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INTRODUCTION

Over a number of years the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada has identified the need to increase the national recognition of the history of Aboriginal peoples. Since 1990 the Board has explored approaches to this challenge. This paper is part of that on-going dialogue which involves many parties. In November 1997 the Board requested "... an appropriate framework to assist in determining the national designation of [sites related to Aboriginal peoples], a sector of Canadian society whose history does not conform to the traditional definition of national significance as used by the Board". In July 1998 the Board "acknowledged that the current criteria, structure and framework used by the Board to commemorate Aboriginal Peoples' history are inadequate. Nature, tradition, continuity and attachment to the land are seen as the defining elements in determining historic significance. ...the Board clarified that its interest was not only in considering groups for commemoration, but in focussing on the importance of place to the Aboriginal group ...." The Board requested "... an examination of the present framework to include other perspectives including spiritual values, cosmic views of the natural world and associative values in the cultural landscape". As part of the response to the Board’s request, this paper approaches the field from a policy and social-science perspective. It explores Aboriginal world views and place, and it situates these world views in relation to the field of cultural landscapes and to national historic site designations related to the history of Aboriginal people. It offers a working definition of "Aboriginal cultural landscape", and it proposes guidelines for their identification.

ABORIGINAL WORLD VIEWS

Indigenous peoples in many parts of the world view landscape in ways common to their experience and different from the Western perspective of land and landscape. The relationship between people and place is conceived fundamentally in spiritual terms rather than primarily material terms. Many consider all the earth to be sacred and regard themselves as an integral part of this holistic and
living landscape. They belong to the land and are at one in it with animals, plants, and ancestors whose spirits inhabit it. For many, places in their landscape are also sacred, as places of power, of journeys related to spirit beings, of entities that must be appeased. Aboriginal cosmologies relate earth and sky, the elements, the directions, the seasons, and mythic transformers to lands that they have occupied since ancient times. Guided by these cosmological relationships, many have creation stories related to their homelands, and they date their presence in those places to times when spirit beings traversed the world, transformed themselves at will between human and animal form, created their ancestors, and contoured the landscape. Laws and gifts from these spirit beings and culture heroes shaped their cultures and their day to day activities. Aboriginal peoples’ intimate knowledge of natural resources and ecosystems of their areas, developed through long and sustained contact, and their respect for the spirits which inhabit these places, moulded their life on the land. Traditional knowledge, in the form of narratives, place names, and ecological lore, bequeathed through oral tradition from generation to generation, embodies and preserves their relationship to the land. Landscapes “house” these stories, and protection of these places is key to their long-term survival in Aboriginal culture.

Aboriginal versus Western World Views
To recognize the values of Aboriginal cultural landscapes and to commemorate these places, identification and evaluation have to focus on Aboriginal world views rather than on those of non-indigenous cultures of Western civilization and Western scientific tradition. The orientations of the two cultural constructs differ radically, the one rooted in experiential interrelationship with the land and the other in objectification and rationalism (Johnson and Ruttan, 1992; Stevenson, 1996: 288-89; Federal Archaeology Office, 1998a). The 1987 Federal Court of Canada case Apsassin vs The Queen and the 1991 Supreme Court of British Columbia case Delgamuukw vs The Queen epitomize the chasm of understanding between the differing world views. Judge Addy’s dismissal of Dunne-za/Cree elders’ oral discourse and expert witness testimony in the former parallels Judge McEachern’s dismissal of Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en oral tradition as valid evidence of the intimate relationship between culture and land in support of their land claims in the latter (Ridington, 1990a; Cruikshank, 1994; Mills, 1994-95). The validity of Aboriginal oral tradition has since become better understood, most specifically as a result of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Additionally, there is administrative acceptance in the federal Environmental Assessment Panel’s requirement in 1995 that BHP Diamonds Inc. give equal consideration to traditional knowledge as to scientific research in the environmental assessment of its proposed diamond mine at Lac de Gras, NWT. Legal acceptance of Aboriginal oral history related to a group’s traditional area is provided in the Supreme Court of Canada decision in the Delgamuukw case in December 1997.
Scientific acceptance of traditional environmental knowledge (TEK) in the natural resource conservation community, by such organizations as the World Conservation Union (IUCN), has also emphasized its role. Traditional knowledge points to the qualities for which Aboriginal peoples value the land. Scholarly analysis based on the methodologies of archaeology, history, ethnography, and related disciplines can contribute to the identification of values but does not play the lead role as in past cultural resource management practice.

Aboriginal peoples in Canada, like indigenous peoples worldwide, approach history not primarily through the western constructs of causal relationship, record, and time sequence, but through cosmology, narrative, and place. Tamara Giles-Vernick observed, for example, in her study of Banda people in the M’Bres region of the Central African Republic, that they express history, or guiriri, as a spatial-temporal phenomenon rather than a temporal sequence of past events (1996: 244-45). Renato Rosaldo’s oral history work with the Ilongot people of the Philippines in the 1970s has shown how place names in themselves become containers of personal memory. “Oral tradition is mapped on the landscape ... events are anchored to place and people use locations in space to speak about events in time” (Cruikshank, 1994: 409). The validity of sources relating to Aboriginal peoples’ history has been an issue on the part of both indigenous peoples and academics, one which the Dene Cultural Institute has long been addressing. Widespread mapping projects in the Northwest Territories, Labrador, northern Quebec, northern Ontario, and Yukon, which appear to have begun with Hugh Brody’s studies for the Alaska pipeline project and Milton Freeman’s studies of Nunavut in the mid-1970s, have documented traditional harvesting areas through oral evidence and place identification. Individual hunters, trappers, fishers, and berry pickers actively participated in identifying lands that they have used and species that they have hunted in their lifetimes, demonstrating the continuity of their traditional economic activity into the 1970s. The impressive degree of consistency among independently prepared maps and the striking extent to which maps from different communities fitted together have persuaded scholars of their reliability (Slim and Thompson, 1995: 52-53). Recent examples of the integration of oral tradition and multi-disciplinary science reflect the sophisticated research approaches now applied to complex historical issues. Dene oral tradition, for example, tells of the dispersal of their ancestors from their homeland long ago following a volcanic eruption; subsequently they became separate linguistic groups. In a recent study, evidences developed from archaeology (such as dendro-chronology and radiocarbon dating techniques), environmental sciences (especially geology), and recent linguistic theory have been connected with traditional narratives of the Hare, Mountain, Chipewyan, Yellowknife and Slavey peoples to create a cohesive story out of the multiple clues. The analysis convincingly locates the
volcanism both geographically, in the White River volcano, Alaska, and chronologically, in A.D.720 (Moodie, Catchpole and Abel, 1992). It thus supports the validity of both oral tradition and science.

**Traditional Knowledge**
What is traditional knowledge? In 1991 the Northwest Territories Traditional Knowledge Working Group defined it as “knowledge derived from, or rooted in the traditional way of life of aboriginal people. Traditional knowledge is accumulated knowledge and understanding of the human place in relation to the universe. This encompasses spiritual relationships, relationships with the natural environment and the use of natural resources, relationships between people, and is reflected in language, social organization, values, institutions, and laws.” Two years later the Government of the Northwest Territories, apparently the first jurisdiction to assign traditional knowledge a formal role in policy, stated it to be: “[k]nowledge and values which have been acquired through experience, observation from the land or from spiritual teachings, and handed down from one generation to the next”. It derives from Aboriginal peoples’ experience in “living for centuries in close harmony” with the land. It means knowing “the natural environment and its resources, the use of natural resources, and the relationship of people to the land and to each other” (cited in Abele, 1997: iii). Emphasizing the fundamental role of relationship to the environment in the lives of Aboriginal peoples, the Dene Cultural Institute has defined traditional environmental knowledge as “a body of knowledge and beliefs transmitted through oral tradition and first-hand observation. It includes a system of classification, a set of empirical observations about the local environment and a system of self-management that governs resource use. Ecological aspects are closely tied to social and spiritual aspects of the knowledge system...” (cited in Stevenson, 1996: 281). Unlike the written word, traditional knowledge is not static, but responds to change through absorbing new information and adapting to its implications.

**Diversity of Aboriginal Experience**
Whether Aboriginal peoples are identified by culture group, language group, or occupancy area, it is widely recognized that their experiences with the land vary from place to place in Canada. Their historical experiences also differ, as do their languages. Their beliefs and practices have forms and traditions specific to their people. Their contemporary environments vary widely, from urban to village to pastoral to traditional living on the land. Stephen Feld and Keith Basso point out, in their introduction to *Senses of Place* (1996: 6), that in 1990 “ethnographic accounts that were centered on native constructions of particular localities – which is to say, the perception and experience of place – were few and far between”. The past decade has seen journal articles, essay collections, conference proceedings, and monographs rectify this deficiency in several ways, while much more remains yet to be done.
George Blondin and Basil Johnston are among Canada’s best known Aboriginal authors who have addressed their own environments to identify and articulate the qualities, meanings, and places of the landscapes in which their cultures have lived for centuries. They have done so in the context of the cultures of their respective peoples and have focussed on traditional narratives of their distinctive groups to explain through stories their relationships to land and place.

Cosmological Relationship to Place
A common perception of human relationship to the land is an integral part of Aboriginal identity. The widespread view of all land as sacred derives from beliefs about cosmic relationships centred on earth and sky, land and water, and perceptions of power and place. The intensity of relationship to the land is based in cosmological and mythological paradigms of experience with the land over centuries. For the Anishinaubaeg people of the Great Lakes region, for example, the sun, earth, moon, and thunder had kinship relationships as father, mother, grandmother, and grandfather. The Creator, Kitche Manitou, brought forth incorporeal beings who embodied the four directions. Mythic stories of Waubun, the east and morning, and Ningobianong, the west and evening, as well as Zeegum, summer, and Bebon, winter, who all engaged in eternal power contests, are moral tales for directing human behaviour among the Anishinaubaeg (Johnston, 1976). To understand the landscape requires an understanding of the related cosmologies. For the Beaver people of the subarctic, for example, the creation story focussed on Muskrat, the diver who brought a speck of dirt from the sea bottom to the earth’s surface, at a point that represented the coming together of trails from the four directions; equally, it focussed on Swan, who flew into the sky and brought back the world and the songs of the seasons. Transformed in vision quest from the boy Swan to culture hero Saya, who travels across the sky as sun and moon, he was the first man to follow the trail of animals and thus established the relationship between hunters and their game. Hunters slept with their heads to the east, the direction of the rising sun, so that they might dream their hunt along the trail of the sun before they experienced it on the physical trail across the land (Ridington, 1990b: 69-73, 91-93).

Certain places embody these cosmological contexts. Ninaistáakis [Chief Mountain] near the Montana/Alberta border, the home of Thunderbird, is sacred among the Niitsitapi [the three Blackfoot-speaking peoples] as the traditional and continuing focus of their spiritual activity (Reeves, 1994: 265-282). For the Lakota people of South Dakota, Bear Butte is a sacred place because it was given to them by the Great Spirit who transformed them. It embodies the seven sacred elements - land, air, water, rocks, animals, plants, and fire - given to them by Wakan Tanka, and they learned there the seven secret rituals, symbolized by the seven stars of the Big Dipper, their place of origin (Forbes-Boyte, 1996: 104-07). The
sacred peaks of the four mountains which enclose the homeland of the Mescalero Apache in New Mexico and Texas are their Four Grandfathers who support the sky; the tipi is a visual metaphor of their cosmology (Carmichael, 1994: 92). For the Cree, the rock which was flooded by the creation of Lake Diefenbaker in Saskatchewan was the gateway between the earth and the underworld. Its explosion in conjunction with the lake construction ended forever their hope that the buffalo, disappeared from the Prairies for nearly a century, would return from their underground sojourn (Dr. George MacDonald, pers.comm).

**Spirit Beings and Places of Power**

Places also embody the journeys of spirit beings who traversed between the ‘Old World’, where humans and animals moved interchangeably between human and animal forms, and the ‘New World’, where they no longer move from one form to another. Others contain the powers of transformers or spirit beings, such as the transformer Xa:ls, the son of the sun, at Th’exelis overlooking the Fraser River (Mohs, 1994: 189-195) and at Xá:ytem National Historic Site (Lee and Henderson, 1992; Smyth, 1997; HSMBC Minutes, November 1997), which are powerful places in the spiritual and religious life of the Stó:lō people of lower mainland British Columbia. Events in the journeys of these spirit beings, such as struggles with other beings and good deeds, are marked on the landscape by tales connected to specific places whose geographical form they frequently shaped. Such stories often focus on the journeys of culture heroes, like Glooscap, the transformer of the Eastern Woodlands, who is credited with creation of the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia (Carpenter, 1985), or Yamoria, the law giver of the Dene in the Northwest Territories (Blondin, 1997). These heroes travelled across the land. Narratives associated directly to a specific people or shared among several peoples record their exploits. The stages of the journeys and exploits of Yamoria and his namesakes of several Aboriginal groups through the Mackenzie Basin can be related to specific features in the landscape (Andrews, 1990). These narratives vary from group to group, but their climax occurs at the same geographical point, Bear Rock on the Mackenzie River, where the several features of the mountain and the archaeological evidence concur in long association. Many Dene regard Bear Rock as a sacred site, and its symbolic importance is reflected in its selection as the logo of the Dene Nation, which represents the relation between the Dene and Deneneh (Hanks, 1993). The Gwich’in cycle of stories of the trickster Raven records how the hollows in the landscape known today at Tsiigehtchic are his camp and bed (Gwich’in Social and Cultural Institute, 1997: 800-07). In northern Quebec sites associated with the travels of the giant beaver still in transformation mode populate the demographically vacant map (Craik and Namagoose, 1992). The main street pattern of Wendake, Quebec follows the mythological route of ancient serpents. Some narratives can be related to periods of time in the life of a people and are distinguished by qualities,
for example, that relate them to the power necessary to manipulate the landscape, to the formation of landscape features, and to making travel safer for the people (Hanks, 1996: 900).

Cosmological relationships and associations with spirit beings identify places of power, where the combination of spirits and place creates environments favourable for spiritual communication. Places of power in the landscape consolidate spiritual energy, strengthening as in vision quest sites, but sometimes malevolent and threatening. Many places of power are sacred sites which intimately link the physical and spiritual worlds. As Nicholas Saunders explains, “sacred landscapes are a manifestation of world-views, which populate a geographical area with a distinctive array of mythical, religious, or spiritual beings or essences” (Saunders, 1994: 172). Identification of sites along two trails in the Dogrib landscape, for example, differentiated five categories of sacred sites to which Dogrib elders accorded recognition: places where the activities of culture heroes are associated with landscape features; sites inhabited by giant, usually malevolent and dangerous, “spirit animals”; locations where the dreaming activities of culture heroes intersected the landscape; places where important resources, such as stone and ochre, are found; and graves. Twenty sacred sites associated with culture hero Yamòzhah and his exploits in making the land safe were identified along the Idaà Trail (Andrews, Zoe, and Herter, 1998: 307-14). Some places of power are reserved for shamans. Over time, the power of transformation between human and animal came to belong only to selected leaders, shamans who possessed medicine power but were proscribed from sharing their knowledge at the risk of losing their capacities. In Dene culture, the medicine power of shamans is a spirit, with a mind of its own, which attaches to them and gives them supernatural abilities (Blondin, 1997: 51-53).

All sacred sites and other places of power are respected; they are approached through rules of conduct, customs, rituals, ceremonies, and offerings. “While ... travelling across the landscape one must constantly mitigate the impact of personal actions by appeasing these entities with votive offerings, and by observing strict rules of behaviour.... In the Dogrib vernacular, it is said that these places, and the entities inhabiting them, are being ‘paid’.” (Andrews and Zoe, 1997). Interfaces between land and water are often such places where power lies, for example the whirlpools in Kitselas Canyon, British Columbia. Mnjikaning Fish Fence at Atherley Narrows in Ontario, where two lakes converge, exemplifies similar power; fish arrive annually, and band councils bring together different peoples who are fed by the abundant resources (Sheryl Smith, pers.comm.). Sites where people obtain materials used in ceremonial activities, such as mineral resources and native plants which are key elements of spiritual practices, are also places of power. The spirits residing in such places guide the daily activities of people in their lives on the land. They also
provide guidance for the placement of camps, the timing of crossing water, crossing points on rivers, and successful approaches to the hunt.

**Narratives and Place Names**

Traditional narratives record the locations of sacred sites and other places of importance. Knowledge of these places is passed from generation to generation through narratives, instructional travel, and place names. “Legends are from the land, and even though there were no maps, the stories made maps for the people”. (cited in Hanks, 1996: 889). Traditional knowledge relates contemporary Aboriginal cultures directly to these places. “The Sahtu Dene narratives create a mosaic of stories that envelop the cultural landscapes of Grizzly Bear Mountain and Scented Grass Hills. The web of ‘myth and memory’ spread beyond the mountains to cover the whole western end of Great Bear Lake, illustrating the complexity of the Sahtu Dene’s landscape tradition” (HSMBC Minutes, November 1996). Journeys, or itineraries or routes to use other terms, move through landscapes; many indicators help travellers find their way. Stars, each with its own story, can guide at night. Geographic features may be natural, as in headlands, fords, or trees, or they may be built by humans to show the way to others who will follow along the course, such as inuksuit. In addition to narratives, place names focus and sustain traditional knowledge related to the land. Often focal points in traditional narratives told to guide the traveller on his way across the land, place names are key elements in stories passed from one generation to the next to enable them to continue the cultural activities of the group which has occupied an area over a long period of time. “Through narrative associated with a place, they reflect aspects of culture which imbue the location with meaning” (Andrews, 1990). Recent field work focussed on traditional place names and narratives in the North Slave Dogrib claim area, which has documented nearly 350 Dogrib place names, has shown that “[a]s part of a knowledge system, traditional place names serve as memory ‘hooks’ on which to hang the cultural fabric of a narrative tradition. In this way, physical geography ordered by place names is transformed into a social landscape where culture and topography are symbolically fused” (Andrews and Zoe, 1997; Andrews, 1990: 4). For both the Dene and the Inuit, some tales comprise mainly lists of places. Among their circumpolar neighbours, the Saami in Finnish Lapland, examination of place names has also shown the important topographic role they play in that culture (Rankama, 1993). But perception of place is not merely visual. For the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea, poetic song texts comprised of place names and communicated through voice evoke the sounds and meanings of the landscape, of its forest, flowing water, and activities (Feld, 1996: 91-96). Pointing to the importance of place names, Isabel McBryde, an Australian archaeologist working with associative cultural landscapes of Aboriginal people, observes that “if we call [Ayers Rock] Uluru we re-contextualise it as a place of major significance
to the Aboriginal people of that part of Central Australia, its values rooted in the spiritual affinities between people and land in Aboriginal culture” (McBryde, 1995: 9).

**Social and Economic Life on the Land**

Inter-connectedness rather than categorization characterizes Aboriginal relationships to the land. Traditional lifeways integrated economic, spiritual, and social aspects of life in use areas over centuries. For the Stó:lō, “the people of the river”, for example, life centred on the Fraser River; the river is a living force, and its resources sustained them and their spiritual sites bordered it (Mohs, 1994: 185-188). In the Mackenzie Basin, Dene elders of Fort Good Hope observed a relationship among use, place, and toponymy. In order to understand why they camp where they do, they indicated, it was necessary to examine how they use the land, and to do that a knowledge of place names was critical (Hanks and Pokotylo, 1989: 142). Collignon has noted that the toponymic system is one of the most efficient sources of information on spatial organization (Collignon, 1993: 78). For the Copper Inuit in the 20th century, changes in knowledge areas accompanied variations in land use patterns that derived from changes in primary economic activity, such as from hunting to trapping, as some areas were no longer visited and once named places were forgotten. Over time, movement patterns and the season of social gathering changed, although seasonal alternance continued. Permanent settlements in the late 1970s altered the occupation pattern from a polarized to a central one (Collignon, 1993).

Enduring life on the land has characterized Aboriginal experience since time immemorial. The seasonal round of yearly activities, its associated places and patterns of movement, shaped traditional lifeways. As animals and marine resources changed with the seasons, they patterned the movements and activities of peoples, who depended on them for food as well as materials for clothing, shelter, tools, and other necessities. In Nunavut, some species “could only be taken at particular times or places: caribou where they were slowed on their long migrations, char in the shallows of their spawning runs, geese during their moult, the great seasonal arrival of whales ... - all of these shaped the movement of Inuit. Every useful thing from the blueberry to the bowhead whale had a time and place when it could most easily or safely be taken, or required special skills to take it in different seasons” (Goldring, 1998). In eastern Nova Scotia, Mi’kmaq camped on the coast during spring and summer, moving inland for eel runs on the rivers in the fall, and hunting moose, caribou, beaver and bear in the winter (Mi’kmaq, 1994). On the Kazan River, caribou crossing points determined camping areas (Keith, 1995: 856). Interaction with the land in daily life - processes and on-going activities - demanded intimate knowledge and understanding of the physical environment: weather, ecosystem, plants and animals, and continuous change.
Success in hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering plants for food and medicinal use requires acute observation, accumulated knowledge, and understanding of the natural environment, its processes and indicators. The Plains peoples’ skillful use over centuries of topography, winds, and animal behaviour to drive buffalo over a dramatic precipice to be butchered at its base is today presented at Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, Alberta. Among Aboriginal people, successful hunting also compels observance of the living forces of the land; knowledge and respect for the land and its spirits are integral to living with it. As Harvey Feit has explained so vividly for the Cree of northern Quebec, the hunt is not an isolated event, but a stage in an on-going process that involves reciprocal relationships of power, needs, obligations, and moral responsibilities among creator, spirits, hunter, animal, and community. To achieve success, hunters must plan carefully and behave towards both spirits and animals in a respectful manner. Recognizing human characteristics in animals, they hunt in accordance with mutually understood signs. They acknowledge the gift of a successful hunt by sharing its bounty not only with their kin and community but also with the spirits who can favour their future efforts (Feit, 1995). A boy among the Inuit in Nunavut or northwest Greenland making his first catch distributes it among members of the community; “the first catch celebration is a recognition of the boy’s development as a hunter and of the relationship he begins to nurture with his environment” (Nuttall, 1992; Goldring, 1998). The tradition of sharing was widespread in the subarctic, where starvation was an on-going risk, as the Dene’s allowing Franklin’s second expedition (1825-27) to use the Deline fishery on Great Bear Lake illustrated (Hanks, 1996).

Annual social gatherings brought together, typically over the summer, extended families or households who wintered separately in diffused areas within the territories of their larger affiliations. Kinship often grouped the families or households who wintered together; it also identified the territories where they hunted and trapped. The larger summer gatherings often extended the sometimes elaborate kinship network. Barter and exchange between Aboriginal peoples extended both access to scarce materials and kinship relationships. These periods provided opportunity for renewing social relationships, weddings, and other celebrations. They were also the occasion for feasts, games, dances, songs, and other traditional customs. Such activities provided opportunities to instruct children in traditional knowledge and to develop their skills for living on the land. The Abitibi8innik, for example, congregated to fish, socialize and trade at Abitibi Point, on Abitibi Lake, the centre of their territory; at their height ca. 1910, about a thousand people of several groups gathered (Société Matcите8eia, 1996). Waterfront locations, with abundant resources, were favoured places for summer assemblies. Such gathering places were often associated with traditional narratives that reinforced
the identity of the group, as stories told by Elders at Arviat and Kazan River illustrate (Henderson, 1995; Keith, 1995). Many groups identify summer gathering places to which they returned over centuries as among the most important places representing their heritage.

**Traditional Environmental Knowledge**

Numerous studies involving traditional environmental knowledge (TEK) and science as partners have demonstrated the intensive knowledge of natural processes, ecological indicators, faunal behaviour, and techniques for survival and safety in an often hostile environment. Recent studies, for example sharp-tailed grouse in the Fort Albany First Nation and caribou among the Inuit, have likewise shown its fragility in the face of permanent settlements and cultural change (Tsuji, 1996; Thorpe, 1997; Ferguson and Messier, 1997; Huntington, 1998). The skills inherent in living on and with the land, such as observation, interpretation, and adaptation, are related not only to traditional knowledge but also to continuing practice through traditional lifeways. The extensive studies have also intensified Aboriginal concerns about misinterpretation, appropriation, and misuse of their "intellectual property" (Stevenson, 1996: 279). The complexity of Aboriginal understanding of the land and its resources is evident in language, and one of the reasons language is currently a key concern. Study of the James Bay Cree hunting culture, for example, revealed five basic meanings associated with the root term for hunting, nitao. The culture combines cosmological, ecological and psychological aspects of Cree life and beliefs that include complex relationships between the hunter and the hunted (Feit, 1995). Aboriginal people define their relationship as belonging to the land, and they see themselves as one element of a fully integrated environment. As Charles Johnson explains, "we, as Native people, are part of the Arctic ecosystem. We are not observers, not managers; our role is to participate as a part of the ecosystem" (Johnson, 1997: 3). As such, humans co-exist with fauna and flora, with equal rights to life. In this belief lies commitment to respect for all living things. In the words of Dene Elder George Blondin, "We are people of the land; we see ourselves as no different than the trees, the caribou, and the raven, except we are more complicated" (Blondin, 1997: 18).

**Associative Values of Place**

As the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples reported, for Aboriginal people, "land is deeply intertwined with identity ... concepts of territory, traditions, and customs are not divisible in our minds" (Canada, 1996: IV, 137). Associative cultural landscapes, while rooted in land, focus recognition of values not on design or material evidences, but on the spiritual significance of place. In some landscapes, material evidences and design decisions relating to them will be prominent, but the spiritual
values of the place may be equally important. The cosmological and mythological associations of sacred places and the continuing cultural relationship to the spirits and power of these places characterize many landscapes important to Aboriginal people in Canada, as to indigenous people in many parts of the world. Narratives and place names bequeathed from generation to generation relate these spiritual associations directly to the land. Traditional life, rooted in intimate knowledge of the natural environment, focussed on seasonal movement, patterned by movements of animals, marine resources and the hunt. Kinship, social relationships, and reciprocal obligations linked people in this complex round sustained for centuries. The inter-connectedness of all aspects of human life with the living landscape – in social and spiritual relationships as much as in harvesting – continuously over time roots Aboriginal cultures in the land.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPES
Landscapes have always been seen in many different ways by different viewers. In a seminal article, geographer D.W. Meinig identified ten perspectives on the same landscape, ranging from landscape as wealth to landscape as system. Each accentuated a different aspect of value in the landscape. As he pointed out, “any landscape is composed not only of what lies before our eyes but what lies within our heads” (Meinig, 1976). Noting the “tremendous variation in status, meaning, and usage of the term ‘landscape’ today” and the different purpose that landscape serves for each of the many disciplines with an interest in it, Eugene J. Palka has observed that each has a different focus, objectives, scales of analysis, epistemologies, and methodologies. The commonalities which he finds lie in an emphasis on that which is visible, an understanding that landscapes evolve through a process of human–land interaction, a recognition of a time dimension, as it pertains to landscape evolution, and a vagueness surrounding the spatial dimension or areal extent of a landscape (Palka, 1995). In Australia landscape architect Ken Taylor has observed that the preconceptions of landscape on the part of colonials and Aborigines there were different, but both reflected a concept of place, inherent experiential qualities, constructs informed by memory and myths, and links of the past with the present and future (Taylor, 1997). Anthropologists and Aboriginal people working on traditional use studies and undertaking to re-establish cultural landscapes on the West Coast have applied this dilemma to ways of seeing west coast landscapes: in contrast to the visitor and the scientist, who perceive wilderness in Gwaii Haanas, the Haida people see their homeland, Haida Gwaii, rich with the historical and spiritual evidences of their centuries-long occupation.

Defining Cultural Landscapes: World Heritage
The concept of cultural landscapes is a relatively new one in the heritage conservation movement, but in the past 10 years it has
emerged as a significant way of looking at place that focuses not on monuments but on the relationship between human activity and the natural environment. After nearly a decade of debate, in 1992 the World Heritage Committee, the administrative body for the World Heritage Convention, adopted a definition for cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value, agreeing that “Cultural landscapes represent the ‘combined works of nature and of man’ ... illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal” (UNESCO, 1996a). Its three main categories - the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man, the organically evolved landscape: relict or continuing, and the associative cultural landscape - provide an elementary identification of types that can encompass the wide range of cultural landscapes around the world.

In the six years since cultural landscapes were added to the list of properties eligible for nomination to the World Heritage List, designed, organically evolved, and associative cultural landscapes have all been inscribed. Many landscapes embody characteristics of all three types. In the designed landscape, however, it is anticipated that aesthetic considerations will prevail over other values. By virtue of their organic nature and human use over time, all landscapes may be said to have evolved. The essence of the organically evolved cultural landscape, whether relict or continuing, is that its most significant values lie in the material evidences of its evolution from a cultural initiative to its present form, in association with the natural environment. Examples inscribed on the World Heritage List to date have been identified consistently under the criteria of “an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history” and “an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change”. They have been primarily agricultural and village settlement landscapes, such as the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, and the Costiera Amalfitana and Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands in Italy. (http://www.unesco.org/whc/nwhc/pages/sites/main.htm)

Writing for the Australian Heritage Commission for the 1996 State of the Environment Report, Jane Lennon finds that, in general, the World Heritage categories apply to the cultural landscapes of Australia. She elaborates (Lennon, 1997: 2.2):

A common thread running through the definitions [of cultural landscapes] is the human use of the landscape and how we see the resultant cultural landscape as an expression of past
human attitudes and values. The relationship between people and place has created patterns in the landscape in addition to those created by the operation of biophysical systems. Landscape is seen primarily as a cultural artefact, consisting of the tangible remains left on the land by present and earlier cultures. These tangible remains form layers in the landscape. Within the layers are human meanings related to the fact that landscapes are a record of history where memory, symbolism and signs of the past, as well as tangible physical remains, are held. Herein lies the basis for contemporary cultural significance found in landscapes because meanings are at the heart of community attachment to places and to the development of cultural heritage values.

**Associative Cultural Landscapes**

Associative cultural landscapes mark a significant move away from conventional heritage concepts rooted in physical resources, whether the monuments of cultural heritage or wilderness in natural heritage. They also accentuate the indivisibility of cultural and natural values in cultural landscapes. While many landscapes have religious, artistic or cultural associations, associative cultural landscapes are distinguished by their associations with the natural environment rather than by their material evidences, which may be minimal or entirely absent. The range of natural features associated with cosmological, symbolic, sacred, and culturally significant landscapes may be very broad: mountains, caves, outcrops, coastal waters, rivers, lakes, pools, hillsides, uplands, plains, woods, groves, trees. A 1995 workshop on associative cultural landscapes, held in the Asia-Pacific region "where the link between the physical and spiritual aspects of landscape is so important", elaborated on their essential characteristics (http://www.unesco.org/whc/archive/cullan95.htm):

Associative cultural landscapes may be defined as large or small contiguous or non-contiguous areas and itineraries, routes, or other linear landscapes - these may be physical entities or mental images embedded in a people’s spirituality, cultural tradition and practice. The attributes of associative cultural landscapes include the intangible, such as the acoustic, the kinetic and the olfactory, as well as the visual.

Cultural landscapes associated with indigenous peoples are most likely to fit in this category. Three properties have been added to the World Heritage List as cultural landscapes for their cultural and spiritual associations with a people: Togariro National Park in New Zealand for its cultural and religious significance to the Maori people, Uluru-Kata Tjuta in Australia for the traditional belief system of the Anangu people, one of the oldest human societies in the world, and the Laponian Area in Sweden, home of the Saami people, the biggest and one of the last
places with an ancestral way of life based on the seasonal movement of livestock. All are also inscribed for their natural values. (http://www.unesco.org/whc/nwhc/pages/sites/main.htm)

**Canadian Approach**
In the past decade national heritage agencies have recognized cultural landscapes within their various cultural resource management programs. Parks Canada defines them as “Any geographical area that has been modified, influenced, or given special cultural meaning by people” (Parks Canada, 1994a: 119) and has included them in the National Historic Sites System Plan. Designated national historic sites include all three types of cultural landscapes: parks and gardens as designed landscapes, urban and rural historic districts as evolved landscapes, and several associative cultural landscapes related to the history of Aboriginal peoples (see below). Most provinces have developed an approach to cultural landscapes [eg Ontario and Nova Scotia: http://www.gov.on.ca/MCZCR/english/culdiv/heritage/landscap.htm, http://www.ednet.ns.ca/educ/museum/mnh/nature/nhns/t12/t12-2.htm], but both the provinces and the territories have generally used an archaeological rather than a cultural landscapes approach to the commemoration of Aboriginal heritage [Appendix D]. They recognize, however, that some designated sites, such as Writing-on-Stone Provincial Park in Alberta and White Mountain on Lake Mistassini in Quebec, have cultural landscape values. British Columbia’s traditional use studies program (British Columbia, 1996) and Yukon’s address to Aboriginal values of place in its planning processes are examples of other approaches to recognizing cultural landscapes. Aboriginal decision-makers, as well, have their own approach, including toponymy for the management of symbolic values.

**American Approach**
The key management guideline of the US National Park Service, *Cultural Resource Management Guideline NPS 28*, states that a cultural landscape is “a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values”. It identifies four types of cultural landscapes: historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, historic sites, and ethnographic landscapes, describing the latter as “a landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources” (Birnbaum, 1994: 1-2). While one type of landscape normally dominates the heritage character of a site, places often contain components of more than one type: that is, “landscape units which contribute to the significance of the landscape and can be further subdivided into individual features”. Petroglyph National Monument in New Mexico contains potentially significant cultural landscapes of three of the four types: pre-contact vernacular component landscape, historic vernacular component landscape, historic designed component landscape, and
ethnographic landscape of special traditional and cultural meaning to the Pueblo (http://www.nps.gov/planning/petr/appdxg.htm). Nora Mitchell, Director of NPS’s Conservation Study Institute, has noted in her examination of the identification, evaluation, and management of cultural landscapes in the United States (Mitchell, 1996: 70-80) that the most important quality of cultural landscapes is their unifying perspective. They link all the resources—cultural and natural—together in a place. Typically, these resources as they now exist are the direct expression of natural and cultural processes. Traditional livelihoods in certain areas maintain significant biological systems, including ecological communities as well as vegetation features. Natural resources thus become part of the historic fabric of the cultural landscape. Vegetation may be considered a living cultural resource, part of the site’s material culture, reflecting historical changes of land use and traditional management regimes (Meier and Mitchell, 1990). Separately from its cultural landscapes initiative, the National Park Service recognizes traditional cultural properties for “their association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that are rooted in that community’s history and are important in maintaining the continuing, cultural identity of the community”. A location associated with the traditional beliefs of a Native American group about its origins, its cultural history, or the nature of the world, or a location where Native American religious practitioners have historically gone, and are known or thought to go today, to perform ceremonial activities in accordance with traditional cultural rules of practice are examples of such properties. The term “culture” is understood to mean “the traditions, beliefs, practices, lifeways, arts, crafts, and social institutions of any community, be it an Indian tribe, a local ethnic group, or the people of the nation as a whole” (Parker and King, 1990:1).

**Australian Approach**

Australia has been a leader in applying the idea of cultural landscapes to lands associated with Aboriginal people in its territory. Once the World Heritage Convention acknowledged cultural landscapes, it moved rapidly to inscribe the cultural associations of the Anangu people with Uluru-Kata Tjuta along with the natural values listed earlier and has encapsulated these values in its co-management regime and management plan (Uluru-Kata Tjuta, 1991). As early as 1984 Australia had already enacted the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Protection Act “to preserve and protect places, areas, and objects of particular significance to Aboriginals and for related purposes” (Australia, 1984). Intended to approach Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage from an indigenous perspective, it specified that a “Significant Aboriginal Area” was an area of land or water in Australian jurisdiction “of particular significance to Aboriginals in accordance with Aboriginal tradition”. In the context of the act, “Aboriginal tradition” was defined as “the body of traditions, observances,
customs and beliefs of Aboriginals generally or of a particular community or group of Aboriginals, and includes any such traditions, observances, customs or beliefs relating to particular persons, areas, objects or relationships" (Australia, 1984: I.3(1)). The 1996 Plain English Guide to the legislation confirms the original intention: “The Act is not concerned with historical or archaeological values, but instead recognizes heritage values of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people today” (Australia, 1996: 5). The national Australian Heritage Commission recognizes the “unique position of indigenous heritage” (Australian Heritage Commission, 1997):

Indigenous people were the first Australians. Their heritage is intimately linked with the landscape, beliefs, and customs. Indigenous people perceive the 'natural' environment as a cultural landscape which is the product of human activities over at least 60 000 years - time immemorial.

Indigenous heritage includes those cultural landscapes and places, intellectual property, knowledge, skeletal remains, artefacts, beliefs, customs/practices, and languages that are important to Australia's indigenous people.

**New Zealand’s Approach**

In New Zealand, in addition to initiating the listing of Tongariro National Park as the first cultural landscape on the World Heritage List, the Department of Conservation’s “Historic Heritage Management Review” recognizes that “[t]he ancestral landscapes of iwi, hapu and whanau are inseparable from the identity and well-being of Maori as tangata whenua” and that “[t]he maintenance of ancestral relationships with wahi tapu is a major issue for Maori”. It defines such landscapes as “all land where the ancestors lived and sought resources. They include wahi tapu and sites of significance to Maori”. Wahi tapu is identified as “a place sacred to Maori in the traditional, spiritual, religious, ritual or mythological sense. Wahi tapu may be specific sites or may refer to a general location. They may be: urupa (burial sites); sites associated with birth or death; sites associated with ritual, ceremonial worship, or healing practices; places imbued with the mana of chiefs or tupuna; battle sites or other places where blood has been spilled; landforms such as mountains and rivers having traditional or spiritual associations” (Department of Conservation, 1998). ICOMOS New Zealand’s new Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value explicitly endorses recognition of the indigenous heritage of Maori and Moriori as well as principles for its conservation (1998: sec.2). Definition of “place” in the charter also enlarges the important earlier concept of Australia’s Burra Charter (1998: sec.22):

**place** means any land, including land covered by water, and the airspace forming the spatial context to such land, including
any landscape, traditional site or sacred place, and anything fixed to the land including any archaeological site, garden, building or structure, and any body of water, whether fresh or seawater, that forms part of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand.

The explicit address to water, sea, and airspace as well as land is particularly useful in focussing attention on the interface of cultural heritage and resources traditionally considered to be natural.

Wilderness to Cultural Landscape
The emergence of cultural landscapes as an integral part of cultural heritage coincided with international recognition in the natural heritage community that areas long identified as pristine wilderness and celebrated for their ecological values untouched by human activity were the homelands of indigenous peoples. Their management of those landscapes has often altered the original ecological system, but it has equally contributed to the biological diversity that has long been regarded as a prime value of wilderness (McNeely, 1995). The World Heritage Convention guidelines make this relationship explicit: “cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity” (UNESCO, 1996a: cl. 38). The intimacy of the relationship between cultural diversity and biological diversity has given new strength to the World Conservation Union (IUCN)’s category V, protected landscapes: “an area of land, with coast and sea as appropriate, where the interaction of people and nature over time has produced an area of distinct character with significant aesthetic, ecological, and/or cultural value, and often with high biological diversity,” and has expanded its applicability beyond its traditional identification with European places.

Intangible Values and Identity
The concept of “cultural landscapes” has thus become widely accepted internationally by diverse heritage bodies, including Parks Canada. While individual definitions vary, their direction focusses consistently on the inter-relatedness between human society and the natural environment. Leading participants in the international heritage movement, where Canada is also an active party, have overtly recognized cultural landscapes which are characterized by the intangible values that indigenous peoples attach to landscape. In according heritage status to places with
NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE DESIGNATIONS OF ABORIGINAL CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Over the past thirty years the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada has recommended a number of places associated with the cultures of Aboriginal peoples for designation as national historic sites. Their recommendations mirror the historiography of their various decision periods. As early as 1969, the Board recognized the Inukshuks at Enusko Point, Baffin Island, Northwest Territories as of national significance. In keeping with the perspective of the time, it saw them primarily as archaeological artifacts rather than holistically as part of a multi-dimensional cultural landscape (Stoddard, 1969). A range of other designated sites in several parts of the country reflect this scientific approach to the identification of values, which situated them within the traditional scholarly disciplines of archaeology, history, or art history. Their scope, boundaries, and significance were normally described by the archaeological investigations which had been carried out, sometimes accompanied by professional historical or ethnological studies, and their values were defined by such established criteria as the exceptional or outstanding example of a culture (see Federal Archaeology Office 1998a, App. B). Limited scale often characterized them, as at the fish weir at Atherley Narrows [Mnjikaning] in Ontario or the mysterious Cluny Earthlodge Village in Alberta. Some sites were designated for their historical significance as defined by Canadian national history, such as Batoche for its role in the North West Rebellion/Resistance of 1885. Other places became national historic sites because of their cultural expression as art, for example the Peterborough Petroglyphs in Ontario or Ninstints, the Haida village in British Columbia. A few large sites, such as Port au Choix in Newfoundland and Debert/Belmont in Nova Scotia, were identified for their culture history, which was analysed through archaeological evidence, not through cultural associations.

The practice of designating sites related to the history of Aboriginal peoples primarily on the basis of archaeological evidence reflected standard approaches in the heritage community nationally and internationally. As recently as 1990, Australian archaeologist Isabel McBayde observed that all Australian properties then inscribed on the World Heritage List for their Aboriginal cultural record were documented primarily in scientific terms, rather than in terms of the continuity of Aboriginal culture. She observed, moreover, that all were large tracts of land, in fact cultural landscapes, “with a range of diverse places which testify to cultural change and human interaction with the
landscape, interaction that is at once symbolic, religious and economic" (McBryde, 1990: 18). Since then, while there has been no move to diminish archaeological values, institutional standards have moved to ensure the participation of associated living communities in the identification of perspectives and values as well as in the management of cultural landscapes.

The Perspective of the 1990s
Under the Commemoration of Northern Native History initiative of 1990-91, the Board explored issues and a preliminary classification of sites related to the commemoration of the history of Native people. That year the Board recommended that sites of spiritual and/or cultural importance to Native peoples, generally should be considered to be eligible for designation as national historic sites even when no tangible cultural resources exist providing that there is evidence, garnered through oral history, or otherwise, that such sites are indeed seen to have special meaning to the culture in question and that the sites themselves are fixed in space (HSMBC Minutes, February 1990).

Background papers identified that “from a Native perspective commemorative potential seemed to derive from one or a combination of the following: the traditional and enduring use of the land; the relationship between the people and the land; and recent events in a first nation’s history, such as its relationships with newcomers...” (Goldring, 1990; Goldring and Hanks, 1991). Inspired by a presentation on the Red Dog Mountain and the Drum Lake Trail in the western Northwest Territories, the Board took particular interest in exploring the significance of mythical or sacred sites and in the potential of “linear sites or trails encompassing a number of tangible resources ... and emphasizing linkages between a people and the land” (HSMBC Minutes, March 1991). As a result of formal and informal consultations during 1990-91, it was apparent that any framework for addressing Aboriginal history must conform with emerging prescriptions in successive northern land claims regarding heritage and cultural sites (Lee, 1997b); must respect Aboriginal world views encapsulated in the enduring relationship between people and the land; and to achieve the latter objective, must recognize

[what distinguishes Native Peoples’ understanding, however, is the extent to which the human relationship with places has ethical, cultural, medicinal and spiritual elements, which are interwoven with patterns of economic use. Stories are told about particular parts of the land, spiritual powers exist in certain places which are absent elsewhere, and teachings are annexed to specific places in ways that have little counterpart in non-Native society. In Native cultures, these attributes are often more important than the physical, tangible remains of past human use of land. (Goldring and
Hanks, 1991: 14)

The latter holistic vision has proven the most difficult to implement. By 1991, the Board had already before them a basic outline of perceptions, issues, and structures for approaching northern Aboriginal sites that would gradually and increasingly direct their considerations and recommendations on the commemoration of the history of Aboriginal peoples for the rest of the decade. The decision not to proceed with a study of petroglyphs and pictographs and to shift resources to community-based studies marked a key stage. The Board has come only gradually, through a series of thematic and site specific studies, to consider how effectively the values of Aboriginal peoples in relation to their history can define national historic significance and identify places that embody that significance. In moving from a focus in scientific knowledge to a focus in Aboriginal traditional knowledge, from types of sites (e.g. trails, sacred sites) to places that embody traditional narratives and spiritual meaning along with economic use, and from criteria to guidelines for directing their assessments, the Board has, however, begun to evolve an approach to commemorating the history of Aboriginal peoples that is based both in Aboriginal values and in the significance of Aboriginal places to all Canadians. The concept of cultural landscapes, rooted in the interaction of culture and the natural environment in all its dimensions, epitomizes this approach.

Consultation and Participation
The movement from viewing objects through perspectives of art history and archaeology, characteristic of the HSMBC’s experience in commemorating Aboriginal history from the late 1960s through the 1980s, to seeing cultural landscapes associated with living peoples reflects the new standards of the 1990s. One of the key implications of this redefinition in approaching landscapes is the involvement of associated peoples directly in the selection, research design, designation, and management of places of heritage significance. The 1980s saw transition in research strategies from culture history to ethno-archaeology in studies, for example, of the Mackenzie Basin in the Northwest Territories and of Stó:lō sites in British Columbia (Hanks and Pokotylo, 1989; Lee and Henderson, 1992). The more active involvement of Dene and Métis in the former area reflects in part a response to the fact that “the Dene are tired of being simply the object of inquiry and are becoming inquirers in their own right” (Hanks and Pokotylo, 1989: 139). The Traditional Environmental Knowledge Pilot Project of the Dene Cultural Institute, started in 1989, exemplifies the participatory action research in which indigenous peoples have primary involvement in the direction of studies which serve their needs, including research design and implementation, “the accepted approach to the study of TEK” (Johnson, 1995: 116). The active involvement of Aboriginal people, particularly Elders, has refocused the investigative effort from the analysis of physical resources to
recognition of the holistic and essentially spiritual relationship of people and land.

Experience in the 1990s endorses the crucial nature of this role. When the petroglyphs at Kejimkujik National Park, Nova Scotia, were initially identified for commemoration, they were seen as the primary cultural resources of the park. Consultation with the Mi’kmaq people reoriented the commemorative focus from the single resource type to the whole park area. Arguing the “strong sense of connection between people and place”, the paper prepared jointly by representatives of the Mi’kmaq people and Parks Canada’s Atlantic regional office proposed three bases for commemoration of the “cultural landscape” of the region: the 4000 year history of traditional land use in which the archaeological resources were largely undisturbed; the natural environment of the park which enhanced an understanding of Mi’kmaq spirituality with the land; and the petroglyph sites, which are a significant part of Mi’kmaq cultural and spiritual expression (Mi’kmaq, 1994). The HSMBC recommended that: “the cultural landscape of Kejimkujik National Park which attests to 4000 years of Mi’kmaq occupancy of this area, and which includes petroglyph sites, habitation sites, fishing sites, hunting territories, travel routes and burials, is of national historic significance...” (HSMBC Minutes, November 1994). Equally, when Parks Canada initiated a commemorative integrity exercise at Nunsting [Ninstints] National Historic Site, British Columbia, consultation with the hereditary chiefs argued for recognition of heritage values that identified not only the achievements of Haida art and architecture represented by the village – the focus of the National Historic Site and World Heritage Site designations – but also “the history of a people in a place”: the continuing Haida culture and history, the connectedness of the Haida to the land and the sea, the sacredness of the site, and its role as the visual key to the oral traditions of the Haida over thousands of years (Dick and Wilson, 1998). Both examples demonstrate Parks Canada’s move to implement three principles resulting from the National Workshops on the History of Aboriginal Peoples in Canada in 1992–94: fundamental importance of Aboriginal traditional knowledge to the understanding of the culture and history of all indigenous peoples; meaningful participatory consultations with Aboriginal groups; and Aboriginal peoples’ taking a leading role in presenting their history and culture (Parks Canada, 1994b). Involvement of Dogrib Elders in extensive studies along the Idaà Trail in the Northwest Territories similarly expanded the initial research design from a survey of traditional sites and documentation of Dogrib place names and narratives to documentation of sacred sites, travelling using traditional methods, and developing a training program in archaeological methods and recording of oral traditions for Dogrib youth (Andrews and Zoe, 1997: 8-10). In the resulting six category classification of sacred sites, Elders recognized five categories but not a sixth which represented identifications of significance from outside their
Recent research projects submitted to the HSMBC have consistently and actively included involvement and consultation of local communities, including Elders. In July 1998 the HSMBC once again “reaffirmed the principle ... that consideration of Aboriginal Peoples’ history must be predicated on active participation and consultation” (HSMBC Minutes).

**Designated Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes**

Since 1990 the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada has considered a number of Aboriginal cultural landscapes [see Appendix A]. As early as 1991, Hatzic Rock, now known as Xá:ytem, in British Columbia presented not only archaeological evidences of potential national significance but also the importance of this transformer site in terms of Aboriginal cultural values. Drawing directly on Gordon Mohs’ research on the Stó:lō people, it demonstrated the cosmological relationships that underpinned its role as a sacred site (Lee and Henderson, 1991). Cost-sharing recommended in 1998, following consultation with the Stó:lō people, endorsed the Board’s acceptance of the exceptional national significance of sites valued primarily for their spiritual importance to Aboriginal peoples.

The inland Kazan River Fall Caribou Crossing site and the coastal island of Arvia’juaq with the adjacent point Qikiqtaarjuk in the Eastern Arctic, designated in 1995, provide exceptional illustrations of the integrated economic, social and spiritual values of Aboriginal cultural landscapes. Chosen respectively by the communities of Baker Lake and Arviat to conserve and depict Inuit history and culture in this area, these areas “speak eloquently to the cultural, spiritual and economic life of the Inuit in the Keewatin region ... and as sites of particular significance to the respective communities” (HSMBC Minutes, July 1995). The results of earlier archaeological investigations, mapping using a global positioning system, on site visits with Elders, oral interviews with other knowledgeable Inuit informants in the communities, and recording of traditional stories associated with the areas identified the traditional Aboriginal values and the scientific values associated with these places (Keith, 1995; Henderson, 1995). The approved plaque texts articulate the associative and physical values of these cultural landscapes:

For centuries, the fall caribou crossing on the Kazan River was essential to the inland Inuit, providing them the necessities of daily life and the means to survive the long winter. Once in the water, the caribou were vulnerable to hunters in qajaqs who caught and lanced as many as possible. The Inuit cherished and cared for the land at crossing areas in accordance with traditional beliefs and practices to ensure the caribou returned each year during their southward migration. To inland Inuit, the caribou was the essence of life. All parts were valuable for food, fuel, tools, clothing
and shelter.

For centuries, the Inuit returned here each summer to camp and harvest the abundant marine resources. These gatherings also provided an opportunity to teach the young, celebrate life, and affirm and renew Inuit society. The oral histories, traditional knowledge, and archaeological sites at Arvia'juaq and Qikiqtaarjuk provide a cultural and historical foundation for future generations. These sites continue to be centres to celebrate, practise, and rejuvenate Inuit culture in the Arviat area.

Presented by the Société Matcite8eia and the Aboriginal community of Pikogan, Quebec in 1996, Abitibi is a point in Lake Abitibi, the centre of the traditional territory of the Abitibi8innik and of the water routes they used to travel through vast areas. It is important to the Abitibi8innik as their summer gathering place over centuries, for sharing resources from the winter hunt, for fishing, feasting and social relationships, and as the place of cultural contact and exchange, both with other Aboriginal people and with Europeans and Canadians. It is also a sacred site to the Abitibi8innik. While use ended with permanent settlement in 1955, Elders' traditional knowledge has been collected and there is "symbolic attachment to the point which is very strong in the collective memory". Archaeological resources indicate 6,000 years of use, including post-contact sites of church, cemetery, fur trading posts, and camp sites. The Société Matcite8eia also identified a rich historical record related to the fur trade as part of the historical significance of the point. The community supports designation of the point to commemorate the history of the Abitibi8innik and seeks to develop it as a historic site (Société Matcite8eia, 1996).

Building on the earlier Northern Native History initiative, the Keewatin area project, and the Deline fishery study (see below), in 1996 Christopher C. Hanks extended the articulation of "the elemental link between ... culture and the land" (Hanks, 1996: 887) as the core basis for understanding the cultural landscape of Grizzly Bear Mountain and Scented Grass Hills in the western Northwest Territories. With a firm base in both local traditional knowledge and the relevant scientific and academic literature, the agenda paper he prepared on behalf of the Sahtu Dene identified three bases for national historical significance: these people had lived on this land since time immemorial, they had evolved there as a distinct people, and the interplay of place names and traditional narratives in Grizzly Bear Mountain and Scented Grass Hills has characterized their relationship to the land (Hanks, 1996: 885, 888). Drawing on a broad archaeological and ethnographic literature of the subarctic, as well as upon extensive oral histories of the Great Bear Lake region, Hanks judiciously presents selected narratives in relation to specific landscape features and larger
landscape meanings. The narratives play important roles in sustaining Sahtu Dene culture by transmitting language, prescribing behaviour, and identifying sacred sites from generation to generation through the association of place and story. By linking places, names, and narratives, he also successfully maps them on topographical representations of the Great Bear Lake region. Five broad periods provide a time framing which serves to group the narratives thematically. George Blondin, whose own narratives of the region are widely read, concurred in the framework while at the same time recognizing it did not come from within his culture. Hanks himself notes that for the Dene, “thematic connections of spiritual power and relationships with animals are more significant than time” (Hanks, 1996: 906). “The rich historical associations between traditional Sahtu Dene narratives and the ‘homes’ of those stories on two of the four headlands that physically divide the arms of Great Bear Lake ... show “the land is alive with stories which blend the natural and supernatural worlds, defining [the Sahtu Dene] as people in relationship to the earth” (Hanks, 1996: 886, 888).

In 1997 the Gwichya Gwich’in of Tsiigehtchic in the western Northwest Territories presented for commemoration, protection, and presentation the segment of the Mackenzie River [Nagwichoonjik] from Thunder River to Point Separation, which they identified as the most significant area of their traditional homeland. Following Hanks’ approach closely, a series of oral narratives of Raven, Atachukaii, Nagaii, Ahts’an Veh, and others are closely tied to the identified land and its defining features (Gwich’in Social and Cultural Institute, 1997). The superimposed five period time grouping of the stories served to develop a “holistic understanding of history, encompassing the whole of the land and assigning the river its meaningful place within it ...[;] the stories of their history and the experiences of their lives on the land ... [are the] fundamental cultural themes [that demonstrate] the important place the river occupies in Gwichya Gwich’in culture” (Gwich’in Social and Cultural Institute, 1997: 824).

In presenting Yuquot in Nootka Sound, British Columbia for designation in 1997, the Mowachaht-Muchalaht First Nations requested “balancing history” by recognition of their history as represented by the integration of place and narrative. In this place “where the wind blows from all directions” and “where all the people of Nootka Sound come together”, they elaborate the significance of Yuquot, their “most important community”, in terms of a “place of power and change”. They describe this centre of the Mowachaht world where they have lived since the beginning of time, where they have hosted travellers since 18th century imperial exploration, where they developed whaling power of which the Whalers’ Washing House is the physical encapsulation, and where they have deep spiritual bonds to the “immense natural power and beauty” of the environment. Western historical values such as archaeological, iconographic, and artifactual evidence as well as primary historical sources
complement traditional knowledge of the central place of Yuquot in their culture (Mowachaht-Muchalaht, 1997).

The recently completed study of the history of Nunavut from an Inuit perspective, based on community consultations and Elders’ judgements and prepared under the guidance of an Inuit steering committee with staff and knowledgeable scholars’ inputs, has identified clear priorities for identifying places of principal importance to the Inuit. Three principles express these thematic priorities: enduring use, Inuit culture, and Inuit identity and regional variation. All centre on the “close traditional relationship between culture and land use, and many traditional dwelling sites, travel routes, resource harvesting sites and sacred places have a rich complex of associative values, combining economic, social, and spiritual purposes in a sequence of annual movements from place to place, with people gathering in greater or smaller numbers according to their needs and opportunities” (Goldring, 1998).

National Historic Sites with Potential Aboriginal Cultural Landscape Values
A number of national historic sites designated prior to 1990 for their archaeological, scientific or historical values have characteristics that identify their potential for recognition as evolved or associative cultural landscapes [see Appendix B]. Commemorated primarily for their capacity through archaeological resources to represent the significant contribution of Aboriginal peoples to Canada over an extended period of time, they are recognized and endorsed by Native peoples in association with their cultural heritage. Batoche, Saskatchewan (NHS 1923, 1985, 1989) is a site of enduring importance to the Métis people as their key settlement after dispersal from Red River, as the centre of their economic, spiritual and political aspirations, and as symbol of the armed conflict of 1885. These associative values are embodied in the cultural and natural resources of the cultural landscape, including the riverlot settlement patterns (Parks Canada, 1997b; HSMBC Minutes, February 1989). Blackfoot Crossing, Alberta (NHS 1925, 1992) is a site of enduring significance to the Siksika Nation, as represented in centuries of intimate connection of their culture with the area and their current initiative in developing Blackfoot Crossing Historic Park. The “Crossing is the thread that ties together the historic features [both natural and cultural] into a cultural landscape” (Parks Canada, 1997a). Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump [Estipah-skikikini-kots], Alberta (NHS 1968, World Heritage Site 1981) is a relict cultural landscape which demonstrates sophisticated communal hunting and harvesting techniques and social organization of Plains peoples. Illustrative of centuries of spiritual, economic and social use of the Prairie resources embedded in the physical place and in the oral tradition of Aboriginal peoples, the site is now presented by Piikani and Kainai who share this cultural tradition with their youth and with visitors (Buggey, 1995). Manitou Mounds [Kay-Nah-Chi-Wah-Nung],
Ontario (NHS 1969) is a site of spiritual and religious significance to the Rainy River First Nation; they are developing it in partnership with Parks Canada and the Government of Ontario to illustrate the 5000 year history of the area. *Wanuskewin*, Saskatchewan (NHS 1986) represents the presence of at least a dozen cultural groupings of Northern Plains people over more than 5000 years in the plains-boreal transition zone. Its historic role as a place of spiritual significance continues today. Participation of First Nations people of Saskatchewan has supported its development, including a symbolically designed visitor centre and four interpretive trails through the landscape (Buggey, 1995). **The Hay River Mission Sites** on the Hay River Indian Reserve, NWT (NHS 1992), comprising St Peter’s Anglican Church, St Anne’s Roman Catholic Church and Rectory, and the two church cemeteries with their numerous spirit houses, were designated for “... their close association with a critical period in Dene/Euro-Canadian relations” (HSMB BC Minutes June 1992). Valued by local Dene for their spiritual role, they may be seen as part of the larger cultural landscape of the community. **The Mi’kmaq on Malpeque Bay**, PEI (NHS 1996, 1997), designated as an “event” rather than as a place, focusses on the historical significance of 10,000 years of enduring use and settlement of the bay – “continuity and attachment to the land are seen as the defining factors in determining historical significance” – and on the bay as “a site of Native spirituality”. For centuries, a traditional area for hunting, fishing, and gathering for the Mi’kmaq of Prince Edward Island, today the bay has a “profound symbolic value for many Mi’kmaq ....” (Johnston, A.J.B., 1996; HSMB BC Minutes 1997, 1996). The identified values of the Mi’kmaq on Malpeque Bay that establish national historic significance are directly associated with the place, a cultural landscape, and “illustrate or symbolize in whole or in part a cultural tradition, a way of life, or ideas important in the development of Canada” (HSMB BC, 1999). In contrast, the **Deline Traditional Fishery and Old Fort Franklin**, NWT (NHS 1996), identified for its significant historical associations, is designated as a place, which “speak[s] eloquently to the relationship which evolved in the 19th century between Aboriginal people in the north and those Euro-Canadian parties who were determined to explore it”, to “the support and assistance of the Dene and Métis people” to Sir John Franklin’s second expedition, and to the impact of Franklin’s and later expeditions on the Aboriginal people of the region, particularly in contributing “to the emergence of the Sahtu Dene as a distinctive cultural group”. As well, “the Sahtu Dene see the fishery at Deline as being of particular cultural significance to their occupation of the region” (Hanks, 1996; HSMB BC Minutes, November 1996). The Sahtu Dene’s request for protection and presentation of the site emphasizes the importance of place as expression of Aboriginal history.

**Relict Landscapes**

There are also a significant number of other national historic sites
designated on the basis of archaeological values to commemorate the
history of Aboriginal peoples that may possess cultural landscape
values and that associated peoples might choose to identify as, or
within, Aboriginal cultural landscapes in the context of their
heritage. In addition to the inuksuit at Enusko Point in Nunavut,
these include relict village sites, other habitation sites,
pictograph and petroglyph sites, tipi rings, burials, and resource
sites, such as quarries [see Appendix C]. Some or all of the nine
abandoned Haida, Gitksan, and Tsimshian villages in British
Columbia, designated NHS in 1971-72, for example, may have
Aboriginal heritage values similar to those identified by the
Some of the relict village sites elsewhere, such as the Iroquoian
palisaded villages in Ontario, could similarly have cultural
landscape values. Consultations with the heritage offices of the
provinces and territories have indicated that they have not
designated Aboriginal cultural landscapes within the meaning of the
proposed definition. They have, however, designated relict village
or habitation sites, such as the Oxbow Site at Red Bank in New
Brunswick, Pointe-du-Buisson in Quebec, Sea Horse Gully in Manitoba,
and Qaummaarvit in the Northwest Territories, for their
archaeological values. Several pointed out that some designated
sites and some yet to be recognized sites could be cultural
landscapes. Pictograph and petroglyph sites, widely designated both
federally and provincially across the country, may be significant
features in larger cultural landscapes, such as their examination
at Kejimkujik demonstrated. Designated tipi rings, such as those
at Herschel in Saskatchewan and the Bezya site in Alberta, are
likewise part of broader cultural landscapes. Designated burial
sites, such as L’Anse Amour in Newfoundland, the Augustine Mound at
Red Bank in New Brunswick, and the Gray Site in Saskatchewan, could
be sacred sites within Aboriginal cultural landscapes. Aboriginal
peoples could also choose to identify as Aboriginal cultural
landscapes some existing national historic sites designated for
other values, as was recently done by the Mowachaht-Muchalaht in
reclaiming Nootka Sound for their own history at Yuquot (Mowachaht-
Muchalaht, 1997). Equally, they might see existing designations of
national historic significance currently related to events, such as
battles, or Aboriginal cultures, as part of their heritage which
would be more effectively commemorated through cultural landscapes.

There are also landscapes related to the history of Aboriginal
peoples which are recognizedly of historic value but with which no
identified people is currently associated. At Grasslands National
Park in Saskatchewan, for example, archaeological analysis of the
cultural remains provides evidence of the diverse activities of
occupation over 10,000 years, but one which ended in the past;
currently no people claim a direct association with the park area
(Gary Adams, pers.comm.). Where such landscapes are submitted for
consideration by the HSMBC, the program might consider addressing
them as relict landscapes, where the cultural evolution ended at
some time in the past but strong material evidences remain, rather than as Aboriginal cultural landscapes, which involve the participation of associated people(s). This division between places associated with living communities and those known only by their physical evidences of the past would be consistent with Australia’s separation of “indigenous heritage places of archaeological significance” and “indigenous places important to the heritage of living cultures” for the identification of environmental indicators for natural and cultural heritage (Pearson et al, 1998).

Recent designations of sites related to the history of Aboriginal peoples demonstrate the applicability of the concept of cultural landscapes. The significance of associative values in Aboriginal relationships to place is especially illustrated in traditional narratives of enduring and spiritual inter-relatedness with the land. The association of living cultures with Aboriginal cultural landscapes is key to their identification. Some important landscapes, no longer associated with living cultures, will be relict cultural landscapes.

GUIDELINES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF ABORIGINAL CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Consultation of Experts

The concept of Aboriginal cultural landscapes has been explored with about forty people in the course of developing this paper. They represent disciplines ranging from history and archaeology to landscape architecture and park management. They include Parks Canada, provincial and territorial staff in all parts of the country, consultants with extensive experience in working with Aboriginal communities, and Aboriginal people in umbrella agencies and in various other positions. Consistently, they pointed out the complexity and intensity of Aboriginal belief and tradition related to the land; they emphasized the importance of land relationship to Aboriginal culture and the holistic nature of that relationship. They noted that the concept of “land” included water and sky as well as earth. They consistently drew attention to the continuous living relationship Aboriginal people have with the land, the interrelationship of people, animals, and spirits in the land. The dimensions always included the spiritual, mental and emotional aspects of living with their particular environment in addition to the physical world. Cosmology, places of power, narratives associating spirit beings with the land, kinship and language attachments to place were recurrent. They also underlined the importance of uses and activities from harvesting and social gatherings to rituals and ceremonies as core expressions of relation to the land. They signalled as defining attitudes Aboriginal peoples’ attachments to these aspects of land rather than to place as physical resource. They elaborated on the diversity of historical experience across time and place as well as differing situations of Aboriginal peoples today. Those differences of historical experience, geographical contexts, and current status
mark Aboriginal peoples’ relations to landscapes today. Those consulted consistently emphasized the crucial role of Aboriginal participation in any identification of landscapes for commemoration as national historic sites. The associated people will not necessarily be current occupiers or users of the land, but may have a historic relationship still significant to their culture, such as the Huron of Loretteville, Quebec to the territory in southern Ontario that they left in the mid-17th century. Traditional knowledge, and traditional environmental knowledge, were continuously identified as the key sources for understanding and recognizing the values of place to Aboriginal people, while archaeology, ethnohistory, and ethnography were acknowledged as the most relevant academic fields.

Definition of Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes
Based on the literature and the consultation to date, the following definition is proposed for consideration and further discussion:

An Aboriginal cultural landscape is a place valued by an Aboriginal group (or groups) because of their long and complex relationship with that land. It expresses their unity with the natural and spiritual environment. It embodies their traditional knowledge of spirits, places, land uses, and ecology. Material remains of the association may be prominent, but will often be minimal or absent.

It is to be recognized that other people than the associated group (or groups) may also have used these landscapes and may attach values to them. The experience in the Americas has particularly shown that the rapidity of waves of immigration and the diversity of cultures they have introduced have significantly shaped the cultural landscape. The result has been not so much a layering of cultures and uses as a concurrence of cultures and uses, all of which are recognized to have validity (US/ICOMOS, 1996).

Identifying National Historic Significance
How should national significance in Aboriginal cultural landscapes be identified? The HSMBC has already agreed with regard to the number of cultural groups, that “any future deliberations could be accommodated by the 60 distinct groups identified in the Royal Commission Report on Aboriginal Peoples” and has requested an analysis of “the implications of using language groups to represent a field against which to determine national historic significance” (HSMBC Minutes, July 1998). It has also initiated discussion with regard to using “the traditional territory of an Aboriginal nation ... as the comparative universe for the site proposed for commemoration or designation” (Federal Archaeology Office, 1998a: 21). Aboriginal cultural landscapes, as defined above, are compatible with these directions.

For traditional cultural properties in the United States, the National Park Service requires that places be currently important
to the community and have been important to it for at least fifty years. They must also meet the established requirements for integrity, which must be considered in the context of the views of the traditional practitioners and must not have lost their integrity in their eyes. As is the case in determining the eligibility of all properties for the National Register of Historic Places, the established National Register criteria apply. The criteria, however, are broad and are interpreted in ways that actively accommodate Native American traditions. Thus, "association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of [American] history" includes, for example, places associated with oral traditions about the creation of a Native American group, and "associations with the lives of persons significant in [the American] past" includes people whose lives cannot be documented through scholarly study and non-humans such as a deity of a Native American people. "As long as the tradition itself is rooted in the history of the group, and associates the property with traditional events [or people], the association can be accepted" (Parker and King, 1990; King and Townsend, n.d.).

Isabel McBryde has asked the question: How does the heritage world approach, conceptualise and assess the various attributes of the Aboriginal and archaeological landscapes of the extensive and complex systems in the hunter-gatherer world? (McBryde, 1997: 12) She identifies five criteria that could provide a response:

1. a significant cultural entity that meets the definition of a cultural landscape [associative]
2. a significant cultural entity that illustrates significant themes in human history and existing cultural practices
3. strong documentation in the life and oral traditions of the indigenous people of the region
4. strong documentation in archaeological and ethnohistorical research
5. documentation demonstrating the values, both scientific and social, that the cultural entity holds

Traditionally, the HSMBC has used historical and anthropological frameworks and specified criteria as the bases for assessing the national historic significance of places, people or events. The Board has, however, recognized that its conventional criteria, structure and framework for evaluation do not adequately respond to the values inherent in the history of Aboriginal people. It has reiterated in its discussions that "nature, tradition, continuity and attachment to the land are seen as the defining elements in determining historic significance" related to Aboriginal peoples. It has likewise emphasized that "its interest was not only in considering groups for commemoration, but in focussing on the importance of place to the Aboriginal group ..." (HSMBC Minutes, July 1998). The concept of cultural landscapes provides a direction for responding to these concerns.
Guidelines for Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes
In the context of the HSMBC’s criteria for national historic significance (HSMBC, 1999), a designated Aboriginal cultural landscape “will illustrate a nationally important aspect of Canadian history”. As evidenced by the Board’s consistent recommendations, the history of Aboriginal peoples is recognized to be such “a nationally important aspect of Canadian history”. As a place designated by virtue of its “explicit and meaningful association” with this aspect, an Aboriginal cultural landscape will “illustrate or symbolize in whole or in part a cultural tradition, a way of life, or ideas important in the development of Canada”. The identified elements indicating integrity of a place, except setting, will not normally be essential to understand the significance of an Aboriginal cultural landscape, and will not therefore generally apply.

The following specific guidelines are proposed for the Board’s examination of the national significance of Aboriginal cultural landscapes. The emphasis follows directions coming from the recently completed History of Nunavut study which the Board considered in December 1998.

1. The long associated Aboriginal group or groups have participated in the identification of the place and its significance, concur in the selection of the place to commemorate their culture, and support designation.

This guideline derives from the HSMBC’s consistent direction since 1990 that Aboriginal peoples will be consulted, involved and participating in the identification of frameworks and sites related to their history. It is consistent with the established consultation process for Aboriginal heritage sites (as described in Federal Archaeology Office 1998a, 17-18) and the Statement of Principles and Best Practices for Commemorating Aboriginal History, draft 3 (Federal Archaeology Office 1998c, item 2). It is likewise consistent with recommendation 1.7.2 of the Report on the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. It can conform with the comparative or contextual framework that the Board chooses for evaluation, such as the proposed traditional territory of an Aboriginal group or First Nation (Federal Archaeology Office 1998a, 14 and 21).

2. Spiritual, cultural, economic, social and environmental aspects of the group’s association with the identified place, including continuity and traditions, illustrate its historical significance.

The guideline focusses on the identification of national historic significance through the associated group’s long attachment to the territory, its enduring use and activities, its social and kinship relationships, its intimate knowledge of the area, and its spiritual affiliations with it.
3. The interrelated cultural and natural attributes of the identified place make it a significant cultural landscape.

This guideline recognizes the integrated nature of Aboriginal relationship to place, including the inseparability of cultural and natural values. Identified places, which will likely be of widely diverse types, will illustrate this core interrelationship of cultural and natural forces that characterizes cultural landscapes. The guideline anticipates that the identification will incorporate diverse aspects of the group’s association (see #2 above) extended over time. Tangible evidences may be largely absent, with the attributes rooted primarily in oral and spiritual traditions and in activities related to the place. There may also be tangible attributes, such as natural resources, archaeological sites, graves, material culture, and written or oral records. The guideline foresees that the identification of attributes will also recognize such physical components as ecosystem, climate, geology, topography, water, soils, viewsheds, dominant and culturally significant fauna and flora in the context of the associated Aboriginal people’s relationship to the place. The Aboriginal expression of these aspects may occur in animal or other natural metaphors. The guideline accommodates the geographic and cultural diversity, as well as the individual experiences, of Canada’s Aboriginal peoples (Federal Archaeology Office 1998c, item 2).

4. The cultural and natural attributes that embody the significance of the place are identified through traditional knowledge of the associated Aboriginal group(s).

This guideline anticipates that the traditional knowledge, including traditional environmental knowledge, will likely encompass narratives, place names, language, traditional uses, rituals, and behaviour related to the identified place. It recognizes that some knowledge cannot be shared, but available knowledge must be sufficient to demonstrate the significance of the place in the culture of the associated group.

5. The cultural and natural attributes that embody the significance of the place may be additionally comprehended by results of academic scholarship.

This guideline recognizes the contribution that academic scholarship makes to the understanding of place. History, including oral history and ethnohistory, archaeology, anthropology, and environmental sciences are the most likely, but not the only, relevant disciplines.

Size, Scale and Values
Those consulted in the preparation of this paper pointed out that the size and scale of Aboriginal cultural landscapes would challenge both Aboriginal people and Parks Canada because of their very differing contexts and views. Aboriginal world views focus on
landscape rather than landscape features. Specific sites certainly have associated cultural significance and oral traditions related to their history. However, given the holistic relationship of Aboriginal people and their land, such places are seen primarily not as isolated spots but as parts of larger landscapes. Identifiable landscapes may equally be only parts of still larger cultural landscapes. The Dogrib sacred sites identified along the Idaà Trail illustrate this relationship of sites with the larger landscape, while the Trail itself is part of the Dogrib cultural landscape, which comprises 100,000 square miles. The Hopi in Arizona occupy 12 villages on three mesas, but their historic heartlands, Tutsqwa, cover a much larger area. Points such as Navajo Mountain, Grand Canyon, and Zuni Salt Lake are among the “shrines on a religious pilgrimage undertaken to pay homage to all ancestral Hopi lands.... [but they] do not constitute the boundaries of Hopi lands, only a symbolic representation of them” (Ferguson, T.J. et al, 1993: 27).

In the context of the Navajo Nation, “... the artificial isolation of important places from the whole landscape of which they are an integral part often violates the very cultural principles that make certain places culturally significant to begin with” (Downer and Roberts, 1993: 12). The scale of these whole landscapes provides significant challenges to the approach of commemorative integrity which underlies Parks Canada’s national historic sites commemorative program. Securing the “health or wholeness” of these vast areas may require close examination of the current understanding of the concept as it applies to historic place, historic values and objectives for large cultural landscapes.

**Boundaries**

How then are boundaries to be drawn? Some preliminary investigations identify some approaches. At the World Heritage Site Angkor Wat in Cambodia, where the outstanding series of capital cities comprising archaeological and natural resources required protection as an integrated assemblage, protection was recommended for two areas - 380 km² and 370 km² respectively - based on principles of protected area management and site development planning (Wager, 1995). Canada’s national parks use a zoning system to identify park areas requiring different levels of protection and to guide their management and use (Parks Canada, 1994a: II.2.2). Biosphere reserves also apply a zoning approach that provides for a core area, a buffer zone, and a transition zone, focussed on different levels of protection and intervention (UNESCO, 1996b: 4). The emergence of bio-regional planning in protected area management, applicable to enormous areas such as the 2000-mile Yellowstone to Yukon corridor (http://www.rockies.ca/Y2Y/) and the 1500-mile Mesoamerican Biological Corridor through Central America (Salas, 1997), may offer some potential applicability for Aboriginal cultural landscapes. Downer and Roberts, who are working with the Navajo Nation in the United States, consider the "broader context ... based on landscapes or ecosystems rather than artificially-defined impact zones ... is emerging from various disciplines in environmental planning. We are convinced that this is the only realistic approach to meaningful
consideration of traditional cultural properties and the cultural landscapes of which they are integral parts..." (Downer and Roberts, 1993: 14). Such planning frameworks and co-management approaches (Collings, 1997) may provide opportunities for developing mechanisms to ensure commemorative integrity of cultural landscapes such as the designated area of Nagwichoonjik [Mackenzie River].

In Australia, many Aboriginal sites are discrete areas separated by long distances but interconnected by trading routes or the paths of ancestral beings; they are most clearly understood when they are recognized as parts of a network rather than individual components (Bridgewater and Hooy, 1995: 168). “Anangu, whose political system is egalitarian and uncentralised, visualise places in the landscape as nodes in a network of ancestral tracks. The Anangu landscape is not susceptible to division into discrete areas” (Layton and Titchen, 1995: 178). The American Trail of Tears National Historic Trail, a multi-route and multi-site network which commemorates the forced removal, march overland and resettlement of the Cherokee [Ani’Yun’ wiya] from Georgia, Alabama, etc. to Oklahoma in 1838–39, is a partnership of diverse groups and diverse sites with linked interpretive programs over nine states. Historian John Johnston, exploring the adaptation of this concept of nodes to the commemoration of Aboriginal history in Canada, notes that it applies to “... places that tell an inter-connected story extending over time and place”, such as trails and water routes associated with seasonal movements for food (Johnston, A.J.B., 1993). Nodes within a network, each of identified importance, could be focal points of protection and presentation in a recognized larger cultural landscape.

Noting that there is “sometimes no obviously correct boundary”, the National Park Service indicates that the selection of boundaries for traditional cultural properties should be based on the characteristics of the historic place, specifically how the place is used and why the place is important (King and Townsend, n.d.). This approach was taken at the Helkau Historic District in California, whose significance area was identified as “a substantial part of California’s North Coast Range”. A compromise decision on boundaries was developed along “topographic lines that included all the locations at which traditional practitioners carry out medicine-making and similar activities, the travel routes between such locations, and the immense viewshed surrounding this complex of locations and routes”. Traditional uses, viewsheds, and changes to boundaries over time were factors considered in developing the rationale for the boundary (Parker and King, 1990: 18-19). The need to change boundaries of existing sites associated with Native American peoples identifies other factors. At Wupatki National Monument, a 35,253 acre pre-contact site in Arizona characterized by painted desert and masonry pueblos, a significant boundary extension was sought for the protection of a natural and cultural ‘system’ as well as for the completion of the park interpretation story (http://www.nps.gov/planning/flag/gmp/news3/flag2p5.htm).
In several respects the American approach can be recognized in existing national historic site designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes. At Kejimkujik, for example, the existing national park boundaries defined a sufficiently large and appropriate area of traditional Mi’kmaq occupancy to represent the larger Mi’kmaq landscape. While in this case administrative convenience provided the basis for accepted boundaries, it is not a recommended selection approach. At Arviq and Qikiqtaarjuk, clearly defined geographical features – an island and a point – with strong spiritual, social, economic and archaeological values related to the Caribou Inuit culture identified the boundaries. Given the importance of the adjacent waters to the cultural significance, future consideration might be given to defining site boundaries that included the key water areas. At Grizzly Bear Mountain and Scented Grass Hills, where the designated sites are also two clearly defined land areas related to water, the site analysis and discussion of values effectively articulate the significant cultural relationships of the larger Great Bear Lake landscape. As well, the historic values of the viewsheds at this site are particularly significant in the identification of objectives for the “health” of the site. While discrete geographical features can be very useful in identifying boundaries, it is evident that the values for which the place is to be designated must predominate in establishing appropriate boundaries.

CONCLUSION
Aboriginal cultural landscapes are a way of approaching Aboriginal history that both relates to the HSMBC mandate and focusses upon the complex relationship that Aboriginal people have with the land. They are not relics but living landscapes – the cosmological, mythological, and spiritual world of the people associated with them as well as the environment of the day to day activities of living on the land. Bequeathed through oral tradition from generation to generation, Aboriginal traditional knowledge connects these spiritual relationships to the land through narratives, place names, sacred sites, rituals, and behaviour patterns that are tied to the spirits of the land. The seasonal round of enduring life on the land relies on the intimate connection of human and animal movements. Examination to date has shown that Aboriginal cultural landscapes are primarily associative cultural landscapes. Consideration of national significance must address the holistic relationship to the land of the people(s) long associated with it. Aboriginal people must have a core role in identifying places they value, in documenting them, and in defining their significance in the context of Aboriginal culture.
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APPENDIX A

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY
THE HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS BOARD OF CANADA
RELATED TO DESIGNATED ABORIGINAL CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Abitibi, Quebec [Abitib8innik]
1996-11  “... both a traditional summering area and a sacred place for the Algonquin. “... importance not only to the Pikogan community, whose origins predate the meeting of the Abitibi and the French in the 17th century, but also by the Wahgoshing community of Ontario. “... vestiges of various periods of occupation by the Abitibi Algonquin dating as far back as 6,000 years ... numerous trading posts which operated there from the 17th century onward”

Arvia’juaq and Qikiqtaarjuk, Nunavut [Inuit]
1995-07  “... speaks eloquently to the cultural, spiritual and economic life of the Inuit in the Keewatin region ... “... focussing on ... coastal activities carried out by the communit[y] of Arviat “... site of particular significance to the community”

Fall Caribou Crossing Hunt site, Kazan River, Nunavut [Inuit]
1995-07  “... speaks eloquently to the cultural, spiritual and economic life of the Inuit in the Keewatin region ...
“... focussing on the inland or caribou hunt ... carried out by the communit[y] of Baker Lake ....
“... site of particular significance to the community”

Grizzly Bear Mountain and Scented Grass Hills, Northwest Territories [Sahtu Dene]
1996-11  “associative cultural landscapes of national historic significance”
“cultural values expressed through the interrelationship between the landscape, oral histories, graves and cultural resources, such as trails and cabins, help to explain and contribute to an understanding of the origin, spiritual values, lifestyle and land-use of the Sahtu Dene”

Mi’kmaq Cultural Landscape of Kejimkujik National Park, Nova Scotia [Mi’kmaq]
1994-11  “the cultural landscape of Kejimkujik National Park which attests to 4000 years of Mi’kmaq occupancy of this area, and which includes petroglyph sites, habitation sites, habitation sites, fishing sites, hunting territories, travel routes and burials”
Nagwichoonjik [Mackenzie River] from Thunder River to Point Separation, Northwest Territories [Gwichya Gwich’in]
1997-06  “its prominent position within the Gwichya Gwich’in cultural landscape”
          “... flows through Gwichya Gwich’in traditional homeland, and is culturally,
          socially and spiritually significant to the people”
          “... importance of the river through their oral histories, which trace important
          events from the beginning of the land to the present ... names given along the
          river, stories associated with these areas, and the experience drawn from these
          stories....”
          “... transportation route, allowing Gwichya Gwich’in to gather in large numbers ...
          during the summer”
          “archaeological evidence ... extensive precontact fisheries and stone quarries,
          ensuring Gwichya Gwich’in survival through the centuries”

Xá:ytém (Hatzic Rock), British Columbia [Stó:lō First Nation]
1997-11  cost-sharing recommended
1992-02  “... the age of the Hatzic Rock site and its close association to a transformer site of
          clear importance to the Stó:lō people”

Yuquot, British Columbia [Mowachaht-Muchalaht First Nations]
1997-06  “... the ancestral home of the Mowachaht and the centre of their social, political
          and economic world
          “continuously occupied for over 4,300 years, the village became the capital for all
          17 tribes of the Nootka Sound region
          “... also the area where Nuu-chah-nulth whaling originated and developed and the
          site of the Whaler’s Washing House, the most significant monument associated
          with Nuu-chah-nulth whaling
          “... focal point of diplomatic and trading activity of Canada’s west coast in late
          18th century ....”

Utkuhiksalik, Nunavut [Inuit]
1997-11  deferred pending completion of History of Nunavut; examine in that context
APPENDIX B

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY
THE HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS BOARD OF CANADA
RELATED TO POTENTIAL ABORIGINAL CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Batoche, Saskatchewan [Métis]
1923  “armed conflict between the Canadian government and the Métis provisional government in 1885”
1989  “Métis riverlot settlements are Prairie settlement forms of both national historic and architectural significance ... commemorated at Batoche ...”

Blackfoot Crossing, Alberta [Siksika]
1925  “... place where treaty [7] was made ...
1992  “... the integral importance of the Crossing in the traditions of the Blackfoot people and the rich variety of its archaeological resources
“... the Program contact the Blackfoot Band Council and the Alberta government in order to determine what aspects of the history of Blackfoot Crossing the Band believes merit commemoration and the manner in which such commemoration would relate to the developmental possibilities of the Cluny Earthlodge village site ... “

Deline Traditional Fishery and Old Fort Franklin, Northwest Territories [Sahtu Dene]
1996  “the traditional Dene fishery at Deline ... its use over time and the long history of sharing its resources, as well as the remains of Fort Franklin, the wintering quarters of Sir John Franklin’s second expedition ...”
“... they speak eloquently to the relationship which evolved in the 19th century between Aboriginal people in the north and those Euro-Canadian parties who were determined to explore it ....”
“... impact of the Franklin expedition and those which were to follow on the Aboriginal people of the region contributed to the emergence of the Sahtu Dene as a distinctive cultural group and the Sahtu Dene see the fishery at Deline as being of particular cultural significance to their occupation of the region”

Hay River Mission Sites, Hay River Indian Reserve, Northwest Territories
1992  “close association with a critical period in Dene/Euro-Canadian relations ... two churches, rectory and two cemeteries with numerous spirit houses - significant features in a cultural landscape, rather than the landscape itself
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump [estipah-skikikini-kots], Alberta [Niitsitapi/Blackfoot]</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>bison jump representing communal way of hunting for thousands of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inuksuk, Enusco Point, Nunavut</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>“Inuit complex of 100 stone landmarks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi’kmaq presence on Malpeque Bay, Prince Edward Island [Mi’kmaq]</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>“the bay has been a place of enduring use and settlement for more than 10,000 years. ... a traditional area for hunting, fishing, and gathering for the Mi’kmaq of Prince Edward Island and today it has a profound symbolic value for many Mi’kmaq ....”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>“site of Native spirituality”; “home to Native peoples for a considerable period of time”; “continuity and attachment to the land are seen as the defining factors in determining historical significance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitou Mounds, Ontario [Rainy River First Nations]</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>religious and ceremonial site for 2000 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunsting (Ninstints), Gwaii Haanas, British Columbia [Haida]</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>“Ninstints, Tanu and Skedans are ... perhaps the most outstanding aboriginal sites in the Pacific Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanuskewin, Saskatchewan [Northern Plains]</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>“juxtaposition of archaeological features representing all major time periods in Northern Plains pre-history”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY
THE HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS BOARD OF CANADA
RELATED TO RELICT SITES
SOME MAY BE CULTURAL LANDSCAPES OR FEATURES THEREIN

West Coast [British Columbia] Villages
1971 Kitwanga Fort - Tsimshian, fortified village, totem poles, pre 18th c.
1972 Kitselas Canyon - Gitlaxdzawk and Gitsaes Kiteselas, fortified village, village across canyon, petroglyphs, 1000BC
1972 Kitwankul - Gitksan, typical village, totem poles, pre 18th c.
   “... ceremonial centre shared by peoples of the Nass and Skeena River”
1972 Kiusta - Haida, village, pre-contact and post-contact
1972 Metlakatla - Tsimshian, winter villages
1972 New Gold Harbour Area, Haina, Queen Charlotte Islands - Haida/Skidgate, village
1972 - Skedans, South Moresby Archipelago, Queen Charlotte Islands - Haida, village
1972 Tanu - South Moresby Archipelago, Queen Charlotte Islands - Haida, village
1972 Yan, Queen Charlotte Islands - Haida/Masset, village, architectural stock
1981 Ninstints [Skungwaii, Nunsting], Gwaii Haanas, Queen Charlotte Islands - Haida, longhouse, totem poles; 1981 World Heritage Site

Ontario (Mainly) Palisaded Villages
1929 Southwold Earthworks, Fingal - 16th c. Neutral/Attiwandaronk
1982 Etharita Site, Dunfroon - 16th /17th c. Iroquoian
1982 Ossossane Site - Huron (Bear Clan)
1982 Walker Site, Onondaga - Attiwandaronk (Iroquoian)
1991 Bead Hill, Toronto - 17th c. Seneca (Iroquoian)

Other Villages
1924 Meductic, New Brunswick - Maliseet
1982 Oxbow, Red Bank, New Brunswick - 3000 year record
1920 Hochelaga, Montréal, Quebec - Iroquoian, visited by Jacques Cartier 1535
1972 Cluny Earthlodge, Alberta  cf. 1991

Other Habitation Sites
1970 Port au Choix, Nfld - Maritime Archaic and Paleo-Eskimo cultures, includes burial sites
1978 Okak, Nfld - several cultures
1978 Indian Point, Red Indian Lake, Nfld - Beothuk
1995 Boyd’s Cove, Nfld - Beothuk
1953 Middleport Site, Six Nations Grand Reserve, Ontario - Iroquoian
1981 Whitefish Island, Ontario - Ojibwa, seasonal
1981 Pic River Site, Ontario - pre-contact Woodland culture
1982 Donaldson Site, Chippewa Hill, Ontario - 500BC - AD300
1982 Serpent Mounds Complex, Ontario - Ojibwa, 60BC - AD300
1982 Parkhill, Ontario - Paleo-Indian, ca. 8000BC
1997 Lower Holland Landing Site, Ontario - Chippewas, Middle Woodland
   ca. 600-800 A.D., ongoing into the 19th century
1969 Sea Horse Gully, Churchill, Manitoba - Pre-Dorset and Dorset
1974 Brockington Gully, Churchill, Manitoba - Blackduck phase
1978 Igloolik Island, NWT - Thule/Inuit 2000BC - AD1000
    Qaummaarvit, Peal Point, Frobisher Bay, NWT - Thule/Inuit

Petroglyph and Pictoglyph Sites
1994 Petroglyphs of Bedford Basin, Nova Scotia - Mi’kmaq, petroglyphs
1980 Peterborough Petroglyphs, Ontario - Algonkian
1982 Mazinaw, Ontario - Algonkian, pictographs

Tipi Rings
1973 Suffield Tipi Rings - Plains, migratory

Burial Sites
1978 L’Anse Amour, Newfoundland - Maritime Archaic culture
1975 Augustine Mound, Red Bank, New Brunswick -
1973 Gray Site, near Swift Current, Saskatchewan - ca. 3000BC
1973 Linear Mounds, Manitoba - burial mounds AD1000 - 1200

Resource Sites
1982 Fleur de Lys Soapstone Quarries, Nfld - Dorset
1981 Cummins, Ontario - late Paleo-Indian stone quarry
1954 Sheguiandah, Manitoulin Island, Ontario - pre-contact stone quarry
1982 Mnjikaning Fish Weirs at Atherley Narrows, on TSW, Ontario - fish weirs
1960 Old Women’s Buffalo Jump, Cayley, Alberta - 1500 years of use
1978 Kittigazuit, NWT - beluga hunting, kittegarymiut, and Mackenzie Delta
1978 Bloody Falls, Coppermine, NWT - pre-contact hunting and fishing

Battle Sites
1925 Senneville, Quebec - site of battle of the Lake of Two Mountains
   French defeat of Iroquois 1689

Transportation
1929 Carrying Place of the Bay of Quinte - site of signing of 1787 treaty between Mississauga
   and British
1994 Aboriginal portages: “the Board has already marked several [portages] with plaques”;
   “compared to other areas of significance, portages were seen as the lowest priority
   for Board attention”
1997 Lower Holland Landing Site, Ontario - Chippewas, pre-contact and post-contact,
   northern terminus of Toronto Carrying Place and Yonge Street
APPENDIX D

DESIGNATIONS AND SOME OTHER RECOGNITIONS
BY PROVINCIAL AND TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTS
RELATED TO ABORIGINAL CULTURAL LANDSCAPES
March 1999

NEWFOUNDLAND
- no designations or commemorations of cultural landscapes
  where the heritage values are primarily associated with
  Aboriginal peoples

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes

NOVA SCOTIA
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes
- federal ownership precludes provincial designation on
  reserve lands, so many lands associated with Aboriginal
  people are not eligible for provincial designation
  - Saint Anne’s Mission Church on Indian Island,
    Northumberland Strait, with its rectory and grave markers,
    [although not the whole island landscape] was designated
    under the provincial heritage act in 1992; the island, given
    to the Mi’kmaq by the province in the 1850s, is now owned by
    the Mi’kmag of Pictou Landing and is the site of the annual
    festival of the Feast of Saint Anne

NEW BRUNSWICK
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes as such
- research is underway in collaboration with Parks Canada to
  identify sites important to the Maliseet people
- cultural principle that one people is not more important
  than another, one site is not more important than another
  focusses research on identification
- the Maliseet Advisory Committee represents all Maliseet
  communities in New Brunswick

QUEBEC
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes as such
- 113 archaeological sites classified under the Loi sur les
  biens culturels have at least one occupation by Aboriginal
  people; most (84) are identified in category 3 (site, bien
  ou monument historique ou archéologique) with many (24) in
  category 5 (dans un arrondissement historique)
- provincial law provides for designations and protection
  under municipal rather than provincial jurisdiction; federal
  ownership precludes provincial designation on reserve lands
- White Mountain, Lake Mistassini was classified as an
  archaeological site under the provincial law when it was
  first in effect; designation and protection apply to the
  whole mountain, and the cultural value of the area as a
  sacred place is acknowledged although the classification
applies specifically to archaeological significance
- other places, such as the sacred mountain in Monterégie,
are known to have significance to Aboriginal peoples

ONTARIO
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes as such
- believe such landscapes exist in Ontario e.g. traditional use areas, sacred areas, burial sites
- early 1990s cultural heritage study of Temagami region and some limited identification of sacred/traditional use areas within the Temagami comprehensive planning area
- provisions under the Ontario Heritage Act empower municipalities to designate historical districts, but there is no power at the provincial level to designate landscapes
- a couple of dozen provincially designated archaeological sites, but their significance has been defined by their archaeological remains rather than landscape values e.g. the Aboriginal stone quarry at Sheguiandah, Manitoulin Island
- provincial heritage program is currently interested in and grappling with identification, significance, and planning issues related to Aboriginal cultural landscapes

MANITOBA
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes
- Tie Creek Boulder Mosaic site in the Whiteshell has been identified as a heritage zone under the Parklands Act, which precludes major development; it is not, however, a provincial heritage site
- 1991 paper by Katherine Pettipas for the Manitoba Historic Sites Advisory Board, “Towards A Working Paper to establish Guidelines for the Identification, Documentation, Protection and Commemoration of Native Heritage and Sacred Sites”, examines American Religious Freedom Act and some current American literature, including Swan typology of sacred sites, some Manitoba sites, and experience in documenting sites sacred to Aboriginal peoples
- multi-jurisdictional committee working towards an agreement on Manitoba model forests for balancing heritage [e.g. sacred sites, archaeology] and industrial use

SASKATCHEWAN
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes as such
- recognition of Aboriginal cultural landscape values at Wanuskewin, although it was designated for its archaeological significance
- Roanmeré Coulee was a candidate in 1988, but was not designated
- other landscapes might well fit the definition of Aboriginal cultural landscape if Aboriginal peoples were consulted e.g. bison kill sites and their associated landscapes, petroglyph sites, sacred sites in the southwest on border lands between Cree and Blackfoot in 18th century
- program consults on such matters as repatriation,
reburial, and “sites of a special nature” such as medicine wheels, with the Elders’ committee of the Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Centre [Saskatchewan Indian Nations], Saskatoon, which includes all major language groups in the province

**ALBERTA**
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes as such
- most sites designated in relation to the history of Aboriginal peoples are pre-contact sites, e.g. Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump
- designations did not involve determining the interests of Aboriginal peoples in the sites
- designations have focussed on features such as medicine wheels or pictographs/petrographs rather than landscapes e.g. the pictographs in Writing-on-Stone Provincial Park; 1997 park management plan, developed by Alberta Environmental Protection and Alberta Community Development with extensive public involvement, emphasizes natural resources [dry mixed grass ecosystem], but includes recognition of the role of First Nations in creating the character of the park area and identifies increased involvement of the Blackfoot Nation in interpretation and use of the park

**BRITISH COLUMBIA**
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes as such
- multi-agency Land Use Coordination Office plays coordinating role for protected areas, including strategy, communications, land use planning
- provincial parks created with historical importance to Aboriginal groups; some co-managed through planning processes
- program of traditional use studies under the Aboriginal Affairs Branch of the Ministry of Forests; no designation, but inventory and recording activities of traditional knowledge and places that enable First Nations to develop information bases from which to respond to planning enquiries and threats to traditional use sites

**NORTHWEST TERRITORIES**
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes
- extensive inventory and mapping programs have recorded locations and traditional knowledge related to places of significance to Aboriginal peoples
- Sahtu Heritage Places and Sites Joint Working Group established under Sahtu Dene and Metis Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement, sec. 26.4, to consider and make recommendations to the appropriate governments and the Sahtu Tribal Council on Sahtu heritage places; draft report 1998
- Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre website with school programs focussed on traditional knowledge and an 11000 entry geographical names data base
YUKON
- no designations of Aboriginal cultural landscapes as such
- authority exists under the Yukon Historic Resources Act, but no sites at all have yet been designated under the legislation
- identification of Special Management Areas under the Yukon Land Claim, such as Old Crow Flats and Fishing Branch (Vuntut Gwitchin) or Scottie Creek wetlands (White River First Nation), answer in part the need to recognize landscape areas that are in need of special protection/management by virtue of their historical/cultural and present significance to a First Nation
- First Nations have identified trails to be of heritage interest; awareness also exists of some other landscapes of particular significance to Aboriginal peoples e.g. Dalton Trail, Beaver House Mountain on the Dempster Highway
- land use planning and development awareness review may address development, land use, or other planning issues which involve landscapes of significance to First Nations.