the Japanese teachers if they spoke Korean. Although Korea gained its independence in 1945, in 1948, the country was divided into North Korea (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea) and South Korea (Republic of Korea). Not long after, the Korean War broke out and it prevented Koreans from bringing back their traditional culture and land title issues; rather, the country rapidly moved toward industrialization. Even though South Korea is today an independent country, conflicts over rights and land title issues occur sporadically. After liberation, reforestation projects succeeded under strong leadership and collective action. As a result, today, forested areas (6.4 million ha) cover 65% of Korea’s total land mass. Due to rapid economic development and urbanization, 70% of Koreans reside in urban areas. Many mountain villages and rural communities face issues related to ownership of lands and resources, access rights, aging communities, and loss of traditional culture and knowledge. While conservation and recreation are priorities in National Parks, the livelihood of people who live in these areas is not a priority and conflicts often arise over National Park policies. Access rights to non-timber forest products, such as mushrooms, edible wild plants, and medicinal plants, are closely related to the livelihood of people who live in or near forested areas. These activities have contributed to the retention of forest-related traditional knowledge (Park & Youn, 2012). Well-conserved and managed forests are essential to Korea’s forest-related traditional culture (Shin, 2009; Koo et al., in press).

Although there are similarities between the experiences of First Nations in Canada and mountain villages in Korea, the priorities of forest management, awareness of customary rights, and emotional sensitivity are quite different. From this perspective, doing research in Canada has been challenging. In Korea, people belong to one nation and have a comparatively homogenous cultural and historical background. In doing community-based research in Korea, ethical reviews are not considered to be as critical as they are in Canada. First Nations’ struggles give more weight to traditional forest use in Canada than in Korea. Some people may argue that if Korea is a homogenous culture, why should Korean scientists make an effort to build trust or have an ethics review. My answer is that Korea should promote community-based research because Korean society is evolving. The gap between rural and urban, and rich and poor, has been widening and the number of immigrants is increasing. Those who are educated and rich live in urban areas and have power. This is why
doing community-based research still requires attention and effort in Korea, especially in the field of forestry. In Canada, the history of colonization resulted in tensions and injustices between First Nations and new immigrants. Although people on both sides of these tensions and injustices tried to balance and compensate, history cannot simply be forgotten. Nonetheless, First Nations people, Sts’ailes in particular, want to move on, rather than becoming trapped in history.

I was educated in a Westernized educational system in South Korea for 20 years. I was also educated traditionally at home and in my community (by extended family and relatives) in South Korea. I had a turning point when I stayed in a small and remote mountain village in Indonesia for two months in 2003 during my Master’s program. After this experience, I realized what my interests were and how my paradigm had shifted. Without the conveniences provided by modern society, such as electricity and transportation, I experienced calm and many memorable moments.

While I was staying in a mountain village in Indonesia, I became sick and a traditional medicine man came to see me. He told people to gather specific plants near the village, then a mother steamed the plants and the doctor placed them on my stomach. Soon, I was cured. I am not sure whether the medicinal plants cured me, the people cured me, or I simply needed time to heal. Whatever happened, I experienced a strong sense of community throughout this experience, even as an outsider, and perceived how people cared for each other in this traditional village. After the trip, I questioned what “development” means and what modern society and materialism bring us. Observing conflicts between Indigenous peoples’ customary rights and forest management practiced by forestry agencies made me ponder who has authority and who does not have a voice. After completing my Master’s program, I came to Canada as an international graduate student. When I searched for an Indigenous community for my graduate research, I contacted three different First Nations. These First Nations were the funding agency’s partner groups and the agency (The Sustainable Forest Management Network) expected us to do research with those groups. The rationale was practical and understandable. However, the three partner communities are located in British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario, far from the university where I was studying. In a first meeting with my research advisor, I presented a research proposal and work plan for this project. The work plan I outlined included the three partner communities,
spending three months in each community, and doing a survey. I had a limited time period (three years) for the research with the partner communities. In the beginning, I was not aware of the fact that we could change the selection of partner communities. The institutions in South Korea, where I was trained and was employed, were not flexible, and researchers had to meet the institutions’ expectations, rather than changing plans and negotiating after research funding was awarded. After showing the work plan to my research advisor, he commented that what I expected to achieve from the project was too ambitious, working with three different Indigenous communities across Canada. On the other hand, the methodology was not ambitious enough, and repeated what others had done. The survey would not be able to capture what I wanted to find in the Indigenous communities. He helped me to see the possibility of using a participatory procedure rather than an exploitative survey. I understood that the participatory approach was meaningful, but I did not realize this was a method I could use for a graduate research in the field of forestry. Participatory research in the field of forestry would have been challenging in a Korean academic environment.

How I came to be in touch with Sts’ailes and how I embarked on this study is described in greater detail in the fieldwork reflection in Chapter 3 (see Section 3.8).
Chapter 2  Literature review

This chapter provides background information on Sts’ailes and the Coast Salish, and describes communication barriers between First Nations and government agencies. The Sts’ailes belong to the Coast Salish group.

Firstly, I will review Sts’ailes as part of the Coast Salish. This section includes a general history of their traditional territory, the impact of colonization, and recent efforts at cultural revival. While some changes were introduced by the colonizers, other changes were brought about by First Nations people themselves. It is not always clear how those two groups interacted and, unlike earlier research, it is important to acknowledge the fact that First Nations people in BC often played an active role in resource development, even after the arrival of Euro-Canadians. This chapter also describes the mechanisms and impacts of colonialism on socio-economic and cultural aspects of the Coast Salish, and their recent efforts at socio-economic and cultural revival.

Secondly, this chapter provides a literature review on communication barriers between First Nations and governmental agencies. While some First Nations and government agencies do not communicate effectively, some communicate relatively well. Here, examples of unsuccessful and successful communications with the First Nations in the region of Clayoquot Sound in BC and the Pikangikum Nation of northwestern Ontario are presented.

Canada, along with other countries in the Americas, has a lengthy colonial history. When Europeans arrived in the New World, First Nations had been living there for thousands of years. As settlers who intended to stay, the Europeans and their descendants expropriated land and resources from the Indigenous peoples. Today, First Nations in British Columbia continue to struggle with overlapping land issues and conflicts over land rights and title issues. Often, First Nations are not included in decision-making processes, even those occurring in their traditional territories. First Nations and government agencies have had difficulties in communication. They often have different worldviews and are not used to each other’s ways of communication. In addition, the colonial history generated issues of inequity between settlers and First Nations, creating tension between both and an unwillingness to speak to each other.
2.1 Language groups of Coast Salish

The Northwest Coast, with its relatively mild climate, temperate rain forest, and rich marine life has long been home to many First Nations people from different language and cultural groups. The Pacific Northwest Coast culture area extends along the North Pacific Coast of North America, from the Copper River Delta on the Gulf of Alaska to the Winchuck River near the Oregon-California border. Inland, it extends up to the Chugach and Saint Elias Mountains of Alaska and the Yukon, the Coast Mountains of British Columbia, and the Cascade Range of Washington and Oregon (Suttles, 1990).

“Coast Salish” is a cultural designation for a subgroup of First Nations people who speak one of the Coast Salish languages and live within the Northwest Coast culture area. “Coast Salish” has been used by anthropologists since the late 19th century to refer to the speakers of the 14 contiguous Salishan languages along the Coast, sometimes extending to include the two isolated Salishan languages of Nuxalk and Tillamook. Coast Salish includes the Northern, Central, the Southern, and the Southwestern Coast Salish (Suttles, 1990).

The Northern Coast Salish include the Comox, Pentlatch, and Sechelt languages, three closely-related members of the Central division of the Salishan family (Kennedy, Dorothy, & Bouchard, 1990). Central Coast Salish refers to five languages: Squamish, Halkomelem, Nooksack, Northern Straits Salish, and Klallam (Suttles, 1990). Southern Coast Salish includes Lushootseed and Twana (Skokomish) (Suttle & Lane, 1990). The Southwestern Coast Salish includes four closely related Salishan languages: Quinault, Lower Chehalis, Upper Chehalis, and Cowlitz (Hajada, 1990). The Sts’ailes are part of the Upriver group of Halkomelem (Suttles, 1990). The Halkomelem language is spoken along the eastern shore of Vancouver Island from Northwest Bay to Saanich Inlet, and on the Mainland from the mouth of the Fraser River to Harrison Lake and the lower end of the Fraser Canyon (Suttles, 1990).

---

9 During the 1970s, as part of the rising consciousness of First Nations’ identity, three Coast Salish groups changed their names to better reflect and confirm their traditional culture: Bella Coola and Nootka to Nuxalk, Kwakwaka’wakw, and Nuu-chah-nulth, respectively (Suttles, 1990). For more information, see http://www.bcafn.ca/files/list-203-first-nations.php
10 This Chehalis group refers to an Indian tribe in Washington State, United States.
11 See above (footnote 11).
2.2 **History of European contact**

The history of European contact has been written exclusively from the perspective of the arriving Euro-Canadians. Therefore, scholars reading these accounts and citing the information therein, have created a nearly universal bias through which new arrivals viewed First Nations’ cultures. Key to this study is the Royal Proclamation of 1763:

The Royal Proclamation of 1763 was proclaimed by King George III of England. It is a statement of British policy recognizing Indian land and rights and prohibiting alienation of Indian lands except by cession to the Crown. The proclamation has never been repealed and has the force of law in Canada, as recognized in section 25 of the Constitution Act of 1982. (McKee, 2000, pp. 143:4-8).

The history of Europeans in the Pacific Northwest goes back to 1741, when Vitus Bering, a Danish explorer, discovered sea otters along the coast of Alaska. By 1774, Spanish explorers were trading with the Nuu-chah-nulth for sea otter pelts on the west coast of Vancouver Island. Four years later, Captain James Cook was also trading with the Nuu-chah-nulth (McKee, 2000). In 1792, George Vancouver charted the coast from California to Alaska, and the following year, Alexander Mackenzie met the Nuxalk and Heiltsuk peoples of the central coast of British Columbia. In 1806, Simon Fraser explored the Fraser River, later named for him, from its headwaters down to its mouth (Suttles, 1990).

Traders, soldiers, and missionaries brought diseases\(^\text{12}\) with them, such as smallpox, to which Indigenous peoples had no immunity (Boyd, 1996). Epidemics swept through First Nations’ territory, killing a high percentage of those who were infected. For example, a smallpox epidemic in BC in 1862 killed, perhaps, thousands of First Nations people along the coast and the Fraser River valley (Boyd, 1996; Carlson, 1997). Missionaries often worked to persuade Indigenous peoples to reject their sacred beliefs and practices and convert to Christianity (Glavin, 2002). Immigrants flooded into BC during the Fraser River Gold Rush of 1858 and the Cariboo Gold Rush of 1860-63. As a result of all of these changes, Coast Salish societies experienced many economic, social, and cultural changes (Brown, 2005).

\(^{12}\) Cholera, leprosy, malaria, measles, scarlet fever, smallpox, tuberculosis, typhoid fever, and whooping cough.
2.2.1 **The impact of colonialism on the Lower Mainland**

New Westminster became the capital of the Colony of British Columbia in 1858, and continued in this role until 1866. Today, New Westminster is still the place where title records are kept. Later, the draining of Sumas Lake and its surrounding marshlands in the Fraser Valley created the farmlands located south of Sts’áiles and Chilliwack, causing significant changes in the landscape. Traditionally, Sts’áiles people fished and hunted, and used forest resources. Within several generations, the contact with Europeans changed the way Sts’ailes people lived, particularly from a socio-economic and cultural perspective.

2.2.2 **Socio-economic changes**

With regard to socio-economic changes in First Nations societies, government regulations played a key role in trade and the ownership of land and resources. Some First Nations people set aside traditional hunting, fishing, and harvesting activities to hunt for sea otters and to trap other furbearers for the fur trade. As a result, there was not enough food put away for the winter and villages would go hungry. Even though the fur trade remained important throughout much of BC, settlers began arriving in Coast Salish territory in the mid-1830s and began to occupy land, which they cleared for agriculture. It was not long before the settlers began to see First Nations people as obstacles to their settlement. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, even though no treaties were signed, First Nations people were put on reserves, limiting the size of their traditional lands.

To illustrate the economic changes in First Nations communities along the Fraser River in the early 1870s in British Columbia, fisheries played an important economic role in the region. The canning industry drew a lot of investment and employed many people, including First Nations. The Fraser River, downstream from New Westminster to Steveston, was dominated by the canning industry. Although there were a few exceptions, the fisheries were established as an open-access resource, which meant that anyone could purchase a license and join the fishery (Harris, 2008).

Sto:lo First Nation\(^{13}\) fishers on the Fraser River showed how the strong enforcement of the increasing regulation of Canadian fisheries (Butler, 2006; Harris, 2008) changed not only the economic climate, but also the political one. In 1827, the Hudson’s Bay Company

---

\(^{13}\) The Sto:lo Nation has a population of approximately 5000, most of whom now live on 23 reserves along the Fraser River between Mission and Hope, BC.
established a trading post in Fort Langley (Brown, 2005; Fisher, 1992). Increasing fisheries regulations transferred the bulk of the salmon harvest from First Nations to the industrial fishery, and transformed Indigenous people from independent producers to wage labourers for the canneries (Butler, 2006; Carlson, 1997).

Government regulations began to seriously impact Sto:lo fishing in the late 19th century. By 1878, weekly fishing closures and gear restrictions were introduced on the Fraser. A distinction was made between “Indian fishing” and “modern fishing,” so that Indians fishing with “modern appliances” came under the general law (Butler, 2006). This distinction became fully legislated with the creation of an Indian food-fishery in 1888. This introduced the licensing of the Indian fishery and limited Indian fishing rights to salmon for their own consumption. This legislation defined Indigenous fishing activities as traditional food, and a ceremonial fishery, as distinct from a commercial fishery. The government prevented Indigenous peoples from making a livelihood from fishing by prohibiting the sale of Indian-caught salmon. Government regulations changed Sto:lo’s fishing practices. For example, some traditional fishing methods became illegal, and fishers were restricted to using set gillnets rather than traps, fish wheels, or weirs (Butler, 2006; Harris, 2008).

Although fisheries management shifted and provided greater salmon harvest allocations to First Nations along the Fraser River—with the inclusion of First Nations in the management structure—, the Sto:lo, and Sts’ailes, have had little real self-determination regarding their fisheries (Butler, 2006). Legal restrictions on the sale of fish forced many people to turn to wage labour for income. First Nation peoples’ labour played a significant role in the industry, and fishing was at the centre of First Nations’ economies on the coast (Harris, 2008). However, the limited-license regime affected many fishers, especially Native commercial fishers (Harris, 2008). Captain George of the Chehalis said only 40 Natives held independent licenses in 1891, although many more people had boats and nets, and wanted to fish independently (Harris, 2008). Sto:lo men and women were employed in the salmon canneries, in the hop yards in the valley, and in logging, berry picking, and other enterprises (Butler, 2006).

In 1858, the Fraser River gold rush had a tremendous impact on the region’s economy (Carlson, 1997). Although the literature does not specifically refer to Sts’ailes, it gives a general idea of the economy in the Fraser Valley. For example, Sto:lo men, including men
from Sts’ailes, began earning money as labourers on the construction of the Cariboo Road and the Alexandra Suspension Bridge (Carlson, 1997). After the gold rush ended, Sto:lo men continued to be in high demand as pilots and deck hands for the paddle wheelers and other steamships carrying people and supplies between the growing communities along the banks of the lower Fraser River. Between 1879 and 1885, nearly every Sto:lo adult male worked for the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) (Carlson, 1997). In addition, the Sto:lo—men, women, and children—were central to the hops industry as “hop pickers.” Hop cones (or fruit) were one of the essential ingredients in the growing brewing industry (Carlson, 1997). Aboriginal people retained this position for 70 years, until they were replaced by automated picking machines in the 1940s (Carlson, 1997). Like the canneries, hop-picking provided seasonal employment for Sto:lo families (Carlson, 1997). Employment in the industrial or agricultural economy did not help maintain Indigenous seasonal fishing activities (Butler, 2006).

2.2.3 Cultural changes

Changes to First Nations’ culture accelerated when the Government of Canada introduced the Indian Act in 1876 and began to actively “manage” First Nations communities:

The British North America Act of 1867 creates the Dominion of Canada, Sections 91 to 94 give the federal government overall responsibility for administering Indian Affairs and maintaining British Colonial policy, Section 109 gives jurisdiction and ownership of lands and natural resources to the provincial governments. (McKee, 2000, p. 143)

The newly formed Canadian Government began to outlaw First Nations’ traditional practices such as the potlatch. At potlatches, titles were received and spiritual ceremonies and political events were held. The potlatch served as a form of government for a number of the Northwest Coast Indigenous cultures. The potlatch was one of the most significant cultural, spiritual, and political ceremonies amongst Pacific Northwest Coast peoples, including the Sts’ailes. The goal of the Indian Act was to assimilate First Nations people, forcing them to give up their traditional ways and to blend into non-First Nations society. In 1884, potlatch ceremonies were banned. In 1921, in defiance of the ban, a potlatch was held in Alert Bay on Vancouver Island and a number of elders were arrested and put in jail. Their ceremonial regalia, such as robes, rattles, and masks were confiscated by the Royal Canadian Mounted
Police and were sold to museums or ended up in the hands of collectors. Across Canada, the Indian Act was revised in 1952 to reverse the potlatch ban, allow meetings to organize land claims, and generally decrease political control over First Nations.

Beginning in the 1860s, First Nations children were taken from their families and placed in residential schools, where they were isolated from their families and culture. The first residential schools in BC were opened in 1861, in Chilliwack and Mission, both located near Sts’alil traditional territory. As a result, many First Nations children did not have the opportunity to learn their cultural traditions. The existence of residential schools is at the root of many problems in First Nations society, problems that continue today, even though most residential schools were closed.\footnote{14 The last residential school, located in Saskatchewan, was closed in 1996.}

Many First Nations people suffered in residential schools, where some people were abused. The number of people taken to residential schools is still not accurately known, because many people have already died, others do not want to recall their experience, while still others report inaccurate memories. However, it is true that many people suffered. As they were taken away and kept apart from their families, many of them lost the opportunity to learn their language and culture and learn about ceremonies and other traditions. The Government of Canada offered an official apology for the Indian residential school system on June 11, 2008,\footnote{15 http://www.pm.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?id=2149} admitting that the objectives of the residential school systems were “to isolate children from the influence of their homes, families, traditions, and culture, and to assimilate them into the dominant culture.” The Government of Canada had assumed that Aboriginal cultures and spiritual beliefs were inferior to mainstream culture and beliefs. The Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement\footnote{16 http://www.residentialschoolsettlement.ca/english_index.html} began on September 19, 2007 and the Canadian government employed a process of compensation based on records of how many years a person attended a residential school.

Due mainly to the destructive forces of the residential school system, younger generations have been disadvantaged in terms of learning about their culture from their families and community. Today, the Coast Salish people are exploring ways of revitalizing and preserving their traditional culture, confirming their sovereignty, and fitting into the local and global economy.
2.3 Recent efforts by Coast Salish to generate change

Although First Nations people still have high levels of unemployment and lower income levels than the rest of Canada, over the years they have fought hard for their rights and for justice. More recently, court decisions provided an opportunity for First Nations to claim their rights. Beginning in the 1970s, national and local First Nations organizations began working for changes that would re-establish First Nations’ rights to the land, and give them control over their own destinies (Kennedy 2009). The Calder (1973), Guerin (1984), Sparrow (1990), Delgamuukw (1997), Halfway River and Taku, and Haida (2004) decisions were followed by First Nations people taking action to assert their rights to their traditional territories. These court decisions, along with government regulations, provided a political climate for First Nations peoples to finally have their voices heard.

Today, there are many reasons for First Nations’ renewed commitment to the land and to the restoration of traditional plant-management techniques and wisdom. First Nations people have been particularly inspired by the politics of land claims and treaty negotiations, the benefits of technical inventions and economic alternatives, and the social and cultural recovery that has captivated the consciousness of so many Indigenous people across North America and Canada (McDonald, 2005). First Nations people can utilize the opportunity to strengthen their cultural identity.

2.3.1 Socio-economic changes spearheaded by Sts’ailes and Coast Salish

The Coast Salish people of the Lower Fraser Valley are organized into several political bodies and exercise their rights based on legislation and court decisions based at the federal, provincial, and local levels. Federally, First Nations hold formal recognition from the government, based on treaties in most jurisdictions, although not in most parts of BC.

Associations and other regional bodies serve as umbrella organizations composed of several culturally-related nations. These larger groups exist to create an economy of scale in order to provide services to community members, by creating a more powerful political presence in the province, and by recognizing a common identity amongst group members (Kew & Miller, 1999). Although Sts’ailes people are culturally connected to Sto:lo, they
have articulated that they do not belong to the same political structure.\textsuperscript{17} Sto:lo came into wider use as a political term, since the Sto:lo Xwexwilmexw Treaty Association began the treaty process in 1995. The process did not include the Sts’ailes. Today, the Sto:lo Xwexwilmexw Treaty Association is at Stage 4 of the BC Treaty Negotiation process.\textsuperscript{18} In contrast, the Sts’ailes Nation has affirmed its Aboriginal rights and title to their traditional lands to enhance their socio-economic position. Affirming Aboriginal rights and title provides the Sts’ailes with an alternative to land claims or treaty negotiations and that allows them to leverage economic revenue from forest operations. Although the Sto:lo Nation has recommended that the Sts’ailes Nation join their political organization, the Sts’ailes maintains their independent status, despite close ties to Sto:lo communities.

The Sto:lo people, including Sts’ailes, have survived two centuries of colonization, whereby their original population was decimated by disease, their lands occupied, their resources destroyed, and their communities reduced in number and pushed onto reserve lands governed by a culturally-destructive system of administration. Nevertheless, the Sto:lo continue to be participants in the economy of the Fraser Valley. Most activities of the Sto:lo Nation, and individual community governments such as Sts’ailes, are devoted to meeting the pragmatic on-going needs of their communities, such as coordinating and administering programs in education, health services, social welfare and child care, housing, employment, and economic development. Two Sto:lo Nation departments have a particular responsibility for issues that influence the disposition of land and resources, and the outcome of treaty negotiations.\textsuperscript{19}

Coast Salish groups such as the Sto:lo Nation or the Sto:lo Xwexwilmexw Treaty Association are seeking economic opportunities to enhance people’s living standards. Neighbouring Sto:lo First Nations, belonging to two free-standing tribal councils, the Sto:lo Tribal Council and the Sto:lo Nation Canada, merged into one, known as Sto:lo Nation, for the purpose of entering into treaty negotiations\textsuperscript{20} in 1993. The Sto:lo communities completed the revision of a formal political structure because they wanted to alter those aspects of the

\textsuperscript{17} http://www.stolonation.bc.ca/
\textsuperscript{18} http://www.bctreaty.net/nations/stolonation.php (April 9, 2013)
\textsuperscript{19} The Sto:lo Nation is preparing for ‘treaty making’. The political leaders believe it provides relatively secure tenure for all segments of the community, and promotes local management and the use of internal and local mechanisms of social control (Kew & Miller, 1999). However, it is still controversial.
\textsuperscript{20} The first stage, Statement of Intent, was completed in 1995. The third stage, Framework Agreement, was signed in 1998. The next stage is Agreement-in-Principle, but progress has been very slow.
Indian Act election system that were incompatible with traditional practices. They created a political solidarity, which is aligned with their cultural identity, for the purposes of negotiating with the federal and provincial governments. They also wanted to create—in the fall of 1994—effective governmental and community institutions as part of developing forms of self-government (Kew & Miller, 1999).

2.3.2 **Cultural changes in Sts’ailes**

Cultural revival is an important agenda among the Sts’ailes and, today, the Sts’ailes, along with other Sto:lo people, are working to ensure that their traditional cultural practices and knowledge survive. Although the residential schools and other discriminatory practices threatened their connection to their traditional language and culture, Sts’ailes have recently begun to recover earlier traditions. Today, there is a renewed commitment to the land and to the restoration of plant-management techniques, due to the politics of land claims and treaty negotiations, and the social and cultural recovery that has captivated the consciousness of many Indigenous peoples across Canada (McDonald, 2005). Today, Coast Salish people are exploring ways to maintain their traditional cultural ways, affirm their sovereignty, and fit into local and global economies (Menzies, 2006). From the perspective of the politics of land claims and treaty negotiations, proving present or past possession of land is important to Aboriginal peoples (McNeil, 1999).

In the late 1980s, some Sts’ailes individuals began working to salvage ancient knowledge, but it seemed to be disappearing quickly. Ceremonies are a core part of Indigenous “peoplehood” (Holm, 2003), which involves sharing prosperity and wealth and caring for relatives and neighbours. Regardless of their financial status, First Nations people still share food and other goods. Although they earn less income than urban people, according to their definition of wealth, Sts’ailes people are not poor: they still have salmon and practice their cultural ceremonies. Although measures of wealth are not analyzed in this thesis, the concept of wealth is closely related to the land.

In recent years, the Sts’ailes have utilized cultural ceremonies as a means to deliver messages in a strategic way. The Sts’ailes Nation has invited politicians, government officials and employees, and business partners to attend select cultural ceremonies. These
non-community members have also been called upon as witnesses,\textsuperscript{21} an incorporative act which draws members of the mainstream political community into the Sts’ailes’ and larger Coast Salish’s world (Kew & Miller, 1999). For example, in July 1993, government officials, including BC Cabinet Minister, Andrew Petter, were called as witnesses by Sto:lo people to attend the Hatzic Rock Celebration—held to commemorate the preservation of a sacred site at Mission. These witnesses heard the addresses of Sto:lo elders who articulated critical values and the contemporary political stance of the community (Kew & Miller, 1999).

More recently, Sts’ailes started a “Policy Pilot Project” with the Chilliwack District of Forestry and invited non-First Nations people to some of their ceremonies and provided them with an opportunity to observe and learn how Sts’ailes practice their culture (See Chapter 5 for more details). To ask a government official to be a witness to an Indigenous ceremonial event is significant. In the past, witnesses were generally comprised of First Nations people only. “Witnessing” is perceived as being similar to recording and providing “evidence,” since oral history was common in the past. Attending a ceremony also gives the witnesses the responsibility and duty to remember. While written history has its own strengths, witnessing is also a tool by which to record history. Witnessing the ceremonies also provides a space for understanding Sts’ailes’ culture, and an opportunity to link the forest and the Sts’ailes people.

First Nations communities in Canada, including Sts’ailes, have many celebrations and gatherings that are a way of delivering messages and acknowledging accountable leadership and hard work. Through the ceremonies, people share meals and also share more than food. However, only recently have these ceremonies served as occasions for inviting government officials and business partners into First Nations communities. While maintaining their core philosophy and messages, the ceremonies serve as a presentation tool for outsiders. Despite earlier attempts to ban traditional practices and force First Nations people to assimilate, Indigenous culture has not disappeared; rather, it has been held in sacred trust by the Elders, who are now helping to revive traditional concepts and practices. One example is the First Salmon Ceremony: a vital ceremony among Coast Salish people, including Sts’ailes (Hill-Tout, 1904; Suttles, 1990) (See section 4.2.2 on Sts’ailes’ culture for further information).

\textsuperscript{21} The witnesses were mostly Indigenous people, validating the work carried out and having the obligation to testify to the nature of the event if called to do so in the future.
2.3.3 Aboriginal rights and title

Today, Coast Salish people are affirming their rights to their traditional territory again. Although Sts’ailes is not participating in the treaty process, they are still affirming rights to their traditional lands. Sts’ailes collects information on the traditional use of land, providing data to fight with when their traditional territory is claimed by others. The previous Chief of Sts’ailes was a member of the Union of BC Indian Chiefs, a group that represents non-treaty groups in BC. Furthermore, Coast Salish people have organized themselves at local and national levels to speak up against provincial and federal governments (see Chapter 5).

Court cases such as Calder (1973), Guerin (1984), Sparrow (1990), Delgamuukw22 (1997), Halfway River and Taku, and Haida (2004) confirmed Aboriginal rights and titles and opened new opportunities. The Delgamuukw decision accepted oral history as evidence. The Haida case created “Consultation and Accommodation” opportunities. The court cases became cornerstones in confirming Aboriginal rights and titles. Today, the court cases provided a rationale for the Sts’ailes to request consultation and accommodation to the Ministry of Forests (see Chapter 5).

2.3.4 Implications of traditional forest resource uses

Sts’ailes people practice traditional resource management as part of Indigenous beliefs and traditions that have been practiced for generations. They do not take more than they need and give blessings before harvesting a plant or other forest resources. Today, these beliefs and practices continue to guide Indigenous people’s use of forest resources. Since the 1970s, awareness of Aboriginal title and rights has provided opportunities for Aboriginal peoples to be involved in forest resources management.

First Nations people are generally guaranteed timber for their homes and for cultural purposes. At the centre of Coast Salish culture are the “winter dancing” practices, which have seen a revival in recent years. Coast Salish people harvest forest resources for these cultural purposes, including stripping bark from certain trees, and gathering cedar roots and berries (Miller, 2001). First Nations people also have aboriginal rights and title to harvest non-timber forest products, which could provide economic opportunities.

22 http://www2.parl.gc.ca/content/lop/researchpublications/bp459-e.htm (June 3, 2010)
In Northwestern BC, for example, the harvest of mushrooms is an example of a source of income from non-timber forest resources. Mushroom picking is also a traditional practice governed by its own tenure system in Northwestern BC. Conflict over logging and the preservation of mushroom patches has been an ongoing issue not at Sts’ailes but some communities in Northwestern BC. This traditional tenure system of mushroom patches could well accommodate mushroom harvesting as a business opportunity (Menzies, 2006).

Political impediments related to the use of forest resources by First Nations people are found across BC. However, a new forestry paradigm can be implemented (Pinkerton, 2000) to mitigate the conflicts that may arise over the use of these resources. In British Columbia, First Nations people are currently engaged in creating more appropriate forest range agreements. These agreements would enable First Nations people to receive royalties and allocations of wood from woodlots, which are managed via non-renewable forest licenses that determine monetary payments based on population, not on forest harvest amounts. Furthermore, governments must consult First Nations before harvesting trees in order to determine whether cultural or spiritual features exist within the harvestable area. The Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) is one way of recording archaeological features and Sts’ailes had conducted an AIA in their traditional territory in collaboration with Simon Fraser University. Ritchie (2010) conducted an in-depth archeological study about the cultural landscape at Sts’ailes and identified several old pithouse sites in his thesis. The AIA has been adopted because previous forest operations disturbed old village sites, culturally modified trees (CMTs), and culturally significant areas. Now, if cultural and spiritual features exist, a buffer zone is set up around that cultural and spiritual area.

2.3.5 Summary

Coast Salish people experienced economic, social, and cultural changes after Europeans settled in the Pacific Northwest. The commercial fishing industry hindered First Nations peoples’ fishing activities, and government regulations did not recognize First Nations peoples’ rights to their land and resources. At the cultural level, the British Columbia colonial, and then provincial government, employed residential schools and laws banning the potlatch to control First Nations peoples’ culture languages. Those changes forced First Nations people to fit into the global economy, live according to government regulations, and
accept the Euro-Canadian concept of civilization. These assimilation policies required First Nations to change, but the result did not necessarily have the intended assimilation. First Nations cultures remain distinctive both in British Columbia and across Canada, and First Nations’ rights have been affirmed through the courts.

Today, Coast Salish people, including Sts’ailes, are affirming their rights to their traditional territories and some see treaties as a way to manage their land and resources. Coast Salish people have organized themselves at the local and national levels to make sure that their voices are heard. Tragically, the younger generation has been disadvantaged in terms of learning their culture from their families and communities, mainly due to the destructive forces of residential schools. However, today, Coast Salish people, including Sts’ailes, are exploring ways to maintain their traditional culture, confirm their sovereignty, and fit into the local and global economy.

2.4 Communication between First Nations and government agencies

In this thesis, “communication” will be used to mean communication between Indigenous peoples and resource management agencies in BC. This communication includes various forms of communication to express Indigenous peoples’ perspectives on forest resources and land within the context of forest resource management. The procedure is made legitimate through consultation and accommodation (Trosper & Tindall, 2013).

Gregory, Failing, and Harstone (2008) published insights to meaningful resource consultations with first peoples in BC:

What constitutes meaningful consultation with First Nations have focused largely on organizational issues, protocols, and legal considerations. These are important, but they count for little if the substantive issues—concerning the values of the indigenous population and the utilization and protection of the resource base—are ignored or only later pursued through closed-door, power-based “horse trading” negotiations. (Gregory et al., 2008)

Communication between Indigenous peoples and natural resource management agencies, such as BC’s Ministry of Forests, is necessary for the successful co-management of natural resources (Forsyth, 2006). Today, many Indigenous communities are involved in natural resource management, since there are issues of overlapping traditional territories, as well as
on Crown land and forest resources. Indigenous peoples are working to make sure that their point of view is heard as part of the decision-making and co-management process (Lindayati, 2002; Wollenberg et al., 2002). Resource management agencies now have the important challenge of responding to an increasingly diverse society through the development of appropriate management plans and policies (Bengston, 2004). The difficulties that Indigenous communities and governmental agencies often face, when communicating regarding resource management issues, result from their different world views, different degrees of power, and different duties. Communication, especially cross-cultural communication, is often challenging (Bengston, 2004; McGregor, 2002) and power imbalances are often an obstacle in achieving open communication (Latour, 2004). Furthermore, people with equal power, but different world views, face communication difficulties that are different than those faced by people with unequal power.

Sts’aléls’ rights to land and fisheries resources, along with those of many other BC First Nations, were ignored by the BC and Canadian governments for many years. Although land—in the form of fisheries, traditional territories and use areas—and fisheries were jointly owned with specific rules for use, colonial governments brought with them the idea of “registered ownership on a paper” (Harris, 2008). This type of ownership, “the legal language of property” (Nadasdy, 2005), did not reflect Indigenous peoples’ traditional view of the land, which involved complicated rules for access, use and “management” of land. Now, Sts’aléls and many other Indigenous governments are asserting their rights. Understanding the best way to be heard is essential to the delivery of their message to government agencies.

Next, I will describe the existing communication barriers: different world views, languages, ways of knowing, ways of communicating, colonial history, and power imbalances. I will also show how communication between Indigenous peoples and government agencies can be facilitated, with examples of successful and unsuccessful communication attempts.

2.4.1 Communication barriers

Communication barriers can arise when people hold different world views (Bengston, 2004; Berkes et al., 2000; McGregor, 2002), which can be described as “human dominant” or
“harmony of human and nature” (Atleo 2004; Salmon 2000). World views are closely related to culture, language, ways of knowing, ways of communicating, and history (Bengston, 2004; McGregor, 2002).

Power imbalances are barriers that make communication difficult. Indigenous peoples were not often heard because they did not have the authority to make decisions, nor the power to deliver their message to government agencies. In other words, listening to Indigenous peoples’ concerns was not a duty of government agencies. Even worse, government sometimes appeared to listen to Indigenous peoples’ concerns and then failed to act upon what they heard. Following the Delgamuuk Supreme Court Decision of 1997, “consultation and accommodation” with First Nations people is now a governmental duty (Christie, 2006).

2.4.1.1 World Views

Several studies have shown that racial and ethnic communities often differ in their environmental attitudes and values (Bengston, 2004; Jostad et al., 1996; Mohai & Bryant, 1998; Pfister & Ewert, 1996), although the Western world view is often considered to be the dominant one (Atleo, 2004) in many parts of the world. Indigenous world views often speak of harmony between nature and humans, and of a belief that all living beings have equal value. Different world views are based on different concepts, and may have different ways to quantify the value of non-human resources (O’Flaherty, 2008). Not surprisingly, different world views can lead to serious communication problems.

2.4.1.2 Language

Today, English is considered a “world language” because it is spoken by so many people around the world. English and French are Canada’s only official languages, although Indigenous languages have been spoken in the lands now known as Canada for thousands of years. Translating an Indigenous language into English is not an easy task (Atleo, 2004), and use of a certain language can limit communication within a cultural sphere. Today, many Coast Salish languages are endangered, with some languages having only a few, or no, fluent speakers still alive. Some communities are recording their languages, while others are trying to revive them. For example, the Sts’alíes Community School teaches students their traditional language, and the Sto:lo Archive records elders’ speeches and vocabulary for
future generations. Resolving differences of understanding between two different knowledge systems is not just a matter of translation. As linguist Edward Sapir (1958) noted, “the worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached” (p. 69). (O’Flaherty, 2008).

Language is closely related to culture. Indigenous peoples’ thoughts are not fully captured in English and elders often say that it is hard for them to explain concepts in English. Even when they speak English, it can be challenging. For example, many First Nations younger people tend to listen to elders rather than to contradict them on public occasions. This example is really a “matter of context” rather than a limitation of translation. Let’s say, rather than listening, someone speaks up whenever they have an opinion. As a result, this person ultimately limits other peoples’ chances to talk. This behaviour also blocks others’ willingness to share their own stories.

2.4.1.3 Ways of knowing

There are both similarities and differences between Indigenous knowledge and Western science. Both knowledge systems are based on the accumulation of observations (Berkes, 1993; Berkes et al., 2000; Inglis, 1993). In the early 1990s, Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) was perceived as being different from Western science in a number of substantive ways: TEK is mainly qualitative as opposed to quantitative; it has an intuitive component as opposed to being purely rational; it is holistic, as opposed to reductionist. TEK is based on the premise that mind and matter are considered to be together instead of separate; TEK is moral, as opposed to supposedly value-free; TEK is based on data generated by resource users themselves, instead of by specialized researchers; and TEK is based on diachronic data (long-time series in one locality), as opposed to synchronic data (short-time series over a large area) (Berkes, 1993) (Table 1).

However, focusing on the differences between these two systems does not help us to understand the obstacles that people who “live” within one system or the other face when attempting to communicate. Furthermore, it has been suggested that the comparison between TEK and Western science made in this table was too simplified (Parrotta & Trosper, 2012).
Table 1 Similarity and differences between TEK and Western scientific knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity</th>
<th>TEK</th>
<th>Western Scientific Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarities</td>
<td>based on accumulation of observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>qualitative</td>
<td>quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intuitive component</td>
<td>purely rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>holistic</td>
<td>reductionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mind and matter are considered together</td>
<td>separation of mind and matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moral</td>
<td>value-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>data generated by resource users</td>
<td>data generated by specialized researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diachronic data</td>
<td>synchronic data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, I am presenting the improved table to show the role of the values of positivist and alternative approaches (Berkes, 2012). Another table showed that not all Western science is reductionist, and that there is a continuum within Western science as well as TEK (Parrotta & Trosper, 2012). I argue that explaining that these attempts to understand what knowledge fits in which category could be tedious, but would help understand the differences, which is critical for successful communication between Indigenous peoples and government agencies.

2.4.1.4 Ways of communicating

Different knowledge systems adopt different learning processes and ways of communicating. Communication in Western society is usually human-to-human, while for Indigenous peoples, communication is also between humans and other beings (Atleo, 2004). In this system, humans have equal value to other beings, including animals (Atleo, 2004).

Communication crises occur when Traditional Ecological Knowledge is required to fit within a rigid technology of literacy (Greskiw, 2006). Indigenous people certainly use written communication today; however, in Indigenous societies, oral communication comes first, and then written communication may follow. Face to face communication continues to be preferred.

Because communication is not an easy task, there are very few people working in the federal and provincial natural resource management agencies who can communicate well with Indigenous peoples. It would be helpful if people in those agencies received communication training, particularly in the area of active listening.
2.4.1.5 History

Colonial history has created obstacles in present-day communication and understanding (Bengston, 2004). Early assimilation measures, including residential schools and bans on ceremonies, have left deep scars amongst First Nations people, and created distrust (Bengston, 2004). Already formed distrust is hard to break. On the other hand, many people have understood the part played by history and continue to seek a way towards reconciliation.

Yet history continues to create barriers to communication. Some descendants of European people might feel guilty about the past treatment of First Nations people and might want to “help” First Nations people in order to assuage their guilt. Unfortunately, this attitude can take on a condescending tone. When Indigenous people are confronted with this situation, colonialism repeats itself.

2.4.1.6 Different levels of power

Power imbalances block unnecessary communication in the jobs of both First Nations staff and Forestry staff. Unnecessary communications are not part of the job description or duties of government employees, including forestry staff. Whether communication is necessary or unnecessary is decided at a higher level of government, for example by the Minister of Forests. First Nations might also have a different list of tasks. While the literature points out “cultural differences” in communication, there is a lack of understanding of how communication barriers are related to broader power and governance structures (Barry, 2011). Healey believes that collaboration occurs due to a negotiation and translation of different discourses, rather than through interpersonal communication (Healey, 1997).

2.4.2 Conditions necessary to facilitate communication

Difficulties in communication often result in inappropriate policies that do not reflect First Nations’ perspectives and may lead to ineffective resource management. Although First Nations people may freely express their knowledge and values, some agencies do not understand what they mean, or they do not have an effective mechanism to interpret this essential information. Similarly, when agencies implement regulations and deliver guidelines, Indigenous peoples often do not understand or want to follow them. It is obvious that there
are unresolved issues related to power and lack of protocol to facilitate mutual understanding. A top-down approach is questionable because of unresolved issues of power. A government-to-government relationship has already started between the Canadian government and First Nations’ governing bodies. However, when it comes to the co-management of forests, there is still limited communication between governments (Greskiw, 2006). There is also a lack of protocol for implementing co-management initiatives, and a paternalistic attitude on the part of the Canadian government towards First Nations people. Cross-cultural education and understanding would facilitate more co-operative communication.

2.4.2.1 Unsuccessful efforts in the communication process and examples

When communicating about the management of land, traditional methods in the social sciences and top-down approaches generally involve written communication, and therefore, the results are often unsuccessful. Two examples of unsuccessful efforts of this type of communication are reviewed in the following sections.

2.4.2.1.1 Traditional social science methods for cross-cultural learning: Anishinaabe perceptions

Questionnaires and surveys used to obtain information about attitudes and beliefs based on the values of the dominant culture are often inappropriate and ineffective when used in the context of racial and ethnic communities (Mcavoy et al., 2000). For example, mail surveys are widely used in social science research, but usually have not been successful with Indigenous peoples (Bengston, 2004).

Reductionist science, which sees systems as the sum of their parts, has limitations in data-gathering and the interpretation of data when doing research with Indigenous peoples. As science and scientific methods continue to evolve, a thorough review of available methodologies and selection of an appropriate methodology is required when working with Indigenous people.

In a study about the perception of landscape amongst the Anishinaabe of northwestern Ontario, researchers tried to map their landscape and provide a translation (Davidson-Hunt & Berkes, 2003). They found that word-by-word translation did not work and that written forms of communication failed. This revealed that even though the written form is one way of communicating, it did not work well in representing the Anishinaabe
perception of landscape. Once the scholars undertaking the research understood these communication difficulties, they worked to map the Anishinaabe cultural landscape again, this time using cross-cultural methodologies, including traveling out on the land with Anishinaabe elders to collect site-specific knowledge. After several seasons of this type of data collection, a new map was created that was a better representation of the Anishinaabe’s views of their traditional territory.

2.4.2.1.2 Top-down approach

Forestry referrals by government and industry to First Nations, such as Sts’ailes, represent another type of communication mismatch. For example, government staff from forestry or other departments send letters of “referral” describing any development planned on First Nations’ traditional territory. The First Nation, which may be understaffed and underfunded, is often given an unrealistic timeframe to respond and, thus, the stage is set for work proceeding without any “meaningful” consultation. In this example, unsuccessful communication occurs when external interests control the process, and First Nations find themselves trying to tailor their responses to fit into categories previously defined from a non-First Nations’ point of view. These responses generally yield less than satisfactory results (McGregor, 2002).

Today, the broader field of Indigenous Knowledge research in Canada continues to be largely dominated by interests external to Indigenous communities, and by methodologies that are rooted in Western social science (McGregor, 2002). First Nations’ methods of sharing Indigenous Knowledge are rarely considered as legitimate forms of inquiry. This top-down approach is associated mainly with written communication. For example, communication crises occur when governments send many referrals to First Nations communities regarding land and natural resources within their traditional territory. Referrals must be sent to First Nations communities in BC informing the First Nation of any planned activity on their traditional lands and asking the First Nation for a response. These referrals are formal written communications that often require specific responses. First Nations communities are often overwhelmed by referrals and, given limited resources, require time to respond. However, they are often given a time limit of 30 to 60 days to respond. When First Nations people do not have the capacity to respond within these unrealistic time frames, their
traditional territory becomes vulnerable to planning decisions that are not based on meaningful consultation. Meaningful consultation would allow First Nations to have their concerns addressed and find a way to co-exist with other stakeholders operating within their traditional territories.

This top-down approach is a typical case of power imbalance in communication processes. Government agencies have more power, and the authority to make decisions, while First Nations groups have less power in the decision-making process. “Consultation” provides room to make First Nations’ voices heard.

2.4.2.2 Successful efforts at communication

2.4.2.2.1 Friendship: hunters and bureaucrats

An individual willingness to create opportunities for communication is one of the most important conditions to successful communication. Indigenous people often comment that spending time with people is the best way to learn and make friends. Nadasy (2003) noted his personal experience in the Southwest Yukon in his book *Hunters and Bureaucrats*. Nadasy (2003) describes how he and two First Nations people went moose hunting. The First Nations people assumed that this white man would not like to taste the “bum-guts” (lower intestines) of the moose. However, Nadasy enjoyed them and it made an impression on the local people. This was a significant event in their relationship and the event leveraged clearer communication. Presumptions often become communication barriers. People may assume many things based on the others person’s background, ethnicity, and so on. Un-packing one’s own values, and allowing the other person to process un-packing, facilitates communication.

2.4.2.2.2 Cross-cultural learning: Clayoquot Sound

The last 20 years have seen improvements in the implementation of adaptive management, cross-cultural learning, and negotiations in relation to Indigenous and scientific knowledge, when compared to previous bureaucratic approaches at forest management in British Columbia (Greskiw, 2006). The Clayoquot Sound case is an example of a successful communication effort in the development of a land management policy between the BC government and First Nations people (Lertzman, 1999; Kim & Trosper, 2008). Clayoquot
Sound encompasses 350,000 hectares of land on the west coast of Vancouver Island, British Columbia. It is covered by ancient temperate rainforests and five communities—Tofino and four First Nation reserves inhabited by the Nuu-chah-nulth people—are located in this region. After environmental activists, NGOs, and local community residents protested against logging in Clayoquot Sound, the Government of British Columbia assembled a scientific body, the Scientific Panel for Sustainable Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound, with the goal to develop and recommend forest practices for sustainable forest management in the area.

In order to achieve these goals, the Scientific Panel examined the sustainability of logging practices, but also took into account First Nations’ perspectives (Scientific Panel for Sustainable Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound, 1995). The Scientific Panel included First Nations people and listened to what they had to say (Scientific Panel for Sustainable Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound, 1995; Lertzman & Vredenburg, 2005). The Scientific Panel addressed “the different origins and shared goals of scientific and traditional knowledge” and also emphasized First Nations’ perspectives and participation (Scientific Panel for Sustainable Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound, 1995). The process involved cross-cultural learning in terms of ontology, epistemology, and morality. As a result, the recommendations of the Scientific Panel encouraged environmentally friendly logging practices in the region, including reduced clear-cut logging and expanded buffer areas around streams. The Scientific Panel learned from different cultures and worldviews during the research process, especially First Nations’ perspectives (Scientific Panel for Sustainable Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound, 1995). Lertzman and Vredenburg (2005) pointed out the achievements of the case:

The Clayoquot Scientific Panel achieved full consensus on all its outcomes. This panel is a precedent setting example of functional dialogue between Indigenous people and Western science based culture. Its mandate to draw equally on traditional ecological knowledge of local First Nations as well as Western science is chiefly notable. (p. 249: 6-12).

As a result, the government released a detailed examination of the panel reports (First Nations Perspectives Relating to Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound), and an ecosystem-based approach to forestry grounded in both traditional knowledge and Western science (Lertzman & Vredenburg, 2005).
2.4.2.2.3 Co-operative approach: Pikangikum

A less hierarchical and more inclusive process contributes to successful communication about land management. Co-operative approaches involve the development of trusting relationships among groups (Bengston, 2004). Adaptive management\textsuperscript{23} and qualitative management (trial and error learning) can be implemented based on a co-operative approach (Davidson-Hunt & Berkes, 2003; Berkes et al., 2000). O’Flaherty’s (2008) research on woodland caribou, for example, involved collaboration with the Pikangikum First Nation of northwestern Ontario and showed that a co-operative approach can accommodate cultural differences, without needing to resolve them, as long as partners remain committed to a respectful cross-cultural dialogue. An early assumption in O’Flaherty’s woodland caribou research was that maps that combine both Indigenous and science-based knowledge would help communication between the community and the provincial government. Indeed, maps proved to be helpful, to a point, in communicating Pikangikum Indigenous knowledge to people outside of the community. However, as much as maps were able to convey information provided by Pikangikum elders, maps could not properly express the content of Pikangikum people’s knowledge systems, because this knowledge is largely transmitted through oral and non-verbal means (O’Flaherty, 2008). Nonetheless, cross-cultural dialogue is meaningful as a mutual learning process (O’Flaherty, 2008). A map can point to the location of certain features and values, but it cannot adequately tell about the land from a Pikangikum perspective; that form of understanding flows from direct experience (O’Flaherty, 2008). This example shows that collaborative planning does not have to produce an elaborate map, which had been previously tried. O’Flaherty’s work also showed that a map cannot substitute for the necessary process of cross-cultural dialogue and mutual learning (O’Flaherty, 2008).

2.4.3 Summary: what the examples contribute

Collaboration has become important in forestry management and planning. However, communication is necessary for collaboration. Both cross-cultural learning and a co-operative (inclusive and participatory) approach facilitate communication. This gap in

\textsuperscript{23} A method of capturing the two-way relationship between people and their social-ecological environment.
knowledge motivates people in the field of forestry to learn how to work using a cooperative approach. However, the methods used to communicate effectively and to accommodate different world views still rely on individual responsibility, rather than being a institutional requirement.

To promote successful communication, federal or provincial forestry management agencies and First Nations people need to recognize that people who have different world views have different methodologies and concepts of forestry management. Both parties need to approach this issue more co-operatively and accommodate different perspectives that will allow communication to move forward. Respect is key to communication and the establishment of trusting relationships. Communicating across different world views and cultures, including different languages and ways of knowing, is facilitated by cross-cultural learning, a co-operative approach, and listening. Conflicts and challenges can provide leverage to improve communication between federal and provincial forestry management institutions and First Nations people.

If people in government agencies are not required to listen, then they usually do not. Court cases and awareness of Aboriginal rights and title have created an environment suited to encourage the participation of First Nations. Recently, government agencies have tried to be more collaborative, because First Nations can utilize the media and NGO’s as channels for communication. Government agencies should be informed about the struggles of First Nations; they cannot accommodate First Nations’ needs if they do not know what their concerns are.

This literature review is focused on world view, language, ways of knowing and communicating, and different levels of power. Next, I will consider how a First Nation community addressed their concerns over forestlands to government agencies. The next chapter will review the process of delivering First Nations’ messages, thus, filling the gap in communication between government agencies and First Nations (Turner et al., 2008). The theoretical framework is reviewed in the next chapter (Chapter 3).
Chapter 3  Theoretical framework and research methodology

This chapter describes the theoretical framework (Section 3.1) supporting revealing cultural values and the research methodology used in this qualitative study (Section 3.2).

3.1 Theoretical framework

The overarching theory of this thesis is a framework for ‘addressing invisible losses’ in forestry management (Turner et al., 2008). This communication framework provides guidelines for effectively addressing invisible losses related to forestlands in First Nations’ traditional territories. Communication is crucial to sustainable forest management. Furthermore, government forestry agencies must consult with First Nations because of legal requirements, as per Aboriginal Case Law decisions.

Forests are a repository of important cultural values, not just economic values (Pinkerton, 2000). Sts’ailes uses forests for both traditional and contemporary purposes, which support their economy and culture (see Chapter 4). Despite the fact that the forestry agency and licensees must consult First Nations when they plan on logging, some of the forests in Sts’ailes’ territory are endangered due to commercial logging. At this time they need to address their concerns on forest management. When logging occurs, First Nations not only lose the trees, but also the forest with its associated values. Recognizing the cultural values found in forestlands is a key for sustainable forest management. This practice aims to meet diverse needs, not only economic, but also the cultural needs for present and future generations (UNCED, 1992).

3.1.1 Strategies to addressing cultural values

The duty of Consultation and Accommodation in forest management creates a situation in which a BC First Nation may be able to have their invisible losses addressed. Power imbalance is another crucial aspect of communication that needs to be considered. Turner et al. (2008) articulate a process to address invisible losses. Addressing visible and invisible losses requires the agency’s capacity to do that. Addressing visible losses, such as the loss of medicinal plants and wildlife, is not an easy task. Explaining invisible losses to government agencies is even more difficult, as the concerns raised may, or may not, be heard. “Being heard” depends on whether procedures have been implemented effectively and
whether or not the other party (government) must listen and accommodate. The meaning of “must” fluctuates because Canadian law does not articulate the criteria of what “sufficient” meaningful consultation means (Supreme Court, 1998).

Turner et al. (2008) identified eight types of invisible losses and a six-step guideline to address invisible losses in land use. The eight types of invisible losses are: 1) cultural and lifestyle losses; 2) loss of identity; 3) health losses; 4) loss of self-determination and influence; 5) emotional and psychological losses; 6) loss of order in the world, and knowledge losses; 7) indirect economic losses; and 8) lost opportunities. The categorization of eight types is a useful tool that First Nations can utilize in addressing invisible losses.

The six processes to make invisible losses transparent and help reduce them, in Turner et al. (2008) are: 1) focus on what matters; 2) describe what matters in meaningful ways; 3) make a place for invisible concerns in decision-making; 4) use a historical baseline for evaluating losses and gains; 5) recognize culturally derived values as relevant; and 6) create better alternatives. Table 5 provides further details on these strategies.

Whereas the list covers a wide spectrum of losses, this does not show how a First Nation articulates these losses due to logging practices, which is a major economic activity in British Columbia and Canada. Eighty percent of Aboriginal peoples live near or in forest areas.
Table 2 Six processes to help reduce invisible losses in land and resource management (Turner et al., 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus on what matters</td>
<td>Focusing on what matters includes people who live there and who can be affected by a decision. It should include not only academics, but also community perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>How do policy and decision makers identify what matters most to the people affected, even when this is hard to articulate and even harder to quantify?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe what matters in meaningful ways</td>
<td>Describing what matters can be explored in different ways. Using comparison, metaphor, qualitative and quantitative assessments can be tried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>How can invisible losses, including cultural losses, be described and acknowledged in ways that are meaningful and compelling to other stakeholders, decision makers, and regulators?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make a place for invisible concerns in</td>
<td>Make a place for these issues and concerns in decision making, using a multidimensional framework and incorporating hard-to-quantify impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making</td>
<td><em>How can invisible concerns be made transparent and, in turn, be given a central place in decisions that affect the lives of First Nations members?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use a historical baseline for evaluating</td>
<td>Acknowledge historical losses by evaluating activities from a historical baseline rather than just from the present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>losses and gains</td>
<td><em>What are concrete ways to acknowledge past conditions of invisible losses so that future losses and gains are put in perspective and can be evaluated more accurately?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recognize culturally derived values as</td>
<td>Recognize culturally derived values as relevant and significant, and include them as legitimate inputs to decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant</td>
<td><em>How can culturally derived values forming an important part of knowledge be acknowledged and accommodated in decision making?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Create better alternatives</td>
<td>Create better alternatives to decision making, so that invisible losses will be diminished or eliminated in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>How can better management alternatives be created that are both responsive to past invisible losses and be able to begin to repair some of the past damage, in part by not continuing to create/perpetuate new damage and invisible losses into the future?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examination of conflicts that have been resolved expands the lists of strategies of communication. The literature on dispute resolution allows us to create an initial list of the types of strategies First Nations can adopt in pursuing consultation and accommodation:
confrontation, communication, relationship-building, and community healing, to name a few. The anthropological literature also provides a list of the different goals that First Nations may pursue: reconstruction of ties to the land, a return to previous diets, and renewal of decision-making processes (Turner et al., 2008). In the research of Sts’ailes, in the findings chapter (Chapter 5) expanded the lists of communication strategies beyond the case of Clayoquot Sound.

Turner et al. (2008) developed the six steps and eight types with these accumulated insights and experiences in mind. This theoretical support builds a strong foundation for communication guidelines. Linking the findings of the study at Sts’ailes with this theoretical framework creates a persuasive argument.

3.1.2 Participatory research

In scientific research, the role of lay people—or non-scientists—has evolved (Turnhout et al., 2010) and public participation has arisen as a key component at different levels of policy and decision-making. While the participation of lay people contributes to legitimacy, it can also cause conflicts in natural resource management, planning, conservation, and development projects (Goodwin, 2008). Despite these challenges, the general public and Indigenous peoples’ participation in scientific research is recognized as being of critical importance when both groups of those people are also understood to be stakeholders who are deeply concerned about land and forest management.

Fortmann (2008) described why “doing science together” contributes to a democracy of knowledge and a philosophical stance of inclusiveness: “Over time I have come to understand that scientists can answer some questions, people with other kinds of knowledge answer other equally important questions, and that some questions are best answered in collaboration” (p. 2).

Academic researchers in such fields as forestry (Menzies, 1994, 2007; Sivaramakrishnan, 1999; Baker & Kusel, 2003), agriculture (Gonzalez, 2001), ethnobotany (Turner, 2005; Turner et al., 2000; Deur & Turner, 2005), veterinary medicine (Davis, 1995), and wildlife management (Danielsen et al., 2005; Goldman, 2007) have become familiar with Indigenous knowledge systems. Currently, Indigenous knowledge is being drawn upon as an emerging theoretical framework, both nationally and internationally (Battiste, 2000; Jodi,
2011; Smith, 1999). The question of what Indigenous knowledge is, and whether it is valid or not, has been posed in many ways. Are scholars seeking to understand a cognitive system, or seeking to gain knowledge for generating profits? While Daes (1993) posited that Indigenous knowledge is an adaptable, dynamic system that is based on skills, abilities, relationships, and problem-solving techniques, which change over time in Indigenous communities, some scholars have used Indigenous knowledge in order to gain knowledge without proper acknowledgement or compensation. Indigenous knowledge is re-conceptualized based on the limitations of Western science and Eurocentric approaches (Battists, 2000; Trosper, 2009).

Indigenous knowledge has been defined as local knowledge held by Indigenous Peoples or local knowledge unique to a given culture or society (Berkes, 2012). Traditional Ecological Knowledge has been defined as “a cumulative body of knowledge, practice and belief, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission, about the relationship of living beings (including humans) with one another and with their environment” (Berkes, 2012, p. 7).

During the past 30 years, Indigenous knowledge and Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) have been promoted in the fields of agriculture, pharmacology, ethnobotany, and environmental sustainability (Berkes, 1993; Kim & Trosper, 2008; Moller et al., 2004). Indigenous knowledge has often been perceived to be interchangeable with Traditional Ecological Knowledge (O’Flaherty et al., 2008; Turner et al., 2008). The visible and invisible uses of forestlands and forest resources reveal how the forest provides an example of putting Indigenous knowledge into action. The use of forestlands and resources becomes a tangible way to illustrate the invisible values of forests.

This research employed an interpretive paradigm. The paradigm constitutes a way of looking at the world, interpreting what is seen, and deciding which of the things seen by researchers are real, valid, and important to document (Le Compte & Shensul, 1999). This interpretive paradigm is based on a cognitive view of reality. Many scholars believe that cultural beliefs and meanings are socially constructed (Archer, 1995), situated, and therefore relative to a specific context, not fixed, negotiated, multiple-voiced, and participatory (Le Compte & Shensul, 1999).
3.2 Research methodology

My research methodology consists of two parts. The first part is to define values in the social and cultural contexts of non-timber forest products for Sts’ailes. The second part is to identify how communication proceeded between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests with regard to a sacred mountain located within traditional Sts’ailes territory.

This research is based on community-based qualitative research and uses the case study method, since this is a collaborative approach well-suited to developing information within the community (Yin, 2003). Identifying where logging puts traditional rights and values at risk, First Nations have the right to have these concerns addressed. Addressing cultural values requires a different method from quantifying timber values.

3.2.1 A case study

A case study has been defined as “an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2003, p. 13). Case study research explores specificities, and scholars using such studies need to be careful when generalizing to different situations. A case study typically describes a particular group or a case to be explored. Case selection is critical when doing a case study. Stake (1995) suggests that researchers should select cases depending on how much they can learn, whether the communities are easy to get to, and whether they are open to the presence of researchers (Stake, 1995). For those reasons, I chose Sts’ailes to work with, and they chose me as a researcher and a person to whom they could talk. Sts’ailes addressed the merits of collaboration with university researchers and were willing to work with me. Sts’ailes’ understanding of how important it is to “be open to the world” defined their willingness to accept me as a graduate student researcher. Personal connections helped me to connect with the community and make myself available and familiar to the people and the place.

Sts’ailes is a First Nation who still practices Winter Dance ceremonies and spiritual rituals. Although they live in communities that are parallel to mainstream society, they are making efforts to revitalize their traditional culture. Sts’ailes still has abundant natural resources, including salmon and forest resources, and the forest environment provides secure places for their ceremonial and spiritual practices.
The theoretical framework (Section 3.1) provided a basis for justifying the significance of the research and its results (Chapters 5 and 6). However, the case study approach has limitations when it comes to generalizations, because of the small number of study sites and interviewees. Nevertheless, the qualitative case study method was chosen, because it provides an in-depth understanding of a case based on theory. Although quantitative research and generalization theories can provide “big picture” information, these methods cannot capture the nuances of what is happening at the community level, such as what decisions specific individuals make when communicating and why.

Although generalizations from a case study may not be accepted in all disciplines, this case study provides details on how a First Nation can make itself heard and is, thereby, useful to other First Nations. The lessons learned from this study can also be used as a framework to develop guidelines for other First Nations and governmental agencies to improve their communication. Furthermore, it is important to note that these qualitative results are hard to capture in a quantitative study.

3.2.2 Sts’ailes

As reviewed in the previous chapter (Chapter 2.1), Sts’ailes is located in a rural area of the central Fraser Valley, about a two-hour drive east of Vancouver. At the margins of an urban area, the community still maintains forest environments and rich natural resources.

The Fraser Valley is home to 24 First Nations, commonly known as the Sto:lo, which means “People of the River.” The Sts’ailes share many traditions with the Sto:lo, however, they are an independent group and do not belong to the Sto:lo Nation in a political sense. The population of Sts’ailes is just over 1,000 people. About 500 Sts’ailes people live on the reserve and depend primarily on natural resources and government assistance for their livelihood. Other Sts’ailes people live either on neighboring First Nations’ reserves, or in other cities or towns, including Vancouver and its suburbs, Abbotsford, Mission, Chilliwack, and Hope.

Sts’ailes cultural traditions are based on fisheries and forestry, notably on salmon and cedar. Fishing and forestry are important to the Sts’ailes people in social, cultural, economic, and spiritual ways. Although the Sts’ailes people are working to revive their culture, they are

---

24 Intermarriage between Nations is common.
struggling due to a lack of economic opportunities. Forestry has always been a big part of the local Sts’ailes economy. During the past century, Sts’ailes people have been involved in logging, cutting wood for boats, and cutting and milling wood for railroad ties for the Canadian National Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway companies (Carlson, 1997).

3.3 Data Collection

The methodology of this study focused upon two research sources: primary sources, in the form of interviews with individuals in the community and ethnographic field notes; and secondary sources, including local resource maps and plans, and other relevant supporting documents. Fieldwork was conducted full-time between September 2007 and March 2009 (see more: sections 3.3.1 and 3.8). Semi-structured, open-ended interviews and ethnography were conducted during this time.

I utilized participant observation during my field study. Participant observation occurred during many family events, community gatherings, school activities, and visits. Although many conversations took place during the field study, the conversations were not directly analyzed as part of this study. Nevertheless, these conversations enhanced my understanding of Sts’ailes and gave me insights into the community and the issues being studied.

After the fieldwork, feedback processes were constantly carried out. When the research was presented on other occasions, presentation materials were reviewed by Sts’ailes members and the Aboriginal Rights and Title department of Sts’ailes. One article was co-authored with a member from the First Nation (Kim et al., 2012), and explanations were given to Sts’ailes at each step of the research process. Historical documents and official referral documents were also used to generate an in-depth case study.

To begin with, the study employed in-depth interviews to pose the research questions that defined values in the social and cultural contexts related to non-timber forest uses such as cedar bark and berries (see Section 4.8). Semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions were conducted (Appendix C). Each interview was recorded and subsequently transcribed and was kept confidential. Prior to recording interviews, an informed consent form (Appendix B) was signed by each interview participant, and an explanation of the research plan and confidentiality measures were given. Field notes were made during
interviews and observations. Interviews lasted an average of one hour, depending on the subject.

A purposive sampling method was used, whereby interviewees were non-randomly selected from among those who were knowledgeable about their people and lands. The sample included key informants in the community, such as elected representatives, cultural committee members, elders, and council members. The snowball method (Babbie, 2010) was used to broaden the initial list of possible participants provided by key contacts. This procedure of sequential sampling may not adapt well to facilitating, encountering, recording or explaining minority views. To avoid bias of sampling, key informants were identified through observation and with the help of local community members. Altogether, I interviewed ten members of the Sts’ailes Nation and four non-Sts’ailes members who are involved in the First Nation, including one from a forestry agency.

Secondly, the community-based participatory research approach was used to explore how communication proceeded between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests to identify what communication barriers exist between them with regard to the sacred mountain that the study focused on.

For 19 months, I had the use of the Sts’ailes’ office to conduct my research. I also visited the community frequently to get feedback and to maintain my contacts after completing the fieldwork. This thesis and any publications stemming from the research have been reviewed by the Sts’ailes Nation.

3.3.1 Fieldwork

Dr. Kyeong Mann Cho, a visiting scholar from Korea, helped me connect with Sts’ailes. This anthropologist was a visiting scholar in the Department of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia from June 2007 to June 2008, and he had built a good relationship with the Sts’ailes since 1998. Gordon Mohs, anthropologist and Cultural Advisor to Sts’ailes from 1998 to 2010, also helped me when initiating contact at Sts’ailes and conducting fieldwork. Many research projects involving First Nations have been initiated based on the personal connections of researchers and First Nation communities.

During the fieldwork period, I settled in for 19 months at Sts’ailes, from September 2007 to March 2009, using an office facility in the Department of Aboriginal Rights and Title.
I participated in staff meetings, community events, ceremonies, and meetings with government agencies. This process helped me to gain the trust of the community. Community members also contacted me to arrange personal interviews for the study.

3.4 **Data analysis**

The research was based on a narrative study, and no specific analysis software package was used. Transcriptions were used to give more context to the small N research. Historical documents and ethnography were the primary data sources for the study. The unit of analysis was focused at the community level, although the analysis also addresses dynamics between the community and the local forestry agency, the Chilliwack Forest District, and the Ministry of Forests.

3.5 **Communication of results**

The results of this research project were presented to the community and members provided feedback. The research has also been presented at conferences after community members had reviewed files. This research will also be published in the form of a thesis, articles and several presentations to community and academic audiences.

3.6 **Strategies for validating findings**

Strategies for validating gathered data involved triangulation, which includes confirming and cross-checking the accuracy of the data (Denzin, 1978). Triangulation of information from different data sources is critical to the validity and reliability of ethnographic research (Le Compte & Shensul, 1999). Cross-checking procedures between transcripts and primary data were also used to ensure accuracy of the transcripts.

Validation, like analysis, should occur throughout the research process. The following are strategies that were used in this research study to ensure that concerns about validity were addressed (Creswell, 1998; Greskiw, 2006):

- Results from different interviews were compared and contrasted to build a coherent justification. Interview participants and community contacts were asked to review my interpretation of the findings to confirm their accuracy.
Using descriptive writing helped to give the readers a sense of the context and setting, and also provided details to help validate interpretations.

Using self-reflection helped to create an open and honest narrative. This also helped identify any bias the researcher might have brought into the study.

Any information that ran counter to themes and data categories was also presented.

Prolonged time in the field ensured that an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under study was gained.

Peer debriefing was used to enhance the accuracy of the research. Colleagues in the Faculty of Forestry at the University of British Columbia and peer reviewers at journals provided constructive criticism in the development of this work.

3.7 Research ethics

This research conforms to UBC requirements regarding ethics in human research and to Sts’ailes research protocol. As a university research project involving human subjects, the research activities had to be reviewed and approved on an annual basis in accordance with UBC standards. The project was implemented in accordance with the UBC Behavioural Research Ethics Board standard operating procedures and policies.

The following specific ethical issues are addressed in this study and the UBC Behavioural Research Ethics Board (Creswell, 1998; Greskiw, 2006):

- The study protects the anonymity of individuals, roles, and incidents in the project.
- Data are kept secure for a reasonable period of time so that they will be not appropriated for other purposes.
- Copies of the transcripts of taped meetings with names of participants edited are available for the participant communities at their request.
- The participants are required to check the validity of the researchers’ interpretation of data, so that an accurate account of the information is assured.
- The research doesn’t use language or words that are biased against persons because of gender, sexual orientation, racial or ethnic group, disability or age.
- The study doesn’t suppress, falsify, or invent findings to meet the researcher’s or the audience’s needs.
In planning the study, special considerations were made to respect the authority, the contribution, and the integrity of participant groups. The results of this study will not be misused to the advantage of one group over another.

Sts’ailes created their own research code in 1995 and the protocol has been used since in all research carried out at Sts’ailes. The research was approved by Sts’ailes and an agreement was signed (Appendix F), which was required by the UBC Behavioural Research Ethics review. In such cases, the researchers’ ethics usually require more commitment than what is asked for in the protocol. Furthermore, researchers should intuitively know what is “right.”

3.8 Fieldwork reflections

At the beginning of the program, I tried to contact several First Nation communities. However, approaching these communities was often more difficult than I expected, and the atmosphere was not always welcoming. I was not aware that contacting First Nation communities would be so difficult. For example, one community was not willing to accept me as a researcher because I was from a university far from their community and unable to live with them for four years. I felt I was not accepted because I was not from Canada and spoke English as a second language. This was an impression I felt from other communities at the beginning of the study, whether it was true or not. The impression was that I did not have enough understanding of First Nations people and of Canada. To some people in those communities, it seemed that I was only a student from a city who was eager to do research for her doctorate.

The impression they had was framed by their previous experiences with other researchers. Some researchers did research in their traditional territory and collected data by asking many questions during a few visits or by disturbing the land and the people. Then, they did not return at all after collecting the data. In addition, some people thought the studies did not reflect the community’s perspectives; the people were either not satisfied or did not agree with the results of the research. Researchers also reported their interpretations to the university or government without appropriate feedback from, and partnering with, the community. Since they have had negative experiences in the past, some First Nations people
tended to be hostile to the idea of research, especially research designed without community input.

In the beginning of my research project, we had a meeting in a First Nation community with other researchers, most of whom had little experience with First Nations. Even though some people liked the research topic, some First Nations members in that community began to criticize the concept of the research. I felt that this was understandable, given the way the meeting was set up and the way some researchers approached the topic. Some First Nations people expressed interest in my research project, but, after meeting in person, it was hard to get feedback from the communities via phone or email.

In doing research, having a strong motivation is important. In working with communities, these are qualifications a researcher needs. Emotions have not been discussed as much as other important qualifications; however, emotion plays an important role when doing a community-based research project. Controlling and balancing motivation and affection is critical, since the researcher is working not only with trees but also with people. Indeed, the community plays a key role in the project, and this role changes as time passes.

While some First Nation communities were overwhelmed with ongoing projects or politics, others did not have the resources, people, or facilities to participate in a project. Many research projects involving First Nations have been initiated based on the personal connections between the researchers and the communities. This saves time when building trust. A personal connection eliminates certain barriers to being accepted, but also brings certain risks. However, when initiating research, the connection plays a key role, as long as the researcher is cautious and aware of the pros and cons.

While I was struggling to find a partner community, Chief William Charlie of Sts’ailes invited me to do research in their community during an informal conversation in June 2007. I had visited Sts’ailes to meet friends several times before, but did not expect the Sts’ailes community to invite me to conduct research there so soon. I accepted the invitation, but soon realized that communicating through emails or phone calls could be challenging, without knowing each other first. Once I established friendships in the community, the research progressed smoothly. Even well-developed research proposals do not guarantee a connection to participating communities; rather, other crucial phases must also take place when searching for a partner community and developing a proposal.
Personal contacts often help initiate collaborative research with First Nations. However, inevitably, issues of trust arise. A dominant perception among First Nation communities was that academic researchers come, exploit First Nations’ ideas, leave, and never come back. This preconception set me back several times until the Chief of Sts’ailes began to see this research as an opportunity and he opened a door for me. Of course, the openness required efforts as a researcher and as a person. I was encouraged with the fact that this actually could happen.

Newcomers to the region or outside researchers find the “personal connection” aspect of doing research with First Nation communities challenging, particularly if they are not familiar with or do not have many contacts in the region. However, this challenge also brings important lessons and eye-opening experiences. Encountering different cultures and world views often stimulates researchers’ intuitiveness and motivation. Trust plays a key role in the success of a project, whether the researcher is an insider or an outsider.

I provided guidelines to several other graduate students who were experiencing similar difficulties. My initial project for my graduate program was entitled “Tools for generating maps of hydrologically sensitive areas for use in forest operations planning.” My goal was to investigate the social and cultural contexts of hydrology. The research team members were mainly natural scientists who were hoping to collaborate with First Nations, since the research sites were within First Nations’ traditional territories and the social science component was highly recommended by funding agencies. My role was to work closely with First Nations and the team of natural scientists, mainly hydrologists. What I learned was that the project was itself a process of “mutual learning.” The collaborative research approach I chose was the appropriate approach to take. My unique background and my previous experience working with Indigenous communities and natural and social scientists, all contributed to framing the approach of the research.

I worked in the Sts’ailes community in the Fraser Valley for 19 months and had the use of the First Nation’s office to conduct my research. This experience provided the groundwork for my later work on Indigenous and environmental issues. While conducting the participatory research, my cross-cultural communication skills and my ability to building trust facilitated my research and resulted in valuable perspectives on forest knowledge and insights in the field of Indigenous forestry. The research involved different stakeholders and
different knowledge systems. The experience enhanced my understanding of First Nations culture and it provided me with appropriate ways of doing research.

Since the time of the field study, I was also involved in several community-based projects in Vancouver. I served as mentor at the Grandview Elementary School, where 80% of the students are First Nations. I also served as mentor and guest scientist for the Young Naturalists’ Club at the University Hill Elementary School. My experience in the field inspired me to understand urban First Nations people and the value of education for future generations. Sts’alas people say education is important for their future and they hope that future generations will receive a good education, succeed in life, and make changes for their people. They see their future in the success of future generations.

Over the past ten years, I have been continually engaged with Indigenous communities of different language groups and cultural traditions in Korea, Indonesia, and British Columbia. I have been building relationships with First Nation communities, under different auspices and working arrangements. Through these endeavours, I have focused on community-based natural resource management. I have maintained links with the Indigenous collaborators and local governments I have worked with, and I maintain especially close contacts with the Sts’alas community in the Fraser Valley. While working on my thesis at UBC, I arranged mutually beneficial research for two of my colleagues, and twice facilitated a guest lecture by inviting the Chief of Sts’alas, William Charlie, to an undergraduate course at UBC. I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to connect with the people of Sts’alas and, in turn, connect them with academia.
Chapter 4  

Sts’ailes and forests

This chapter shows the broad organizational context of forest management at Sts’ailes and in BC, as well as the role of consultation and accommodation requirements and regulations. This chapter includes three sections: 1) forest management policy at the Provincial level, 2) forest management at Sts’ailes level, and 3) cultural uses of non-timber forest resources.

The forest management policy at the Provincial level shows a broad organizational context of forest management at Sts’ailes and in BC, the role of consultation and accommodation requirements and regulations. The forest management at Sts’ailes level provides overviews on Sts’ailes governance structure, culture, economy, and their forest management. It describes connection between Sts’ailes and forest lands by articulating cultural uses of forest resources and lands (Section 4.3).

4.1 Forest management policy at the provincial level

The Ministry of Forests, Land and Natural Resource Operations (hereinafter referred to as the Ministry of Forests) is the current provincial forest management agency of the Government of British Columbia. It is specifically concerned with forest management and its name has evolved over time along with changes in provincial politics (its previous name was Ministry of Forests and Range).

Provincial forest management units in BC are divided into eight regions (Table 3). Sts’ailes’ traditional territory is within the Chilliwack Forest District of the South Coast Region. Sts’ailes band communicates with the Chilliwack Forest District regarding forestry management practices, unless federal consultation is necessary. Reserve lands are under federal authority while non-reserve lands are under provincial jurisdiction. In the Chilliwack Forest District, one First Nations Liaison Officer has 23 First Nation groups under their mandate.
Table 3 Eight regions of the provincial forest management units²⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Region</th>
<th>Sub-Regional Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cariboo</td>
<td>100 Mile House District, Cariboo-Chilcotin District, Quesnel District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kootenay/ Boundary</td>
<td>Selkirk District, Arrow Boundary Forest District, Columbia Forest District, Kootenay Lake Forest District, Rocky Mountain District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Northeast</td>
<td>Fort Nelson District, Peace District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Omineca</td>
<td>Northern Interior Forest Region, Fort St. James District, Mackenzie District, Prince George District, Headwaters Forest District, Vanderhoof District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Thompson/ Okanagan</td>
<td>Southern Interior Forest Region, Cascades District, Okanagan Shuswap District, Thompson Rivers District, Headwaters Forest District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Skeena</td>
<td>Kalum District, Nadina District, Skeena Stikine District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 South Coast</td>
<td>Chilliwack District, Metro Vancouver-Squamish District, Squamish Forest District, Sunshine Coast District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 West Coast</td>
<td>Coast Forest Region, Campbell River District, Haida Gwaii District, North Island-Central Coast District, South Island District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Sts’ailes people have used forest resources and practiced forest management for a long time, communication with the Chilliwack Forest District is a recent initiative. Since 2007, the Sts’ailes have had to address various forest management conflicts. Some of these have provided leverage to carry on communications with the Ministry of Forests. One of these was a Policy Pilot Project undertaken between the Chilliwack Forest District and Sts’ailes, achieving a substantial improvement in communications related to forest management. This achievement allowed Sts’ailes to communicate with other government agencies and contributed to effective communication between the Chilliwack Forest District and other First Nation groups. Recent Aboriginal Case Law successes regarding Consultation and Accommodation (e.g., Delgamuukw, 1997; Haida, 1982; Taku, 2004), and Government-to-Government relationships (e.g., New Relationship Agreement), have resulted in opportunities for improved communication and consultation between First Nations, governmental agencies, and corporations.

4.1.1 The broader policy context – treaty negotiations

The British Columbia Treaty Commission²⁶ proposed treaty settlements as a solution to the conflicts noted above. Whereas government regards treaty negotiations as the solution,

²⁵ [www.for.gov.bc.ca/mof/regdis.htm](https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/mof/regdis.htm) (April 15, 2013)
different First Nations see land claims differently. While some First Nations see treaty negotiations as an avenue for compensation, or for building capacity, others are unwilling to participate in the treaty process at all. The treaty process consists of six stages requiring a considerable commitment of time and effort. Only a few treaties have been signed in BC over the past 10 years:

When BC joined Confederation in 1871, only 14 treaties on Vancouver Island had been signed, and aboriginal title to the rest of the province was left unsolved. It wasn’t until 1970 that Canada’s aboriginal peoples were able to pursue aboriginal rights in the supreme court of Canada. … Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, affirmed that aboriginal title, and the rights that go along with it exist whether or not there is a treaty. Aboriginal rights refer to practices, traditions and custom which distinguish the unique culture of each First Nation and were practiced prior to European contact. Aboriginal title is an aboriginal property right to land. (BC Treaty Commission, 2015)²⁷

The intent of treaty settlements by the two Crown governments, the provincial and the federal, is to remove First Nations’ rights from the land that they do not receive as part of a treaty settlement. The amount of land First Nations can receive through treaty is limited. Although a First Nation may originally be willing to negotiate land claims (treaties), they often stop because they realize that the treaty process does not benefit their people (e.g., Douglas First Nation).

Treaty negotiation is one way of affirming Aboriginal rights. Coast Salish people are trying to affirm these rights regardless of whether they pursue treaty negotiations. While Canadian law asserts people can own a piece of land through property systems, according to the Indigenous view, the traditional values of the land remain, regardless of the rights of ownership, as the people cannot be separated from their land.

²⁶ http://www.bctreaty.net/ (April 15, 2013)  
4.1.2 Consultation and accommodation

In Canada, the government must consult with Aboriginal people when the actions of the government may infringe on Aboriginal rights or claims, according to ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada in 2004 (Supreme Court of Canada, 2004). When Canada became a country in 1867, Aboriginal rights were not legally recognized in British Columbia. Therefore, there are unsolved issues of Aboriginal rights (Gregory et al., 2008).

In the past, forest management practices have led to blockades and disputes because of conflicts arising over statutory ownership of forestlands and the legitimacy of First Nations’ rights and title. Such conflicts are based on a different tenure system and a different proof of legitimacy than government agencies may be familiar with. A new phase of Consultation and Accommodation, Government-to-Government relations, has been initiated since the Haida ruling (2004) clearly stated that the provincial government has a legal duty to consult First Nations and to accommodate their interests (Barry, 2011).

Consultation and Accommodation, a duty of the government, is a process of consulting with First Nations and making accommodations to address issues that have been raised. Court cases such as Calder (1973), Guerin (1984), Sparrow (1990), Delgamuukw28 (1997), and Haida (2004) with Taku River Tlingit (2004) confirmed Aboriginal rights. Notably, the Delgamuukw case opened up a new opportunity for affirming Aboriginal rights in Canada. The Supreme Court of Canada declared that the government must consult with First Nations and the consultations must be “meaningful.”

Organizational issues, protocols, and legal considerations were mainly focused on discussions about what constitutes meaningful consultation with First Nations. According to Lawrence and Mackelm (2000), meaningful consultation includes a process of recognizing different communication styles, and building a relationship of trust:

“Duty to negotiate does not mean a duty to agree. It means, instead, a commitment to reconciliation over litigation.” (Lawrence & Macklem, 2000, p. 257).

Indigenous values have not been adequately considered in many consultations (Gregory et al., 2008). Although First Nations may not have their concerns addressed as part of the consultation process, the process could be still considered “undertaken.” For example,

28 http://www2.parl.gc.ca/content/lop/researchpublications/bp459-e.htm (June 3, 2010)
Sts’ailes stated their concerns regarding the visual impact of a forest management practice, logging plan in Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. In this case, the government agency should try to accommodate that concern, to address not only the visible impacts, but also the invisible ones. The fact that cultural losses due to natural environmental changes are not adequately measured by a market-based conventional compensation approach could make the consultation challenging (Gregory & Trousdale, 2009).

“Since the Delgamuuk decision in 1998, the courts of Canada and British Columbia have started to insist that government agencies contemplating actions involving lands subject to claims of Aboriginal rights, including Aboriginal title, must consult and accommodate the interests of the First Nations that are asserting the existence of the rights, even if no court has ruled on the existence of the rights or no treaty has been agreed to.” (Trosper & Tindall, 2011, p. 314)

Missing layers of guidance on what a constructive government-to-government consultation might look like, and how to accomplish practical and workable consultation led to frustration and urgent calls for clarity (Gregory et al., 2008). Eventually, on March 25, 2011, the Government of Canada released the revised Guidelines to federal officials for consulting and accommodating with Aboriginal peoples (the Guidelines). The Guidelines, developed following the Supreme Court of Canada decisions in Haida Nation,[1] Taku River,[2] and Mikisew[3], cover how and when to consult and seek to accommodate:

“The Guidelines were initially issued in interim form in 2008. Civil servants across Canada were trained in the consultation process based on these interim guidelines. The Guidelines were then revised in response to feedback from Aboriginal groups, provincial and territorial governments, industry, and federal civil servants”.

“The revisions add substantial discussion of guiding principles for the consultation and accommodation process that was not present in the interim guidelines. These guiding principles inform much of the new discussion on how to perform specific steps in the consultation and accommodation process.” (Minister of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, 2011)
4.2 Sts’ailes and forest management

4.2.1 Sts’ailes’ governance structure

Today, the Sts’ailes’ governance structure is comprised of a Chief and a Board of Councillors. This current structure is not a traditional Sts’ailes form of governance; rather, it is representative of a structure imposed through the Indian Act and resembles a structure characteristic of other government or administrative agencies. This study focuses on the current governance structure since traditional governance structure lies beyond of the scope of this study.

Each department of Sts’ailes government (Figure 2) within the organization is overseen by a Councilor. Although each department has its own mandate, it may also work together with other departments during Sts’ailes’ communal events. Although these activities are not part of the staff’s written job descriptions, Sts’ailes’ work ethic is somewhat different from Western government agencies. Although each department has its own responsibilities, everyone is expected to participate in communal events such as youth sports activities, funerals, weddings, and other ceremonies.

![Governance Structure](http://www.stsailes.com/about/governancecommittees)

Figure 2 Sts’ailes’ governance structure

http://www.stsailes.com/about/governancecommittees (December 15, 2015)
Sts’ailes’ leadership has been effective in promoting Sts’ailes’ rights and title, especially in the 2000s. Traditional rights have been affirmed through dialogue with government agencies, and are reflected in the revival of Sts’ailes’ traditional cultural practices. During this time, Sts’ailes’ leadership became an exemplary model among Coast Salish and other First Nations in BC.

4.2.2 Sts’ailes’ culture

Sts’ailes’ cultural traditions are based on fishing and forestry. Salmon and cedar are important to the Sts’ailes people. Salmon has always been a main source of nutrition and is considered an essential food and it is still accessible for food and ceremonial consumption.

Many research studies have shown salmon to have great nutritional value (e.g., it is a source of omega-3 fatty acids) and to prevent depression and other conditions. Yet, to Sts’ailes people salmon is more than just food: for them, salmon not only nourishes the body, but also the spirit. Many Sts’ailes people are fishers, and those who do not fish, receive salmon from their families, relatives, and friends. Sometimes people exchange canned fruits, moose meat, and other food for salmon.

A significant cultural ceremony related to the salmon is the First Salmon Ceremony, which has remained one of the common cultural practices among the Coast Salish, much like the winter dance ceremonials (Amoss, 1978). Currently, only a few First Nations, including the Sts’ailes, still practice the First Salmon Ceremony in the Fraser Valley (Hill-Tout, 1904; Suttles, 1990). The ceremony reflects Indigenous laws and world view. People share their first-caught salmon with the rest of the community and each member consumes a piece of the flesh. The bones are collected in a wooden cedar bowl, then blessed and returned to the river with the hope that they will become fish and return to the river again. This practice reflects how the Sts’ailes people perceive nature: the practice is a part of the life cycle of the resource. It also reflects Sts’ailes’ world view. If people want fish the next year, they must share the fish and return the bones of the salmons to the river (Trosper, 2002).

Sts’ailes people are actively involved in the revitalization of their culture and language. During the Potlatch Prohibition period (1884-1951), they were forbidden to practice their culture and spirituality, as were other First Nations in British Columbia. With the implementation of the Indian residential school system (1861-1968), some Sts’ailes
families decided not to teach their children about Sts’ailes’ culture, spiritual traditions, or language, because of the possibility of punishment at the residential school — children who spoke their own language or didn’t conform to the rules of the school were often punished. As a consequence of the Indian residential school experience, several generations no longer practiced their culture and language. Today, this has changed and the revitalization of culture and language is a key agenda for modern-day First Nations. For example, the Sts’ailes Community School teaches elementary and secondary school students the Halq’eméylem language, and offers cultural activities as part of regular school activities, including basket-making, weaving, fishing, gathering of Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs), and carving masks and canoes. These activities are part of an effort to revitalize Sts’ailes’ culture for future generations. In addition, First Nations peoples use forest products, including NTFPs, from their traditional territories, demonstrating possession and use of the land. This is important evidence in land claims and treaty negotiations (McNeil, 1999).

4.2.3 Sts’ailes’ economy

Although the Sts’ailes people are reviving their culture, they still struggle due to economic depression and other issues, as do other First Nations. Both fishing and forestry have been an important part of the Sts’ailes’ economy, but the importance of forestry has grown, since forestry generates revenue for the community, and that revenue has increased since the 2000s. In addition, a number of agreements and contracts with forest industries were signed. The Sts’ailes people have been involved in logging and cutting wood for boats for a long time, including cutting and milling wood for railroad ties for the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railway companies.

Sts’ailes is a progressive First Nation and is interested in developing business opportunities. Unfortunately, they have experienced economic depression since the mid-late 1800s, because they became marginal to the market economy. Nowadays, Sts’ailes people, for the most part, depend on the market economy for their existence, although traditional fishing, hunting, and harvesting of NTFP provides a substantial part of their subsistence living. Income sources are mostly comprised of part-time jobs in the community, fishing, ecotourism, revenue sharing from forest operations and gravel extraction, as well as government transfer payments. Sts’ailes people remain optimistic about their economic
future. For example, they recently created a Development Corporation,\(^{30}\) which incorporates tourism, forestry, and fishery businesses under one umbrella organization, as well as several proposed future businesses such as timber homes development, carbon sequestration initiatives, Aboriginal cultural tourism, and ecotourism projects. Sts’ailes’ cultural activities and traditional uses of NTFPs could have a positive influence on cultural tourism endeavours, educational programs, and forestry practices.

### 4.2.4 Sts’ailes and forest resource management

Sts’ailes’ forestry operations are located in the Fraser Timber Supply areas. The Sts’ailes Forestry department came under the jurisdiction of the Sts’ailes Development Corporation in 2008. The tribal council formed the Development Corporation with the vision to create profitable businesses for Sts’ailes.

Sts’ailes forestry operates three forest licenses, does harvesting, and also has silviculture operations (Table 4). The three forest licenses include a 20-year and 10-year renewable woodlot license, and two 5-year non-replaceable forest licenses.\(^{31}\) The 5-year non-replaceable forest license (A63986) is held by Sts’ailes Natural Resources Incorporated, which is owned by Sts’ailes and managed by the Sts’ailes Development Corporation. Initiating the business model has been a great achievement to Sts’ailes even though financial challenge follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>License identification</th>
<th>Annual Cut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodlot License</td>
<td>20-year, 10-year renewable Woodlot License #89</td>
<td>2,732 m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRFL</td>
<td>5-year, non-replaceable Forest License A63986</td>
<td>8,000 m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRFL</td>
<td>5-year, non-replaceable Forest License A80584</td>
<td>27,728 m³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sts’ailes negotiated the licenses and the Sts’ailes Departments of Forestry and Aboriginal Rights and Title were involved in the negotiations. Sts’ailes community members

\(^{30}\) [http://www.stsaillesdevcorp.com](http://www.stsaillesdevcorp.com) (September 30, 2011)

\(^{31}\) [http://www.stsaillesdevcorp.com/natural-resources/stsailles-forestry](http://www.stsaillesdevcorp.com/natural-resources/stsailles-forestry)
were also consulted as to whether anyone had issues in the areas. Sts’ailes first employed a registered professional forester in 2004 and another in 2009 to write the forest management plans within Sts’ailes traditional territory. The Chilliwack Forest District is in charge of the Fraser Timber Supply areas. A liaison with the forestry agency communicates with First Nation communities in the Fraser Timber Supply areas.

The licenses are located within Sts’ailes’ traditional territory. However, none of them is within spiritually and culturally-sensitive designated areas. Logging activities previously occurred on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum (Mount Woodside) in 2004. Sts’ailes expressed their concerns on a number of occasions, and eventually, they conducted a Policy Pilot Project with the Chilliwack Forest District. The details of this process are analyzed in Chapter 5.

4.3 Cultural uses of non-timber forest resources

Non-timber forest products (NTFPs) are a collection of biological resources such as fruits, nuts, and medicinal plants derived from both natural and managed forests and other wooded areas (Peters, 1996). This section uses the term NTFPs as source of food, medicine, and crafts. When referring to a concept of place rather than a product, the term “non-timber forest resources” will be used.

Although non-timber forest resources do not play a key role in the market economy for Sts’ailes, the uses are important in their culture and traditional economy. Sts’ailes people use non-timber forest resources for (1) food and medicine, (2) cultural products such as clothing and crafts, (3) ceremonial rites, and (4) spiritual practices. These four categories overlap and are related each other. However, here, the four uses are categorized to explain the Sts’ailes people’s cultural uses of non-timber forest resources based on interviews and community feedback.

4.3.1 Non-timber forest products as a source of food and medicine

Harvesting berries, and gathering Labrador tea (*Rhododendron groenlandicum* (Oder) Kron & Judd,) to make tea (Turner, 2006) are common activities at Sts’ailes. Some
families have their own family spots to gather Labrador tea and others just pick it from common spots within the Sts’ailes’ traditional territory (Figure 3).

Figure 3 Labrador tea

Sts’ailes people pick berries to have fresh fruits, but also store enough berries for winter, either as jam, frozen, or as canned fruits. Common berries (Figure 4) for picking are salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis* Pursh), blackberry (*Rubus ursinus* Cham. & Schlecht.), thimbleberry (*Rubus parviflorus* Nutt. var. *parviflorus*), huckleberry (*Vaccinium membranaceum* Dougl. ex Hook.; *Vaccinium ovatum* Pursh), and blueberry (*Vaccinium* spp.).

Figure 4 Salmonberry and thimbleberry

hoarseness. The strongly aromatic leaves of the tea can be used to make a palatable herbal tea, rich in vitamin C.
Thimbleberry leaves are used for containers for berry picking because they absorb moisture. Soapberries (Shepherdia canadensis (L.) Nutt.) were also picked to make, Indian ice cream, which was made by whipping the bittersweet froth in a special soapberry basket with the hand and it was eaten with a special paddle-like spoon. Today, the soapberry is not as commonly picked as other berries, since Sts’ailes people buy mainstream ice cream treats from the supermarket. However, the taste is quite different. They occasionally pick soapberries for educational purposes as the Sts’ailes’ school has an afterschool program where picking berries and making Indian ice cream is one of the activities. However, the Sts’ailes regularly pick other berries during the spring and summer months.

4.3.2 Non timber forest uses for cultural products

Sts’ailes people make basketry and traditional clothing using cedar (Thuja plicata Donn ex D. Don)34, Chamaecyparis nootkatensis (D. Don) Spach35 bark and roots (Figure 5).

![Figure 5 Sts’ailes person holding stripped cedar bark (left), and cedar roots (right)](image)

Coast Salish people used to make clothes with cedar bark and blankets with the bark mixed with the wool of their domesticated woolly dogs. They also made diapers with cedar bark and roots.

---

34 Common name: western red cedar. This is the provincial tree of BC.
35 Common name: yellow cedar
Tree sap was used for waxing fish knives, as an ingredient in their pictograph paint, and as a resin for waterproofing their boats. They used bulrushes (*Scirpus acutus*) to make mats for bedding, and tree branches for fishing, hunting, and for cooking tools as well.

### 4.3.3 Forest uses for ceremonial rites

Sts’ailes people hang cedar branches and Devil’s Club (*Oplopanax horridus* (Smith) Miq.) in the corners of their ceremonial longhouses. They also use cedar branches as a means of blessing and purification for all important ceremonies (Figure 6).

![Cedar branches and Devils Club](image)

*Figure 6 Cedar branches and Devils Club in a longhouse*

Reeds (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.), ferns (Figure 7) and cedar branches are used for their Winter Dance ceremonials, while hemlock burls, berries and devil’s club are used to make some paints.

![Plants for ceremonies](image)

*Figure 7 Plants for ceremonies*
Salmonberry, blackberry, and thimbleberry are commonly used for the paints applied to the face and body during the Winter Dance ceremonial season. All ceremonies practiced by the Sts’ailes are essential for their mental and physical well-being, and often require forest environments (including rivers and creeks) and NTFPs for their cultural and spiritual practices. Ceremonies such as the Winter Dance ceremony, rites of passage, and ceremonial burnings for the ancestors, all require rich natural environments. To illustrate, in the case of puberty rites of passage, girls practice spiritual bathing, learn about their physical and spiritual necessities, and learn how to gather plants and preserve them. Boys also practice spiritual bathing, learn the origin stories, and learn how to fish and hunt. First Nations from neighbouring urban communities come to Sts’ailes to fulfill these ceremonial rites. Three traditional longhouses, sufficient NTFPs, and a pristine natural environment, including the forests, rivers, and sloughs in the area, make Sts’ailes a natural choice.

4.3.4 Forest uses for spiritual practices

Traditionally, most Salish people practiced spiritual bathing, fasting, and vision questing (Amoss, 1977), and many Sts’ailes people still practice spiritual bathing today. A person chooses secretly a favoured place for bathing near the Chehalis or Harrison Rivers, or in the smaller creeks, a place hidden from view by the security of the forest environment. In their spiritual practices, the cedar branches are essential as they are used to brush the body and purify the spirit. In addition, people sometimes use other leaves and mosses for bathing and fasting (Figure 8).

Figure 8 Bathing place in the chehalis river
4.3.5 Implications of the traditional forest uses

Western redcedar (*Thuja plicata*) is essential for Sts’ailes people’s spirituality and cultural identity, and one of the cultural keystone species for the coastal First Peoples of British Columbia (Garibaldi & Turner, 2004). The traditional uses of NTFPs described above were common among the Sts’ailes and most other Coast Salish peoples. For example, gathering berries and Labrador tea are common activities among the Northwest Coast (Turner, 2006; Menzies, 2006). Basketry and clothes making using cedar bark and roots are also common crafts among the Coast Salish (Turner, 2006; Turner et al., 2000). Historically, the cultural ceremonies were essential to the Coast Salish (Amoss, 1977), and Sts’ailes still use NTFPs today in ceremonial rites and spiritual practices. The geography of Sts’ailes provides the community with abundant natural resources, forest areas rich with NTFPs, and rivers teeming with salmon and waterfowl.

Today, the use of NTFPs for cultural revitalization and business development opportunities is facing challenges. Forest operations often threaten spiritual practices in forest areas (Turner et al., 2008) and have negative impacts on these spiritual practices in the Sts’ailes’ area. These negative impacts on the spiritual practices are sometimes difficult to explain, as a mainstream society do not share the ways of their spiritual practices. What Sts'ailes people easily address, however, are the species important to the people, thereby keeping their sacred practices from the public eye. Spiritual places have been disturbed by logging, the construction of roads, the application of pesticides and herbicides, gravel and mining operations, and the removal or destruction of ceremonial regalia meant to remain in the forest. The Sts’ailes spiritual practices include spiritual bathing, vision questing, and the “putting away” of spiritual regalia in secret locations in the forest. Forest operations, while offering economic benefits to others, often threaten cultural and spiritual practices of First Nations. The Crown’s duty to consult and accommodate has created the requirement that the Ministry of Forests and Range consult and accommodate First Nations regarding forest operations, in order to reduce the threats to their cultural and spiritual practices (Christie, 2006).

In addition, the implications of the term NTFPs have been raised in other fields. Since the term is a counterpart of timber forest products, using the specific term NTFPs can imply “products” for consumption within a capitalist perspective rather than “cultural objects.” In
the field of forestry, timber forest products are the main product. Non-timber forest products are minor or secondary products. However, considering NTFPs’ “cultural” aspects shifts the western paradigm that perceives the value of forests as being economic and environmental, and not cultural or spiritual. Although there has been certainly a shifting paradigm since the 1990s, illustrating the cultural aspects of non-timber forest resources is meaningful and essential to understanding their importance to the cultural survival of Aboriginal people.

A Sts’ailes community report prepared in 2012, states that,

Sts’ailes has an inherent right to self govern ourselves and all Sts’ailes people. The aboriginal rights and title department follows the laws of our land according to traditional laws (snowoyelh) and insures that others respect the title and rights of Sts’ailes and our way of governing ourselves for the protection and assertion of our sacred land (Xa’xa temexw) and to determine future uses of our traditional territory. We are the land. We have lived in balance with all things since time immemorial, therefore we have an ongoing responsibility to protect and respect our Xa’xa temexw. We believe our strength is achieved by maintaining our connection to the land, stories, culture and spirituality. By maintaining our solidarity we will continue to grow and flourish as a strong, independent Sts’ailes Nation. (Sts’ailes Community Report, 2012, p. 17)

Sts’ailes have an intimate connection with the lands in their traditional territory. On December 4, 2007, a landslide occurred at Chehalis Lake (Brideau et al., 2012). The landslide was a natural disaster that may have been partly caused by heavy rainfall, and it was a significant concern at Sts’ailes. Sts’ailes people were the first group of people to notice the landslide; they were also the first people who went out to the place by helicopter (the trip was paid by Sts’ailes as well) and to hold community meetings to discuss how to cope with the landslide. They did not wait for the Provincial Government to act; instead, they acted voluntarily and immediately and those actions demonstrated their land stewardship.

The Provincial Government acted a few days later. Even though the Sts’ailes’ rights to their traditional territory are not legally recognized, they care for the land and for the lake, their names come from the land, and their ancestors are buried in their traditional territory.
They are connected to the land and to the salmon that return to the rivers. The landslide may have impacted the land and the ecosystem, but the Sts’ailes people took action and cared for it. This is an example of how Sts’ailes people are connected to the land, pay careful attention to what is happening there, and take action when needed.
Chapter 5  Communicating the cultural values of a sacred mountain

This chapter has two major goals. The first is to describe the cultural significance of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, a sacred mountain located near the community of Sts’ailes (see Section 5.1). The second is to explain the communication processes used in the Policy Pilot Project (see Section 5.2), which was initiated because of conflicts over plans to log areas on the sacred mountain. The Policy Pilot Project was a joint collaborative project between Sts’ailes and the Chilliwack Forest District that was carried out over a 15-month period, from January 2007 to March 2008. It was a groundbreaking collaboration in the South Coast Region. I analyzed the significance of the communication strategies in revealing cultural values of the sacred mountain (see section 5.3) in this chapter.

5.1  Kweh-Kwuch-Hum: a sacred mountain

Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, called Mount Woodside in English, is a sacred mountain located within Sts’ailes traditional territory: it is located along the Harrison River in an area that has long been used by Sts’ailes. Kweh-Kwuch-Hum is considered to be sacred because it has been used extensively for Sts’ailes spiritual practices associated with the Winter Dance ceremonies. The Winter Dance is an essential cultural practice that sustains Sts’ailes’ cultural identity as Coast Salish (Amoss, 1978). Many spiritual objects have been secretly stored here for generations.

While Sts’ailes people have long considered Kweh-Kwuch-Hum to be a sacred mountain, its significance has only recently been made clear in public. The full range of values, once secret, has now been revealed as part of Sts’ailes’ strategy to preserve these values. Here, non-secret values are listed that explain the significance of the mountain:

The mountain is also known as a ‘place of spirits’ (e.g., slollicum-spirit beings). The slollicum associated with Kweh-Kwuch-Hum include: Sasquatch (the Sasquatch trail passes through here), Thuxwiya (wild woman of the woods, who is reported to have a cave on the mountain), and the Chet-cha-lis (little water spirits about the size of a dog). There are also two transformer sites associated with the area. …There are two historic cemeteries located here and formerly there were tree burials associated with
the old village of Hiqelem, and numerous ‘burial mounds’ between about 1,600 and 800 years old. (Chehalis Indian Band and Chilliwack Forest District, 2008)

Sts’ailes’ beliefs regarding Kweh-Kwuch-Hum are difficult to describe since they are changing and different people have different perspectives. However, many Sts’ailes people regard the sacred mountain as an important spiritual and cultural area. It is a visible landscape that faces the Sts’ailes’ reserve and an area that is used frequently for ceremonial purposes, including secret ceremonies with few tangible remains. The relative location of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum to the community of Sts’ailes is very important. It is where the sun rises on the community every day, and it is the direction people face for their morning prayers. One community member described Kweh-Kwuch-Hum’s significance as follows: “every morning we greet the day and we look over on that side [of the river], and that is where the sun comes up, and we know that is where our ancestors looked after things, forever” (Chehalis Indian Band and Chilliwack Forest District, 2008).

Sts’ailes people agree that Kweh-Kwuch-Hum must be protected to maintain their health and well-being. Until 2005, though, the only value placed on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum by the Ministry of Forests was that of a large timber supply area with no record of archaeological sites. The next section will discuss Sts’ailes’ use of non-timber forest uses generally and, more specifically, those values associated with Kweh-Kwuch-Hum.
5.1.1 **Cultural values associated with Kweh-Kwuch-Hum**

Kweh-Kwuch-Hum is a spiritual place integral to the cultural practices and traditions of the Sts’ailes people. The mountain has always been important, for as long as anyone can remember. The Policy Pilot Project revealed 14 categories of cultural values associated with Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. These have been supplemented with comments and quotations (in italics) from people interviewed during the course of the Policy Pilot Project. Unless otherwise indicated, these quotations come from the Policy Pilot Project report (2008).

The 14 types of spiritual values are interrelated and associated with: a) location; b) burial/mortuary practices; c) ancestor spirits; d) spiritual activity and repositories; e) spiritual beings; f) transformer sites; g) places of spiritual power/questing areas; h) spiritual avoidance; i) ceremonial areas; j) geographical features; k) special resource areas; l) former longhouse locations; m) trails and traplines; and n) old village and archaeological sites. In addition, the report addressed the social implication and benefits of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. The categories of the Sts’ailes classified are consistent with categories of invisible losses provided by Turner et al. (2008): 1) cultural and lifestyle losses; 2) loss of identity; 3) health losses; 4) loss of self-determination and influence; 5) emotional and psychological losses; 6) loss of order in the world; 7) knowledge losses; and 8) indirect economic losses and lost opportunities.

Table 5 shows that contents of 14 types of spiritual values of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum are consisted with categories suggested by Turner et al. (2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cultural and lifestyle losses</td>
<td>Burial/mortuary practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Loss of identity</td>
<td>Spiritual Activity Area and Repository; Transformer Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Health losses</td>
<td>Social Implications and benefits*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Loss of self-determination and influence</td>
<td>Place of Spiritual Power/Questing Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Emotional and Psychological Losses</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Loss of order in the world</td>
<td>Ancestor spirits; Spirit beings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Knowledge losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Indirect economic losses and lost opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.1.1.1 Eight categories of invisible losses

This section describes the cultural and spiritual aspects which Sts’ailes people concerned about loss due to logging on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum.

#### 1) Cultural and lifestyle losses

- Burial/mortuary practices

  Burial and mortuary practices are associated with specific places found on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. Sts’ailes people are concerned about burial and mortuary practices and any damage to graves is associated with cultural lifestyle losses, emotional and psychological losses, and loss of order in the world. One of the Chehalis’ two historic cemeteries is located here, and, in the past, there were also tree burials here, which were associated with the old village of Hiqelem (“going underneath”). There are also numerous ancient burial mounds located on the mountain. One interviewee was eloquent in their description of this very special aspect of the mountain:

  *The whole area is of great importance to our village and to our people. Our grandfather, he always told us that that’s where they looked after death and looked after the dead ones, our loved ones... where they’d go and put them in the trees, over on that side of the mountain; they’d hang them over there. I remember too, he said...*
they left them for seven years over there, hanging in the trees… and then they’d have
a ceremony, and then they’d bring them back and put them with their people, because
they wouldn’t want to leave their loved ones over there. So, after seven years they’d
bring them back over here. (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 34)

2) Loss of identity

• Spiritual activity area and repository

Kweh-Kwuch-Hum is—and has been for as long as anyone can remember—a
spiritual activity area. It is a repository area for spiritual regalia associated with the Winter
Dance Ceremonial, notably spirit-poles and the regalia of “babies” or “new dancers.” The
mountain is also a repository area for other spiritual regalia, including “Chalmoq’ches,”
rattles, and other items. One person interviewed for the study described this aspect of the
mountain as follows:

People from our village have always looked upon [Kweh-Kwuch-Hum], that you only
go over there for the Spirit; you don’t go over there for anything else. That is what
that place is. You only go over there for the Spirit, nothing else; you don’t go over
there for wood; you don’t go over there for hunting; you only go over there for the
Spirit. Basically that is what that place is. So many people have gone over there,
because when you go in the Longhouse, because you were given all this stuff, you
were told that you would have to bring it back from where it comes from, give it back
to Solh Temexw, and that is where everybody goes, cause its almost like it is
untouched, and there is always that big concern all the time, when you look and you
see heli-logging happening, or any type of logging, and they are over there. And that
is a very strong spiritually significant place to our people... forever. (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 36)

Another man remembered travelling on the mountain with his brother for the purpose of putting dance regalia away:

Well, we were trekking through some beautiful land [...] Like the moss on the ground, for example, was like... it seemed like it was a foot thick. It was like a giant carpet and it was really quiet and peaceful. Just beautiful over there and you could tell it’s like a whole new world or something... (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 36)

• Transformer sites

Transformer is a type of being that is present in many creation stories on the Northwest Coast. The physical manifestation of transformer sites among the Sts’ailes, like among all Coast Salish peoples, helps to communicate and perpetuate knowledge that reinforce cultural origins and identity (Arnett in York et al., 1993; Mohs, 1987; Oliver, 2006; Ritchie, 2010). There are two transformer sites associated with the sacred mountain, both of which are related to the transformer Xa:ls, who came to the Earth to put things right. One site called Lexwyélés: (“toothed vagina”) is the place where a slollicum woman was transformed to stone. Another transformer site, Sxéyeltels te Sqoyéxiya: (“tracks of mink”), is a place where marks were left in a rock formation by Mink, a travelling companion of Xa:ls.

3) Health losses

• Social Implications and benefits (different section with an attempt of cost analysis)

4) Loss of self-determination and influence

• Places of Spiritual Power/Questing Areas

Kweh-Kwuch-Hum is a traditional place of spiritual power, that has been, and
continues to be, used for puberty training, ritual fasting and bathing, and as a place of spirit power for shxwelam. One person interviewed talked about this general sacred aspect of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum:

_We use it. Use that whole side of the mountain, because there’s no roads there and that’s something where, if the ancestors are there, all we have to do is go there and bring our kids that are suffering to wake up their spirit and to put them on the right path so they can carry on with their lives in a good way in today’s society, which is so near impossible to adapt to, function in today’s world, because there’s a lot of things out there that aren’t for us._ (Sts’ailes and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 39)

Another interviewee talked about how one should undertake a spirit “quest” on the mountain:

_One of the things... when people are on the spiritual quest that they embark on, everything is spirit guided, so they’re asked to walk. You’re told that when you go and you look after certain things that you [need to do]... There is no map that tells us; there’s not just one little area, like they say, “OK, we’re gonna go in here and you’re gonna do that.” No, you go in there, and you just go and the Spirit guides you. It takes you. So, some people have walked for hours and hours on this mountain, to where they need to go, to find what it is that they need... So, ten people would go up there on their quest and they would go in ten different trails and directions to find what they need._

(Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 40)

5) Emotional and psychological losses

- **Location**

  The location of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum has also a symbolic meaning for Sts’ailes. Logging in the area brings emotional and psychological losses to the Sts’ailes people. This
meaning relates to spirit people who believe that their ancestors are in Kweh-Kwuch-Hum and that their ancestors are looked after there. The relative location of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum to the community of Sts’ailes is very important. It is where the sun rises on the community every day, and it is the direction people face for their morning prayers. One person interviewed talked about this special quality of the mountain’s location, saying: “I know that every morning we greet the day and we look over on that side [of the river], and that is where the sun comes up, and we know that is where our ancestors looked after things, forever.” (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 33). Another person interviewed said, “well, you wake up every morning, just like we are right now. We look over there. That’s just a part of what we are. Xwelmexw. Comes from Solh Temexw. We come from this and it would be a shame if it was tampered with.” (Ibid., p. 33)

6) Loss of order in the world

- Ancestor spirits

Sts’ailes people are also concerned about the disturbance of ancestral spirits, which is also connected to loss of identity, loss of self-determination and influence, emotional and psychological losses, and loss of order in the world. Ancestor spirits such as Spopleqwitza or ghost spirits are associated with Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. As one person described it:

Well, our ancestors, they buried them all over the place [on Kwech-Kwuh-Hum], on any one of these high ridges, where the spirits can, like, keep an eye on everything...

Just because a person’s gone or dead doesn’t mean that their spirit dies. Their body perishes and they go into the ground, but the spirit... When we acknowledge the spirit and feed it, and pray to it, we keep that spirit alive and we keep it strong. And the spirit lives forever..., and that’s why it’s so important to take care of this side of the mountain. This is very sacred. We honour our ancestors to the highest degree..., because they’re still here and they’re looking after us. They’re watching over us.

(Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 35)
• Spirit beings

Kweh-Kwuch-Hum is also an important area associated with three notable “spirit beings,” including Sasquatch, Thuxwiya (the “wild woman of the wood”), and Chet-cha-lis (small water spirits about the size of dogs). One person remembers an encounter with Sasquatch on the mountain:

*Me and my brother... we saw the Sasquatch. I can’t even describe what we saw. But they walked out of the woods and one of them sat down in the water, and when it sat down it just twirled around in the water while it was sitting. And then it just sat there for a second... And then it stood up and then walked into the water up to about its... thighs, and then it just stood there for a second. Then it turned around and it walked back in [to the forest] and that was it...* (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 37)

• Spiritual avoidance

Generally, Kweh-Kwuch-Hum is considered a place where people do not go, unless they have a reason. It is considered such a special mountain, that most people will not hunt here, as one interviewee explained:

*Also, me being a hunter, I was always told... we always see game over there. But we were always told that we were never to hunt there. Because that’s where we look after that, that’s where our ancestors went, and that’s [why] we just can’t go over there.*

(Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 39)
7) Knowledge losses

• Ceremonial area

Various community and personal ceremonies, such as ceremonial burnings, are regularly conducted at Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. One person remembers what they learned about the proper way to handle ceremonies:

*When Ed was teaching us, before we became spiritual people, he said, you got two fires, and those two fires are what you share with your ancestors, and they belong to the ancestors, and we’re only using them for that purpose. But it’s only seasonal that you use the two fires, and once you put them inside a home, it becomes a sacred home to the ancestors—and reusing it for that purpose only, because they’re sharing all that information and your spiritual belief of what they gave you, and what they showed you in life. But once you use the fires for different reasons, you will feel what they meant by how sacred that mountain is, Mount Woodside.* (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 40)

• Special geographical features

There are also special geological features of importance, considered of a spiritual nature, on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, including rock outcroppings, creeks, caves, and rock slides. One person interviewed talked about these special spots and how the sacred quality of the mountain is not just held within such places:

*It’s not just spots. It’s a place where it [the spirit] is going to lead you... There was a crack [in the rock] there, and there’s a deep hole there... When they were trying to look after all of their sacred stuff so that it didn’t get burned or whatever, they went and they put that stuff—and you can only do that at a certain time of the year... they*
went and they put it in that crevasse and they say they’re supposed to look after it so that nobody… it would fall into the wrong hands… And we were told about shxwexwó:s, thunderbird that has a cave… around that area. (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 41)

- Special resource area

Few resources are taken from Kweh-Kwuch-Hum for personal, economic, cultural or spiritual purposes. General exceptions are fishing and harvesting certain medicinal plants. One person described this critical aspect of the mountain’s sacredness, a description that clearly implies how logging could damage the sacredness of the area and its importance to the people of Sts’ailes:

Every place has its power. There’s a place where you go and gather your medicines. There’s a place where you go and gather things, but there’s a place that you look after death, and there’s a place where you go to find your power to reveal your gift. That’s one of the places over there, and that’s why all of those things that you just mentioned were never done. (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 42)

Another person equated the mountain to “the church,” again emphasizing the sacredness of the mountain for Sts’ailes people:

Anything coming from this [Kweh-Kwuch-Hum] side of the river is used for ceremony and spiritual purposes… for sxwaisxwai, or skweh-di’lech. Anything from this side is just like borrowing something from the church… When we go into the longhouse, we have a connection with mother earth, with the land. And when we look after mother earth, mother earth looks after us and takes good care of us. And that’s why we
believe that when we have a place as sacred as that mountain, we have to look after it.

It’s very powerful. It’s very meaningful and important to us. (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 42)

• Former longhouse locations

There was formerly an important historical longhouse on the Kweh-Kwuch-Hum side of the river, in the area of Willoughby’s. One interviewee remembered this longhouse:

“William Philips. It would have been his dad. His dad had a spot over there and that would have been Andrew Philips, and his father’s name was Old Pilep, Chehalis Philip. And that’s where they had a home over there.” (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 46)

• Old village and archaeological sites

To Sts’ailes people, archaeological sites and remains represent the remains of the ancestors and are generally considered sxaxa, “sacred.” During the summer of 2007, a team of archaeologists from Simon Fraser University conducted surveys of the Kweh-Kwuch-Hum area. A total of 21 archaeological sites were identified, the most notable of these being at the former village of Hiquelem, located in the vicinity of IR6. This site is an extensive pithouse and plank house village with an associated mortuary complex, burial mounds, dating between 1,500 and 1,100 years ago. (Chehalis and the Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 46)
5.2 Policy Pilot Project

In this section, I describe the communication processes used in the Policy Pilot Project, with the support of chronological figures and tables, and a theoretical framework proved by Turner et al. (2008).

The collaboration of Policy Pilot Project started in 2007 and was carried out over a 15-month period. I showed milestones in the communication between BC First Nations and the government (left hand column of Figure 9) and the chronology of the communication between Sts’ailes and Ministry of Forests (right hand column of Figure 9). In this study, communication refers to exchange of information through written, verbal, and non-verbal means (see section 5.2.2 for more information on communication barriers).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Supreme Court of Canada rules on Delgamuukw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haida launch lawsuit regarding lack of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Logging was main employment for Sts’ailes Band Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>BC court of Appeal finds Province has legal duty to consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict over logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>First letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter concerning on BCTS’s plans for logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Provincial mandate for G2G negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logging occurred on KKH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RPF to run its forestry operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sts’ailes declares KKH ‘spiritually sensitive designated areas’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>‘New Relationship’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Policy Pilot Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-KKH discussions begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MoFR reps visit cultural ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews &amp; Research at Sts’ailes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Policy Pilot Project ended &amp; Joint Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>KKH Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KKH is a designated area for ceremonial activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Forest and Range Consultation and Revenue Sharing Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>from Chehalis Indian Band to Sts’ailes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9 History of the relationship between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests**

(Left hand column: milestones in the communication between BC First Nations and the government; Right hand column: chronology of the communication between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests)
5.2.1 **Act 1: Sts’ailes need to have their concerns heard**

Sts’ailes people needed to find a way to get their concerns about logging on their sacred mountain heard. They had several options. The first option was for Ministry of Forests representatives to come to Sts’ailes and listen to the people. However, this meeting never happened. Then, the Sts’ailes people sent a letter to the Ministry of Forests, and the government agency responded that they would minimize the visual impact from logging and, as a result, the Ministry of Forests made discretionary decisions. Because of these problems, neighbouring First Nations tried a second strategy: to go to court. Sts’ailes did not go to court, but developed other innovative strategies aimed at creating a dialogue with the Ministry of Forests. As they developed their strategy, they discussed the issues of secrecy, putting lines on a map that were frozen in place, and other issues.

Conflicts between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests had been occurring since the late 1990s because culturally sensitive areas were being disturbed on a regular basis. In particular, the conflict, which focused on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, arose when BC Timber Sales (Chinook) was awarded a tenure property for logging operations on the mountain (see Table 6).

At the beginning of the conflict, Sts’ailes people expressed concerns among themselves. Unfortunately, they did not have an opportunity to express these concerns to
government agencies, even though the consultation process was required according to Aboriginal case law and government regulations. In practice, “meaningful” consultation was a recommendation rather than a duty (personal communication with Sts’ailes members, 2008).

In 2003, Sts’ailes opened discussions by sending a letter to the Ministry of Forests concerning BC Timber Sales’ plans for logging on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. However, the language used in the letter did not fully articulate what the mountain meant to Sts’ailes. They expressed their concerns in terms of impacts to visual quality and other interests, including tourism. The letter was not powerful enough to stop the logging practices at that time:

This letter is to express our concern regarding the deteriorating visual quality of the landscape, as viewed from the community of Chehalis, as well as from numerous other vantage points of the Harrison River corridor and Morris Valley Road. This has been, and continues to be, an on-going issue with our membership.

We have expressed our concerns to the previous District Manager and to his staff of the unacceptable system employed by the Ministry to determine visual quality, relative to the community of Chehalis. We even met to discuss this matter. Since then, five new clear cuts have appeared on Mount Woodside alone. An amount greater than this has also appeared to the north view of the community.

In terms of impacts to other Chehalis interests, clearcuts negatively affect our tourism sector. For example, three new boat tour companies now operate on the Harrison River, some of which will be linking with the Kilby Museum and campground. Our recently completed Chehalis Tourism Strategy identifies considerable eco-tourism opportunities and we are concerned with the impacts of clear cutting to that sector of our economy.

Therefore, before you approve any new FDP’s in our territory I ask that you and I meet to discuss these concerns. (Letter sent by Sts’ailes, March 26, 2003)

Table 6 Chronology of forest management at Sts’ailes prior to the Policy Pilot Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Sts’ailes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Logging main employment for Sts’ailes Band Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1997</td>
<td>Sts’ailes hired an Aboriginal forestry manager in the 1990s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodlot license W0089 acquired in 1997, annual cut of 2,732 m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodlot: 800 hectares (½ on-reserve, 400 ha; ½ off-reserve, 400 ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sts’ailes was the first Indian Band to acquire a woodlot license in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fraser TSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2001</td>
<td>5-Year Non-Renewable Forest License A63986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquired 2001—Joint venture with Interpac Forestry Resources Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Conflict over logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Revenue Sharing Forest Range Agreements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sts’ailes received incentives to participate in the forest industry through wood allocations (NRFLs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Range Agreement signed for 3 years (2003/04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royalties from wood stumpage in traditional territory of $2.5 million,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130,000 m³, over 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2004</td>
<td>Sts’ailes sent a letter concerning BCTS’s plans for logging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2004</td>
<td>Logging occurred on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sts’ailes hired a registered professional forester (RPF) to run its forestry operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2005</td>
<td>Leadership changed from Chief A to Chief B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief B also continued leadership in this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Sts’ailes declares Kweh-Kwuch-Hum “a spiritually sensitive designated area.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At that time, Sts’ailes did not have a registered professional forester, so the Chief of Sts’ailes and staff in the Department of Aboriginal Rights and Title corresponded about the matter. In the letter dated March 26, 2003, Sts’ailes did not address the cultural values of the sacred mountain or claims related to traditional territory. In other words, Sts’ailes did not communicate that this mountain was a sacred mountain, since this was a cultural perception of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum that Sts’ailes people tended not to talk about in public. In the letter, 36

36 This is terminology used during the colonial times when First Nations were relocated and had to stay within the boundary of the reservation. The terminology is still widely used even among First Nations.
the Chief suggested that a meeting at Sts’ailes could give forestry staff an opportunity to view the cut blocks from the Sts’ailes reserve and have an opportunity to meet in person. Communicating only through referrals limits opportunities to explain and understand cultural and spiritual values of place, and hinders forward movement.

The conflict escalated over logging operations that took place in 2005 on the Connor Creek hillside on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, the side of the mountain facing Sts’ailes Indian Reserve #5 (Figure 11). Sts’ailes felt that the government and the BC Timber Sale did not adequately address the issues raised in their letter of March 2003.

![Figure 11 Landscape of the Kweh-Kwuch-Hum (photo taken by In Ae Kim in 2007)](image)

The logging on the ridge of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum resulted in a clear-cut in the shape of a Mohawk haircut. The presence of this eyesore was upsetting for the Sts’ailes people, and they began to call the clear-cut “Mohawk.” Figure 11 shows how the “Mohawk” looked after two years.

In July 2006, Sts’ailes proclaimed a 5 km² area of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum to be a “spiritually sensitive designated area” (Figure 12). This decision was made only after careful deliberation. In the beginning, drawing a line on a map around a sacred place was controversial because Sts’ailes people thought that knowledge of the sacredness of the mountain should be kept secret. As with many sacred sites, revealing site-specific information created anxiety within the community about how they could protect Kweh-Kwuch-Hum’s sacred qualities. Once Sts’ailes drew a line on a map and sent it to the forestry agency, it was no longer a secret, and people worried that someone might disturb the area. If
it was destroyed, it could not be kept sacred. Although some Sts’ailes people were against drawing the line on the map, after several meetings with the leadership of Sts’ailes, it was eventually done. The map was then forwarded to the Ministry of Forests in August 2006 (Figure 12). This step was a very significant moment in the community, as Sts’ailes made the decision to speak up about Kweh-Kwuch-Hum to save the cultural and spiritual values of this special place.

![Figure 12 Spiritually sensitive designated area (Sts’ailes, July 2006)](image)

After Sts’ailes people designated a spiritually sensitive area on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, representatives of the Ministry of Forests came to Sts’ailes to listen to Sts’ailes’ concerns and
what they had to say on this important subject, looking for an opportunity to accommodate. The forestry agents admitted the failure of consultation during the visual quality impact assessment of the logging plan. The first consultation attempts by the BC Timber Sale in 2004 failed because Sts’ailes were not in the list of stakeholders for the visual quality impact assessment, although Agassiz residents and Lougheed Highway were. The agents in the Chilliwack Forest District thought of using a Policy Pilot Project for Sts’ailes. The forestry agents talked to Sts’ailes people about the idea, and as they were interested, the two parties pursued the idea. It seemed that staff of the Chilliwack Forest District had a good heart and the will to collaborate with Sts’ailes people and, in response, they were open to this opportunity and agreed to pursue a government-funded policy pilot project. Act 1 closed with the two parties reaching an agreement to undertake the Policy Pilot Project.

5.2.2 Act 2: “Policy Pilot Project” — tool for consultation and accommodation

Through the efforts described in Act 1, the Chilliwack Forest District and Sts’ailes sought to develop a mechanism to reach a positive solution in the Kweh-Kwuch-Hum matter. The government recognized that the Ministry of Forests had not done their job in terms of meaningful consultation, and saw the possibilities for accommodation. The Policy Pilot Project was an opportunity for the Forestry Agency and Sts’ailes to identify what culturally significant areas are, and to find out what the government could do to accommodate the needs of the Sts’ailes. In addition, it became a learning tool to enhance their understanding and conflict resolution skills:

The perspectives and expectations outlined in this Policy Pilot Project are based on developing an understanding of mutual interests between the Ministry of Forest and Range (MFR) and the Chehalis Indian Band, and why these interests should be considered. The process recognized each other’s policies that are in place, where they are coming from, and what limitations are inherent. It also recognizes the need for sensitivity on spiritual matters and to be respectful of each other. (Kweh-Kwuch-Hum

37 http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/frep/values/heritage.htm
Spiritual Areas and Forest Management, Chehalis Indian Band and Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, p. 12)

Table 7 Chronology of Policy Pilot Project to recognize culturally sensitive areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Sts’ailes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kweh-Kwuch-Hum discussions begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests’ representatives visit Charlie longhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-July 2007</td>
<td>Kweh-Kwuch-Hum archaeology surveys and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>Policy Pilot Project ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>Kweh-Kwuch-Hum ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kweh-Kwuch-Hum is a destination for ceremonial activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forest licensees must consult and accommodate First Nations within their areas of operation—already in its Haida decision, the Supreme Court of Canada had emphasized the requirement to consult and accommodate; “the Crown’s duty is to consult and accommodate” (Christie, 2006, p. 178). The outcome report of the Policy Pilot Project is posted online under Cultural Heritage Resources on the Ministry of Forests’ website. The end of the negotiations resulted in a Government Regulation Order (Annex from the Policy Pilot Project): “The Government Actions Regulation Order (GAR) provides direction for establishment of localized land designations and features that require special management for certain forest values, such as First Nations cultural heritage resources.” (Chehalis Indian Band and Chilliwack Forest District, 2008) (Figure 13)
Figure 13 Government Actions Regulation Order Map
This map represents an area protected by a Government Actions Regulation (GAR) Order, as identified in the report of the Policy Pilot Project *Kweh-Kwuch-Hum Spiritual Areas and Forest Management* (Ministry of Forests and Range and Sts’ailes, June 2008). The map shows high and dispersed areas (Figure 13). “High” areas identify areas of high cultural use and are exempt from logging. Areas identified as “dispersed” are areas of low to moderate cultural use. Selective logging is tentatively approved for “dispersed” areas, pending consultation with the Sts’ailes. It should be noted, however, that since ratification of the GAR Order, timber harvesting within the entire Kweh-Kwuch-Hum area by forest licensees has increased significantly.

In protecting their sacred mountain, Sts’ailes sought to engage the Ministry of Forests in several ways, including accepting a joint research project to study the problem and inviting forestry employees to feasts and ceremonies. Sts’ailes chose an alternative way, the Consultation and Accommodation process, rather than going to court, which often requires more time and could create antagonism between the parties.

In the end, a compromised area was designated as protected area (Figure 13) and the participatory process turned out to be one of mutual learning and joint capacity building.

---

*Groundbreaking agreement protects Chehalis heritage*

The BC Government and Chehalis Indian Band have agreed to protect an area in the Chilliwack Forest District that contains sacred sites of the Chehalis people.

Using a regulation under the *Forest and Range Practices Act*, a 1,072-hectare management area on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum (Mount Woodslee) in the District of Kent will be affected.

This follows a 15-month policy pilot project involving the BC Government and Chehalis to increase shared knowledge of the location’s spiritual areas, practices and forest management.

*Kweh-Kwuch-Hum* was declared a spiritually sensitive designated area by the Chehalis in July, 2006.

This is a good example of the BC Government’s effort to establish a new relationship with BC’s First Nations.

Another important initiative that is part of the “New Relationship” is the Wellness Village being built near Chilliwack Lake - see page 2 for details.

**Figure 14** Local newspaper article about the Policy Pilot Project

---

Invitations to community events and meetings at Sts’ailes were also of critical importance in the communication process. Eleven formal meetings between Sts’ailes and the Ministry took place between January 2007 and March 2008. They were followed by informal meetings and invitations to events in the community. These meetings were a learning process for both parties, the Chilliwack Forest District and Sts’ailes. The meetings and events also provided opportunities to showcase Sts’ailes’ cultural ceremonies and to share how Sts’ailes people value Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. The Chilliwack Forest District enhanced their understanding of cultural practices and Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, and also began to understand forest issues from a Coast Salish perspective.

Sts’ailes people also benefited from the meetings, learning what areas specific bureaucrats are responsible for, what decisions they could or could not make, how each level of government works, and whom they should talk to about particular concerns. These meetings and events were essential to increasing trust between Sts’ailes and forestry staff.

5.2.3 Act 3: Implementation of the recommendations

Act 3 is the implementation of the recommendations from the Policy Pilot Project and the continuation of the relationship created by the project. By then, Sts’ailes has changed their approach to communication and their understanding of the importance of their sacred mountain. The forestry agents have an enhanced understanding of First Nations’ culture and ways of communication. Below are the recommendations and learning outcomes from the Policy Pilot Project (Chehalis Indian Band and Chilliwack Forest District, 2008, pp. 72-73):

1. That Chehalis Indian Band and Chilliwack Forest District (CFD) commit to revisit this work annually, or as required, to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the Government Actions Regulation Order and the working relationship.
2. That Chehalis Indian Band and CFD start a dialogue to explore and determine an area-based tenure, according to the principles outlined in the Policy Pilot Project.
3. That Chehalis Indian Band and CFD continue to promote the awareness of Chehalis cultural and spiritual practices with industry and government partners.
4. That Chehalis Indian Band and CFD share the learning outcome regarding the Policy Pilot Project model with government agencies and other First Nations:
5. That future project participants develop an understanding and agreement on communication whereby certain information is kept internal and confidential to the committee and other types of information is presented when needed.

6. That a project component is to hold events outside the Steering Committee meetings to:
   
   o Build trust with the community through participation in events;
   o Respond to the invitation to observe spiritual practices and traditional territory;
   o Recognize that to really understand the culture is to understand the initiative;
   o Include senior officials from the First Nation and government in these activities;
   o Have ceremonies and interaction that follow traditional cultural practices.

7. That at the outset First Nations need to have the capacity to interact with Ministry of Forests, including some technical knowledge that supports understanding the roles and responsibilities.

8. That Ministry of Forests assists in capacity development with First Nations in similar projects to support effective working relationships.

The participants have had some level of trust before embarking on the project. Sts’ailes expressed the “cultural and spiritual values” of the mountain in the Policy Pilot Project and this new approach changed their communication strategies in responding to government referrals.

Table 8 Major events at Sts’ailes since the Policy Pilot Project ended (year 2008-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>Policy Pilot Project ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>Kweh-Kwuch-Hum ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kweh-Kwuch-Hum is a destination for ceremonial activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sts’ailes hired another registered professional forester (RPF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Forests Consultation and Revenue Sharing Agreement between Sts’ailes and BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since May 2011</td>
<td>Changing group name from Chehalis Indian Band to Sts’ailes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sts’ailes Homepage Opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publish regular newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post the Kweh-Kwuch-Hum report online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the process of consultation, Sts’ailes people decided that referring to themselves as Sts’ailes, rather than Chehalis, would be appropriate. Although this traditional name was not
fully recognized in Federal and Provincial Government jurisdictions, Sts’ailes people continued to call themselves Sts’ailes.

At the end of the Policy Pilot Project, project assessments were carried out among participants. The project facilitator created an assessment questionnaire, which was filled out by Sts’ailes members and by people from the Ministry of Forests. The results were generally seen as positive. Though Sts’ailes and the Forestry Agency were satisfied with the result of the project overall, the Sts’ailes were not satisfied with the decision to draw boundaries on the map. However, the two parties eventually agreed on what to reveal and what not to reveal. Sts’ailes agreed to reveal the location of culturally modified trees and common practicing areas, while sacred practice areas, such as repository areas and vision questing places, were not revealed.

This ends the first scene of Act 3, the implementation of the recommendations from the Policy Pilot Project, although follow-up activities are not fully monitored yet. Logging is now restricted in the culturally significant area, problem areas have been identified and can now be addressed in planning. The story is not over because the map does not include all of the important sites. Thought the map grants more protection, it might also become a constraint. What has occurred during the implementation of the Policy Pilot Project has influenced changes in people’s structures. New communication structures have been created, which include the relationship with the Ministry of Forests. As a result, the anticipated continued destruction of the mountain has been diverted. However, it is important to keep in mind that the third act is not complete; although one can clearly see what has changed for future relationships.

The Sts’ailes First Nation created a webpage for their band. In Act 3, the department of Aboriginal Rights and Title of Sts’ailes responds to government and industry sectors more actively, compared to the period of Act 1 and Act 2: “Of the many initiatives developed under the Aboriginal Rights and Title department, a powerful historic achievement is the designation of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum [...] as a Cultural Heritage Resource Feature” (http://www.stsails.com/business/aboriginal-rights-title, September 23, 2015, para. 1).

The Aboriginal Rights and Title department also expressed their willingness to build a partnership with the government and industry sectors to benefit the Sts’ailes people. Sts’ailes described examples of positive developments as follows:
1) Forming positive relations with the green energy industry (independent power producers).
2) Signing an interim agreement with Statlu Sand and Gravel, Inc.
3) Building positive relations with DFO and the sports fishing industry.
4) Having [Sts’ailes] people monitoring [...] rivers and waterways as Fish Guardians.
5) Achieving successful negotiations with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and the Arts for the management of campsites within [their] traditional territory.
6) Moving forward with a Memorandum of Understanding with the Harrison Hot Springs Village.
7) Signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Kwikwexwelhp Healing Village [...].
8) Negotiating nation-to-nation agreements with neighbouring First Nations.
9) Partaking in the Hemlock Resort 60-year development plan.
10) Developing a coordinate consultation process and standardizing the referral process with the Integrated Land Management Bureau and all other BC Government Ministries. (Sts’ailes, 2015, para. 5)

Under the Aboriginal Rights and Title department, the final Kweh-Kwuch-Hum report is available online (http://www.stsailes.com/business/aboriginal-rights-title). This is one example which Sts’ailes people did not expect before the Policy Pilot Project.

5.3 Analysis of the Policy Pilot Project as related to a theoretical framework

Based on Turner et al. (2008)’s framework, Sts’ailes addressed the invisible values of a sacred mountain in a strategic way. Sts’ailes utilized their own communication strategy to address the conflict. Without having previous knowledge of Turner et al. (2008)’s article, Sts’ailes utilized communication strategies that were similar to the framework proposed by Turner et al. (2008).

5.3.1 Act 1: step 1

Initially, Sts’ailes did not appoint someone to communicate with the Ministry of Forests. Therefore, responses to the Ministry of Forests were duplicated. When Sts’ailes confirmed who was to communicate with whom, it improved the internal process dealing

with the responses to the Ministry of Forests. Both the Ministry of Forests and Sts’ailes have their own structures and their own principles; some create communication opportunities and others communication constraints.

5.3.2  **Act 2: steps 3, 4, 5, and 6**

The key here was that both Sts’ailes and the Ministry had effective agents that were present throughout the process. Also key to the process was the fact that the Canadian courts had changed the rules and required consultation and accommodation with First Nations in regard to their traditional lands—even though the consultation and accommodation processes had not been meaningfully delivered.

The Policy Pilot Project forced Sts’ailes to address the invisible losses related to the forests of the sacred mountain. They utilized several strategies to address this: agreements to have confidential meetings and confidential reports; hiring a professional facilitator; recognizing a mutual learning process; and learning to compromise. The communication process between Sts’ailes and the Chilliwack Forest District articulates how the communication process has evolved between them. The communication process (Table 9) correlates with the communication strategies (Turner et al., 2008; see section 3.1.2). Sts’ailes had already utilized the six steps before the article (Turner et al., 2008) was published. Table 8 describes what the Policy Pilot Project addressed in their report. Both parties had also noted in the report that values are interrelated and it is hard to capture every value in the report.

### Table 9 Communication process between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication processes</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Focusing on what matters</td>
<td>Community meetings</td>
<td>Referrals on logging/ discussion on consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Describing what matters in meaningful ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proclaiming KKH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Making a place for invisible concerns in decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPP*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Using a historical baseline for evaluating losses and gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recognizing culturally derived values as relevant

Creating better alternatives

PPP* Policy Pilot Project

“Making a place for invisible concerns in decision-making” (Turner et al., 2008) is critical to the process of alleviating invisible losses. Step 3 repeats until a counter party considers it meaningfully; this process may take years. The procedure depends on whether or not “what matters in meaningful ways” (Turner et al., 2008) is well described and convincing.

The case study of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum at Sts’ailes shows that one example of progress took seven years. Focusing on what matters (Step 1) also takes time. It is not surprising that consensus might not be easy to reach and that it might take considerable time for a community to decide what to focus on and how to accomplish their goals.

Table 10 Processes that alleviated invisible losses at Sts’ailes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sts’ailes</th>
<th>6 steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Logging on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum matters — Community meetings and referrals on logging</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 24 — Discussion on working toward a protocol agreement with the Ministry of Forests with the view to developing a shared understanding regarding consultation, cooperative management, and other areas of mutual interest. Also discussed some of Sts’ailes’ guiding principles that define impacts to Aboriginal interests.</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Letter — it was not meaningful enough</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Proclaiming Kweh-Kwuch-Hum as a spiritually sensitive designated area</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Policy Pilot Project by the Chehalis Indian Band and Chilliwack Forest District Meetings: Jan 5, Feb 5, Mar 5, Mar 8, Apr 5, May 14, Jun 20, Oct 3, Dec 5, 2007; &amp; Jan 14, Mar 12, 2008 = 11 times</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Elders’ sharing knowledge</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The event of Logging on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum (2002)</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Strong action — Organizing a research group</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the Policy Pilot Project</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the Sts’ailes share common values related to the land, there were internal disagreements on what to reveal and what not to reveal about sacred places and practices, as Sts’ailes members hold different opinions on how to protect their culturally sensitive areas. Drawing lines on a map was controversial because some people were concerned about what was going to be recorded, which was not static, and because some people thought it was supposed to be kept secret. While some disagreed, they observed that “not talking” did not stop logging in the area.

Describing what matters in meaningful ways (Step 2) should be analyzed based on how the information was meaningful. Therefore, strong descriptions are very helpful when “making a place for invisible concerns in decision making.” Step 4, “sing a historical baseline for evaluating losses and gains,” is one of the strategic ways to describe invisible values. The links of the steps result in “recognizing culturally derived values as relevant” (step 5). The last step, “creating better alternatives,” can be divided into two parts: (1) creating better alternatives in a matter (directly); and (2) creating better alternatives in the circumstance (indirectly). For example, a better direct alternative in the Sts’ailes’ case was the “government action regulation order: designated areas of cultural and spiritual areas.” Effective indirect alternatives were: 1) creating alternative ways of communication, and 2) networking—getting to know each other. The Policy Pilot Project provided the opportunities and the time needed to getting to know and learning how to communicate with each other. Networking is one key aspect of social capital and it helps the progress of projects in many aspects. For example, learning who Sts’ailes should talk to saved effort when working with other agencies, including the Provincial Government.

5.4 Communication strategies revealing the cultural values of Kveh-Kwuch-Hum

The underlying communication barriers between the people of Sts’ailes and the BC government, specifically the Ministry of Forests, was a result of conflict between the
statutory ownership and Indigenous land tenure, where rights over the land are still 
controversial. In Canada, forestland tenure under statutory laws and customary practices are 
not the same as Indigenous traditional land tenure. Ownership credentials do not necessarily 
define land stewardship or absolute rights. When land use changes happen, and communities 
are not meaningfully consulted, the communities often believe a rule has been infringed:

In the communication process, they [Sts’ailes] had faced challenges: confidentiality of 
information and scheduling meetings. Therefore, the participants develop an 
understanding and agreement on communication whereby certain information is kept 
internal and confidential to the committee and other types of information is presented 
when needed. Strategies used were such as invitation to ceremonies and seeing the 
land, using maps and knowledge sharing by elders, and hiring an external facilitator 
(Kweh-Kwuch-Hum Spiritual Areas and Forest Management, Chehalis Indian Band 
and Chilliwack Forest District, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Obstacles</th>
<th>Communication Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>Proactive, Confidential report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Compromising: Designate area on a map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural</td>
<td>Invitations to ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiring a qualified neutral and external facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint learning and participatory process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Communication obstacles and strategies

My study has already briefly described the events surrounding the designation of 
“sacred” sites on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, and provided a more detailed analysis of the 
communication process that led to this outcome. The strategies that Sts’ailes and the Ministry 
of Forests used included a joint report addressing the cultural and spiritual values of the 
Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, formal and informal meetings and invitations to community events, and 
working with a facilitator.

Sts’ailes addressed the cultural and spiritual values of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum through 
meetings, although they also produced a Policy Pilot Project report in 2008, in cooperation 
with the Ministry. Interviews and research for the project were carried out in Sts’ailes. This
research motivated the Sts’ailes to organize the historical documents related to the sacred mountain. At first, Sts’ailes people were concerned about writing down cultural and spiritual values, because they are not static. In addition, some people were concerned the Ministry of Forests would reveal specific secrets to others, thus, endangering the sacred mountain. In order to accommodate the Sts’ailes’ request, the Ministry of Forests convinced them to reveal what areas were of concern and what kind of cultural practices could be lost because of forestry practices.

The concept of invisible losses was discussed earlier in this study, based on the work of Turner et al. (2008) who identified eight types of invisible losses: cultural and life-style losses, loss of identity, health losses, loss of self-determination and influence, emotional and psychological losses, loss of order in the world, knowledge losses, indirect economic losses, and lost opportunities. This chapter analyzed how Sts’ailes addressed the cultural values of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, and compare their strategies to the eight types of invisible losses discussed previously. Sts’ailes recognized 14 categories of cultural and spiritual values found on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum (Section 5.1.1). These categories may change over time because Sts’ailes people are concerned about what they say and write about their sacred mountain. However, as of this writing, those were the cultural and spiritual values Sts’ailes had identified on Kweh-Kwuch-Hum.

Overall, the cultural and spiritual values of Kweh-Kwuch-Hum that Sts’ailes addressed illuminated the 14 categories of cultural and spiritual values and the 8 types of invisible losses. Emotional and psychological losses were identified in every category. Cultural and lifestyle losses and loss of identity were also strongly expressed. The Sts’ailes’ communication strategy worked, and the process followed during the Pilot Project was critical to its success. A facilitator was hired to participate from the beginning, keep talks on track, record notes from meetings, and send reports back after each meeting. The facilitator was a retired forester who had previously worked for the Ministry of Forests and had also worked with Sts’ailes, so, he was familiar with the different ways in which Ministry staff and Sts’ailes people communicated. Furthermore, he had been working with Sts’ailes and other Coast Salish peoples for the previous 20 years. He understood what the differences and similarities were between both parties, and what was the best ways to communicate with
each party. The facilitator also acted as a bridge between both parties, and helped them focus on their mutual goals.
Chapter 6  Toward meaningful communication

This chapter shows, how in a situation of polycentric governance, as is the case in British Columbia, one level of the government structure can create a rule that then leads other levels to improve the relationship between those who manage forests and First Nations with concerns about those forests.

Government duty, namely the Consultation and Accommodation regulation, facilitated communication achieved in the Policy Pilot Project along with Sts’ailes corresponding statement of claim to their sacred mountain. The policy instrument empowered Sts’ailes, an Indigenous community, to express their concerns. Then, Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests reached an agreement on the designation of culturally sensitive areas (Chapter 5). The government-to-government relationship becomes reality only when First Nations hold legitimate authority.

The Policy Pilot Project assisted Sts’ailes in expressing their concerns about the sacred integrity on logging practice at Kweh-Kwuch-Hum. The Chilliwack Forest District enhanced their understanding of Sts’ailes’ point of view and produced an outcome ‘Government Actions Regulation order. (Section 5.2.2)’ The process helped Sts’ailes to find a way to elaborate their concerns and engage further with other jurisdictions.

6.1 Polycentric governance of forest commons

Ostrom (1990; 2009) discussed the concept of polycentric governance in forest commons, a Nobel Prize-awarded theory of the “commons.” The discourse about the “commons” has evolved since a significant article, “The Tragedy of the Commons” was published in 1968 (Figure 15). The article supported the idea of “privatization” and government-centered and top-down control of the commons (Hardin, 1968). In 1990, Ostrom published a book, “Governing the Commons,” which included empirical case studies with effective autonomous governance systems, which Hardin did not explain. The cases showed that effective governance systems could work without privatization or government-centered top-down control. The notion of governance outlined by Ostrom (1990) stimulated further discussions on the commons and it expanded the knowledge on governance systems and institutional arrangements that support the sustainable management of the commons (Ostrom, 2005).
Scholars have recently been doing research on adapting the concept of “commons” into the diversified governance that is called polycentric governance. Acknowledging different types of knowledge systems and different governance systems can promote the resilience of socio-ecological systems (Ostrom, 2009) and participatory decision making through democracy of knowledge (Fortmann, 2008).

6.2 Forest governance on Kwe-Kwuch-Hum

Chapter 5 showed a case study on Sts’ailes utilizing the policy instrument “Consultation and Accommodation” for a legitimated authority. Sts’ailes demonstrated a privileged traditional cultural knowledge and brought this Indigenous knowledge to the discussion table during the Policy Pilot Project. This helped encourage Sts’ailes’ active discussion in the process.

The forest governance system can be found at the national, provincial, regional, and community levels. Collaboration and communication is encouraged at all levels. The multi-level governance and collaboration between levels promotes communication between the levels. Community level governance becomes empowered when the community proactively exerts authority in decision-making. Sts’ailes exerted their authority through the Policy Pilot
Project. The Policy Pilot Project was facilitated through Consultation and Accommodation, which is a legitimate authority.

Sts’ailes proclaimed the cultural significance of the sacred mountain and sent letters to government agencies (see Chapter 5). Apparently, the government only heard Sts’ailes when they became proactive. The Ministry of Forests listened to Sts’ailes when Sts’ailes articulated the government’s duty of “consultation and accommodation” in the letter and publicized it in the local newspaper (2006). Sts’ailes effectively utilized the Supreme Court of Canada’s decision (2004) to make themselves heard by the Ministry of Forests (Figure 16), without pursuing a court battle.

However, when the Ministry of Forests requested the identification of specifics, concerning areas on a map, difficulties of expressing Sts’ailes concerns and drawing lines on the map involved the concerns of sacred integrity.

| Federal level | • Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada  
| Provincial level | • Ministry of Forests  
| Regional level | • Chilliwack Forest District  
| Community level | • Sts’ailes  

Figure 16 Components of polycentric governance on Kwe Kwuch-Hum from a government perspective

There are several levels of governance related to forest management in Canada. Each level of governance has its own principles to govern forests (Figure 16). Sts’ailes could act either as an equal to the federal/provincial government, Nation to Nation, or under the jurisdictions of federal/provincial government. International level governance such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) is beyond the scope of this study; however, it could have had an influence in the situation when Sts’ailes referenced it as a
source of moral authority, in backing their rights. The international level declaration provided some background, even though it was not directly involved in the discussion.

Sts’ailes exercised Aboriginal Rights and Title in the Consultation and Accommodation and exercised their right as a legitimated authority (Figure 17). This polycentric governance contributed to the collaboration between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests, namely the Policy Pilot Project, and to social learning between the two parties.

Figure 17 Components of polycentric governance looking from a Sts’ailes perspective

In the communication between the provincial and regional levels of government, and the Sts’ailes during the Policy Pilot Project, three strategies were utilized. First, the Ministry of Forests and Sts’ailes employed a facilitator who had the necessary skills to communicate with Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests. The individual is a retired government officer from the Ministry of Forests and an independent facilitator. This person had built trust with the Sts’ailes over the past 15 years and was already aware of the scope of the duty and responsibility of the provincial government. Second, Sts’ailes invited government staff into their sacred ceremonies, where Sts’ailes demonstrated their traditional uses of land and plants. This was an example of learning about Sts’ailes’ identity and the cultural significance of the sacred mountain. Third, the two parties held over 13 meetings during the Policy Pilot Project. They included a confidential meeting and confidential reports for culturally sensitive agendas,
and they opened their meetings with Sts’ailes’ prayers and drumming at Sts’ailes. It would have been difficult to include the same opening ceremony had the meeting taken place at a government office or at a common conference venue—Sts’ailes would have had to drive to that place (as there is no public transportation) and would not have been familiar with the space.

6.3 **Benefits of bringing indigenous knowledge to the discussion table**

Power imbalance in decision-making caused failure by not having all forms of knowledge in the deliberations. Inviting Indigenous knowledge into a discussion table can contribute to participatory decision-making, because it facilitates communication between First Nations and other stakeholders. It affirms the legitimacy of First Nation’s knowledge and authority. This facilitates creating channels for interaction between vertical and horizontal governances. Acknowledging different knowledge systems, and the inclusion of minority groups, contributes both to empowering people and to a democracy of knowledge (Fortmann 2008). From this perspective, participatory and community-based approaches have meaningful value.

6.3.1 **Indigenous knowledge and conventional science as types of knowledge systems**

Knowledge can give power and this becomes obvious when knowledge exerts its power within the context of “agenda setting.” Conventional science has long influenced policy-making. Recent attempts to bridge Indigenous knowledge and other knowledge systems have enhanced understanding of society.

Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) refers to “a cumulative body of knowledge, practice and belief, handed down through generations by cultural transmission and evolving by adaptive processes, about the relationship between living beings (including humans) with one another and with their forest environment” (UN 2004, adapted from Berkes et al., 2000; Trosper & Parrotta, 2012). The terminology “traditional ecological knowledge” is often interchangeable with other terms such as local knowledge, traditional knowledge, and Indigenous knowledge (Berkes, 2008; Bohensky & Maru, 2011; Trosper & Parrotta, 2012). Here, I use the term “traditional ecological knowledge” because it is widely accepted in the
field, although the notion of “traditional” could be associated with stagnation and an unwillingness to change. However, we recognize that traditions change and evolve (Trosper & Parrotta, 2012).

TEK has been validated by practice amongst global Indigenous societies for many, many generations. TEK helps people to care for each other and for the land, and incorporates observations gathered over a long period of time about specific places and areas of knowledge. However, the dominant society and Western science can prevent its ideas from being recognized as legitimate. In order for TEK to be put to use, it must be placed on planning agendas by people who have the power to make decisions.

The boundary between TEK and conventional science as it is practiced today, is not always clear and research on boundaries has been done by several researchers (Turnhout et al., 2009; Nakashima & Roue, 2002; Roue, 2003; Mazzocchi, 2006). Working with Indigenous communities in science is rooted in the philosophical approach of inclusiveness. However, including an Indigenous perspective in a research project is important for more than philosophical reasons. Working with Indigenous peoples produces meaningful outcomes in terms of the quality of the knowledge collected and the social impact of the mobilization of this knowledge (Buruchara, 2008). Since the 1990s, TEK has been recognized by the scientific community, and integrating TEK into conventional science has been considered meaningful and has been deemed to produce meaningful outcomes (Trosper & Parrotta, 2012; Woo et al., 2007; Buruchara, 2008). Although it is still somewhat controversial as to whether or not traditional ecological knowledge should, or can, be integrated into more scientific models, the meaningful participation of Indigenous communities in forestry studies should be seriously considered (Smith, 1999).

There are several different views of the philosophy of science. Conventional science is not monolithic, and neither is traditional ecological knowledge. Science is a systematic knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the universe (Heilbron, 2003). The discipline of the philosophy of science explores different approaches: empiricism; rationalism, i.e., falsification (Popper, 1968); instrumentalism (Newton-Smith, 1994); and scientific skepticism (Godfrey-Smith, 2003; Quine, 1969). Approaches such as falsification (Popper, 1968, 1983), a set of programs (Lakatos, 1976; Chalmers, 1999), and Kuhn’s “paradigm shifts” (Kuhn, 1962; Chalmers, 1999) attempted to do “boundary work” to
determine “what science is” (Gieryn, 1999). Latour (1991, 2004) critiques the distinction between fact and value. Knowledge is situated, and is produced and valid, in a certain context (Haraway, 1998) and science does not have a privileged access to truth.

Most scientists used to believe that hypotheses should always be tested and that the research methods used, as well as the results of experiments or studies, should be reviewed by other scientists. At the basic level, a hypothesis could, in theory, be developed without consideration of whether or not it has operational meaning in the larger world. Scientists build hypotheses that can be tested according to conventional scientific methods. Therefore, non-testable hypotheses do not even have an opportunity to be examined by scientists. Therefore, scientific knowledge is limited by the selection criteria of hypotheses.

Traditional forest-related knowledge, and knowledge from conventional science, also known as Western science, have similarities and differences (Trosper & Parrotta, 2012). Traditional knowledge and conventional science are both based on cumulative bodies of knowledge that have been observed and tested. While “Western science” is a term that has commonly been used to describe “science,” Western science is also used by scientists from Asia and Africa. The term “Western science” is controversial because the term “Western,” while having roots in the Western world, is not relevant in the contemporary era (Trosper & Parrotta, 2012). Here, I will use the term “conventional science” instead. Since the 1980s, attempts have been made in several disciplines to integrate Indigenous knowledge and conventional science (Bohensky & Maru, 2011). However, in many ways, Indigenous knowledge and conventional science are not comparable. Both Indigenous knowledge and conventional knowledge are associated with their own ways of seeing, knowing, and understanding (Atleo, 2004; Berkes, 1993, 2008). For instance, most Indigenous systems assume a “living world” that includes entities such as sentient glaciers, while conventional science assumes an inert world (Cruikshank, 2005). Thus, the idea of “listening” to the world differs between the systems. As a consequence, it is questionable whether or not the two types of knowledge systems can be fully integrated.

In doing forestry research (which was initiated using a conventional scientific paradigm), acknowledging the two knowledge systems is valuable when practicing forest science. It helps to generate new knowledge and to understand the new knowledge generated by others. Using a participatory research approach serves as an alternative to a top-down
approach. Conventional science does not necessarily imply a top-down approach, since conventional science also covers a spectrum of possibilities. The more important question is the degree of participation of Indigenous peoples in research being conducted in their traditional territories. The participatory research approach comprises decolonizing and inclusive methods (Smith, 1999). A participatory approach at least attempts to incorporate Indigenous (or community) perspectives. The need for collaborative research has been raised by official development assistance projects and within academia (Smith, 1999). However, criteria, challenges, and opportunities, have not delivered enough from on-site researchers (Shirk et al., 2012; Campbell & Vainio-Mattila, 2003). Collaboration is expressed in several different ways, and rather than advocating full participation of Indigenous communities, this research highlights the “importance and the quality of participation” (Shirk et al., 2012).

6.4 **Toward meaningful collaboration with Indigenous communities**

The Policy Pilot Project included research on the cultural significance of the Kwe-Kwuch-Hum. The Ministry of Forests requested Sts’áiles to define culturally sensitive areas within Kwe-Kwuch-Hum. Sts’áiles conducted the research on the cultural significance of the Kwe-Kwuch-Hum to express their concerns about logging in that area. This activity was a participatory research in the notion of Wulfhorst et al. (2008). Wulfhorst et al. (2008) suggested the key criteria for participatory research were: 1) community-centred control; 2) reciprocal production of knowledge; 3) outcomes and who benefits. The Policy Pilot Project achieved the three criteria for participatory research (Figure 18).
Figure 18 Participatory research criteria of the Policy Pilot Project

Criterion 1, community-centred control, is established on community ownership, credibility, and continuity of trust. Trust should be mutual, mutual interests should be involved, and the participant groups should have the capacity to participate in the research. In other words, the participant groups should not be overwhelmed with the research.

Beckley et al. (2008) described the concept of “community capacity” from different angles. However, the notion of capacity implies capacity as outcome. I would argue that recognizing capacity in the beginning of the research is also critical. For example, the other communities whom I initially contacted mentioned that they had already participated in other projects and did not have the time and energy for another one, especially for a university project involving a researcher from a different city. A university research project often contains a policy implication. In the long term, university projects from a distant city do not allow frequent returns to the community. Additionally, the high costs of travel reduce opportunities to get involved in the long term and become one of the reasons why researchers do not return to communities after collecting data or after the completion of a study. This reality influences mutual trust and mutual interests. Indigenous communities place a high value on local projects carried out by institutions in the region.
Criterion 2, the reciprocal production of knowledge, addresses the issues of overcoming marginalization and knowledge production. Here, the point is that mutual learning and a joint learning process can be achieved. When joint learning takes place, the project is valuable for both parties. Acknowledging different types of knowledge is beneficial to academia, and involving different actors who have not been heard before is crucial to the democratization of the decision-making process. This confirms that bringing Indigenous knowledge to the discussion table is helpful in the inclusion of Indigenous peoples’ voices in the decision-making process. While this idea was developed in relation to academia, it also can apply in the context of polycentric governance.

In the same line, criterion 3, outcomes and who benefits, highlights the outcomes and benefits brought to communities. This depends on the characteristics and circumstances of the participatory research. Certain participatory research projects produce tangible materials such as community gardens, wells, technology, or even policy tools. At the same time, many participatory research projects generate opportunities to recognize different ways of thinking and seeing.

Outcomes and benefits of participatory research can be tangible or intangible. Any benefits achieved can be valuable to the community, the scientists, or both. The benefits of building trust can also open a window for further collaboration (Hickey & Mohan, 2004; Wulfhorst et al., 2008). If the research generates insights for both parties, the participatory research can also generate benefits. Yet, not every participatory research project has to produce material outcomes. For example, the Policy Pilot Project (Chapter 5) enhanced communication strategies: the outcome was capacity-building in communication. Sometimes, outcomes are not easily measurable. Networking is another outcome which is intangible and not easy to measure. Networking opens a window for collaboration and provides communication channels for the future.

The list of criteria in Figure 4 addresses the particular circumstance of a project involving a government agency and a community. These criteria help in doing research in partnership with an Indigenous community. The list was compiled using the experience of observing the Policy Pilot Project (Chapter 5). The criteria contribute to the distribution of power in polycentric governance, allowing people from different knowledge systems to participate. This extends to research projects with First Nations.
6.5 **Summary**

This chapter discussed the linkage between Indigenous knowledge and polycentric governance in terms of a move toward collaboration. Different levels of governance systems operate with different knowledge systems. An Indigenous knowledge system greatly contributes to an Indigenous governance system. A diversified governance system is likely to promote communication between different parties. This contributes to promoting democracy of knowledge and sustainable forest management practices.

First, polycentric governance and interactions between levels help to ensure that Indigenous voices are heard. In the case of Sts’ailes, the Indigenous knowledge system operated within the Indigenous community. Recognition of this knowledge system gave space to Sts’ailes people at the community level and created channels so that Sts’ailes people made themselves heard. Polycentric governance structures also helped to make Sts’ailes’ voice heard. Consultation and Accommodation requirements from the courts became a communication channel between multi-levels of governance entities.

Second, this chapter discussed Indigenous knowledge as one of many types of knowledge systems. The concept of the commons has been discussed in light of different systems operating at different levels on scales such as space and time. Each of these levels needs its own governance framework. This chapter also articulated that different levels of governance operate with certain knowledge systems. It brought forward the concepts of “Indigenous knowledge” into the polycentric governance. The study’s findings add to the knowledge in the field of forestry and provide a valuable lesson in forest governance systems, not only for Canada, but also for other countries with differences between statutory rights and customary rights.

Recognizing different types of knowledge systems and bringing them to the discussion table provides an opportunity to include Indigenous peoples in the discussion of Consultation and Accommodation. The concept of “polycentric governance” (Armitage, 2008; Ostrom, 2008; Nagendra & Ostrom, 2012) enables Indigenous knowledge to become legitimate at the discussion table. In addition, collaboration and social learning are encouraged in the communication process necessary for conflict resolution between levels of governance.
Chapter 7  Conclusions

This chapter summarizes the contributions of this study to the field of Forestry, describes my critical reflections as a researcher, and provides suggestions for future research. Many First Nations struggle to address their rights to forestlands because statutory land ownership does not operate within First Nations’ rights to the land. Based on the conflicting concept of ownership regimes, addressing First Nations’ rights to the land requires a more sophisticated strategic framework.

7.1 Key conclusions and contributions to the field

This thesis explored traditional forest uses at Sts’ailes, communication strategies and conflict resolution processes in forest management, and factors that facilitate communication between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests. Central to this exploration has been the concept of “invisible values” and how to make them visible, and it also confirmed a framework to work with Indigenous communities. The study was developed based on a theoretical framework developed by Turner et al. (2008). First Nations are at a stage of the “possibility” of exercising their Aboriginal rights and title through consultation and accommodation. This new era provides an opportunity for First Nations to revive their identities.

The communication difficulties between First Nations and the Provincial Forestry agencies arise out of different ways of seeing the “visible” and “invisible” values of a forest, and of different power levels, which in turn are based on different government authorities and laws. The different ways of seeing these values, and governmental authority, are the result of history, world views, and cultures of different groups of people. Whereas focusing on differences does not guarantee moving forward, recognizing the differences certainly helps identify how both parties can improve communication to bridge these gaps.

BC forest management has faced challenges due to protests and land claims. Without resolving land claim issues, BC forest management cannot fulfill sustainable forest management. Due to conflicts around forestry and other resources, the BC Treaty Commission40 was launched. Getting recognition for Aboriginal Rights and Title is not a simple task when dealing with communication, because value-oriented questions are often

40 http://www.bctreaty.net/
involved in the process. Some First Nations want to contest their rights and title through the courts claims agreements and others do not. There are currently three options available: going to court, treaty negotiations, and consultation and accommodation through mitigation. The consultation and accommodation option is likely a positive step, since it does not create a direct confrontation between First Nations and government agencies. Although treaty negotiations secure a certain level of land tenure for the First Nations, the rationale of the negotiations can be challenged. Negotiations require First Nations to have the capacity in terms of availability of time and capable human resources. The main point of all of these options is the mutually acceptable co-existence of First Nations and non-First Nations.

This thesis contributes to the forestry field in the area of communication strategies. I observed and documented successful communication strategies being used by Sts’ailes and the forestry agency, and analyzed how and why the strategies succeeded in revealing invisible values and rendering them visible. Sts’ailes utilized the following strategies: 1) being proactive; 2) inviting government agents to the land to show them the importance of the land to the people; and 3) hiring a facilitator to carry out communication. To be proactive, Sts’ailes proclaimed the mountain, Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, to be culturally and spiritually significant. Sts’ailes also utilized the local press to announce the event. When they invited government agents to the land, Sts’ailes invited them to witness the Winter Dance Ceremony and First Salmon Ceremony. Forest-related cultures are embedded in these types of ceremonies. Sts’ailes and the forest agency helped to develop a Policy Pilot Project, hired a facilitator, and agreed on what to reveal and what not to reveal to the public during the process.

Turner et al. (2008) described strategies for addressing invisible losses. The Sts’ailes’ Policy Pilot Project confirmed that these strategies can facilitate communication. Thus, in focusing on communication related to this Policy Pilot Project, this thesis presents an authentic case study that can help guide First Nations and government agencies when addressing and accommodating the invisible values of forests in future situations. This study recognizes the need of the Ministry of Forests to improve their standards of communication with Indigenous peoples and presents ideas intended to promote meaningful communication.
7.1.1 **Objective 1 – cultural uses of non-timber forest resources**

A key conclusion of the study of non-timber forest uses (Chapter 4) is that cultural uses of non-timber forest products (NTFP) at Sts’ailes illustrate invisible values and help to reveal them or to make them visible. Today, Sts’ailes people continue to use forestland and forest resources for cultural reasons. These non-timber forest uses can be categorized as: 1) food and medicinal sources; 2) cultural products; 3) ceremonial rites; and 4) spiritual practices. Although potlatches and Winter Dance ceremonies were banned in the past (1884-1951), Sts’ailes people revived them and the traditional language and culture associated with them. The result of the study on non-timber forest uses among Sts’ailes thus confirmed the invisible and visible values of the forest. Sts’ailes people use forestlands for diverse purposes, whether or not the people’s ownership is legitimated by the government. Using non-timber forest resources serves not only to bolster the local economy, but also strengthens Sts’ailes people’s identity. Non-timber forest uses are closely linked to traditional culture. Today, recording the historical utilization of natural resources and lands brings strength of claim, and serves as a strategy in asserting aboriginal rights and title. This information is also useful to scientists and practitioners in recognizing that the forests are important to Sts’ailes.

Forestry is a major contributor to the economy of Canada. Much forestry research has viewed forests as a source of timber and of environmental services. Compared to the discourses on economic and environmental aspects, the academic discourse on the cultural aspects of forestry is rather limited. Instead, forest ecosystems and the economic opportunities of forest products have been the focus of attention. Forestry researchers have paid too little attention to non-timber forest resources in Canada, even though they are categorized under forest resources. Linking culture and non-timber forest uses at Sts’ailes articulated the invisible values of forests.

7.1.2 **Objective 2 – communicating cultural values: the Policy Pilot Project**

The in-depth case study of the conflict resolution between Sts’ailes and the Ministry of Forests illustrates what communication strategies Sts’ailes used and how the communication process evolved. By grounding the example in the analysis of eight types of
invisible losses and six steps to address invisible losses (Turner et al., 2008), what Sts’ailes experienced confirmed this framework as a viable way to address invisible losses.

The first contribution, communicating cultural values, is that the study identified communication strategies and processes to the field of Forestry. By bridging the guidelines to the case study of the Policy Pilot Project, the communication process and the strategies have been identified based on the Sts’ailes case study. Other First Nations could utilize this study when communicating with government agencies.

Conflict is often perceived as something to avoid. However, these findings suggest that conflict can be leveraged into opportunity. In this case, the representatives of a government agency employed a collaborative approach by listening to Sts’ailes. When Sts’ailes invited them to attend traditional cultural ceremonies, it provided government representatives with opportunities to witness Sts’ailes’ culture. Through “Consultation and Accommodation,” the agency staff made an effort to resolve the conflict.

The study articulated six communication steps and eight categories of invisible losses. Kweh-Kwuch-Hum, the sacred mountain of Sts’ailes, was used as a case study through which to explore the articulation, consultation, and accommodation of invisible values. This analysis provides guidelines for First Nations and government agencies that can be used when communicating. This study also confirms different ways of communicating, different levels of power, and the possibility of compromise.

Although different levels of power can constrain willingness and capability to communicate, the possibility of compromise through consultation and accommodation creates an opportunity to confirm First Nations’ identity and rights. Current ownership does not confirm Aboriginal rights and title, unless First Nations have proof of the Aboriginal rights and title. Whether the First Nations have proof or not, the connection to their land exists. Confirming traditional rights can foster the stewardship of the land at Sts’ailes.

7.1.3 Objective 3 – linking knowledge types and polycentric governance

Chapter 6 linked types of knowledge systems and polycentrism. These multiple knowledge systems include Indigenous knowledge systems and conventional science. Polycentrism supports multiple governance systems, each one operating with its own
emergent properties. This link suggests multi-level forest governance and it contributes to facilitating communication between agencies when power imbalances exist.

The findings of this in-depth case study can provide guidelines for researchers and practitioners. Practitioners can use the communication strategies when they communicate with First Nations, and First Nations can also use the communication strategies when they communicate with government agencies. A key contribution of this study on multi-level governance is the improvement of existing forest management governance. Conflicts often arise because of the co-existence of statutory land ownership and customary rights. Because of this gap, communication can become difficult. The multi-level governance model and linkages with other knowledge systems can help broaden communication channels between agencies.

Challenges in communication happen not only when managing natural resources, but also when doing research with Indigenous communities. In the literature, those challenges are often mentioned only briefly; they are rarely analyzed on their own, or seen as a key finding of the study. This limits opportunities for sharing knowledge by overlooking the value of communication. As a result, future research continues to repeat similar mistakes. These lessons are critical for future research in the discipline of forestry, but the source of knowledge is quite limited. This thesis thus makes a further contribution to the literature by presenting a conceptual framework toward meaningful communication as the result of the study.

Doing science together (Fortmann, 2008), bringing the science into democracy (Latour, 2004), and promoting social justice and equity have become accepted discourses within the scientific community. How are we doing in that regard? Have we progressed in the journey of doing science together and democratizing the sciences? Though this chapter is rather preliminary, the framework and discussion presented here can help promote collaborative research in the field of forestry. For example, power imbalances are often a critical reason for communication challenges. Linking the concepts of governance and knowledge systems is one effort of this research and hopefully, this effort will contribute to sustainable forest management in BC.
7.2 Limitations

Given that this is a single case study, the results of this study cannot be generalized. In British Columbia, there are 198 First Nation groups and they are not homogenous in terms of their culture and economic class. The findings in the current study may have been different with First Nations with different stages of Aboriginal rights and title claims.

Another limitation of the current study is that I might have missed some nuances of the English language during fieldwork. To overcome this limitation, I conducted an extended fieldwork, rather than limiting myself to one time data collection. I also adopted a ground theory to confirm findings of the study.

7.3 Suggestions for future research

This research was initiated as a focused research study. While I proceeded with the research, substantial modifications were necessary, including a change in the partner community and addressing the partner community’s needs and interests. The flexibility of the research and the cooperation with the research team enabled me to carry on and complete the research.

The cultural aspects of forest management have not been studied often enough. Further topics to explore would include: 1) to identify how governance, culture, and the economy affect conflict resolution about forest sustainability among Indigenous peoples; and 2) to explore ways neglected voices can be heard in forest management, collaborative research, and cross-cultural contexts, paying special attention to traditional knowledge.

To identify how governance, culture, and the economy affect conflict resolution in forestry issues, possible research questions could be: 1) what are the characteristics of governance, culture, and economy in Indigenous communities?; 2) how can governance, culture, and the economy of Indigenous communities be considered, and how can they be involved in decision-making processes?; 3) how do Indigenous communities safeguard their rights?

To explore ways in which neglected voices can be heard from a different perspective, what strategies can forestry agencies utilize? What strategies work, or do not work, and what frameworks can assist forest co-management toward sustainability? Finally, social learning among multi-level governing entities also needs to be studied.
The findings from the current study and ongoing research in this area should take a responsibility leading the development of policy instruments and guidance to assist sustainable forest management for the future generations. Such consideration helps scientists and practitioners pay attention to the relationship between governance entities, and diversified views of natural environments. In conclusion, the complimentary utilization of various forms of communication (written including visual representation, oral vs. legal, ceremonial vs. conventional science, traditional knowledge vs. analytical, descriptive) could help assist the potential of participation of Indigenous peoples in the decision making process.
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Appendix A: Contact/Recruit Letter

Forest Resources Management
2nd Floor, Forest Sciences Centre
2619 – 2424 Main Mall
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4

[ Date ]

[ Address of Subject]

Invitation to participate in research study

Dear [Subject’s name],

This letter is an invitation to participate in the ongoing research study entitled ‘Tools for generating maps of hydrologically sensitive areas for use in forest operations planning’. I am a graduate student of the Department of Forest Resources Management at the University of British Columbia, conducting this research under the supervision of Dr. Markus Weiler (phone: 604-822-3169, email: markus.weiler@ubc.ca) and Dr. Ronald Trosper (phone: 604-822-8089, email: ronald.trosper@ubc.ca), as part of a graduate degree (Doctor of Philosophy in Forestry).

The purpose of this research is to better understand the cultural values of Aboriginal lands for Aboriginal people. This proposal seeks your participation in defining the cultural values of lands in the context of the Chehalis people.
We would like to learn (1) what meanings the Chehalis people attribute to their lands, especially, wetlands, (2) the ecological significance of culturally significant areas, (3) how culturally significant areas are used within the social and cultural contexts of the Chehalis people, and (4) how mapping could contribute to the well-being of the Chehalis First Nation.

The research project is currently funded by the Sustainable Forest Management Network (www.sfmnetwork.ca), and all research activities will be conducted in accordance with both the UBC office of Research Services (www.ors.ubc.ca) and local Chehalis Indian Band research protocols. You have been invited to participate based on your experience and knowledge regarding traditional land in the Chehalis land.

The research process requires a single personal interview (approximately two hour of your time). If you choose to participate, your identity will be kept strictly confidential. However, you will have the option to release your interview record to the Chehalis Aboriginal Right & Title Department. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to sign a consent form. If you would like further information you can contact me at the Chehalis Aboriginal Right & Title Dept. (tel) 604-796-2116 or by (email) inae@interchange.ubc.ca. I would be happy to meet with you to answer any questions.

Respectfully,

Inae Kim, PhD student,
UBC Department of Forest Resources Management
Email: inae@interchange.ubc.ca
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Communicating the Values of Hydrologically Sensitive Areas with the Participation of the Chehalis Indian Band

**Description of Study:**

We are asking you to take part in a research study about the perspectives of members of the Chehalis Indian Band regarding certain wet areas. We are asking you because you are a knowledgeable member of the Chehalis Indian Band. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before you agree to be in the study.

If you decide to take part, you will participate in an interview about values held by the Chehalis Indian Band. The interview will take from 30 minutes to two hours.

The result of the study will be a doctoral dissertation by Inae Kim, along with a report to the Chehalis Indian Band describing the values of certain areas of Forest Resources Management
2nd Floor, Forest Sciences Centre
2619 – 2424 Main Mall
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4

778-387-2843 (Cell), 604-225-2843 (Home)
forestinae@gmail.com
the Chehalis. This information will be helpful to the Band Council and the community in making decisions about the use of any lands the Band obtains in negotiation with the government.

The study is funded by the Sustainable Forest Management Network.

**Principal Investigator and Co-Investigators:**
The Principal Investigator for this study at the University of British Columbia is Ronald Trosper, Professor, Faculty of Forestry. Adjunct Professor Markus Weiler and graduate student Inae Kim of UBC are co-investigators.

**Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:**
The risks to you if you take part in this study are minimal. We will simply be asking you about your social and cultural activities on certain areas. You will be occupied for about an hour in talking with us about them.

Participants’ communities will benefit from this research as it involves the mapping of areas that they deem culturally significant. There will also be a technology transfer and associated training so that the communities can apply these tools to other areas of interest or concern.

HSAs maps have a multitude of functions for First Nations in addition to their value for forest management and planning. The maps can be used in land claims, treaty negotiations, education curricula, and community planning. As an information tool, the maps can assist First Nations in resource development decision-making. Additionally, the mapping of HSAs will benefit both industry and government by evaluating their harvest plan and thus ensuring minimal water runoff as result of operations.
Confidentiality:
The identity of all interview subjects will be kept confidential. All documents will be identified only by code number and kept in a locked filing cabinet. Copies of data records maintained on computer hard disk will be identified only by code number, and protected by password at all times to ensure the security of the computer record. Subjects will not be identified by name in any reports of the completed study. If interview subjects are comfortable with reporting, subjects can waive confidentiality.

I do / do not wish to be identified by name in any materials that result from the conduct of this research.

Access to the data:
Principal investigator (Ronald Trosper) and co-investigators (Markus Weiler, and Inae Kim) will have access to the data. The Chehalis Indian Band will keep copies of all interviews with Chehalis people both electronic and transcriptions upon completion of the research. If the band chooses to make information public or provide access to the data by a person(s) not named in the consent form, it can do so with express permission of the research participant. Copies of associated papers and PhD dissertation will be provided to the Chehalis Aboriginal Rights & Title Department upon completion of research and the Chehalis Indian Band can provide access of them.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
Your decision to take part in the study is voluntary. You are free to choose not to take part in the study or to stop taking part at any time without any penalty to you.

**Contacts and Questions:**
If you have questions now, feel free to ask us. If you have questions later, you may contact Inae Kim 604-225-2843 (Home), 778-387-2843 (Cell) or forestinae@gmail.com

**Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects:**
If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

**Statement of Consent:**
I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been provided with a copy of this form.

___________________________   ___________________________
Signature of Participant             Date

_________________________
Printed Name
Appendix C: Draft Interview Schedule

In addition to basic demographic information that will be collected for each interviewee (including details on their age, gender, ethnicity, and place of residence), the following questions are proposed as a First Draft Interview Schedule to be refined through discussion and pre-testing.

QUESTION AREA: BIOGRAPHICAL

1. How long has your own community been here?
   1a. How long have people in your own community used the forests?
   1b. How long have people in your own community used the watersheds (river, lake, and pond)
2. How long have you lived in Chehalis Indian Band?
   2a. How long do plan to stay living in Chehalis Indian Band?
3. How do you use the forests in Chehalis Indian Band?
   3a. How do you use the watersheds in Chehalis Indian Band?
   3b. What watershed values are important to you?

QUESTION AREA: CULTURALLY SIGNIFICANT AREAS

4. Do you have any place where specifically meaningful to you?
5. What kind of memory do you have related to the areas?
6. What meanings do you attribute to the areas?
7. Do you think certain places are meaningful for your community?
   7a. If so, why?
   7b. If so, how?

QUESTION AREA: SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS

8. What kind of memory do you have related to river, lake, or pond?
   8a. What meanings do you attribute to the river, lake, or pond?
9. Have you seen wet areas where saturated certain time of year?
   9a. When did you see the wet areas at first?
9b. Have you seen plants in the wet areas?
9c. What kind of plants have you seen?

10. Do you think the wet areas are related to fishing?
   10a. Do you think the wet areas are related to hunting?
   10b. Do you think the wet areas are related to medicine?
   10c. Do you think the wet areas are related to art?
   10d. Do you think the wet areas are related to spirituality?
   10e. Do you think the wet areas are related to your community?

11. Does your community depend upon the wet land for sustenance?
   11a. Do you think the wet areas are related to drinkable water?

12. What change has occurred in your memory as a consequence of logging activities, forestry roads, silviculture activities, or pulp and/or sawmills operating in the wet land?

**QUESTION AREA: MAPPING**

13. How forestry affects the well-being of your community?
14. How land use planning affects the well-being of your community?
15. What kinds of mapping projects have done in your community?
16. How the mapping affects the well-being of your community?
   16a. How has forestry benefited your community?
   16b. How could the positive impacts have been maximized?
   16c. Do you believe the mapping affects your community in a negative way?
   16d. If so, how and why?
   16e. How could the negative impacts have been avoided?

**QUESTION AREA: COMMUNICATION BARRIERS**

17. Have you heard about communication between community members and bureaucrats or scientists?
18. Have you communicated with bureaucrats or scientists with regard to the wet land?
   18a. If so, could you describe the topic and your feeling during the communication?
   18b. Do you think bureaucrats or scientists fully understand the communication?
   18c. Why or why not?
19. How could the communication barriers have been avoided?
Appendix D: Release Form

Communicating the Values of Hydrologically Sensitive Areas with the Participation of the Chehalis Indian Band

Principal Investigator and Co-Investigators:
The Principal Investigator for this study at the University of British Columbia is Ronald Trosper, Professor, Faculty of Forestry. Assistant Professor Markus Weiler and graduate student Inae Kim of UBC are co-investigators.

Purpose:
The purpose of this research is to better understand the cultural values of Aboriginal lands for Aboriginal people. This proposal seeks your participation in defining the cultural values of lands in the context of the Chehalis people. We would like to learn (1) what meanings the Chehalis people attribute to their lands, especially, wetlands, (2) the ecological significance of culturally significant areas, (3) how culturally significant areas are used within the social and cultural contexts of the Chehalis people, and (4) how mapping could contribute to the well-being of the Chehalis First Nation.

Release Procedures:
If you choose to release a record of your interview to the Chehalis Aboriginal Right and Title Department, the co-investigator will transfer both a written
transcript and an audio recording, identifying your names and title, to the Chehalis Aboriginal Right and Title Department. The investigators will only release your interview record to the Chehalis Aboriginal Right and Title Department, and only with your explicit written consent (i.e., a signed release form).

**Contact for information about the study:**
If you would like further information you can contact me at the Chehalis Aboriginal Right & Title Dept. (tel) 604-796-2116 or by (email) inae@interchange.ubc.ca. I would be happy to meet with you to answer any questions.

**Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects:**
If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

**Consent:**
Your agreement to release your interview record to Chehalis Aboriginal Right & Title Department upon completion of research is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to agree to this release or withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty to you.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this release form for your own records.

Your signature indicates that you consent to release the record of your interview records, identifying your names and title, to Chehalis Aboriginal Right & Title Department of the Chehalis Indian Band.