perspectives embodied within *America's Wilderness* cohere to enhance our understanding of the underlying value and contribution of Wilderness to the cultural make-up of this country.

Protected Areas on Tribal Lands and Historical Ties with the Wilderness Movement

Diane L. Krahe, *Environmental History Workshop*

Ute Mountain Tribal Park on the Ute Mountain Reservation in Colorado. Mt. Adams Recreation Area on the Yakama Reservation in Washington. The Wind River Roadless Area on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming. The Mission Mountains Tribal Wilderness on the Flathead Reservation in Montana. These are but a few examples of tracts of tribally owned land that Indian nations have chosen to protect from extractive use. Both within the boundaries of Indian reservations and on lands beyond reservation boundaries that tribes have recently acquired, these types of tribally designated natural areas are growing in number. Although carrying the moniker "Wilderness" in only a few instances to date, these lands are being managed by tribes to retain or restore traditional Native values that overlap considerably with contemporary Wilderness values: the protection of fish and wildlife, the protection of vegetation and water, the protection of cultural heritage.

Within this expanding lot of protected areas across Indian Country, the aforementioned tribal park, recreation area, roadless area, and tribal Wilderness share a common history. These areas were once part of a federally mandated network of Indian "roadless" and "wild" designations that predated federal Wilderness. While serving as chief forester of the Indian Office in the 1930s, Bob Marshall designed a federal policy to preserve the Wilderness character of 16 scenic areas on a dozen Indian reservations without tribal consultation or consent. The policy kept nearly five million acres of Indian lands free from roads and motorized vehicles for two decades. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs declassified all but one of these areas because Indian nations did not want their *tribal* lands included in a *federal* Wilderness system, which early Wilderness bills proposed. Reservation lands were dropped from intermediate versions of what became the Wilderness Act of 1964. Later, some tribes elected to protect the natural conditions of portions of their defunct roadless areas on their own terms. The Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho tribes have chosen to retain their Wind River Roadless Area all along.

In addition, off-reservation tribal preserves today include the Intertribal Sinkyone Wilderness on the California coast and the Nez Perce's Precious Lands Wildlife Area in eastern Oregon. Tribal sovereignty is the unifying theme of the stories behind all these contemporary designations. Otherwise, the origin story of each is unique, dependent on economic conditions and the cultural values of the tribal communities involved. Ongoing management of each of these areas is also unique, usually combining traditional methods of landscape preservation with borrowings from federal models. All Indian nations currently managing protected areas on their lands or pondering the designation of new areas of this sort could benefit from learning more about these and other examples of native innovations in landscape protection today.

Protecting Relationships with Wilderness as a Cultural Landscape

Roian Matt, *Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes*
Alan Watson, *Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute*

Interviews of tribal and nontribal Indian Reservation residents in Montana, U.S., were conducted to contrast the meanings that different cultures attach to a Tribal Wilderness. Legislation that created a national system of Wilderness areas (in 1964 and still growing) was conceived, supported, and enacted by a fairly distinct social group generally residing in urban areas and schooled in modern civilization's scientific model and relationship with nature. The places this legislation protects, however, provide many other poorly recognized and little understood meanings to other parts of society. There is a link between indigenous people and nature that is not described well in this legislation or management policy in most places. The Wilderness Act suggests that these protected areas should be "untrammeled," or unmanipulated, unfettered, when in fact it is common knowledge that, for most areas in North America, indigenous people have intervened, with respect, for generations. The Mission Mountains Tribal Wilderness in Montana, though not part of the National Wilderness Preservation System, was designated to protect many of these same values but also extend to protect important cultural meanings assigned to this wild landscape. Protecting the relationship between indigenous people and relatively intact, complex systems, which we commonly refer to as Wilderness in North America, can be an important contributor to sustainability of the landscape and cultural heritage. The meanings tribal members attached to the Wilderness are described here as (1) protecting nature and culture; (2) functional, emotional, and symbolic attachments; (3) wildlife and watershed protection; and (4) access, beauty, privacy, and recreation. The mean-

ings nontribal members attached to the Wilderness are summarized here very similarly to the classification of meanings reported for tribal members to facilitate emphasis on contrasts: (1) environmental protection; (2) functional, emotional, and symbolic attachments; (3) wildlife and watershed protection; and (4) access, beauty, privacy, and recreation. Non-tribal residents of the reservation seem to conform well to the Eurocentric perspective largely represented in the U.S. Wilderness Act. Recreation, exercise, and exploration in a relatively pristine and uncrowded environment, along with some acknowledgment of ecosystem services provided to wildlife and off-site watershed values are common. Among tribal members, however, the additional cultural significance of this protection, the deep personal and cultural attachments described, and the importance of free-flowing water and free-ranging wildlife contribute to a contrasting set of cultural landscape meanings.

Wilderness & International Indigenous & Community Lands & Seas, Toward 21st Century Wilderness Conservation

Sharon Shay Sloan, *WILD Foundation*

This interactive panel presentation explored cross-cultural notions of "nature" and "Wilderness," and the implications to Indigenous Peoples (IP) and local communities (LC) and their ancestral lands and waters. While some IP have celebrated, influenced and enhanced "Wilderness," others have rejected, been challenged by – and in some cases harmed – through various forms of Wilderness and protected areas policies, and their applications. Session highlighted examples of challenges and benefits of the Wilderness concept, and concluded with suggestions for a concept for 21st Century conservation and generating a new legacy for Wilderness, including redressing past and current injustices, engaging processes of dialogue, reconciliation and trust building, and re-defining Wilderness as *"well-conserved nature that intrinsically includes people"* (WILD10).

Indigenous Peoples and local communities traditional knowledge systems, customary rights, governance and practices have sustained "Wilderness" for thousands of years. Currently, IP total 5% of the world population, have traditional land claims to 24% of the Earth's lands and seas—containing 80% of the planet's biodiversity – and inhabit 80% of Protected Areas. Their lands and seas are some of the best protected on the planet. That said, in the majority of cases, conservation schemes have been developed and superimposed on their territories, without consultation or inclusion of these long-time caretakers. Colonialism generally, and this process specifically have resulted in gross violations of rights. Further, the majority of the conservation priorities for this century are on IP lands. IP are currently the stewards of at least the same amount of wild nature as all regional and national governments and conservation organizations combined (11%).

Key findings: The future of Wilderness and Protected Areas in part depends on the ability to bridge the priorities of conservation and Indigenous Peoples. A new legacy for Wilderness is paramount. 21st Century Wilderness conservation must be rooted in the best practices of Indigenous Peoples *and* institutional and contemporary conservation. These can be defined as enhancing the protection of all life—wild nature and human communities, cultural and biological diversity.

Findings suggest:

- Processes of reconciliation, trust building, and explicit dialogue between IP and conservation leaders are paramount
- Conservation stakeholders need to redress and remedy past injustices, affirm IP sovereignty and rights, implement Free Prior and Informed Consent and other measures in accordance with international instruments, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP; 2007)
- Multiple, cross-cultural notions of Wilderness, nature and culture need to be included in a redefinition of Wilderness, and strengthened through a collaborative, global Wilderness movement and community.