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Abstract

While efforts toward environmental management (EM) have been increasing, the state of our natural world is getting worse. Numerous reports have outlined that today’s environmental problems are predominantly human-induced, yet approaches to EM often only address “environmental” rather than “human” issues. More holistic approaches are required. This thesis explores “ecological citizenship” (EC) as an alternative framework that may have the potential to address elements too often left out of top-down and reductionist approaches. Academic and case-based notions of this concept are explored, and a new definition for the term is developed.

A case study, drawn from the rich results of in-depth interviews, and analyzed and presented using social-ecological systems theory, examines the dynamics of ecological citizenship in southwest Yukon and how they have been shaped by formal and informal institutions over time. Results have indicated the importance of addressing human-based components across all scales, whereby internal virtues are shaped by elements closer to home: community values, education, and time spent on the land; and external behaviours are often affected by systemic structures and institutions. Systemic and institutional elements are considered to play a positive role when they foster participation, awareness, and/or a culture of respect. The highest results are believed to be achieved when a culture of environmentalism is reflected in all social and institutional structures and brought together by a high-level integrated governance plan that utilizes democratic and community-oriented decision-making processes.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Our planet is in a state of crisis. While many individuals recognize the need for change, the societal structures by which they live make this change difficult. There are many more challenges to consider than a climate crisis: rates of inflation rising considerably faster than income, debt-to-income ratios on the brink of holding on, societies overridden with mental health and/or addiction problems. How are people to make “sacrifices” for their planet, when many can barely take care of themselves and their families? Citizens cannot do it alone; help is required from governments and institutions of all scales.

Within the aims of achieving “sustainability”, environmental managers and policy makers have spent considerable energy on aspects of the environmental crisis that are easier to manage and less complicated to address: recycling, energy efficiency, and fuel consumption. Many other areas have been neglected: increasing consumption of goods and resources, clearing of forests and wildlife habitat, a cheap food system built on exploitation of land and people. While operationally-based solutions are necessary, there are more complicated matters that also require attention.

While the field of EM has become more widely studied, we have also seen the loss of global biodiversity reach a rate of 50% over the past 40 years (WWF, 2018). This begs the simple question: how can we be putting more effort into managing the environment than ever before, and continuing to see more negative cumulative effects? Where and how are we failing?

Recent studies have pointed to the fact that our environmental crisis has been caused by human activity (IPCC, 2018), yet the focus of environmental management (EM) is primarily to address “environmental”, rather than “human” problems. As the source of our environmental
problems change with time, perhaps the scope of environmental management requires broadening as well.

As Barrow (2005) has acknowledged, environmental management is not easy to define: it can refer to a vision or a goal, to attempts to steer a process, to the application of a set of tools, to a philosophical exercise seeking to establish new perspectives towards the environment and human societies, and to much more. Environmental managers are a diverse group of people including academics, policy-makers, non-governmental organization workers, company employees, civil servants, and a wide range of individuals or groups who make decisions about the use of natural resources (e.g. fishers and farmers) (Barrow, 2005). There is a plurality of approaches addressing a plurality of issues. Traditionally, these efforts are siloed, treated in a reductionist manner, and place humans outside of the scope of the environmental systems in question. There has been a wide recognition that more holistic approaches are required, but to date, few are implemented on the ground.

From John Livingston (1981) to Arne Naess (1973), many have argued that our environmental problems stem from a too distant human engagement with nature, too shallow a conceptualization of what is needed, or approaches that are too top-down. Theorists and practitioners have called for rethinking or “restructuring” approaches to environmental management and governance, many emphasizing participation, community, and issues of language and power. Some have called for something more citizen-based. Ronald J. Engel makes a strong case (1992: 64-65):

“If there is a common cause of global warming, over population, unsustainable economic growth, loss of biodiversity, depletion of natural resources, and the needless suffering of humans and other animals, it is the failure of ’we the people’… to take moral responsibility for our world. The only possible locus of accountability and therefore the only proper subject of moral initiative, praise, and blame, is what we do or fail to do as communities of people, our practice of individual and collective self-government. It is easy to lose sight of this obvious and basic fact… The ecological crisis is a crisis of citizenship… How we think of the meaning of citizenship -- it’s grounds, its bounds, its
practices, its purposes -- has everything to do with the ecological crisis. “Create citizens, and you will have everything you need,” said Rousseau. We also tend to lose sight of this basic fact.”

I believe that this discussion is the most crucial of our time for advancing on sustainability issues, and it receives far too little attention. “Ecological citizenship” (EC) is a concept from political philosophy that encourages people to reflect on their identity in the context of their ecology and relation to home place. It allows them to identify their status based not merely on their role in human society, but on the entire ecosystem, uniting people around their home and therefore strengthening community (Dobson, 1995). It lends itself to discussions about participation, rights and responsibilities; and calls to question meanings of justice (Dobson and Saiz, 2005). While these topics are often addressed in environmental management, there could be extraordinary benefit in restructuring approaches in such a way that they are brought to the heart of its endeavours; whereby structuring approaches in such a way that they foster the development of good ecological citizens is the goal.

To address these ideas effectively, holistic approaches must be taken to understanding systems and their structures. Social-ecological systems theory hosts an effective set of tools and approaches by which to explore these concepts and their many sub-themes.

1.1 Thesis Goal

The primary goal of this thesis is to engage in an exploration of ecological citizenship that is both conceptual and applied and use this conversation as a vehicle to identify more holistic approaches to environmental management.

1.2 Objectives

1. Explore academic and case-based notions of the term Ecological Citizenship.
2. Utilize a Social-Ecological Systems (SES) lens to explore a case study in the Greater Kluane Region and examine factors that have fostered or discouraged good ecological citizenship.

3. Use these insights to present a discussion about how to facilitate holistic pathways to ecological well-being and human flourishing.

1.3 Theoretical Context

The literature reviews three multi-faceted subjects, under two banners: frameworks and discourses. This is based on the notion that we need first, appropriate and holistic language by which to frame our vision and goals, and second, a comprehensive approach to assess situations and apply solutions. This thesis reviews literature on three broad and interconnected topics: Sustainability and Environmental Discourse, Ecological Citizenship, Social-Ecological Systems Theory and Environmental Governance. As the often-central goal of today’s environmental approaches, the sustainability literature is reviewed to highlight the flaws of utilizing this discourse to meet its ends. Ecological citizenship is presented as a possible alternative, reviewing its current definitions and uses. Finally, social-ecological systems theory is utilized to bring the many facets of these conversations together, providing a cohesive strategy to oversee large and complex environmental goals. This systems conversation often looks to the field of environmental governance, as this is seen as highly appropriate for framing the complex problems of sustainability that are at the heart of this thesis.

1.4 Research Methodology and Methods

This research is complex and involves multiple layers of inquiry. It is deeply qualitative and employs a multi-method approach. At the center of this research is a rich analysis of a
wilderness-based case study. This case study has been brought together primarily with information gathered through a series of in-depth interviews and supplemented by a review of relevant documents and historical sources. It aims to show the opportunities provided by combining the use of a holistic discourse with a holistic framework for analysis and discovery; utilizing the language of “ecological citizenship” and employing a social-ecological systems methodology.

Social-Ecological Systems (SES) theory brings together both social systems and ecological systems, accepting the view that these systems are linked through a series of feedback mechanisms and the distinction between them is artificial and arbitrary (Berkes and Folke, 1998). SES offers both a methodology and a set of analytical methods. Very closely linked to the systems methodology is the use of a case study, which is common in systems studies.

The case study explored in this thesis is set in southwest Yukon, Canada, referred to as the Greater Kluane Region\(^1\). It has been chosen due to its wilderness setting, complex history, and for its indigenous and non-indigenous people who continue to live close to the land. This work could be completed anywhere, but it is particularly interesting in the Yukon and especially the Greater Kluane Region for two reasons: (1) in a mere half century, we can see a society transition from living almost completely off-the-land lifestyles, to an almost completely modern lifestyle much like any other first world region; and (2) the region is sparsely populated, yet biologically and politically diverse. It provides an opportune microcosm to observe direct causal linkages for how and why people’s connections and interactions with the land and nature have changed over time. Additionally, the current literature about ecological citizenship is mostly

\(^1\) It may be referred to throughout this thesis as “Kluane” (as it often is locally), “GKR” for conciseness, or simply “Southwest Yukon”. 
presented in an urban context and I was interested to see what there was to gain from exploring this topic in the context of a place that is less developed and more nature-based.

Data was collected over three different trips to Yukon in 2010 and 2011. The first was a six-week trip in the summer of 2010 with my advisor, to learn first-hand, the culture and the history. The second was a solo seven-week trip from early November to mid-late December of the same year, based around the completion of my interviews. The third trip was more informal, returning for three months over the summer of 2011 to live and work. While no formal research was collected during this time, this trip added great depth to my understanding of Yukon and its cultural nuances and was beneficial for the completion of this thesis.

There are two intersecting, but juxtaposed parts to this work. There is a portion that is conceptual: exploring the definition and terms of ecological citizenship and all it encompasses. There is another part of this thesis that is more empirical: exploring historical facts, policies, and institutional developments. Together, these two approaches play an important role in supporting each others’ development. Systems tools are used to determine and understand the inter-workings of the empirical findings and qualitative analysis is used to address the rich, conceptual concepts that fall in and between. Throughout the interview process, various themes emerged. Quantifying how often certain topics were referred to provided insight into the relevance of certain areas for further study and helped to shape the flow of the topics addressed.

1.5 Case Study Overview

The Greater Kluane Region includes four diverse communities located along the historic Alaska Highway. These communities are situated amid three First Nations’ traditional territories – two of which have settled land claims and one which has not. With a population of only 2000
or so people, it shares a juxtaposition of multiple cultures: roughly half are First Nations, while the other half are various European immigrants, both long-term residents and newly settled. The region supports mining, industrial development, forestry, game hunting and outfitting, and vast opportunities for wilderness tourism. It is based in a complex biophysical landscape, with multiple competing ungulates and other mammals. Most of the region is regulated by community-based renewable resource councils; part of it is not. Other environmental co-management boards have also become intermittently involved in managing the area’s diverse natural resources. It faces multiple transboundary issues: the overlap of first nations’ settlement lands, a controversial history of imposed borders from the national park, and the complexity of sharing boundaries with both Alaska and British Columbia. Furthermore, the region is regulated and managed by four different levels of government: three First Nations’ governments, a municipal government, the Yukon territorial government, and the Canadian federal government.

This case study focuses on the institutional changes and their effect on human-environment relations from 1960 to 2010. This timeline is important, as it describes the unfolding of a changing Yukon: from a time when the effects of modernity are just starting to take place, through numerous incremental developments that have brought us nearer to today. The development of the Alaska Highway in 1942 was a striking point in history that changed this system forever. Communities were resettled, access to the outside was opened, and the incremental increase of new technologies that followed transitioned the people of this region to a fundamentally new way of living. For context, a brief history of the territory from pre-contact native life to the establishment of the highway and a less brief description of the 20 years leading to this case study are also included.
1.6 Outline of Thesis

Chapter 1: Introduction describes the content and context of this thesis. Chapter 2: Literature Review provides a review of the key literature that contributed to its completion: sustainability, environmental discourse, ecological citizenship, and environmental governance. Chapter 3: Research Methodology and Methods describes how the research was collected, analyzed, and presented. Chapter 4: A Systems Overview of the Greater Kluane Region provides a synopsis of territorial history, gives a systems overview of the region, a description of relevant institutions, and briefly describes how all elements of this system are interconnected. This chapter is intended to provide background and context for the content to follow. Chapter 5: Exploring Ecological Citizenship in GKR summarizes insights and opinions of interviewees about the term, how it is embodied, trends witnessed in SW Yukon, and how EC may be fostered through formal institutions. Chapter 6: The Dynamics of Ecological Citizenship in GKR brings together tools from SES and concepts from chapter 5 to explore the dynamics of ecological citizenship in the region. Chapter 7: Synthesis and Recommendations brings together all lessons learned from previous chapters. It summarizes conceptual ideas about EC, methods to governance from an EC perspective, and provides recommendations to improve environmental governance in Kluane. Chapter 8: Summary and Reflections presents a summary of the thesis and concluding remarks. It reflects on the process, revealing both the highlights and the limitations/conflicts that revealed themselves throughout. It concludes with ideas about future research that could expand on this study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter starts by introducing the broad topic of “sustainability” and reviewing the many ways in which it is used and applied in the literature. An argument is presented for not only why this discourse is problematic in achieving its own goal, but that it is centered on the wrong goal. Followed by a broader discussion about the importance of discourse, a selection of earlier schools of thought are reviewed that are assumed to be more beneficial. It acknowledges why each of these may have been left behind and aims to recognize the value of them that may also have been unnecessarily forgotten.

Choosing to explore the concept of “ecological citizenship” as a better way of addressing ecological well-being, the second section of this review will examine literature on the topic to comprehend the term and its many facets. It does not aim to review the conceptual history of “citizenship” and its various forms but is more interested in “ecological citizenship” itself and how this term is being utilized. This will set the foundation for exploring new interpretations of the term in the discussion portion of this thesis.

The final section of this literature review takes a slightly different turn. With the goal of navigating practical approaches for a new way forward, it utilizes social-ecological systems theory as a comprehensive and holistic framework to assess the case study. Environmental governance is explored, as a subset of this conversation, for this system exploration has raised many governance related questions that deserve further attention.

2.1 Sustainability and Environmental Discourse

“A discourse is a shared way of apprehending the world. Embedded in language, it enables those who subscribe to it to interpret bits of information and put them together into
coherent stories or accounts. Discourses construct meaning and relationships, helping define common sense and legitimate knowledge. Each discourse rests on assumptions, judgments, and contentions that provide the basic terms for analysis, debates, agreements, and disagreements” (Dryzek, 2013: 9-10). The sustainability discourse is no different. Stated as a common goal, the term “sustainability” (as accepted in today’s society) is loaded with a number of underlying assumptions and interpretations. Most often these interpretations refer to actionable pathways to sustainability, rather than the state itself.

2.1.1 Defining Sustainability

The term “sustainability” can be defined as, “the capacity to endure, support, or maintain” (Onions, 1964). Increasingly, this term has been used as a reference to well-being for the natural environment. Broadly speaking, two threads of literature have contributed to sustainability concepts (Chapin et. al, 2009). One comes from ecology and addresses ecological sustainability as a basis for biodiversity conservation. The other more popular form comes from United Nations development efforts and addresses the socio-economic sustainability of human well-being (Chapin et. al, 2009). The latter stems most immediately from the highly influential 1987 UN report from the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. Also referred to as the Brundtland Report, it states that sustainable development is “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987). This term has often come to refer to three pillars: environmental protection, social progress, and economic growth (IUCN, 2005).

Since the release of Our Common Future, there has been no shortage of definitions for sustainability in the environmental literature (El Serafy, 1992; Meyer and Helfman, 1993;
Callicott and Mumford, 1997; Ott, 2003; Adams, 2006). Due to its abundance and variation, some environmental theorists disparage the concept, believing that its elusiveness can easily shut down any debate around the topic (e.g., Starik and Rands, 1995), or that it can be adapted as an empty slogan to fit any cause (e.g. Worster, 1993, or Ott, 2003). While it may be ambiguous in many respects, we do however, see some general themes that this concept tends to address.

2.1.2 Early Sustainability Discourse

Vucitech and Nelson (2010) provide a comprehensive outline of the common themes under the banner of sustainability: development of efficient technologies and markets for meeting human needs (generally the purview of engineering, physical science, biotechnology, economics, and business); understanding the state and nature of ecosystems (ecology and environmental sciences); understanding how exploitation affects ecosystems (applied ecology and environmental science); understanding how exploitation affects human cultures (sociology, political science, policy, law, anthropology, and the arts and humanities); and understanding the meaning of normative concepts such as human needs, socially just, depriving, and ecosystem health (ethics and philosophy).

To get an accurate sense of the attention being served to each of these areas, I completed a thorough scan of all academic books and scholarly journals in the Scholar’s Portal database associated with “sustainability” and quantified their abundance. I did this first in 2011 and then again in 2019. The purpose of this exercise was to expose how the sustainability discourse was primarily being interpreted and applied.

In 2011, approximately 30% of the list was attributed to technological solutions, and half of these were in reference to energy production. Following this, there were three topics that
appeared in relatively equal volumes: architecture and design, (e.g. Orr, 2002; McDonough and Braungart, 2002); planning and landscape change (e.g. McHarg, 1969), and environmental and wildlife management (e.g. Mitchell, 2010). While each of these broad topics had stood independently before the rise of the sustainability discourse, their underlying objectives could be seen to have shifted more towards a framework for sustainability.

These were followed by a large concentration of business and economic philosophies of many forms. The major topics in the area of business include ecological accounting practices, new forms of marketing and more ecologically-friendly packaging, and the revision of overall organizational strategies to acknowledge their role in human society and subsequently, the natural environment. In this context, the natural world is acknowledged in accordance to supporting longer-term industrial sustainability - resource management for economic purposes. Theorists within environmental economics value ecosystem services as externality costs and use these in environmental accounting.

With roughly the same numbers as those related to business and economics, were groups of articles pertaining to carbon emissions, environmental destruction/restoration, the ecological footprint, and a newer topic: “Education for Sustainable Development”, (ESD). Literature about EDS only begins to appear in 2008, but rapidly caught up in volume with these other topics.

The following themes on this list are distinctly fewer than those above, but prevalent enough to deserve mention. In 2011, there are a relatively small number of articles related to climate change sciences, but due to the volume of current articles at that time, it was clear that attention towards this field was on the rise. Population dynamics (from a survivalist standpoint) returned the same volume of books and articles as the climate change sciences, but newer works were rare, not receiving much attention later than the 1990s.
In 2011, there is a mentionable and growing number of works relating to ecological integrity and environmental indicators. Ecotourism (as a solution for a more sustainable way to travel) has seen increasing attention over the past decade; with the discussion becoming more balanced between both its positive and negative effects. Agriculture and food systems were also a new topic on the rise, with more predominant attention beginning in 2008 as well. The smallest categories (of those which are worth noting) that referenced “sustainability” as a keyword were governmental policy and regulation, consumption, and topics related to environmental psychology.

Until this point, the sustainability literature lacks an important component: promoting or understanding humans’ deep-rooted connection to the natural world. While this subject matter does exist, based on the evidence of volume, it is not a high priority to this discussion.

When this research began, the popular conversation about the environment and sustainability was to the effect that the environment needed “saving”, and the way we were to do this was to drive hybrid cars and replace our lights with mercury-filled energy-efficient bulbs. Turning to academia to examine if this message held true for the experts as it did for the masses, the literature confirmed that it mostly did.

There was little conversation about the inherent importance of the natural world and our connection to it. We were talking about “saving” something that we were truly disconnected from. Environmental problems aside, there was little conversation about the effects that this disconnection might have on humans themselves. There was little discussion about systemic change, or “creating a sustainable society”. When reviewing the literature in search of this discussion, there were an abundance of books and articles suggesting the need for society to become more ecologically sustainable; however, this was often just stated as a precursor for
other topics, as indicated above. Even from the most radical side of the environmental literature, we are still missing a conversation about human connectedness. See Table 1, below (Thrupp, 2005).

**Table 1: Perspectives within the Environmental Sustainability Movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues/Aspects</th>
<th>Ecological/Scientific Environmentalism</th>
<th>Social Ecology/Radical Environmentalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View of nature and ecology</td>
<td>Strict preservation; ecocentrism; nature/wildlife protectionism</td>
<td>Natural resources as a basis of production; Ecology/nature is often linked to indigenous culture (sometimes spiritual phenomena)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and explanation of problems</td>
<td>Functionalist or technical analysis; science prevails; Causes often attributed to greed; poor education; overpopulation; inappropriate technology</td>
<td>Structural analysis; root causes are generally viewed as socio-political in nature; capital exploits nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics/ideology on human-nature</td>
<td>Biological determinism, “life-boat” ethics</td>
<td>Equality, social justice, non-exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politiciews</td>
<td>Liberal to conservative</td>
<td>Progressive/leftist to radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of people and population</td>
<td>Perceived superiority of educated scientists; tendency to believe in Malthusian theory</td>
<td>Emphasis on inequitable distribution of wealth and exploitation of poor; Anti-Malthusian views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main topics of concern</td>
<td>Habitat, wilderness, biodiversity and animal species extinction, population, carrying capacity</td>
<td>Human rights and environment, environmental justice, toxic waste, worker health, food consumption/inequities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of participation</td>
<td>Scientists, private sector, and state policy makers decide on problem solving</td>
<td>Grassroots mobilization, empowerment of communities and disenfranchised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of energy problems/issues</td>
<td>Insufficiency and poor technology and strict limits</td>
<td>Capitalist relations and corporate control create disparities and aggravate dependency on oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to overcome “environmental” problems</td>
<td>Consciousness-raising; Nature Preservation/Protection Agency regulations; technocracy; Appropriate technology; Education, training; Expand birth control; scientists provide fixes</td>
<td>Structural changes; break down to corporate control that leads to natural and human degradation; Social and community organizing, labour movements; political action; social equity; Feminist and/or distributive values; justice in resource distribution; human rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.3 Sustainability Evolved

Since the start of this thesis, the popular conversation about the environment has advanced and deepened. In the news and media, we hear more about climate change and its effects: melting glaciers and sea ice, mass flooding, extreme weather, etc. Many political figures are taking these events seriously and actively discussing solutions (e.g. a carbon tax). And while not all political leaders see this as a priority, most of the educated public is in support of addressing climate change and other environmental factors. Spending time in nature is becoming a popular topic on national radio and in day-to-day conversation. “Forest bathing” and horticultural therapy have received increasing attention as important components to maintaining one’s personal health. Community and backyard vegetable gardens are once again becoming popular.

Obvious interest in the environment is also visible through other sources of media. One of Apple’s top 100 podcasts is entitled “Sustainable World Radio” and features titles such as “Working with Nature to Heal the Land” and “How to Mend our Broken Relationships to the Earth”. Netflix now features an abundance of environment-related documentaries, including “Planet Earth” and others.

This shift is also reflected in the literature. The term “sustainability” has continued to be more esteemed than ever. Using the Primo by Ex Libra catalogue through Wilfrid Laurier University’s library database, my original search of all literature published in and before 2011 had returned 506,732 items. By early 2019, nearly double that amount had been printed since that time: 982,249 works containing “sustainability” as a keyword have become available between 2012 and February 2019. The topics in the literature have also broadened.

The top textbooks about sustainability that have been released over this time have taken an increased interest in government and governance (Portney, 2015; Hogl et al, 2012), resilience
and environmental health (Thiele, 2016), consumption and natural capital (Goodall, 2012), political economy (Gale, 2018), and grassroots/community-based innovations (Davies, 2012), to name a few. Most recently, there has also been a new wave of spirituality and sacredness being brought to this discussion (Filho, et. al, 2018).

We have been asked to re-think “sustainable development” (Goodall, 2012; Gale, 2018; Bakari, 2017) and critique current models for sustainability (Parker, 2014; Hahn and Figge, 2018). Businesses are becoming more serious about their sustainability policies (Gonzalez-Perez & Leonard, 2013); they are more interested in changing the culture of their organizations (i.e. “transition theory”, “learning organizations”), than using eco-friendly approaches as pure marketing tactics. There is also stronger conversation about leadership (Hoffman, 2018; Kuruca, et. al, 2013) and an increasingly regular reference to systems and systemic change (Horne et al, 2016; Mitchell, 2019). In this same regard, there has also been significant work in many fields of social science and social theory in regard to the environment (Horne et al, 2016; Stern, 2018).

The recent expansion of the sustainability and environmental governance literature has led to research at all scales from local to global and focused on issues such as resource scarcity and conflicts, allocation and access, and biodiversity conservation in forest, agricultural, freshwater, marine, and even atmospheric systems (Bennet and Satterfield, 2018). It has covered many topics, including the broad participation of non-state actors, the attempt to improve vertical and horizontal coordination, and the effort to integrate different types of expertise in an effective and democratically accountable way (Hogl et al, 2012). It has been approached as an angle from which to understand the factors enabling or undermining the effectiveness of conservation and management (Armitage, et. al, 2012). As for governmental support of the environment, literature about sustainability initiatives have gained most attention at the local scale and have most often
been written in an urban context, about “sustainable cities” (Cohen, 2017; Roberts et al, 2014; Pollalis, 2016).

“Sustainability is grounded in the responsibility we have to sustain the community that sustains us” (Thiele, 2016). This is the basis for resilience and environmental health literature, which aims to support conservation biology. Human society is embedded in and part of the Earth’s biosphere, where each are truly intertwined and interdependent: a social-ecological system. Humans are not external drivers to ecosystem dynamics, but constant inputs to production processes (Biggs, Schluter, and Schoon, 2015). The resilience literature attempts to take a holistic view of systems over periods of time to understand their constitution and patterns, viewing disturbance and change not necessarily as something negative, but as part of a larger scale of reorganization. Resilience literature is about adaptability and transformation and goes hand in hand with social-ecological systems approaches to governance, which are described in the final section of this chapter.

The scarcity debate has been replaced with a discussion about “natural capital”, which has been described as “an idea whose time has come” (Helm, 2013). It has been suggested that the reason why natural capital is the way to think about the great environmental challenges we face is because of three characteristics. Natural capital is all about assets – the assets nature provides us with for free; it forces us to see the environment as a (or indeed the) key input into the economy – ending the apartheid between economic growth and protecting and enhancing the environment; and by focusing on capital maintenance, it makes a clear distinction between renewable and non-renewable assets (Helm, 2015). We can see this topic applied through the lens of ecological engineering, focusing on restoration (Bloginet et. al, 2014). Suggestions have been made about how the economy can contribute to conservation biology through practices of
sustainable use (Kok et. al., 2014). Primarily, it is used in an economic debate, suggesting qualitative over quantitative development (Jorgensen, 2015). The topic has also been approached through a number of scenarios in which various asset modelling or life cycle evaluations have been applied (Peng et al, 2015; Demirkesen and Evrendilek, 2018; and Yisong et. al, 2019).

As climate change and environmental degradation mark the most pressing issues of our time, sustainability concepts have also become widespread across many streams of social science. This includes a look at social theories and their relation to the environment, including the complex interactions between different spheres of economy, politics and civil society when dealing with environmental questions as social problems. It includes understanding the tensions and trade-offs when dealing with and between individual/society, economy/politics, cultural values/technical efficiency, environment/economy (Faran and Boda, 2018). Environmental sociology is also becoming a crucial background for environmental practitioners. Subjects include theories of motivation, cognition, and reasoning; identity-based theories and understandings of morals, intuitions, and culture; trust, negotiation, and public involvement; organizational theories, and systems theories (Stern, 2018).

Over the past decade, the “sustainability” discourse has evolved immensely. Related conversations are pervading all aspects of society and there is a mass recognition of the need for change. Sustainability-related topics are showing up in many more fields than geography and environmental studies, and in many cases, more fundamental issues are being asked in these other realms. The topics addressed within environmental sociology and philosophy are the closest to addressing the human-environment connection piece that is missing from the ecology/geography-based sustainability literature of today. But how can we begin to re-marry
these? A more values-based approach to environmentalism has been referenced in earlier environmental discourse movements that have come and gone. While there are reasons that these discourses have been left behind, it is a misfortune that we have let their central messages get lost in our move towards a more top-down, science-based relationship to the natural environment. It can be argued that it is time to find our way back to these, while still looking ahead.

2.1.4 Values-Based Discourses

It has been said that there are two distinct visions of nature and solutions to environmental problems: “environmentalism” and “ecologism”. According to the first, environmental problems are mainly management problems, soluble within the context of the dominant political and economic system, and without any rigorous change in our values or culture. To the second, there is a profounder vision, aiming at more structural change, according to which a radical change in our attitude towards nature, and therefore also in our political and social system, is necessary (Achterberg, 1993). “The value perspective of environmentalism is anthropocentric, while that of ecologism is ecocentric. Ecocentric in this sense does not mean subordination of human values to (those of) nature, but complete recognition of non-human nature’s intrinsic value” (Achterberg, 1993). The dominant sustainability dialogue falls within the category of “environmentalism” and is reluctant to address any ideals of “ecologism”. While it is natural to embrace new language in changing times, to simply leave behind important components of past conversations is unwise. This section reviews past discourses of the past that do address ideas from an ecologism perspective: social ecology, deep ecology, bioregionalism, and place. Of
which, speak to some of the foundations by which I base my understanding of “ecological citizenship” in the section to follow.

A pioneer of the ecology movement, Murray Bookchin labelled his contributions under the banner of “social ecology”. In Bookchin’s view of social ecology, he presented a philosophy of human evolution that combines the nature of biology and society into a third “thinking nature”. This theory suggests ethical principles for replacing society’s propensity for hierarchy and domination with that of democracy and freedom (Stokols, 2018).

Well before the development of a wide public environmental consciousness, Bookchin wrote about the social, psychological, and health consequences of urbanization, the use of industrial chemicals in food production, and a variety of other anti-ecological consequences of modern industrial society (Rudy and Light, 1995). His writings date from the early 1950s and evolve over the decades to follow (Bookchin, 1990). In 1982 Bookchin published his most well-known book, The Ecology of Freedom, where he extensively develops his view that the social domination of human by human leads to the idea of the domination of nature, and then, to the destruction of nature (Rudy and Light, 1995).

Bookchin is recognized by many due to not only his emphasis on deep seated social relations and their effects on the natural, but also for his utopian visions of the future – therefore drawing a wide audience. While renowned as a political leftist, he has also offered many critiques to the left, including Marxism and deep ecology. His contributions cannot be understated, but there have been shortcomings to his theories that have been addressed.

The heart of the critique of Bookchin is in his understandings of historical change, and therefore understandings of the processes of future transformations (Rudy and Light, 1995). Bookchin’s timeline follows the quantitative expansion of one form of political domination to
another, from production to technical administration and machinery. It has been argued that while this makes for a good storyline, there are more qualitative factors at play that must be recognized in order to understand why, as well as how, economic, political, and ecological crises occur under capitalism (Rudy and Light, 1995). In response to this, a new contribution titled “social labour” has been used to debate how alternative economic forms may allow communities to rise to power in an ecologically-supportive way (Rudy and Light, 1995). While Bookchin regards capitalism as an uncontrollable cancer that is only problematic, many newer economic theorists have attempted to find ecological solutions through various forms of new-age capitalism. Since capitalism has been recognized as having too many positive aspects to forego, his opinions have been considered too radical and unusable.

In the midst of Bookchin’s theorizing, a separate stream of radical ecology evolved. In 1972/73, Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess coined the term “deep ecology”, this was to point out the distinction between a more long-range ecology movement and the “shallow” anthropocentric and technocratic environmental movement, which was concerned primarily with pollution, resource depletion, and the “health and affluence of people in the developed countries” (Naess, 1973: 1). “The essence of deep ecology is to keep asking searching questions about human life, society, and Nature” (Devall and Sessions, 1985: 65). The deep ecology movement involves working on ourselves, what poet-philosopher Gary Snyder calls “the real work”, the work of really looking at ourselves, of becoming more real (Snyder and McLean, 1980). This is the work of cultivating ecological consciousness, and then taking direct action. Engaging in the “real work” is often found in the minority tradition of Western culture: decentralized, nonhierarchical, and democratic decision making, small scale community, local autonomy, self-responsibility, leadership by example, helping others/mutual aid/communalism, simplicity of
“wants”, self-regulation, respecting spirituality, participation, and a broader definition of community (including animals, plants, etc.) (Devall and Sessions, 1985).

While it shares many ideologies with social ecology, the difference is in its belief of where the environmental crisis has stemmed from: social ecology posits that it is from the history of emergence of hierarchies, classes, the market economy, and capitalism; deep ecologists locate the origin in belief systems – be they religions or philosophies. Both attribute our problems to the result of dominating nature, but deep ecologists go beyond, attributing this solely to capitalism and the state. Deep ecology also suffers from a similar critique to that of social ecology: essentially, it is out of date – the natural proceedings of society have shut-down elements of its argument. The standard deep ecology package is the conception that dominant scientific attitudes are mechanistic, reductionist, and fostering manipulative attitudes and practices with respect to the natural world. It offers a call to return to the old wisdom of non-technological cultures (Grey, 1986). Scientists and systems thinkers have suggested that science can be holistic and believe in interdependence and structural unity; and the move towards this type of scientific practice is only becoming more dominant in environmental studies. Due to this internal conflict, deep ecology and its moral guide, is often invalidated as too narrow an approach for today’s complex and modern society; but this approach is still supported by many.

There is a branch of thinkers that have organized around the simple calling of a closeness to the natural environment, structured around one’s bioregion. Out of this, a more defined movement evolved, referred to as “bioregionalism”. Bioregionalism is the idea of restructuring our economy and politics into self-sustaining units, more or less along ecological lines (Sale, 1985). Sale emphasizes that this approach is practical and essential for sustaining our resources into the future – it is not just a utopian scheme for some pleasant and nebulous dream for the
future. While the movement of “bioregionalism” is rarely referred to by name, it is still evident in today’s call to “support local” – however today’s movement is also paired with a more global, “earth citizen” approach.

In the literature of the past decade, these concepts have been re-allocated to the subject of “place”. Durning (1996) effectively summarizes the need to engage in our home places when working towards sustainability, exemplifying the power in place for bringing unity around important matters: “Natural units of place... have always mattered more to people than has humanity in general or the planet in its entirety… people will sacrifice for villages, homelands, or nations, even giving their lives. But humans seem unwilling to sacrifice for their planet, despite the fact that it is now suffering proportionately greater losses from social decay and environmental destruction than do most countries at war” (Durning, 1996: 6). “If places motivate but the planet does not, a paradox emerges: it may be possible to diagnose global problems globally, but impossible to solve them globally (Durning, 1996: 7).” Connection to place falls within its own set of literature. It is often connected to pillars of psychology, sociology, and philosophy within geography, and though it seems like a perfect fit, it is often not considered with political decision-making and institutional structuring in relation to place.

While these notions have been passed up as “radical” environmentalism that is impractical in today’s society, the ideas and values behind them have not lost their significance. Although modern institutional structures do not support an ecological way of living, hope for their potential reform must not be given up. The discussion of these ideals should not be tucked away merely because it is too difficult to foster them within today’s cultural values and competing economic systems. Because it is so hard to compete is the reason that these mantras must not be given up.
“Sustainability” has provided us a broad avenue from which to explore many options on a variety of scales, but it remains all too problematic and limiting due to its inherent connection with modernity, economic growth, and technocratic solutions. Many argue that we must continue to evolve our conversation and use new language that is able to reach further depth – a discourse that triggers a heartfelt human connection to the natural environment, through identity and virtues, and which supports a dialogue about meaningful and systemic change.

2.2 Ecological Citizenship

There seems to be a consensus among analysts who have turned to citizenship, that the very enlisting of the idea implies a recognition that sustainability requires shifts in attitudes at a deep level - deeper than those reached by fiscal measures such as traffic congestion charging, or charges levied on household waste. These measures only work, so the suggestion goes, as long as they are in place. They change behaviour, but they do not necessarily change attitudes - and if they are removed, behaviour could revert to type. The citizenship approach to sustainability, then, aims at attitudes, and it does so in part by drawing on a powerful commitment in citizenship theory and practice through the ages to the idea of the ‘common good’ (Dobson and Saiz, 2005: 157).

2.2.1 Addressing Ecological Well-being through the “Citizenship” Lens

There are several different themes under which citizenship and the environment have been brought together. Some of its various forms have been presented under titles such as “green citizenship” (Dean, 2001; Smith, 2005), “sustainability citizenship” (Barry, 2006); “environmentally reasonable citizenship” (Hailwood, 2005), “ecological stewardship” (Barry, 2002, 1999), or “civic environmentalism” (Ohran, 2008). More directly relevant is “environmental citizenship” (Dobson and Bell, 2006; Luque, 2005) and the term that is explored

This conceptual diversity is not merely a terminological issue but reflects the complexity of the citizenship and environment debate, and the numerous frames of reference within which it can be viewed. In general, academic theorizing has tended to center around whether there is a distinct type of green citizenship, or whether ecological citizenship can be accommodated by building on current political models within existing schools of thought (see Dobson, 2006; Eckersley, 1996; or Doherty and de Geus, 1996, etc.)

As Cohen (1999) discusses, in terms of an environmental agenda, the nation-state is becoming considered by political theorists to be obsolete from a moral legitimacy and efficacy point of view. Environmental forms of citizenship are often fit within a combination of four quadrants: liberal/conservative and cosmopolitan/civic. In the simplest terms, the “liberal” outlook tends to revolve around rights, while the “conservative” position is more interested in responsibilities. The “cosmopolitan” literature takes an urban, globalized slant, where the “civic” favours a more local and nationalized approach. In response to globalization, the citizenship debate is increasingly being cast as a choice between just two forms: liberal cosmopolitanism or some form of democratic civic republicanism/conservativism (Cohen, 1999). In terms of structure, the picture of a “sustainable society” is almost always assumed to fit under the structure of democracy. (There are those that promote a green authoritarian type regime, [e.g. Beeson, 2010], but these are too few to regard in any depth here.)

MacGregor (2006) describes three slightly different kinds of discussion around environmental citizenship. All stress some degree of political participation, and/or moral responsibility to the common good, but differ in their emphases on issues of scale. The first
emphasizes direct democracy in local communities in an active eco-communist approach; often described under other titles such as bioregionalism and social ecology (see Dobson, 1995, 2003; Sale, 1985; Pepper, 1993; Bookchin, 1980, 1989; Curtin 1999). This form can arguably relate to many different typologies of citizenship, from a communist to republican or conservative perspective. The second shares a commitment to participatory and democratic ideals; yet emphasizes the cultivation of individual virtues of green citizenship (i.e. stewardship) rather than localist solutions. It looks to establish deliberative democratic processes that can occur in different political spaces (see Barry, 1999 or Christoff, 1996). The third form demonstrates a conception of earth citizen, with an interest in supranational forms of governance. This acts as a way to adequately address the variety of transboundary problems, which no local community or nation-state is equipped to cope with on their own (Altvater, 1999; Low and Gleeson, 1998; Attfield, 1999; Falk, 1997; Urry, 2000; Beck, 1998; Van Steenbergen, 1994). This form takes the shape of “cosmopolitan” citizenship, referring to virtues of the common good and basing membership within the entire human race.

2.2.2 Defining Ecological Citizenship

While it works within the language of citizenship, ecological citizenship takes a recognizably different form (Dobson, 2003). Many use the terms interchangeably, but understanding the distinction is important: environmental citizenship deals in the realm of green politics, specifically dealing with rights and duties regarding the environment, and leaves ‘citizenship’ unchanged (Dobson 2003; Bell 2005; Eckersley 1996; Agyeman and Evans, 2006). Ecological citizenship, on the other hand, asks us to rethink the traditions of citizenship. It assumes by the pure fundamentals of its conversation that we are members of a greater
community that is connected to the natural environment and discusses how we should operate based on that assumption. It disregards the nation-state, dealing primarily with justice in a sense of *moral* duty. It shares a focus on “common good”, assimilation of space, and consumption of “resources” (Dobson, 2003). It houses conversations about membership, rights, identity, and participation, but questions the traditional perception of what these refer to and asks us to re-evaluate these concepts based on something larger than human constructs.

In an early form, Environment Canada defined ‘Ecological Citizenship simply as “the idea that we have responsibilities for the environment rooted in the communities to which we belong” (Environment Canada, 1993). Steward (1991) pointed to a rise of green global citizenship that “embodies a new sense of the universal political subject beyond the context of the nation state, and a refreshed awareness of equality in terms of our shared dependence on nature”. Hailwood describes it as “a matter of seeing ‘respect for nature’s otherness’ as continuous with the exercise of virtuous citizenship in accordance with the ‘spirit of reasonableness’” (2005). For some, descriptions include why it is not like other political structures: “a structure of civic faith, a faith that stands at considerable odds with other civic faiths, most especially those that assume some form of exclusionary principle wherein humans are excerpted from the conditions of life shared by all species in nature, or one group or class of humans is excerpted from the shared condition of humankind” (Engel, 1998). For others, it takes a liberal slant, referring to rights: “Citizens (rightly) demand to be free from environmental risks inflicted on them by others, inside or outside the territory of the nation-state(s) they belong to. They argue for environmental security in a similar vein as implied in the debates on national security” (Spaargaren and Mol, 2008).
The most cited description comes from Andrew Dobson, leading author on the subject, who states that ecological citizenship “deals in the currency of non-contractual duty; it inhabits the private as well as the public sphere, it refers to the source rather than the nature of duty in order to determine what count as citizenship virtues, it works with the language of virtue, and it is explicitly non-territorial” (2003: 68). To be non-contractual and non-territorial, he argues that these ideas must move beyond the state and expand the scope of obligations, referencing moral duty over institutional duty across space and time. In this sense, there is a temporal extension of justice (concern for the future) and a spatial extension of justice (concern for geographies outside of the local region or nation) (Dobson, 2003). Central themes revolve around morality, social justice, and a sense of fairness (Dobson, 2003).

Dobson and Bell challenge the traditional confinement of citizenship to the public sphere and suggest that people’s actions and private choices about consumption should be brought to the forefront; challenging the concept of the ‘self-interested rational actor’ which pervades policy, government thinking and economic modelling (2006). Dobson posits that ecological citizenship should be concerned with the unconventional ideal of asymmetrical obligations, whereby the balance of duties is determined by the size of one’s ecological footprint (2003).

While Dobson’s perception of the term is the most accepted, his ideas about duties being related to one’s ecological footprint have been challenged by more traditional scholars as being too abstract and not political enough to prove valid (Hayword, 2006). However, Dobson argues that if cosmopolitan citizenship can exist (based on the morals of common good for humanity), then ecological citizenship based within the political economy of consumption should prove its relevance as being more political than that of a moral politic (2006). While I agree with Dobson that the polity of the matter is not the issue here, I do agree with Hayword that the abstractness of
working within the bounds of an ecological footprint could be too overwhelmingly individualistic to make it workable from a systemic scale. And while I agree with the need for a discussion about the private-sphere, I believe this conversation should be founded on a broader ideal. Limiting the focus to the ecological footprint centers the identity portion of this concept around consumption, rather than something more intrinsic, such as connection.

2.2.3 Utilizing “Ecological Citizenship” in Practice

While there are many descriptive avenues to debate within its scope, I am most interested in exploring the discursive space that ecological citizenship provides and the opportunities this could offer. While the literature is not overwhelmingly broad, there are several social theorists that have begun to utilize this term in practice.

Sverker C. Jagers conducted a random sample of 3000 Swedes, where he found a group of respondents who claimed to be ‘ecological citizens’, namely by interest, ideologies, and most importantly, willingness to act (2009). He then attempted to determine why they may have a willingness to act, asking a core question “What characterizes ecologically sound citizens and how can these characteristics be promoted nationally and globally?” (Jagers, 2009: 19). In 2014, Jagers et al. (2014) expanded on this work, by looking at what factors of ecological citizenship are more relevant in driving pro-environmental behaviour. He states, “Though most suggest a transformed concept of citizenship as a viable road towards increased individual environmental responsibility, one significant aspect of EC remains largely unaddressed: if ‘saving the planet’ is the question, then EC can only be the answer in so far as it contributes to individuals doing precisely that. Reviewing the literature, we find rather few examples of scholars empirically
addressing the concept of EC and its connection to pro-environmental behaviour” (Jagers, 2014: 434).

As an environmental philosopher, Andrew Light looks to “environmental citizenship” as a potential outlet for a new discussion, believing that “rarely, if ever, do environmental ethicists discuss how to form better relationships between society and nature in human-dominated settings – namely cities or other urban communities – rather than simply considering the value of nature in the abstract” (2006). He highlights William H. Whyte as one of the most important environmental philosophers of all time due to his focus on natural spaces that are within most people’s grasp (i.e. local parks and small tracts of land in the middle of lived spaces), rather than abstract wilderness that many rarely visit or engage with. Within this, he presents ‘restoration ecology’ as a perfect example of environmental ethics in practice (Light, 2006).

Emily Huddart Kennedy describes ecological citizenship as a normative theory that has been used to explain how some individuals lead sustainable lives within the constraints of late capitalism – believing its individual orientation is a weakness and that it largely neglects the role of collective, cultural shifts in environmental politics (Kennedy, 2011). Calling on work from Boyd (2003), she states that “from the vantage point of environmental sociology, environmental crises are material problems with ideological roots” (in Kennedy, 2011: 843). Yet still, in both social and public policy theory, there is a strong emphasis on the material only. Within a discussion of ecological citizenship and its potential for a new frame of dialogue to unite the political masses and the individual, Kennedy (2011) uses sustainable consumption as an entry point to examine an informal neighbourhood network committed to reducing impacts on the environment.
Alex Latta also branches out, stating, “my intent herein is to draw some of our attention away from questions of what ecological citizenship might look like as a normative theory, and to redirect it toward the equally compelling possibility of using the turn toward citizenship as a springboard for advancing the democratic impulse that has long been one of the hallmarks of environmentalism” (Latta, 2007: 378). Here he presents the importance of addressing ‘collective action’, which has often been set to the sidelines in academia and embracing the “proliferation of a wide plurality of ecological citizenships, corresponding to the active politicization of the human-nature and human-human relationships that coalesce in various socio-ecological orders” (Latta, 2007: 378). He acknowledges Torgerson, who argues that most practice-oriented environmental work has been crisis-oriented constructions leading to the instrumentalization of politics in environmental practice, but rarely a sphere in which a broad spectrum of citizens can engage in fulsome debate. What citizenship offers, Latta argues, is a “discursive space in which to cultivate the attitudes that will lead individuals to behave in an ecologically responsible manner by ‘doing their bit’ – whether by recycling, buying ‘green’ products, reducing consumption, taking a holiday close to home or getting involved in community environmental initiatives” (2007: 380). “The turn to ecological citizenship offers fresh theoretical ground upon which to cultivate this inner revolution as a basis for action, by connecting individual ethical commitments to the political context of a larger collective” (2007: 380).

More recent work from Roe and Buser (2016) utilizes ecological citizenship as a backdrop for a deeper conversation about complex food connections and how they shape wellbeing (personal, economic, cultural, and environmental). The article explores the role of performance, matter, and practice in cultural food studies. It is critical of the food marketplace as the sole site of informing consumer behaviour and looks to reflect on the use of non-commercial spaces for
forming ecological citizens in respect to food. This participatory research invites people to respond not only as “ethical consumers” but as “ecological citizens” and aims to contribute toward understandings of human-world entanglements. This article is one of few examples that go beyond defining and exploring the term and focuses more on how ecological citizens are created in relation to food. Ecological citizenship is defined for the purpose of this article, as “not in its traditional relation to the state but rather to the world of humans and non-humans whose lives are materially connected through nourishment” (Roe & Buser, 2016: 583).

2.2.4 Summary of Literature, Gaps and Opportunities

In a special edition of Environments Journal dedicated to ecological citizenship (2005), Latta and Garside state that the current literature concerning the topic asks questions about attitude change, environmental ethics, education, gender, and the appropriate scale of ecological politics. Since 2005, more practical attention has been regarded through an interest in the obstacles and opportunities presented by neoliberal democracies and capitalist economies (Melo-Escrehelho, 2008). It has been argued that ecological citizenship could be instantiated in the economic sphere, through practices such as ecological modernization (Christoff, 1996), the social economy (Smith, 2005), sustainable consumption (Seyfang, 2005; Spaargaren and Mol, 2008; Kennedy, 2011) or ethical investment (Carter and Huby, 2005). Other avenues are through environmental education (Carlsson and Jensen, 2006; Gough and Scott, 2006; Hailwood, 2005; Dobson, 2003) and activism/public participation (Horton, 2006; Latta, 2007; Light, 2006). “Although none of these initiatives to foster ecological/environmental citizenship through the economy, the education system, or activism have been systematically studied. The emphasis has been placed on rights, democratic processes, and personal duties” (Melo-Escrehelho, 2008).
While the use of this term has been increasing, there has been limited growth in the ecological citizenship literature over the past decade. The literature is tending to move away from descriptions and explorations of the term and more towards practical applications and studies of ecological citizenship on the ground. So while there have been advances, the field remains young and offers many opportunities for growth. There is a considerable lack of attention to systemic studies; particularly those addressing influences for or against good ecological citizenship. There is also a particular lack of attention to the term from a wilderness-based context. The literature is mostly urban and sometimes rural in its focus. So far, there have been limited attempts to merge lessons learned from those already living close to the land with cosmopolitan conceptions of the ecological citizen. This research aims to address all of these gaps.

While this term is not popularly used, concepts from it have been widely popular in recent years, and exponentially so in recent months. The sheer mass of the climate strikes and marches taking place around the world, spurred by Greta Thunberg, are a tribute to the fact that citizens want a world in which society begins to think and act differently in regard to the environment. These actions are a showcase of ecological citizenry on a wide scale. One cannot escape the conversation of how we as humans can do better in regard to our planet, in respect to the climate crisis, to the massive scale of universal environmental degradation, and in regard to our everyday choices. When this thesis work began, this conversation was held in regard to “global warming” and mostly in the name of “sustainability”. Today, this conversation is about “climate change”. But none of these dialogues provide the space to address the breadth of the conversation that we should be having. “Ecological citizenship” could provide this platform.
In July 2017, the first issue of “The Ecological Citizen” journal was released, claiming to “hold and advocate for an ecocentric worldview that finds intrinsic value in all of nature and the ecosphere” (Washington, et. al, 2011). The “Ecological Citizen’s Project” was started in the same year as a think/act/learn space in Garrison, NY. Their mission is to grow citizen-led campaigns to produce a more just, healthy, democratic, and sustainable way of life and they are currently running pilot projects in 6 states (Ecological Citizen’s Project, 2019). In the past few years, there have also been numerous “Environmental Citizenship” classes introduced to various Ontario colleges: Algonquin, Fleming, Niagara, George Brown, Durham, Georgian, St. Lawrence, etc. One can also complete an Environmental Citizenship Certificate at the University of Guelph. While it appears that this language may be making some traction, for these ideas to manifest at a large scale, they must be adapted within our systems and structures.

2.3 Social-Ecological Systems & Environmental Governance

While the first two sections of this literature review have referred to language and approaches to discourse, this final section looks to frameworks for assessing these concepts on the ground. This review explores social-ecological systems (SES) theory as a holistic approach to analyzing and breaking down complex systems. Themes of resilience, transformation, and change are explored, as topics that are central to SES approaches. Environmental governance is then introduced, as an emerging theme from the systems study in this thesis. In the context of southwest Yukon, understanding environmental governance is considered a foundational component for understanding ecological citizenship within the social-ecological systems.
2.3.1 Social-Ecological Systems Theory

“Managing environmental issues has become more complex due to expanding scales of problems and the dynamic and evolutionary characteristics of these problems. One approach to dealing with the complexity of managed resource systems has been to acknowledge the strong coupling between the social and ecological aspects of systems” (Chaffin & Gunderson, 2016: 1-2). “Using a social-ecological systems (SES) approach in the generation of knowledge and the formulation of sustainable governance solutions is critical, as it explicitly recognizes the connections and feedbacks linking human and natural systems” (Leslie, et al, 2015: 5979).

A system is a “dynamic and complex whole, interacting as a structured functional unit,” (Sterman, 2000). Though we can find them in many places, there are certain characteristics that identify a system versus a collection of independent objects: parts can be identified; the parts affect each other; the parts together produce an effect that is different from the effect of each part on its own; and the effect, or the behaviour, of these parts together persists over time in a variety of circumstances (Meadows, 2008: 13). The systems approach broadly refers to a holistic view of the components of a system and their interrelationships (Berkes and Folke, 1998: 6).

*Social-ecological* systems theory brings together both social systems and ecological systems, accepting the view that these systems are in fact linked and the distinction between social and natural systems is artificial and arbitrary (Berkes, and Folke, 1998: 4). Quite obviously, some social and ecological systems will interact more than others at certain scales, but the social system is consistently embedded within a larger ecological system, which it relies on for survival (Berkes, and Folke, 1998). Social systems are dependent on the broad-scale effects of ecological systems, (e.g. hydrological and atmospheric processes) and interdependent with beings interacting at a human scale (e.g. trees and cows).
Systems approaches attempt to understand patterns of relationships and how these translate to emergent behaviours (Kay, 2008: 3). This type of approach is helpful for understanding more complex systems, avoiding reductionist ways of thinking, and overcoming blind spots between sub-systems that traditional science tends to miss. Systems thinking allows for problem-solving from multiple perspectives whereby boundaries can be altered to suit different goals. It can use traditional science to understand the workings of smaller sub-systems, and cross-scale examinations to link these sub-systems back together to create a full picture of the entire system. Due to its ability to identify triggers for change and unpack complexity, this type of approach is most appropriate for understanding large complex systems – particularly social systems – and is especially beneficial for making management type decisions (Kay, 2008).

Because “translating systems thinking into action is what systems approaches are about” (Kay, 2008: 4), it is important to be familiar with key systems concepts to understand how to apply them and interpret their results. There are many frameworks and approaches for assessing social-ecological systems. Some of the most regarded approaches are described here: Checkland’s Soft Systems Methodology (SSM), the Diamon Diagram, the Adaptive Methodology for Ecosystem Sustainability and Health (AMESH), and Ostrem’s SES Approach. There are also many related methods under the banner of “resilience approaches”.

**Checkland’s Soft Systems Methodology (SSM)**

Often seen as the first of soft systems form of modeling, Peter Checkland revised the “hard” systems work of statistician and commercial enterpriser Gwilym Jenkins to reflect a systems assessment that could be reiterated to suit multiple types of systems. Over two decades of SSM modelling, this participatory style of enquiry changed multiple times, from block diagrams and
then a seven-stage process to two-stream model. A few years later, SSM was presented as just four recursive stages, less formal and more flexible than before (Richardson, 2016):

1. Finding out (include culture & politics)
2. Construction of relevant models
3. Debate via models which seeks agreement over improvement
4. Action to amend the situation

Each stage is presented with a series of pictures and diagrams to best represent complex situations in the most comprehensible and logical arrangement.

The Diamond Diagram

The “diamond” heuristic shows how scenarios, visions and managing for sustainability emerge from the integration of ecological and sociocultural understanding. The scientists’ role here is to collect information about the system and describe scenarios of how the future might unfold, based on the known ecological constraints and possibilities.
Through a combination of systems approaches and collaborative process, the community develops a coevolving vision of the future, and a plan is developed by which to achieve this vision. Finally, a combination of management, governance, and monitoring is implemented to support the development of a self-organizing complex system that can reach its goals (Waltner-Toews and Kay, 2008). This method was developed by James Kay and his students and colleagues at University of Waterloo. It is described in Figure 2-1, below.

Adaptive Methodology for Ecosystem Sustainability and Health (AMESH)

While often attributed to the work of Waltner-Toews, AMESH was developed through a series of research and intervention projects, coupled with in-depth reflection by several international teams of researchers (Waltner-Toews and Kay, 2008). Most AMESH projects have focused strongly on the “top” of the diamond (above) and raise questions about stakeholder-governance-issue relationships and how these influence system definition, problem identification, and possible resolutions. It does not prescribe a set of procedures and quality testing techniques, but draws on a set of “guiding principles”: (1) methodological pluralism and locally grounded multiple perspectives, (2) hierarchical and cross-scale interactions, (3) self-organization, and (4) unpredictability and uncertainty (Waltner-Toews and Kay, 2008).
AMESH acknowledges the fundamentally important role of local people in any endeavor to address ecosystem sustainability and health and supports the full participation of local people and the inclusion of nonexpert perspectives. It also recognizes the importance of the larger context in which the local is embedded. This approach strongly considers the systems as multi-scaled nested hierarchies.

This approach is summarized in Figure 2-2, left (from Waltner-Toews and Kay, 2005).
Ostrom’s SES Approach

In 2009, Eleanor Ostrom presents an updated version of a multilevel, nested framework for analyzing outcomes achieved in SESs (Ostrom, 2009). See Figure 2-3 below. The figure above shows the relationships among the first-level core sub-systems of an SES that affect each other, as well as linked social, economic, and political settings and related ecosystems. Each core sub-system is made up of multiple second-level variables, which are further composed of deeper level variables.

This framework has been designed to help identify relevant variables for studying a single focus SES, as well as to identify common variables for similar studies. Particularly, it has been designed for industry standardization, for the purpose of assembling cumulative data (Ostrom, 2009).
Resilience Approaches

While resilience thinking is a core aspect of all SES approaches, resilience approaches (specifically) have a slightly different focus. Resilience is the ability of a system to absorb disturbance and still retain its basic function and structure. At the heart of resilience thinking is the simple notion that things change, and to ignore or resist this change, is to increase our vulnerability and forego emerging opportunities. It recognizes that we are all part of linked social-ecological systems that are complex and adaptive and focuses on “resilience” as the key to the sustainability of these systems. Many of the ideas from resiliency theory have been inspired by the work of C.S. “Buzz” Holling and fortified by the Resilience Alliance (Walker and Salt, 2006).

While there are many ways to approach a framework for resilience thinking, Walker and Salt (2006), approach it with 3 steps:

1. Consider a systems perspective of how the world works: linked social-ecological systems that are complex and adaptive.
2. Develop an understanding of the two central themes that underpin resilience thinking: thresholds and adaptive cycles
3. Apply this understanding to the real world:
   - How might a resilience approach be put into operation?
   - What are the costs of a resilience approach?
   - What are the implications for policy and management?
   - What might a resilience world be like?

Resilient social-ecological systems have the capacity to change as the world changes while still maintaining their functionality, and are therefore open to multiple uses, while also being more forgiving of management mistakes (Walker and Salt, 2006: 10-12).
Key concepts have been pulled from each of these approaches and organized in a four-step process that is used to assess the Greater Kluane Region as a social-ecological system. This four-step process and the tools/sub-themes within it are described in more depth in the methodologies chapter to follow.

2.3.2 Resilience, Transformation, & Change

The “Consortium for Sustainable Development”, the US National Research Council, and the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment have all focused increasing attention on notions of robustness, vulnerability, and risk. As stated by Walker, et al., there is good reason for this, as it is these characteristics of social-ecological systems that will determine their ability to adapt and benefit from change. To overcome these, there are three attributes of stability dynamics that can be used to compliment these uncertainties: resilience, adaptability, and transformability (2004).

Walker and Salt state, “at the heart of resilience thinking is a very simple notion - things change - and to ignore or resist this change is to increase our vulnerability and forego emerging opportunities” (2006: 9). It “presents an approach to managing natural resources that embraces human and natural systems as complex systems continually adapting through cycles of change” (Walker and Salt, 2006: 10). More definitively, “resilience is the capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while undergoing change so as to still retain essentially the same function, structure, identity, and feedbacks” (Walker, et al. 2004).

Similarly, adaptability is the ability of a system to shift just enough to accommodate disturbance, while maintaining the same essential structure and dynamics. Resilience is often thought to be the overarching goal, and adaptability is a characteristic of a resilient system – if the system is adaptable, it will most often be resilient. Understanding the Adaptive Cycle is one
of the key components to understanding resilience and adaptability. In general, resilient systems can (1) absorb shocks and stresses, (2) self-organize, and (3) learn and adapt (Gunderson and Holling, 2002).

If the system in question is not resilient or is not working towards the desired goal, it may be necessary to intervene. Leverage points may be introduced to influence change in the system. There are three leverage points that are most effective: (1) Reduce the gain of a reinforcing loop by introducing balancing loops to the same feedback or introducing/changing speed of a delay; (2) shifting the dominance by reorganizing the hierarchy; or (3) by completely reorganizing (or “transforming”) the system to reflect more directive goals (see Meadows, 2009).

Transformability refers to fundamentally altering the system. It is defined as, “the capacity to create a fundamentally new system when ecological, economic, or social (including political) conditions make the existing system untenable” (Walker, et al., 2004). New variables are introduced or allowed to emerge. The changes cascade through and may change the entire panarchy with all its constituent adaptive cycles (2004). The key is to be able to recognize the need for change and transform to something more desirable before it is too late (before a threshold is reached).

If a transformation is needed, resilience is not always a good thing. Peter Drucker (1973) made a distinction between doing things right (efficiency) and doing the right thing (effectiveness). “The righter we do the wrong thing, the wronger we become... In contrast, when a correction is made to an error in pursuing the right thing, we become better because we learn. Therefore, it is far better to do the right thing wrong, than the wrong thing right” (Ackoff and Rovin, 2003: 1). If we realize the system is functioning in opposition to our goals, then it is appropriate to take actions that encourage a more positive transformation: move the system
closer to its threshold to encourage change or disregard the current system altogether (Meadows, 2008).

If reorganizing the system is too difficult (which it generally is), one may be able to start by recognizing trends to help predict and plan for future organization of the system (Meadows, 2008). To do this, we must recognize which types of changes have positive effects and which have negative effects. Some examples of factors that may affect social-ecological resilience have been identified by Berkes and Seixas (2003: 293):

Key factors that weaken social-ecological resilience:

1.) Breakdown of ‘traditional’ institutions and authority system
2.) Rapid technological changes leading to more efficient resource exploitation
3.) Rapid changes in the local socio-economic system
4.) Institutional instability in higher political level negatively affecting local management.

Key factors that strengthen social-ecological resilience:

1.) Strong institutions:
   a. Robust local institutions
   b. Strong enforcement of rules (local, regional, or national)
   c. Strong leaders with credibility and willingness to promote changes
2.) Good cross-scale communications:
   a. Sharing of facts about resource status and threats; ability of resource users to detect environmental modifications and management crises
   b. Co-management using both scientific and local ecological knowledge
3.) Political space for experimentation
4.) Equity in resource access
5.) Use of memory and knowledge as source of innovation and novelty
   a. Innovation in regulations based on past arrangements
   b. Memory/knowledge of resource monitoring and management practices

Understanding change dynamics is essential for making decisions about the future. Making note of the effects that various types of changes have on the system over time will give a good understanding of similar changes to encourage or avoid. While there may be general similarities among all social-ecological systems, there will also be unique differences.
Acknowledging change at all scales and evaluating trends is an important first step to understanding resilience and/or transformation of/for the system.

While our various ecological systems have proven their resilience through many changes over the period of our human history, it has been acknowledged that this resiliency may be declining. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2018) states that we have 11 years to make drastic changes to the way that humankind is operating. Our global social-ecological system is not in a state of resilience and is likely moving towards one or more thresholds.

Our social system has been described as a nested sub-system that is dependent on a broader ecological system (Berkes, et al, 1998). Yet, I have yet to find environmental management theory that focuses specifically on the effects of this nested sub-system. Numerous examples point to the inherent anti-environmental nature of the socio-economic system that drives human behaviour and human interactions with ecological beings/processes. While acknowledging the interdependence and connectivity of social and ecological systems is countlessly important, it is clear that the “social-economic” part of our social-ecological system is the one that is driving our global system to lack resiliency.

Our path to ensuring resiliency for social-ecological systems as a whole will require an acknowledgement of the necessity to transform many social sub-systems within it. When redesigning these systems and sub-systems, there are two scales of most interest to this research: (1) How does the system affect citizens’ daily interactions and relationships with the natural environment? (2) How and by whom are wider-scale environmentally-related decision made? In this regard, I am particularly interested in environmental governance within the system, and more specifically, approaches that consider effects on citizens.
2.3.3 Environmental Governance

“The complexity and nonlinearity of social-ecological systems has led resilience scholars to question traditional models of governance as they are deemed ill-equipped to result in better and more resilient outcomes,” (Biesbroek, et. al, 2017). While conventional “command and control” environmental management has been remarkably successful in providing a continuous supply of ecosystem services, it has come with steep environmental and social costs (Armitage et al, 2012). Recognizing that how decisions are made, and by whom, is a central component to addressing these pitfalls (see Holling and Meffe, 1996), the field of environmental governance has been gaining increasing traction.

Environmental governance has been defined as “the institutions, structures, and processes that determine who makes decisions, how and for whom decisions are made, whether, how and what actions are taken, and by whom and to what effect” (Bennett and Satterfield, 2018: 2). It can be interpreted simply as the arrangement of power and ownership within society. It is not organized solely through structures of government but emerges from the interaction of multiple actors within the private and public spheres. “It can be formally institutionalized or expressed through subtle norms of interactions or even more indirectly by influencing the agendas and shaping the contexts in which actors contest decisions and determine access to resources” (Lebel, et al, 2006: 1). “The aim of environmental governance is to manage individual behaviours and collective actions in pursuit of public environmental goods and societal outcomes; and to comprehend it, is to understand how decisions are made and if these will lead to environmentally and socially sustainable outcomes” (Bennet and Satterfield, 2018: 6).

Management and governance are not synonymous, and they are not mutually exclusive either (Armitage et al, 2012). Management involves operational decisions to achieve specific
outcomes, whereas governance refers to the broader processes and institutions through which societies make decisions that affect the environment (Armitage et al, 2012). Although the umbrella of governance facilitates (or undermines) effective environmental management, it can be differentiated from management as the resources, plans, and actions that result from the functioning of governance (Lockwood 2010). Without good governance, combined with effective management, [environmental management and conservation] initiatives are unlikely to succeed socially or ecologically (Bennett and Dearden 2014).

While the field of environmental governance is not new, it has evolved considerably in recent decades. Early literature tended to be more conceptual and political and today’s literature tends toward practical guidelines and approaches. In a review of nearly 50 years of scholarship on environmental governance prior to 2001, Davidson and Frickel (2004) find that the literature can be fit into six broad perspectives, referring to: (1) pluralism (e.g. Buttel, 1985), (2) agency capture, (3) ecological Marxism (e.g. Robert and Grimes, 2002), (4) ecological modernization (e.g. Sonnenfeld and Mol, 2002; Spaargaren & Mol, 1992, Spaargen, Mol, & Buttel, 2000), (5) social constructionism (e.g Buttel & Taylor, 1992; Hannigan, 1995), and (6) global environmentalism.

Environmental governance today is said to focus on two central and interrelated areas: governance design and implementation and governance performance (Bennett, 2015). Five key concepts that have been highlighted are: (1) recognition of the importance of fit and scale; (2) fostering adaptiveness, flexibility, and learning; (3) coproducing knowledge from diverse sources; (4) understanding the emergence of new actors and their roles; (5) changing expectations about accountability and legitimacy (Armitage et al, 2012). Conventional notions of what governance implies (good governance), how governance takes place (through the state),
and what governance processes seek to achieve (efficient resource use) are shifting (Armitage et al, 2012).

Due to the increasing recognition of the complex and multi-scaled reality of our environmental problems, no one actor will be able to resolve these problems on their own. “Traditional, government-led approaches have not, and perhaps cannot, create the conservation outcomes that are desired” (Armitage et al, 2012). Coincidentally, the state is increasingly less interested in leading these outcomes. The hollowing out of the state offers many opportunities for emergent models of governance involving state and non-state actors. However, this shift has also led to a push for the privatization of commons resources and off-loading of responsibility, rather than a move toward more deliberative processes and greater participation (Bäckstrand et al, 2010).

Models of governance reflect how society should be organized, how problems should be addressed, and by whom (Glasbergen, 1998). Some singular forms of idealized governance resemble models that are regulatory, self-organizing, led by civil society, based in co-operative models, or market-based (Glasbergen, 1998). Often, forms of governance are hybrid when applied in practice, taking on forms such as co-management, state-private partnerships (e.g. certificates), or private-social partnerships (e.g. ecosystem service payment schemes) (Lemos and Agrawal), 2010.

Research questions within environmental governance have been approached from various scales and focus predominantly on issues in resource scarcity and conflict, allocation and access, and biodiversity conservation in forest, agricultural, freshwater, marine, and atmospheric systems (Bennett and Satterfield, 2018). While this field is concerned with people and their processes, there is limited attention in environmental governance to addressing human behaviours and
relationships to nature for its own intrinsic reasons. Attention is centered on the resources themselves, and the effects that citizens have on them. I am interested in the counterpart of this: how processes affect citizens relationships to natural resources, and therefore their actions and behaviours toward them. While this encompasses the overall effects on the natural environment as an end result, I am interested in governance processes that address human-citizen development at the heart of its approaches.

2.3.4 Citizen-centered Approaches to Governance

Berkes and Folke state that “a people-oriented approach which focuses on the resource user rather than on the resource itself is not a new idea; many have pointed out that ‘resource management is people management’. However, tools and approaches for such people management are poorly developed and the importance of a social science of resource management has not generally been recognized” (1998: 2). I would argue further that the people-oriented approaches to resource management that we currently have, are often narrow in their focus and don’t encompass the complexities of day-to-day human choices that indirectly affect global resources on various scales.

I am interested in finding approaches to environmental governance that go beyond these approaches - that transform human interactions and connections to land and nature. If humans are the ongoing cause of environmental degradation, reforming their way in the world could be considered a measure of “disease prevention”. In this regard, focusing on environmental solutions from a purely environmental capacity can be compared to “disease treatment” – a common endeavor of environmental management and governance practices today.
In “Ecosystem Sustainability and Healthy: A Practical Approach” (2004), David Waltner-Toews (2004: 3) presents a basic figure of a medically based assessment and treatment process:

![Figure 2-4: The Basic Figure: A medically based assessment and treatment process.](image)

He goes on to use this process to broadly assess human health and ecosystem sustainability. It translates well across disciplines and is a useful model to assess social-ecological systems. My area of interest is in the diagnosis and setting of goals. Very little literature in environmental management and governance refers to the broad “diagnosis” of a society structured on inherently anti-environmental human values, or a set of goals that is directed towards facilitating good ecological citizenship (or some variant of themes within this umbrella). However, some literature does lend itself to a similar basis of goals.

“Health – physical, social and mental well-being – is rooted in the ability and power to accomplish goals. Philosopher Larry Haworth has called this ‘flourishing’. In the world as currently constituted – that is, as a complex eco-social system in which it is meaningless to talk about ‘social’ or
‘ecological’ systems as if they have any independent reality – this flourishing has both biophysical and socio-cultural dimensions. For plants and animals, these goals are biophysically determined, within socio-economic and cultural constraints set by people. For people, these goals have mainly become culturally determined. For people, then, health is a socio-cultural construct but clearly within biophysical constraints (our bodies, our ecosystems)...

“When we get down to the details, health, being goal-driven, is always context specific and negotiated… is it impossible to talk about achieving health in some universal sense? I think not. It is an ideal that informs our practice, but perhaps not much more. There are at least two ways to work through this. One way is to acknowledge the goal as an ultimate ideal, but focus on a process that nurtures sustainable, adaptive goal-setting and goal achieving… The other way… is to identify the constraints to health and see if we can remove some of these so that people, animals and ecosystems can flourish from the inside out” (Waltner-Toews, 2004: 89-90).

The Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (Alcamo, J. et al., 2003) considers a human flourishing component that is unique from many other approaches to environmental management and governance. Its goals are broad, and its questions are deeply fundamental. The assessment framework claims to offer decision-making mechanisms for three central goals: (1) to identify options that can better achieve core human development and sustainability goals; (2) to better understand the trade-offs involved – across sectors and stakeholders – in decisions concerning the environment; and (3) to align response options with the level of governance where they can be most effective. It identifies the central problem as the growing demand for ecosystem services. It identifies ecosystem services as food, fuel, and fiber; regulating services such as climate regulation and disease control; and nonmaterial benefits such as spiritual and aesthetic benefits. The demand for these services is now so great that trade-offs among services have become the rule. It acknowledges that this ever-growing demand seriously diminishes the prospects for sustainable development. It recognizes that human well-being is affected not just by gaps between ecosystem service supply and demand but also by the increased vulnerability of individuals, communities, and nations.

The conceptual framework for the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment places human well-being as the central focus, while recognizing that biodiversity and ecosystems also have intrinsic value and that people take decisions concerning ecosystems based on considerations of well-
being as well as intrinsic value, focusing particular attention on the linkages between ecosystem services and human well-being.

“Ecosystem services are the benefits people obtain from ecosystems. These include provisioning, regulating, and cultural services, which directly affect people, and supporting services needed to maintain the other services. Changes in these services affect human well-being through impacts on security, the basic material for a good life, health, and social and cultural relations. These constituents of well-being are, in turn, influenced by and have an influence on freedoms and choices available to people” (Alcamo, J. et al., 2003: 5).

This framework is most in-line with the goals of this thesis, placing a focus on citizens and their relationships with the environment first.

While this human component often goes unnoted in the dominant management and governance literature, it is studied more deeply in other areas of geography, such as human dimensions (Manfredo, 2008) and human ecology (Steiner, 2002; Cronon, 1996). Other disciplines have also played an important role in informing theory on human-nature relations: conservation psychology (Clayton & Myers, 2009), ecopsychology (Roszak, Gomes, and Kanner, 1995), anthropology (Moran, 2006), and ecological economics (Babe, 2006). Reviewing these in detail is beyond the scope of this thesis, although many themes in the discussion, analysis, and conclusions point to these topics.

2.4 Chapter Summary

While the sustainability-based literature has been evolving, the dominant discourse remains rooted in technocratic and operationally-based approaches. Many have argued that a more fundamental shift in our cultural values will be required to tackle today’s environmental issues in a meaningful way. Arguing that this shift is only possible if we change the language by which we discuss these issues and the frameworks by which we approach them, this chapter reviews other environmental discourses that have traditionally been more values-based. Settling
on “ecological citizenship” as a multi-functional discourse lending itself to both operational and values-based conversations, a review of this body of literature has been presented. After establishing a basic definition of the term, this chapter focuses on literature that utilizes the term in practice – as this thesis attempts to do the same. While there is room for growth in the development of applied research in this field, there is evidence that points toward its growing acceptance as a conceptual framework by which to approach many of our growing and complex human-environment issues.

Turning away from discourse, and toward applied frameworks, the final section of this thesis reviews social-ecological systems theory and environmental governance. Social-ecological systems theory provides a holistic framework by which to comprehend the complexity of human-environment relationships. Accepting that our current ecological system is in a state of peril, change will be required to redirect our systems toward a sustainable state. With this in mind, ideas of resilience, transformation, and change are reviewed. The depth of a social-ecological systems study is vast and widespread. Within these many themes are questions rooted in the field of environmental governance. Since this thesis uses tools from social-ecological systems theory to answer questions about environmental governance in the region, an overview of the field of environmental governance is presented here as a sub-set of this systems review. Recognizing that traditional top-down environmental management has led to numerous repercussions, there has been a growing interest in environmental governance, as a necessary set of processes to provide oversight for more effective and sustainable management.
Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods

This chapter provides a detailed account of the process by which this research was developed, carried out, analyzed, and presented, with an attempt to bring the reader along on the intellectual journey that was the creation and exploration of this thesis. It will be presented through four sub-sections: purpose, methodology, methods, and analysis and presentation.

3.1 Purpose

Defining the purpose of this project is a multi-layered process, with three areas of inquiry: (1) what is being analyzed and why (goals and objectives); (2) who is doing the analyzing and why (perspective); (3) why is this goal being studied in the chosen region?

3.1.1 Goals, Objectives, and Research Questions

The primary goal of this thesis is to engage in an exploration of ecological citizenship, using insights from a wilderness case study to broaden how this term is used and applied. This research is meant to foster conversations about the human-environment relationship and its effect on ecological well-being. It aims to understand perceptions of how the good ecological citizen is embodied, then attempts to identify institutional and systemic elements that foster this type of citizen. These interests are itemized by the following three objectives and their supporting research questions.

**Objective 1:** Explore academic and case-based notions of the term “ecological citizenship”.

a) How is ecological citizenship defined in the current literature?

b) How is ecological citizenship defined in the opinion of Yukoners?
c) What actions and behaviours embody the good ecological citizen? In general, and particularly in the Southwest Yukon?

**Objective 2:** Utilize a social-ecological systems lens to explore the Greater Kluane Region, its human-nature relationships, and the elements that have affected these relationships over time.

a) Historically, how have the people of the GKR used and interacted (or identified) with nature and wildlife?

b) How do the people of GKR currently interact with land and nature?

c) Which formal and informal institutions exist in the GKR that directly or indirectly impact the ecological system? How do these influence the actions and perceptions of the local community?

d) How have these institutions changed over time and what has triggered this change?

e) What significant events, processes, or institutions have changed the way people interact with land and nature?

**Objective 3:** Identify if there is a demonstratable qualitative connection between changes in institutions and changes in the embodiment of ecological citizenship.

a) Have trends towards ecological citizenship increased, decreased, or both?

b) What are the most influential factors for this change?

b) Do GKR members value ecologically-related institutions as important for contributing to a more sustainable society? Which of these are most important?

d) According to GKR residents, who should play the largest role in the move toward a more sustainable society? Government, citizens, or the private sector?
While these are the original goals that guided this thesis, the results that emerged led to questions and ideas beyond these.

3.1.2 Perspective of Analysis

Due to the inevitability of human bias, it is important to acknowledge all elements of the research process. This section provides a background of the researcher and her purpose for engaging in this research.

This thesis has been undertaken with the purpose of fulfilling a Master’s in Environmental Studies from Wilfrid Laurier University. However, more than this, it has been pursued as an intellectual and spiritual journey to engage in insights about values, politics, behaviour, and the overall human condition, in relation to the natural environment. It has provided an exploration about the way people live, their relationships to nature, and the relationship that they wish they had to nature. Among many other things, I realize upon looking back that I was asking a lot of these questions with the hope of figuring out how I could live a better life and how I could help the people around me to do the same.

Growing up in a variety of small rural communities across Ontario and spending summers in the wilderness of North-Eastern Ontario, I developed a strong affinity for nature at a young age. I was not aware of how important this exposure to the natural world was in developing my character until I moved to an urban setting. As I became more reflective of the importance of the human-nature connection, my worldview became very ecologically-oriented and what some may call fairly left-leaning. I took up a volunteer position with the WLU Student Union’s environmental awareness committee (“The EcoHawks”), which quickly led to extensive involvement in campus sustainability initiatives that engulfed the latter half of my undergrad and
In my early graduate years. In addition, the coupling of a degree in business and an ongoing interest in social behaviour has largely slanted my focus towards institutional impacts on human behaviour and the environment.

My time in the Yukon in 2010 and 2011 during the development of this thesis, also greatly impacted my personal development. My interactions with the people there provided me with a detailed understanding of its history and a nuanced understanding of its culture. However, while my intention is to provide an academic account of the region, it must be noted that my strong affinity for the land and the people there lends itself to a potential for bias. I spent a lot of time in social settings, interacting with various people and communities about the Yukon – I developed strong relationships and made very personal connections with many. I hope to overcome this bias by remaining aware of this potential and aiming for neutrality where possible. I must also note that it has been several years since these relationships were formed. I no longer maintain close contact with the people there and believe that it has been enough time for me to revisit this case study in a more even-handed way.

I started this thesis eight years before its completion and while my approaches to life may have changed slightly, my opinions on the relevance of these topics and all that they can offer have only deepened with time. In addition to my deep ties to sustainability work upon entering this thesis, I am now a mother, a land-owner and permaculture/gardening enthusiast, and greatly involved in my local farm and food community. Over these years, I have acquired experience in education, research, marketing, and the food industry. I have also been deeply involved in supporting the co-operative business sector.

My ontological perspective is that of critical realism. I believe that storylines can be interpreted differently by various subjects and all realities require critical examination.
However, I also believe that there are certain facts that will always remain true and are beyond belief or interpretation of the view of the subject. In relation to this, my epistemological perspective is constructionist in nature. I believe that meaning is created by the interplay of both the subject and the objects by which they are viewing. My theoretical perspective in regard to this research is based in critical theory. I believe that the research acquired from this study should be used to help evolve current situations and understandings. The research has been approached holistically and intends to empower individual citizens by examining their interpretations of histories and effects on societies. Understanding and interpreting key themes hopes to highlight important components of understanding that may have otherwise been missed.

3.1.3 Why Kluane?

I was originally introduced to the idea of studying in the Southwest Yukon because it was one of my supervisor’s key regions of study and is especially interesting as a complex social-ecological system – which was my primary topic of interest. As my coursework progressed and my curiosity deepened, my interests became more centred on fundamentals, ethics, and political ecology. I maintained the decision to do work in the Yukon based on an emerging understanding that there may be some relevant lessons to be learned from more nature-based lifestyles and a land-based ethics.

Since ecological citizenship is a place-based concept, it is important not only to talk about it in theory, but to understand its application in relation to place – for all places are different, and therefore all understandings of the term will differ as well. I have chosen to take a regional approach to this work because it provides a setting that is broad enough to draw opinions across
a range of varying communities; yet focused enough to offer a specific set of events and processes from which to draw conclusions.

This work could be completed anywhere, but it is particularly interesting in the Yukon and especially the Greater Kluane Region for two reasons: (1) in a mere half century, we can see a society transition from living almost completely off-the-land lifestyles, to an almost completely modern lifestyle much like any other first world region; and (2) the region is sparsely populated, yet biologically and politically diverse. It provides an opportune microcosm to observe direct causal linkages for how and why people’s connections and interactions with the land and nature have changed over time. Additionally, the current literature about ecological citizenship is mostly presented in an urban context and I was interested to see what there was to gain from exploring this topic in the context of a place that is less developed and more nature-based.

3.2 Methodology

This research is qualitative in nature and draws primarily on the use of data collected from interviews. Its primary methodology is the use of a case study, which has been analyzed through a social-ecological systems lens.

3.2.1 Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is a scientific method used to gather non-numerical data. "This type of research refers to meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and descriptions of things and not to their counts or measures” (Babbie, 2014). It is phenomenological and constructionist, it emphasizes process, perceptions and their meanings and how these emerge and change. Data is derived from closeness and extended contact with
research participants and therefore a preference is given for an inductive approach to data collection; starting with observation and allowing grounded theory to emerge (Palys, 2003).

Due to its interpretive nature, there has been a long-standing history of debate about the validity of qualitative research. Evolving from the work of Kuhn (1970), it has become widely accepted that all knowledge is produced, and all scientists embody a worldview and “paradigm” from which they work, including numerically-driven positivists. This assumption has given increasing validity to qualitative research; however, “it still often stands more rigorous questioning than its quantitative cousin” (Gerring, 2017). To overcome this, one can recognize:

“qualitative research methods are founded on an understanding of research as a systematic and reflective process for development of knowledge that can somehow be contested and shared, implying ambitions of transferability beyond the study setting. Drawing on these assumptions, the researcher must be prepared to use strategies for: questioning findings and interpretations, instead of taking them for granted; assessing their internal and external validity, instead of judging them obvious or universal; thinking about the effect of context and bias, without believing that knowledge is untouched by the human mind; and displaying and discussing the process of analysis, instead of believing that manuals present trustworthiness” (Malterud, 2001).

Due to its exploration of definitions, ideas, and observations, the nature of this study is deeply qualitative and aims to overcome all challenges this may present. The author has attempted to recognize all potential biases and acknowledges that since this research is grounded in one specific case study, its findings cannot be attributed to universal statements based on its of findings.

3.2.2 The Case Study

Case study is a form of research that endeavours to produce rich descriptions about singular contemporary events, topics, or places (Lapan and Armfield, 2009). In general, case studies are the preferred strategy when “how” or “why” questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon
within some real-life context (Yin, 2003). Silverman encourages “purposive sampling,” or choosing a case because it illustrates some feature or process in which we are interested (2005). Due to its wilderness setting, ecologically-rich lifestyles, and interesting land-based politics and history, the Greater Kluane Region is an ideal case study from which to explore ideas related to ecological citizenship.

This case study has been used as both an instrumental case study and an intrinsic case study (Stake, 2000). It has been used to draw insight into themes around the topics of ecological citizenship and more broadly, environmental governance; however, it recognizes the uniqueness of the Greater Kluane Region and strives to present its story as original.

Challenges of the Case Study

Completing a single case study, informed by broad conceptual theory, may lead to inaccurate analysis and generalizations that may not be accurate or relevant elsewhere. Looking for similarities among multiple case studies may help to overcome this, however there are always exceptions to the rule and a multitude of case studies may also coincidentally lead to these same inconsistencies (Yin, 2003). While it would be beneficial to compare other cases with a similar setting, in this circumstance, observing the single case study is not seen as a detriment. There are no direct assumptions that have been derived from this case study; it is merely an exploration of how we can evaluate ecological citizenship.

Since each place is unique, place-based research should be based around exemplifying how an understanding on certain topics can be understood, rather than identifying differences and similarities from them and trying to elucidate generalized theory as to why these interactions are taking place. Understanding something as deep and broad as ecological citizenship or
sustainability requires in-depth study and exploration, even for a single place. The limits of a master’s thesis do not allow for multiple case studies to be reviewed in the depth that this topic deserves. While I am interested in completing similar studies elsewhere in the future, this research is seen as a pilot study for similar future research.

3.2.3 A Social-Ecological Systems Approach

Social-ecological systems (SES) theory is the central theory that has guided the analysis and presentation of this research. It offers a framework by which to examine the case study, as well as a set of tools to analyze and clearly present its complexities – how it behaves, and which variables affect certain types of change. This gives us the ability to understand the function of the system and make decisions about how to intervene (or not) in the future. The core ideas of SES were presented in section 2.3.2; here we review methodologies of using SES for analysis.

While there are a variety of methodologies for completing a social-ecological systems analysis (see Appendix A), they all encompass the same general set of principles, and can be executed through a variation of these four steps (McCarthy, 2008):

1) Frame the system.
2) Define and describe the system.
3) Define and describe the dynamics of the system.
4) Synthesize the understanding gained from the first two phases into narratives about how the situation might or could unfold in the future.

While the overall systems framework is considered a methodology, the steps within it can be considered methods for analyzing and presenting information. As such, each of these steps is described in the analytical methods section to follow.
3.3 Data Collection Methods

This section explores the multiple facets of my data collection processes. Field research and observation were used to prepare the study, 39 comprehensive in-depth interviews are used as the primary source of data, and secondary sources have been addressed to verify the data from interviews. This section also describes all required ethics approvals and research licenses, as well as the benefits to participants.

3.3.1 Field Research and Observation

I first visited the Yukon in the summer of 2010 with my advisor and another student. We stayed for approximately 7 weeks at Yukon College (just outside of downtown Whitehorse) and took various trips to the communities. During this time, I spent a lot of time attending social events and getting a feel for the culture and spirit of the Yukon. I spent time in the Kluane National Park library and the Territory’s Environment, Mining and Resources (EMR) library getting to know about the history and the documentation on hand. Dr. Slocombe spent many days driving us around the territory: visiting important monuments, museums, and other sites of significance, and ensuring we had a strong background for understanding the history and culture of the Yukon. Following this trip, I returned home and began to develop my thesis that fall.

Later that year, I returned for another 7 weeks, from early November to mid-late December. This trip was focused around completing my interviews. I rented a bedroom in a home just outside of Whitehorse and spent most of my time in the city, on foot. As many of my interviewees either worked or made regular trips here, this was the easiest location for a home base. However, I did visit the Kluane Region for a portion of this trip. I rented a car and spent one intensive week visiting people in the Kluane communities, in their homes or at work,
completing nearly a third of my interviews. I stayed in motel rooms and spent time in the evenings making calls and tracking down the individuals that I had heard so much about. I learned so much from these interviews that I will never be able to document or explain – both in Whitehorse and the communities. This trip was a very intensive growth period for me personally and it truly changed me going forward. I learned a lot about myself through exploring ideas with the people here and I developed several new and deep relationships during this time.

In the following summer of 2011, I was invited by one of my interviewees to work in an archaeological field camp just outside of Beaver Creek – situated in the borderlands between Yukon and Alaska. I spent one month in camp acting as an assistant to the professor, ensuring that the logistics went smoothly, and the students were well cared for. For a few days of the week, I also worked in the town of Beaver Creek, assisting on a land-use planning project and helping to organize and digitize the archives of the White River First Nation. After my time in Beaver Creek and camp, I travelled down the highway to Burwash Landing, where I stayed with a friend who had recently attained work there. I attempted to start a similar archive organization job with the First Nation there, but the project was delayed. I was there for less than a month, but I felt a deep connection to the people here and developed many strong and unique relationships during this short time. The final two weeks of that summer, I returned to Whitehorse and reconnected with connections made during my winter trip. That summer gave me a much deeper and stronger understanding of the uniqueness of Yukon culture.

Each of these visits built on the previous and helped to further my understanding of the culture and the many nuanced details that are relevant to this thesis. While I wasn’t collecting primary evidence and data during the first and third visits, I was continuing to formulate my narrative and take note of ideas that were relevant to this thesis.
3.3.2 Interviews

An interview is literally that, an *inter view*, an interchange of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest. A qualitative research interview attempts to understand the world from the subjects’ points of view, to unfold the meaning of peoples’ experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations; acting as a construction site of knowledge (Kvale, 1996). While conversation has been an ancient form of obtaining knowledge, within modern social science, systematic interview research is a relatively new phenomenon of past decades (Kvale, 1996).

The interview is the central method of primary data collection for this thesis. This research is exploratory and relies heavily on thoughts and opinions from local environmentally-active citizens. While there is a historical component to this research, it is framed within a time period that is still current enough for living people to provide an account from memory. To diminish any error on account of the flaws of human memory, distinct facts about dates, etc. have been cross-checked with secondary documents or informed specialists.

During my second trip to the Yukon – in the winter of 2010 – I completed thirty-nine in-depth interviews with key members of environmentally-mandated institutions in, or that affect, the Greater Kluane Region. I collected my sample through a combination of selective and snowball sampling. Fourteen of these interviewees were chosen prior to my travel to the territory, by seeking out people in key roles across various governmental and other institutions. At the end of each interview, I would ask the interviewee if, based on what I was asking, there was anyone that came to mind with whom I should speak. If I heard a name more than once, I would contact that person. I continued with this snowball sampling process until the names
addressed were repeating themselves and all relevant groups appeared to be addressed (e.g. loggers, miners, FNs, etc.). I also probed for people from certain groups when my sample seemed limited. See Appendix A for a limited description of interviewees.

These interviews lasted anywhere from thirty minutes to three hours, most commonly between ninety minutes and two hours. The interviews were semi-structured; I had a set list of questions, but I also asked further questions to clarify responses. (See Appendix B for the complete Interview Guide.) The Interview Guide was created in advance of my trip to the Yukon. After interviews had commenced, slight changes were made to the wording of questions to allow them to come across more clearly when repeated aloud, but generally, my original guide was very successful. The flow of questions created a strong framework for deep conversation. However, my approach did change slightly.

I had originally created two similar but different interview guides, one for community members and one for organizational representatives. They were the same questions with slightly different wording. I had thought that certain people would represent the voice of their institutions and others would represent the voice of their communities or sectors. I quickly learned that this would not work. Everyone is an individual. Regardless of whether they worked for a certain organization, they didn’t necessarily assimilate all opinions and perspectives of that organization. For example, government workers were still often referring to “the government” as a very separate entity from themselves. I am told this is not an unusual experience in the Yukon. After my first few interviews, I decided to just use the same wording for all, and to not try to separate or cluster opinions based on societal groups or sectors. In the end, all data was acknowledged within one pool and treated as equally useful and unique.
While I tried to remain neutral in the research process, I also must acknowledge my impact on the process. This was my first major research project and my first set of formal interviews. I was very keen and passionate about the subjects and sometimes my excitement was difficult to contain given all that I was hearing. There is a possibility that I was more encouraging about certain topics over others, either through facial expressions or even through probing with deeper questions. I do not believe that I did this work any injustice, but it must be noted that responses may have been swayed due to my presence in the process.

The interview process was the most compelling component of this work and provided noteworthy experience and insight beyond what I could have imagined. The interviews provided a strong set of in-depth feedback, covering a diverse number of topics and a vast array of rich experiential data. They also determined the key topics and themes of this thesis, from which I was then able to investigate through other documentation.

3.3.3 Secondary Research

Secondary research has been used as a supplement to stories and information gathered from interviews. My research has included a review of governmental strategic-planning documentation, land-use planning documentation, land and resource management documentation, and other documents from the EMR and KNPR libraries. I also consulted newspaper archives, history books, and materials featured online to better understand the events and processes that were highlighted in the interviews or to provide context of other events happening at the time that were not referred to.
3.3.4 Ethical Issues and Approvals

Due to the human component of this research, research ethics approval was required by Wilfrid Laurier University. A standard Yukon research license was also required.

**Wilfrid Laurier University Ethics Review.** Wilfrid Laurier University requires all research completed on behalf of the university is subject to an ethics review. This review requires all researchers to submit an overview of basic project information, details about funding, timelines, and type of data collected. It includes information regarding participant recruitment, consent, risks and benefits to participants, participant compensation, privacy and confidentiality, conflict of interest, and feedback to participants. After submitting a request for ethics review with this information, along with a copy of the interview guide (Appendix B), a phone/email script extending an invitation to participate, and the consent form (Appendix C), the Research Ethics Board of Wilfrid Laurier University determined that the proposal was ethically sound and I was granted REB #2548 on November 12, 2010.

**Yukon Research License.** Under the Scientists and Explorers Act, all persons entering the Yukon for research must obtain a Scientists and Explorers License from the Government of Yukon. The requested information is similar to the information outlined in the WLU ethics review. On November 17, 2010, I was granted Yukon S&E license number 10-67S&E from the Heritage Resources Unit of the Cultural Services Branch, Tourism and Culture, Government of Yukon.

3.3.5 Benefits for Participants

The conceptualization of people as ecological citizens not only contributes to a more environmentally sustainable world, but a more socially just world as well. It gives people the
opportunity to see themselves as one piece of the entire ecosphere, grounded in their biophysical region, rather than their constructed nation-state. This vision understands all communities as equals and opens discussion between cultures. Uniting people around the place in which they live can promote the discovery of similarities between what otherwise might be divided communities. This research intends to provide an open dialogue by which all community members can come together. It will also provide a context for thinking about building a more sustainable future of the region.

From a more practical perspective, I intend to put together an executive summary of my findings for presentation to the Regional Resource Councils, the communities, and some of the key informants of this research. I hope to provide a summary of recommendations to the Land Use Planning Council and all levels of government in regard to environmental governance findings in the region. I also intend to send a summary of findings about ecological citizenship and its character to all interview participants and other parties of interest.

### 3.4 Analysis & Presentation Methods

The large quantity of broad data that was gathered from interviews lead to a long and arduous analytical process. The methods I used to analyze this data were thematic coding and social-ecological systems tools. Codes were used to identify themes that arose from the interviews and systems tools were used to further break down these themes and provide a more cohesive understanding of the case study. A social-ecological systems methodology also offered a framework by which to design the presentation of this thesis.
3.4.1 Thematic Coding

Upon returning from my research trip, each of the 39 interviews were transcribed word-for-word. I completed most of these transcriptions myself, but some were also completed by an RA that my advisor hired. I chose not to use a program to transcribe these interviews, as I believed that it gave me a chance to review them in more depth, reminding me of the tone and general flow of the interview in a way that the written transcript could not. I am also not keen on technical devices and was of the understanding that the transcription technology of the time required a considerable amount of “training”. Although a program might have been able to learn my voice over time, the majority of talking was done by the interviewees. This would have meant that the program would require new “training” for all 39 interviewees. I took notes during this transcription process so I could more readily return to each interview, based on key themes that came out of it. (As certain people touched on some topics more than others.)

When all interviews were transcribed and printed, I re-read them again from paper. I developed a series of colour codes and highlighted text that referred to these codes:

- Purple = place-based information referring to history or descriptions
- Red = human-environment activities
- Yellow = specific changes that have taken place
- Orange = influencers of change
- Red = specific acts of ecological citizenship
- Pink + checkmark = positive trends of ecological citizenship
- Pink + “X” = negative trends of ecological citizenship
- Blue = thoughts on institutional support options
Who should play a role? = highlighted red and marked with “C” in a circle for citizen, “G” in a circle for government, “I” in a circle for industry, and “O” in a circle for other.

The process of highlighting data referring to these themes brought to light more refined sub-themes. I set up a master data sheet in excel with headings that reflected the above list and cells that were colour filled with their respective colours. I inserted 4 columns to the left that listed the interviewees, their respective reference code, their official title, and a summary of their personal relationship to the Kluane Region. I left an empty row under each highlighted theme for sub-themes. I referenced the highlighted text on the printed files and copied all of this text from the digital files into the excel sheet. As sub-themes presented themselves within these categories, I added columns, and dumped the text into the respective sub-themes. When all highlighted text from each interview was entered into the master sheet, I rearranged the columns/sub-themes to reflect a sensible flow of ideas. The following are the respective categories that presented themselves:

1.) Place-based info, descriptions, timelines
   a. Global
   b. National
   c. Community social profiles
   d. Community features: physical geography and wilderness
   e. Alaska highway
   f. First nations

2.) Human-environment activities
   a. General comments
   b. Occupational and political
   c. Recreational
   d. Living/surviving/other
   e. Harvesting
   f. Arts and culture
   g. Spiritual/being on the land
   h. Knowledge of the land
3.) Changes of activities from past
   a. Environmental factors
      i. Landscape and wildlife
      ii. Weather and climate
   b. National
      i. Kluane National Park and Reserve
      ii. Other
   c. Territorial
      i. Government of Yukon
      ii. First Nations
      iii. Organizations and NGOs
      iv. Resource mgmt. processes
      v. Economic/demographic
      vi. Tourism
      vii. Forestry
      viii. Outfitting
      ix. Trapping
      x. Mining
   d. Regional/Personal
      i. Access and ownership
      ii. Public participation
      iii. Lifestyle/social
      iv. Consumption of resources
      v. Recreational use
      vi. Personal harvesting
      vii. Technological

4.) Influencers of change
   a. Climate change
   b. International politics and pressures
   c. National
      i. Federal legislation
      ii. KNPR/Parks Canada
   d. Government of Yukon
      i. Territorial government departments, etc.
      ii. YTG legislation
      iii. Resource mgmt. processes
   e. Territorial
      i. Land claims
         1. General
         2. YESAA/YESAB
         3. RRCs
   f. Cultural/societal norms and pressures
   g. Economics/industry (YT generally)
   h. NGOs/orgs
i. Regional
   i. Land, water, and wildlife
   ii. KFN/CAFN/WRFN
   iii. Town of Haines Junction
   iv. Access and development
   v. Forestry
   vi. Mining
   vii. Tourism
   viii. Demographics
   ix. Educational facilities
   x. Media
j. Personal
   i. Modern lifestyle changes
   ii. Technology
   iii. Other

5.) Ecological citizenship
   a. Definitions
   b. Thoughts on the term
   c. Characteristics
   d. Specific acts of EC
   e. Positive trends of EC seen in the Kluane Region
   f. Controversial action – positive and negative
   g. Negative trends of EC seen in the Kluane Region

6.) Should institutions be put in place to encourage good EC?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Comments/suggestions

7.) Suggestions of what could be done

8.) Who should play the largest role in moving towards sustainability?
   a. Citizen
   b. Government
   c. Industry
   d. Other
   e. Comments

The first four categories helped to inform the case study outline and history, as presented in Chapter 4. I jotted down all historical events to investigate further. I did not quantify these themes, as I did not find it relevant, and some people knew more about certain events than
others. No one gave a full history. I listed all emerging themes about changes and influencers of change in a word document, where I was more easily able to re-categorize themes and identify further sub-themes, see Appendix D. I was then able to draw on these themes further in the analysis, presented in Chapter 6.

The following categories (5-8 above) were easier to tend to. Since these questions were direct inquiries of opinions, and answered by most respondents, I was more able to quantify results. I established emerging themes (as shown in Appendix E) and then tallied references to each theme to identify their relevance. These themes are presented and discussed in the conceptual discussion space of Chapter 5.

3.4.2 Social-Ecological Systems Tools and Design

As introduced in the literature review and described in the methodology section, Social-Ecological Systems tools were used as a central method to analyze and present the research. The four steps of the social-ecological systems framework that was used are presented here, with descriptions of corresponding tools and themes. My understanding of each of these steps have been derived from lessons learned in an introductory systems course with R. Bullock, two semesters as a teaching assistant for systems courses with S. Slocombe, and an overview text from D. Meadows (2009). Each step has been supplemented by other literature as required. My interpretation of this approach guides the framework for how the case study is presented and analyzed.
Step 1: Frame the System

Framing the system involves two sub-steps: defining the purpose of the system itself and defining the purpose of analyzing that system. The purpose of a system can be described as “the aim or goal that the system is working towards, or the function it serves” (McCarthy, 2008). Outlining the system purpose is most critical for defining system boundaries, organization, and behaviour. Assuming a purpose for the system gives purpose for the analysis and allows one to modify their framework accordingly.

Defining the purpose is an iterative process; the purpose of the system may have to be redefined once the system’s behaviour has been assessed, because the originally understood purpose may not align with the structure of the system itself (McCarthy, 2008). Once the purpose or function of the system is defined, the next step is to define the purpose for analyzing that system by looking at who is talking about the system and why. These two steps usually reinforce one another, as a system’s analysis will never be undertaken without a specific purpose in mind by the person (or team) analyzing the system and the assumed function of the system will always be constructed by whoever is viewing it. As the old adage goes, “it’s in the eye of the beholder”.

These initial steps should provide a background on the research being undertaken, the researchers, and a basic background of the system itself (function and history). This provides full disclosure to minimize biases in the assessment and provide an understanding of the approach taken. Because systems approaches can be so broad and all-encompassing, disclosing the initial framework is important for validating the analysis. In this study, this step is described in section 3.1 of this chapter.
Step 2: Define and Describe the System

Once the background is provided and the perspective for analysis is framed, the system itself can then be defined and described. This step includes defining the system, all elements within it, and how they interact with one another.

To define the system, one must first define the system type: the classification of perspective from which the system is viewed. This is very closely tied to the system function and purpose of analysis, as the type of system that is perceived changes the entire structure of how this system interacts and how it can be viewed: biophysically, institutionally, culturally, etc. System type also refers to if the system is open or closed: if components within the system interact with components outside of the system or not (Meadows, 2009).

Determining the system type can help to define the boundaries of the system. A boundary is an imaginary line which separates the objects in the system from objects in the environment (or outside of the system). Temporal, as well as spatial boundaries must be considered, as certain events may have changed the system to a point where it is incomparable to its past form (Meadows, 2009). Boundaries are difficult to determine because it is easy to overlook tentatively important components and easy to include components that seem relevant but are not (Meadows, 2009). Due to this, it is very important to determine a concise purpose that the system is working towards before determining the boundary.

Setting boundaries goes hand-in-hand with considerations of scale. Scale pertains to issues of size and span, as well as the size of the finest distinction made in any study (Allen, 2008). Broad goals or problems will involve a broader scale of analysis and more pointed goals or problems will make use of a smaller, more detailed unit of analysis. Scale is a social construct and varies based on perception, where changing the scale will change the entire way the system
is defined. This is why determining boundaries is so complex, but also so beneficial, because it can be tailored to suit specific needs.

Once an appropriate boundary is set for the system, scales above and below that system level can be identified. This organization and classification of nested super-systems and sub-systems is known as hierarchy (Meadows, 2009) - which is discussed further in Step 3.

Once the organization of the system is understood, all elements relevant to the function of the system can be identified and defined. Elements are classes of objects that perform similar functions and tasks. These can be referred to with multiple names (components, parts, factors, etc.) but will be referenced as “elements” throughout this thesis. An example of classes of elements is shown in Figure 3-1 (Slocombe, 1990). It is important not only identify all elements within the system, but also elements in the environment – objects which affect the system but are not a direct part of it (Ahl and Allen, 1996).

![Figure 3-1. Model illustrating various classes of elements within the evolution of the Kluane/Wrangell-St. Elias socio-biophysical system](image)

The final step in describing the system is to describe the structure and organization of the elements in the system, or how they connect and interrelate. Interconnections are critical, as changing relationships usually change systems’ behaviour. “Flows” are the exchanges of stocks
among and between elements. Flows in social systems tend to be intangible and based on the exchange of information, where flows in ecosystems (or those that we are aware of) tend to be more tangible and physical. Therefore, access to information is very important in determining power structures in a social system. Because flows in a social system are not physical, they may take time and deeper cultural/historical understanding to emerge into view, as they may be interconnected in unexpected ways (Berkes, 2017).

This step is most easily described by a systems map, where all elements and interconnections can be displayed and understood simultaneously. **Figure 3-2** (Martin, 2001: 2) is a very basic form of a systems map, showing how elements are connected within and between social and ecological sub-systems. (In a typical systems map, more detail is given, identifying specific elements within the classes shown here.) The overall goal of Step 2 is to provide a strong understanding of all parts of the system, and briefly, how they are thought to be connected. *This step is completed in Chapter 4 of this thesis.*
3.2.3.1 Step 3: Define and Describe the Dynamics of the System

Once the components of the system have been identified – its boundaries, its elements, and how they are interconnected – we can then attempt to understand the dynamics of the system, or how the system behaves. This step describes the more complex interactions beyond a simple cause-and-effect model. “A simple system can be described by using a single perspective and a standard analytical model... but a complex adaptive system cannot. Rather, complex systems can be characterized by scale effects, non-linearity and tipping points, inherent uncertainty or unpredictability, self-organization, connectivity, path-dependence, and emergent properties such as resilience that cannot be predicted from examining the parts of the system” (Berkes, 2017).

There are three main components to be aware of when understanding a system’s behaviour: feedback loops, hierarchy and power dynamics, and thresholds (Meadows, 2008).

**Feedback Loops.** Many components within a system operate through a feedback loop: a closed chain of causal connections from one component (or grouping of components, known as a ‘stock’) through a set of decisions or laws (based on the stock size) and back again through a flow to change the stock (Meadows, 2008). To understand where these feedback loops exist, we must understand which variables affect change and which variables are affected by change. Feedback loops describe processes that re-occur regularly.

In their simplest forms, there are two main types of feedback loops: the balancing (or negative) feedback loop and the reinforcing (or positive) feedback loop. *Balancing feedback loops* are stabilizing and goal seeking; always working to restore. When a stock grows or contracts within a limited range, no matter what else is going on around, a control mechanism is at work, helping to bring it back to its goal. *Reinforcing feedback loops* generate more input to a
stock the more that is already there. These are found wherever a system element has the ability to reproduce itself or grow exponentially. This type of feedback is more constant in everyday behaviour than balancing loops, but their surprising strength usually goes unaccounted for (Lafuite, et al, 2017), especially when delays are involved.

Because it must go through the process of reaching other components, information delivered by a loop can only affect future behaviour. This progression is known as a delay. Knowing how long delays are is very important for setting goals appropriately so the system does not overcompensate and lever in the wrong direction before the loop delivers (Meadows, 2008). The main fault of many models is that they either estimate an inappropriate lag time or forget to include one altogether – which is the major reason why most models do not represent real society. Delays may cause problems or work as a source for stability (Lafuite, et al, 2017). Short-term problems may appear to arise as a result of actions not happening quickly enough, but delays also allow room to maneuver, give more time for analysis, and make revisions.

**Hierarchy.** The world is organized into multiple systems and subsystems, and the arrangement of these subsystems at different scales is called a hierarchy. Although we tend to identify and define our hierarchies earlier in the systems analysis (Step 2), understanding behaviours due to these hierarchies comes later – and is an important component of understanding dynamics. An imperative note about elements, is that their level in the hierarchy tends to govern the speed in which they move, or how long they might be delayed. Generally, elements at higher scales of the hierarchy will move slower, but hold more power, while elements at lower scales will move faster, but have less power over the way the system functions (Ahl and Allen, 1996).
Systems at different scales or levels of the hierarchy operate semi-autonomously but are linked by key variables at each level that create balance between one another by helping them to push and pull against one another. Keeping sub-purposes and overall systems purposes in harmony is an essential function of a successful system. When power is involved, many subsystems compete and conflict with the larger system’s purpose; which is usually why ecosystems flourish in harmony and human social systems do not (Gunderson and Holling, 2002). Understanding hierarchy is important because it helps to acknowledge cross-scale linkages that can provide insight about certain characteristics and behaviours of the given elements, and help us overcome blind spots (Cash, et. al, 2006).

**Power and Control.** While hierarchy does tend to play a large role in determining levels of power or influence on the system, it is not the only important variable. System “drivers”, or key influencers of the system, can be identified with a systems map (see Figure 3.2). Once all elements have been plotted, arrows are drawn to display which elements affect which other elements. Power structures and vulnerabilities are then able to be identified. The elements that tend to have many flows moving away from them and towards other elements hold the most power. Those that have the highest number of elements moving towards them, but none going away, tend to hold the least power and may be the most vulnerable.

**Thresholds.** Also known as tipping points, thresholds are levels of control which change system feedbacks once they are crossed (Walker and Salt, 2006). When fundamental changes occur, the structure and function can enter a new regime, where it becomes difficult and sometimes impossible to return to the original state. Unfortunately, thresholds are not always observable
until the threshold has been crossed and the system behaves differently. This is why it is important to be aware of what thresholds exist and the outcomes of crossing them, so even if we don’t know when it will happen, a backup plan is in place to adapt to this change (C.S. Holling in Walker and Salt, 2006). Thresholds can be met in two ways: a feedback loop operates enough times that it gradually flips the stock into a new steady state, or an incidental event occurs that quickly moves the system through to the “release” phase and changes the state of the system forever (Gunderson and Holling, 2002). A threshold that is commonly discussed is in relation to climate change; whereby our atmosphere could enter a new steady state if a certain level of temperature change is reached.

Understanding the dynamics of change in the system is the most advantageous part of any systems analysis (Meadows, 2008). “Sometimes changes are slow (like population growth); sometimes they are fast (like exchange rates, or the price of food and fuel). Humans are usually good at noticing and responding to rapid change. Unfortunately, we are not so good at responding to things that change slowly. In part, this is because we don’t notice them, and in part it’s because often there seems little we can do about them” (Walker and Salt, 2006: 10). Understanding the complexity of system dynamics allows us the ability to observe behaviour that often goes unnoticed, therefore providing the ability to make more accurate predictions, and therefore better decisions about the future. This step is completed in Chapter 6 of this thesis.

3.2.3.2 Step 4: Synthesize Understanding into Narratives about the Future

Once we understand the dynamics of change in the system, we can look at the broader system and determine if these dynamics are effectively operating towards the greater good of the
system, or not. We can then either let the system play its course or choose to intervene. If the system in question is *not* working towards the desired goal, it may be necessary to intervene.

*Leverage points* may be introduced to influence change in the system. There are three leverage points that are most effective: (1) Reduce the gain of a reinforcing loop by introducing balancing loops to the same feedback or introducing/changing speed of a delay; (2) shift the dominance by reorganizing the hierarchy; or (3) completely reorganize (or “transform”) the system to reflect more directive goals (Meadows, 2009). If we realize the system is functioning in opposition to our goals, then it is appropriate to take actions that encourage a more positive transformation: move the system closer to its threshold to encourage change or disregard the current system altogether (Meadows, 2009).

If reorganizing the systems is too difficult (which it generally is), one may be able to start by recognizing trends to help predict and plan for future organization of the system (Meadows, 2009). Making note of the effects that various types of changes have made on the system over time will give a good understanding of what types of change to encourage and which to avoid. While there may be general similarities amongst all social-ecological systems, there will also be unique differences worth noting. Understanding dynamics of change are essential for making decisions about the future. Dynamics of change in the Greater Kluane System are explored in depth in chapter six.

3.5 Chapter Summary

The primary goal of this thesis is to engage in an exploration of ecological citizenship, using insights from a wilderness case study to broaden how this term is used and applied. This work is explored through the use of a case study. This case study is set in southwest Yukon
Territory and is framed by a social-ecological systems methodology. While it presents a strong historic review using secondary sources, the central discussion in this thesis is based upon findings from a series of in-depth interviews. An informal approach to coding these rich interviews has been described in this chapter and has pointed to a variety of emergent themes that are explored throughout this thesis. A social-ecological systems methodology not only offers a framework by which to approach this work, but a series of tools by which to present it as well.
Chapter 4: The Greater Kluane Region: A Systems Overview

The aim of chapter four is to provide context for many comments made in interviews, discussed in chapter five. It starts with an overview of the Greater Kluane Region from a systems perspective. It then provides a short historical overview of the territory, from pre-contact native life through to the building of the Alaska Highway and the twenty years following this development. The rest of this chapter focuses on the storyline of events and processes from 1960 to 2010 that have more immediately affected peoples’ interactions and relationships with the land and animals and analyzes this timeline to reveal several trends for change. A description is presented of the subsystems and important institutional elements today. The chapter concludes with a chart and systems map summarizing these elements and their interrelationships. This chapter draws on documents, historical texts, observational knowledge, and to some degree interviews, but main interview results are presented in fuller detail in the following chapter.

4.1 The Greater Kluane Region: A Systems Overview

The Greater Kluane Region is a geographically awe-striking and historically-rich area in the northwest of Canada. It is one of few areas in the first world with large tracts of intact wilderness and rich biodiversity. It is located within a boreal cordillera ecozone, combining boreal forest, high alpine, subalpine, and alpine tundra characteristics. Due to its proximity to the Pacific Coast, this area is host to the most productive forests in Yukon, which is significant, considering the Territory’s subarctic climate and short growing seasons. It is home to some of the highest mountain peaks in the world (the St. Elias Range) and is drained by two major watersheds: the Yukon River and the Alsek River. It features numerous tributaries and small
lakes, as well as some larger lakes: Kluane, Kloo, and Dezadeash. The area is rich in mineral deposits, including gold. It shares a landscape with many competing ungulates and large and small mammals and is still home to the First Nations families that walked the lands centuries ago (Smith, Meikle, and Roots, 2004).

Today, these families are acknowledged under three different bands: Champagne-Aishihik First Nation, Kluane First Nation, and White River First Nation. They carry fascinating stories of both their past, and the relatively quick transition to modern times. A small dilapidated village south of Kluane Lake hosts visible evidence of the historic gold rush, which marked the beginning of a new era in the Yukon. Demographics began to change as European immigrants stayed in the territory after the rush was over and made lives upon native land, but the greatest interruption of indigenous lifestyles followed the introduction of the Alaska Highway in 1942. People were moved off their traplines and re-settled around the four main communities that are seen here today: Haines Junction, Destruction Bay, Burwash Landing, and Beaver Creek. Today, this region is home to a population of nearly 2000 people.

Approximately half of this population is of First Nations descent, while the other half (with very few exceptions) are white Euro-American immigrants, both old and new. Some of these immigrants have been settled for generations (since the gold rush), while others have emigrated from Europe and other parts of North America in recent decades (mostly since the establishment of Kluane National Park). The majority of people who live in this region tend to exercise very wilderness-oriented lives, partaking in a variety of land-based activities for economic as well as recreational purposes.
4.1.1 System Type

The Greater Kluane Region is a planning name that was once given to the Southwest corner of Yukon, a territory in Northwest Canada. It is an open system, where the key elements (the human citizens and wildlife) are free to come and go. This study primarily observes the social system (the humans) and the institutional, cultural, and economic subsystems embedded within it. This research aims to understand how these subsystems affect the actions and behaviours of the humans that live there, and how in turn, these human behaviours affect their natural environment, and the biophysical system: its species, ecosystems, changes, and levels of productivity. See Figure 4-1.

![Figure 4-1 Illustrates humans linking both the social and biophysical systems. The purple arrows display connections between humans and the biophysical system (the primary foci of this research) and red arrows display social factors affecting humans' perceptions, actions, and values.]

4.1.2 Boundaries

There are three types of boundaries which could be recognized in this area: institutional (determined by the Yukon Land Use Planning Council and its precursors), cultural (First Nations’ traditional territories), or natural (biophysical). The system is identified here by institutional boundaries, as defined in the 1989 Greater Kluane Region Draft Land Use Plan. See Figure 4-2 (map from Yukon Tourism and Culture, 2011) below. Because the Land Use Planning Council has made an effort to design all regional planning boundaries in the Yukon in accordance with pre-established biophysical and especially cultural bounds, it ultimately takes...
into account all boundary types. Theoretically, an institutional boundary is suitable due to this study’s interest in governance and institutions. It is practical because it has been formally recognized by the territory, and environmental and planning decisions are made within the capacity of these bounds (although maintaining this as a recognized region into the future is under negotiation).

The temporal boundaries of this study focus on the years from 1960 to 2010. Modernity has just begun to take hold in the 1960s, forming a completely different era and set of lifestyles that is hard to compare to the past. Over the 50 years to follow, the characteristics that make for a more modern way of life become further embedded, ultimately changing human relationships with the land and animals. The completion of interviews in 2010 closed the window to this timeline and provides an understanding of the major changes throughout this time.
4.1.3 Scale and Hierarchy

The system in study is regional in scale: illustrated by the dark red region in Figure 4-3, below. Scaling up, the Territory is considered the ‘wider system’, since most elements in the Yukon Territory have a direct impact on the system but are controlled by forces outside of it. The ‘environment’ – the area just outside of the system that indirectly affects it, but not necessarily how it is structured – is the nation, Canada, since federal governmental decisions are still quite impactful to the reason. For the purpose of this study, the continental scale (North America) has no relevance and is considered within the wider environment along with the rest of the globe. Due to globalization and modern communications, international elements are increasingly relevant, particularly influences from new cultural groups moving to the area.

**Figure 4-3:** Nested hierarchy of system, its sub-systems and super-systems. System of focus is central red ring. Super-systems are shown outside of this, and sub-systems within.
4.1.4 Subsystems Today

For this study, the region has been divided into five sub-systems: (1) Kluane National Park and Reserve; (2) Village of Haines Junction; (3) CAFN territory; (4) KFN territory (including Burwash Landing and Destruction Bay); (5) WRFN territory and Beaver Creek. These sub-systems have been determined by their cultural and institutional composition. They also largely represent different land bases, but there is some physical overlap. There are a number of nuanced differences among the institutional, cultural, economic, and ecological elements within each of these sub-systems, but from a high-level overview, they have many similarities. While this study focuses on the institutional elements that compose this regional system, it does so in the context of how they impact the citizens within these sub-systems.

*Kluane National Park and Reserve (KNPR)*

Kluane National Park and Reserve is a very prominent feature of this area but has very different characteristics as a subsystem from the other four. Part of Canada’s national parks system, it encompasses 22,013 square kilometres of the southwest corner of the Yukon, bordering both Alaska and British Columbia and acting as a corridor between Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Reserve and Tatshenshini-Alsek Provincial Park (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2015). Together with these two parks and Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, it is a part of the largest international UNESCO World Heritage Site, containing 109,000 square kilometres source (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2015). Its western border is shared with that of Alaska, its southern border is shared with B.C., its easterly border jogs along the Alaska Highway, running
East to Kluksu and North Northwest to Destruction Bay, and its Northern border cuts across North of Destruction Bay and due West to Alaska.

The KNPR “celebrates and protects a spectacular Canadian landscape of high mountain peaks, massive valley glaciers, boreal forests, northern wildlife, and rich cultural heritage” (Parks Canada, 2010: 9). It is home to Canada’s highest peak, Mount Logan, a jagged 6050 m summit. “Fringing the glaciers and barren rocky mountain peaks is a narrow “green belt” of alpine tundra and lush valleys of coniferous and deciduous forests, providing critical habitat for the parks abundance wildlife. The park is well known for its wildlife, including ground squirrels, caribou, moose, grizzly and black bears, Dall sheep and mountain goats” and some 150 bird species, from golden eagles to golden-crowned sparrows (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2019).

Today, Kluane National Park and Reserve is managed jointly by the Kluane National Park Management Board and Parks Canada. The Board consists of six voting members: two are nominees of CAFN, two are nominees of KFN, and two are nominees of the Government of Canada. All are appointed by the minister responsible for Parks Canada. The park superintendent sits on the board as a non-voting member. The Board provides advice to elected representatives and First Nations officials and can make recommendations to the federal Minister of the Environment (Parks Canada, 2015).

**Village of Haines Junction**

Haines Junction is the most easterly community in the region, located approximately 150 kms from Whitehorse. It is set in an expansive flat-bottomed valley known as the Shakwak Trench, where residential areas blend themselves with Boreal landscapes, and the jagged St. Elias mountain range towers over the village to its west. Home to approximately 800 people, it
is the largest of the four main communities in GKR, and the fourth largest community in the territory. The majority of the population here is Euro-American, both newly immigrated and longer-term. The popularity and size of Haines Junction can be attributed to Kluane National Park and Reserve, whose inception in the mid-70s was the reason for the village’s expansion and infrastructural developments. Although the population has expanded to house many others, a relatively large portion of this community is still made up of Parks staff. This fact plays a large role in the culture and lifestyles found in Haines Junction.

All of the people that live here tend to live very wilderness-oriented lifestyles and have developed a strong connection to the spectacular landscape at their doorstep; however, they are two very different groups of people, with differing orientations to this wilderness. In general, the Parks staff and other newer residents tend to bring a more preservationist-minded approach to their view of conservation, while many other longer-term residents are resource-users that see their natural environment in a more utilitarian type way. This is not a permanent conflict in the community, but since the natural environment plays such a strong role in many activities that take place here, these two worldviews tend to have a deep-seated presence in community politics. This divide generally persists amongst the white community, while the First Nation community tends to fall somewhere in between.

Due to its temperate climate, Haines Junction has some of the largest trees in the territory, making forestry an important sector to the area – though many of the forestry companies here tend to be based out of Whitehorse and elsewhere. Staking and mining activity has been back on the rise since about 2008, but the majority of this is found further North on the highway. Another prominent industry is the service sector. There are a number of contracting, construction, and mechanical services in Haines Junction, with other forms of employment made
up by general community services (general store, bank, library, police, landfill, etc). There are also many options for those with higher education: the new Yukon College campus, a Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Board office, and the Kluane Regional Biologist’s office provide opportunities for employment in the science sector.

While Haines Junction is home to the central office for the local First Nation, the Champagne-Aisihik (CAFN), the main roles and responsibilities in the village fall to the municipal government of Haines Junction. It is a jurisdiction of its own, located within CAFN territory. It is governed through the Yukon Municipal Act, the bylaws and policies of the village, and holds democratic election of mayor and council. For this purpose (and the fact that it is mostly non-native people that populate Haines Junction), the Village is considered a different sub-system from that of its surrounding CAFN territory.

*Champagne-Aisihik First Nation Territory (CAFN)*

The homeland of the Champagne-Aisihik First Nation is located in the southwest Yukon and northwest British Columbia, with its traditional territory covering 41,000 square kilometres. CAFN’s native language is Southern Tutchone and belongs to the Athapaskan language family. Most CAFN members reside in three small settlements outside of Haines Junction: Champagne (located on Dezadeash River), Aisihik (at the headwaters of the Alsek River drainage), and Canyon Creek (East of Haines Junction). The First Nation was named after two of these historic settlements. Formerly, this Southern Tutchone population was located throughout the region in other villages including Kloo Lake, Klukshu, Canyon, Shäwshe, and Hutshi, but these populations were re-situated to Haines Junction by the federal government in the 1950s (Champagne Aishihik First Nation, 2019).
Today, the CAFN people have become their own Nation with their own government, by signing the CAFN Final Agreement with the Government of Canada and the Government of Yukon in 1993. This was the first local FN Agreement in the Yukon to be signed. Negotiations with the BC government are still not complete, although an agreement between the BC government and CAFN provides joint management authority of the Tatshenshini-Alsek Park. CAFN’s Land Claim Agreement provides for the ownership of some 2,427 square kilometers of land and most importantly, it establishes CAFN as co-managers of all natural and cultural resources in its traditional territory. CAFN is now a full partner on the Kluane National Park Management Board and the Alsek Renewable Resources Council. They also have representation on numerous other regional and territorial boards that make recommendations on heritage, educational, environmental and economic issues. Although CAFN has undergone radical change in the last 100 years, the Agreement is helping them to regain their culture and connection to their homeland and fostering the foundation for building a sustainable economy (Champagne Aishihik First Nation, 2019).

**Kluane First Nation Territory**

Growing from the shores of Kluane Lake in all directions, the KFN’s recognized territory spreads across the Boreal forest to the Ruby and Nisling mountain ranges on the northeast and the St. Elias Mountains to the southwest. The majority of First Nation people from this area identify themselves as descendants of Southern Tutchone speakers and follow a matriarchal moiety system of two clans, Khanjet (Crow Clan) or Ägunda (Wolf Clan). Other ancestors of the Kluane First Nation came from nations such as the Tlingit, Upper Tanana and Northern Tutchone (Kluane First Nation, 2019). CAFN and KFN territorial lands overlap at their borders,
but the areas in which they reside are distinct and separate. The majority of residents within this territory are located in two highway villages: Destruction Bay and Burwash Landing. Other activity within this territory can be found at Silver City and the Kluane Lake Research Station.

_Destruction Bay_ is the next community located on the highway after Haines Junction (110 kms NE). With 40 residents spread along a small section of Kluane Lake, it doesn’t have too much to speak of in the way of community. It was established as a centre for construction and maintenance along the Alaska Highway and this remains its primary use today as well. The Talbot Arms motel, restaurant, bar, and gas station is the main (and basically only) destination when visiting Destruction Bay. The motel tends to always be housing construction crews or highway maintenance people, providing temporary housing that doubles the population of this small stopover. Destruction Bay also has a two-room school house for both its residents and those of Burwash Landing and area.

_Burwash Landing_ is a small community of roughly 80 people, located on the northwest edge of Kluane Lake. Unlike other communities in the region, Burwash Landing is tucked in off the highway, making it barely visible to the average passerby. Once inside the village, the only infrastructure is the Lodge and the First Nations office with small gravel roads and trails connecting residential areas and municipal services. The majority of the population in Burwash are of Kluane First Nation descent. Other than the lodge and restaurant (which were a hub of activity during this research, but are now shut down), the majority of work in Burwash is related to the KFN government in some form or other – whether it is in administration, lands management, public works, daycare, or through their construction company (Ketza) – except for a few local private businesses based in wilderness tourism and outfitting. With the large deposits of white gold and other minerals in the area and its increasing worth, the mining sector is also
picking up interest. Residents are taking up personal mining around the Burwash area and many companies are setting up base camps in the months that allow it and flying out to sample and stake many areas in the region.

Silver City. About 3.4 kilometers down a gravel road heading north towards Kluane Lake at Kilometre 1635.8 of the Alaska Highway sits the largest ghost town in the Yukon (Lundberg, 2015). Silver City began because of its location at the end of the wagon road from Whitehorse and proximity to a small mining boom - from there, goods were transported by boat. Slowly but surely the town is disappearing as the buildings crumble and Mother Nature reclaims the site. Further down this road, there are a few more modern houses where a very small community resides today.

Kluane Lake Research Station is located close to Silver City, on the South side of Kluane Lake. The extreme elevation difference between Kluane Lake and the crest of the St. Elias Mountains establishes a strong gradient in environmental attributes and results in a remarkable diversity of research opportunities within a small geographical area. This diversity is reflected in the unique scientific legacy of KLRS across the disciplines of glaciology, geomorphology, geology, biology, botany, zoology, hydrology, limnology, climatology, physiology, anthropology and archaeology and in over 1500 scientific publications (Arctic Institute of North America, 2019). It has an interesting history of aviation and has been a temporary home to many notable Northern scientists. While the purchase of supplies to support this camp does add to the economy of the Yukon, this small centre of internationally-profound scientific activity can be seen as a microcosm of its own.
White River First Nation Territory/Beaver Creek

The contemporary White River First Nation (WRFN) is made up of two Athapaskan language groups: Upper Tanana, whose traditional territory extends from the Donjek River into neighbouring Alaska; and Northern Tutchone, whose traditional territories include the lower Stewart River and the area South of the Yukon River on the White and Donjek River drainages (White River First Nation, 2019). The WRFN people of today are mostly based in the village of Beaver Creek so, culturally, this sub-system revolves around the activities of the village. Beaver Creek is not only home to the WRFN people but is also home to two other groups: the border security and national services community, and the seasonal community of workers at the RV Park and the motels. Since the latter two populations roll-over often, the WRFN community (and the very few longer term non-first nation residents that live among them) oversee most decision making for the community and the band office is the administrator for the village.

Beaver Creek is the final community in Yukon along the Alaska Highway, just a few kilometres before crossing the border to Alaska. Due to its distance from any other major hubs, it is relatively isolated from the rest of the Yukon and residents here often do most of the errands on the other side of the border. Its position as a border town, however, brings a higher level of activity than one might expect. As a Canada Customs post, Beaver Creek has many amenities and services which other smaller communities lack: an RCMP office, a pool, a well-equipped fire station, a tourism building, a community hall, and a school. The government positions offered here have brought many outsiders that have settled and stayed here, making roughly a quarter of the population non-first nations. Due to the numerous community events, physical openness of the town, and perhaps the fact that most of the white people here work in public service jobs where they must overemphasize more friendly behaviour, the white and native
community seem to be fairly well integrated here in comparison to many other communities in the Yukon. Divisions in the community appear to arise over the politics of land claims. WRFN is one of three first nations in the Yukon that have yet to sign an agreement. Due to this, the people of this nation are still governed under the Indian Act of the Government of Canada.

The physical attributes of the area are also very different from the communities further South on the Highway. As one travels closer to Beaver Creek, the land tends to become gradually flatter and swamplier, with smoother rolling hills rather than significant inclines and declines. The mountains are further from the highway (almost invisible to Beaver Creek) and are smoother in feature than the jagged mountains that border the Park or can be seen from Burwash and D’Bay. Like Haines Junction, the town has amenities on either side of the highway, making it very visible to passersby and a common overnight destination for tourists. The approximately 100 people that live in Beaver Creek grows to about 150 in the summertime and many of these are service workers that come back year after year.

Although the Highway acts as a hub of activity, bringing along many visitors, these communities remain small, autonomous, and culturally grounded. They share similar means to many other modern places, but the rich in-tact landscape preserves an atmosphere and lifestyle that is very different from the rest of the First World. While there have been many large and rapid developments that have shifted the ways of the people here, ties to land remain strong and deep. Development has been very limited in comparison to the rest of the continent, and the wildness that remains keeps a history of the land very much alive.
4.2 Background and History

As one of the last places in North America to be developed, the Yukon has witnessed significant change over the past century. Due to the severity of this change, the history of the Yukon is very relevant in the lives of Yukoners today. Yukon history can be most easily understood by dividing it into five distinct periods: (1) pre-contact indigenous life; (2) first contact and the gold rush; (3) post-gold rush to the Alaska Highway; (4) the Alaska Highway and the Post-WWII Years; and (5) the period that is explored in this thesis: the transition to modernity.

These first four periods are explored here, essentially as a summary of three key sources: McClellan, 1987; Coates and Morrison, 2005; and Johnson, 2009. Certain details have acquired more focus over others if they were frequently alluded to in interviews. Other sources were referenced as required.

4.2.1 Pre-Contact: Native Life in Southern Yukon

It is believed that people began to live for the first time in North America in the latest stage of the Pleistocene: somewhere between 10,000 and 25,000 years ago (McClellan, 1987). Even as the natural environment underwent several drastic changes, human culture tended to consistently revolve around a subsistence lifestyle. The area now known as the “Greater Kluane Region” is believed to have been inhabited by three different Athapaskan (or Dene) language groups: Upper Tanana, Northern Tutchone, and most dominantly, Southern Tutchone. These groups are said to be the most firmly linked with the languages of Yukon Indians today (McClellan, 1987). Although they did not negotiate geopolitical boundaries, Native peoples of
the region had developed complex social systems for controlling and sharing resources (Johnson, 2009: 5-6).

As hunters and gatherers, life was governed by the natural environment and the changing seasons (Coates & Morrison, 2005). It has been described as “restricted wandering”: staying within generally consistent areas but moving about freely in pursuit of different seasonal foods (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 12). For most Athapaskan groups in the interior, large game was important for food and hides, but small game and fish often contributed an even larger portion of the diet. From the relatively small size of the traditional territories, it is believed that the lands of this region were abundant with wildlife, berries, and other edible plant life so the people here did not have to move far.

Though there are many cultural details that could be discussed here\(^2\), one of the most significant is that early Native peoples not only lived a life on the land, they lived a life of the land, where their intense spirituality and strong awareness of natural forces governed their way of life. Their religion taught them about the nature of power and about the spirits whose presence they sensed in the land, the water, the animals, the plants and all throughout the natural world (McClellan, 1987: 79). Their histories and life lessons were passed down through natural metaphors, and signs and spirits were embedded in all animate and inanimate objects around them (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 12). A harmonious relationship with spiritual forces was of great importance to people who, as hunters and fishers, derived their livelihood directly from their environment (McClellan, 1987: 79). This spiritual connection to the land and water can be said to be the pillar of Native culture itself.

\(^2\) See McClellan’s *My Old People Say*, 2001, for a detailed ethnography of Native life in Southern Yukon
4.2.2 Contact: Fur Trade, Missionaries, and the Gold Rush

Yukon Native peoples learned of the existence of white men long before their coming into the territory (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 13). Several clans moved east to exploit trading opportunities and interior Native trade networks shifted forever. Eager for metal products like knives, axes, and pots, these new technologies could not compare to the loss that was to come. Before the white man was even present in the Yukon, European diseases were spreading to the Interior through traders that had made contact, and the Yukon native population rapidly declined (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 13).

Russian and British diplomats negotiated a boundary in 1825 separating their North American territories at the 141st meridian plus the “panhandle” (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 16) – the boundary that still separates Alaska and the Yukon today. In the 1830s, the upper Yukon River Valley was one of the few blank spots on European maps of North America, which was particularly intolerable for a place with such seeming potential for commercial opportunities (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 13). Europeans began to move inward and Natives dependent on new trade networks awaited their arrival.

Many details follow about the meetings between Europeans and different native tribes, as well as the competitive power struggles between the British and the Russians to conquer the trade networks that were developing. Trading forts were established on multiple Native stopping grounds and though trading in the Yukon tended to be controlled by the Hudson’s Bay Company, these still remained mainly Native settlements in the southwest Yukon. These trade networks changed some of the social networks of the Native population, and their material culture began to change as well. Culturally and spiritually, however, Native life remained strong in the Yukon
throughout this time (McClellan, 1987: 63-70). The fur traders, explorers, scientists and journalists who trickled in to the Yukon during the nineteenth century did not want the land of the Yukon Indians, nor did they try to make any changes to their way of life (McClellan, 1987: 75).

It was only the missionaries who openly said that they wanted to change the Indians’ ways of thinking and behaving and came to the Yukon precisely for that reason (McClellan, 1987: 75). The missionaries did not understand that the Native peoples’ own religion was deeply spiritual and guided them to live good lives and behave well towards one another and the world that they lived in. Although Native people did come to accept white man’s God, they often also quietly held on to their earlier beliefs (McClellan, 1987: 79). The advent of missionaries drastically changed the lives of Yukon Natives much more than any other Europeans in the later 19th century, but unfathomable change would shortly be seen from a new group of incomers: prospectors (McClellan, 1987: 79).

Ever since the first trading post was built at Fort Yukon in the 1840s, white men had known there was gold in the Yukon watershed (McClellan, 1987: 82). As American governments established clearer borders and surveyed more closely, there were gold discoveries and news spread quickly (Johnson, 2009). The eventual detection of very significant gold at Bonanza Creek in 1896 shifted the entire scene, and by 1898, forty-thousand men and a few white women flooded the countryside (McClellan, 1987: 84). While much of this activity took place in and around Dawson City, the influx of people triggered several smaller gold rushes and by 1904 several creeks in the Kluane Lake area had also been claimed (Danby et al, 2003). This activity was anchored by Silver City, a small settlement on the south end of the lake connected by wagon road to Whitehorse (Theberge, 1980).
As news of the Gold Rush events spread to Ottawa, politicians and officials were sent to maintain control of an overwhelmingly American occupied territory (Johnson, 2009). In 1898, the Yukon Territory Act was established to settle legal issues that had arisen. Yukon’s indigenous people were not mentioned and were left to the administration of the federal Indian Act of 1876, however no treaty had been signed and no reserves had been established in Yukon as they had in other parts of the country.

As thousands came to set up, the scrambling for mining claims, scarcity of food and commodities, and threats of disease and disorder, all contributed to a freewheeling atmosphere. Most expected little interference from government authorities; this was not the case. The Yukon Act excluded early pioneer prospectors and newcomers from direct participation in formulating policies for governance. Most officials were patronage appointees, friends of Prime Minister Laurier, or other influential Liberals. Miners were frustrated by the imposition of a federal authority and the new inability to make financial gains. Miners’ meetings turned to mass protests, and they began demanding elected representation. Within a few years of the initial gold rush, Dawson City transformed from a wild frontier mining camp to a more orderly town with full services and amenities (Johnson, 2009). It developed a partially representative government and acted as the capital of the territory.

Although many of the whites left soon afterward, the Gold Rush marked the end of traditional Indian life in many parts of the Yukon (McClellan, 1987: 84). After thousands of years of successful living in their homelands, Native peoples found themselves enmeshed in a new world they knew very little about, regarded as part of the population of a political territory in a nation whose government was run by white people (McClellan, 1987: 85). Rivers, lakes, mountains and countryside had been renamed, and these white visitors had also given out various
tribal and band names, which Native peoples had never used themselves (McClellan: 1987: 85).
The face of the landscape had been forever scarred and the irrevocable changes that went with it brought this once free land firmly into a modern world of development and technology (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 47).

4.2.3 Developing ‘the Frontier’: Post-Gold Rush and Pre-Highway

As Stampeders moved on and demand for gold declined, the people that had put in so much time and effort building themselves a new northern home feared that their community might fade away to a ghost town. By 1905, the population of Dawson had fallen to a third of its size; but those that remained fought hard to build a home. In response to many federally imposed policies, many of these new northerners advocated for a responsible local and territorial government (Johnson, 2009).

A political battle waged throughout the years to follow. Eleven years after the establishment of the territory, the first fully elected council would represent the people of the Yukon in territorial legislature. A federally appointed Commissioner served as both head of government and head of the state, with full executive powers and responsibility over Yukon administration, but the new fully representative Council still served as a strong symbol of democracy. In July of 1909, ten white men were elected to the first Yukon Council, to represent the people of the Yukon in the territorial legislature. Not one of them was born in the Yukon. The Council was to be fully representative, but only allowed seats for male non-aboriginals who were British subjects (Johnson, 2009: 1)

“Aboriginal people had occupied these lands for countless generations, but they had no representatives, no vote, and no role in the new Council… more than half a century would pass
before either a Yukon aboriginal person or a woman would be elected to this legislature” (Johnson, 2009: 1). While they could still not hold seats, amendments to the *Indian Act* in 1906 did enfranchise some Yukon Indians to vote, under certain conditions. However, since most aboriginals were excluded from participation, Council represented a division between aboriginal and non-aboriginal segments of society – yet they still had authority to legislate on many matters affecting aboriginal people, including wildlife issues (Johnson, 2009).

Some indigenous leaders petitioned for government compensation due to reduced food sources, displacement from traditional lands, and more frequent illness, but to no avail (Johnson, 2009: 13-14). The federal government and the Department of Indian Affairs had rather little contact with Yukon Natives until World War II. While this may have been frustrating at the time, later, they would come to have preferred this non-contact. Pre-WWII, aboriginal peoples who lived beyond the main industrial and transport corridors were able to continue with traditional lifestyles. Trading posts remained in these remote areas and fur trade continued as Yukon’s other principal economic activity – pursued mainly by aboriginal families (Johnson, 2009).

The years leading up to World War I were filled with a number of small economic booms and busts, due to minerals, liquor or fur (Johnson, 2009). The government’s interest in the regulation of aboriginal hunting and foraging products came in waves and was slowly wrapping aboriginal peoples in legislation that required them to be a part of the new economy – although most still carried on acting as though it did not exist. To onlookers, Indians seemed to have no part in the new Yukon, but it remained in many ways theirs – no treaties were signed and they moved freely about the land, ignoring the seasonal migration of other Yukon workers (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 216).
The latter half of the 1920s brought many possibilities for development: air travel, plans for an international highway, and new mining ventures (Johnson, 2009: 194). Improved communication and transport systems encouraged frequent year-round exchanges with the outside world. Few Yukoners had the means to travel abroad, but tourism to the area was beginning to prosper – showcasing old gold rush trails and the exotic wilderness. Particularly in the Kluane Region, big game hunting was becoming a world-class sport. The Jacquot brothers – who had originally come from France for the Gold Rush – sent stories of their many wildlife finds back home and opened guiding to the world. “If gold mining acted as the catalyst in opening up the valleys of the St Elias Mountains, then big game hunting was its equivalent in bringing people into the peripheral highlands” (Danby et al, 2003: 196). Guided hunting expeditions continued throughout a large portion of the St. Elias Mountains and surrounding areas until a successive designation of protected areas began in the 1940s (Danby et al, 2003). As the economy grew, Ottawa always found a variety of new means to exert more control over Yukon administrators.

Another gold strike in the mid-30s brought attention to the territory yet again, and the “Alaska Highway Committee” made their first visit to inspect local roads in connection with American interests as a military route. Shortly after this visit, another small downturn of the economy brought news that Yukon would be annexed to BC in the near future, resulting in uproar and protest in the Yukon that lasted for two years. However as the reality of WWII began to set in, plans for annexation came to an abrupt halt, and this launched the Yukon into a new and fast-paced era of expansion (Johnson, 2009: 147-212).
4.2.4 Alaska Highway and the Post-War Years: 1940-1960

World War II was a very different experience than the First World War. Yukon was catapulted into the headlines as a strategic component in a new North American defense system (Johnson, 2009: 281). Within a few years, the entire social and economic structure of the territory was altered. Whitehorse became the logical center for expanding air transportation, which lead to it becoming the new capital in 1946, following the war. After the bombing of Pearl Harbour in 1941, and several attacks off the Aleutian Islands, the military highway assumed a new sense of urgency (Johnson, 2009). A well-used path from a trading post at Kluane Lake to Whitehorse would soon be developed as the new highway and Indian guides were important in establishing this new route.

The project moved so quickly that Yukon officials were barely informed of what would happen next. Thousands of American troops converged on Whitehorse in mid-April of 1942, transforming a small railway town of 500 people into a sprawling tent city overnight (Johnson, 2009: 237). The original highway was completed in 12 months, followed by the implementation of a telephone system. These two massive infrastructural changes provided the territory with new levels of access to the outside. To many white people, the highway was a heroic example of drive, cooperation, and successful development. To indigenous people, the results were more complex (Johnson, 2009).

During the building of the highway, pressure was directed from American leaders to provide special hunting privileges for U.S. Army personnel. At that time, the Yukon Game Ordinance had been enforcing a $100 license fee and required the hiring of a licensed guide for hunting big game. Both were dropped for Army personnel without discussion and without any report in the newspapers (Johnson, 2009: 238). The Ordinance had been amended in minor
ways on numerous occasions since its inception in the early 1900s, but never with this much leeway. Despite the mass killings and wastage that was being reported, government officials turned a blind eye and accepted this as par for the course. Within two years, damage to wildlife populations along the highway corridor became too extravagant to ignore. In 1943, the *Game Ordinance* was amended again, designating areas of land along the Alaska Highway to become a Game Sanctuary – no one would be allowed to hunt there. Though these areas had been favoured hunting grounds by Southern Tutchone people for centuries, their needs and concerns were not considered. The Indian Act offered almost no means to advocate for themselves, and there had been no Indian Agent in the territory since the late 1930s to advocate for them (Johnson, 2009). Fearful of enforcement under these protectionist regimes, accepting government assistance was necessary for survival. (Though many quietly found a way to hunt anyway, and if they were lucky, certain conservation officers turned a blind eye from time to time.)

Back in Ottawa, federal policy makers were becoming conscious of the inequitable position of indigenous people throughout Canada and they became the focus of many new government programs (Johnson, 2009). Initiatives were planned and administered by the feds, mostly through departments in Ottawa. Education for aboriginal children gained momentum, separating many aboriginal children from their families for years. Parents were threatened with large fines if they didn’t allow their children to be taken to residential schools to learn the white way of life (Coates and Morrison, 2005).

Federal governments organized health care in various communities and took responsibility for “Status Indians”. In the 1950s, federal family allowance programs and other policies put increasing pressure on aboriginals to relocate to communities near schools, health
facilities and government administrative bodies – drawn together with whites for economic and political reasons. First Nations people who had traditionally been caring for and living off the land for centuries were moved away from their trap lines, threatened with large fines and incarceration had they done otherwise, and ‘gifted’ with free housing and developments had they followed suit. So for most, they did. Until this point, most Yukon native people were still living subsistence or semi-subsistence lifestyles, which were disrupted by this resettlement. Tensions between aboriginals and non-aboriginals began to rise as they were forced into lives that were unwanted and unwarranted (Johnson, 2009: 263-290).

Residential school children suffered the worst, as it was difficult to transition back to their communities. Schooling provided a mixed blessing: new skills were gained, but children were forced to join a system that was culturally insensitive to their native ways (Coates and Morrison, 2005). Children were often abused for speaking their language and practicing their traditional ways while at school. Away for at least 8 months of the year, coming home for summer did not allow enough opportunity to regain this lost time from learning traditional ways. The residential school system did not last as long in the territories as it did in other parts of the country. By the early to mid-1960s, all Yukon residential schools had been phased out. The territorial school systems expanded, bringing classrooms closer to Indian communities. Still, Indian culture was seen as irrelevant in school, and at best, treated as a historical curiosity (Coates and Morrison, 2005).

For administrative convenience, the new communities were designed by grouping together several Indian bands. This first re-settlement took place in the 1950s, and then a second wave of further amalgamation followed in the 1960s, grouping all FNs west of Haines Junction. They were then directed to hold elections to determine leadership structures for their new band
councils – a different process than had ever resonated in traditional native culture (Johnson, 2009: 263-290). Traditional native leaders who were raised in the bush often lacked the skills necessary for the bureaucratic age of administration.

Following the move to these communities came alcoholism, problems with the law, poor education, and poverty. The housing that was provided was exceptionally bad, adding to already serious health problems that came as a result of the infiltration of outsiders. But the main concern was about cultural dislocation, reinforced by government and a white population that didn’t seem to value Indian ways. Governments sought to integrate native populations into the industrial economy. Loans, advice, supervision, and training was offered to entrepreneurs and Native employers, but there were very few success stories, and mostly no success. The individualism of capitalism countered the co-operative ethos embedded in Indian culture and this new way seemed unappealing and nonsensical.

In a short period of 20 years, traditional ways of life had become redrawn. Young people were beginning to lack the necessary skills to survive a bush life, and with the erection of the Game Sanctuary, few even had the opportunity to do so. These changes were enough to draw the line by which traditional native society never return to its same form again. While many other changes and developments are still to come that would draw them yet further from the life they had once known, many other events would transpire in the decades to follow which allowed Yukon natives newfound power and respect.

4.3 A Transition to Modernity: 1960-2010

Each decade in the half-century following 1960 brought with it new technologies, new challenges, and a series of developments that continuously altered ways of life and relationships
with land. Many institutions introduced during this time allowed for positive change, some contributed negatively, but most often, the forthcoming changes simply added more complexity, offering both opportunities and benefits and challenges and drawbacks. Supplemented by secondary documents, the following sub-sections were built upon information learned in interviews. They expand upon the historic events and processes that are believed to have played a role in shaping human interactions with nature.

4.3.1 1960: Economic Development and an Establishment of Voices

Between the WWII highway developments and Prime Minister Lyon Mackenzie King’s strong Northern economic development plans, the drive towards modernity was well underway by 1960 (Johnson, 2009). The real construction of the Alaskan Highway is taking place – replacing its original rickety state with a much more generally usable road – and the area is slowly becoming more motorized. Across the territory, there is a much higher political presence; many new buildings and telecommunications infrastructure are under development, with next to no environmental regulation.

Until this point, FN populations have been regarded as administrative numbers to “deal with”, rather than people with families and culturally significant lives. But in 1960, they are able to gain some significant wins. First Nations’ people attain the right to vote in Canada and are also now able to attend public schools (Johnson, 2009). These federal-level changes trigger a series of events that allow a stronger political voice for Yukon First Nations in years to come.

In this same year, the new Yukon commissioner is also campaigning for more autonomy. As a territory, all decision-making power has been in the hands of the federal government since they started to pay any attention to the territory amidst the Gold Rush. A political struggle
continues for 5 years, and by 1966, the power of the Yukon Territorial Council outweighs federal power (Johnson, 2009). Responsibilities have gradually been handed over, including responsibility of the Alaska Highway, which was transferred from the nation to the territory in 1964 (Yukon Tourism and Culture, 2006). Natural resources are still owned by the nation, but the territory leads the decision-making process on almost all other items, with ultimate authority at the national level. While territorial government priorities shift through a variety of cycles between NDP and Conservative reign (with periodic holdings by the Liberals), political autonomy of the territory stays fairly consistent for the next 40 years.

Internationally, a worldwide environmental movement is brewing that will have negative implications for Yukon’s people. In the mid-1960s, pictures of the Canadian seal hunt in the Maritimes are leaked to the world - bringing Greenpeace and worldwide supporters together against the cause. This triggers the beginning of the animal welfare movement. The entire fur industry is grouped into one very negative entity, and over two decades of bad press, eventually kills the entire industry. Many trappers who have acted as a land stewards for generations are forced to find other economic means of survival.

4.3.2 Late 1960s to Early 1970s: Early Environmental Protection

In contrast to this, we can see more positive environmental action finally taking place on a local and territorial level. In 1968, the Yukon Conservation Society is founded: a grassroots environmental non-profit organization with a mission to pursue ecosystem well-being throughout the Yukon and beyond, through advocacy, education, and research (Yukon Conservation Society, 2016). This became the first institutional presence acting on behalf of the natural environment and for conservation of its resources.
This was also the year in which the Yukon Native Brotherhood (YNB) came into form. “The YNB formed in the Yukon as First Nations people throughout Canada were finding a common voice and working toward recognition of their rights. In 1969, the federal White Paper gave momentum to the Indian Movement as First Nations people joined forces to fight a common enemy” (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2019: 1). By 1973, the YNB had initiated a strong grassroots movement to secure a land claims settlement for the Yukon. The claim was founded on the principle that aboriginal rights still existed in the Yukon Territory and that the Government of Canada had a longstanding obligation to negotiate a treaty with the aboriginal peoples of the Yukon. Elijah Smith and a delegation of Yukon Chiefs marched to the Ottawa parliament to ensure action. The presentation of Together Today for Our Children Tomorrow marked the beginning of a long and arduous struggle for a land claims settlement for Yukon First Nations peoples (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2019). While letters had been put forward to the federal government from Yukon chiefs since Gold Rush times, this was the first real negotiation amongst Yukon First Nations and the Government of Canada (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2019).

In the same year, the Yukon Water Board was established. The Board issues water use licenses for the use of water and/or the deposit of waste water. It is an independent body established under the Waters Act, however the board is made up of members that are appointed by the Minister of the Executive Council (Yukon Water Board, 2019). “In the 1970s and through to the late 1980s, the water board was the primary environmental regulator in the Yukon. During that time, water use licenses went from being relatively short documents that established a licensee’s rights, to more complex regulatory instruments that went beyond the limited scope
of water quantity and quality” (Yukon Water Board, 2019). This would be the sole environmental regulator until the 1990s.

In the early 1970s, the Alaska Highway is paved, making the region even more accessible than before. In 1972, Kluane National Park & Reserve is established, replacing the Game Sanctuary and beyond. While the mandate of the Game Sanctuary was just to protect the animals there, the mandate of the Park is to protect their habitat – a major benefit for long-term conservation of a large tract of sensitive Yukon land. However, to locals, the primary narrative is that the Park has shut them out of yet more land – for hunting, harvesting, forestry, etc. – and stolen their means of survival.

4.3.3 Mid-70s to Early 80s: Technology and Communications

Coincidentally, the introduction of the Park coincides almost directly with the increase of snowmobiles in the region. Arriving in the mid-to late 1960s, snowmobiles had almost completely replaced dog teams by about 1973 (Nadasdy, 2003). This allowed hunters to go further and compensates for the lack of local land that they had traditionally gained their resources from. While immediate gains are imminent, they will see over the next 40 years what kind of effect this will have on the landscape – not to mention, the tradition of hunting. Since hunters are now able to just venture out for a kill and come home, it immediately changed one’s connection to landscape and all that happens on the long trek to find your animal. There is no longer the same time spent on the land where one might acknowledge potential transformations: to the flora and smaller fauna you might pass along the way, the changes in herds, habitats, etc. and all that had been gained from centuries of TEK through slower, more intimate forms of hunting. The other downfall is the increased ties to the economy. Hunters are now reliant on gas
and oil prices in determining the cost of their expeditions, whereas before they could feed their dogs on fish and game from their hunts (Nadasdy, 2003). When times were tough, snowmobiles were parked and people went without. On the other hand, First Nation peoples can still carry on their economically-tied lives in their communities but return to using the land in ways that would have been followed during their traditional hunting rounds in past bush lives.

While this shift from dogsleds to early snowmobiles had a major effect on hunting lifestyles, changes in snowmobile technologies continued to affect people’s approaches to being on the land in other ways. When they were first introduced, snowmobiles were treated as a tool – using them to get from one point to another, to complete their on-land endeavours. As snowmobiles became lighter and faster however, they were increasingly used as a toy. In later decades, people often use their snowmobiles for on the land entertainment, rather than to get from place to place for other on land activity. The effects of using ATVs have been similar. This change in technology has been one of two major technological changes that was seen to disrupt life on the land and ties to one’s environment. The other is the advancement of broadcasting and home entertainment technologies.

Much behind the rest of the world in terms of communications technologies, Yukoners were without television broadcasting until the early 1970s, when the Hougan family introduced the first cable system to Yukon. For many years, tapes were flown in from the US and Southern Canada, and Yukoners watched yesterday’s news. In 1980, the CRTC issued a Cancom system that would beam several southern stations into communities in YT and NWT, live for the first time (Alia, 1999). They filtered in one at a time, and slowly the communities started to receive more channels incrementally over the years. The first local programming became offered weekly from Whitehorse in 1986, focusing on Northern issues (Alia, 1999).
Coincidentally, while Yukoners’ communications technologies started opening them up more to the rest of the world, their political processes also started to resemble more of their neighbouring provinces. In 1977, the Yukon Elections Act is passed, replacing the Yukon Territorial Council (YTC) with the Legislative Assembly, which held its first election in 1978. While the YTC was also an elected body, it acted only as an advisory body to the Commissioner of the Yukon – who was appointed by federal powers and held the final authority over all decisions. While the Commissioner still held high authority, the elected Legislative Assembly would now hold all of the final decision making power. This change had a large effect on the autonomy of Yukoners, giving them a more responsible government and offering the beginning of more democratic political environment (Linklater and Coleman, 2018).

As they enter the 1980s, the rest of North America is suffering from the worst depression since WWI, but most of the Yukon goes unfazed (Coates and Morrison, 2005). A market surge on furs creates a large enough impact to keep Yukon in an economic bubble for some years. Unfortunately, this does not last long, as the worst press for trappers is just about to begin. In 1983, the global press clamps down and seal products are banned in the European Union (Legge, 1984). Yet again, the entire fur market crashes. Yukon fairs better than Northwest Territories because of the wide variety of fur products that are less controversial, but the fur market never fully recovers. In 1984, the federal government invested approximately $12 million into a ten-year study of more humane fur trapping methods and techniques. The Fur Institute of Canada was formed the following year and has since received over $58 million in funding from governments, fur traders, and NGOs, and is providing expertise and access to technical information that is internationally renowned (Legge, 1984). While there was a sharp decline in fur prices throughout the 1990s, the market had turned around by the early 2000s and into today.
4.3.4 Late 80s to Mid-90s: Institutions and Processes

By the late 1980s, the free-for-all frontier attitude is starting to diminish, and a series of events set the stage for a more institutionally-bounded and environmentally conscious territory to unfold throughout the 1990s. Internationally, the United Nations set up the World Commission on Environment and Development (aka the Brundtland Commission), and out of this, the world was broadly introduced to the concept of “sustainable development” in its 1987 report (WCED, 1987). In 1988, the *Yukon Fisheries Protection Authorization* is passed – a policy agreed on by DFO, Environment Canada, and DIAND – to discharge standards from the 1970 *Northern Inland Waters Act* (NIWA), which by-passed water use licenses from placer mining projects (Environment Yukon, 2010). In this same year, the initial Umbrella Final Agreement is written and concluded – after a 15-year process – and awaits signatures, which will kickstart a series of legislation to protect and care for not only Yukon’s first people, but also their natural resources (Canada, Council for Yukon Indians, & Yukon Territory, 1993). In 1989, the *Canada-Yukon Freshwater Fisheries Agreement* is signed, transferring responsibility for managing the Yukon’s freshwater fisheries to the territorial government, and marked the beginning of a comprehensive fisheries management system that would continue to evolve over time (Environment Yukon, 2010).

At this same time, a major event in the Northwest would flare an environmental controversy that would have unforeseen effects upon bringing together Yukon’s divided social communities. A discovery of cobalt and copper ore in the Northwest corner of BC and the adjacent lands bordering Alaska and Yukon (the Tatschenshini-Alsek Park of today) would lead to a five-year controversy over the development of the Windy Craggy Mine. The mine project
proposed an estimated $15 billion worth of product, creating over 500 direct jobs, 700 indirect jobs, and $1.2 billion in tax revenue (Walters, Hsu, & Duncan, 2007). But the mining company was proposing unproven mitigation techniques that carried serious risk for major salmon-bearing rivers and others important habitat. For the first time in the Yukon, allies formed among the hunting and fishing communities, the conservationists, and the First Nations, to stop this mine. On June 22, in 1993, B.C. Premier Mike Harcourt announced the creation of the Tatshenshini-Alsek Park, a Class A Park under the provincial Park Act, closing the almost one million hectares of wilderness to natural resource development and effectively terminating the Windy Craggy project (Walters, Hsu, & Duncan, 2007).

In the midst of this battle, the spruce beetle makes its way to the Kluane Region, where the first signs of its arrival are witnessed around 1991 rapidly changing the forests throughout the 1990s and into the early 2000s and altering the forest industry (Garbutt, Hawkes, and Allen, 2006). This year was also the beginning of a major Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS) campaign to promote a Protected Areas Strategy – bringing awareness to the importance of maintaining large tracts of land – and the beginning of a CPAWS Yukon chapter (Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, 2019). This topic drew lots of media attention and started local people talking about land issues in a different way. Years later, the first Protected Areas Strategy would be created by the territory in 1998 (YPAS, 1998), and a new one is nearing completion now.

The Kluane Region also saw more local environmental action at this time, with the start of “Friends of the Kluane Region” in the early 1990s. While there is no documentation about projects that they may have completed, there are still people who speak about this vibrant group who came together to think and talk seriously about environmental issues in their region. In
1992, the federal government introduced the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. This was applied to any projects that received funding from the federal government and was intended to achieve sustainable development by encouraging and promoting economic development that conserves and enhances environmental quality (CEAA, 1992). And then internationally in 1993, the RIO Earth Summit brought environmental awareness to the world stage. As a follow-up to the Brundtland Report, it was the first major meeting to address climate change and led to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement decades later.

In 1993, the Umbrella Final Agreement is officially signed by the Council for Yukon First Nations, Government of Canada, and Government of Yukon (Canada, CYFN, & Yukon Territory, 1993). It is not a “legal” document, but a “political” document and outlines the themes and guidelines by which each individual FN’s self-government agreement is defined. Under the organization of this agreement, the Yukon Water Board becomes a “land claims board”. The Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board is founded, as well as the grounds for its Regional Resource Councils. The Yukon Placer Authorization replaces the Yukon Fisheries Protection Agency and the *Yukon Waters Act* is established (Yukon Water Board, 2019). The Wilderness Tourism Association of Yukon (WTAY) is also founded this year (Tourism and Culture, 2008).

Following the signing of the UFA, 1994 brings the establishment of *Yukon First Nations Land Claims Settlement Act*, the establishment of *Yukon First Nations Self-Government Act*, and the establishment of *Yukon First Nations Surface Rights Board Act*. In this same year, The Yukon Conservation Society, represented by Sierra Legal Defense Fund, files a lawsuit against the federal government over approval of mining exploration activities and permit in the Killerman Lake area by DIAND.
In 1995, the Champagne-Aishihik First Nation is one of the first four to sign a Final Agreement in the territory and are the first for this region. In addition to its rights to self-government and other benefits from land claims, this gives CAFN rights to hunt and fish on KNPR land within their traditional territory. It initiates the use of traditional knowledge in ecological monitoring for the Park. It also includes the creation of the Alsek Renewable Resources Council – the first of the RRCs.

“In the 1990's, other environmental legislation developed (EARPGO, CEAA, EAA), and the environmental regulatory gap closed. Other tools became available for environmental protection, and overlapping authorities resulted in a climate of uncertainty for proponents and interested parties” (Yukon Water Board, 2010). This legislation and organization had come just in time, as the mid to late nineties reveal several human induced environmental failures. In 1995, KFN and YTG jointly establish the Ruby Range Sheep Steering Committee to address concerns about a population of Tachal Dahl sheep that are in serious decline (see Nadasdy, 2003: 150). In 1996, the Aishihik dam releases, flooding Champagne and it becomes clear that better environmental assessments are needed for large scale developments (Joe, 2012). In 1998, the imported bison herds hit over double their original population and start climbing beyond their recovery goal. They begin causing obvious damage to the natural alpine landscape as their population grows to unexpected numbers, and the Yukon Wood Bison Management Team is formed (Boyd, 2003).

4.3.5 Late 90s – 2010: Re-connection, Devolution, Development and Climate Change

By the late 1990s, the political terrain is ready for change and people of all sides have started to come together. The environmental and tourism communities observe their first big “win” as YESAB turns down the Killerman Lake proposal. This is the first major mining
proposal to be turned down in the Yukon due to environmental sensitivities. The Yukon also sees changes to its placer mining land use regulations, whereby restoration is now required for all exploration projects and mining projects. In the same year, a new convention centre is built in Haines Junction that showcases its regional natural history and a wider effort is attributed toward documenting FN oral histories. In 2000, the *Klondike Soft Gold program* begins, supporting the revitalization of the fur industry in the Yukon (Hatler and Beal, 2008).

Many new territorial Acts and Regulations are also introduced in the early years of the 21st century as it continues to become more organized and developed as a legislative body. This restructuring is in motion as the territory leads up to the second most important process the territory will see: devolution. In 2003, the Government of Yukon assumes full responsibility for management of land, resources, water, forests, and environmental matters. This kicks off the signing of the *Waters Act*, the *Territorial Lands (Yukon) Act*, the *Territorial Lands (Yukon) Act*, and the *Yukon Environment and Socio-Economic Assessment Act* (YESSA). The *Waters Act* basically mirrors the previous *Yukon Waters Act*, but with responsibility given to the territory. The other listed acts follow guidance from the UFA and are now able to be implemented at a territorial level. The *Lands Act* gives rights to any unclaimed Yukon land to be tendered by the territory, rather than the national government.

In the same year of devolution, Kluane First Nation signs their self-government agreement. In 2004, KFN members are invited to sit on the Kluane Park Management Board along with the CAFN. Parks Canada’s *Healing Broken Connections* program begins, inviting KFN and CAFN members back in to the Park and restoring their connection with this land that was originally part of their territory and cut off from them for two generations. The program is
used to make amends, to reunite FN’s peoples of today with long lost trails and hunting camps of their ancestors (Parks Canada, 2010).

This decade also sees a bigger interest in technology and development within the territory. There is an increased use of the Haines Pass for recreation, where normally this area was just used for hunting. This has been attributed to the significant development in snow machine technology and the ability of lighter, faster machines to maneuver deeper, heavier snowfalls. Not only is there a visible increase in snow machining at this time, other activities become more evident in many other back country areas, as people can come in on snow machines and proceed to cross-country ski, etc. The group “Sled Porn” also make their mark in the territory, creating a hype about extreme snowmobiling, and producing videos of enthusiasts jumping peaks and creating tricks in high alpine areas. This hype draws more people to extreme sport enthusiasm taking place in very ecologically sensitive areas. The loud noises of these powerful engines cause wildlife disturbances for long distances.

Industrial development starts pushing through the North as well. Back in Whitehorse, a new community group “Citizens for Responsible Planning and Development” are in dispute with the Whitehorse City Council about the potential development of a mall and other box stores, including Wal-Mart. In 2001, Wal-Mart is built and “low low” prices finally take hold of Yukon shoppers - threatening the slow demise of independent store viability. The territory is exchanging elements of its unique Northern culture for popular influences from mass-market commercial and entertainment culture. Though this level of development has not hit the outlying communities, it leads to further outmigration and more regular travel to the capital city.

This timeframe also lends itself to the beginning of visible evidence of climate change. In the late 90s, evidence of an increasing spruce beetle infestation lead to devastation to the
usually productive forests of Haines Junction by the early 2000s (Garbutt, Hawkes, & Allen, 2006). (Warming has reduced the level of spruce beetle die off in winters and resulted in higher populations than normal.) In 2004 a Strategic Forest Management Plan was signed by CAFN, YTG, and the Alsek RRC (ARRC, 2004). In 2004-05, CAFN coordinated FireSmart projects for Haines Junction, Canyon, and Champagne residential areas and in 2006, KFN and CAFN worked together to seek proposals for forestry companies to develop spruce beetle lumber.

In 2006, CAFN organized and hosted a climate change workshop in Haines Junction (CAFN & ARRC, 2006). The Town of Haines Junction created an integrated sustainability plan for the municipality in the same year (Village of Haines Junction, 2007). Around this same time, there is evidence of increased glacial activity. In 2009, the Lowell Glacier surges significantly and is expected to soon change watercourses.

In 2008, mineral prices peak and another small gold rush is beginning to emerge as the timeline of this research comes to its end. Up until this time, mining is limited to multiple small-scale operations in the Kluane Ranges and parts of the Ruby Range (Danby et al, 2003: 196). But today, large international exploration companies have moved in to this region, are hiring many locals and outside workers and are flying them to the tops of mountain ranges all along the region and beyond, to stake claims that have been well beyond the measures of any activity seen during the Gold Rush. While short-term economic benefits are accepted by the communities from the heavy investments in exploration, many wonder what the long-term effect of these stakes could mean for the future of this region. By 2015, much of this activity is gone.

Over this 50-year period, Yukon shed its often parochial “isolated territory” perspective and created an internationally confident and savvy political and administrative culture, emerging
as a significant player in northern international engagement. A new Yukon has emerged in the past quarter-century, one that demonstrates greater commitment to the land, its people, and their future (Coates and Morrison, 2005: 316).

4.3.6 Summary of Trends and Factors of Change

Leading up to the years of interest of this systems study (pre-1960), the system is highly problematic and completely misaligned from any relative environmental goals. Its political and socio-economic landscape is not one that functioned to provide a basis for ecological citizenship and is built upon a foundation for the complete opposite: colonial exploitation of the land, disregard for its people, and the attempted overthrow of a culture that does care about the land. However, there are still many positive influences embedded in the territory.

Primarily, the people here still live in a wilderness-based area. They are seeing wildlife and having daily interactions with a wild landscape. Although it is difficult in this region to hunt due to the large tract of land set aside for the Game Sanctuary, hunting for land meat is still a way of life for many. Berry picking and other foraging methods have also remained common practice. People are still heating with wood and often carrying water, as indoor plumbing is still rare in the communities. While all structures around them are setting up for a modern future, people in general are still very connected to the landscape and are surviving and recreating on and within it in many forms.

In the following years, many events and processes take place that slowly work to change that relationship – both positively and negatively. A historical examination of impactful events and processes, as explored through interviews and recounted in this section, point to several trends about factors that have affected change:
1. **Ecological events** – naturally occurring events or processes, or those with significant effects on natural elements.

2. **Technological changes** – predominantly refers to transportation and communications developments.


4. **YT autonomy politics** – political events and processes regarding Yukon independence.

5. **Environmental legislation changes** – significant changes to national and/or territorial environmentally-related legislation.

6. **Land-use/resource controversies** – environmentally-related events that have spurred ongoing public debate and attained significant media coverage.

7. **FN voice, involvement, autonomy** – events or process that recognize First Nations peoples’ rights, enhance their ability to be involved and heard, or support the development of their self-governing abilities.

8. **Co-management processes and NGOs** – environmentally-related boards and NGOs.

9. **Industry changes** – events that have contributed to change in industry practices of the region.

10. **Demographics** – signals of changing demographics in GKR.

11. **KNP&R relations** – events that affect the relationship between KNPR and the local population.

12. **Politics surrounding land-based activities (i.e. trapping)** – events/press that affect opinions and alter lifestyles.

When all impactful events and processes are plotted within categories that reflect these “factors of change”, a story of transformation starts to emerge.

The 1960s was a time for establishing autonomy and a voice for FNs and Yukoners alike – in different realms of course. This is the beginning of the territory establishing its own regulations and political regimes, and the beginning of a 20-year process that ultimately allows FNs the ability to do the same. The 1970s started shifting the territory into a more modern way of being with the introduction of many new technological developments, both in communications and transportation, and a broadened demographic due to the introduction of the National Park. The decade that followed basically hosted a transition to a more modern way of
life (faster paced, more mobile, and more individual and territorial connections to outside) and the beginning of heavier building development, with no new striking events occurring outside of the trapping politics taking place worldwide.

The late 80s into the mid-90s saw many new institutional shifts: the territory had just begun legislating for environmental regulation outside of the Water Board, environmental NGOs were becoming more active, and co-management boards, heightened public participation, and more decision-making authority were given to the communities and local people. FNs also signed the UFA, and by the mid-90s, the first self-government agreements are being signed as

![Figure 4-4. This chart summarizes a timeline of all substantial events and processes as highlighted by interviewees and described above. “Factors of change” indicate groupings of similar types of events and processes. Events are indicated by a dot and processes are indicated by a line. The dashed line indicates a trend that is interpreted here as an informal process.]
well. By the early 2000s we start to see further technological advancements in off-road transportation and the negative landscape effects that has caused, unraveling a series of other ecological events happening right around the same time. In 2003, the territory received devolution and over the ensuing decade has continued to work and implement plans for a more autonomous territory. This has included the rollout of numerous co-management boards and environmental governance regimes that have evolved as a result of land claims.

Other critical factors for transformation reveal themselves over time and cannot be pinned to certain events or processes: changes in cultural values and identities, changes in societal norms and pressures, and changes in the availability of information.

4.4 An Overview of the System Today: Elements and Interactions

While the cultural and biophysical elements of this system have always been rich and plentiful, this timeline sees the onset of a complex array of economic and institutional elements as well. Today’s Yukon holds four active levels of government and numerous co-management boards and oversight bodies with shifting levels of decision-making power. Appendix F describes the roles of the Federal, Territorial, First Nation and Municipal governments; the agreements, associations, and environmentally-related boards that have been developed as a result of Land Claims; and key environmentally-related industry associations and advocacy groups.

Table 2 (below), provides a summary of all elements of the GKR system that are relevant to fostering ecological citizenship. Each of the elements described earlier or in Appendix F are listed here within four categories: biophysical, cultural, economic, and institutional.
### Table 2: Elements of the Greater Kluane Regional System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biophysical</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within the System: Regional Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Species:</strong></td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Energy/Fuel demand</td>
<td>CAFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fish</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Upgrades to Alaska Highway</td>
<td>KFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Small game</td>
<td>Food/Recreation:</td>
<td>Mining industry</td>
<td>WRFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wolf</td>
<td>- Hunting</td>
<td>Tourism industry</td>
<td>Village of HJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bears</td>
<td>- Fishing</td>
<td>Forestry industry</td>
<td>KNPR Mgmt Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bison</td>
<td>- Gardening</td>
<td>Service industry</td>
<td>Dan Keyi RRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moose</td>
<td>- Foraging</td>
<td>Guiding industry</td>
<td>Alsek RRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dahl sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td>KNPR jobs</td>
<td>Temporary Co-Mgmt Boards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Productivity:</td>
<td>Entertainment/Recreation:</td>
<td>Industrial waste</td>
<td>Ruby Range Sheep Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- composition</td>
<td>- Snowmobiles &amp; ATVs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- diversity</td>
<td>- Low impact outdoor rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- abundance</td>
<td>- Photography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystems</td>
<td>- TV, computer, video games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Change:</td>
<td>- Drugs &amp; alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spruce Beetle</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flooding</td>
<td>Housing/Heating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carbon emissions</td>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Surging glaciers</td>
<td>- Household Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human access to back country</td>
<td>Perceptions, attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healing Circles &amp; Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Within the Wider System: Territorial Scale** | | | |
| Communication | Regulations and promotion of economies | CYFN | Devolution (DTA) Land Claims YESSA |
| Perceptions, attitudes and values | YOA | YTC | Wildlife Act |
| | YCM | YLG | Environment Act |
| | TIA/WTAY/YFNTA | YFWMB | Environment Reg’ns YESSA/Reg’ns |
| | | Water Board | Yukon Lands Act |
| | | Surface Rights Board | Waters Act /Reg’ns |
Within the Environment and Wider Environment: National and Global Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospheric and climatic structures and processes: - climate change</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Gem &amp; mineral prices</th>
<th>Environment Yukon EMR Yukon Energy YCS CPAWS Raven Recycling</th>
<th>Park &amp; Lands Certainty Act Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Perceptions, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Fuel prices Technology/Marketing of Tech products Travel</td>
<td>GC INAC/AANAC DFO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These elements have been diagrammed in Figure 4-5 (below), illustrating the interrelationships among them. Plotting these elements in a richly detailed way to determine if and how they relate to one another provides a broad outline of the dynamics of the system. From this influence diagram, we can start to see that there is not only great diversity and complexity to this system, but also clear drivers and vulnerabilities. The pink circle identifies government agencies that directly impact environmental activity. The orange circle represents the various co-management processes. Yellow describes prevalent human activities with a land-based component. The green circle represents species of flora and fauna that interact most with humans. Blue represents industry and the purple represents other environmental institutions and agencies. Elements outside of the circles are processes operating outside of the regional/territorial scale.
Figure 4-5: Interrelationships among Elements in the Greater Kluane Region System
4.5 Chapter Summary

The Greater Kluane Region is a complex and heavily institutionalized social-ecological system. This study primarily observes the social system, and the cultural, economic, and institutional elements within it. It considers these in relation to the biophysical system and its species, ecosystems, ecological changes, and productivity. The system is regional in scale and is composed of 5 identifiable sub-systems: Kluane National Park and Reserve, Village of Haines Junction, CAFN territory, KFN territory, and WRFN territory/Beaver Creek. For most of its history, its native people lived semi-nomadic land-based and subsistence lifestyles. These lives and lifestyles were drastically interrupted by contact with European immigrants, who travelled to this new world in waves, and for various reasons. Through contact with fur traders, missionaries, and then migrants of the Gold Rush, the Kluane Region was forever changed. A complex history of colonialization and institutionalization of the territory follows from the Gold Rush-era into World War II, and from 1960 onward, the territory rapidly evolves to represent a modern institutionalized state. This thesis explores those years, the evolution of formal and informal structures, and their implication for local citizens’ relationships to land and nature.

Regardless of the many changes that take shape over these years, the abundant natural features and large intact landscapes of the region offer citizens the ability to remain engaged in deeply land-based lives and livelihoods, presenting a rich landscape by which to study ecological citizenship.
Chapter 5: Exploring Ecological Citizenship in GKR

The primary purpose of this chapter is to summarize and reflect upon opinions shared in interviews. It begins by reviewing interpretations of a definition of ecological citizenship and the characteristics and actions that embody a good ecological citizen. It reviews the perceived trends in these actions and behaviours and reflects on the contradictions of modern ecological citizenship. It synthesizes key themes coming out of these discussions and then reflects upon interviewees’ opinions about utilizing institutions to shape ecological citizenship.

With the idea that “citizens” should be at the center of “citizenship”, I thought it would be worthwhile to explore ideas about this concept from a group of citizens themselves. I interviewed thirty-nine people either from the Kluane Region or that work for environmental institutions important to the region and/or who have ties to the community in some form. Basic descriptors of each of these thirty-nine interviewees can be found in the table in Appendix B. The people of this region have multiple ties to the land and a strong awareness of these connections. I was not aware of how strong these ties could be until the interview process commenced.

I asked a series of questions within three categories: (1) about human relationships with land and nature and how they’ve changed over time; (2) about the term ecological citizenship and how it is embodied; (3) and the role of formal institutions in shaping ecological citizenship.

The first group of questions were intended to be easy to answer and to allow people to open up about topics they were familiar with. They provided a diverse range of answers that enabled my understanding of key points in history that altered people’s relationships with their natural environment. They helped to guide the development of Chapter 4.
The second group of questions were significantly different. Interviewees were asked to reflect on the term “ecological citizenship” and try to define it. They were asked to describe the actions and behaviours of “good” ecological citizens, and then describe good ecological citizens that they see in their communities. These questions all required considerable thought from interviewees, and most took the time to think these ideas through and answer thoroughly. I encouraged them to think in terms of their own personal definitions of EC as we pursued the rest of the questions. The more they used the term, the more comfortable they became with their understanding of it. This group of questions is reflected upon in 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

The third and final group of questions were related to institutions and processes and their impacts on EC. They touched on very similar topics that had been discussed in the original set of questions but were framed with a new lens. The earlier discussion seemed useful in assisting the latter. An overview of these opinions are shared here in section 5.4 and expanded upon in chapters six and seven.

5.1 Descriptions and Insights

This section describes themes from 3 questions asked of interviewees: (1) What is ecological citizenship? (2) How would you describe a good ecological citizen? What characteristics might they possess and what actions might they take? (3) You needn’t name them, but are there people you know in Kluane that come to mind as good ecological citizens? What characteristics of them or actions have they taken that make you think this? Emerging themes were developed from responses and are summarized below. They are organized by popularity of response, dictated by the number of people that referred to each theme in comparison to the number of total interviews.
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5.1.1 What is Ecological Citizenship?

When asking interviewees to define the term, the results were remarkable. Only one had claimed to have heard it before. The cross-section of interviewees held diverse backgrounds and schools of thought. Yet collectively, all respondents referred to the same list of topics. Nine themes presented themselves throughout these interviews (listed in order of popularity):

1. Responsible use; living within limits; impacts (62%)
2. Relationship with the land; interconnectivity between humans and nature (51%)
3. Consciousness or being “aware” (30%)
4. Respect (24%)
5. Stewardship; caretaker; preservation (24%)
6. Rights and responsibilities (19%)
7. Participation; action; advocacy (19%)
8. Sense of place; identity; belonging (16%)
9. Environmental ethic or reference to values (14%)

It must be noted that these categories might have taken on different weights had the participants studied the term further and/or had more time to determine their thoughts on the subject. From my personal point of view, it was valuable to introduce this term to fresh ears, as I believe there is more value in an instinctual first response than in partially thought-out possibly regurgitated answers built from small to moderate amounts of information and/or based on someone else’s thoughts.

*Responsible use, living within limits, awareness of, and limiting impacts.* This category includes all references to “responsible use” of resources (natural or otherwise). This includes the aim to produce as little waste as possible and the intention of making choices according to needs.

---

3This is the percentage of respondents that referred to each term. These percentages are based from a denominator of 37, as two of my interviewees were quite elderly, had completed little to no academic schooling, and preferred engaging only in contributions to my historical analysis rather than speaking about more academic terms or their interpretation of them. Appendix E shows the raw data that helped to determine these numbers.
over wants. It also includes references to awareness of one’s ecological footprint or levels of consumption.

**Relationship with the land and interconnectivity between humans and nature.** This category is about the acknowledgement of the fact that humans are interconnected with not only one another, but every other species in our natural world. It encompasses references to ‘Gaia’ (Lovelock, 1979): that we are one with the Earth and all that encompasses it, and we need each element of our natural system in order to survive. It is about taking into consideration other species and ecosystems when making decisions, acknowledging the value of services offered by these ecosystems, and the value of biodiversity in general. These responses appeared on multiple scales: most acknowledged this category in a broader sense, referring to the importance of respecting the dynamics between humans and nature as a whole; others referred specifically to their personal relationship with the land and the tangible, reciprocal benefits of keeping it healthy.

**Consciousness or being aware.** This category describes any reference to consciousness or awareness on a number of levels: from the sense of being “awake” and “aware” in a psychological consciousness way, experiencing heightened sensations and emotional attachment to the land, to simply being careful/mindful in one’s surroundings and acquiring enough information to act appropriately in different settings. For example, as brought up in interviews, journeys into the high alpine should be limited to winter access only, due to sensitivities of lichen and other flora that grow there and its tendency to host more sensitive birthing grounds in spring and summer.
**Respect.** While many respondents actually used the word “respect”, others described very similar concepts, usually referring to being considerate or acting with integrity and care. They often referred to having care and compassion for other members of the community, a respect for animals and landscape, and for the Great Mother in general. This category is complex and difficult to label outright, because it is inherent in all other categories as well – perhaps even so inherent that many wouldn’t think to explicitly mention it. One respondent even went so far as to say that I could consider substituting “ecological citizenship” for “respect” because that’s what it was all about (Interviewee #39, interview, Dec. 17, 2010). An interesting point to note is that whenever “respect” was mentioned or referred to, 95% of the time the same respondents also referenced ideas of “responsible use” as well.

**Stewardship, caretaker, preservation.** This category is in reference to those who explicitly said the words “stewardship” or “taking care” of the environment from a caregiver perspective. (For those that only mentioned “taking care” that their human activities didn’t affect the natural balance of things, or to the extent of just “picking up after yourself”, this was labeled under the “responsible use/impacts” category.) While this is a more prominent theme in the environmentalism of urban and developed-spaces (including agricultural areas), it is not unusual that it would present itself further down the list here. In a wilderness community, the natural elements have a much stronger presence and tend to visibly dictate the flow of human activities, rather than the other way around. From the size of large game that inhabit the area, to the St. Elias mountain range towering overhead, there are constant reminders of the power and
significance of the elements here – in which case, it may be more natural that someone here think of themselves as “living with the land”, than being a “steward” of it.

*Rights and responsibilities.* While many other themes share a “responsibility” component, this category was only counted when there was a definitive reference to “rights” as well. Interestingly, whenever “rights” were mentioned, interviewees were compelled to mention “responsibilities”; whereas when they spoke of “responsibilities”, respondents did not always refer to rights. This is worth noting in favour of this form of citizenship. Liberal political theorists often treat rights as the focal point to most state citizenship literature which, arguably, is not always positive for society as responsibilities are what determine our virtue as citizens.

Specifically, interviewees referred to “rights” as our entitlements to clean water, fresh air, intact landscapes, abundant wildlife populations, etc. The responsibilities component is often seen as its counterpoint: being mindful of current and future populations and living in a way that does not harm the state of the environment and the level of ecological services that it offers. This discussion of rights and responsibilities implied having a stake in something and also showed implications for connectedness and interdependency.

*Participation, action, advocacy.* “Participation” in reference to ecological citizenship is much broader than civic participation. For the ecological citizen, participation could be picking up garbage, spending time in nature or with animals, perhaps hunting. Every human action explicitly connected to the environment could be considered “participation” from this point of view. In terms of the interviews, references to this category were mostly about more specific action and advocacy from an explicitly political point of view: being involved in decision-
making processes about environmental resources and speaking out on behalf of the environment. Some also referenced taking actions to mitigate negative effects on the environment and general leadership in the community in terms of maintaining ecological processes.

**Sense of place, identity, belonging to.** This category was acknowledged when either of these three terms were specifically mentioned. While it does have a strong link to “interconnectivity” (listed second), this area refers to something more personal. These respondents mentioned a deep connection to place as home or in relation to their identity.

**Environmental ethics or values.** While only 14% explicitly used the terms “values” or “ethics”, a strong environmental ethos is implicit in almost all definitions given in one form or another. Again, as for many of these categories, it is difficult to define where one starts and the next begins.

5.1.2 Embodiment: How Would You Describe a Good Ecological Citizen?

After giving their personal definition of the term, interviewees were asked about how they would describe a good ecological citizen: what characteristics might they possess and what actions would they take? Many of the topics brought to light were actionable versions of their descriptions of the term (as above). Because people often think more in terms of “doing” than describing, more details presented themselves when thoughts were framed in terms of practice.

While similar to the earlier sub-section, new themes have also presented themselves here:

1. Be responsible, limit impact, conserve, lower carbon footprint (59%)
2. Ethical thinking, consciousness, awareness, being knowledgeable (54%)
3. Be respectful, care, be considerate (30%)
4. Acknowledge interdependency, ecological services (30%)
5. Engage in community, public participation, protect and speak out (27%)
6. Teaching, spreading knowledge (19%)
7. Ethical consumption (16%)
8. Reduce, Reuse & Recycle (11%)
9. Spend time on the Land (8%)
10. “Live sustainably”, live off land (8%)
11. Maintain biodiversity/restoration (5%)
12. Reciprocity (3%)

**Be responsible; limit one’s impact; conserve; lower your carbon footprint.** This is the actionable form of the same “responsible use” category that also topped the last list.

**Ethical thinking; consciousness; awareness; being knowledgeable.** While we see reference to these topics in the general definition, when considered in actionable terms, the popularity of this theme raised considerably (54% vs. 30%).

**Be respectful; care; be considerate.** Not surprisingly, these traits were brought up in almost equal numbers in both the description section and the characteristics section. EC cannot exist without environmental respect and acknowledgment at its forefront, and to adhere to this level of respect, one must act respectfully.

**Acknowledge interdependency and ecological services.** The popularity of this characteristic dropped significantly from conceptual definitions to actionable embodiment: from 51% to 30%. I believe this is important to recognize. Being aware of our interdependency is certainly something to acknowledge, respect, and discuss, but it is more difficult to see evidence of this in day-to-day actions and behaviours. Acknowledging interdependency can be thought of very similarly to themes of membership or “status” in national citizenship literature; it is an elemental
theme of being a citizen, but it is difficult to consider how this identity affects daily behaviours. Due to this, it is more complex to consider how to foster acknowledgment. It may be possible through means of education but will be difficult to measure.

**Engaged in community, public participation, protect and speak out.** In terms of action, this topic was also much more popular. The obvious reason for this may be due to the fact that participation is an actionable item. It must be noted, however, that the “direct action” form of public participation is more prominent in the white community. Although this is changing for younger FN generations, it has been embedded in First Nations culture to act more as quiet protectors than loud leaders – though sometimes this role is forced upon them due to extreme circumstances. One must be conscious of the many forms of participation that take place, and support must be provided for all.

**Teaching, spreading knowledge.** This category and the six subsequent ones appear only on the “characteristics and actions” list and are not listed at all with conceptual definitions. It has been noted that while some people may be natural teachers and leaders who will promote their stories and views without assistance, others may need a forum or invitation to speak and teach. Finding appropriate structures to promote sharing of knowledge from all walks of life is something that could be facilitated to encourage better overall ecological citizenship.

**Ethical consumption.** Consumption is another complex subject, whereby fulfilling desires can often be seen to trump reasoning. As marketing efforts become increasingly more effective and commodities become cheaper, a heightened desire for non-necessities is also growing. Because
ethically produced products are the alternative, not the norm, ethical consumption has remained marginal.

**Reduce, Reuse & Recycle.** With the widespread acceptance of recycling, it is now very easy to participate in this shallow green act, and due to heightened access to inexpensive goods, is often more common than reducing and reusing.

**Spend time on the land.** While this theme was referenced relatively little in regard to this question, as the interview evolved and other questions were answered, it came up increasingly more often.

**“Live sustainably”; live off the land.** It was noted numerous times that living off the land is not only unnecessary, but also difficult in today’s society. This may be why this component was considered so minimally in regard to the others – for people were thinking of actionable items that they could adhere to.

**Maintain biodiversity; be involved in activities towards ecological restoration.** These acts could be seen to fit within the “stewardship” category from the previous list, however only 5% of people referred to it here, whereas 24% of people referred to stewardship as an important component of ecological citizenship. I believe this can be attributed to the fact that people recognize “stewardship” as being an important characteristic that is often discussed, however it is often something people talk about more than follow through on.
Reciprocity. Although this was only referenced by one interviewee, it is deserving of further discussion. In the Yukon, reciprocity is culturally important – particularly in terms of food. Historically, to survive well in Yukon conditions, the work of a whole community was required. Sharing is not only a good way to secure the safety of your community but is also ecologically important as it nearly eliminates wasting of resources. Even with greater access to food in the Yukon, meat sharing has remained a large part of the culture here. As Nadasdy notes (2003: 67), historically,

“Kluane people also had a deep interest in their place in the world, in how they related spiritually and socially to the animals on whom they depended for survival. Many of their most precious beliefs dealt with these relationships and how to successfully negotiate them in order to survive and to gain power in the world. Hunting was not merely an important activity to them; it permeated nearly every aspect of their lives. Another important historical aspect of Kluane social relations (as for all northern Athapaskans and hunting peoples in general) was the sharing of meat. Kluane people saw the sharing of meat, like the act of killing animals itself, as an integral part of hunting... sharing functioned as a principle of social organization, embedding people in sets of reciprocal obligations and reinforcing ties with kin.”

In informal conversation outside of interviews, many people alluded to the fact that they were hunters and did partake in reciprocal behaviours of meat sharing. Perhaps when something is so implicitly embedded in one’s culture, the significance of it is not consciously recognized. It may also have received less attention in the interviews because it could be considered a stronger element of social culture and less significant from an environmental lens.

5.1.3 Embodiment of Good Ecological Citizenship in the Yukon

After discussing people’s views about the term, and then the characteristics and actions that described a good ecological citizen, I asked interviewees to think of good ecological citizens in their communities and describe their ecologically virtuous characteristics. Only when interviewees began thinking about these ideas in actual practice did themes begin to coalesce into what I believe to be their most holistic and detailed configuration:
1. Conserve resources, consumption patterns (69%)
2. Spend time on the land, become knowledgeable about local landscape (50%)
3. Respect and protect wildlife and wilderness (42%)
4. Public Participation (31%)
5. Hunt, Harvest & Garden (31%)
6. Live your values, be a leader (27%)
7. Have a sense of home on the land (23%)
8. Pass on knowledge (19%)
9. Pick up after yourself, “leave no trace” (12%)
10. Develop ecologically-positive economic opportunities (4%)

All of the same variables and elements have been repeated, however the way that people spoke about them was more direct. It appeared that they better understood what was meant by the “good ecological citizen” after picturing someone in their community. This breakdown is useful, for the more actionable the item, the easier it is to pinpoint and offer behavior-changing incentives from an external source.

Sadly, many mentioned that there were no true ecological citizens left to describe, but everyone was able to pull traits from one character or another to broaden the discussion. The most prominent thing that I saw come out of these localized discussions was the importance of connection and time on the land. For a wilderness community, I was surprised that this concept was mentioned so little in the earlier part of the interview. I believe this to be a large portion of what was missing from the Ecological Citizenship literature in general and thought this was what contributions from a more remote community could offer. However, it could be that this is such an obvious point to the people here that stating this simple fact may have been overlooked.

While “spending time on the land” was an idea discussed by only 8% of interviewees when thinking of EC in an abstract fashion, in practice on the ground, it arises in three of the ten

---

4 Due to this repetition, I have not included a new description for these categories.
categories listed above: “spend time on the land and become knowledgeable about the local landscape”; “hunt, harvest & garden”; and “have a sense of home on the land”.

While applying these concepts from a grounded perspective brought more concrete and tangible answers, it also tended to steer people away from conceptual ideas altogether, particularly by eliminating direct references to consciousness and/or interdependency. At the same time, practices and actions were described more meaningfully, and shallower acts, such as recycling, were rarely mentioned at all. Though the conceptual piece is a very important one, this final list may provide the most benefit for this discussion, as it presents practical and tangible elements that can be addressed in this region.

5.2 Trends

To get an idea of how the embodiment of ecological citizenship in the region may have changed over time, I asked about which actions and behaviours of the good ecological citizen had increased in the region, decreased, or both increased and decreased at the same time. Descriptions of these themes are accompanied with reasoning for them, because in this instance, I also asked interviewees if they were aware of why these behaviours had changed. In conjunction with information taken from interviews, this section also draws on observational knowledge gained from time spent in these places, and also reflects lightly on lessons from the literature.

5.2.1 Increasing Positive Action and Behaviour

Of the thirty-nine respondents, seven believed that acts of good ecological citizenship had only decreased and therefore they did not give any response to what factors have seemed to
increase. Three participants said that over that time period, they thought things had stayed relatively the same, mentioning that Yukoners do live and continue to live close to the nature. Two of these three mentioned that there was a noticeable increase in public participation, but also said that they weren’t really sure if this says something about more positive values or just more opportunities to participate. The other one mentioned that people were getting smarter, referring to them as being more aware of larger processes. (Although this does not necessarily mean that their behaviour was any better.)

The other 29 respondents’ responses varied:

1. Heightened awareness/consciousness (69%)
2. Increased participation (41%)
3. Positive political and industrial changes (38%)
4. Changes in views and values (21%)
5. Increased promotion of FN culture (14%)
6. More reduce, reuse, and recycle (10%)
7. Increased co-operation (10%)
8. Evidence of no trace camping/less litter (7%)
9. More responsible hunting practices (7%)
10. Better consumption practices/home development techniques (7%)

**Heightened awareness, consciousness.** Due to living in a northern, wilderness-based community, the results of climate change are readily visible and close-to-home: surging of the Lowell Glacier; new discoveries in archaeology due to permafrost melting and access to deeper soil horizons; and a decline in the culturally significant Dall sheep populations (originally thought to be from over-hunting and progressively understood as resulting from climatic changes to their sensitive alpine habitat (Nadasdy, 2003). Though Yukoners have historically been very connected to the landscape for cultural and economic reasons, heightened awareness of global impacts and issues can most likely be attributed to increased attention toward environmental issues in the media and increased access to information via the internet.
**Increased participation.** There is growing evidence that shows public participation in environmentally-related processes are increasing in the Yukon. However, reasons for this are unclear. It may be that environmental concern is becoming more prominent in day-to-day lives, or people may find it more important to speak out than in the past. There may be more controversies and negative reasons to bring (or force) people’s voices to the table, or there simply just may be more opportunities to participate. Interviewees have alluded that there may be some truth to all of these explanations.

**Political and industrial changes.** Although I was asking about citizen-oriented acts, with almost two-fifths of interviewees pointing to political and industrial changes as a key component, it was worth mentioning. The signing of the Umbrella Final Agreement has been a pinnacle for localizing autonomy and restructuring the governance of natural resources (in some cases, representing the first attempt at oversight of resources at all). This has induced more individual care to be taken as more people see themselves as having a direct stake in the land. Following this, the introduction of environmentally-related policies and regulations from the territorial government was an important signifier of a transition time: away from a free-wheeling frontier and toward something more visionary, structured, and strategic. The introduction of stronger industrial standards for placer mining and forestry in particular can also be seen to translate into more respect and care on behalf of individual citizens as they become less and less helpless to prevent the demise of the land around them.
**Positive change in views and values.** Over the time span that is being reviewed here – the 1960s to today – views and values have changed significantly. At the beginning of this timeline, there was next to no environmental legislation. There were no limits for forestry and mining, and mass destruction and degradation were common. The only saving grace for Yukon is that its populations have been too small to have many long-lasting effects. The founding of the Yukon Native Brotherhood in the late 1960s gave power and voice to Yukon indigenous people, who sought to address environmental values and protection of the territory. The establishment of Kluane National Park in the early 1970s brought an influx of environmentally-minded individuals who began altering the demographic from one of largely resource-use-oriented individuals to more soft land users who came specifically out of appreciation for the land. These people often had large government salaries and a significant impact on the economy. Tourism began to take shape in the Yukon in a big way and people began to have more options for earning an income than purely through resource exploitation. Though it is often argued that modernization has brought more greed, selfishness, and a major disconnect from the environment, there is clear evidence that practices today are much less destructive than in the 1950s and 1960s that there is a growing sentiment for environmental care in the Yukon.

**Increased promotion of FN culture.** While only 14% of interviewees referenced this theme here, there is considerable evidence that points to the fact that increased promotion and respect for First Nations’ culture has had a very profound effect on the rest of the population. Aside from the significant changes to lands management and citizen-level involvement due to the signing of the UFA, the discourse that has accompanied territorial lands settlement and FN rights in general has made a significant impact on changing values and virtues of Yukoners and
reframing ways of thinking about land and nature. In fact, the Kluane National Park and Reserve Visitor Centre is located in the new Da Ku Cultural Centre in Haines Junction. A perfect example of the fusing of First Nation culture into all of Yukon history and attractions.

**Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle.** Like participation, this is difficult to engage in without an institutional arrangement to support it. Recycling is near impossible without the proper facilities. As institutions were put in place to allow the collection and shipping of recyclables, it became a much more popular act – as was the case everywhere across the rest of the country.

**Increased Cooperation.** The inclusion of this topic as important to environmental matters demonstrates the depth of insight that people here have undertaken on the subject. While it was not something that came up in any of the earlier answers, increased co-operation has been said to be extremely important in moving forward with environmental programs and policies in the Yukon. Yukoners tend to be very strong-willed, opinionated people, and are often unique in many ways. Not surprisingly, their standpoints on resource use and how to appropriately interact with the natural environment are also mostly well-defined – sometimes leading to conflict. Before recent times, there was not very much intermingling among viewpoints, but over time, broad issues brought some of these groups together from time to time, to stand up against certain issues where they did find a common ground. Although there are still many points of view, acceptance of others’ views and opinions has certainly increased over time. As more events and processes have come into place that ask for public input, people have learned how to communicate more openly and effectively.
This discussion showed the importance of engaging in dialogue from multiple angles. While 10% of interviewees referenced this theme in the context of time, it was not discussed at all when thinking about ecological citizenship on its own.

**Evidence of no trace camping, less visible litter.** This could be attributed to many things. Some made the point that most litter comes from tourists with less respect for the land, and therefore a decrease in Highway tourists passing through the area could be seen as the reason for decreased litter. In general, however, it may be attributed to changing values and increased knowledge and consciousness, as discussed previously.

**More responsible hunting practices.** This topic is complex and difficult to explain. With a decreased abundance of large game, it seems that people are coming to value the resources more than they had in the past. Big game tags are increasingly limited (especially in the Kluane area) and Yukoners are often being sent to other regions they are unfamiliar with, in many cases, unable to hunt the lands nearest them. Hunting courses are now a requirement and becoming more intensive each year; as regulations are becoming stricter. During my first Yukon visit in the summer of 2010, there was a trial taking place for a Dawson City man who had shot a female moose out of season and who had exceeded his bag limit just the week prior. The man faced forty-five days in jail, and this became the first time in recent memory that anyone in the area had been jailed for a wildlife offence. Since that time, similar cases have arisen. Culturally, there is no longer any excuse, nor any tolerance, for poor hunting practices.
**Better consumption practices and home building techniques.** This is another difficult trend to assess because although there are many with better consumption habits and more sustainable building techniques, there are also a noticeable number of people who are buying more and building larger/more inefficiently than necessary.

5.2.2 Decreasing Positive or New Negative Actions and Behaviours

In contrast to the last, this section describes the EC-characterized actions and behaviours that have been seen to decrease in the region:

1. Government is falling behind (25%)
2. People are less connected to natural world (21%)
3. Environment competing with the modern world (21%)
4. More mechanized access/more driving (21%)
5. Not being good stewards (18%)
6. Environment is lesser part of lifestyle, no longer dependent on it (18%)
7. People are more individualistic/selfish and more consumptive (14%)
8. Heavier resource use by individuals (11%)
9. More and larger housing and development (11%)
10. More people are disobeying environmental regulations (7%)
11. Personal politics stand in the way (4%)

**Government falling behind.** Although this is not citizen-specific behaviour, it is a very large concern for citizens of the territory. A quarter of the people in the Yukon work for a government agency in some form or another, but many do not understand, nor agree, with how it operates – especially when under the Yukon Party. Industry still rules in the Yukon and is the primary concern of the long-standing Conservative government that was in power during this research. This was obvious for many reasons, but especially evident in the ongoing debates over land use planning in the Peel Watershed, as illustrated in a CBC news article (Nersyoo, CBC, December 1, 2014):
In 2011, the Peel Watershed Planning Commission released its final land use plan for the 67,000 square kilometres of wilderness in northern Yukon. The plan, created over five years at a cost of $1.6 million, called for up to 80 per cent of the watershed to be withdrawn from any industrial development, including mineral staking.

Following the 2011 territorial election, the Yukon Party government rejected the commission’s land use plan and developed its own plan, which it released in 2012 and approved in January 2014. It provides protection from development of less than 30 per cent of the land.

A vast majority of Yukoners recognize the need to protect Yukon land and find other uses for it than resource exploitation (Yukon Territory, 1998), however for a large territory still requiring growth and development, resource development is a lucrative business that is appealing for large, short-term economic gains. Yukoners tend to vote in majority Conservative governments when the economy is not very stable, but baulk at their responses when they start taking action.

Although progress has been made in terms of environmental legislation, co-management boards and general processes, there are still many gaps and abilities to devise loopholes. One example in particular was given about recent placer mining restrictions in fish-bearing streams:

"With some of the mining policies, it’s not that they’ve been hindering or whatever, there’s just big gaps… they are incomplete you might say. For example, if I want to start a placer claim on the Alsek, I’m going to have to go through all of the regulatory regime. I’m going to have to go through an environmental assessment and all that kind of stuff, but the Alsek River hasn’t been classified as far as… in the Yukon for example, there are levels one to five for fish bearing importance. And the Alsek hasn’t been classified, so it doesn’t actually stop mining. So you still go through the environmental assessments and all of that stuff, but there’s still no classifications in place to compare it to… I mean, resource use hasn’t stopped because there’s no policy in place to address it." (Interviewee #3, interview, Nov. 16, 2010)

**People are less connected to the natural world.** This stems from themes discussed in the previous two topics. References were made to the loss of our direct reliance on nature as the luxuries of modern life create infrastructural boundaries between humans and nature.

Technology has brought us an easier and often more socially connected life, but has also severed ties to a more natural, and quieter time. Due to the conveniences and distractions of modern life, it is easy to be disconnected from the natural world, and therefore we often are.
Environment competing with the modern world. The “modern world” is a broad term that has seen many definitions and interpretations from early industrialization to today. Conventionally in the social sciences, modernity is referred to through a series of more pointed terms: democracy, technology, the nation-state, citizenship, industrialization, urbanization, epistemological superiority of science, the autonomy of reason and the law, the existence of a public sphere, individual ownership of property and individualism (Venn and Featherstone, 2006). In almost all senses of the term however, modernity describes acts and processes that are averse to an environmentally-connected lifestyle. Technology is able to replace tasks that are generally grounding for humans - particularly in farming and gardening practices where many are no longer connecting with soil or plants at a direct level. Industrialization leads to cheaper products, making it less economic to personally make our own clothes, food, and other essential products. The relatively new concept of property ownership is another component classed under “modernity” here. Implications of this change are evident all over the Yukon. One interviewee speaking of FN people’s view of land ownership:

“Weell here’s a people, who lived on the land, and they had a sense of ownership, they had a sense that … well that’s the irony of it all, because you see, FN people actually detest ownership. And the reason they detest it is because they never needed it. European people, want to own everything. We want to buy up land. There are people all over the Yukon that just hate that there are people that have this beautiful lot, with horses and a fence and everything else, and they’re stuck on this tiny little lot downtown. And they think, now if I try to buy one of those things it’s a half a million dollars, and they got it as an agricultural lease... And there’s lots of people that hate that stuff, they get really angry. Most of them detest it because they don’t have it, and a lot of them detest it, because they think a lot of people shouldn’t have it. Art Johns, a FN Tagish guy, one of my good friends, 79 years old. When he was a kid, him and his dad put his horses in a pasture near Tagish, and people said to them, “why don’t you buy that land?” And he would look at them with complete disdain: “why would we buy this land? Why would we need to purchase it? This is here for everybody to put their horses.” But they were the only ones that used it. And then one year they brought their horses back there, and there was a fence around it.” (Interviewee #17, interview, Nov. 26, 2010).
More mechanized access/more driving. To the same extent, our fast-paced society and desire to “do more and see more” has brought an increased need for mechanized access and getting around quickly and efficiently. Unless in a major urban centre, public transit is rarely sufficient to meet most people’s needs. This is especially true in the Yukon, where communities are separated by very large distances, with few (if any) public transport options. Many natural attractions and activities that people here engage with take place in fairly remote areas. Driving becomes a necessary evil when the time advantages it provides are enormous in day-to-day life.

Not being good stewards. It was noted that due to this disconnection and independence from the natural world, it is no longer a priority to be good stewards to the land. When actions are taken based on morals, guilt, or forced responsibility only, they are either rarely taken or corners are cut. Taking action based on “intrinsic value” has been noted as often too abstract to comprehend or consider.

Environment is a lesser part of lifestyle; people are no longer dependent on it for survival. With the ability to buy groceries and clothing at a cheap price, get around quickly by motorized vehicle rather than foot, horse, or dog sled, obtain water by turning on the tap rather than scooping or pumping from a local source, people are no longer dependent on the natural environment for their survival - or at least for the direct goods that we associate with our survival and wellbeing. For those in the communities, running water and electricity is a reality; however, many still remember a time when they carried water and lived without electricity, and many still heat with wood. During the time that this research was completed, the town of Beaver Creek was still running off a diesel generator. People must still be conservative in these remote
communities, but as infrastructure is always improving, the direct need for this is diminishing. Whitehorse is only a few hours’ drive, where most desired goods are available and ready for purchase.

**People are more individualistic/selfish and more consumptive.** In a massive wave of marketing to egos and individualists, there is an incrementally increasing desire for more and better. This is made possible by a combination of unethically produced cheap goods and increased availability of credit. While there is a tendency toward a more simplistic and nature-based lifestyle in Yukon, the territory has not escaped the world of mass marketing and media that encompasses the globe.

**Heavier resource use by individuals.** As with driving more and consuming more in general, we have all become much heavier resource users. Gas and oil aside, the introduction of certain technologies as a central tool in society requires massive amounts of raw minerals and various toxic processes. Products are now designed to have a shorter lifespan to encourage further purchasing and, in most cases, repairing appliances is more expensive than buying new. The entire economic model is designed to encourage abundant consumption rather than resourcefulness. Some have made comments that there should be some onus put on companies by government to take back dead products and dispose of them in an ethical manner.

**More and larger housing and development.** While some people are getting smarter and more efficient in their choice of building products and space allocation, others are moving in the opposite direction: buying larger houses for fewer people and with less sustainable materials.
**People disobeying environmental regulations.** While this may still be a problem, there is obvious evidence to point to the fact that people are certainly obeying more regulations than they were in the past. (Although there were also fewer regulations to obey altogether.) Records show less poaching, less over-fishing, etc. In the “frontier days” there was little education about wildlife conservation and best practices. In more recent years, mass education, enforcement and regulation have become more prominent and people seem to be responding by becoming more aware of the laws and appear to be adhering to them.

I know there was a lot of illegal salmon snagging that went on in the Klukshu River. A lot of the kids would come to school and brag about it, how they would go with their family and snag big king salmon out of the river. It didn’t get wasted though. It would get snagged because they were taking it home and eating it, but it was not a legal method of catching fish. But everybody condoned it at that time, whereas now… well, first of all, there are not as many people living here who are that tuned into taking advantage of resources like that, and if they do, they play pretty close attention to the rules. Especially license people.” (Interviewee #38, interview, Dec. 15, 2010)

**Personal politics stand in the way.** Not unlike many other places, personal politics have often stood in the way of moving decisions forward for better environmental protection. Decision makers have been unable to work together with colleagues based on personal politics and have let these politics stand in the way of the greater good of the issues. In more recent years, however, this has been less of the case. Community members are learning to cooperate and work better together. Regional resource councils are thriving. Conflict specialists and those working directly with locals in environmental decision-making scenarios table have witnessed a drastic increase in cooperation, and less standstill than in the past. It is possible that interviewees commented on the downfall of personal politics as increasing due to the fact that there are more public processes to make these politics visible; many people may not have seen these processes when they were at their worst.
5.2.3 The Contradictions of Modern Environmental Citizens

When talking about the increases, decreases, or general activities that embody ecological citizenship, there were often matters that stood out as inherently contradictory and difficult to classify; e.g. activities that could be classed as positive in many respects, but negative in others, depending on your frame of reference. This sub-section was not in reference to a particular question asked but rather reflects a recurring and emergent theme that deserved further attention.

Modern comforts versus living closer to the land. As already referred to, modern comforts have become a normalcy in today’s society. Reverting to more natural techniques is difficult and leaves people vulnerable to natural conditions that tend to bring up feelings of inadequacy, discomfort, uneasiness, and lack of control. Many believed that people will not choose to discard these previously experienced comforts to live a life on the land, so the only foreseen option is to continue to accept these comforts but look for more “sustainable” ways to pursue them.

Connectedness plus a carbon footprint. While people in the SW Yukon are very active in their natural environment – with skiing, snowmobiling, hiking, canoeing, and hunting as major activities within the culture there – SUVs and larger trucks or vehicles are perceived necessities in order to maintain access to the areas people like to go. They allow people to remain connected to nature, but also require a much larger carbon footprint. This observation is not new. It has been noted how, for example, parents move their families from urban areas to suburban or rural ones in the desire to have a better environment for their children to grow up in, consequently having to commute long distances to workplaces and schools in order to maintain
their ‘nouveau-environmental’ lifestyles. Similarly, awareness of biodiversity may be stimulated by an expensive long-haul flight to an African safari resort or eco-tourism destination in South-East Asia - implying that awareness can also have a price in terms of leaving a larger ecological footprint (Smith & Pangsapa, 2012: 62-63).

“Sustainable Development”. Numerous texts and articles have referred to the inherent contradiction of this term (see for example, Michael Redclift, 2002). Development requires the use of many new resources and destruction of the land and is very difficult to acquire in a sustainable way. Interviewees who used this terminology were often speaking in a positive light, but I thought it important to recognize the many contradictions within these conversations.

“Progress” plus a growing carbon footprint. This idea is similar to both of the previous but differs slightly. As spending more time on the landscape often leads to a larger carbon footprint, making change towards a more positive and conscious world in other realms often requires the same. Spreading ideas to different areas requires speakers flying or driving long distances to speak and work with people in other areas. Regardless of advances in communication technologies, the power of face-to-face interaction will never be replaced. On a more personal level, enrolling children in team building and sporting events requires significant amounts of travel, but parents often see this as important for the development of a better-rounded child and providing more opportunities for their future (Interviewee #27, interview, 6 Dec 2010: And I don't feel guilty about doing it [referring to bringing her son to hockey in Whitehorse four times a week]. It was a choice, a decision that we made - I guess it’s when I stop and think about it a little and that’s why it keeps coming up. It’s like yeah, every time you go, that’s an imprint. But it’s… I don’t normally feel guilty, it isn’t… I wouldn’t do it if we really felt guilty about it all the time, it’s a commitment we’ve made to my kids. They’re playing on a hockey team for the Canada winter games and they have to be in for practice every second day, four days a week. But it was a decision we made because of an outcome we see as keeping them, something in life, of
creating good citizens in the end. And to get there and we've talked about it as how were doing this and we say ok we're doing that and we're flying, they're flying off to tournaments and its… but it's about finding balance. And being a little bit aware of it as well, rather than just doing it without awareness.

What was brought up on numerous occasions is that people increasingly want to do more, see more, and go more places, and there is small chance that this will ever stop or retract. Although behaviour change is the most promising solution, if lifestyles continue to reflect desires for more, technological advancements (in terms of carbon reduction tech) may prove to be the best and only solution. If we can determine a number of systems and devices that are able to move people around without releasing harmful emissions, travel could prove to be much less harmful.

**Awareness of the issues vs. deep comprehension and empathy to take action.** Awareness of environmental issues may be growing due to limelight in the media, etc. But while knowledge is more abundant, it doesn’t necessarily reflect a change in behaviour. Some have suggested that it is difficult to draw the line as to where more information helps or hinders in terms of progress.

**Deep beliefs coupled with negative actions in the present.** Due to the stories that have been passed down within families that have lived on the same land for 10,000+ years, climate change and its potential effects are not new concepts. There is clear evidence of these effects in the history of Alaska and Yukon First Nations, who have witnessed the Little Ice Age and the White River Ash event (McLellan, 1987). First Nations communities have watched as negative societal values and environmental degradation have become widespread as more power was put in the hands of western Europeans. An apocalyptic mentality is common for certain First Nations communities, as they appear to just be waiting, watching, and preparing to return to the old way of being. Although they may not be the experts they were in the past, they still have the skills
and values within their tradition to be able to sustain a hunter-gatherer lifestyle again if it came to that. In the meantime, they are just going to have fun – use all the new toys and technologies that have come about and not worry about it. If it’s all going to erupt anyway, why worry about what effects we are having on this current state? Perhaps, they may argue, speeding up this process is for the better. An interview with someone who had been adopted into a First Nation family describes this mentality:

“When they potlatched me into their family – that was one of the things that [xxx] said to me:
“You know, if it ever goes bad, I meet you in [xxx] Creek – you know that place, eh? Well if it ever goes bad, when it goes bad, that’s where we’re going – that’s where we went when the volcano came, and we survived. And if the next problem comes around, that’s where we’ll go, and we’ll get by.” And I know that place. I’ve been to that place, I know the trail to that place…it’s way the **** up Scotty Creek. It’s a good hard days walk – 12-15 hour walk – and then you’re there and it’s a little oasis – [xxx] Creek River – and quite frankly, we can have cabins built within a week and no one will go hungry and life will sustain. And they have that right here… in the meantime, let’s have Chinese food. And uhh, watch a DVD on a widescreen television set, how cool is that? Pretty cool. But there is this sense of impermanency about that. And this assurance that when it collapses, we are the blessed ones, because we have taken care of our place, and we have loved our place, and it will love us back, as it has generation after generation. So when you ask if there is an increase – no, I think there is a sustenance – I think there is kind of this constancy, it’s not up or down – it is just kind of right there” (Interviewee #20, interview, 29 Nov 2010).

Close to land but taken for granted. People who have lived in wilderness communities their entire lives may take the wilderness at their fingertips for granted. Inherently, these people will be closer to the land; but if they are not conscious of the effect this has had on them, or they have not developed a large level of respect due to it, it is questionable if it makes a difference or not. While this point was raised throughout the interviews, I believe it is different for those who live in tourism-based areas. With outsiders coming and going on a regular basis, Yukoners are constantly being told how beautiful their home is and may therefore appreciate it more. They also tend to travel a lot, whereby “coming home” is always appreciated.
Both sides of the ecological citizenship scale (the good and the bad) are growing. The population is growing - both in the world, and especially in the Yukon. Different people have been drawn to the Yukon at different times – expanding the scale of characteristics and worldviews from all aspects. While one may say that the dominant worldview here is shifting towards a “greener” society, others may say the opposite. It has been raised that, until better conceptions of how to fuse economy and environment in holistic and positive ways become a reality, the people that make up either of these realms will tend to work in opposition to one another.

**Regulation versus self-control.** Due to the the comforts of modernity and globalization, the increase in mechanized tools and technologies, and the general systems that move us through our lives, it is simply easier to make environmentally destructive decisions in today’s modern world. This fact has pointed many toward asking how best we can curb these negative behaviours and replace them with something better. There is a fine line between educating and empowering people to make their own decisions and regulating them with methods of enforcement. Yukoners are a culture of independent people who generally do not like regulation and have a strong history of fighting for their rights. As the population grows, however, and an influx of Europeans and more urban-minded people arrive in the Yukon, citizens are starting to accept the need for regulation to balance the understanding of what is right and wrong for those with little or no land-based experience.

In this respect, it is important to consider what institutions do seem to play a role in fostering ecological citizenship and leverage these to impact future trends and behaviours. These are discussed and analyzed in depth in chapter six.
Discussing trends within their communities has not only provided more context about ecological citizenship in today’s society, but also allowed interviewees to ponder more deeply on the subject, revealing further themes.

5.3 Are Institutions the Way Forward?

In the final section of interviews, respondents were asked if ecological citizenship can and should be fostered through formal institutions: “Should policies, regulations, environmental organizations, or any other means be put into place to encourage people to act as good ecological citizens?” This was followed up with “What should be done, and why?” This sub-section reviews some of the responses that followed from these questions and relies heavily on quotes.

75% of interviewees responded that, “yes”, ecological citizenship should be fostered by institutions. For a territory with many radical opinions and many anti-authoritarian “do-it-yourselfers”, the strength of that response was surprising. But many explained that, without interference, those who will make environmentally respectfully choices will do it regardless; but for those who don’t regularly make sound environmental choice, more information, incentive, and perhaps a bit of regulation could go a long way.

"Most of the time, when you are setting regulations/requirements, there is a reason you are doing it – usually a few are doing it, not that common of a practice, but because a few are doing it, it has a specific impact. So you regulate to that minority whatever you are doing - whether its environmental, angling, or hunting. So, when you get a new regulation out there, for the vast majority, it’s not going to affect them, because they don’t normally do that.” (Interviewee #5, interview, 17 Nov 2010)

However, legislating broadly for ecological citizenship would require much more complex and conceptual foundations than just legislating for particular environmental behaviours, as has been the traditional practice.
“That comes from an interesting idea. I mean, can you legislate good behaviour or good intentions? I have yet to see a really good example where a variety of policies are put into place with sort of an underlying principle, like a governing principle, where the development of certain policies has this in mind. I mean, one could argue that’s trying to do some sort of social engineering exercise; orchestrating a variety of policies that could somehow get people to act well. I think, having said that though, it’s certainly worthwhile to consider and understand a variety of policies that might act as barriers and prevent people from doing or acting in a good way. I think...that kind of a thing ought to be considered in the development of most regulations and such, if not only just from a sense of doing some kind of strategic review of the development of plans, legislation, and regulations that need to consider the implications of instituting or endorsing these things” (Interviewee #22, interview, 30 Nov 2010).

When considering what should be done from the standpoint of formal institutions, the conversations could be grouped into four areas. Primarily, people spoke of education, enforcement, and participation. These three topics have been organized as one as they were often spoken about together and it was claimed that one could not work without the other. The second most important subject area for formal institutions was to create land-based experiences and opportunities (economic and otherwise) that fostered a deep connection. Third, respondents pointed to the importance of infrastructure that allowed people to make positive environmental choices with more ease. Fourth, many discussed the need for both long-term plans and long-term vision. This meant having comprehensive and integrative strategies and plans for the territory, as well as a cultural vision that its citizens could embrace. Many of the themes from these responses are integrated with the conclusions shared in Chapter 7.

Although most agreed that systems should be in place to encourage positive environmental behaviour, it was understood that rules, regulations, and institutional education do not create the good ecological citizen, but they can help to ensure their better behaviours. Ecological citizens are formed by values and worldviews that are instilled by more personal faculties of life (particularly, family, community and cultural values, experience, or informal education). Formal institutions are important, but mostly as a backbone of support.

“It’s something you sort of have to have inculcated and internalized within yourself through upbringing and education, I’m not sure it’s something you can legislate. Legislation usually comes at
the end when the government has no more choice because they’re facing a pretty obvious mess or disaster” (Interviewee #38, interview, 15 Dec 2010).

The 25% of interviewees that thought EC could not be fostered by formal institutions at all also spoke of a strong educational component, however they referred to this through upbringing and informal education, such as time on the land.

“I think most people come to these opinions on their own, I don’t think that’s something that you can legislate” (Interviewee #4, interview, 17 Nov 2010).

“Yeah, that’s the problem, you can’t legislate ethics or values. You either have them, you’re taught them, you’re born with them, they’re passed onto you. You can’t enforce the habit” (Interviewee #35, interview, 8 Dec 2010).

“I think through education, reading, spending time themselves. Having an interest. People who are of normal intelligence, I think, do a certain amount of self examination and self regulation of their own behaviour at regular intervals, and kind of keep testing or assessing how they’re doing in the world and how they live. And some things are self-evident too to the average person. But education is obviously important... I think if you’re born into the wilderness all on your own, and you grew up on it with minimal or no education, you would come to some of these things by your own self education. I don’t know where this “what’s right and what’s wrong” comes to us in lots of different fields” (Interviewee #38, interview, 15 Dec 2010).

“Well, I think the question is exactly the antithesis of what makes a good ecological citizen. More regulations and policies don’t make good ecological citizens. Ecological citizens are people that make decisions on their own; they make decisions on their own momentum... I think that there are regulations and there are policies that have changed. And I think the intent is to try and get people to change the ways that they think. Then... because Yukoners hate regulation, which is the antithesis of that... see that’s the great thing about it, you probably haven’t even picked up on that yet, but Yukoner’s by nature are really great ecological citizens and they just don’t know it. They hate regulation and they don’t know why. I mean, it’s absolutely fascinating... But the way that you can effect legitimate change, is by having individuals change the way individuals do what they do” (Interviewee #17, interview, 26 Nov 2010).

There are many benefits to having this conversation in the Yukon. Due to the people’s embeddedness in a largely intact expanse of natural wilderness, there is a strong ecological component to everyone’s lives there, regardless of the choices that are made in relation to it. The hope of many is that Yukoners can appreciate and maintain the high value of ecological integrity by which they live, before it too closely reflects neighbouring lands to the South.

“the trade-off is that in 500 years, if we can maintain Kluane, or the Yukon, as a place that respects its ecological value, this may be the only place on the planet left in 500 years that isn't criss-crossed with seismic lines, it doesn't have four million people living in it. It’s a northern remote wilderness, we don't have to mimic the South to have success; I think there’s probably other ways of achieving
success and sustainability in the communities. And the more we protect it, the more likely that sustainability can happen. You know, the Europeans love the Yukon. Germans, Swiss, love it here, because it’s nothing like what they have left. The more we protect it, the more it’s going to be like what they don’t have, the valuable, what we have is going to be left. That’s where I think we need to go - the value of this place is not what you can dig out of the ground it’s the fact that there is ground, without a road on it” (Interviewee #14, interview, 25 Nov 2010).

“I think we can, for now, show bad examples that happen in the South. And I’m talking about the US, I’m talking specifically about Alberta, that once was a beautiful province, with the rich population of wolves and grizzly bears and animals, and look what happened, and what it cost. This country has been criss-crossed with linear features. Fragmented habitats. Pretty much all habitat; from grizzlies to ungulates. Is that we want for our children? Do we want the water used for pumping oil? Do we want the energy and natural gas used to produce bitumen in the oil sands? Is it the cost of polluting our water? And farmers not getting enough water. I think that’s a question we need to ask citizens and the children. Yes, I mean, right now, it brings us money and we have a good life, but what life will our children have? And I think that’s the key. What life do we want for our children? What do we have to do to make sure that they still have something to live for and to live in? And I think that’s where the connection should be made in our schools. Education. So people really understand that we’re going through fundamental changes right now. And perhaps in 50 years, we’ll be looking back at what we’re doing to our environment, and we’ll look back at it in the way that we look back at slavery. In the days of the 1850s or before, didn’t we use the same economic arguments to justify slavery? And the difference between slavery and not slavery, are that it’s a value, right? You simply don’t hurt or use other people for your benefits. And I think the same argument can be used here. You don’t hurt other creatures, you don’t hurt indigenous peoples or other people in order to make a quick buck. And I think if we teach those histories and transformatives in today’s world, my hope is that kids will understand it and tell us what the right way is. I think for many of us, it’s too late to turn around. It will still take a few years” (Interviewee #15, interview, 25 Nov 2010).

5.4 Synthesis of Key EC Themes & Reflections

While there have been many broad ideas circulating throughout these discussions, there are certain components that have been more dominant than others. The topics from the lists in sections 5.1 and 5.2 have been compiled and further reduced to their core components. These dominant components have been plotted on the concept map in Figure 5-1, illustrating how each idea connects and intersects. Assessing these connections can help to determine which subject areas are key drivers. While they all relate, some of these concepts intersect every other conversation, while others are just sub-topics of a bigger picture. Drivers play the most important role in the system and leveraging them allows one to have the largest impact. Figure 5-1 shows that many of the themes within EC hinge upon ideas about respect. Other important
components are perceptions of the environment, identity, consciousness/awareness, culture, community, and time on the land.

Reflecting on these discussions, we can see that ecological citizenship is a multi-scaler topic that crosses many bounds. It draws on psychology and sociology and asks philosophical questions within spheres of environment and politics. To question the meaning of good ecological citizenship, refers to questions of ethics and values. While this paper does not intend to critique or point to seminal profiles of a moral good, it does often refer to “virtues” of ecological citizenship. Virtues, in this paper, assume the standard definition of “behaviour showing high moral standards” (Lexico, 2019). They are a universal standard of ethical care and
go beyond cultural values. They are not prescriptive and diminutive but are broad and all-encompassing.

A review and synthesis of sections 5.1 and 5.2 has pointed to 13 virtuous characteristics that describe the good ecological citizen:

- Ecologically conscious and aware
- Acknowledge dependence
- Respectful of environment
- Responsible/conservative with resources
- Practice good waste management
- Practice ethical consumerism
- Practice stewardship/take care
- Feel connected to environment
- Practice participation and leadership
- Practice co-operation
- Encourage diversity/inclusivity
- Teach/promote awareness

These characteristics are acknowledged later in this thesis, as we look to evaluate which institutions foster or diminish good ecological citizenship.

While the topic of “environmental governance” was not a foundation for the development of this thesis, it has become clear throughout the analysis process that it is in fact a very important component. As has been reviewed in the literature, environmental governance has been defined as “the institutions, structures, and processes that determine who makes decisions, how and for whom decisions are made, whether, how and what actions are taken, and by whom and to what effect” (Bennett and Satterfield, 2018: 2). The very question of which institutions, structures, or processes foster or hinder good ecological citizenship, (the leading question of this thesis) is a governance question. The interviews revealed many themes about power dynamics and decision-making processes as key pieces to building good ecological citizens. And while my interview questions asked more about what affects individual citizens, the citizenship processes –
the larger structures/community by which they are all a part of – became an important part of this discussion as well.

5.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter has explored themes from definitions of ecological citizenship (as provided by interviewees) and the characteristics that are considered to embody a good ecological citizen. These themes include ideas about consumption and responsible use, relationships with land, consciousness or being “aware”, stewardship, identity, and respect, among others. After discussing conceptions of ecological citizenship, interviewees were asked about trends of EC that they perceived to be taking place within the region. Most believed that positive behaviours are increasing, but simultaneously, so are negative behaviours as well.

Some positive trends were considered to be a heightened awareness of environmental concepts and issues, increased participation in environmental processes, better regulations against industry, and increased promotion of First Nations culture. Some negative trends are that government is and has been falling behind, people are less connected to the natural world, the environment is competing with the modern world, and motorized use (and therefore carbon emissions) have been consistently on the rise. A key theme within this discussion of trends is that it is difficult to be a good ecological citizen in today’s modern world; hey themes surrounding this point have been expressed in a sub-section devoted to this topic.

Since this thesis is devoted to analyzing the social-ecological system of the Greater Kluane Region and discovering if the structures here (formal and informal institutions) foster good ecological citizenship or not, the next obvious steps would be to use this information to better promote ecological citizenship within the system. (Or to design a structure intended to
govern for ecological citizenship.) Before this is to take shape, however, it is important to know if the people here support the idea of social structures being put in place to foster good ecological citizenship at all. Section 5.4 reflects on some of the answers around this dialogue and how that might happen. While many believe that these ideals are fostered primarily through more informal means (such as at home, in communities, and through time on the land), the majority do find it important for them to be entrenched throughout the formal institutional system, so that these goals are reflected in the culture and function of day-to-day life for all.

Ecological citizenship is a complex subject, involving complex ideas on numerous scales. To ensure that a system promotes good ecological citizenship requires careful consideration of its many moving parts and how they not only directly affect the human and non-human citizens within them today, but how they will foster the development of future behaviours. Often, the effects of our decisions are not accounted for until many years later. Looking back at how the system has developed over previous decades, and which elements have affected ecological citizenship along the way, can provide insight into which types of elements may further affect ecological citizenship in the future. The influences and dynamics of ecological citizenship in the region from 1960-2010 are explored further in the following chapter.
Chapter 6: Dynamics of Ecological Citizenship

This chapter merges insights from the system description and history (Chapter 4) and the conceptual EC discussions (Chapter 5) to explore the dynamics of ecological citizenship within that system. A social-ecological systems methodology is used to explore the many facets of this system and how/why it has changed, through an exploration of hierarchy, drivers, feedbacks, cross-scale interactions, and control. These systems tools have been described in section 2.3.2 and are presented here in an order believed to best inform the purpose of this case study. Lessons from this analysis are synthesized in chapter seven, identifying vulnerabilities and strengths of the system, for the purpose of recommending strategies for governance.

6.1 Hierarchy

From a systems point of view, ecological citizenship can be considered a nested sub-system within the GKR social-ecological system. When looking to nurture EC, there are two scales by which we can examine why certain actions and behaviours arise: (1) outwardly, by the systemic forces that encourage or oppress actions and behaviours of ecological citizenship, or (2) from within, by examining the elements that nurture EC-related virtues. This study examines the institutional and systemic forces, with the aim of broadening approaches to environmental management and governance\(^5\).

---

\(^5\) Because of the hierarchy of elements at play, we know that the institutional system also plays a role in fostering certain values and virtues. While this study aims to acknowledge these correlations, it does this based on the opinions of Yukoners experience, and does not presume to reflect any foundations from the study of psychology.
The outer shell of this hierarchy, the GKR system and its economic, biophysical, institutional, and cultural elements have been described in Chapter 4 and are examined in the systems diagram of Figure 4-5. Concepts of EC related to actions, behaviours, and virtues have also been previously explored, in Figure 5-1. This chapter attempts to explain how components of these nested systems do and have acted and interacted in the GKR.

While chapter four reviewed the GKR system in its physical form, the sub-systems were reflected similarly, by communities and physical landforms. When we consider a more conceptual system, with “ecological citizenship” as the central sub-system, the hierarchy of the system changes form. It is no longer defined by regional or physical dimensions, but is defined in terms of which hold the closest impact to nourishing certain virtues and encouraging certain
behaviours. With that in mind, we must identify the drivers of ecological citizenship to more clearly identify scales and hierarchies of influence within and around this concept.

6.2 Drivers

Drivers can be identified by mapping the relationships among the elements of the system, and taking note of which variables seem to have the largest effect on the others in the system, and/or which have effects on the most other parts of the system. When we refer to Figure 4-5 at the end of chapter four, the variables driving the system are quite obvious: i.e. the land claims process/Umbrella Final Agreement (UFA) and Yukon Territorial Government (YTG). Following these are hunting, tourism, media, Kluane National Park & Reserve, individuals’ food choices, and climate change.

Although it is a very useful tool, identifying drivers from a systems diagram does not automatically tell the whole story. Drivers may have positive or negative effects. They may also hold more or less power or influence than what appears on the surface. Using a systems diagram to identify drivers is a good first step, but follow-up research is necessary to understand the true influence of the identified variables. The drivers discussed in the following sections have been identified from the systems diagram, and elaborated with information from interviews.
6.2.1 Fostering Ecological Citizenship

When interviewees were asked which institutions were seen to help foster good ecological citizenship, answers were returned that reflected both formal and informal institutions. Both are described here. Primary formal institutions were the Umbrella Final Agreement, the Renewable Resource Councils, and the Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Act. Secondary formal institutions were Raven Recycling, the implementation of a bear fence around the HJ landfill site, the Yukon Conservation Society, the Yukon Fish and Game Association, the Yukon Bird Club, and the Junior Rangers. Informal institutions were parents and elders, independent community leaders, spending time on the land, and political controversies over environment and land-use, and ecological events.

Formal Institutions

The signing of the Umbrella Final Agreement changed everything in terms of power structures, participation, and interactions amongst people and wildlife in the Yukon. It began the formalization of the land claims process, laid the foundations for the development of self-government agreements, and led to the development of various environmental boards and co-management regimes – building some of the first safeguards for the environment to exist in the territory (shy of the Yukon Waters Act). As the overarching institution that directs all management of lands and animals, it now acts as the central driver of the territory’s social-ecological system — and is therefore the primary driver of the region’s S-E system as well.

It can be considered the primary institutional driver of ecological citizenship in GKR today. It acknowledges connections between First Nations people and the land that they lived with sustainably for generations, therefore restoring and re-establishing this piece of identity. It
acknowledges rights and designates responsible measures. Restoring rights to a people whose culture and identity are based around a life on the land, restores not only justice, but also respect – as all decisions now pass through a body that is substantially built upon a land-based ethic and respect for the natural world. This is a multi-faceted agreement that has considered all aspects of life in the Yukon and is designed to facilitate a flourishing lifestyle from the perspective of Yukon First Nations. It invites public participation and is built on the basis of co-operative management regimes. It provides the mechanism that a number of other drivers of ecological citizenship are built into.

One of these other drivers is the Renewable Resource Councils (RRCs) regime. They are regional co-management councils, made up of locally elected volunteers who provide input for resource-based decision-making in and around their communities. They are derived from the UFA and act to advise the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board. They not only offer important roles by which to participate in decision-making, but in the end play a large role in educating the community. They provide their members with an education about conservation science, how to approach issues from a governance perspective, and how to participate in a formal process – considering all aspects and negotiating best practices with others who may not share similar views.

“And I don’t know if it was intentional or not, but people hopefully feel empowered that they can have input into how government functions. Like I think it was an accident, but I mean, after… we were the first group that was appointed to the Resource Council in 1995. So that’s 15 years. So there’s been… well, there’s six overlapping terms, so there’s thirty people that have been through the resource council regime that have been exposed to, “Okay, so here’s a little bit of science about ungulate populations versus predators. And if you don’t like something about it you can ask some questions, and if you think it deserves a regulation change, then you can send a letter of recommendation to the minister.” So I think it accidentally educated a whole large group of people” (Interviewee #28, interview, 6 Dec 2010).
The **Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Act** (YESSA) is the other component derived from the UFA that has been a major driver for ecological citizenship in the territory. It provides an extra layer of inquiry and due process for (even small) development projects in the Yukon. Final decision-making is still made by elected government officials (except for projects on FN settlement land), but recommendations from the Board are held in high regard. Supporting the Board, there are also staffed offices around the territory that conduct smaller reviews and background research regarding the effects of proposals.

Members of the public can ask questions and receive answers that are posted publicly. Regular public meetings are hosted. People can walk in and speak face-to-face, write letters, or comment on an online forum. This entire process not only offers an extension for the public to participate but provides an ongoing platform that promotes awareness. It brings more transparency to the decision-making process itself and provides a higher opportunity for consideration of all components. Due to the fact that the process now essentially provides space for an endless number of people to come to the table in some form or another, it is more apt that all potential issues will be heard. For this region, there is an office in Haines Junction – this again adjusts demographic, as it brings researchers and higher-level managers to the area.

“...And one of the things that they need for effective assessments of projects, is for the public to be able to share their views: what are their values; why they think a specific project would or would not affect their value; how a project could be changed to reduce the impact on their value. And those are the things that make people think about what their values are. In fact there’s a document on the Y.E.S.A.B. website called “Make Your Voice Count”, and it tells people exactly how to articulate their concerns over something that they care about. I like to think… YESAB for all its worth, makes people think about what they are interested in, and if they actually see a potential conflict with their value, YESAB is able to hear it in a way that’s – in Canada – a cutting-edge process. There’s socioeconomic considerations, which is a new field in environmental assessment. Nobody knew how to deal with it before, not to say that it’s not without bugs, but ah, but, there are several instances where socioeconomic values have been taken into consideration and products have been changed or cancelled, or recommended not to proceed. And in some cases the government has agreed with that, so, so that's that's a UFA driven process that result, that the first nations wanted to have more influence by all Yukoners and I'm, I would say that's made a significant change in people's ability to understand what they care about and push them to be able to articulate it so that it’s actually useful for development” (Interviewee #14, interview, 25 Nov 2010).
Other institutional factors that are not necessarily “drivers” but have made an impact, are infrastructural changes that allow citizens to act better. It should be noted that the two main infrastructural impacts that were discussed came to be through temporarily formed community groups that took the initiative to make these changes a reality. Raven Recycling is a not-for-profit recycling center that is run independent of government. It is active in all communities in the Yukon and provides a strong educational component and an active incentive program for kids. The other major component was the implementation of a bear fence around the Haines Junction landfill site in 1992. Over time, human-caused mortality rates for bears decreased significantly, as there came to be fewer “problem bears” visible in the community. Bear-related incidents spiked for two years following the fencing, and then reduced to less than half, previous to the fencing (Homstol, Rear, and Coatta, 2011). Furthermore, while it was noted that the Village of Haines Junction does not seem to have much of an effect on ecological citizenship in the region, it must also be acknowledged that the functions of the municipality do aim to operate in a non-harmful way.

Other notable institutions are those that foster education, awareness, appreciation, and respect for nature. There are a handful of organizations that operate in different capacities.

“The people who, you know, conservationists who just want to see it there, and have a concern about habitat as opposed to mining or water use or all that stuff, they don’t get nearly the voice that I think that they should. There are some good organizations, like the Yukon Fish and Game Association, and the Yukon Conservation Society, and the Bird Club, all those sorts of things… even groups that come and go, like Friends of the Wolf. If they can get their message out and around, or have free and open debates on those kinds of thing, people will listen if they’re interesting enough” (Interviewee #38, interview, 15 Dec 2010).

The Yukon Conservation Society houses many educational campaigns about various issues in the Yukon. They also offer various walks and talks to not only inform but to get people out in nature. They are a mainstay in the Yukon, having been around since 1968. They do
excellent work, however are sometimes regarded as “too left-wing” due to an early stance on humane trapping that was interpreted as anti-trapping. The **Yukon Fish and Game Association** is another long-term organization that was started in 1945 after the noticeable devastation from Alaska Highway workers. Their aim is to protect and support thriving wildlife populations and its membership is made up of the hunting and fishing community. The **Yukon Bird Club** is another very active society and has chapters in all of the major communities. Youth clubs, like the **Junior Rangers**, are also important for instilling a life of the land, providing evidence and experience that allows young people to form a bond and appreciate wilderness and nature, and the skills and confidence to be out in a safe way.

**Informal Institutions**

While I came into these interviews looking to identify the institutions and agencies that could best foster ecological citizenship, I came away understanding that the most important were the informal elements that create the foundations of people’s ways of being in the world: family and community values, inspirational individuals, education and experience, and time on the land.

**Parents and elders** and the lessons taught at home, are those that are reflected most through generations. This transforms over time as people gain education and experience and form new ways of being based on these, but the foundations of home life always stand strong. Change is also encouraged by the inspiration of **independent individuals** in the community that inspire those around them to live good lives like they do: recycling and compost enthusiasts, master gardeners, positive facilitator types that actively aim to bring the community together, and quieter, committed, and proactive types that do their part on the land day-in and day-out.
In general, spending time on the land was seen to be the biggest influence on creating ecological citizenship. Just being out was seen to foster connection and awareness and facilitate and reinforce the understanding that we are just one in a species of many. No matter the way in which people spent time – hunting, skiing, trapping, bird watching, photography, walking – just being out was the central component to invoke respect, appreciation, and deep connection to the greater home outside of their own doors. This was obviously heightened for those whose life was centered on land-based activities, e.g. trappers.

Another activity that was clearly relevant throughout the interviews was the importance of political controversies over environment and land-use. Three particular controversial events came up in conversation on numerous occasions: the Windy Craggy Mine, Killerman Lake, and, taking place during the research, the Peel Watershed regional planning process. Drawing attention to major issues puts the environment at the top of people’s minds and encourages them to consider and think through the issues. Regardless of what action is being taken, this awareness brings the environment closer to people’s minds and lives and connects them to these places in more fundamental ways, potentially drawing new people to appreciate them that might not have otherwise before. But on top of this, astounding things start happening in the community. People start coming together that might not have otherwise – finding common grounds to unite and stand together, to achieve the same goal, for different reasons. And in the best of situations, all people learn how to cooperate and work together to find a conclusion - people of very different mindsets are brought together. For a wilderness-based culture, this is very significant because different opinions generally encompass many different groups and affiliations in the region - no one is really left out because everyone has a stake in one way or another. Learning to co-operate and come to conclusions that can best serve all parties is not
only a way to bring peace and harmony to the people, but to also get the best results for the land and wildlife that share this home.

“And there was, maybe 10-15 years ago, the Windy-Craggy mine, which was on the Tatshenshini River. It was a mixed metal mine. There was a proposal to open that mine up and put a road in that would parallel the Tatshenshini River and then up Slims Creek to the mine site. And that, that was a fairly controversial kind of proposal. The FN didn’t support it, and the Tourism Industry didn’t support it, and the Environmental Industry didn’t support it, and the Alaskans also were against it because of the Tatshenshini and the Alsek are major satellite (?) rivers. And that kind of split the Yukon between the pro-mining/pro-development crowd and … and the rest. And it was quite controversial. And in the end, the BC government compensated the mine owners and turned it into… it’s a Provincial Park – the Tatshenshini Provincial Park, which it borders right up to the Kluane National Park right on the Haines Road. And the mining industry said that there was going to be repercussions throughout the industry because of a lack of interest in the Yukon to have new mines comes on board. So it was fairly controversial throughout the territory. And the BC Government turned it into a Park and compensated the owner. And since then, things have quieted down and there haven’t been much in a way of conflict in the area for those things. The Windy-Craggy mine site would have been the name of the mine site and it would have probably been in the mid-80s. And it became a national kind of an issue, and it was a big one, because the Tatshenshini and the Alsek are internationally-known rivers for rafting, and people come from all over the road internationally to raft those rivers, so it was a known tourism … not so much a destination… but a known tourism activity for rafting those rivers, so it was a case where, you know, what do you choose? Do you choose mineral extraction and the big mine, and you know, the economic and jobs related to that, or do you choose leaving it fairly natural and look at all of the alternative forms of economics, like wilderness tourism?” (Interviewee #10, interview, 23 Nov 2010).

“So we were talking about Windy Craggy and the whole… that issue. So when that happened, when things like that happen and an area becomes in the spotlight and it’s become known that there’s really cool things to see, people flock to it. So prior to that, there was not much happening on the Alsek and Tatshenshini Rivers, not a lot was happening. So then bam all of these people want to come … all these groups from Canada and the US descended on the river for the next few years” (Interviewee #24, interview, 1 Dec 2010).

Similarly, ecological events play a significant role in raising environmental awareness and educating citizens about the causes of such events. While it may be counter-intuitive that an environmental disaster could be a positive thing, it is the education and counter-action that comes as a result of this that has led these events to be seen as positive. Some major ecological events are the spruce beetle outbreak, the Champagne flood, the surging of the Kaskawulsh glacier, and more generally, climate change.
6.2.2 Hindering Ecological Citizenship

The major driver considered to hinder good ecological citizenship is the economic marketplace. Individually, people often neglect consideration of environmental impacts when it is cheaper and quicker to do otherwise. This is linked to the argument about societal norms and pressures. Fulfilling consumptive individual desires does often tend take precedence over longer-term considerations for the impact of these choices – even for those who might consider themselves environmentalists. In general, modern society has created a faster-paced culture with the desire to do and have more. Our economy offers many opportunities to make poor environmental choices, and more limited opportunities to consider the sustainable choice. It must be noted, however, that there is a much stronger locally-based economy in the southwest Yukon, offering numerous naturally-based products, than in many other areas. Many people do still hunt for their own meat. But in many cases, much that is consumed is imported – from both domestic and international sources.

In the same respect, the economy plays a role in driving the local job market – which designs the day-to-day activities that people rely on for their sense of economic security and survival. While the Kluane Region does offer many jobs that allow people to act positively on the land, there is one major market that doesn’t. Due to its rich mineral resources, the entire territory suffers at the hands of mining – which often presents large (although short-term) economic gains, and longer-term environmental implications.

“But it’s a pretty tough argument, when you’re up against the mining industry, because that’s a large part of the little economy that the Yukon has – here and now. No one thinks much past the 4 year window, you know. Wildlife has an intrinsic value, and wilderness, that’s going to become more and more and more apparent, as other places have less and less of it. But nobody wants to wait around that long. And we’re not learning from mistakes, I mean, look at the cesspools left over from mining – where people have come and made their millions and gone back to Ontario, or Australia, or wherever. Taxpayers, federal government, they hold back the dams for restoration – they’re not even doing restoration, they’re just holding the dam back. There’s a buffer inside of Carmacks and Mount Nassan, there’s the Faro pit – all of those places eat up millions of dollars a year just to look after...
them so they don’t cause huge ecological disasters. They’re dead zones, behind firms. Yet… they’re still pushing mining” (Interviewee #38, interview, 15 Dec 2010).

Not only does it leave a mark on the actual site itself, but another major effect of mining activity (and also forestry) is the **access roads** that are created that allow workers to get to these resources. Access roads encourage deeper travel into the bush by motorized vehicles, and less forethought about it: “well, the road is already there...” It doesn’t so much change what people are doing, but how and how often they are doing it and where. As can be seen from the systems diagram, greater access to the backcountry is a large vulnerability of the system. While snowmobiles and ATVs are already causing issues in more sensitive backcountry, new access roads exacerbate the problem. As has been noted, ATVers and snowmobilers often seem to want to explore new terrain and tend to make their own trails further than the roads. Once the original trails are made into access roads, new trails are cut that extend from the end of these roads. This disrupts wildlife populations that have traditionally been used to these areas being undisturbed by human activity and interrupts their needs for quiet and safe habitat.

**Motorization and access** have also changed people’s relationships with the land. We see this with small machines, like snowmobiles and ATVs, as well as road vehicles. As snowmobiles and ATVs are being used more as “toys” and not strictly “tools” for getting from A to B, we see more ecological damage. Everything was said to have changed when snowmobiles became faster and lighter and could go deeper and further into the bush (without sinking in deep snow drifts, as they had in the past). Not only are they more likely to disturb sensitive ecological areas, this form of being outside is not quite the same as partaking in slower activities. There can be little connection to or observation of the elements around you, as you are whizzing by at high speed, just trying not to hit anything. This new use of motorized vehicles for “fast and fun” has
led to the formation of new groups, such as “Sled Porn”, who can be seen and heard doing tricks off the peaks of the high alpine.

In terms of road access, the combination of the Highway and its improvements over time, and then people acquiring vehicles, and those vehicles advancing to get better mileage, has allowed people the luxury of leaving their communities a lot more often than in the past. And because they can, they often do, heightening their ties to other places, increasing their carbon footprint, and reducing their ties to home.

“When I was growing up here, we only went to Whitehorse every 6 weeks to buy groceries and do your shopping and you lived closer to this place than we do now. And I think that’s generally for the whole communities along the highway. I mean Beaver Creek is still a long way from Whitehorse, but it’s still not as far as it was 35 years ago. I go to Whitehorse 4 times per week now. My kids play hockey in Whitehorse - that would never even be thought of when I was growing up. And so our time was spent - I played hockey here every chance I got, the arena was a big thing for me - but my time was spent here in this place versus rushing off to other places and I think society as a whole rushes off to other places more than we used to 35 years” (Interviewee #27, interview, 6 Dec 2010).

“Today, most people in the village have a car (or truck). Local use of the highway has increased to the point where one person could joke to me that people these days think nothing of making the trip all the way into Whitehorse and back “just to play bingo”. Increasingly, people have been structuring their lives around the highway. Grace Chambers, a Kluane elder who remembers life before the highway, lamented to me that these days most people “can’t go nowhere without a car.” This has clearly had an enormous impact on how people use, and what they know about, the land. In the course of conducting some semi-formal interview in the community, I asked people to identify on a map the parts of the country they feel they “know well”. A number of young people just laughed and pointed to the highway” (Nadasdy, 2003: 37).

**Developments in communications and entertainment technologies** have also contributed to lessening people’s relationships to the land and nature. This story is fairly straight-forward, and widespread: as there have become more interesting activities to keep people inside (television, computers, and video games), there is less time to spend getting to know the local world outside.

“I did notice it changed when we got TV. And that was about 1976 or 77, like it was only a year or two after I moved to the community. I was 13 years old when we moved here and I was so happy because we could go and play - all the kids would go and play ball we’d play baseball, we’d go out hiking, we would go skiing, we’d play hockey, like it was a mixture of sports and outdoor recreation but we did it every day all the time, and TV came in about a year or two after we moved here and because I’d already experienced TV in my life before living in Haines Junction, I didn’t want it and I
was mad at it coming. And even though it was one channel, it was CBC North, it was one channel, my friends wanted to stay inside and watch a baseball game instead of going out and playing and I remember that it was only a year or two after that it started to change. But it wasn’t bad when there wasn’t too many, it was only one channel and it wasn’t too much and I’ve just seen as the communities become had more TV influence and now internet and social media influence that we are no longer remote and so therefore being as connected has many good aspects to it but I think there’s some, there’s some changes and it’s about becoming a busier society and busier life too” (Interviewee #27, interview, 6 Dec 2010).

Entertainment and communications technologies not only provide other forms of entertainment that distract people from being with the land and nature, but they also provide distractions from what is going on in the rest of the world as well. People may feel more connected, knowing what is going on elsewhere, but they are more disconnected from what is going on in their own backyard and are losing touch with the importance of this.

Another notable factor is the impact of alcohol and drugs, although it does not appear to be an obvious driver here. This was alluded to a few times in interviews and observed more intimately through my time there. When caught up in alcohol and drugs, there is no choice but to be disconnected – not just from the land, but from all relationships that surround the user.

“I think people need to feel healthy and take pride in who they are first before they can start to participate and be part of that - to be good ecological citizens... Social ills, alcoholism, many of those kinds of things are forces that take sort of the self-pride away from people and there’s a need for healing to really be part of that. Interestingly enough, some of the key steps to healing are, for the first nations people, getting back on the land. So there’s an interesting approach to that” (Interviewee #14, interview, 25 Nov 2010).

Alcohol certainly played a strong role in the communities when First Nations were first moved to them. It not only became more accessible and readily available due to the highway, but when they were taken off their trap lines and banned from the Game Sanctuary, they were left with nothing to do. Paired with the results of losing their children to residential schools, alcohol often became an activity for filling those hours and soon became used in destructive ways. While I did not engage in very many conversations about the role of alcohol in the communities today, it appears that while still relevant, it is not quite as prevalent a problem as it was in the past.
6.2.3 Simultaneous fostering and hindering of good EC?

While it may seem counter-intuitive, there are many forces that simultaneously foster and hinder acts and behaviours of good ecological citizenship. Examples are large institutions with multiple arms and value sets (e.g. within YTG), or evolving institutions that have had different values at different times (e.g. KNPR). Specific events, processes, or developments have also been witnessed to hold both positive and negative impacts simultaneously. These are the Yukon Territorial Government, the Kluane National Park & Reserve, First Nations’ Final Agreements, snowmobiles and ATVs, tourism, and federal transfer payments.

**Yukon Territorial Government**

There are two elements to the territorial government: the elected officials that oversee decision-making and guide priorities of government, and the administrative staff that carry out the day-to-day duties. The administration of government is large and multifunctional, as it oversees a broad range of functions across many different departments. Due to the differences in their mandates, the values within each of these departments tend to be inconsistent from one to the next. The **Yukon Territorial Government** is no different.

“Well there is no unity in the government, even one so small as the Yukon Government. There is a multiplicity of views amongst civil servants about what the future should hold. Amongst departments, and amongst individuals, and even on different events. The government ultimately, I suppose, tries to put these in some sort of holistic vision. Though what the cabinet says and what the government delivers, lag. These things all take time” (Interviewee #1, interview, 15 Nov 2010).

While the position of elected officials may change from election period to election period, the administrative departments and duties often stay the same. There are departments that take up
roles that are positive for environmental welfare: particularly the Department of the Environment and the Department of Tourism and Culture, and components of others, such as Housing.

In talking to a Conservation Officer: "We do trap line administration, and then about 60% of the positions are forestry related. So, a lot of it is outfitting related, resident hunting related, trapping regulations, fishing regulations. Environmental protection to do with industrial development, businesses, special ways we do wilderness tours and forest development. Then we get tied in with probably another dozen or 15 different acts and legislations that we’re kind of the primary lead in doing the enforcement of. So that would be kind of our primary role and then of course, in combination with that, we do quite a few educational roles. We do hunter education, trapper education, environmental awareness, and then of course… in the last 10 years, there’s been wilderness tours and wildlife education that’s becoming more prevalent” (Interviewee #31, interview, 7 Dec 2010).

“"Well, some of the governments’ policies, like Yukon Housing has some programs that you can apply for to help insulate your house. Even if it’s just weather stripping a door. I don’t know if they pay for it all, but they pay for a portion of it. And I think that’s really positive! … And the territorial government is trying – and they got dumped on for doing it – for using economic stimulus money from the federal government after 2008 when the economy collapsed to boost up the hydro potential of an electrical dam up in Mayo and try and tie it into the grid… And they could’ve said “No, we’re not gonna do that. We’re going to support our buddies in the oil industry and keep spending money.” You know, it’s good for business: they hire people and they’ve gotta keep putting money into their trucks and fixing their tires, and for people that fix tires, that’s good for business. “And if it’s good for business, its good for the Yukon economy, so we’re going to keep doing that.” But they didn’t. And they reduced the amount of diesel consumption by hundreds of thousands a year by using a renewable resource” (Interviewee #28, interview, 6 Dec 2010).

There are other departments that appear to not consider environmental values or are in direct opposition with them:

“Some of the groups that might have a more negative voice… sometimes some of the government departments, especially when you deal with things like timber harvesting plans. Often, their focus is purely economic oriented, like how can we get the most out in the quickest time. Some of the Chamber of Mines types. The Kluane gas types – especially with the pipeline. They’re like “oh, we’re going to have to have a huge right of way”, and yadda yadda. The Highways types are also not very helpful – they like long straight roads, with massive right of ways, which ecologically are bad because animals have a tough time crossing them, and when they do cross them, wolves can use them to really increase the predation rate. Yeah, because a wolf can sit on a high spot, and in the forest can see about 500 m. if that, but if you’re sitting up high and can see kms either way in the clear, as soon as you see something, you can instantly go. And yeah, seismic lines are rather bad for that as well – they call them wolf highways – because now wolves travel very quickly and can see game much further than they would regularly see” (Interviewee #8, interview, 19 Nov 2010).

While the role of democratic government does not necessarily affect the day-to-day actions and behaviours of its citizens, its rules, regulations, and enforcement efforts, can help to counter extreme behaviours and keep the system functioning in a certain way.
"We do enforcement, so we have an effect based on the certain guidelines and regulations that were set, but...you're not necessarily asking to work with people to come up with a cooperative solution. There’s a … if it says, “this is prohibited, you’re not allowed to do this.” If an individual is caught doing one of these things, then they are charged, convicted, and it has an effect on their ability to continue doing it… we do a quite a bit of education as well – of educational programs. So I think that’s had as much of an effect as the enforcement for kind of creating an increase in stewardship for some of the resources around here and having people better understand the value of them…. We do public talks, community talks, attend the RRC and educate during meetings – things like hunter education courses, school community hunts…that’s the whole enforcement model, which is education, enforcement, and community involvement” (Interviewee #31, interview, 7 Dec 2010).

Governmental decisions allow for certain economies and social structures to exist in the territory, and this in turn affects the way that people live here. To some extent, it affects certain people more than others. Newly implemented costs of hunting tags, fishing licenses, and particularly trapping licenses and courses were said to have negative implications on those that could not afford them. It turns people who want to live a life on the land into criminals if they are economically incapable of acquiring a license to do so. Some checks and balances have been put in place to overcome this, such as FN governments allocating funds that pay these courses or licenses for their people.

Generally, YTG’s environmental work is thought to be positive, but it is in direct opposition with their more economically focused areas of operation.

“certainly the general environmental protection legislation and the assessments of development projects, I think those new changes have had a really positive effect in encouraging people to be better citizens. I think some of the slippery stuff is around the triggers, and when assessments are required, and the size of the development before a permit is required. There are some issues around those that encourage some people to be sneaky or to go with piecemeal kind of proposals” (Interviewee #21, interview, 30 Nov 2010).

A Liberal government is in power in the Yukon today (since 2016), but during the time that this research was completed, the Yukon Party (the territory’s Conservatives) had been in power since devolution (2003). With a tagline of “Open for Business”, their central mandate was essentially that.

“Because we have a conservative territorial government that believes we’re open for business and any restriction is seen as nothing but a barrier for opening us up for business. Umm, I personally don’t
think that they see that we have much value except for resource extraction, and are short sighted” (Interviewee #14, interview, 25 Nov 2010).

"If you’re talking about a place like the Kluane Region – nobody needs to have to stake every square foot of it in hopes that it will turn into an industrial waste land. Which is unfortunately always a potential. Especially when you have a government in place that wants to sell us to foreign countries for the lowest common denominator” (Interviewee #17, interview, 26 Nov 2010).

Many of their values were focused more around the economy than the environment. In this regard, it may be said that their economic actions have had a much higher negative impact than any amount of environmental education or enforcement that they could possibly do. Beyond being “open for business” to industry, another major initiative of the Yukon Party was to ensure the right to land for all Yukoners. While this may seem like a positive social mandate, environmentally, it was not well thought through. The introduction of the “Spot Land Application Process” allowed Yukoners to apply for rights to random pieces of property within lands that do not have an official land use plan, which results in both habitat fragmentation and closing off access to the back country.

“There are things that continue to undermine those sorts of relationships. Things like the spot land application process. In the absence of land use planning, the government still supports getting land into the hand of Yukoners, and it’s resulting in a fair bit of strip development along the highway corridors and over time, these little pockets of land developments start to eat up and create a barrier of access to the back country” (Interviewee #22, interview, 30 Nov 2010).

"The Yukon Party has a platform, and their platform is to make land available to all Yukoners. Well that may be improving the individual’s connection with a small part of land, but it’s not improving the overall. So, it’s impacting the entire region, as you see these developments occur… and then everything becomes… there’s like a barricade here, using the land, because now you have to go through someone’s backyard so you can’t get there anymore. So you create all these barriers to people accessing and using the land” (Interviewee #35, interview, 8 Dec 2010).

They also threw out the Protected Areas Strategy:

"as soon as the Conservative government we have now got in, it was one of the first things they did, was kill it [the Protected Areas Strategy]. Because they really aren’t in favour of protection. They right winged conservative players in this territory believe that everything can be mitigated. So you can still have mines and large-scale forestry, and you can just mitigate your acts to wildlife and other users, and of course some of us just don’t buy into that” (Interviewee #10, interview, 23 Nov 2010).
While there may be positive environmental actors within government, it is clear that their values are fragmented, and industrialization and development still rule the day here – even though many (if not most) support environmental protection.

"And the role for that is really shared, but if you’ve got stovepipe governments, so we’ve got a forestry group, we’ve got a water group, we’ve got a wildlife group, or anything related to ecology, split between all of these different jurisdictions, and now it’s split also between first nation governments and non-first nation governments, between federal governments and regional governments. When you’ve got all of these things, it becomes really difficult to coordinate all of those kinds of things, so that maybe what you do is you unify it around a vision, right, and you say “if we want to move and be this way...” And they’re starting to do that with the climate change discussions. What’s really interesting with the climate change discussions is that it all becomes based around infrastructure. Which roads are going to collapse? Which buildings are going to collapse? Which bridges are going to collapse in a flood? It’s amazing. We can’t seem to get to a habitat discussion, or the need for looking at migration corridors, or gene flows and things, it’s only those really practical details. If this road breaks, and it takes 2 months to prepare, we’re going to have to fly food in” (Interviewee #21, interview, 30 Nov 2010).

_Kluane National Park & Reserve_

The history of the Kluane National Park & Reserve is not a positive story for inhabitants of the region. Environmental historians and anthropologists alike have noted that the development of the institutions and practices of state wildlife management at the beginning of the twentieth century was inextricably bound up with the expansion of state power (Nadasdy, 2003). This was certainly the case in the Yukon. The Kluane Game Sanctuary was built with the intent of protecting shrinking wildlife populations following overhunting by U.S. military personnel during the construction of the Alaska Highway, but restrictions were applied to all people. Not only did people of the Kluane Region suffer from a lack of food due to declining wildlife population, they were now restricted from hunting and trapping on a large part of their traditional territory, and unable to continue past commercial hunting guiding. This not only left them with an inability to make a living off the land, bordering on an inability to survive, but it had profound effects on Kluane people’s hunting patterns and seasonal movements.
Although Kluane FN members regained the right to hunt in the park and sanctuary with the implementation of their land claims, some Kluane elders were still hesitant to enter these areas, recalling with fear the years during which it was a crime for them to even set foot in the sanctuary. By prohibiting Kluane people from entering a huge part of their country, the creation of the sanctuary caused them to lose a great deal of knowledge about the land. Even though it is now legal again for them to hunt in Kluane Park and Reserve, few Kluane people alive today possess much detailed experiential knowledge of this vast area (Nadasdy, 2003: 39-40).

Realizing that access to the Park was not nearly enough to restore the connection to land and overcome the hardship that had lasted for an entire generation or two, the Kluane National Park and Reserve implemented a five-year program in 2004, called Healing Broken Connections (HBC). This project was managed by the Park, in partnership with the Champagne-Aishihik and Kluane First Nations and included a series of culture camps, guided interpretative walks, and healing circles. Many have agreed that HBC played a strong role in starting the process of healing from the fifty-year period of displacement of CAFN and KFN people from their land. It has been noted that this program can only begin to address these long-term effects and that the healing process needs to be actively addressed for years to come (Nakoochee, 2018).

The displacement of First Nations from Game Sanctuary territory is not the only questionable relationship that the Park has impressed on area locals. In 1976, when the Reserve became a National Park and built up its gates at the Town of Haines Junction, this small community was forever changed. Locals will admit that the Park has done many positive things for their community: changing the demographics, bringing money to the community, and opening up means for creating new public infrastructure for easier living in the municipality.

"the Game Reserve being turned into a National Park. That brought a huge group of middle class, educated professionals; originally parks people, but they brought their families so there were more
nurses and teachers, etc. And those people didn’t have to take sides of a community that was just a little highway community and when times were tough, you had to fight over every scrap and stuff like that between families. Well the middle class could come in and say “I don’t have to take a side, because I have a job. And being nice to that guy and not nice to that guy isn’t going to cost me a job, I’ve got a job.” So it ended up that the middle class was expanded in Haines Junction. I mean, there were always nurses and teachers, but I mean, it really grew with the Park” (Interviewee #28, interview, 6 Dec 2010).

“What’s changed is the Park is there, which is an economic draw for the area, which has caused a lot of tension. The local people hate the park. And I think it’s pretty inappropriate that they do actually, because most of them realize that they have tourism businesses and whatever, and the town of Haines Junction would probably be a ghost town if it wasn’t for the park… potentially. Champagne Aisihik FN would be in Champagne, or they’d be in Aisihik, they wouldn’t be in Haines Junction, but that’s where they are” (Interviewee #17, interview, 26 Nov 2010).

However, the locals that had lived here before the creation of the Park feel that they were shut out of their own backyard.

“the relationship between Parks Canada and both the relationship with the first nation and the community of Haines Junction has historically been less than great. And you’ve probably heard that from people, that Parks Canada is like this little enclave. The people don’t mix well with the community, and when they do mix well with the community, it’s in a patronizing way. And it’s kind of like, “we’re the federal government, and we know what’s best for you, and you’ll come to thank us later on in your life, or your kids will,” or whatever. And I think, really slowly, but I think that’s shifting. And of course again the healing thing” (Interviewee #11, interview, 23 Nov 2010).

“So I think the big changes were the creation of the Game Sanctuary and the alienation of the Park from the First Nations people here, then the creation of the Park that invited outsiders in – which was another change for the local business and resource users here, because all of a sudden the place that they couldn't go to was used by all these other people” (Interviewee #14, interview, 25 Nov 2010).

“And if I can’t go hunting back there, you know, then why would I care? And it’s the same thing with the Park. Nobody gives a rat’s ass about the Park around here. I mean, you know, a few people go back there from town and kind of like it, but they’re not… can’t say they’re “living off the land” type people, but they’re recent people who’ve moved here. There’s no connection to that place anymore. Just, nobody cares what happens back there, just as long as what’s happening back there stays on that side of the road – we don’t care. I would never make it back there unless I worked for the Park. I worked as a trail keep for a few years and went back there, otherwise, there’s no reason to go back there” (Interviewee #32, interview, 7 Dec 2010).

“Parks strives to help, but I think by educating people and providing experiences for people, it’s a hard one within the community, we tend to provide more as for visitors or, then it’s necessarily the community. The communities are a hard group to reach in those messaging. But I think we try whether it works or not, I’m not the one to say, in by providing the place, by providing education, and hoping that people, and providing experience and experience is probably most important for someone to go out and experience the land and their connection to it, a connection to place is, I think is essential to them becoming good environmental citizens. At the same time, the park has numerous rules and regulations that perhaps makes the community, or that many community may not think of the park as being the place that helps but rather hinders….And so it’s, you know, slowly changing but the parks, protected areas like the park has to have some rules and those rules can especially hinder local people that may have done that for generations but people want to go berry picking to this good patch but its inside the park boundary so they can’t go there and so it hinders, it makes a wall or a
Over time, however, these relationships are getting better. The Park has recognized the benefit of including the community and have started to do so. The Park Management Board now has equal voices at the table from Kluane and Champagne-Aishihik First Nations and the Government of Canada. There are many that support the Park and recognize its benefits - certainly those that moved to the region after 1976 and also longer-term residents – but many are still resentful to have had their “rights” to this land stripped from them. However, as it’s been in operation as a National Park for 40+ years, people have also realized with time that life is just as okay with the Park, as it was before. Slowly, it seems, the Parks vision is spreading through the community and changing the way that people look at things – or at the very least, forcing them to think about it.

“in theory, the Park is supposed to be protecting the environment of Kluane. So there’s less hunting… I mean the FN still do some hunting in there, but generally, well we hope there’s less hunting of animals. There’s no resource extraction, so… that’s been a positive influence on that region. I mean, a lot of what Kluane National Park protects is very remote ice and snow fields and steep mountains… which isn’t… which doesn’t receive a lot of use anyway – but the valleys do. So if the Park wasn’t there, there’d probably be more mining. And yeah… that Park is joined on to two Parks in the US and Tatshenshini Park – and that’s a world heritage site. So yeah… that’s a big area. But it is in theory protected… somewhat. So I think that organization… but yeah, people have mixed feelings about the Park that live there, for sure. But I would like to think that the organization has been more positive than not” (Interviewee #23, interview, 30 Nov 2010).

“Without National Parks, we wouldn’t be here in Canada. It’s a jewel, it’s a quality, it’s a value that I very closely associate with being a Canadian. If National Parks wouldn’t exist in Canada, I wouldn’t be in Canada. National Parks here…specifically Kluane Park which was just more recently established in the 70s, was associated with moving people – residents – out of the park. So people have past experience being able to travel in the park motorized and do their exploration and recreation, and now feel that they have been expelled from a regional area and are very bitter about it and would really like to reverse this and this negative sentiment is sometimes reflected in their response talking about ecological values and whether the park’s ecological integrity is indeed there, or what needs to be done in order to secure this” (Interviewee #15, interview, 25 Nov 2010, [immigrated to Haines Junction from Austria in 1990s]).

“I think there are lots of people in Haines Junction that ponder these kind of things. It is framed largely, I think, because of the presence of the National Park. Having a National Park immediately adjacent to your community, and impinging upon (for FN) their traditional territory, and for non-FN, their neighbourhood, puts these things in the forefront of your mind because Parks Canada is nominally an environmental agent in that it manages a big chunk of land for an ecological purpose, along with other tasks it puts on it, such as economic development. There’s a vision there. And so
it’s highly visible and therefore I think it’s a much more conscious element than in a community where I think that kind of thing isn’t quite so much in your face. And I think it probably skews it to some extent, because it becomes much more of a response to what Parks Canada does to some extent, as opposed to it just being a local invention… With the kind of questions a national park throws at you… I’m guessing it’s just the dynamics of how ecological citizenship might be framed by the nature of your neighbours. You know, if you’re next to a petro chemical plant, there’s another vision there, which is probably tied more directly with income and so on. But you have that kind of thing framing responses for ecological citizenship, and I think Parks Canada plays that kind of role or has that kind of effect. So there’s a whole series of variables I suppose that people exercise in that sort of thing. The Park makes Haines Junction different than communities that don’t have a national park in their front yard” (Interviewee #1, interview, 15 Nov 2010).

“I think the Park is a large influence in that community. Just having a large National Park, which is also part of a World Heritage Site, sort of in your backyard, and seeing what protection perhaps does over time, so to be able to distinguish what goes on inside the park, and what goes on outside of the park, (and this is a bit theoretical because I don’t live there) I would think that it would then be an influence on what kind of choices people make. Because the park hasn’t been there that long, you have people in the community who are not so keen on the national park, and they get the concept that it may be okay, but it’s in their backyard and they are now not able to do things that used to be able to do. And they may think that there have been unkept promises and those kinds of things. But I think now since the establishment of the park, part of the influence is that people are now moving to the community because the park is there, more as a lifestyle thing because they know that large, protected thing is there. So whether it increases or diminishes their sense of citizenship, but I think overall, the area then is attracting people who either like that lifestyle” (Interviewee #6, interview, 18 Nov 2010).

Past resentments are still there, and they will certainly take more time to overcome. It has been mentioned that the simple fact that people complain less about the Park, says something about how people perceive its role in their community.

First Nations’ Final Agreements

In this region, there are three First Nations communities, two of which have settled land claims (Champagne-Aishihik and Kluane), and one which has not (White River). For those that have settled, the benefits are obvious. Their communities are starting to thrive. While this may be for more reasons than purely settling land claims, it does seem to play a large role. They are creating jobs, developing comfortable and sustainable housing, and are developing many new activities and services which are controlled and managed by and for their communities. They also have control and authority over their lands and are seeing to it that they are managed well. I
got the sense that people generally feel empowered and are making strides toward a better future. While I was completing my research, the Kluane First Nation was in the beginning stages of multiple solar and wind projects. The Champagne-Aishihik First Nation was fine-tuning very complex land management strategies with the goal of regenerating wildlife populations. They are happy and proud to have autonomy over their communities and their land and are taking full advantage of what this offers.

However, these “successes” do not come without their own set of drawbacks. While these communities may be working towards a brighter independent future, this trajectory is set within the confines of a modern white colonizing society that completely re-oriented their ways of being in the world. As has been noted by Nadasdy (2003):

“The very idea of land claims is based on the European concept of “property”; modern land claims in Canada grant First Nations “ownership” of certain lands and spell out the rights they possess in relation to those lands. Yet many of the relationships inherent in the notion of property are incompatible with many of the beliefs, values, social relations, and practices that constitute Kluane people’s relationship to the land, animals, and one another. As a result, Kluane people have had to learn to think and speak the “language of property” and to create a bureaucratic infrastructure as preconditions for engaging government officials in a dialogue over land and sovereignty. The land claims process – because it has forced Kluane people to think, speak, and act in uncharacteristic ways – tends to undermine some of the very beliefs and practices that a land claims agreement is meant to preserve.”

Not only does this force First Nations people into talking and thinking in ways that are not in line with their traditional cultural values, it inherently takes First Nations away from the ability to be First Nation – which is to live a life of the land. The necessary bureaucracy to maintain their status as a self-governing community within Canada pushes them indoors, in front of screens and papers. While values certainly have changed over time, and the lifestyles of younger generations are more aligned with modern lifestyles that accept the need for this bureaucracy, this is still a fact that requires attention and contemplation.
Snowmobiles and ATVs

This is another controversial topic – in terms of snowmobiles especially, and now somewhat with ATVs. In congruence with the previous argument, in spite of the modern world they now live in, these technologies allow FNs to live a semi-subsistence lifestyle and complete traditional rounds on their traditional lands. With the use of these tools, they can do this over the course of a weekend, all while remaining housed in their communities, with their bureaucratic jobs. However, just being able to hunt is not the same as spending weeks at a time on the land, tracking your moose, walking and observing. It gives the illusion that they are still partaking in the same cultural activities, on their land, but it has changed everything about the process – which is at the foundation of its importance. While getting “your moose” was the goal, everything that was learned along the way was what provided the generations of Indigenous Knowledge that we’ve come to appreciate so well. Furthermore, hunting used to be an activity in which the whole family participated. While the kill may have been completed by the man in the family, the entire family came along and was needed to pack the meat out of the woods. This is no longer the case. With the use of a snowmobile or ATV, the entire animal can be placed on the vehicle and taken out alone. Hunting in this way has led it to become a more male-focused activity, negating the need to involve the rest of the family, and breaking up traditional community processes.

Tourism

There are two types of tourism in affect here: 1) tourism to the Yukon by visitors from the outside; and 2) tourism from the Yukon to other parts of the world by Yukoners. Both have positive and negative implications.
Tourism is a very important cornerstone of the economy in the Yukon. It not only provides many jobs that allow people to be on the land in a positive way, but the fact that these jobs exist, provides an economic argument for keeping nature pristine and not knocking it all down for forestry or mining purposes. It promotes the natural beauty of the region and allows visitors to connect to the wilderness in such a way that they may not be able to at home, in places with less natural and awe-striking features. The downside of this is that it is a very carbon-heavy industry – from getting to the territory, to the means of travelling around it. While in its place, it seems positive, it is contributing heavily to climate change on a greater scale.

“And that is why I am so annoyed by the tourism industry, saying “well, we’re better than the oil industry or planning”, but tourism is completely dependent on cars and trucks and... and are, you know, the fruits of a lot of industrial landscape change. And you know, if I was living in a region, I would prefer it to be a tourism region over a mining region, but with it being a tourism region, I know there is a mining region somewhere to compensate. Or oil and gas. So... ya, I find people are somewhat hypocritical when they talk about it. Like the tourism group in the Peel – which is one of the groups of people that want to keep it in a natural state – is dependent on a hell of a lot of oil and gas from the people from let’s say, Florida, then up here to go see the wilderness, so you have to back your philosophy up to a very high level and say, ‘we’re all in this together’” (Interviewee #18, interview, 29 Nov 2010).

“The tourism industry – we tend to forget about that – it’s kind of a tough one because this type of tourism that a lot of them are advocating is this huge rubber tire RV tourism, which I would argue is not necessarily ecotourism, but at the same time, they have a very strong vested interest in ensuring that all of the viewscapes are protected, that there’s not huge industrial sterile mining. Some of the more extreme ecotourism, going for a week long hike in Kluane, that sort of thing, some of the rivers leading away to the North as canoe able, that sort of stuff, so those organizations. So the Wilderness Tourism Association of the Yukon – now that’s not Haines Junction specific, that’s Yukon-wide – but they, I think, have quite a positive voice” (Interviewee #8, interview, 19 Nov 2010).

The same argument can be made for Yukoners that travel. Due to the remoteness of the Yukon itself, and especially of the communities, today’s Yukoner tends to travel often (and there are even income tax credits that support travel out of the Yukon).

“Living where we live, you can’t make them all of the time. [Good ecological choices.] Because we have to travel away from the Yukon, so we either have long drives or we’re on an airplane. And as soon as you’re doing that, you know, it’s not such an environmentally good thing. And so, by living remote, and still being... and I think that’s a big change in the 35 years that I lived here, is that most people will go travel now... If you’ve got time and money, then you could get there much quicker than you used to be able to... I think maybe in the mid 80s, late 80s, I really noticed um, it that everybody was would talk about “oh where you going this winter?” I don’t know if I would say trendy, I would
think with trendy it was trendy 10 or 15 years ago and now it’s just the norm. I don’t think it’s trendy anymore it’s the norm” (Interviewee #27, interview, 6 Dec 2010).

But aside from the carbon footprint that it leaves, Yukoners who travel say that they always come home refreshed and more appreciative of their home, no matter where they go.

**Federal Transfer Payments**

The northern territories are heavily subsidized with incentives to keep people living there, predominantly to maintain national security in the far north, and to maintain and develop resources. Territorial monies received in the form of federal transfer payments are the reason that there are so many government jobs and the reason that most of the territory is affluent. This affluence has two opposite effects. In many regards, it allows people to make more sustainable choices because they are not subject to economic vulnerability and do not have to make trade-offs. On the other hand, these extra jobs back up the efficiency of the system and allow these affluent Yukoners to be more frivolous with resources (e.g. numerous vacations). This driver often goes unnoticed but plays a very important role.

6.2.4 Summary of Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Summary of Drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YESSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders/individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political controversies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One observation is that primary positive drivers emphasize participation, on the land or in public processes; they foster values/respect (elders) or lend themselves to creating awareness/education. Secondary positive drivers can be considered support structures, either for further educating/fostering ecological values, getting people on the land, or providing infrastructure to support environmentally-friendly behaviour. Negative drivers either remove people from the land or encourage them to make choices centered on greed and short-term gain, over respect and long-term vision.

The primary elements that are seen to have both positive and negative effects are those that have mandates that are too large or conflicting. This can be overcome with conscious consideration of a stronger mandate that balances all goals. The secondary conflicting elements could be mitigated with infrastructure, support, and clearer guidelines to oversee activities in a way that lessens harm, and still maintains their positive contributions.

6.3 Feedback Loops

A benefit of the systems approach is that it acknowledges the complex dynamics that go beyond cause and effect models. As we know from the literature, many components within a system operate through feedback loops – a closed system of causal connections that either continuously reinforce (e.g. a downward spiral, or runaway growth) or that aims to re-balance/seek stabilization (e.g. a thermostat). Often in society, we find more reinforcing loops at
play – both positive and negative. We must take the time and effort to build in social mechanisms that create balance, but this takes being aware of which functions require a restorative mechanism, and then putting forth the energy to implement them.

Interpretation of the interviews has identified many feedback loops in the GKR system, as they center around ecological citizenship. Most of these feedback loops are triggered by the drivers already discussed, which trigger certain actions and behaviours that start acting in a loop of other reinforcing behaviours. Some of these loops are new, but all are related to one another in some form. Most are in relation to actions and behaviours.

6.3.1 Climate Change

The feedback loop of global climate change is obvious and relevant in the GKR system. While the “loop” portion of this process occurs at a global scale, many impacts from this loop occur regionally. In the past 50 years, the Yukon has lost 22% of its glacial cover due to climate change (Reid, 2016). Four percent of glaciers in KNP&R surge (meaning they sometimes move relatively rapidly as water gets between the ice and the ground) and may move up to a mile in a month (Reid, 2016). In 2016, the Kaskawulsh Glacier retreated enough that its meltwater switched from flowing out the Slims River to Kluane Lake and ultimately to the Yukon River, to flowing south to the Alsek River, greatly reducing the height and flow of Kluane Lake. Another important regional example is the effect on the Dall Sheep population, whose numbers were dropping for many years with no understanding to why. It was
later discovered that climate change was affecting the growth of primary alpine species within their plant-based diet, therefore affecting the availability of food, leading to lower birth rates (Nadasdy, 2003). These are just two of many impacts of climate change.

However, the feedback of this cycle is doing much more than causing detrimental environmental effects; it is also driving social change. As the results of climate change are becoming obvious, people are realizing the importance of making more environmentally-friendly choices in all aspects of their life. While in this respect, it acts as a driver, it would not be so fundamental had it not been attached to a reinforcing loop that will tend to cause greater change, increasingly driving this message home. The hope is that this awareness will act as a leverage point and lead to enough action to balance the state of this global system.

6.3.2 Hunting, Trapping & Fishing

Hunting and trapping, (and for some, fishing) are particularly important activities to people of the Greater Kluane Region. While trapping tends to be a revered activity of the past or happening on a smaller scale, hunting culture remains strong. There are many feedback loops relevant to these topics – both those in terms of today’s actions, and those related to perceptions of possible foreseen events.

There is a general concern amongst the hunting community about the state of wildlife populations in the Yukon – particularly, of moose. Within some groups, low moose populations are blamed on wolves; for others, on development and the Highway. The governance concerns around moose populations are described more in section 6.5, but what we can see are certain behaviours that are taking place because of these lower populations. Primarily, hunters are driven further into the backcountry to get moose, which is causing disturbance of naturally
undisturbed areas. While backcountry access was noted as a vulnerability of the system, driven by the development of access roads for mining and logging, and amplified by snowmobiles and ATVs, the main reason for their use is not just for pleasure riding, it is to hunt. Hunters are going deeper into the woods on their machines to get the moose they have more difficulty finding in the front country, which is leading to further population disturbance.

For many in the region, hunting is their main connection to the land. It is what brings them out into the wilderness, and it is perceived that the act of being able to do this, is what makes them care about their land. There are an increasing number of factors that are making hunting in the Yukon vulnerable: lower wildlife populations, increasing regulations, decreased personal time, increased variety of available activities, and increased access to other affordable meat. Many hunters are convinced that some larger force is trying to stop hunting altogether, and they believe that this is the first step to losing the vast wilderness here altogether.

Figure 6-3. The effect of a lowered moose population becomes negatively reinforcing when hunters go deeper into the woods to find more moose.
"What I really worry about is that First Nations culture is just going to get hammered. And the outfitting industry. Once I am not allowed to hunt anymore, or so restricted that it’s just not worth going out, which does happen. They’re done. Because there won’t be the political world to keep them around. No matter how much money there is, people just won’t be interested in having them out there anymore. I don’t think... there’s a lot of them that don’t understand that. It comes back to this real protective thing. None of the outfitters want any locals around where they hunt or anything like that. They’re trying to push you out… they’re trying to do a whole bunch of stuff to keep you out. And it’s all because there isn’t a moose behind every tree anymore. There isn’t a caribou behind every tree. They’re pushing you out because it’s just human nature to protect every little thing you have left. And after us, they’ll be the next ones to go. And then the First Nations population, they may be able to pull off a community hunt every once in a while, or … but there’ll be nothing left and then we’re all miners and oil workers” (Interviewee #32, interview, 7 Dec 2010).

This could be said not just for hunting, but for all land-based activities, especially activities involving wildlife and other species. This fear is validated by the evidence of populations diminishing in all areas, fish included.

"you know, even though we accepted that it was necessary [to add more fishing restrictions] – he’d always say, “we’ve seen the best of it”. And I say that to my kids now. We have seen “the best of it”. We’re falling into that road to diminished expectations. You know, “the good ol’ days”. Everybody’s good ol’ days are different, but as generations go, the good ol days aren’t as good as they used to be. What you’d expect is a far cry – if you were talking about hunting and fishing and all those sorts of things – is a far cry from what’s topnotch now” (Interviewee #38, interview, 15 Dec 2010).

There is a widespread acknowledgement here that people and wildlife go hand-in-hand and the hunter-prey relationship is a major reinforcement of this fact. Once that connection to
hunting/trapping/fishing is lost, there will not only be less motivation to keep wildlife habitats alive, but also less reason to take note of their abundance.

6.3.3 Time on the Land

As was previously noted, time on the land is a central driver for ecological citizenship. For some, it is the essence of ecological citizenship itself. While it acts as a driver for other elements in the system, it also works to reinforce itself.

Simultaneously, the same effect works in reverse, when people start spending less time on the land. As with hunting, as less time is spent, there is not only less desire or motivation to protect, and less ability to be on the land, but less awareness of what might need protecting.

This loop may be balanced by inserting a leverage point for education. Education about the environment in an off-land setting may help to restore levels of awareness and respect, but some would argue that no level of formal education could ever replace the knowledge learned and connection built from being there in the first place.
6.3.4 Postmodern Lifestyles and Developments

In today’s postmodern world, there are many feedbacks that work to reinforce a gradual slide away from an eco-centric lifestyle. These are mostly triggered by the design of our economy and reinforced by desire. As we can see in the first loop here, as we take on more hours at work, it gives us less time to take care of traditional duties (cooking a meal, growing and gathering food, etc.), we end up purchasing more things in the marketplace to make up for this time, and in return, are further indebted to the need to work. Due to the Federal transfer payments and the generally higher wages in the Yukon, this “hamster wheel” effect is often less prevalent, but still a reality. However, the spin-off of this reality in many other parts of the world has led to the development of a marketplace for cheap goods and services. A combination of media and marketing, and the ability to acquire many goods and services at low prices, has led to an increased desire for and possession of these goods. The most relevant to this study are food choices, entertainment technologies, and cheap travel.

As each individual absorbs more of the comforts of modern society into their daily routines and behaviours, turning back becomes more difficult and less desirable – even if it is

Figure 6-8. Increased costs of living lead to a necessity to work more, and therefore a necessity to consumer more time-saving goods and services to save the time spent working.

Figure 6-8. Desire for more leads to further consumption, and therefore further desire for yet more.
causing an adverse effect in the long-run. People have proven time and again to choose their own selfish desires over greater good of the environment. Of course, this is not often a conscious choice. Fulfilling these consumptive desires is not out of any direct desire to cause a detrimental impact. It is a different desire altogether, which has a residually negative effect. Due to the design of our current marketplace and economy, it is very easy to make poor environmental choices, and often difficult to make more positive choices.

To overcome this will require government intervention – with new rules and regulations to modify not only our behaviour, but also to modify the marketplace, and restrict and regulate what is available to the public. As was discussed in Chapter 5, this is a deeply emotionally struggle for many – they want more for themselves and their children, and they think many of these choices (e.g. driving from Haines Junction to Whitehorse four times per week to play hockey) will give them something better. In the end, will it really? Government asserting larger control over some of these choices would reduce this internal struggle. Of course, handing over this level of control could also be a slippery slope, and must be handled with care.

6.3.5 Engaging Citizens

Inserting the mechanisms to help shape environmental behaviours is a difficult task, and highly controversial. What I consistently found in my research was the importance of education and inspiration, over regulation and restriction. Fostering participation and empowerment was key to all positively conceived actions and behaviours of the “good ecological citizen”. Regulation and restriction was still noted as necessary for the outliers who had not been impacted by more positive influences, but was regarded as a last measure. Community values and inspiration from community members were seen to be a key positively reinforcing motivator.
Moreover, many actions and behaviours are said to be spurred by some sort of educational component (formal, informal, or experiential) that drives awareness of the need for certain positive behaviours, therefore creating a desire to act. If we can find functional avenues to inspire awareness and education, it can lead to driving a thirst for more knowledge and awareness and in turn lead to more positive actions and behaviours.

While it was noted that enforcement and restriction may be necessary, it was also noted that any act that keeps people off the land has a negative effect – whether or not it was considered to be for a good

**Figure 6-10.** Leadership in environmental activities inspires further action within community.

**Figure 6-11.** Knowledge gain drives knowledge gain, with a side effect of behaviour based on that knowledge.

**Figure 6-12.** Integrating regulations that keep people off the land drives further negative environmental behaviours, not the opposite.
purpose. Allowing for inclusion and participation (in combination with education) encourages individuals to care for their natural spaces and make more positive decisions regarding them.

Not only should inclusion and participation be considered on an individual level, but we must consider inclusion in the greater aspect of group dynamics. Good co-management processes achieve good results. Learning to work together in a respectful and co-operative manner fosters a positive atmosphere

Figure 6-13. All-inclusive participatory models for environmental decision-making leads to respectful engagement in processes and respect for the decisions being made. It drives people to participate more in the future, and therefore improve the skills they bring to these processes.

Figure 6-14. There are multiple intersecting reinforcing loops at work in teamwork dynamics, all centering around ideas of cooperation and respect. If teams cooperate, this leads to respect for others within the team. These two components can only be achieved through strong communication skills. A dynamic of cooperation and respect then allows for strong collaboration to occur. When all interested parties are included in the conversation in a respectful manner, results are imminent. Results often lead to further respect, and therefore a better ability for further future collaboration.

for collaboration and comprehensive problem-solving. At the center of these processes is the skill of communication and the approach of open-mindedness/inclusivity.
Cooperation can only be achieved when it is driven by respect. Only when there is cooperation can there be collaboration. When collaboration leads to results, it drives the desire for further collaboration and results. When results are achieved, it leads to increased respect for all parties involved, therefore driving the ability for further cooperation and collaboration.

6.3.6 Overview of Feedbacks

The important feedback loops affecting EC of the system fall within 5 categories: climate change, hunting/trapping/fishing, time on land, postmodern lifestyles, and citizen engagement. These are all reinforcing loops, some with positive and many with negative effects. Some are natural processes, and some are human processes. Many refer to internal human behaviours. In general, negative reinforcing loops can be countered with education and increased time on the land (when it is driven by respect). Information and regulatory devices should outline appropriate land-based behaviours for different ecozones. Respect and care are seen to follow as a result of just being out, especially if one is informed about the land and animals with which they are interacting. This should be coupled with engagement in political processes from all members of the community. Inclusivity and collaboration have been seen to drive the development of strong co-management policies and processes.

6.4 Scale, Influence & Control

Understanding cross-scale interactions in the social-ecological system is seen as increasingly important for addressing human-environment issues. “Scale challenges are pervasive, and the misconception of scale is part of the explanation of why societies throughout
history have faced challenges of sustainability” (Cash et. al, 2006: 2). I would argue that the lack of attention on internal drivers is a scaler issue, and a current gap in addressing sustainability.

If we reflect upon the hierarchy of ecological citizenship in 6.1, we can see that the actions and behaviours of citizens are influenced by the institutions of the wider system and by their own personal virtues. Often approaches to sustainability are considered from one side or the other. In environmental management and governance, as well as public policy, we often consider structural approaches and external drivers to behaviour. In psychology and philosophy, we consider ethics, virtues and internal drivers of human behaviour. Rarely do we consider practices that merge internal virtues and external institutions. An ecological citizenship approach provides a landscape by which we can bring these two scales together and evaluate impacts on the scale in between: the external actions and behaviours of the citizen. First, I begin by evaluating the various scales of institutional factors. I discuss how these can be seen to influence virtues. I then scale up to reviewing the broader forces of control in the system.

6.4.1 Scale

If we refer to Figure 5.4 in the previous chapter, we can see that the key elements that affect virtues are pervasive across all scales: citizen-level internal processes and everything beyond. In the following chart, I have organized all major elements in the GKR/EC system both by spatial/jurisdictional level and by temporal rate of change. These levels are a general determinant of how fast the elements within each scale move and by what relative speed they can impact other elements.
Table 4: Institutions, Events, and Processes by Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Global / National</th>
<th>Territorial</th>
<th>Regional / Local</th>
<th>Citizen</th>
<th>Virtues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>- Climate change</td>
<td>- UFA</td>
<td>- CAFN FA</td>
<td>- Elders</td>
<td>- Ecological consciousness/awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fed policies</td>
<td>- YTQ</td>
<td>- KFN FA</td>
<td>- Influential</td>
<td>- Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; regulation</td>
<td>- YCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>individuals</td>
<td>- Responsible and conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Federal</td>
<td>- YFGA</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Time on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>- Goods &amp;</td>
<td>- YESAB</td>
<td>- RRCs</td>
<td>- Land-based</td>
<td>- Good waste management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commodities</td>
<td>- LUPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>behaviours</td>
<td>- Ecological economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Snowmobiles</td>
<td>- Stewardship/taking care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Travel trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; ATV use</td>
<td>- Diversity &amp; inclusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>- Fuel prices</td>
<td>- TV</td>
<td>- Spruce beetle</td>
<td>- Day-to-day</td>
<td>- Connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mineral</td>
<td>- internet</td>
<td>- Champagne</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>- Participation &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prices</td>
<td>- video games</td>
<td>flood</td>
<td>- Food choices</td>
<td>leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fur market</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Glacier surges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Factors of Change and Transformation

- Ecological events
- Technological change
- Access & development
- YT autonomy politics
- Environmental legislation changes
- Land/resource-use controversies
- FN autonomy & voice
- Co-management processes and NGO creation
- Industry changes
- Demographic changes
- KNP&R mandate changes and relationships with community
- Land-based lifestyle politics
- Changes in cultural values and identities
- Societal norms & pressures

The general pattern of scale can give us some insight into how certain elements affect citizens: those higher in the hierarchy typically move slower and have a longer effect, those lower in the hierarchy move faster and have a shorter-lasting impact. Determining which variables to leverage for change depends on which level of change we would like to affect. If we
want to act fast, we must look to make changes to fast factors at the citizen level. If we want to create longer-lasting institutional change that will trickle down to citizens in the future, we must implement these in accordance with the slower moving variables at the top of the hierarchy.

Since Devolution, the territorial scale is the level with the most impact on the system overall. While many other national and global-level components are making impacts on the day-to-day thoughts, opinions, and behaviours of citizens in the system, environmental institutions are governed by the structures of the Umbrella Final Agreement and decisions made by the Yukon Territorial Government. Industry and organizations operating at the regional level have the greatest effect on citizens and their relationships to land and nature. The citizen-level offers an array of activities and behaviours that are as diverse as the citizens themselves. These activities reflect a commitment to virtues of ecological citizenship – which people choose to adhere to within every decision they make.

While this is a fluid system, the institutions within it are relatively stable. However, often trends or events will create change within the system, possibly, transforming it and its institutions to behave differently altogether. While it is important to be aware of the key drivers and at which scale they operate, it is equally important to be aware of the key factors of change and transformation that could reorganize the flow of the system. These factors are fundamental (for altering them, means altering the entire system) and are reflected in multiple scales.

A better understanding of scale ultimately provides a better understanding of the design of the system. It makes us aware of which players are inside the control of the system, which lie outside, and how quickly they change. Understanding scale is important, but understanding influence and control is even more important.
6.4.2 Influence

Reflecting on behavioural trends of citizens can help to identify the overall influence that the structure of the system may be having. Behavioural trends were shared in interviews and are summarized in section 5.2. It is believed that evaluating these behavioural trends can offer some insight about the broader structural influences of the system, and their effect on fostering/diminishing virtues of ecological citizenship.

Trends in actions and behaviours (from 5.2) have been linked to the identified factors of change (from 4.3 and listed in Table 3). These trends have also been linked to the virtuous characteristics (identified in 5.4) that these actions and behaviours express. We can utilize these trends as the link between evaluating how certain factors of change affect virtues of ecological citizenship (see Figure 6-14 below). Linking these factors to virtues allows us to home in on the importance of certain systemic elements that are often missed by neglecting to consider virtue development in the development of systems and institutions.

Figure 6-15. The links between virtues and factors, are the actions and behaviours that we see play out as a result of them.

Following this line of reasoning, we can infer which factors affect the development of which virtues. Utilizing an ecological citizenship approach to governance means framing our governance strategy in such a way that it fosters the 13 virtuous characteristics of EC outlined in section 5.4.
A review of trends in behaviour (as identified in section 5.2) can help us to understand if the current system has been successful in fostering ecological citizenship. When asked generally about the behavioural trends that interviewees had seen to have taken place in the past 50 years, responses could be grouped into 10 areas of positive trending behaviours (section 5.2.1) and 11 areas of negative trending behaviours (section 5.2.2), which are grouped in Table 5, below. Believing that these changes in behaviour are due to changes in the system, these trends have been linked to groupings of events and processes that were determined to be “factors of change”. Each behavioural trend has been assembled in the table below, in conjunction with the corresponding factors that had been identified to affect them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors of Change</th>
<th>Trending Behaviours and Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological events</td>
<td>Heightened Awareness/Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Increased ability to maintain subsistence lifestyle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological advances</td>
<td><strong>Increased flows of communication and ability to attain information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Reduce, Reuse &amp; Recycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of No Trace / Less litter</td>
<td>Heavy housing and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YT autonomy politics</td>
<td>Political and Industrial Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Characteristics in italics refer to trends that were not referenced explicitly by interviewees, but which were clearly implied, illustrated in the interviews.
Environmental regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental regulations</th>
<th>More responsible hunting practices</th>
<th>People disobeying environmental regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of No Trace/ Less litter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental political conflicts, and significant events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental political conflicts, and significant events</th>
<th>Political and Industrial Changes</th>
<th>Heightened Awareness/Consciousness</th>
<th>Increased Participation</th>
<th>Change in views and values</th>
<th>Increased co-operations</th>
<th>Personal politics stand in way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FN voice, involvement, autonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FN voice, involvement, autonomy</th>
<th>Increased promotion of FN culture</th>
<th>Increased Participation</th>
<th>Yukon Government is falling behind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-management processes & NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-management processes &amp; NGOs</th>
<th>Increased Participation</th>
<th>Increased Cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Change in views and values</th>
<th>Change in views and values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KNPR relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNPR relations</th>
<th>Increased Participation</th>
<th>Increased Cooperation</th>
<th>People disobeying environmental regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trapping & on-the-land lifestyles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trapping &amp; on-the-land lifestyles</th>
<th>Heightened Awareness/Consciousness</th>
<th>Environment is less part of lifestyle/dependency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final two transformative factors have been left out (changes in cultural values and societal norms and pressures), as these are processes that have changed over time, affect all described behaviours in multiple ways, and would be difficult to leverage from a governance perspective.

Each of these trending behaviours can also be seen to fit within the already identified categories of virtues, as in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Virtues Representing Behavioural Trends and Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virtues of the Good Ecological Citizen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trending Behaviours and Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness; Strong value system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heightened Awareness/Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in views and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased promotion of FN culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More individualistic/selfish/consumptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledged dependence on nature</th>
<th>Increased promotion of FN culture</th>
<th>Change in views and values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respectful of environment</td>
<td>Evidence of No Trace/ Less litter</td>
<td>More mechanized access/ more driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible and conservative</td>
<td>More responsible hunting practices</td>
<td>Heavyer resource users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of No Trace/ Less litter</td>
<td>Heavy housing and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More responsible home development</td>
<td>People disobeying environmental regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper waste management</td>
<td>Reduce, Reuse &amp; Recycle</td>
<td>Political and Industrial Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of No Trace/ Less litter</td>
<td>Ethical consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical consumerism</td>
<td>Ethical consumption</td>
<td>Responsible home development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible home development</td>
<td>Government is falling behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship/Taking care</td>
<td>Evidence of No Trace/ Less litter</td>
<td>Not being good stewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More responsible hunting practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heightened Awareness/Consciousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in views and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>Increased promotion of FN culture</td>
<td>Less connected to natural world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competing with Modern World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less part of lifestyle/ dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in views and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Increased Participation</td>
<td>Personal politics stand in way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operation</td>
<td>Increased Co-operation</td>
<td>Personal politics stand in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in views and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Inclusivity</td>
<td>Heightened awareness</td>
<td>Personal politics stand in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased promotion of FN culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, teaching, promoting understanding</td>
<td>Increased Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Promotion of FN culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aiming to find a connection between the factors that have an impact on helping or hindering the virtues of ecological citizenship, behavioural trends have been used to bridge the two. To do so, I merged Table 5 (behaviours and factors) and the components of Table 6 (behaviours and virtues), so that behavioural trends met in the middle, connecting factors and virtues. I then removed the behavioural trends altogether, so I could now see which virtues directly linked to which factors of change. (This intermediate step is messy and is not shown here, as it is difficult to bring together in a clean and comprehensible chart.) We can now view the results in one of two ways: from the point of view of virtues, with the associated factors of change that encourage them; or from the point of view of factors, and the impact that they have on certain virtues. Each variation is displayed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Virtues and Corresponding Impactful Factors of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consciousness; strong value system</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping and living on the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN voice, involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledged dependence on nature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN voice, involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping, living on the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respectful</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible and conservative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proper waste management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YT autonomy politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical consumerism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO EVIDENCE OF CONNECTING EVENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stewardship/Taking care</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping, living on the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviro regs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNPR relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-management processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNPR relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN autonomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this perspective, the GKR system does appear to foster many of the virtuous characteristics of good ecological citizenship. We can see that the strongest support for consciousness, waste management, stewardship, participation, cooperation, diversity, and education. There is slightly less support for encouraging an acknowledgment of dependence on nature, respect, responsible use, and connectedness to the natural environment. There are no formal structures in place to promote ethical consumerism.

Not only does this table tell us about the state of the system today, it gives us the knowledge of which factors may be used as leverage points. When we see them coming, we can either utilize these factors to foster transformation or put functions in place to diminish the effect they may have. Using this data to inform leverage points is more easily conceived in the following chart, with the factors and virtues relationship viewed from the opposite direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Factors of Change and Corresponding Virtues they Promote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecological events</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political conflicts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trapping/living-off-the-land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effectiveness of these factors is valued in relation to the plurality of virtuous characteristics that they promote. Under this assumption, Table 7 illustrates the effectiveness of the various classes of factors based on the number of virtues they point to. From this table, we learn that the order of their effectiveness is as follows:

1) Events/processes that give FNs autonomy and a voice.

2) Environmental regulations/enforcement and co-management processes.

3) Environmental events that create political conflicts, events/processes affecting land-based activities, or processes that affect relationships with the Park.

4) Ecological events, changes in demographics, access and development, and politics regarding territorial autonomy.
For a fuller picture, these can now be considered in conjunction with the informal institutions that have been identified to more closely influence the individual citizen: influences from parents, elders and community members, and time spent on the land. As well as more formal processes, such as environmental education and enforcement. Merging ideas about formal and informal institutions that affect the development of ecological citizenship offers us a potential new hierarchy of influence for understanding the development of EC from a systems point of view. See Figure 6-16, below.

**Figure 6-15**: Individual citizens and their development as ecological citizens is influenced primarily by parents, elders, and community members; secondarily by time on the land; education and enforcement; and then events and processes.

6.4.3 Control

Although fostering ecological citizenship may lie at the center of our goals, we must consider the impact of other non-citizen components to attain a holistic view of the system. The social/citizen component is just one part of a nested system that includes greater political and economic forces. If the social structure were truly democratic and individuals wholly good,
fostering ecological citizenship could provide the entire solution; for good ecological citizens would ensure good ecological decision-making. However, because the decision-making structure is not wholly democratic, there are other components to consider for strong environmental decision making than that of citizens alone. We must understand more about who holds the decision-making power, and what motivates their decisions.

The story of shifting power and control in this region is an interesting one: the impact of federal government representatives coming in and out of the territory in the early days, and sending direction from Ottawa; the imposition of the Game Sanctuary on FNs and other local people, and then new restrictions with the erection of the Park; the ongoing clash of top-down approaches imposed from YTG on the communities; and various “outsiders” coming in and out, trying to push values, trends, or “know-how”. The ongoing drive for autonomy from Yukon and FNs people is an important element of the storyline.

The signing of the Umbrella Final Agreement completely restructured all decision-making processes in regard to the natural environment, and was considered by interviewees to have the largest effect on “ecological citizenship” of all other formal processes and institutions that took place in the territory. While decision making authority is mostly still in the hands of the Territory (except for on FN settlement lands), the UFA determined a new decision making process that offered more public input and participation and greater levels of oversight in regard to decisions about the environment. The signing of this agreement is believed to have offered a restoration of justice in many respects – to both the land and to a people that lived of and with it for generations. While the processes that evolved out of signing this agreement did lead to more FN people spending more time in offices and less on the land, it also brought elements of FN culture to lands management and the rest of the political landscape of the Yukon - a culture of
co-operation and respect. It gave autonomy not just to the local governments and communities, but to the people, by encouraging new processes of participation and feedback at a citizen level. This multi-tiered citizen-based approach to governance has been recognized as revolutionary. It lends itself well to a study of ecological citizenship here, because it offers the structures said to foster EC.

But aside from its many positives, its execution is not without fault. While there are multi-layered processes for citizen participation, final decision making is still executed from the top. Territorial government representatives have the final say on most issues and the values of those elected determine what controls the system. The Yukon Party was in power during the time of this research and was observed to be guided most often by business interests, especially from mining and land development. In this respect, it can be said that mining was at the top of the hierarchy of influence, followed by YTG, and the UFA, and all of the boards and regulatory devices that were created from the UFA followed. This opinion is controversial, as there are mechanisms in the UFA to help curb unwanted development pushed through by YTG – but this requires the energy and resources to pursue litigation.

6.4.4 Leveraging Scale, Influence, and Structures of Control

From a governance perspective, understanding power structures defines pathways for leveraging change. While this study focuses on systems and institutions, it does so with particular attention to how these affect citizens. The actions of individuals in our free society cannot legitimately be controlled by government or other agencies, but their day-to-day activities can be influenced based on the programming available to the region. Because the study area populations are so small, there is a much easier capability of swaying actions towards certain
events. These could be considered the easiest points of entry. In reference to the hierarchy diagram of Figure 6-15, the most influential is through the teachings of elders and other leaders in the community. Due to the size of these communities, individuals are noticed. If one can find ways to work in partnership with the leaders of these communities, this will be the fastest route to transformation or change – if it is seen to be needed.

While considering the relevance of leveraging each individual component is important, an arguably more effective route is to take note of the wider processes at play – the transformative variables – and consider how to make alterations within them. Finding an outlet for transformative change will trickle through all scales and therefore provide a larger effect on the system than through one variable at a time – especially if it affects more than one transformative variable. We can see this, for example with the Umbrella Final Agreement, which instilled political autonomy and co-management processes.

A further acknowledgement to be made when we are considering aspects of influence and control, is that due to our more global and modern world, the number of outside influences is much higher than it has been in the past. Technology, media, ease of travel, and affluence all spark desires for a faster-paced life, and most often one that is not connected to land and nature. It is harder than it has traditionally been to give purpose to connections and care of the land, when its role in our lives is much less apparent. We are no longer carrying water, we do not need to hunt or fish for meat. To influence the perceptions, actions, and behaviours of the individual, we must pay attention to the few variables that are maintaining the connection to land in these modern times. And these can be considered the events that have the most impact. Here, that is time on the land, education/experience, and community leaders.
6.5 Chapter Summary

To understand pathways for fostering EC, it is useful to consider the hierarchy of ecological citizenship, whereby it is driven by both internal virtues and external institutions. The external drivers perceived to have positive effects on EC in the region are those that foster or support participation, respect, and/or awareness. Negative drivers are considered those that remove people from the land and/or encourage decision-making based on greed and short-term gain, over respect and long-term vision. When considering more complex dynamics, such as feedback loops, almost all challenges at all scales can be overcome by leveraging education, and positive processes can be furthered by leveraging co-operative and inclusive engagement. The territorial government has the highest level of decision-making control over land and resources, but institutions at the regional and community levels are of most impact to citizens and their relationships with land and nature. To bridge this gap, attention is required in regard to decision-making autonomy within co-management processes. Overall, current institutions and processes do seem to be successful in supporting the virtuous characteristics of EC, but more support is still needed, particularly in regard to addressing consumer goods. The increased pressures of society driven by many elements of postmodernity have added another level of complexity to the questions of governing for good ecological citizenship.
Chapter 7: Synthesis

This chapter synthesizes the lessons learned in previous chapters and summarizes the three central discussions that have evolved out of this thesis. It focuses first on conceptual ideas about ecological citizenship. Second, ecological citizenship is discussed as a goal for environmental governance, elaborating on four themes that have evolved out of interviews. Third, the case study is revisited, whereby strengths and challenges of the region are discussed, in regard to support for fostering ecological citizenship. Recommendations are made for how environmental governance may be improved in this regard.

7.1 EC as a Pathway to Wellness and Flourishing

Sharing conversations about ecological citizenship and its many facets have offered deep and valuable results. The complexity of the term itself offers many avenues from which to embrace it, and its relative youth as a field of study has left room for further interpretation. This section introduces a new definition of the term, engages in a discussion of EC as a “tapestry”, and concludes with an exploration of the possibilities it offers as a discourse and a concept.

7.1.1 Introducing a New Definition

Upon hearing the term “ecological citizenship”, it spoke to me in a fundamental way, offering what I thought might encompass many of the deeper elements of the human-environment dilemma that are too often left out of dominant conservations on the subject. And while the literature has provided a wide embrace of many of these topics, I have still found current definitions of the term to continue to be somewhat limiting. Although they are often descriptive and all encompassing, they are deeply rooted in political theory and layered in
Looking to provide something that might be easier to embrace, I have come to a new descriptive definition: “Ecological citizenship is a way of understanding oneself as an actor in the natural world with rights, responsibilities, and a moral obligation that extends beyond human society.” This definition has been composed through careful consideration of the opinions of Yukoners, highlights from the literature, and my own opinion.

In the political literature, “citizenship” is distinguished by at least three aspects: status, rights, and identity (Jopkke, 2007). While these characteristics still remain as central pillars to EC, reframing them based on my results leads to slight changes in terminology. The “status” component evolved first to “membership”, as a more inclusive form of discourse, and then later to “community”, as a more appropriate and colloquial fit for how these concepts have been discussed in practice. As presented in section 5.1, “responsibilities” were seen here to be just as important as “rights” (if not more) when discussing this type of citizenship. The identity component remained strong in each interpretation, and deserved to be brought to the forefront. You can see in the breakdown of my definition how these components have been established:

1.) Identity: “a way of understanding oneself as an actor in the natural world…”

2.) Rights & Responsibilities: “…with rights, responsibilities and a moral obligation to…”

3.) Community: that extends beyond human society.”
I have come to find even more meaning in considering this concept visually, through a reference to “pillars” and “virtues”. The Venn diagram in Figure 7-1 displays the three “pillars” of EC described in the definition. These pillars encompass the broad foundation from which all else stems. In the spaces where these pillars intersect are the “virtues” of ecological citizenship. While the pillars are inherent in citizenship, the virtues set the precedent for “good” ecological citizenship and bring balance to the system. These provide context and purpose to the term, bringing it to life by outlining the central actionable functions that lead to ecological wellness and human flourishing.

The beauty and brilliance of this term reveals itself through the ambiguous and unassuming nature that it provides, whereby defining it any further might bring more harm than good. It leads us to more questions than answers:

**Identity:**
- Who are we as human people?
- Who are we as ecological beings?
- What factors have shaped us and our relationships?
- What do we associate belonging to?
- How do we identify ourselves in relation to our environment?

**Community:**
- Extends our concerns to recognize those of the biological community
- What is our role…
  …as humans in the biosphere?
  …in our social communities?
  …in our families?
**Rights & Responsibilities:**
- Includes exploring not only judicial rights but moral rights
- Regards a change in attitudes and behaviours
- Refers to broader issues, like distribution and access
- Reframes our way of thinking around concepts such as “animal rights”

As one can see, my interpretation of the term is relational in nature. I am interested in the ability that utilizing this terminology offers to reframe perspectives on fundamental issues; therefore, I find myself referring to current themes, and questioning how this outlook allows them to appear differently. While it may not present a definitive form, I believe the central opportunity that it does provide, is its ability to offer a discursive space whereby one can ask broad questions about humans role in the environment and the politics that abound these questions. Latta (2007: 381) shares a similar disregard for bounding this term to any one form:

> My contention, is that a narrow focus on this approach, a preoccupation with outlining particular visions of an ecologically enlightened citizenship, has muted the democratic sensibility that citizenship might bring to the politics of nature… proponents of green citizenship clearly recognize the need for debate about the exact contours of environmentally sustainable futures… There is a sense in which the democratic element is bounded by attempts to devise theoretical answers to the question of what ecological citizenship should look like, rather than asking the more open-ended question of how nature can be politicized as part of the politics of citizenship, and vice versa.

While I am interested in the conception of what actions and behaviours best support the envelopment of the good ecological citizen, my fascination with the term is how it can encompass, describe, and inspire so many similar ideas, while leaving itself open to varying interpretations on all scales. The form from which ecological citizenship is seen to take is not necessarily relevant. It is the discussion and the unique worldview that such a discussion can implant that makes it so powerful. **Figure 5-1** describes the themes that presented themselves as a result of discussing the embodiment and definitions of ecological citizenship: consumption habits, conservation of resources, resource distribution & property rights, attitudes and behaviours, perceptions of the environment, rights and responsibilities, ecological knowledge,
consciousness/awareness, stewardship and restoration, identity, sense of place, respect, participation, hunting and harvesting, community affiliations, interdependence and interrelationships, ethos and ethics, connectedness, culture, and reciprocity. All of these can be attributed to one or many of the pillars or virtues represented in the Venn diagram.

7.1.2 Ecological Citizenship as a Tapestry

Though I began the interview process with the conception that ecological citizenship was somewhat of a sliding scale - whereby there were outstandingly “good ecological citizens” on one end and shockingly “poor ecological citizens” on the other - this point of view really began to shift as I progressed through the interview process. I began to realize that there is often no one “good” ecological citizen, but that the population is a tapestry of genuinely different citizens: all with ecologically positive and negative characteristics and behaviours, that can only in rare circumstances be labeled as completely good or completely bad. “There is no such thing as the right green attitude, since there is no such thing as the right sustainable society” (Arias-Maldonada, 2012: 167). Not only are there many types of citizens, there are also many levels which this term refers to: the citizens themselves and their internal drivers, the actions and behaviours in which they engage (both individually, and in support of greater change in the system), the political and institutional structures that support them, and all layers in between.
On the individual scale, environmentally-engaged Yukoners can basically be characterized by one of two stereotypes, and variations of and between them (see Figure 7-2). On one side are the resource-users, on the other, the lighter land users and preservation-oriented residents. Amongst these, are different levels of consciousness and understanding. The resource users consist mainly of long-term residents that have been in the territory for multiple generations, both of First Nations descent and descendants of early European explorers, traders, or those that stayed from the gold rush. The group that I class as “preservation-oriented” are often those that have immigrated to the territory in the 1970s or later and are involved with the Park or other tourism-based industries. While they have different approaches, both would consider themselves conservationists.

The “resource users” can be considered to have stronger ties to the land: they are hunters and gatherers, relying on the land for consumption and survival, and see themselves as part of the landscape with a direct impact on it. The “preservationists”, while often leading deeply environmental lives, are slightly more removed. They choose to cross-country ski, canoe, etc., and participate in “softer” land-based activities. They are often more affluent and politically involved. Though they are still consuming resources in some form or another, many of these resources are imported and are not directly connected to the landscape in which they live. They believe themselves to have a lesser impact, however many of them travel extensively; their carbon footprint is heavy due to this, and that they are importing desirable goods from other...
areas of the world. They often look at the resource users as “hicks” and heavy fuel consumers. But while these resource users are carbon heavy in their locality, regularly using snowmobiles, ATVs, and larger vehicles to complete their land-based activities, they are also living their lives more locally and not travelling as widely.

While the extremes of both groups tend to be critical of one another, they both possess positive and negative qualities which make it difficult to judge either as more “right” or “wrong”. Often, those who stand somewhere in the middle, do recognize this (Interviewee #27, interview, Dec. 6, 2010):

"When I use motorized access, I use it to get from point A and point B, it’s not about the journey in between, it’s about to get from here to here. And many people are different about that. So there are people that use it and they find joy in that, and I don’t find joy in that. So it’s personal. But it’s also ethical... but I struggle to say that because I find it so hypocritical because of what else I do. It is a consciously ethical choice in some respects, but it’s almost hypocritical because I drive to Whitehorse 4 days a week. So the damage I might be doing by that versus if I motorboat on a lake, how can I say that one is right and one is wrong? Ethically, I don’t want to do it when I’m in a more pristine nature environment. I don’t want to be putting the motor there. But when I’m on the road, it’s okay. And really, it’s not, it’s all sort of the same thing. But my motor is to get me from A to B.”

The preservationist-types are often formally educated, while resource-users have often found their education informally, through experience, observation, and spending time on the land. The preservationists here want to protect their “pristine” environments by standing back and letting them remain “natural” and undisturbed; resource users actively manage and interact with their environments, aiming to conserve their resources for the direct purpose of survival. While there are certainly those that over-consume and do not consider the future, the majority here are respectful of ecological limits and attempt to maintain limits to their levels of consumption. While the preservationists may directly interact less with their resources, they are often more politically involved and play a large role in limiting destruction by industry and other
outside elements. They write to the newspaper, they advocate for more protection, and they slow government processes and encourage more thoughtful decision making.

Clearly, both (and all forms in between) are beneficial. What must be at the forefront then, is respect and cooperation. Though it may be difficult to reach consensus, there is certainly a positive element to everyone living amongst one another and participating in different forms. Where one group may be falling short, the other can pick up the pieces, and vice versa. The most important factor is that there is conversation, care, and concern for the environment as a whole. Evidently, it could be said that relationships with the natural environment are what the entire Yukon culture is built upon. Controversies may run deep, but the extent of these rivalry are out of care (and perhaps some misunderstanding) – apathy is certainly a non-issue here

(Interviewee #14, interview, Nov. 25, 2010):

“In my experience here, people are fairly polarized on their interests. The resource users have limited understanding and tolerance of the values or interests of the non-motorized travelers. And conversely those… that want to ski and hike and climb mountains aren’t the hunters and resource users that I know. So I would say that within each of those groups though, there are good environmental, good ecological citizens, because people are doing the three things that I said: they’re attending meetings of the local resource counsel, they are staying informed, they are sharing their opinions, and they are changing how they behave to reflect their values.”

It must be noted that while the reflections and responses of this interview sample were deep and meaningful, they were not wholly representative. I chose interviewees particularly for their involvement in environmentally-related institutions and initiatives, and although I tried to acquire a diverse range of parties, each of them was a leader in some form. They were mostly articulate, deep-thinking people, with strong attachments to the land, nature, and their communities. Due to their roles in the communities, I believe that insights from these select individuals do hold weight, although I recognize that they do not necessarily reflect a complete representation of the motives and behaviours that do take place here.
While there is an obvious appetite for ecological citizenship, historical evidence shows that not all citizens in Yukon are good ecological citizens, or necessarily even on the scale of getting there. While it seemed unfathomable to the many that I spoke with that a conservative government with its nearly “anti-environment” views could keep being re-elected term after term, it does say something about the population that resides there. However, voting decisions are not necessarily fully representative of environmental views and values only. Many alluded in interviews to the fact that Kluane Region residents are mostly living environmentally-engaged lives, and based on my time there, I would say that most in the rest of the territory are as well.

For the ecological citizenship discourse to fulfill its potential, one must be open minded about how the good ecological citizen may appear. Humans are composed of many different skills, personalities, attributes, and approaches and all deserve respect. It is by pursuing our full potential with purpose and pride that we will achieve flourishing lives (Younkins, 2003, in reference to Aristotle); how these potentials are brought into formation will be different for all. Only by recognizing the value in our differences and cooperating amongst them, will our society be able to thrive, both from a human and an ecological perspective.

7.1.3 Opportunities of “Ecological Citizenship” as Discourse and Concept

Upon seeking pathways toward environmental wellness and human flourishing, there are many opportunities that can be derived from speaking and thinking in terms of “ecological citizenship”. First and foremost, it moves us away from the pitfall of “othering”, whereby we speak to “solutions” as if humans are completely separate entities from the natural environment. Its underlying assumption is that we belong to a greater community that involves natural beings and asks us to envision how society may look in respect to this assumption.
In this regard, it offers a deeper more fundamental conversation about how we view politics and polity. When discussing ideas of “citizenship”, ecological citizenship could be argued to be its truest form. It involves many layers of relationships, connections and identity, and goes well beyond the essence of constructed political bounds. It involves rights and responsibilities to one’s human community, as well as its surrounding biotic and abiotic communities. Through our very existence, we live and breathe our rights to the Earth, offered from the carbon sequestering of the plants and our access to food and water; and though it takes conscious work in this modern life, we can live our responsibilities just as simply.

Being a part of our environment, a part of our home - is innate. Ecological citizenship offers a space of understanding that is not necessarily political in the traditional form of politics, but is a common space where gender, nationality, and ethnicity do not have to matter. It is our culture, our food, and possibly, our entertainment. Our places make us unique, based on the resources around us that we need to live and the places we go in our day-to-day activities. It is the truest form of citizenship, because it is recognizable and understandable, and inherently fundamental to all beings.

Although the term “citizenship” is political by nature, it does not always have to be legal in nature. Going beyond this may provide for more meaningfulness. It lends itself to a deeper and more all-encompassing discussion than is provided by almost any other space regarding the environment and our future. It grounds us in a discussion of values, of rights and responsibilities, and of connection and identity. It offers an opportunity to frame conversations in a new realm, about a new way forward; providing us with not only a truer path to ecological sustainability, but a path to a flourishing human existence.
It asks us to reflect on our role as individual citizens, but also to look at how we can unite and come together as one. Citizenship is not a static identity, but an ever-evolving process, morphed by struggles of power. Posing questions about whether our systems foster good ecological citizenship, questions the very processes that allow us to participate and be involved within the broader systems that structure our lives. It inherently questions autonomy, power, and relationships, and lends itself to discussions of these topics on many scales. The human-environment dilemma is complex and requires a broad landscape such that “ecological citizenship” offers to engage in meaningful discussions about pathways forward.

Not only does it speak to the multi-scalar complexity of these issues, but it offers a space whereby a discussion of virtues can lead these topics. Leading with virtues offers universal guidelines that do not discriminate against the variety of approaches by which to fulfill them. For example, there are many avenues by which to embrace respect, diversity, and inclusiveness. Due to this, designing approaches to governance that center around virtuous principles is necessary for finding resilient pathways to wellness and flourishing.

7.2 Governing for Good Ecological Citizenship

This research has been built on the premise that the field of environmental management, and the discourse of sustainability within it, are not achieving their goals because the spectrum of what they encompass are too limiting. Primarily, they are missing a central component about the human-nature connection. Engaging in conversations about ecological citizenship was intended to bring to light some of these gaps and point to important topics that might be missing from current approaches.
This research was intended to explore these conversations in Kluane, and not to make broad inferences about what institutions could and should support and foster ecological citizenship elsewhere. However, the results have undeniably pointed to four broad factors that deserve elaboration.

Based on the results of this research, if the goal of fostering good ecological citizenship was at the center of approaches to environmental governance, then they would encompass four central components: (1) embrace diversity; (2) foster three central virtues: awareness, participation, and respect; (3) consider multiple scales and build from the bottom; and (4) provide appropriate infrastructure and support.

7.2.1 Embrace Diversity

Ecological citizenship is about more than just individuals, it is about community. There must be consideration for not only the natural environment and our non-human companions, but the diversity of humans and human-values that encompass each community/system. A strong and resilient system is one that is bonded by multiple interconnections and interrelationships. To encourage this plurality requires strengthening relationships between humans and humans, and between humans and non-humans. (It also requires strong bonds between non-humans and other non-humans, but this is something outside of the scope of this project.) Strengthening these relationships requires embracing a diversity of views and viewpoints and being inclusive. Embracing diversity is the key to resilience (Stockholm Resilience Centre, 2019). This requires understanding that individuals are unique, and everyone has something special to offer. It is about being open minded, moving beyond tolerance, and embracing a plurality of views. It provides a space where hunters and gatherers, preservationists and policy makers are all regarded
of equal value. This requires creating a culture of respect, whereby fostering strong communication and co-operation skills are central components to moving forward.

7.2.2 Foster Awareness, Participation, and Respect

At the center of all conversations about ecological citizenship and how to promote it has been three central tenets: awareness, participation, and respect. Awareness can be fostered, for example, through formal or informal education, including experience and observation, and through marketing and awareness campaigns. Participation can involve simply spending time on the land or participating publicly in dialogue/decision-making. The scale is broad when it comes to playing a role in one’s human-environment community. Fostering participation refers to promoting any and all activities within various scales. It also refers to providing the structures of support that allow people to participate in all scales of processes (i.e. providing alternatives to technologically-based voting systems for non-tech users; or assisting the physically challenged on to the land.) Respect is the most central virtue and is the most dominant. It is the most universally understood, but the most difficult to describe. Keeping respect (for the natural environment and its processes, for fellow human beings, the future, etc.) at the center of all decision-making is a simple strategy with rippling effects. (See, for example, Clark and Slocombe, 2009).

7.2.3 Consider all Scales and Build from the Bottom

Citizenship is a multi-layered construct. It is about individual citizens within a certain membership or community, but more importantly, it represents the united vision that connects them. This is what makes citizenship so relatable and applicable to strategies for governance. A
good governance strategy recognizes and oversees the diverse institutions within its reach but connects them in such a way that they operate toward a common goal. Governing for good ecological citizenship requires a multi-layered strategy that considers impacts on the lives of individual human and non-human citizens, as well as the multiple functions operating at all scales that touch these citizens: jobs, the marketplace, leisure activities, culture, government functions, etc. It is about not only governing in a way that fosters good ecological citizenship among people, but also in a way that includes a number of self-evolving, self-flourishing mechanisms that allow citizens to be at the center of these processes as they evolve – making decisions democratically and participating in the development of their future.

This approach must not only consider all elements and functions, but also the relationships between all of them – aiming always to strengthen these relationships and build a stronger overall system. This is where elements of systems theory become an important consideration. Ecological citizenship is complex and requires a comprehension of multiple scales and dynamics. Namely, it requires attention to three scales of goals that require consideration to achieve good ecological citizenship:

1.) Build virtues at the citizen level; consider how these are demonstrated through attitudes and behaviours;

2.) Construct ecologically-virtuous institutional structures and processes (options for consumer goods, transportation infrastructure, community services, etc.); and

3.) Enable a truly democratic structure of governance.
7.2.4 Provide *Appropriate* Infrastructure

*Building Virtues.* The research has shown that there are many more important and influential components that contribute to building values in the day-to-day lives of humans than formal institutions. The most influential are family and community values, learned through lessons from elders and influential community leaders. Next are education and experiences. This included time on the land, and ceremonies such as culture camps and programs for healing, as well as institutionalized forms of education, through schools. Mental health and addictions are also considered to have a strong effect on human-environment relationships. To this end, facilitating meaningful pathways to sustainability may mean strengthening societal infrastructure that is not traditionally associated with the natural environment: family assistance, healthcare and wellness support. It also means integrating environmental programming throughout the educational system and through other agencies, such as naturalist clubs, etc. Providing a diverse system of support and engagement will be especially useful to those who may find it difficult to engage in such themes at home. It also helps to establish permanency and represent long-term goals. With the potential for community values to become less visible and influential as populations grow, integrating formal institutions that can maintain these values and virtues are important to establish alongside this growth.

*Constructing virtuous societal structures.* These are the infrastructure and institutions that facilitate people’s day-to-day practices and operations. In the example of GKR, it means ensuring that all 13 virtuous characteristics (section 5.4) can flourish. Measures should also be considered to counter negative impacts, such as reinforcing loops that might dilute connections to nature. A combination of strong education and awareness campaigns, mixed with regulation and enforcement, are considered to provide the ability to overcome many negative elements.
Citizens must be provided with both the alternatives to make positive choices and the supports to overcome the broader forces that encourage more negative behaviours (i.e. the ability to meet basic needs, such as safety and security). Conflicts and challenges must be embraced as opportunities for learning and bringing people together to solve problems and move forward.

*Enabling truly democratic structures of governance.* A resilient system self-manages and self-supports. In a resilient governance structure, hierarchy is enabled to delegate and re-direct inefficiencies, rather than to pursue power and abuse control. If the history of the Yukon has shown us one thing only, it is that land and resource-based decision-making autonomy is best in the hands of the lowest possible level. If citizens are supported in such a way that they are able to make good decisions, both independently and co-operatively, allowing them to do so will lead to the most optimal results.

The central component to facilitating good ecological citizenship is a governance structure that promotes and facilitates stewardship, wellness, and empowerment, through collaborative democracy.

### 7.3 Assessment & Recommendations for Yukon and the GKR

Considering the broad lessons highlighted above, this section returns to the case study. It offers an assessment of the strengths and leverage points of the Greater Kluane Region in regard to fostering ecological citizenship with its current formal and informal institutions. It reflects on the vulnerabilities of this system and its governance challenges. Finally, it provides recommendations for the GKR, and Yukon more generally, about how environmental governance structures could be improved to better promote ecological citizenship in the region.
7.3.1 Strengths & Leverage Points

There are obvious strengths possessed by this system that have led to its choice as a case-study region: large intact landscapes, an interesting history, active First Nations communities, extensive land-based job opportunities, and unique co-management approaches. However, one cannot understand the true power that these components hold without engaging in conversation with the people who live here. Connections to the land and nature run strong and deep. Even in those who don’t outwardly express it, volumes are spoken by the way in which they live their lives. This is true for most inhabitants of the Greater Kluane Region, regardless of their heritage. However, the presence of First Nations communities and the relatively new development of their modern self-government provides extended opportunities to rally around, by which there is room to build structures for a more deeply embedded eco-centric future.

The Umbrella Final Agreement provides a particularly special piece of oversight and guidance that is relatively unique to the territory. It considers all structures of an eco-centric life, from lands management and planning, to housing and education. It uses democratically organized structures that encourage collaboration and co-operation, utilizing a series of public processes and co-management boards operating at various scales. It lays the groundwork to develop autonomy and support for First Nation communities and self-governments, but more than that, it offers a wider environmental voice for the entire territory. The development of the Regional Resources Councils (RRCs) that came out of this are one of its most impactful components. They offer the opportunity for local people to be deeply involved in decisions about resources and provided with the education and support to do so in a good way. The ability to participate in the RRCs has been considered very enriching and valuable to the members that have been able to engage in these processes.
Kluane National Park & Reserve is becoming increasingly accepted by the community, especially since the introduction of the Healing Broken Connections program. As awareness grows about environmental devastation and destruction in other parts of the world, and development continues to increase throughout the territory, people are generally coming to understand the importance of setting boundaries for long-term protection and conservation. Having an internationally recognized institution for protection of natural areas right in their backyard brings a level of consciousness to the communities that would not be there otherwise.

The abundant wilderness and large tracts of intact landscape allow people to live lives that center around the land, through tourism, resource-based industries, or the Park. The wildlife population, while possibly declining, is still abundant enough to support many local people’s annual meat consumption. Wilderness surrounds these communities in all directions. The interface between humans and nature is inevitable and entrenched in daily Yukon living.

These factors lend themselves to fostering strong virtues of ecological citizenship, and therefore supporting resilience and sustainability.

7.3.2 Vulnerabilities

While the Greater Kluane Region has many strengths, it also faces various challenges and vulnerabilities. Ecologically, it is facing a number of effects from climate change and access and development. Socially, it is still heavily dependent on support and imports from outside of the territory and region and struggles to find balance among its heavily institutionalized governance structures.

The spruce beetle outbreak of the early 2000s has led to a significant level of standing deadwood in forests within the Haines Junction area and is considered highly vulnerable to forest
fires. Efforts to “fire smart” this area have not been considered successful and have led to other challenges. Enlarged forestry operations have increased access to the back country with logging trails. Simultaneously, spikes in gold and other mineral prices have encouraged mass levels of staking and exploration, and therefore the creation of further access trails. This has been exacerbated by increasing levels of ATV and snowmobile ownership and use – which use these industry trails, and then often go further.

Wildlife populations are of great concern. Particularly ungulate species that are important to hunters. Of chief concern are moose populations, whose decline is yet to be diagnosed. Tachal Dall Sheep have shown a vulnerability to climate-related changes due to their sensitive alpine habitat and reliance on select vegetations. Other climate change-related concerns are those in regard to glacier movement. The melting and surging of glaciers are having some effects on watercourses. There is a concern that large sheets of ice will come to block waterways that have been traditionally important for fishing, etc. and opening up new flows in other areas.

At the time of this research, there was no regulation in regard to ATV use, which was referenced considerably in interviews as needing to be addressed. At this time in 2019, there are regulations in development. Interviewees expressed that there was a considerable lack of enforcement for all conservation regulations. It is difficult to know if this has been addressed.

The territory’s heavy dependence on fuel further drives effects from climate change. The remoteness of these communities and the increased desire for travel between them and to Whitehorse, as well as to other areas of the world, have created a heavy fuel footprint for Yukoners. Furthermore, a large part of the economy here is based upon tourism of many kinds, which requires even more fuel consumption for the visitors to which they provide services.
The Yukon economy is heavily reliant upon investment from exploration, mining and other controversial funding (such as the annual Dall Sheep hunt, which raffles a hunting tag within the Kluane Game Sanctuary, to the highest worldwide bidder), as well as large federal government transfers. The territory is also heavily dependent on outside consumer goods, especially for food. Given this fact, they are especially vulnerable to individual decision-making, as there are no measures in place to curb poor economic consumption habits.

Considering that most decision-making control is in the hands of their elected territorial representatives, Yukoners and the land/resources around them, are also vulnerable to the values and interests of these elected representatives.

7.3.3 Governance Challenges

Not unlike other places, this system is embedded within several governance challenges. Some are particular to this region, while others can be considered common: a need to balance multiple perspectives, interests, and actors; lack of integration; trade-offs between development and conservation; expressions of local and self-interest; distrust/dislike of government, and of environmentalists; institutional cost-cutting/seeking efficiency; and the challenge of inconsistent rights/responsibilities for FN/non-FN citizens.

While the need to balance multiple interests and actors is a common challenge of management, it is especially challenging here due to the multitude of formal institutions and layers of government. There are four levels of government, numerous co-management boards, community groups, and non-governmental organizations. The strength of this is that there is room for all voices at the table and all perspectives are often heard. The difficulty then, is determining the best approach for any particular challenge based on this multiplicity of views.
The regional resource council model has proven to be very successful for bringing multiple positions to the table and working through various perspectives to collaborate on best approaches. The problem has been in seeing these visions through at every scale and getting through to the decision-making powers at the top. It appeared that often, decisions have already been made behind closed doors long before the communities have had the chance to deliberate on them.

“We participated with our staff in Environment with some of the forest planning work, you participate and you allocate people’s time and you go to meeting after meeting after meeting, and in the end you really wonder if your participation or the energy that you spent was even worth it because it seems there were already foregone conclusions. No matter what concerns you raised, they were trumped by safety concerns and you look at the policy or plan that’s come out and you wonder where all of the effort went, because it’s just a standard kind of forestry plan. The most valuable wood gets harvested, even if it’s dead or not, even if it’s good moose habitat or not. You know, for all of the talk, the plan... the roads that were going to be closed are suddenly left open because there’s some rule or liability issue you know, so all of the promises, “yeah, we’ll close the access down”, those constraints get left out in the end” (Interviewee #21, interview, 30 Nov 2010).

Expressions of local and self-interest from those at the top are often a bigger problem here than the challenges of co-operating over a variety of diverse views.

The large number of institutions and co-management processes require considerable contributions of time and energy from local community members. The population from which to draw is small and this high level of demand leads to a heavy burden, and for some, burnout. During my period of research here, it was obvious that many were still enthusiastically involved in the processes and appreciated the ability to learn and participate. However, this participation appeared to be driven from hopefulness that the processes would improve; there was an underlying sense that participants were not feeling validated enough for their efforts. This is not sustainable for the long-term and may lead to hostility and then lack of future support. The people involved often care too much about the issues to give up, but it seemed that there will
soon be some rebuttal if territorial authorities do not provide more consideration of input from local community participants.

It is processes such as these that have led to dislike and distrust of government. Yukoners in general are a culture of free-spirited individuals with a strong sense of personal autonomy and independence of mind. The frontier mentality is still embedded in today’s culture and there is a general dislike for “outsiders” of all kinds imposing their ways of life upon locals – especially from government. An ongoing battle for autonomy has led to many improvements, but it is clear that this fight is not over. While territorial control is considerably better than federal, regional autonomy is considered even more valuable. This is yet to be established.

Another common challenge is the ongoing trade-off between economic development and environmental conservation. “Despite this limited population, there is growing pressure to expand resource-based activities such as forestry, mining, and even agriculture, and to improve and expand tourism and related service facilities and infrastructure. The struggle to find a balance between such development and environmental sustainability has been ongoing in the region for at least 30 years” (Slocombe, 1990) – and still continues today. Interviewees that were or had been involved in RRCs believed that this trade-off did not need to exist. They were confident that they had a strong enough understanding of the land that there could be ways to develop economic activity in a way that maintained ecological integrity and the goals of conservation. Yet opposing functions of territorial government have difficulty finding this balance and often pit one off against the other.

The conservative powers that had ruled the territory since devolution had been most favourable to industry, and during the time of my research, support for this was obviously ending. In 2016, a new liberal territorial government was elected. This government has been
said to hold slightly more progressive views than their conservative counterparts, but they have engaged in little in terms of progressive action to date. While they are not outwardly anti-environmental (which was often argued for the past government), they have not been very proactive either. They are not pushing for industry, but they also do not wish to ruffle any feathers. And with this, the dismissal of the role of government in the Yukon has remained.

While it is not true for all Yukoners, many (especially trappers), have a strong dislike and distrust of those who identify as “environmentalists” – especially those “outsider environmentalists”. Many are of the opinion that environmental groups that demonize land-based activities in the name of animal welfare often do more harm than good. The impact of Greenpeace campaigns on the fallout of the trapping economy has led to a suspicion of all “environmentalists” and preservation-minded individuals and activities. As the necessity for protected spaces is becoming more obvious, this opinion is becoming fewer and far between, but this is still a notable challenge for environmental managers and governance efforts, and must be considered for attaining community buy-in.

Another recognizable challenge is institutional cost-cutting and efficiency seeking. Although there is a large sum of federal transfer funds sent to the Yukon, there appears to be a shortage of funding delegated for environmental programming. It is the opinion of many that a large amount of funding is delegated to government workers, and there is too often a shortage of funding for the actual projects they are involved in. Non-governmental organizations especially find themselves lacking the support required to complete endeavors to the degree of success for their satisfaction. Particularly, they find it difficult to find support for longer-term projects.

The most noted challenge is the lack of integration across all institutions and forms of agency in the territory. Most agree that all of the right institutions are in place and are fulfilling
appropriate mandates, but there is no overarching strategy or unified vision about how they come together. There is a lack of cumulative affects assessments and lack of a stratified long-term plan. Some regions in the territory have completed land-use plans that have addressed some of these integration issues, but this region has not.

A final consideration is that due to the arrangement of land claims agreements, First Nations and non-First Nations citizens have different legislative rights and responsibilities.

“The Kluane First Nation people are allowed to hunt within that National Park where as nobody else in the free world is allowed to do that. Just that one exclusive right and then you multiply, when you go through the agreement, there’s multiple agreements like that regarding forestry, fishing. So the ecological integrity is I guess put, almost at a higher level for First Nations’ peoples because they have more of a right and access to those things, and that’s why when I said at the beginning, you learn from your elders. Like if you catch 100 fish, you have to be able to do something with those fish, you can’t just waste them. And if you can’t do something with them then don’t catch them. It’s just, yeah, so there’s kind of these elder’s teachings installed in you as you’re growing up that make you, I guess an, a good ecological citizen” (Interviewee #25, interview, 1 Dec 2010).

Because of their greater freedom, First Nations communities may feel they are required to hold themselves to a higher set of standards to maintain ecological integrity – because there is no legislation to set limits on them as there is for non-natives. Non-native communities must be able to trust that these personal standards can and will be maintained. While most respect these freedoms in theory, many long-term non-FNs residents are resentful of these new rules for other reasons. They feel it divides their communities. Many of the longer-term non-FN residents in this area grew up hunting with their FN friends. They were able to commiserate together when the Park implemented regulations to keep all locals out – the government was seen as the problem, but the people here were one in the same. As FN were allowed back in the Park and all others weren’t, this changed the social structures of these joined communities, because they could no longer participate in the activities that their friendships were built upon.

Overall, it appears that the Greater Kluane Region and Yukon Territory are positioned in such a way that maintaining environmental wellness is possible, however some changes could be
made in order to bypass simply “sustaining” current states and embrace a model of flourishing. Reflecting on the four principles of governing for good ecological citizenship, we can see that the current institutional structure of the GKR is meeting the first two (embracing diversity and fostering virtues of EC) and struggling with the others (considering all scales and providing appropriate infrastructure). Diversity is being embraced and there are numerous institutions and structures positioned to promote awareness, participation, and respect. The greatest weakness of the governance structure here is its embrace of participatory democracy. While many institutions are in place to support strong community participation, recommendations from these local levels are too often ignored. There are many institutions contributing strong environmental research and raising healthy public awareness campaigns, but there is a lack of integration and planning to give this work verifiable purpose.

7.3.4 Recommendations for Kluane and Yukon

Based on this study, there are three major recommendations that would lead to a stronger overall governance regime for fostering ecological wellness and human flourishing.

1. The Yukon Territorial Government should embrace an environmentally-supportive vision and create an awareness campaign that celebrates the specialness of Yukon’s ecological integrity. This would offer something by which to unite its citizens and provide consistency to its mandate.

2. An overarching environmental governance strategy is needed that integrates the efforts of all environmentally-related institutions and guides all citizens to live a life of ecological integrity
through a balance of planning, education, and regulatory devices. This would consider impacts at all scales. It would include social devices to support better home and community lives and comprehensive regional land use plans that balance conservation and development. These plans would be created in conjunction with a comprehensive monitoring plan that allowed for evaluation and ongoing improvement. It would integrate an appropriate level of education and enforcement to ensure the goals of this plan were kept intact. It would bring together the efforts of all environmentally-related territorial institutions and utilize the range of their skill sets and visions. Finally, it would consider several broad devices to guide national/international elements that affect local citizens, such as consumer goods and imports. This could be composed by a coalition body that had members at the table representing all current institutions. Careful consideration would be required to ensure that a balance is maintained between the role of this oversight body and the integrated role of citizens at the community level. Additionally, this plan should address 4 major concerns:

i. A wildlife support strategy, addressing ATV use and habitat protection legislation.

ii. Increased legislation regarding the responsibilities of mining operations.

iii. Infrastructure, support, and legislation of consumer goods.

iv. Improved land-based enforcement, through an increase in Conservation Officers.

3. The entire environmental governance structure requires re-organization on many levels. While most of the necessary institutional functions are in place to support a strong and democratic co-management regime (the wildlife management board and regional resource councils, the land-use planning council, and the environmental socio-economic assessment
board), there is too much authority left to territorial government representatives for final
decision-making. Public research, participation, and input must hold more weight.

Regional resource councils have been proven to be an effective resource and must be
given more autonomy, authority, and respect in land and resource-based decision-making
processes. They could also require more support to aid in the improvement of communication
and co-operation skills so that their contributions can remain effective when new board members
are integrated in to these councils.

The operations of the territorial government can sometimes be considered top-heavy,
leading to inefficiencies on many scales, particularly over-management and interference with
community-based processes that would otherwise be working well. Overall, less management
from the top and more support for regional/community-based processes is considered optimal for
moving forward.

How to particularly go about implementing these suggestions is outside of the scope of
this research. While the UFA enables much, it is also seen as unalterable. Its all-encompassing
nature provided a strong template for holistically improving environmental governance in the
territory for many years, but for this same reason, as a better understanding of the needs of the
territory are established, rules are bound by old processes, which are tied to the constraints of
constitutional and comprehensive claims law, and therefore difficult to alter. More research is
required about future steps to make the necessary adjustments.
Chapter 8: Summary & Reflections

This final chapter presents a short summary of the thesis and its results. It elaborates on the contributions of ecological citizenship as discovered throughout this research and summarizes how this might contribute to current streams of literature. Reflections are made on the research process, the results of this research, its limitations, and other conflicts and contradictions that were identified. Ideas are presented about possible future research and concluding thoughts are shared.

8.1 Summary

This thesis explores the term ecological citizenship and uses a wilderness-based case study to examine the institutions and processes that have fostered or diminished acts and behaviours of good ecological citizenship over a period of time. It draws predominantly on the results of 39 in-depth interviews, which explored conceptual ideas about the term ecological citizenship and provided insight to the various events and processes that have shaped the ways in which citizens in this region interact with the land and nature.

Ecological citizenship has been described in this thesis as a way of understanding oneself as an actor in the natural world with rights, responsibilities, and a moral obligation to something greater than human society. This language has been chosen for both its multi-dimensional nature and its address of the human-nature connection, that is seen as too often left out of current conversations. The nature of a citizenship approach offers the ability to explore human-environment dynamics from multiple levels: the individual citizen, their communities, and the multiple layers of systems in which they are embedded. It is a fluid concept and refers to a transitional process as much as it does the goal of getting there. It does not aim to prescribe a
certain way of being but offers a space by which to explore the human-nature relationship and all of its political embeddedness. Ideas about ecological citizenship are seen to encompass three conceptual pillars: identity, rights/responsibilities, and community; and are guided by three central virtues: awareness, respect, and participation.

An assessment of environmental governance in Southwest Yukon, in respect to its ability to foster good ecological citizenship, has revealed rich and interesting results. It has identified the complexity of human-nature relationships (from the human perspective) and how these are affected by both internal perspectives (referred to as “virtues”) and external institutions. These relationships are defined by actions and behaviours regarding consumptions habits, time and activities on the land, environmentally-related political contributions, conservation of resources, acts of stewardship, and ecological knowledge. Individual conceptions of EC are tied to ideas about ethics, identity, sense of place, connectedness, interdependence, culture, community affiliations, resource distribution/property rights, and perceptions and attitudes.

There are three components that have been identified as the most important elements for fostering virtues of ecological citizenship: time on the land, broadly, environmental education (formal or informal), and family/community values. The top three institutions and processes considered to hinder good ecological citizenship were all responsible for separating humans from nature in some way and reducing time on the land: the economy and postmodern lifestyles, technological advancement, and bureaucracy.

Aspects of systems theory have been utilized to analyze and explain the many complex elements that have influenced human-nature relationships in the Greater Kluane Region, through a review of drivers, feedback loops, scale, influence and control. Overall, the GKR system is believed to show considerable institutional support for good ecological citizenship; however, it is
not seamless. There are many unique processes for co-management, providing exemplary models of participation and collaboration. There is also a strong culture of respect for the natural world, which allows these processes to thrive. However, the Yukon Legislative Assembly holds the final decision-making power. It does not always consider decisions based on results determined from these co-management processes, or the greater good of its constituents.

In terms of the issues, many elements of the Kluane story are not unique. While the setting provides many interesting sub-plots, its tale remains the same. As society “advances”, the desires of postmodern living have disrupted relationships with land and nature. Technology and development have offered many opportunities, but they have also changed communities and the functions of society. Often, they have put a barrier between humans and their natural environments, disguising interdependencies and severing relationships. These developments have all been driven by broad economic forces fueling the allure that more is better.

What is unique about Kluane is that there are still large tracts of intact wilderness and that many people there do still truly live wilderness-oriented lives, despite many changes. The fact that First Nations communities have only recently settled land claims also provides an interesting element. As Western society is becoming more conscious, open-minded, and more enthusiastic about environmental issues, the value of First Nations culture is more obvious than before. Respecting FNs and reinstating their power offers the ability to realign approaches to daily environmental practices, to learn from the deep generational knowledge and spirituality of FNs and use this knowledge to guide us towards a more ecologically-positive framework. Because development reached Yukon so late, the ecological culture here never died enough that the FN story needs resurrecting from generations of past. It can carry on, true and renewed, with guidance from those still alive from earlier times, working together with the innovativeness of
newer generations. The fact that FN communities here are only just beginning to evolve their self-governments and community plans allows for many opportunities.

In this same regard, the territory benefits from the holistic approach of a FN-related agreement (UFA) acting as the central framework of environmental governance for the territory. However, despite the uniqueness of the UFA, the struggles regarding its implementation are not unique. People still grapple with bureaucracy, top-down control, and the self-interested motives that have been entrenched in old-time party politics. Yukoners still struggle to find balance between conservation and development and continue to learn how to communicate, co-operate, and approach new conversations with respect, learning, and betterment for all.

8.2 Literature and Contributions

This research contributes to three areas of academic study and literature. It contributes to environmental governance, in so much as it questions current approaches and offers an alternative framework for inquiry. It contributes to social-ecological systems theory, as it further exemplifies the opportunities provided by this approach and offers yet another example of how it can be utilized. Primarily, it expands on ideas about ecological citizenship.

The concept of ecological citizenship is considered powerful because it is a multi-layered construct that offers both an alternative discourse and an approach to governance. In this sense, it is similar to systems theory, which encourages people to think holistically and embrace complexity, but also provides some tools and frameworks by which to analyze and embrace this complexity. Ecological citizenship encourages people to consider sustainability-type conversations from a more holistic and relationship-based perspective and can also be used as an approach to governance.
8.2.1 EC as Discourse

As can be seen in the discussions coming out of interviews, utilizing the EC discourse has unveiled complex results that center around relationships with land and nature. While many attributes of postmodern society have taken their toll on human-nature relationships, it is critical that we begin to consciously re-acknowledge humans as but one species in a complex world of many and start using language that reflects this.

Biodiversity and ecological health are important to humans not just for survival, but for overall health and happiness as well. (And their ability to flourish.) This must be the central message for future approaches to the management of environmental spaces that include humans. As I see it, this can be done by rejecting the desire to find “sustainable” solutions for our current ways of living, and to re-center our approaches in a way that looks to nourish the virtues of good ecological citizenship at the center of all goals.

8.2.2 EC as Approach

When I started this thesis, I was interested primarily in the opportunities of ecological citizenship as a discourse. While there were references to it being an approach to governance throughout my research, the essence of this only became obvious to me in the later stages of writing. “Ecological citizenship” provides more than a number of valuable talking points, it also points to a citizen-centered approach to governance. This approach recognizes that the goal of environmental institutions should be to foster ecologically-rich lives for their human citizens and those closest to the land should be the ones with the highest level of decision-making authority.
It puts human-nature relationships at the center of its approach. It promotes connections to nature through awareness and participation and bases all decisions on the ability to foster respect for the natural world. It goes beyond crisis-state decision making and problem-solution situations and embraces a wider vision for a better world where humans can flourish within healthy and sustainable ecological systems. Above all else, it puts citizens first. While current methods of environmental governance often consider many elements of a citizen-first approach (including components of participation, etc.), they usually don’t use the language of citizenship to approach them.

EC can be used to consider both impacts on the individual citizen and the results of the broader structures that affect society and its citizenry. Often approaches to sustainability are considered from one side or the other. Institutionally, we consider structural approaches to environmental management and governance, or public policy measures to guide citizen behaviour. In psychology and philosophy, we consider virtues and internal drivers of human behaviour. Rarely do we consider practices that merge internal virtues and external institutions. An ecological citizenship approach provides a landscape by which we can bring these two scales together and evaluate impacts on the scale in between: the external actions and behaviours of the citizen.

8.2.3 Current Environmental Literature

From my perspective, there seem to be two very distinct fields of environmental literature. Literature that is human-centered and values-based, and literature that is administrative and management-oriented. While both certainly have their purpose, I wonder
why there have not been more attempts to merge the two. Is there room for policy with heart? For regulation embedded in understanding and care?

Many would argue that the purpose of environmental conservation was lost when the dialogue shifted away from philosophy and ethics and closer to management and sciences. The ideas of early environmentalists (the Thoreaus and the Leopolds) had much to offer, but the landscape has changed dramatically. Arguably, it has lost its depth; its heart. While I can understand the intellectual arguments for leaving behind deep ecology and social ecology, I still believe that ideas from these fields deserve to be resurrected in some form. Perhaps ecological citizenship could provide a space that offers more balance; whereby we can consider approaches for oversight that embrace the depth of the human-nature relationship. Acknowledging the importance of deep emotional motivations will be a key component for change.

Certainly, the “sustainability” literature needs to be rethought. It is no longer an appropriate discourse for addressing solutions to the state of our environment, as the underlying assumptions that have become the word will never allow us to achieve a sustainable world. More recently, the term “flourishing” (Ehrenfeld, 2016) has been presenting itself in various frameworks. While it has been used to address environmental wellbeing, it has also been used to address social and economic wellbeing as well. This may be a more appropriate term that could address similar concerns of those explored through the ecological citizenship lens in this thesis.

8.3 Reflections

The development, research, and presentation of this thesis has been an interesting journey. This sub-section reflects upon this process and its results – it considers outcomes, possible contradictions, and valuable lessons learned along the way.
8.3.1 Am I satisfied with the results of this research? What stands out most?

Completing the interviews for this thesis offered an unforgettable experience. Each and every interview provided new interesting elements; all were unique and enlightened in their own perspectives. The overall results were well beyond my expectations and I came away feeling that this process had provided mutual benefit. Not only did I learn countless lessons and rich details, but my questions were appreciated for providing a space to speak and reflect in a meaningful way (which appeared to be a rare opportunity).

I did not specifically describe what type of information I was looking for when I originally engaged interviewees, and at first, some were not interested in talking to me at all. But by the end of the interview, most thanked me for the discussion. Without providing anything but a set of questions, many came away with the feeling that they had learned something – purely through expressing themselves. They were happy to have had the time to talk, and this framework by which to discuss their thoughts.

The interview process revealed many benefits to using the language of ecological citizenship. It allowed citizens to think about the issues from a different lens, and touch on sensitive, personally meaningful, and rich information. It brought forth deep conversations about connection to the land, interdependence, consciousness and values. It reinforced the importance of embracing such an approach, and sidestepping the sustainability discourse, which so often leads people to think only of more shallow topics, such as recycling and hybrid cars. There are certainly times when focusing on these shallow issues is necessary; but engaging in deep, personal, and sensitive discussions will be essential for tackling our current conservation issues. Ecological citizenship provides a space by which to ask difficult questions. “It’s not always easy
to feel good about the impact that we as human beings have. It can be really depressing” (Interviewee #17, interview, Nov. 26, 2010). But while it may not be easy, changing our questions may be the only way to finding better results.

There is something rooted in Yukon culture that acknowledges the interdependence of humans and nature as deeply fundamental, whereby conceptualizing it was considered important, but also almost offensive, because there should be no reason to question it. One of my early interview questions, which was intended to simply start conversation and engage people to open up, was, “How do people here interact with the land and nature?” I had many people scoff at this, as they tried to explain that they interact just by being alive: by breathing, by stepping outside and looking around, by drinking water and eating food. They went on to describe deeper connections than this, but the fact that they were deeply connected was often treated as very obvious. This spoke volumes to me about their relationships, understanding, and respect for nature and its natural processes. I do not believe that results would have been reflected similarly in urban Ontario. Having the opportunity to learn more about a culture of people that are truly connected to the natural world, and see processes through their eyes, returned lessons much larger than I knew to even look for.

8.3.2 Are the results what was intended or how did the process change?

When this thesis began, I did not have a definitive picture of its end results. There were two pieces that I was interested in. I wanted to explore people’s ideas about the term ecological citizenship, as I saw a level of depth to it that I believed could offer many opportunities. I was also interested in the wider processes at play that make people act, behave, and believe in certain ways. I had a foundational knowledge of systems and thought this might provide a good
platform by which to explore these two elements simultaneously. These interests were piqued by a background in sustainability-related initiatives, some of which were growing tiresome. The deeper I had delved into the sustainability work, the more that I realized the “sustainability” discourse and its incremental approaches were not and could not achieve their own goals. Hopeful to find something closer to the constructs of an eco-centric approach to human life, I wanted to know if and what larger structural forces may be driving our environmental behaviours.

I designed the interviews to reflect these interests. I asked questions about three different areas: (1) about ways that people interact with their natural environments and how and why this was changing; (2) about ecological citizenship as a concept; and (3) about formal institutions and their role in fostering ecological citizenship and sustainability. The interviews were well received, and the order of questions allowed the flow of dialogue to keep layering and building as it proceeded. As described in the methodology, I originally had two different interview forms that were worded slightly different. I thought I would have one set of interviews for people from institutions and one for community members, but soon found that the people working for these institutions did not necessarily, or even usually, align their opinions with their workforce, and had equally critical contributions as the community members/“the citizens”.

When this research started, I pursued “ecological citizenship” as a landscape by which to discuss human-nature relationships, but I was interested in formal institutions and the effects that institutions had on these relationships. As the research persisted, I became increasingly less interested in institutions and more interested in the nuance of components closer to the people. There were more important stories that presented themselves: those of family, of culture, of communities. I stayed in these stories for some time and considered the presentation of a
different thesis altogether. But eventually, this led me back to institutions from a different
direction—which institutions most affected these more immediate elements of daily lives.

It seems obvious now and counter-intuitive that I would not consider it given the topic,
but working through my ideas from start to finish brought me to a breadth of understanding that I
did not even know I was questioning. I did not set out to do so, but I learned about the
importance of governance and of democracy throughout this process. At first, I was considering
ecological citizenship from its smallest scale: the ecological citizen and what fosters the good
ecological citizen. I learned that the most optimal way to facilitate this was by institutionalizing
a governance structure that allowed citizens to be fully autonomous and self-governing. That
allowing citizens to participate in the building of this process is in fact the only way to
institutionalize good ecological citizenship at all. While I thought that ecological citizenship
could just provide an interesting landscape for discussion, I understand now that it can provide
an approach to governance that has great environmental benefit and I look forward to exploring
this more in the future.

8.3.3 What are the limitations and what could have been done differently?

I know that I cannot do everything, but as I come to the end of this project, I do feel that
it is deeply unfinished. I would like to have spent more time reading the governance literature,
perhaps using lessons from the literature to make further insights about approaches being used in
SW Yukon and how they compare. I have been reminded that the importance of this thesis is its
exploration of Kluane (and inherently, its governance structure), from an alternative framework;
that it does not also need to be a systematic exploration of approaches to governance as well.
Despite it being one of my key areas of literature, the importance of governance presented itself
closer to the end of my process. I did the research first, completed the readings later, and tried to tie them together at the end. In one respect, this may have offered more fruitful insight, because I was not tied to any preconceived notions about the direction of this work, but it also didn’t make for the most fluid continuum of how this thesis relates to advancing the current literature.

Another limitation is the geographical division of the case study area. While studying the area itself offers numerous benefits, its boundaries were difficult for some to understand. The “Greater Kluane Region” is a boundary identified in an early draft of a land-use plan from 1987. It had been the latest delineation of regional bounds for that area when this thesis started; however, the interviews revealed that this boundary was not necessarily considered by many of the residents there. Often, I had to explain the area I was referring to before the interview started. While the outline of this boundary did not much change the results, the controversial nature of it still must be noted. In the past few years (amidst the duration of this thesis project), new approaches to land-use planning have drawn a different boundary than the one outlined in this thesis. The new region that is referred to as “Kluane” encompasses the traditional territories of the Kluane First Nation and the Champagne-Aishihik First Nation. It disregards that of White River First Nation and the community of Beaver Creek.

WRFN is yet to sign a land claim agreement and is therefore subject to terms of the Indian Act. Since there is no agreement with the territory, the territory is not able to engage in planning upon this land and has continued to just work around it. This gives more autonomy to White River First Nation on the small plot of land that has been identified as theirs alone, but they lose rights to provide input on the extended WRFN land that crosses into other territories, where joint decision-making could be possible had there been a settlement. The difference between communities with settled land claims and unsettled land claims is significant. As there
are many other discussion points for this thesis, details about this process have been left out. If results from this thesis were to contribute to land-use planning in the region, further attention to this subject would be required.

The fact that these areas have been redrawn in recent years due to non-compliance with new processes says a lot in and of itself: political boundaries reflect structures of power and can be “redrawn” to maintain them. The Land Use Planning Council has done its best to identify appropriate lines based on cultural, ecological, and institutional components, but modern-day land-use planning does not lend itself to representing the fluidness of earlier cultural beliefs that did not entertain ideas about property rights and divisions. In fact, there are no cohesive boundaries that are universally recognized anywhere in the Yukon, other than the boundary around the territory itself.

8.3.4 Other Conflicts and Contradictions

This work has been difficult to frame, because to find a truly eco-centric approach to human living could be said to require a complete overhaul of our current society – which is built on economic growth and embedded in a culture of competitiveness. “Environmental governance” is one thing, but to find an “ecological governance” (where an inherent value is recognized for all beings) may be contradictory, for it involves the use of a political structure that is based in domination and control. It came up more than once in interviews that the foundations of “ecological citizenship” are inherently apolitical, and closer to something spiritual in nature; and how do you politicize something so sacred? I believe the better question is, is it possible to find a balance? Can we live within today’s political structures in an ecologically sound and meaningful way? Can approaches to governance be used in the purest form of hierarchy, in a
way that helps to support and care for our most vulnerable and works to make the entire system stronger? Is true democracy possible?

This story of the Yukon shows some promise, for one may argue that the environmental governance structures here are performing relatively well. While more democratic structures may provide a better answer, the ability to formally participate in political processes and the integration of numerous institutional outlets for education, knowledge, and awareness have been nothing but beneficial for the growth of these communities and societies. However, arguably, this is only “better” relative to the original institutional structures and the cultures of growth that built them. Without these institutions at all, First Nations people were living in harmony with the natural Yukon wilderness for centuries.

In a similar vein, is another related challenge: the near impossibility of achieving “good ecological citizenship” in today’s modern, institutionally-embedded society. How can we find ways to connect to our natural environments, when the results of how we interact with them (often through consumption) is removed from sight? (i.e. water, food, and waste.) People don’t need the landscape in ways that they used to – it is now more of a desire than a method of survival to be connected and learn the ways of Mother Nature – and this appears to make a difference. As people no longer need the landscape for their survival, they are able to let go of it. No more trapper’s eyes on the land, no more fish to feed dog sleds, no more dog sleds. As we are not out interacting with it daily, this interdependence begins to go unnoticed and these relationships slowly fade.

Although, this is arguably not yet the case for Yukon. Modern developments have made life easier there and people continue to maintain strong ties to the land. How can we learn from the Yukon to rebuild that connection in places where less sustainable lifestyles have already
become the norm? What drives these inherent relationships to land, even when the necessities are taken care of by technology and economic developments? I think most would say by taking the time to just go out and be in nature. While this is easier in Yukon due to its easily accessible and natural landscape, it is still possible elsewhere in varying degrees.

While behaving perfectly in harmony with our ecological systems is not immediately achievable, at least having a framework for thinking about how we might get back to a more harmonious way of life is important. While there are numerous contradictions, we must understand that this process is a continuum and that we need to point towards a better trajectory, even if it is not immediately attainable.

8.3.5 Where has this research led me?

I learned a lot throughout the undertaking of this thesis project; about myself and my interests, and the study topics presented. Although I was deeply involved in sustainability initiatives before the commencement of this work and had acquired a minor in geography, I came into this program directly from an undergraduate degree in business – which was a considerably different stream of thinking. I’ve since absorbed a broad range of literature from environmental management and philosophy to many other aspects of the social sciences. This work has aided in my ability to complete research, to embrace and break down broad ideas, and to present these ideas more clearly and cohesively.

It has not only improved many academic and intellectual skills but has brought me to a number of conclusions about the ways in which I want to live my life, in regard to our current society, my communities, and the environment. I have actively been spending more time in
nature, learning to grow my own food, and becoming more involved in many aspects of my local community.

While this research has led to numerous insights and conclusions, it has also led to many more questions. There are many ways in which this work could be applied, and many directions that future work could take. Primarily, I would like to deepen my understanding of approaches to environmental governance and continue to search for other frameworks that might encompass similar constructs. Secondarily, I am interested in completing future case studies of a similar nature. While this thesis has reflected on several ideas for an EC approach in the Yukon, it would be useful to bring these together with insights from future case studies and compile a structured framework for an EC approach to governance, which expands on the principles outlined in Chapter 7.

8.4 Future Research & Contributions

While the ecological citizenship lens offers a new framework for approaching human-environment systems and governance structures, the basic ideas that have come out of this work are not new. Political ecology informs ideas about governance, participatory democracy, and power structures. Philosophy can inform ideas about ideas of flourishing, community, cooperation, and respect. Environmental sociology and ecopsychology can aid in developing research for fostering ecological citizenship from both the system inward, and the psyche outward. While many of these concepts have been studied in other fields, the broad disciplines of environmental management and governance could benefit from applying an overarching ethic or set of guidelines that integrates some of these values into its processes and applications.
To further advance this research in regard to the Yukon, a better understanding is required of the legal structure of the Umbrella Final Agreement and how it may be tweaked, altered, or broadened. There have been calls for more integration and a better approach to comprehensive planning. There are many moving parts to the structures within the agreement that are operating well, but there is not enough cohesion for re-integrating these parts in a long-term plan. While the UFA is often seen as unique and exemplary, more research is required about other similar agreements and how they have evolved with advancing research and improved processes.

8.5 Conclusion

While environmental management has become more studied and practiced, environmental health has continued to suffer, and in many cases, the state of the environment is getting worse (see WWF, 2018). Evidence suggests that either approaches are still lacking, or the wrong issues are being addressed. While environmental managers cannot provide all of the answers for building a better world, it is possible that they could provide more. The reductionist nature and linear thinking of past approaches have often led to mismanaged ecological systems and worsened results. As the field has embraced ideas about complexity and the need for integration, advancements have been made. Approaches are becoming more holistic, however perhaps not as all-encompassing as they require.

The acknowledgement of the need to embrace complexity has led to an increased interest in systems thinking and systems approaches. The acknowledgment of the need for integration has led to an increased interest in governance. This thesis recognizes environmental governance as a young field and envisions many opportunities for it to continue to evolve. While there has
been a strong focus on methods and approaches regarding how to manage and govern for environmental matters, I argue that we have not yet approached the heart of what we should be managing or governing for.

As environmental managers, we are often looking to address something specific – usually within the context of “sustainability”. And while “sustainability” is a noble goal, it is clear that this approach is not yet targeting the results that are needed. Common themes under this banner include topics such as efficient technologies, clean energy production, architecture and design, ecological economics, consumption and the carbon footprint. They are operationally-oriented and look to technocratic solutions. They provide surface-level results for surface-level problems and miss what I, and others, see as the central cause of our current dilemma: a lack of human connection to nature. Until this is addressed, our “sustainable” solutions for individual issues will remain fundamentally flawed.

While the sustainability literature has been expanding, it still does not address the level of transformative change that is required. Incremental changes to our current way of living are simply not enough. A deeper discussion about values, ethics, and our fundamental vision must be central components if we wish to find true pathways to sustainability. It will be difficult to have this discussion in the confines of a field that we have already so boldly carved out to refer to a vision where there is both environmental wellness and economic growth.

While working toward a more sustainable future may ultimately be the goal, perhaps we need to introduce an alternative dialogue in our path to getting there – one that illuminates the human experience and its ability to flourish in relation to its reliance and dependence on the natural world. This thesis suggests that we need to shift our discourse and approaches away
from that of “sustainability” and toward something more evolved, such as “ecological citizenship”.
Appendices

Appendix A: Limited Description of Interviewees and their Reference Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview #</th>
<th>First Nation</th>
<th>Non-FN</th>
<th>Resident of Greater Kluane Region</th>
<th>Resident of Whitehorse</th>
<th>Employed by Parks Canada/Kluane National Park &amp; Reserve</th>
<th>Represent an environmental board/assoc. that impacts GKR</th>
<th>Employed by Government of Yukon</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B: Interview Guide

Thank you for agreeing to participate today. As you saw in my email/heard in my call requesting this interview, I am working on my masters’ thesis in environmental studies at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario. I’m happy you took the time to meet with me today as this interview is instrumental in the completion of my research. This interview should take roughly 45 minutes to 2 hours, and will ask only about your own knowledge, personal experiences, and opinions. Specifically, I want to explore your experiences of people’s interactions with the natural environment and your understanding and thoughts on the meanings of ecological citizenship in Yukon, and specifically in Kluane. If you have any more questions about the project, I don’t mind speaking to you in more depth now or at the end of the interview, but for now it’s probably best we get started.

If you don’t mind, I’ll be using a tape recorder throughout the interview, though if you are uncomfortable at any point, please let me know and it can be turned off. You will be notified of the use of any quotations and can remain anonymous in all final reports if you so desire. The only people who will have access to the interviews will be myself and my supervisor Dr. Scott Slocombe. Please read through the consent form, let me know if you have any questions, and then sign it. After that, we’ll move forward with the questions.

On interacting with/relationship with the environment:

1.) Can you describe your background to me and your relationship to the Kluane Region?

2.) In what ways do you or people you know in the region interact with their natural environment?

3.) How have you seen people in the Kluane Region interacting with their natural environment in the recent past (approximately the last 40-50 years) in ways that are different from today?
   a. [If applicable:] Are you aware of any particular reason for this change in behaviour?

4.) Have any events or processes (economic or industry changes, policies or regulations, etc.) that took place in the last 40-50 years changed the way that people in your community interact with land and nature?
   a. [If they haven’t:] Can you expand on what was significant about this/these event(s)?

On Ecological Citizenship:

5.) When you hear the term “ecological citizenship”, what do you think of and how would you define it?
6.) How would you describe a good ecological citizen? What characteristics would they possess? What actions do you think they would take?

7.) You needn’t name them, but are there any people in your community that come to mind as good ecological citizens?
   a. What characteristics do they possess or what actions have they taken that make you think this?

8.) Have you noticed any trends that might point towards an increase in good ecological citizens in your community?
   a. [If applicable:] Are you aware of any particular reason for this change in behaviour?

9.) Have you noticed a decline in acts of ecological citizenship over the past 50 years or less?
   a. [If applicable:] Are you aware of any particular reason for this change in behaviour?

10.) What people or organizations in Kluane that you are aware of do you think either help or hinder good ecological citizenship?

On Ecological Citizenship and Institutions:

11.) Are there any organizations/policies/events/etc. that exist in Kluane that could be seen to encourage residents to become better or worse ecological citizens?

12.) Do you think these things you have just spoke about have a large influence on individuals and the way they interact with their natural environment, or only a small influence? Why?

13.) Should policies/regulations, environmental organizations, or any other means be put in place to influence people to act as better ecological citizens?
   a. What makes you feel this way?

14.) As a follow up to the previous questions, what should be done and generally, how?

15.) Who do you believe should play the largest role in the move towards a more sustainable society? Is the individual’s responsibility the most important or does the responsibility lie in the hands of government, industry, or other organizations?
   a. [If they haven’t:] Could you explain why you feel this way?

Thank you very much for your time. I'll be completing my thesis hopefully by next August and sending you a copy of the Executive Summary if you have requested that option. If you have any questions or concerns in the meantime, my contact information is on the consent form.
Appendix C: Consent Form

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Exploring Ecological Citizenship in Kluane Region, Yukon
Principal Investigator: Amanda Solmes, MES Candidate, Geography and Environmental Studies
Advisor: Dr. Scott Slocombe, Wilfrid Laurier University, sslocomb@wlu.ca, (519) 884-0710 x2781

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to explore influencing factors on human-nature interactions in Kluane through a discussion about ecological citizenship. This is undertaken in a context of seeking to foster regional sustainability and conservation.

INFORMATION

This study involves interviews with two groups of people. The first will be approximately 20 male and female professionals who are, or who have been, active in government, co-management boards, resource industry, tourism, and non-governmental organizations relevant to Kluane. The second group of participants will include approximately 10 current or past local residents that well represent the communities of Kluane and have a good understanding of its history.

Interviewees will be asked to answer questions about two related topics. The first group of questions will be pertaining to the term ecological citizenship and what this could mean as a vehicle for a more environmentally-sustainable Kluane. The second group of questions will be regarding the influences of environment-related institutions in Kluane and their effects on citizens’ relationships with land and nature.

Interviews will consist of about 10 questions with room for comments and further discussion and will take approximately 45 minutes to 2 hours to complete. The interview will be recorded unless otherwise requested by the interviewee. All interviews will be completed by the investigator, Amanda Solmes.

RISKS

There are no foreseen risks in completing this study.

BENEFITS

This research will attempt to understand which environmentally-related institutions encourage more sustainable behaviour from the citizens of Kluane, and which do not. This will give the ability to provide the region with feedback about their potential future for becoming a more environmentally sustainable society.
CONFIDENTIALITY

Anonymity is assured, as all participants will be assigned an alternate identity in any published or released findings, unless permission is granted to the researcher to do otherwise. Permission will be sought in advance for the use of any quotations in reports or publications, and participants will be specifically notified if any information used may make the participant identifiable. If you do not wish for any of your quotations to be used, you may notify the researcher at any point during or after the interview. The interview will be recorded to allow for transcription and fuller analysis; however you may notify the researcher at any time if you do not wish for recording to occur.

Only the primary researcher and supervisor will have access to the collected data. Digital information will be kept in a password-protected computer. Paper-based data will be kept in a locked cabinet for two years, at which point it will be shredded.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Amanda Solmes, at solm3170@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-1970, extension 5225 or rbasso@wlu.ca

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. If you withdraw from the study, every attempt will be made to remove your data from the study, and have it destroyed. You have the right to omit any question(s)/procedure(s) you choose, and may decline to answer any question without any repercussions. You may also, at any time, ask any questions about the study, its procedures, or your rights as a participant.

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

The results of this research will be presented in the primary investigator’s master’s thesis, and may also appear in a journal article and at conference presentations. This thesis is planned to be completed by August 2011. An Executive Summary of results will be made available at that time if requested. A full copy of this thesis will also be made available to interested individuals, as well as to the Yukon Archives and Yukon College.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study. Initials: __________
I agree to the use of a recording device during this interview. I understand that only the primary investigator and the supervisor will have access to this data. Initials: _________

I agree to the use of anonymous direct quotations taken from this interview in the investigator’s master’s thesis and other publications. Initials: _________

Participant’s Name (please print):

Participant's signature: ___________________________ Date

Investigator's signature: ___________________________ Date

I would like a copy of an Executive Summary of this thesis, when complete: Y ☐ N
Contact information (if yes): ___________________________
Appendix D: Changes and Influencers – Emerging Codes

Changes:

1. Landscape and wildlife
   a. Wildlife numbers
   b. Where wildlife can be found
   c. Introduction of bison
2. Weather and climate
   a. Archaeology and past climactic conditions
   b. Severity of past winters
3. Kluane National Park
   a. Change of ownership/rights on land (free land to sanctuary to park, etc)
   b. FN rights in the Park
      i. Hunting
      ii. Reconciliation and rebuilding (Healing Broken Connections)
      iii. Letting FN use motor vehicles and chop trees for culture camps
   c. Changing park mandate and principles (introduction of economic opportunities)
      i. Changing focal point
      ii. Introduction of economic opportunities
      iii. Change in resource mgmt practices
         1. Introduction of traditional knowledge
         2. Park Management Board / planning process
4. Government of Yukon
   a. Impact on/involvement with land claims
   b. Introduction of regulations over time
      i. Protected Areas Strategy
   c. Devolution
   d. Remediation projects – proactive action (re oil and mining)
   e. Much less regulation before the 80s – ppl could basically do what they wanted
5. First Nations
   a. Development of bands / FN territories
   b. Change of lifestyle
      i. Nomadic to semi-nomadic to established communities
      ii. Becoming bureaucrats
   c. Signing of agreements and evolution of them
      i. Non-signing of WR
   d. Properties of self-govt – how run their lands
   e. Empowerment
      i. FN Involvement in decision making processes
      ii. Reclaiming the Park as traditional hunting territory
   f. School
      i. Can go to public schools in early 70s
6. Development of organizations
   a. Setup of public boards and bodies (first public organization around sep issues)
   b. Wilderness Tourism Association
   c. YCS
7. Resource Management Processes
   a. Transition to more participatory
      i. Impact of RRCs
      ii. Community based number counts, etc
      iii. Regional biologists
      iv. Fish and Wildlife Mgmt Board
   b. FN involvement
   c. Enforcement /COs
   d. Yukon Environment Act / Regulation
e. Forest fires / burn mgmt
f. Inherent public mgmt from trapping
g. Wolf management
h. Aisihik-Kluane Caribou Recovery Program
i. Bear safety/mgmt
j. Introduction of bison
k. Change in way people disposing of waste

8. Economic/Demographic
   a. Development of Burwash Landing/D’Bay in 60s
      i. St. Elias School
   b. Development of Beaver Creek (90s? look into this)
   c. Increasing population
d. Influx of Europeans (Austrians, Germans, Swiss)
e. Business development in HJ (germans/tourists)
   i. Road side hwy stops to real communities
   ii. Experimental farm started
f. Increasing wealth in Haines Junction
g. Coming and going of locals
h. Industries improving practices (more green)
   i. Major employment by government of all realms
   j. Small scale to mega projects

9. Tourism
   a. Shorter trips for all tourists
   b. Want less remote, want to be connected to mobile devices
   c. Alaskan Highway travelers
      i. Numbers shrinking
d. Park Visitation
   i. Numbers shrinking
   ii. People pushing for motorized access
e. Yukon attractions – mining to wilderness

10. Forestry
   a. Forest mgmt for beetle kill
   b. CAFN Mill in Champagne – now closed

11. Outfitting
   a. The BIG Kluane Sheep Trophy Hunt
   b. Family focus of outfitting no longer – often outside guides now

12. Trapping
   a. “Yukon Soft Gold” (company)
   b. Healthy trapping economy from post-war to 70s
   c. Economy lost
      i. 70s fur ban in Europe / worldwide anti-fur lobbying
   ii. No market for wolf pelts, wolverines, coyotes, etc
d. No serious trappers anymore, just a lifestyle
   i. Only 15-20 active traplines in KFN traditional area
e. Trapping with snowmobiles vs. dogs
   f. New regulations
      i. Trapper’s license
      ii. New traps – kill faster

13. Mining
   a. 1880s Mining Act – how many changes have really happened?
   b. Mining in the Park area – ownership/law changes
   c. New regulations
      i. Waste disposal
      ii. Reclamation
      iii. Reforestation
      iv. Placer mining more strict (due to improved classification of fish-bearing/non streams)
d. Seeing new climate where proposals are finally being turned down (YESSA influence)
e. Killerman Lake “victory”
f. Increased staking and recent increase in activity due to heightened gold prices

14. Access and Ownership
   a. Physical land development and opportunities
      i. Alaskan Highway development and improvements
      ii. New trail systems and hiking systems
      iii. Increased high altitude access since 70s
   b. Motor-vehicle access
      i. Increase in vehicles and transportation ownership
      ii. Increased access for ATVs due to improved technology – mountain tops, etc
   c. Discussion/personal impacts
      i. White people holding land
      ii. Thoughts on “ownership” generally

15. Public Participation
   a. FN gradually engaging in public policy to get their rights back
   b. In past, no place for ppl to vent or share opinions (esp white people)
   c. People more involved now due to public boards and outreach from land claims legislation
      i. By default getting smarter on the topics
      ii. People learning how to act appropriately at public meetings
      iii. Govt has discussions and presentations, not just tell info to empty room
      iv. Empowerment
   d. Participation in green activities appears cyclical every decade (re ppl recycling, etc)
   e. Local issues and impact can easily die out if don’t get proper footing
   f. General public burnout -- due to over-planning with little action
   g. Regulated checks and balances reduce need for public interference

16. Lifestyle/Social
   a. Environment was much more part of everyone’s lives, but less talked about it
   b. Events promoting lifestyle changes
      i. Semi-nomadic life to modern – no longer subsistence
      ii. Moving people off traplines gave them nothing to do
      iii. Introduction of wage economy completely changing way of life
         1. People work many more hours
         2. People just “don’t get out like they used to”
      iv. Everyone used to trap – and everywhere you went, it was central to conversation
      v. Technology has made people stay in
         1. People are getting lazy
         2. New generation is hooked
      vi. Hunting as a way of life to co-modified – means to another end
      vii. New demographic – ppl living here not for resource use, but for views and scenery
   c. Young people and family structures
      i. Kids going to school longer
      ii. Young people not on land as much – steady decline in skills with each generation
      iii. Families not going out together anymore – children not part of it, grandpas and grandmas not part of it
   d. Social welfare system has improved
   e. Modernity
      i. Lives are faster now – everyone need to be somewhere doing something
      ii. People fishing and hunting less – more attracted to the city
      iii. People “go out” for a weekend, rather than “living out”

17. Consumption of Resources
   a. Not as many people harvesting for themselves
   b. Burning wood to burning oil for heat
   c. Housing insulation increase – heating resources not as cheap as before
      i. Used to spend lots of time just keeping warm

18. Recreational Use
   a. Increased activity in…
i. Mechanical recreation
   1. “Sled Porn”
   ii. More back country skiing down Haines Road (can get there by snowmobile)
   iii. Mountain biking a more recent activity
   iv. Kite skiing is new
   v. Rafting more popular since about the 90s
   vi. First summit of logan in ’25, gradual attempts; more in ’80s; recent dropped

b. Decreased activity in...
   i. Less camping now, more quick in and out adventures (mechanical)
   ii. Less family activities now

c. New Park activities allowed/deciding on
   i. Push for motorized vehicles
   ii. Heli-hiking (helicopter in to high altitude greenbelts)

d. New regulations for water use – limited departure dates on Alsek-Tatschenshini

e. Increased use of Haines Pass for recreation (skidoos couldn’t get there until recent technology)

19. Personal Harvesting
   a. Used to be out more often – almost daily
      i. Just did it – didn’t pay attention to conditions - it was necessary
   b. Most trap lines gone or moved away from
   c. Everyone had dog teams and life revolved around them
   d. Less hunting and trapping for sustenance
   e. Increasing hunting regulation and evolution of permit system
      i. Must travel to hunt legally in most cases
      ii. Permits especially stringent in Kluane
   f. Sustenance harvesting for CAFN and KFN now available in Park
   g. Hunt with ATVs/snowmobiles and spend less time on land
      i. Used to be foot, dogs, or horses
   h. Haines Road and Dezadeash major moose hunting areas – now very little moose there
      i. The Cow Moose season of the 70s
   i. Less poaching – or at least less people getting caught
   j. Introduction of buffalo/bison hunting
   k. Thoughts on hunting changing over time as yuppy newcomers assimilate
   l. Trend of FN friends all over territory giving hints to where the moose are and all swarming to one location
   m. The Big Dahl Sheep Hunt – auction
   n. Bear hunting – FN would hunt for necessity or spiritual challenge – now 2nd biggest thing for trophy hunters
   o. Rarely any fishing with nets anymore
   p. Fishing getting better (when was it worst?) – more regulation that people actually follow
   q. Increased regulation on timber harvesting

20. Technological
   a. Increased technological development in 60s and 70s
   b. Access through ATV, snowmobile, boat and airplane are biggest changes to area
   c. Development of new, more efficient technologies (cars, ATVs, snowmobiles)
      i. Machines are faster and more able to go anywhere
ORANGE CELLS - Influencers of Change

1. Climate Change
   a. Spruce beetle infestation
      i. Beetle-kill wood
      ii. Heightened potential for forest fires
   b. Surging glaciers (possible attraction for tourists)/affecting glacier melt
   c. Ruby range sheep herd – driven by regional climate change
   d. Creating large scale awareness amongst public
      i. Evidence that climate change is very real

2. International politics and pressure
   a. European fur bans
      i. Stigma of trappers/trapping
   b. Green parties growing around the world
   c. UN Declaration of Tribal Rights of Indigenous People – Canada just signed
   d. Transboundary committee that makes decisions about major international waterways
   e. Transboundary Salmon Committee
   f. Limitation of departures on Alsek River
      i. Regulated by Parks Canada, Glacier Bay National Park, and Tatshenshini Park

3. Federal Legislation
   a. Department of Indian Affairs
      i. Moving people off their land
      ii. Feds moved everyone to Haines Junction to grow potatoes
      iii. Changing ways of Chieftainship
   b. 1976 – Brotherhood of Yukon Indians takes YTG and Feds to supreme court to recognize inherent rights to hunt and fish
   c. Family allowance and old age pension seen as replacing FN harvesting needs
   d. Fisheries and Oceans - mandate with no meaning
   e. Mackenzie Valley Resources Act – replaced all smaller acts in NWT – might have an impact on Yukon as see how it plays out
   f. National Parks
      i. The “ideal vision” imposed on Yukon

4. Kluane National Park and Reserve
   a. Past effects onFNs
      i. Game sanctuary removed everyone from area
      ii. Hunting restrictions
      iii. FN alienation from Park caused mistrust
   b. New changes as became a Park (mining restrictions)
   c. Setting aside land
   d. Brought jobs to area
      i. Park jobs
      ii. Tourism jobs/business opportunities for locals
   e. Brought new demographic of people
      i. Attractant for Europeans and conservation-minded yuppies
      ii. Less integrated with long-term locals
   f. Introduction of co-mgmt solutions: Kluane Park Management Board
   g. Local adversity against the Park
      i. Restriction against motor use
   h. Culture camps/healing camps/Healing Broken Connections – impact on FN communities
      i. Kluane National Park as a World Heritage Site – any real impact? What year?
      j. “This is not a Banff” mantra
   k. Research and park studies influence outside of park – ie bear canisters
   l. Interpretive work / cultural history – look into if this just for visitors
   m. Development of more trails has encouraged ppl to wander more

5. Territorial Government Departments/Other
   a. Government bureaucracy and conflict
      i. Increased community meetings paired with lack of community consultation
ii. Sounding board with reported info going nowhere
iii. Environment Yukon overspending
iv. Insulated jobs – performance not evaluated
v. Politicians are seldom connected to wilderness and environment

b. Irresponsible mgmt of fed govt money given to Yukon
c. Wildlife Mgmt Zones and Boards
d. The Territory bringing bison in
e. Wolf control issue – lack of mgmt
f. New trapping controls and trapper’s course
g. Permission for logging roads and mining roads
h. Gov’t of Yukon airport admin in Haines Junction
i. YTG Renewable Resources patrol in communities
j. Local wildlife education by Conservation Officers
k. Wildlife technicians patrol locally now
l. Thought to be lack of wardens and enforcement
m. Game regulation
n. Chamber of Mines – purely economical, in direct contradiction with Environment Yukon
o. Dept of Highways –
   i. improvements to road have affect
   ii. provides jobs as office moves to D’Bay
p. Yukon Housing offsets insulation costs if need it
q. Building up hydro lines/dams to offset diesel generation
r. Current Yukon Conservative Government platform
   i. YTG trying to sell land to foreign countries/ “Yukon: Open for Business”
   ii. Yukon Party platform to make land available to all Yukoners
   iii. YTG did many good things until past few years when started to become very secretive – public trust went down
s. Land Use Planning
   i. Past Kluane Regional Plan
   ii. Influences from the Peel Plan
t. Improvements to general environmental protection and assessment of developments - YESAA

6. YTG Legislation
a. Devolution
b. Support and consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Management Board
c. Agricultural leases/spot land applications
d. Yukon Environment Act
e. Wildlife Act
f. Trapping policies and education
g. Hunting permits
h. Forest Act
i. Yukon Fisheries Regulation Book
   i. Catch limits (fish)

7. Resource Management
a. Shift in management principles - favouring “users” to favouring “conservationists”
b. Thought to be a lack of elder consultation
c. Government involvement messing with local conservation practices
d. The recognized need to engage trappers more
e. The controversy of predator management
   i. Bears
   ii. Wolves
      1. Past FN wolf denning
      2. Wolf cull - Aisihiak
f. Increase in community participation in management
g. FN overharvesting
h. Bison introduction

8. Land Claims - general
a. Implementation of boundaries amongst nations
   i. Implication of division of rights to land (KFN and CAFN can’t hunt together)
   ii. Category A/B Lands – FN must give approval for certain activities to take place
b. Self-government
   i. The benefits - self-empowerment (legitimizing industry)
   ii. Heightened ecological integrity for FNs
      1. FNs as a voice for conservation
   iii. Turning Indians into bureaucrats
c. Management Boards ... Could perhaps link this section with RRCs section
   i. Yukon River Salmon Committee (international)
   ii. Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board
   iii. Kluane Park Management Board
   iv. Land Use Planning Council
   v. Surface Rights Board
   vi. Water Board
      1. What they do
      2. High opinions from public on “outstanding work”
      3. Decision-making is final – not just recommending board as most
d. Outline of rights and responsibilities
   i. Hunting rights
   ii. Rights of access for development (a say in mining)
   iii. Divided the community between FN and white
e. Focus on preserving and enhancing the renewable resource economy (conservation by involvement and use) -- heart of agreement (but believed to not quite being met)
   f. Education - lack of inclusion in agreements
   g. Difficulties of putting FN-reflective agreements into English/FN life policies into words
   h. Job creation
   i. It’s major affect on change of Yukon culture/change on way of interacting

9. YESAA/YESAB
   a. Composition and roles; structure within other organizations
   b. Weight/impact of their decisions (some say heavy, some not so)
      i. Lack of enforcement and follow-through
      ii. Government overturning YESAB decisions
c. Screening/assessment and recommendation process completed by YESAB
d. Improvements from old EA regime
e. Public opportunity to get involved / how does YESAB reach out?
f. Killerman Lake Project
g. A cutting-edge process (does anything similar exist elsewhere?)
h. Limits of cumulative effects in process
   i. The need for more integration with other Acts and bodies

10. Renewable Resource Councils
    a. Composition and role (50/50 FN and other)
       i. Elder and youth incorporation
       ii. Diverse group of public
       iii. Thought to be lack of “soft conservationist minded people” involved
    b. Impact of recommendations
    c. Effects on members/public – co-management regime changed everything
       i. “Accidental education”
       ii. Impact of giving people a voice
       iii. Burnout
d. Variance of policies amongst each traditional territory
e. Alsek RRC – strongest in territory (earliest start)

11. Cultural/Societal Norms and Pressures
    a. Territorial Cultural Norms
       i. People do not trust the government
          1. Seems like they are trying to turn people into criminals
ii. Hunting culture: “Getting your moose”
iii. People want consumptive lifestyle along with Northern opportunities
iv. Community activities built around ties with environment
v. Territorial culture of political misalignment and non-cooperation

b. Current local issues/events
i. People recognizing they can make a difference with all co-mgmt regimes now available and participation increasing dramatically
ii. The “ATV issue” and its impact on public awareness
iii. Peel planning process bringing groups and voices together

c. Trends
i. Modern electronic world
ii. People are handicapped by modern society because only way to really be inspired is to actually be out there
iii. Families not going out as often
iv. Young people are travelling the world instead of making wilderness/Parks trips
v. Changing values
   1. Through life experience
   2. Through education

d. FN views/impacts on
i. The FN struggle – modernity vs traditional culture
ii. Differences in views amongst FN and white
   1. Surviving off steady income vs. surviving off natural resources
   2. Noglaís – the contrary view, those that don’t “get it”
iii. On ownership of land

e. On “outsiders”
  i. Stigma of predator control from outsiders (bears and wolves) and its impact
  ii. Impact of guides and traditional knowledge on integrating outsiders (cultural respect)
  iii. Effects of outsiders “personal agendas” on mgmt practices

f. Relying on environment for necessity makes you get out

g. Past groups created around forest mgmt – RISK vs. REDS …. Move to “Special Interest Groups” Section

h. Impact of the local press … move to “media” section

12. Economics/industry (YT generally)

a. Influence of the wage economy
  i. causing wkd trips only and less time on land
  ii. more influence to children from outside sources as parents working

b. Drop in price of pelts
  i. Changed the frequency of people going out
  ii. People of the land had to find other types of work or often didn’t
  iii. Killed culture and stewardship ethic
     1. Now industry more able to get on land
  iv. Imbalance of ungulate and predator populations

C. Lack of enforcement for industrial development – loopholes for miners, etc.

D. High mineral prices – largest staking boom

E. “Yukon isn’t the wilderness place it used to be”
  i. Impact of [unnecessary?] agriculture

F. Lack of voice for conservationists; industry owns government opinion

G. History of outfitting
  i. Questionable nature of outfitters – positive/negative impacts?

H. Millions of dollars annually into holding back mining disasters

i. The threat of loss of income funding user groups (ATVs)

j. The politics and economics of energy use
  i. Subsidized hydro causing ecological degradation (drains lake)
     1. Aishihak Lake
     2. Gladstone (did it happen?)
  ii. Changing culture as limits being reached
     1. Yukon Electric giving incentives and tips for using less energy
k. ATV/snowmobile purchases increase because prices are down
l. High number of imports to territory
m. Renewable resource industries have stake in maintaining ecological integrity
   i. Outfitters, hunters, forestry, tourism (sort of)

n. Strength of economy determines if people concerned about environment or industry and which party they will vote for
o. Most tourist companies, etc based in kluane are not even from there - usually Whitehorse or international

p. Desire for economic development impacts thoughts on preservation
q. Canadian dollar – impacts travel and Europeans settling

13. NGOs/Special interest groups
   a. Negative thoughts of longer-term locals on special interest groups
      i. Forced trappers out of livelihoods
      ii. Idea that they often don’t see the whole picture (YCS included)
      iii. A lot of animal rights people coming to Yukon
          1. Most don’t get it; some do good (re advancing trapping techniques)
      iv. “Tree huggers” cause more problems to spruce tree infestation
   b. Yukon Fish and Game Association
   c. Yukon Conservation Society
      i. Provides media support for FNs and other temporary groups
      ii. Mass education
      iii. Trail walks and cultural history interpretations
      iv. Act as a watchdog - for Chamber of Mines for example
   d. Aisihiak-Kluane Steering Group
   e. Junior Rangers
   f. Yukon Bird Club
   g. TOYA – Trails on the Yukon – reaction to the ATV impact debates (pro ATVs)
   h. CPAWS (Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society) … influences territorial culture but no direct work in Kluane
      i. Raven Recycling
   j. Friends of the Kluane Region … does this still exist?
   k. Ski clubs and other outdoor recreational clubs
   l. Local snowmobile club – HJ
   m. Pembina Institute – Alberta

14. Land, Water, and Wildlife
   a. Declining populations of moose
      i. Hunters must travel long distances
      ii. Hunters go deeper into forests
      iii. Stories of the past
   b. Agriculture disturbing wildlife and habitat
   c. Introduction of bison
      i. Blessed with more meat options and can hunt [almost] all winter
      ii. Alter the landscape – making prairies
   d. High predator populations
      i. Wolverines
      ii. Wolves
   e. Spruce beetle outbreak
      i. Changing hydrology due to major changes in forest
      ii. Economic opportunities provided
      iii. Increasing risk of fire
      iv. Increasing public debate about how it should be harvested
   f. Declining caribou
      i. No more caribou hunt unless FN (also FN self ban)
      ii. Chisana Caribou Project – brought the herd back up
   g. Beauty of the landscape is the draw for most outsiders
   h. DFO in Alaska now having large effect on Klukshu salmon run
   i. Must keep trapping to keep children knowledgeable
   j. Respect for land and landscape changes when hunting – new level of integration
k. Bear safety (canisters)

15. KFN / CAFN / WRFN and general FN issues
   a. Indian and Northern Affairs moving people into communities
   b. Changes to Indian Act
      i. Changes in ’84 allowed women to keep their status and quadrupled the amount of Indians that could now legally harvest
   c. Self agreements and intent to care for land for generations = perfect EcoCits
      i. Have been there for generations already – no reason to change ethics
   d. Kids not getting out enough
   e. Trying to engage public in habitat and wildlife mgmt
      i. Climate change workshops
      ii. Water strategy
      iii. Fish and Wildlife Mgmt plans
      iv. Forest management plans
      v. CAFN wildlife reporting is lacking – not the culture to do so
   f. Encouraging trapping again – programs …. What is KFN doing?
   g. In FN culture, if you aren’t taught young, someone will eventually educate you on respect and the way of the land. Community
   h. Elders wood cutting program
   i. Cultural activities
      i. Having cultural ceremonies in Park → changing way Parks normally operates (lessons for the rest of the country)
      ii. Healing camps for mental and sobriety
      iii. Kids camps: science camps, gopher camps
      iv. First community moose hunt in fall; salmon fish in spring
   j. Just by living and breathing their culture, they have an effect on the population
      i. Beliefs, principles, respect to environmental management – vocal in public
      ii. Stronger political presence, so have rights, and people take note
         1. Can challenge territorial government, but don’t often participate politically (writing to paper, etc) like white people – more complex
         iii. Less actual carbon imprint because often stay in communities – don’t travel a lot
   k. Still encourage wolf trapping
   l. Have a hand in stopping agricultural development up the Alaskan Hwy
   m. FN struggles to work through:
      i. Land claims – 20 years in process
      ii. Building up self government
      iii. Dealing with hard history of residential schools – psychological trauma
   n. WRFN unsigned claims

16. Town of Haines Junction
   a. Recycling depot
   b. The town council
      i. Maintaining viewscape, etc. – seem to care
      ii. “Kluane Regional Tourism Development Plan”
         1. Sustainable tourism ideas
         2. Good work, but a lot of “political elbowing”
      iii. Look into their history and other past works

17. Access and Development
   a. Alaskan Highway
      i. Shut down river boats
      ii. Brought new goods along – certain vegetables in early days, etc.
      iii. Paving and hwy improvements over time
         1. Increased travel from communities – encouraged vehicle-oriented culture
         2. North Alaska Hwy improvements – (did they affect anything)
         3. RV crowd more apt to travel here now – different than past
         4. Closure of hwy lodges because can get further in a day
      iv. Opened up region straight to Alaska
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b. Development of the communities
   i. Haines Junction
   ii. Burwash Landing – brought all local Indians in – nothing to do
   iii. Beaver Creek
   iv. More congregation in one area is creating more enforcement issues

c. Housing Development
   i. Double paned windows
   ii. Insulation requirements

d. Trails for ATVs and snowmobiles
   i. Some say many have grown in/not enough access
   ii. Others say too much access

e. Increase in mining activity further into traditional territories
   i. Auxiliary roads/“CAT roads” – expanded immediately
   ii. Marked declines in sheep and ungulate populations close to access roads

f. Land applications for agriculture

g. Aishihik dam
   i. Flooding collapsed fish populations and ruined spawning grounds

h. Windy Craigy mine controversy
   i. Brought attention to the area – encouraged travel and tourism

i. Wishes to convert Gladstone River to hydro … did this happen?

j. The Alaskan Pipeline debates … what is the actual development scenario?
   i. Encourages public to ask questions about their land

k. Development of Kusawa Park in question??

18. Forestry
a. Forestry in the region didn’t really exist before recently (was this because of spruce beetle??)
b. Forestry passed on to territorial responsibility after Devolution
   i. Forest Act created – strong public lobby to create something powerful
      1. Community/regional forest mgmt plan
         a. Heightened confidence in industry actions
c. Push on logging to make use of wood before infested with spruce bark beetle
d. Maximized self-interest in forestry culture – generally non-cooperative (how does this affect?)
e. Forest Planning Process adding a lot of benefit to general planning of area
   i. Must be careful here due to such slow growing conditions
f. Logging roads creating access
g. Massive cutting of right ways on highway causing public concern (why is this happening?)

19. Mining
a. Placer Authorization changing to Yukon Placer Secretariat (adaptive mgmt)
b. Mining roads creating lots of access
   i. “Roads to Resources” – program shut down, now use trails for ATVs
   ii. Usually used mostly by others than miners (non-local people with less knowledge and respect of the land)
c. Diamond mining in NWT affects prospects for mining here
d. Less industrial development in area, but lots of recent staking due to gold prices
   i. Unfettered access to all land if it is not a Park
e. Miners get more rights to land than FN that took 20 years to fight
   i. Staking trap lines, etc. – subsurface more important
f. New placer mining regime. … Look into this
g. Changes in mining principles, but with obvious gaps
   i. “Fish bearing” classifications – not all rivers completed
   ii. A century of modernization not really accounted for
h. Windy-Craigy
   i. Killerman Lake Project
   j. Ultimately causing land degradation, even when attempt otherwise

20. Tourism
a. RV / other traveler traffic peaked several years ago and on way back down
b. In general, people taking shorter holidays – more intensive, less exploratory
i. Environment less for learning, more of a gym
c. Environmental changes and degradation cause ability to attract tourists
d. Strange message from tourism industry: maintain environmental integrity but big sells for gas-guzzling RVs, etc.
e. Tourism maps about the “Yukon experience” – fishing tips, etc – allow outsiders to visit key areas and potential for disturbance
f. Tourists sometimes threatening locals because don’t understand traditional rights
g. More garbage on road in summertime and feeding the animals
i. But at same time, more people interested in region and keeping it well

21. Demographics
   a. Population has gone through surges – been recently just increasing in population
      i. brought increase in affluence - More disposable income for further trips, larger houses, larger trucks, etc
      1. for the Yuppies already here, thought to be a “better crowd” now
      ii. heightened pressure on wildlife for hunters, plus less habitat from building
      iii. newcomers don’t always know responsibilities that come with rights of being there – often learn over time, but always struggles
   b. Large population of European immigrants over last 20 years
      i. European dog mushers seen to be a nuisance – not taking proper care
   c. Comfort zones drop when strangers move in, buy up private property, post “keep off”
   d. Newcomers inventing their own Haines Junction – bringing change through technology
   e. Some economic disparity – leads to negative environmental choices
   f. Small population is only reason Yukon people able to seem “sustainable” - vehicle culture

22. Educational Facilities
   a. Temporary Burwash school in 80s/(late 70s) turned out fantastically accomplished people – politically and environment-savvy
      i. Not doing enough these days
   b. Very important role in shaping children
   c. Curriculum needs help
      i. “Know about the Spanish Inquisition, but not about pot latches”
      ii. Just starting to teach more about conservation, etc
   d. Bring in teachers from “outside” who don’t “get” the culture
      i. People believe school should bring students “on the land” and don’t
   e. Experiential science program (multi-disciplinary place-based projects) at St. Elias school
      i. Put on by Park
      ii. May have influence on parents of children involved as well
   f. Haines Junction school’s bison hunt – science=biology, math=pop’n dynamics, then hunt
   g. The Kluane Arctic Research Institute – for research/post-secondary education facilities

23. Media
   a. Environmental issues showing up in the news – broader public knowledge of issues
   b. Hollywood – particularly Richard Bourdeau and the fur ban
   c. Advertising
      i. Subliminal media messages – product placement, etc in movies
      ii. “Sled Porn”
   d. Some kids shows with good ecological values
   e. David Suzuki column
   f. Not much news on communities – just structured around Whitehorse

24. Modern Lifestyle Changes
   a. People obsessed with desires of “modern lifestyle”
      i. Want to be neater and tidier
      ii. Want development
      iii. Higher rates of consumption
      iv. More interest in investments than getting out
      v. Want to eat nice food, go on nice holidays, make good money
   b. People are getting lazy
      i. Comfort of home leaves you not as likely to get up and go trapping, etc – don’t NEED to for survival, so don’t
      ii. Diabetes – people less active, but with high access to sugar
iii. Car culture – can easily go to grocery store
iv. Kids outside significantly less
   1. Video games
   2. TV
   3. Computer/internet
   4. Organized sports and activities, rather than making them

c. Less time on the land
   i. Increased pressure from jobs – less days off
   ii. No need due to faster technology – ATVs, etc. and less foot travel
   iii. More strict school schedules for kids

d. More token cultural activities than really part of cultural fabric
e. Increased communication and interaction with family across borders due to modern conveniences – paved roads, cars, telephone, … Now Facebook
f. Easier to connect and travel
   i. planes going everywhere – not as expensive
   ii. social media and internet make world seem smaller – more desires
   iii. more disposable income to travel and for upper middle class, now culturally engrained to do so without thought

g. Life is just busier
   i. More planned activities, more trips, shopping, hustle/bustle
   ii. More people just desiring a fast paced life

h. Introduction of chemicals into our lifestyles in the 50s – larger ability to alter enviro
   i. Western World’s new level of wealth since 50s brought idea that we could do whatever we wanted and that we, as humans, were greater than all natural powers (weather, etc)

25. Technology
   a. High number of vehicles per capita for territory
   b. Snow machines and ATVs faster and lighter, can cover more ground
      i. Changed entire culture/landscape as became more affordable
      ii. Continue to heighten access as technology evolves – can go further
      iii. Gives you luxury – no struggle in hunting
      iv. Less need to involve the family for packing out the meat
      v. More trail expansion
      vi. Wider reach to address subsistence issues
   c. Argos can go anywhere – mountain tops, etc. – altering prime habitat
   d. Television – as each channel added, people outside less and less involved in community
   e. Computers and video games allow people the same adrenaline and rush of shooting, etc. without all of the hard work and dirtiness
      i. Lead to a loss in connection
      ii. Kids don’t need outdoor activities anymore (running dogs, etc.)
f. Internet – allows people to interact worldwide easier, but less face-to-face and community
   i. Must be careful with information from the internet
      1. Heightened ability to learn, but sources not always reliable
   ii. Facebook uniting Indian families across borders

g. Ability to fly in and out of the Park
   h. GPS technologies allowing for more back country exploration
   i. High powered rifles, optics
   j. Increase in quality outdoor gear allows for easier time
   k. Pepper spray and satellite phones to make people less vulnerable
   l. The freezer – can now keep more meat, with less waste
      i. Also don’t need to share so much – can keep to yourself

26. Other (personal)
   a. Elders’ and community teachings make a huge impact – esp in smaller communities
   b. Parents getting their kids on the land
   c. Passionate individuals in the community (quiet leaders) – FN and non
   d. Many adults are not aware of local flora and fauna and natural processes
   e. Heightened alcohol and drug use causing social problems
i. More break and entering
ii. Drug use thought to have come at the time of heightened forestry activity and increased affluence
f. Healing circles
Appendix E: Ecological Citizenship-related responses – grouped by emerging codes

The following list shows the specific terminology used by interviewees, grouped under emerging themes/codes.

E-1: Defining of Ecological Citizenship:

Environmental ethics
  Concerned with ethic and ethos and care.
  Withhold ethical environmental values.
  Philosophical environmental ethos and account of actions

Respect
  Be respectful.
  Respect in harmony.
  Respecting everything that's been taught and given to you and being responsible in your actions for the future generations.
  Behaving respectfully within your rights.
  Be respectful.
  Be nice to all species.
  Respect future use.
  Respect.

Awareness/consciousness
  Conscious decision making based on all species.
  Being aware of how conduct oneself in natural world.
  Doing the right thing.
  Treating the land properly.
  Treat it right.
  Don't take too much.
  Take what you need and leave what you don't.
  Look after yourself.
  Being responsible for your natural environment.
  Live within natural balance of ecosystems
  Responsible use.
  Being responsible
  Take responsibility
  Responsibility. Environmentally responsible decision making.
  Conscious of environment. Conscious of impact.
  Be a caretaker of the land. Think consciously about all aspects of all land-based decisions.
  Mitigate negative impact to environment. Being a steward of the land.
  An ethic of care for the land. Being with a light imprint.
Acknowledgement of ecosystem services and supporting their conservation. Being a steward to the land.
Being a steward. Thankful for being taken care of.
Being a caretaker.

Acknowledgment of Interdependence
Decision making based on geography Knowing where you fit in your environment and living appropriately.
Relationship with natural environment.
How does one relate to the land and their planet?
Being part of the land and the water.
Being part of the land
part of the environment. Interact as an interdependent species
A connection to landscape. Discuss and defend values and land ethic. Take ownership.
Recognizing interrelationship with entire ecological realm.
Recognizing your interdependence and immersing yourself in the ecosystem.
Acknowledgement of interconnectivity to natural environment. Taking action with that in mind.
Recognizing interconnectivity.
Holistic thinking recognizing interdependency.
Identify with natural environment.
A sense of belonging to place.
Citizen of place. Maintaining a healthy connection. Accepting change and facilitating healthy change.
Recognizing interconnectivity.
a citizenship of place, beyond political nation.
Connection to local area or a certain geography. Citizen within a region.

Rights AND responsibilities
Rights and responsibilities. Acknowledgement of ecosystem services and need to preserve them.
Rights and responsibilities.
Rights and responsibilities by virtue of community and place in concert with environmental conservation. Sustainability. Harmony.
Rights and responsibilities.

Participation
Active participation in protection & wildlife enhancement
Envisioning and taking action.
Advocacy.
E-2: Embodiment of Ecological Citizenship

Ethical thinking, consciousness, being aware
  Ethical thinking.
  Awareness.
  Aware of landscape.
  Knowledge of the land and how to use it.
  Knowing where food/resources come from.
  Think of entire ecosystem.
  Be aware of landscape and impact.
  Awareness of ecosystems and ecology.
  Make thoughtful decisions about full picture.
  Educate oneself. Make conscious decisions.
  Make decisions consciously and consider environmental sensitivities.
  Being aware.
    Be conscious.
  Responsibility to become well-informed.
  To think beyond the back yard.
  Be informed.
    Be aware.
  Acknowledge responsibility of care.
  Being knowledgable of ecosystems and making responsible decisions accordingly.
  Be aware of landscape and impact.

Be respectful, care, be considerate
  Making the right choices.
  Responsible.
  minimal impact.
  Impact/footprint.
  Minimal impact.
    Interact respectfully.
  Be aware of actions and their impact.
  Don't waste. Consider future. Consider impact and minimize.
  Minimal impact. Clean up after yourself.
  Minimal impact.
  Clean up after yourself.
  Minimal impact.
  Conserve. Limit consumption.
  Limited impact.
  Limit one's impact.
  Limit impact.
  Limit impact.
  Pick up after yourself. Minimize impact. Only take what you need.
  thinking about future generations. Using resources efficiently, not wasting.
  Be responsible.
  Harvest respectfully.
Minimize impact.
Lower carbon imprint.
Use technology properly and responsibly.

Respect
Consider entire ecosystem in all decisions.
Share and respect.
Respect others and all decisions.
Respect.
Respectful.
Care and respect.
Respect.

Reciprocity.

Spend time on the land
Care about and spend time on land.
Spends time on the land.
Spend time on the land.

Acknowledge interdependency, ecological services
Immerse yourself - recognize interdependency of all species.
Respect interdependency of all living things.
Acknowledgement of interdependency.
Recognize role of other species.
Recognize existence and interdependency of all species.
Recognize and respect interdependency.
Maintaining interdependency.
Acknowledge ecological services.
Hunt - "take from both sides of the scale".

Teaching, spreading knowledge
Giving knowledge away and teaching others.
Passing on knowledge.
Educate others.
Promote conservation.
Inform and spread good word to others.
Child raising - passing on knowledge.
Encouraging and teaching youth.
Engage and inform others.

Engaged in community, public participation, speak out
Community-based.
Community-minded.
Be active in community.
Political participation
Participate publically. Stand up for ecological rights. Help plan for future development.
Public participation.
Participate publically.
Protect traditional and ecological values.
Stand up for ecological rights.
Participate publically.
Public participation.
Ethical public participation.

Reduce, reuse, and recycle
Reuse.
Recycle.
Reduce, reuse, recycle.
Recycle.
Recycling.
Reduce, reuse, recycle.
Proper waste disposal.

Live sustainably, live off the land
Make a living off the land - in a sustainable way.
Live sustainably.
Living sustainably.
Live your beliefs and principles.

Ethical consumption
Ethical purchasing.
Ethical purchasing.
Consume ethically and efficiently.
Eat local, efficient carbon consumption.
Use balanced approaches - include ecosystem services in economic thoughts.
Eat and live locally.
Ethical consumption.

Maintain biodiversity/restoration
Aim to improve habitat.
Maintaining ecological and biological diversity.
E-3: Kluane-Specific Actions of Good E.C. -- Initial Codes

Picking up after yourself
- respecting the land
- not throwing away garbage
- keeping area clean
No trace when on land; minimize impacts
no trace - picking up garbage and not littering

Respect and Protect Wildlife and Wilderness
Avoiding birthing areas with ATV
Clean cooking (no smells for pests);
Concerned about wilderness and takes action
Making sure village doesn't mow nesting habitats at certain times - pass on knowledge
Dedicated to protecting fish and wildlife
Care about nature and wildlife and wider processes (climate change)
have and execute (if altering) vision of the landscape that is ecologically-appropriate
take ownership in caring for resources
recognize negative actions/habits and changing to conserve
aware of wildlife issues and act accordingly (bear proofing, etc.);
Concern about natural processes - interact (doesnt matter where are on spectrum)
conservation-minded;
recreate with little impact (ski, snowshoe, hike);
Protect forest and plant species
Fire smarting
Pulls invasive species
fire smart;
Respect for land

Participate in community
Good social citizens (pay taxes)
Involved in community
Supportively facilitates user groups and getting people of polar extremes to work together
Communicate well
participating in local community groups organized around environmen
speak out on issues; attempt to influence policy
active in politics on behalf of maintaining habitat;
people balancing debates to find best solution;
participating in decisions for future
attend/promote nature clubs, viewing, and recreating (ie bird club, etc.);

Sensible Consumption practices/Conserve resources
Sensible resource use
Doesn't allow car to idle
Limiting waste
Successful community recycling program;
Reducing consumption, mindful of packaging;
  Consuming locally
Live simply
  live conservatively and do not waste energy and resources
lowered consumption patterns;
recycle
generate own electricity
carry water; use outhouse over toilet;
live close to land with small ecological footprint;
live simply;
drive smart car;
Recycling
live simply; live off land as much as possible;
recycle; minimize footprint;
Choosing dead wood over live trees for fireswood;

Pass on knowledge
  passes on knowledge of the local land
  elders teaching younger
knowledge of land and past knowledge of change
  educate people and spark interest;
  bring people out and teach about land;
doing media and spreading knowledge
  encourage others to spend time on land and educate

Spend time on and become knowledgeable about local land
  enjoys wilderness and passionate
  active outdoors
spending abundance of time on and using land
spend lots of time observing land
Always thinking of surroundings
Living as part of one's environment;
passionate about ecology and ecological ways of being;
study local habitat;
recognizing limits and cumulative affects (how everything relates)
Living close to land
  knowledgeable about local area;
spending time in the bush;
don't travel far - live locally;
spend time on land; aware of traditional teachings
aware of natural surroundings;
Hunting and Harvesting
- Responsible hunting and consuming
- Ethical hunters/harvesters
- Balance give and take harvesting traditionally
grow vegetables
growing vegetables;
elders living off land
live off land;

Have a sense of home/place on the land ("citizen of trapline --")

Live your values
- Inspire others
- being a leader;
bigger-scale, longer-term thinkers;
against fast-paced lifestyle;
may still participate in modern structures, but desire and attempt to live most sustainably;
pursue traditional lifestyle
being proactive; being a leader
very conscious/mindful;
do not value materials highly;
live values
vision of future
reflect about relationship with land
leader in community;

Develop economic opportunities

E-4: Actions/Behaviours seen as Increases in Good Ecological Citizenship

-7/39 (18%) respondents do not believe there is any “increase” in good ecological citizenship as they see it
-2/39 (5%) mentioned not much change at all

------------------------

Reduce, Reuse & Recycle
- Volunteer recycling program a big success; increased education on recycling > increased consciousness of community
- Organizations encouraging reusables
  - water bottles
  - potlatch bags with reusable utensils, etc;
  - people becoming less wasteful;
More evidence of no trace camping principles
- Less damage, less litter out in remote areas;

Heightened awareness/consciousness
- Local awareness -- due to Land Claims and boards
- Change in attitudes and awareness (b/c more laws and education on laws)
- People are becoming more conscious - thinking of how affect one another;
- Part of Yukon culture to think of environment (mostly a constant);
- Worldwide awareness - wanting to know more re environment on tourism trips;
- More awareness of issues (climate change); broad discussion about climate change and broader discourse on environmental protection encourages awareness
  - Most people now understand a wolf cull is not necessary - more educated;
  - Consciousness about issues (climate change);
  - Actions shows increased awareness (re bear fence around dump)
  - Increased trend to recognize impacts (ATV issue);
  - More aware of our impact
  - More aware here just because live in the bush;

Increased Participation
- Increased Boards (re environmental integrity)
- Forest Management Plan (RRC initiative)
- People actively participating in surveys/comments, etc. (gvt)
- People participating more - showing up to events and speaking minds;
- People speaking up about too much motorized access (ATV issue)
- Provide environmental awareness and leadership - high per capita effect on rest of Canada
- High interest in more environmentally-focused community projects;
- Participation rates rising for councils;
- Increasing participation and enthusiasm
- Residents participating in initiatives;
- People speaking out more and being involved
- More people speaking out on issues all over the territory
- People questioning the pipeline;

Increased Cooperation
- RRCs involved more with other councils
- Land claims increased co-operation and opportunities for people to work together;
- Increased cooperation where environment defines and opens up relationships among the people there
- Learning to work together and overcome differences;

Change in views and values
- Value of wilderness becoming increasingly recognized;
- Views are changing - more conscious and values oriented - more willing to take a protectionist stance;
More Responsible Hunting Practices
- more forethought; less poaching; more thoughtful hunters - no problem with self-restrictions
- self-government = own hunting laws = more observant and conscious
- more hunting awareness due to marketing and education

Political and Industry Changes
- Environment Act (industrial waste and development)
- Forest Management Plan accepted
- Strengthening ecological slant for curriculum
- Game wardens doing good job interacting with community and keeping people mindful
- Parks is not hated as much by locals and better relationship with FNs. As trust builds, can one day be an institution that helps foster EC.
- Yukon Chamber of Mines just developed best practices for Sustainability
- realize need to set areas aside (but may also see large amounts of activity soon)
- more plans in place that encourage better behaviour - not necessarily chosen
- way the Park is being managed is more integrative and about supporting locals

Consumption and Home Development
- People building smaller and more efficient houses;
- people buying more efficient cars
- increased personal use of green energy (solar panels)

Best Ecological Citizens continue to be the elders/older generation
- Native elders teach younger. Older are always more responsible
- elders most consistent and only getting better
- many people moved back there in earlier days because of access to resources and lack of regulation, but turning into conservationists with age

Increased promotion of FN culture
- despite cosmopolitan ways, FNs transformed when on land; healing camps and reconnection with FN way is positive for whole communities connecting again
- growing sense of pride in culture and encourage youth participation in a cultural ethic based around the Earth
E-5: Actions/Behaviours seen as Decreases in Good Ecological Citizenship

**More individualistic/selfish/consumptive**
- more individualistic society with people less willing to help and contribute
- not being good stewards;
- generally more concern with having luxury items than environmental awareness;
- deniers for convenience/business

**Modern world**
- society more oriented towards consumption that don't realize their impacts
- people here take lots of trips and drive a lot
- More concerned with economy and bankers collapse - which is built on a society of mastering the environment
- competing with a faster-paced world
- a little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing - mass media causing narrow-mindedness about environmental issues
- faster lifestyles encourage less thought about the environmental impacts

**Less Connected to Natural Environment (generally)**
- Not as connected to the environment
- For older FNs, taken away from their homes, don't feel comfortable interacting in the same way - like it's not "home"
- not as much connection because not living right there; people not out to the same level;
- everything has changed - impossible to even have that same relationship
- younger people (below 40) have less regard for environment
- less connection
- a generation of FN lost from land - now set back;

**Less part of lifestyle/dependency**
- seems to be decline in concern because general lifestyle much more removed from nature
- There's not the constant conversation about trapping, hunting or wildlife like there used to be
- poor environmental citizens;
- less knowledge of local plants and environment - no longer wrapped up with land and environment because no longer need it for survival - many people don't know the basics of how land there was formed and what plants exist there

**More mechanized access / more driving**
- more people taking mechanized access into woods than low impact means - young people not picking up slack as much as used to
- ATV issue - currently many people expanding trails or riding in ecologically sensitive areas
  - places so changed and so many restrictions that feel less inclined to protect

**Heavier Resource Users**
- heavy vehicle use and not collectively investing in public transit
- overharvesting due to increased technology (stronger guns, more ATVs, etc.) - MORE of an onus on people, while often taking less;

**Housing and Development**
- mostly switching to burning fossil fuels vs. Wood
- often bringing in outside materials to build homes;
- increased use of toxins(agent orange in ditches) to keep down weeds;
- often choose non-renewables and kill off chances for renewables when developing (ie mines over fish)
- houses getting larger in terms of sq ft per person

**Government**
- individually we're doing things, but collectively we're not - not touching big picture
- questionable regulations - re no more burning, instead fill key watershed land
- planning process seems backwards where some areas can be seen to be industrial playgrounds while others are to be preserved
- govt more concerned with adapting than thinking - philosophy that we're just a poor Northern victim
- narrow ideas - should be involving people more than pushing away with regulations;
- govt can not see big picture - needs hard numbers
- lots of good work put in by local scientists, overturned by government trying to create jobs;
government ignores citizens calls for protection (use quotable quote from Dieter Gade)

**People disobeying environmental regulations**
- not enough people to speak on behalf of wildlife; many people breaking rules - re catch limits/hooks at kathleen lake; harder to make decisions because land base so split up and too many different people at the table (tho arguably, this has gone on for a long time)
- still apathy re poaching, taking pregnant moose, riding snowmobiles in sensitive areas, etc;
too much information - messages often get diluted
- development still heavy - often cut corners on ridding wastes (expensive to deal with hazardous waste and recycling - transportation)

**Personal politics stand in way**
- dissatisfaction with Kluane Park;
- not enough cooperation between groups

**E-6: Controversial Actions/Behaviours Towards Good Ecological Citizenship**

**Progress vs. Carbon Footprint**
- Near impossible to go "totally green" right now if want to make any progress (references curing cancer, AIDS, etc.). Rely on fossil fuels with current technology and use them even to do "green" things.
- not going to behave more ecofriendly if lost opportunity for their families or any real drastic changes to lifestyle
- making a commitment to kids and helping them develop (ie competitive sports) requires travel... which isn't good environmentally, but believe to create better citizens

**Connectedness + Carbon Footprint**
- unconscious decisions about carbon footprint - want to preserve the wilderness and heavily engage in it, but drive massive vehicles in the meantime
- environmentally aware because live in it, but resource intensive lifestyles because so remote - shipping in goods, driving long distances - like to be outdoors and "connect", but cause direct and indirect damage while doing it.
  - Don't think much about driving on roads, but feel bad putting a motor in the woods-
  - Park's new plans encourage people to visit and experience the Park, but is promoting fossil fuel consumption
  - travel a lot, but gives them more appreciation for home and wilderness (takes a heightened carbon footprint, but reinforces other values)

**More general awareness but less deep knowledge and connectedness**
- People are smarter - want to do more and are more aware, but often less engaged
  - People are becoming more aware and conscious, but because of the societal pressures on habitat and wildlife, there's just not enough understanding or preservation to sustain it
  - even with awareness in social fabric, the base drivers are often to satisfy consumer-based desires;

**Modern Comforts and Full-time Wage Jobs vs. Living Closer to Land**
- if you want to have modern comforts (functional plumbing and electricity), then you need to have a wage
  - the UFA is single most important policy document to promote EC and most detrimental to erode it
  - Clash between the economy and the environment
  - there are people that honestly have all premonitions and philosophies of good EC, but modern society set up in a way that is so convenient to live the opposite where it is fundamental to participate in negative things

**Close, but take wilderness for granted**
- Often, people who grow up there take all of environment for granted (connected but not appreciative)

**Regulation vs. Self Constraint**
- More space than ability to regulate - mostly people can police themselves, but sometimes they don't
  - thinks people would generally want to be have more of a wilderness culture if could protect themselves, but being taken away from them bit by bit

“Sustainable Development”
- "more balanced development" - people need to use a certain amt of non-renewables, increased access, and growth if communities are to grow and flourish
  - going to be good and bad no matter what, must recognize what works and what works better
  - seems like we're so bent on destroying everything and then fixing it... always a pendulum; may look negative to hunt, but certainly a smaller footprint;

**Residential School/Park Removal**
- imbalance and inner conflict for generation that spent time in residential schools - essence is there, but not the focal point like it used to be;

**Belief in the Environment; with belief of Modern Demise/Collapse and “why not” attitude**
- FN have complete understanding of how to survive and plan for the downfall of society, but in the mean time, don't mind basking in modern luxuries - sense of impernancy about it, so a sort of "why not?" attitude;

**Both Conservation and Destruction is Growing**
- “It’s interesting how my mind thinks to leaders, conservation leaders, as ecological citizens. It’s interesting. I’m actually having trouble thinking of people that might suit. They may be citizens in one dimension, but not in others.” (L343-347)
- Both population of conservation-focused and heavy resource-users is growing in area.

**What do you do when the terms change?** (new info, different POV, etc.) - Chambers quotable
  - talking about when trappers became villains over night

E-7: Other Thoughts on the Term

**Confining**
- Ecology and citizenship both very confining and political. Ecology is about interconnectedness of beings, but missing essence of respect.

**Too academic**
- “Sounds like academic jargon”
- covalence between "science" and "Dene sensibility" .... but use terms that are less high falutin - 'eco cit' is not their frame of reference: "respect your mother, be kind, pick up after yourself, love, be careful, watch where you step; --- same language as native way, but too sacred to just throw around
- it's a buzz word and I think it turns a lot of people off; ecology wasn't even being used until 50 years ago, but now more broad; it's too yuppy

**Other suggestions for terminology**
- Different terminology: 'ownership'
- citizenship not used very much; other words: stewardship, community, family (ie family-based conservation vs. community-based conservation with FNs makes more sense)
- better to just say 'stewardship', 'nature appreciation' or 'environmental appreciation'

**Interesting term**
- interesting term - inventing words around something that's been around forever
- a beautiful phrase/way of putting it
- all types of different citzenships that are entangled - entangled mess of identity... complexity, mosaic
Appendix F: Primary Environmentally-Related Institutions in Yukon

This appendix describes the roles of 3 levels of government: federal, territorial, and first nations. (The municipal government of Haines Junction is described in section 4.1.4.) It also describes the processes of land claims and final agreements, environmentally-relevant industry associations, and active environmental advocacy groups.

F-1: Federal Government

Due to its status as a territory, the Government of Canada (GC) has a very close relationship with the Yukon. However, the signing of the Devolution Transfer Agreement (DTA) in 2003 transferred the management of responsibilities over water, land, forestry, and minerals from the Government of Canada to the Yukon Territorial Government (YTG). This is supplemented by a separate arrangement (the Canada-Yukon Oil and Gas Accord) governing oil and gas activities. Although this devolution agreement hands all resource matters over to the territorial government, there are still several federal departments that have a notable effect on governance areas relevant to this thesis: AANAC (INAC), Parks Canada, EC and DFO.

A large portion of the land in the Greater Kluane Region is federal property, managed by the Government of Canada through Parks Canada. The federal land holds over the Kluane National Park and Reserve now provide the only direct federal power over lands management in the territory. All other ecological licenses and regulations are mandated through YTG.

F-2: Territorial Government

Only recently has the territorial government been given any real decision-making power. Prior to 1978, the Territorial Council had been appointed by and served as the non-partisan
advisory council to the Commissioner, who was appointed by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in the federal office, where basically all control of Yukon decisions were made at a federal level. In 1977, the passing of the *Yukon Elections Act* devolved power from the federal government to the territory by creating a responsible government for the Yukon, and a democratic electoral system. The passing of the *Yukon Act* in 2003 has further devolved power from the federal government by giving the territory control over all land and natural resources in the Yukon. This has erected basically the same rights and responsibilities as all provinces in Canada, short of criminal prosecution. Since the first democratic election in 1978, the Yukon has wavered between a Conservative and an NDP government, with Liberals sitting in for a short two-year period. The Yukon Party (Yukon’s conservatives) held the legislative power in the Yukon for over a decade since 2002 – one year prior to devolution. With “*Open for Business*” as one of their government taglines, the Yukon Party’s main concern is of creating jobs, with little to no concern for the natural environment. Therefore, the territory’s state affairs have fundamentally revolved around resource extraction for its entire political existence. In 2017, a Liberal Government was elected, believing to have shifted this mentality, but has not shown very much proactiveness in terms of changes course too strongly.

In terms of YTG and the natural environment, there are four related departments: *Energy, Mines and Resources; Environment; Economic Development;* and *Tourism and Culture*. Two of the five crown corporations in the territory also affect environmental decisions (*Yukon Energy Corp* and *Yukon Development Corp*), but do not affect the region closely enough to describe here.

There are many other policies and committees of importance that fall under YTG’s mandate of “Ecology and the Environment”: a conservation action team, environmental advice and energy
solutions services, a co-operative working group on the environmental effects of resource extraction, recycling clubs, and a wildlife viewing program\(^7\). Other important actors at the territorial level are *Yukon Parks, Yukon Museums Associations*, and *Yukon Heritage*.

F-3: CYFN and First Nations’ Governments

The *Council of Yukon First Nations* (CYFN) is the central political organization for the First Nation people of the Yukon. It has been in existence (in different forms) since 1973. CYFN’s mandate is to be a unified organization supporting First Nations Governments, First Nations aspirations, and advocating on key issues where appropriate. The Council works in conjunction with many other local, national, and international organizations on various issues significant to the lives of Yukon First Nation people and acts as an ambassador to represent Yukon First Nation’s people nationally and internationally (CYFN, 2019).

F-4: Land Claims and Final Agreements

The Government of Canada recognizes the inherent right of self-government as an existing Aboriginal right under section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. “Recognition of the inherent right is based on the view that the Aboriginal peoples of Canada have the right to govern themselves in relation to matters that are internal to their communities, integral to their unique cultures, identities, traditions, languages and institutions, and with respect to their special relationship to their land and their resource” (Government of Canada, 2015). This document reads further to say that, “The inherent right of self-government does not include a right of sovereignty in the international law sense and will not result in sovereign independent Aboriginal

\(^7\) From the website – get source.
nation states. On the contrary, implementation of self-government should enhance the participation of Aboriginal peoples in the Canadian federation and ensure that Aboriginal peoples and their governments do not exist in isolation, separate and apart from the rest of Canadian society” (Government of Canada, 2015: 2-3).

The Yukon First Nations have benefitted from taking the time to create strong self-governing agreements that will allow them self-sufficiency now and into the future. The *Umbrella Final Agreement* (UFA) was reached in 1988 and finalized in 1990, approved in 1993. This is the overall agreement of the Yukon Land Claims package and provides a general agreement between the Government of Canada, the Yukon Government, and the Council for Yukon Indians (now CYFN). It is not a “legal” document, but a “political” document and outlines the themes and guidelines by which each individual FN’s self-government agreement is defined.

The chapters of the UFA are as follows:

1.) Definitions
2.) General Provisions
3.) Eligibility and Enrollment
4.) Reserves and Land Set Aside
5.) Tenure and Management of Settlement Land
6.) Access
7.) Expropriation
8.) Surface Rights Board
9.) Settlement Land Amount
10.) Special Management Areas
11.) Land Use Planning
12.) Development Assessment
13.) Heritage
14.) Water Management
15.) Definition of Boundaries and Measurement of Areas of Settlement Land
16.) Fish and Wildlife
17.) Forest Resources
18.) Non-renewable Resources
19.) Financial Compensation
20.) Taxation
21.) Taxation of Settlement Land
22.) Economic Development Measure
23.) Resources Royalty Sharing
24.) Yukon Indian Self-Government
25.) Transboundary Agreements
26.) Dispute Resolution
27.) Yukon Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Trust
28.) Implementation and Training for Settlement Implementation

Since many of the cultural and political interests of First Nations people are embedded in the natural world around them, much of this document pertains to resource and lands management. As a result a number of environmental boards and councils have been created to oversee decision making processes in regard to these issues: Yukon Land Use Planning Council, Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Board, Yukon Surface Rights Board, Yukon Water Board, Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board and the regional Renewable Resource Councils. Local agreements specific to each first nation have been negotiated, and these agreements convert land ownership to the first nation groups and ensure their involvement in resource management and major development decisions within traditional territories.

Yukon Land-Use Planning Council

Land use planning and development is mandated by Chapter 11 of the Umbrella Final Agreement and subsequent First Nations Final Agreements between the federal, territorial and first nations’ governments. There are 8 land use planning regions in Yukon, all mandated by natural boundaries, following traditional first nations’ boundaries where possible, and taking consideration of affected communities as an initial condition. This research takes place within one of these planning regions. The Government of Canada provides funding for the preparation of land use plans, which are administered by the Yukon Land Use Planning Council (YLUPC), an independent arms-length organization. Separate Regional Planning Commissions are
responsible for identifying regional issues; defining cultural, ecological and economic values; collecting and analyzing data; considering alternative future scenarios and preparing recommendations about appropriate levels and types of human activity (Yukon Land Use Planning Council, 2017).

**Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Board**

The Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Act (YESAA) came into effect May 13, 2004 as a direct result of Chapter 12 (Development Assessment Process) of the UFA. YESAA was created to establish a process for assessing the environmental and socio-economic affects (positive and negative) of certain activities in Yukon. Assessments will be completed by integrating scientific information, traditional knowledge and other local knowledge in all assessments. The enactment of this act establishes a Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Board (YESAB) with six designated offices in different communities around the Yukon (YESAB, 2019). A YESAB office exists in Haines Junction that reviews projects in and around the GKR.

**Yukon Surface Rights Board**

The Yukon Surface Rights Board is a tribunal whose primary role is to resolve access disputes between those owning or having an interest in the surface of the land and others with access rights to the land for sub-surface or other reasons (usually to do with minerals, oil, or gas). The primary authority for the Board is set out in the *Yukon Surface Rights Act* (Canada), which came into force in February 1995 as a result of principles established in Chapter 8 of the Umbrella Final Agreement. Additional responsibilities of the Board are set out in other laws and
agreements including the *Quartz Mining Act* (Yukon), the *Placer Mining Act* (Yukon), the *Expropriation Act* (Canada), the *Radiocommunications Act* (Canada), and individual Yukon First Nations Final Agreements (Yukon Surface Rights Board, 2018).

**Yukon Water Board**

The Yukon Water Board is an independent body established under the Yukon Waters Act. The Water Board Secretariat provides administrative support and works on the Board’s behalf. Under the *Yukon Waters Act*, the Yukon Water Board issues water licences for various activities for the use of water and/or the deposit of waste to water. This process promotes the balance of conservation, development and utilization of Yukon water for all Yukoners and Canadians (Yukon Water Board, 2019).

Although the Yukon Water Board is now managed in relation to guidelines set out in the UFA, this Board was originally established in the 1970s and for many years, was one of the strongest, and only territorially-based, sources of environmental protection that existed in the Yukon.

**Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board**

The mission statement of the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board (YFWMB) is “to ensure the continued well-being of fish and wildlife populations in the Yukon for the use and enjoyment of all Yukoners and future generations while protecting First Nations special interest in wildlife”. The Board was established out of Chapter 16 (Fish and Wildlife Management) of the UFA and consists of 12 members appointed by the Minister of Environment, with 6 nominated by the CYFN and 6 by YTG. The Board works in partnership with federal, territorial,
and FN governments, as well as other UFA boards and councils to affect territorial polices, legislation, and other measures to help guide the management of fish and wildlife, conserve habitat, and enhance the renewable resource economy (YFWMB, 2019).

Renewable Resource Councils

Renewable Resource Councils (RRCs) are local management bodies in the Yukon established where individual land claim agreements have been signed. They are a body of locally elected members that act as a voice for local community members in managing renewable resources, such as fish, wildlife, habitat, and forest matters specific to their traditional territory. The creation of local RRCs has also arisen out of Chapter 16 of the UFA and they play an important advisory role to the YFWMB by raising awareness and providing information on specific local issues. Important to this study area are the Alsek RRC and the Dan Keyi RRC. With the early settlement of the CAFN land claim, the Alsek RRC is very well-established and functioning as a very strong body. The Dan Keyi RRC for the Kluane First Nation traditional territory is still fairly new and working to find its ground.

F-5: Industry Associations

Industry associations in the Yukon have been set up to speak on behalf of their members, keep members informed on relevant issues and trends within their industry, and maintain communication between all members as well as their relevant government bodies. Three industries (and their respective organizations) are of most importance to the Yukon economy and this thesis: Yukon Outfitters Association, Yukon Chamber of Mines, and the Tourism Industry Association.
Yukon Outfitters Association

Yukon is divided into 20 outfitting concessions, with non-resident hunting guiding rights given to only one “outfitter” in each, all which are members of the Yukon Outfitters Association (YOA). Hunting in the Yukon is a highly regulated and controlled industry. All hunting by non-residents must be guided by an outfitter in each concession who holds a valid outfitting license from the Government of Yukon and must comply with “sound wildlife conservation” as outlined in the Yukon Wildlife Act by the territory. Outfitters must take responsibility for the actions of their customers and have a moral and legal right to ensure wild game meat from the animals is not wasted. No outfitter shall trespass upon the rights to property of any other YOA member. Outfitters offer traditional local knowledge work with biologists and other experts to supply information to the Yukon Department of Renewable Resources and support conservation and wildlife management with large financial contributions to related projects.

Outfitting is a stable, long-term, family-oriented business, most often run out of the homes of the Yukoners that hold the outfitting rights. It has made a large contribution to the Yukon economy, drawing hunters worldwide. The present outfitting concessions were set out in 1958 and the licenses to these regions largely have been passed down generationally, making for a powerful network of control over the land and wildlife it inhabits. All hunters wishing to hunt big game in the Yukon are required to pay a game seal before the hunt. Non-resident trophy fees for this game are large in comparison to their resident counterparts, and since outfitting rights belong to a small, powerful group of Yukoners that tend to lead international hunters, access to these permits can be more easily attained by the outfitters - giving them a significant amount of control over Yukon wildlife populations (YOA, 2019).
Yukon Chamber of Mines

The Yukon Chamber of Mines’ mission is “to strive to represent the full spectrum of exploration and mining activities in the Yukon, to promote responsible and prosperous exploration and mining industries in the Yukon, to represent the interests of the mining industry at all levels of government discussion, to increase public awareness of the benefits of responsible, sustainable development of mineral resources.” Other objectives include promoting or opposing legislative measures affecting prospecting, exploration, and mining; give basic instruction in geology, exploration, and mining through offered courses; circulate information relative to the mining industry and maintain a mining exhibit and mining library; and to provide a meeting place for all interested in working in mining. The Yukon Chamber of Mines is a non-profit, independent society with financial support from membership dues. Members include the Klondike Placer Miners Association and the Yukon Prospectors Association, scientists, government officials, First Nations, among other private firms and independent miners (Yukon Chamber of Mines, 2019).

Tourism Industry Associations

The tourism industry in the Yukon is represented by three associations, each with a different focus that is explicit in their names: Tourism Industry Association of the Yukon (TIA Yukon), Wilderness Tourism Association of the Yukon (WTAY), and Yukon First Nations Tourism Association (YFNTA). These are supported by the Government of Yukon’s tourism department: Yukon Tourism. Each association has been created to bring together a common voice and actions to influence, promote and assist the development of tourism in the Yukon.
Members are expected to maintain the highest standard of conduct, act with fairness, integrity, and in a manner complementary to the Yukon’s tourism industry. Each industry association provides business and marketing support to members that join in return for them paying membership fees and following a certain code of conduct set out by the association, for example, the WTAY expects members to practice “leave no trace” and wilderness etiquette, among other Standards.

F-6: Advocacy Groups

There are two main ENGOs in the Yukon: the Yukon Conservation Society and Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon chapter. The Yukon Conservation Society (YCS) has existed since 1968 and was formed in the efforts to educate, advocate, and conduct research on Yukon environmental issues. The organization has gained increasing respect and has come to play a fairly large role in influencing environmental policy and education in the North. YCS coordinates activities on a number of environmentally-related issues around the Yukon and are currently working at projects related to energy and climate change, off road vehicles, mining, water, wolves, sustainable communities, and the Peel Watershed (YCS, 2016).

The Yukon Chapter of the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS-Yukon) appears to have a similar mandate to YCS, with a focus on advocacy and network building, but it is a very different type of organization. Where YCS tends to focus on numerous individual and local matters, broadly sustainability oriented, CPAWS-Yukon tends to work on a larger scale, with a mission to establish a network of protected areas and conservation lands to safeguard wilderness and wildlife throughout the north (CPAWS-Yukon). With that, CPAWS-Yukon long had one project in progress: protecting the Peel Watershed. More recently they have been
expanding their campaigns, with the settlement of the Peel planning case. They are relevant because they provide education and awareness across the territory, however they have never had a hand in any particular issues in the Kluane Region.

Other community groups have popped up for periods of time as well. *Raven Recycling* started in 1989 as a group of volunteers that wanted to see recycling happening in the Yukon – this has evolved to become the community recycling centre for the territory. A short-term grouped formed and successfully advocated for a bear fence around the Haines Junction landfill site – which was starting to cause problems for the local wildlife community. *Friends of Kluane* was a local environmental group that gathered in Haines Junction and advocated for environmental awareness, while taking up various initiatives around the community and with the Park. This was active for just under 10 years from the mid-late 90s and into the 2000s. The Wildlife Conservation Society has now had a Whitehorse office for over a decade and is quietly active on conservation planning and science.
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