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In a 10-year participatory case study of conflicted communities, the author describes the historical, social, economic, rural and legal contexts of their conflict in relation to the survival of their Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultures and of the Atlantic salmon, each of which is in jeopardy of extinction. A thick description of the communities in relation to one another and to their place, Listuguj First Nation, Gespe’gewa’q, Mi’gmaq; the Restigouche watershed of northern New Brunswick and the Gaspé, and to the Atlantic salmon on which they depend, was constructed through semi-structured interviews with representative members of each community, together with long-term attendance at salmon-centred community events, ranging from scientific to ceremonial and trust-and-relationship-building informal conversations, supported an iterative methodology designed to honour Indigenous knowledge and methods. Theories of social learning, social capital, bridging, and bonding have been applied to the thick description, revealing a combination of socio-economic-political and epistemological-ontological differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous rights and stakeholders to be central to continuing conflict and failure to resolve what is understood by non-
Indigenous groups as “natural-resource management” for “conservation” and to continuing Indigenous resistance to scientific management. In the current context of unresolved issues of territory, consent, reconciliation, cooperation, and collaboration between Canada’s First Nations and its federal and provincial governments, this case study provides insights into necessary pre-conditions for their resolution.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to Plamu, the Atlantic salmon of Listuguj, Gespe’gewaq, Mi’gmaqi, the Restigouche Watershed, who, far from being saved by human agency, has the power to save us.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preface

This dissertation addresses a protracted clash of interests and disagreement over fishing practices between two culturally distinct communities and its roots in their respective world views. Unresolved, the survival of the species, cultures, and rural communities are at risk. The dissertation arises for my experience of unresolved competition between culturally conflicted communities over access to and use of the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed. Its importance is based on the fact that conflict over natural resources is a universal indicator in the 21st-century struggle for cultural, species, and rural-community survival.

It is the story of a river, its valleys, tributaries, and estuary. It is the story of a fish, born and bred in the river, the Atlantic salmon. But, above all, this is the story of the people of that river, their relationship to it, to one another, and to the fish.

It is also a story of my relationship to the river, the fish, and the people of the Restigouche River, its lands, and its waters. In that personal sense, it began over 30 years ago, when I was first invited to fish at one of the private camps that control much of the river. Over the ensuing years I would spend five summer days each year in the company of friends, family, and guides in pursuit of the salmon and in retreat from professional responsibilities. Arriving at camp after lengthy journeys from outside the province of New Brunswick, I knew little of the people who lived there year-round and nothing about the People of the Last Land, the Mi’gmaq of Gespe’gewaq. Like every other angler, I knew that there were fewer fish in the river than in “the good old days,” and like most I supported the idea of conservation and its practices, such as “catch and release.”

Those years of disengaged ignorance ended on November 11, 2010. Strangely, and for the purposes of this story tellingly, the end came not in a canoe or in camp but around a table in a mahogany-paneled room in midtown Manhattan. I was attending the Restigouche River Camp Owners’ Association (RRCOA) annual meeting on behalf of
Watiqua, one of over 20 private camps represented by the association. The Chief of the Listuguj First Nation, Allison Metallic, and his advisor were our guests. The irony of treating Indigenous Americans as guests in Manhattan was lost on me at the time.

Although the agenda described the purpose of their presence as “Economic development opportunities and the gill-net fishery at Crosse Pointe,” they and we knew that they were there to defend their practice of fishing for and harvesting the salmon of the Restigouche. Every fish caught in their nets at the mouth of the river is killed and therefore does not live to spawn or fertilize eggs. Coincidentally, and perhaps as importantly for anglers, it is never tempted to rise to our flies, to be hooked, played, and released to continue its journey upriver to spawn. We were to discuss the possibility that the camp owners could help to improve the economy of Listuguj for, as the minutes stated, “High employment levels will reduce the number of fishers tending nets.” To us the goal was clear, the time limited.

Chief Metallic began discursively, telling stories of his people. His assistant showed us a movie, *Incident at Restigouche* by Obomsawin and Thomson (1984), telling the story of the events of 1981 at Listuguj, the rebirth of their community and its culture. Behind their presentation was a narrative that was hundreds, if not thousands, of years old. It could not be reduced to an item on an agenda or be contained in 30 New-York minutes. Knowing that the agenda and goals of the camp owners were limited to restricting the Listuguj catch, I was struck by the contrast between our agenda-driven goal and a radically different understanding of the world.

Despite Chief Metallic’s return to New York in 2011, the long saga of conflicting fisheries practices of anglers and the Mi’kmaq of Listuguj continues. The study described in this dissertation is an attempt to understand their differences, their cultures, and their communities, for it is only by deepening our stories that the salmon and they will survive.
1.2 Research Goal

In the Restigouche watershed, three differentiable yet interdependent communities share its rivers and its salmon: the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj First Nation; the non-Indigenous residents of Campbellton and Restigouche County, New Brunswick, and of the municipalités régionales de comté d’Avignon and de Matapédia in Quebec; and the non-resident camp-owning anglers and their guests. Sometimes in co-operation, more frequently in conflict, each impacts the Atlantic salmon and its habitat. The survival of the salmon and of each community, with its attendant cultures, is in jeopardy. How is this to be understood and what is being done to engender cooperation and collaboration for survival?

The overall research goal was to gain an understanding of “what is going on” within and between the three communities, in terms of their relationships to the salmon. How does each group construct its own relationship with the salmon, and how does each group construct and understand the other groups and their relationships with one another and with the salmon?

1.3 Research Tasks

To achieve the research goal and to help give definition to it required that a number of research tasks be undertaken. In keeping with the role of the researcher as a participant in ongoing and evolving social and ecological systems, a range of tasks were undertaken, broadly encompassed in literature reviews and direct engagement.

The literature reviewed was that relevant to history, colonialism, post-colonial perspectives, representation, epistemology, fisheries regulations and statistics, social learning, communities of practice, social capital, natural resources management, governance, place and symbolism.

Direct engagement was iterative and included presence in all three communities, including both Anglophone and Francophone non-Indigenous residents; observation, semi-structured interviews, travel, by land and water, through much of the watershed,
participation in community meetings and presentations of the research to all three communities for clarification and verification.

The specific objective of the research was to gather information for interpretation leading to understanding. This required learning about:

• the histories of the three communities, especially in terms of colonialism and governance;
• the historical impact of the three communities on the Atlantic-salmon fishery;¹
• present fishing and conservation practices;
• the epistemologies at work in the three communities;
• the role of symbolism in regard to the Atlantic salmon for and between each community;
• the importance of a shared “place,” in terms of creating and sustaining identity and providing meaning;
• the ways in which members of each community understand themselves, the place, and their practices in regard to the fishery and its conservation;
• the ways in which members of each community understand the other communities, their relationship to the place, and their practices in regard to the fishery and its conservation;
• the perceived points and causes of present conflict;
• the points of interdependence between the communities; and
• the impact of collaboration on practice and conservation.

¹ The Atlantic salmon is but one species of fish found in the waters of the Restigouche estuary. Cod, lobster, striped bass, eels, sea run trout, snow crab, haddock and halibut have and, in some cases, continue to provide valuable food and income. The Atlantic salmon is unique in that it also provides sport fishing in fresh water, with a substantial and significant economic spin-off for the non-indigenous resident community. (Sea run trout are fished by residents but are of relatively little significant economic importance.)
The information gathered from the completion of these tasks was then interpreted to understand “what is going on” within and between the three communities, in relation to their survival and that of the Atlantic salmon.

1.4 Chapters

Chapter 2 – Historical and Current Contexts. The chapter establishes the current contexts of the watershed, its communities, cultures and conflicts around the declining and threatened stocks of Atlantic salmon, in terms of their present socio-economic, geographic, and cultural constitutions; their colonial and post-colonial histories; and their incubi.

Chapter 3 – Literature Review. The chapter explores concepts of community, differing epistemologies, the importance of symbolism and place as sources of identity and meaning and theories and practices of social learning and models of collaborative governance, the literature review leads to a conceptual framework and theoretical construction of the issues of community, cultural, and species survival. It also supports a participatory, on-the-ground, narrative focused, interpretivist research method. Together the theoretical literature, conceptual framework and methodology provide insights into “what is going on” and possible ways forward beyond conflict to collaboration.

Chapter 4 – Methodology. The chapter is grounded in a constructivist understanding of how people know about and represent themselves, their communities, cultures, and environments, the methods used for gathering largely qualitative data are discussed. The identification of interviewees by principal informed respondents, protocols for the protection of interviewees, including members of the Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj, are discussed, together with the conduct of semi-structured interviews, the construction of narrative summaries and their distribution for feedback, verification, clarification, correction, and emendation.

Feedback and verification through formal oral and visual presentations of collected and summarized data to representative groups from all three communities and the researcher’s
presence at relevant events held by and in the communities, together with informal conversations and informally shared narratives, are discussed.

While the review of historical, geographic, political, economic, scientific and ethnological literature, provided context and background, this is a period of rapid change in relations between Canada’s First Nations and the federal and provincial governments affecting governance and control of natural resources. Further, anglers and non-Indigenous residents live in a far from economically and environmentally stable world. The use of up-to-date information from such ephemeral sources as annual reports, newspapers, magazines, and the Internet was therefore necessary. These sources provided valuable insights into these changes.

Chapter 5 – Results. The chapter provides a thick description (Geertz, 1973) of the communities, their cultures, and conservation of the Atlantic salmon, based on over 60 interviews conducted with representative Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents and anglers. Together with data gathered as described above, these interviews provide a contextual web of significance revealing an enhanced description of the watershed, its inhabitants, and angling visitors, their understandings of themselves and the others, and of the Atlantic salmon and its conservation.

Chapter 6 – Analysis. The chapter describes the changing practices and understandings at work in each community in regard to their self-understanding and their relation to one another and the salmon. The narrative data generated in the research stage is examined in terms of definitions and understandings of community, place, ways of knowing, symbolism, management, governance and bridging, in order to discover how change has and is occurring. What does the data tell us about this evolutionary process? Does it

2 During the course of the research the Listuguj Mi’gmaq Government signed an agreement to settle their claims against the Federal government for loss of lands set aside for their use. It amounts to over $60 million and is without prejudice to their territorial claims. Further, the election of a new Federal government, whose stated priority is to renew its relationship with First Nations, resulted in a new (Spring, 2016) mandate for Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) to reopen negotiations with First Nations on fisheries on a treaty basis.
support, or contradict, the literature and the practice of community-based natural-resource management and mutual dialogical learning? What means of enhancing dialogical learning, including the building of leadership and community capacity for the creation of social capital, might the results and analysis suggest?

**Chapter 7 – Conclusion.** Contextually based conclusions are drawn from the analysis of results, using the literature of social learning, social capital, governance, natural-resource management, place, and symbolism in conjunction with conflicted epistemologies and the reported up-to-date assessments of representatives of the three communities.

**Chapter 8 – Contributions to Knowledge, Theory, and Practice.** The chapter reviews the importance of the first sociological study of the Restigouche watershed in particular or of any major Canadian Atlantic-salmon river. It is the first to use a narrative-based approach to understanding “what is going on,” in terms of conflict and fragmentation and also in terms of social learning for changes in practice and governance between culturally and epistemologically conflicted communities.

Insofar as this study deals with both a threatened species, the Atlantic salmon, and threatened cultures, Mi’gmaq, sport fishing, and rural, coexisting on a Canadian periphery, it provides information and insights relevant to the solution of complex, *wicked problems* (Waddell, 2013) through mutual, dialogical learning for survival.

It is also the first such study to examine a largely foreign and urban-based community in relation to a First Nation and to long-established but precarious Canadian settler communities, revealing issues of the exercise of transnational political and economic power for control over a limited natural resource for sporting, rather than industrial, use.

While the narrative data and current fisheries practices reveal continuation of both conflict and fracturing between and within communities, there is within the Restigouche watershed evidence of bridging between communities and cultures and of an increase in scientific and management capacity, leading to the creation of social capital between and within communities.
The dissertation concludes that a bricolage of theories applied to complex communities, struggling with survival and conservation, gives insight, understanding, and support for changing protocols and practices.

**Chapter 9 – Limitations and Further Research.** Since the research is limited to one watershed and the historical, governmental, and economic particularities of the region, over one short and changing time period, the results may be of limited applicability to other places where intercultural conflict over a natural resource is being experienced.
CHAPTER 2 – HISTORICAL AND PRESENT CONTEXTS OF THE CONFLICT

For a thousand years, the Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar L.) has occupied a salient position in the history of Eastern North America. Originally a food source with both social and ceremonial purposes for Aboriginal people, it became an increasingly important factor in both the domestic and commercial life of the developing colonies. Commercial salmon fisheries in Canada remained important to rural economies of the Maritime Provinces through the 1960s and through the 1980s elsewhere. The salmon as well provided an important recreational outlet for sportsmen and evolved as a principal object of intellectual and scientific investigations. It is a heritage of Atlantic Canada and Québec, an important indicator of environmental quality, an object of respect, a target of eco-tourism, and has a unique intrinsic value. North Atlantic-wide, the species has a significant cultural and economic value for which substantial public interest and support exists, particularly because of the association between salmon and pristine natural environment.

The recent downturns in abundance of some stocks, however, have led to a focus on community level conservation as well as on the related high value recreational fisheries and the socio-economic opportunities they provide. The growing acceptance of catch and release recreational fisheries has permitted the coexistence of both a fishery and maximization of escapements, thereby sustaining thousands of jobs primarily in rural and remote areas where there is limited opportunity to establish viable, alternative industries.

—Fisheries and Oceans Canada (2009), p. 46

2.1 The Fish

In the public space between the northern-New-Brunswick town centre of Campbellton and the Restigouche River stands a 10-metre statue of a leaping Atlantic salmon, symbolizing the importance of this fish to the community’s past, present, and hoped-for future. It is, however, a symbol rich in conflicted meanings. The Restigouche River has seen a, so far, irreversible decline in the number of Atlantic salmon returning from their feeding grounds in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, coastal Labrador, and Greenland to their breeding grounds upstream in the Restigouche and its equally famous tributaries, the Matapédia, Upsalquitch, Patapédia, and Kedgwick rivers. This watershed has been long
renowned for the size of its *multi-winter sea* (MWS) fish, and so local residents, visiting anglers, conservationists and their organizations, governments, and the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj First Nation all express concern for the future of this culturally and economically essential animal.

Historical accounts indicate that the average weight of commercially caught salmon at the end of the 18th century was between 19 and 23 lb. (8.6 and 10.5 kg) (Madden, 2000). The reported catch in 1791 was in excess of 70,000 large salmon. In 1846, half a century after the first British settler began a commercial fishery, a visitor, Moses Perley, commented, “For a long period no river in North America (except perhaps the Columbia) yielded so large a supply of salmon as the Restigouch [sic]” (Dunfield, 1985, p. 124). A century later, in 1930, 133,000 large salmon, most destined for the Restigouche, were caught in commercial nets in Baie des Chaleurs (Madden, 2000). Sport-fishing catches throughout this period and beyond were of sufficient numbers and of sufficiently large fish to maintain the river’s reputation as a world-class Atlantic-salmon sport fishery. As late as 1988 Mike Crosby, a well-known sport fisherman, released a fly-caught male fish estimated to “easily top 60 lb. [27.3 kg]” (Crosby, n.d., p. 59).

However, Madden (2000) reported that “in 1971…the year preceding the closure of the commercial fishery in the upper Bay of Chaleur…the total catch by the entire commercial fishery” equated to only 3,000 salmon, as many as were caught in one day at one stand in the early 19th century. Spawning escapement figures have revealed a downward trend. The Restigouche River Watershed Management Council (RRWMC) reported at the Salmon Summit held in Listuguj in 2015 that the responsible government agencies, federal and provincial, calculated that the watershed would require approximately 7,000 multi-sea winter fish (MSW) to spawn in order to achieve a minimum escapement to maintain the fishery. The Listuguj Mig’maq First Nation Fishery Plan calls for an

---

3 See, for instance, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) cumulative counts statistics for the Upsalquitch Protection Barrier averages from 1995 to 2016 reported at https://inter-j01.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/asir/report/count and https://inter-j01.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/asir/report/graph?countPeriod=1031&site=1&speciesType=1
escapement of 12,200 MSW fish. (Listuguj Mi’gmaq Government, 2012) The management consensus is that neither target has been met in recent years.

The reasons for this decline are only partially understood, since this anadromous fish, spawned in the headwaters of rivers around the North Atlantic, faces threats both natural and anthropogenic during its maturation in fresh water and in its long ocean journey to and from the west coast of Greenland. Threats as local as destruction of spawning and juvenile habitat, natural predators, poaching, river and estuary pollution and as far-reaching as high-seas fisheries, intentional and by-catches, and changing ocean-temperature regimes continue to be combatted and studied, even as the number of returning fish decreases. Doubt over the continuing survival of this species and the human communities and cultures dependent on it are the larger context for this dissertation.

The Restigouche watershed\(^4\) is one of fewer than 1000 around the North Atlantic to which mature Atlantic salmon return to spawn. Some watersheds have sizeable human populations: the Liffey flows through the Republic of Ireland’s capital, Dublin. Some, the rivers of Anticosti Island in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, for instance, have no permanent settlements. The Restigouche watershed is neither urban, nor is it a wilderness. In fact, three distinct and describable human communities coexist, while interacting with the Atlantic salmon. Each has a long history of interaction with one another as well as with the salmon. Indeed, the salmon was an initial cause of their presence on the river’s banks.

### 2.2 The First People

Beginning with the human re-colonization of the land at the end of the last Ice Age, the Indigenous people of Gaspe’gewaq, the Mi’kmaq,\(^5\) have been sustained by the salmon

---

\(^4\) The Restigouche River watershed represents an area of more than 10,000 km\(^2\), distributed approximately 60% in New Brunswick and 40% in Quebec. This basin includes the sub-watersheds of the Matapédia, Patapédia, Kedgwick, Little Main, and Upsalquitch rivers.

\(^5\) The Mi’gmaq of the Listuguj First Nation, Gespe’gewaq, (“people of the last land”) are their present-day descendants.
harvested by spearing as they passed by the camp at “the Bottleneck” and, more recently, in gill nets in the river’s estuary. Despite *de jure* and *de facto* attempts by colonial, provincial and federal governments to curtail their fishing activities, the Listuguj First Nation, re-privileged by recent court decisions upholding their rights (See Appendix A), continue to net salmon in the river’s estuary as these fish begin summer runs to spawning sites upstream. The Listuguj Mi’gmaq Government (LMG) adopted a fisheries management plan in 2012 (Listuguj Mi’gmaq Government, 2012). The extent to which it has been followed remains a matter of controversy (Representatives of RRCOA, LMG, and Gespe’gwaq Mi’kmaq Resource Council, personal communications, 2013–2018). Currently there is no federal or provincial monitoring or control of their catch.

### 2.3 Settlers

Ancestors of the second community, sailing from Europe, arrived in the estuary as early as 1534 (Mi’kmaw History-Overview, 2016). Following the conquest of New France by the British, a commercial fishery was established in the estuary by 1773. In the years following the American Revolutionary War, Robert Ferguson of Athol House, upstream of Campbellton, “annually caught and exported 1,400 barrels, (280,000 lbs. pickled) of salmon from his own fishing stations alone” (Dunfield, 1985, p. 64). This fishery continued until 1972, when the federal government bought out the last commercial nets. Two centuries after the promise of profit and livelihood from commercial fishing, together with land for farming and forestry, had brought British settlers to the Restigouche, that part of the local economy had ended. Today tourism, with the river as its focal point, is seen as a developable resource to help to sustain the non-Indigenous resident community through its long northern New Brunswick winters. Campbellton is a regional centre, with provincial and federal government, health, banking, and educational services driving the local economy. Nevertheless, the average income of people with full-time employment in 2007 was $19,159, 8.9% below that of New Brunswick. Unemployment at 13.16% (2007) was similarly greater than New-Brunswick as a whole at 9.5% (2011) and Canada at 7.5% (2011). In 2017, the City of Campbellton opened the Restigouche Experience Welcome Centre on the banks of the Restigouche at the first
highway exit from the Inter-Provincial Bridge. Modelled on a classic up-river salmon fishing lodge, the exhibits celebrate the natural history of the salmon and the social history of salmon angling.

2.4 Sport Fishers

While settlers joined their Indigenous neighbours in capturing salmon for their own sustenance, as well as cooperating in the commercial fishery, the third community, that of non-resident, recreational anglers, began to take control of the river and its riparian rights in the period immediately preceding Confederation (Parenteau, 2004; Thomas, 2001). This remains a present reality.

The nearby airport at Charlo no longer hosts scheduled Air Canada flights, but private and corporate jets still discharge their passengers, who come from metropolitan homes to enjoy the “sport of kings” at their camps6. In 2012 the RRCOA numbered 22 camps. Each summer their members and guests fish for approximately 15,000 rod-days. In New Brunswick, by law, all the salmon they catch are released, and 85% of all their fly-caught grilse are released to spawn. By contrast, in Quebec the figures for grilse are reversed, with fewer than one in five being released. In addition, some multi-winter sea fish are killed (RRCOA, 2012).

Today, the privately owned, non-commercial, sport-fishing camps continue to provide seasonal jobs, to purchase supplies locally, and to pay taxes. A study, commissioned by the RRCOA and conducted by Van Lantz of the University of New Brunswick in 2007–2009, showed that

6 Camp Harmony, the first permanent camp, was built at the confluence of the Upsalquitch and Restigouche rivers in 1879. Others quickly followed. When Camp Harmony was later expanded a frequent guest, the famous New-York architect, Stamford White, was its designer. The Restigouche Club required its members and guests to dress in black tie for dinner. While not all camps were, or are this elaborate, from the beginning they have hired local people as guides, kitchen staff, wardens, managers, and maintenance personnel. The urban-rural link between these camps continues to this day, with the RRCOA holding their annual meeting at the University Club, 54th Street and Fifth Avenue in New York City.
with total expenditures exceeding $10 million, direct and indirect income and output value contributions exceeding $6.4 and $5.4 million, respectively, and employment contributions of 535 (part-time equivalent) jobs, these camps provide an important engine of economic activity in the region and “a significant contribution to New Brunswick and Quebec economies” (Lantz, 2010).

2.5 Biological and Cultural Diversity.

The challenges facing the Restigouche River watershed, its Atlantic salmon, and the cultures unique to it, reflect a global concern with the loss of species and cultures. Diversity of species and cultures is held by many to be essential to the future survival of the human species. (See, as examples, Davis, 2009; Wilson, n.d.).

Specie loss often goes unrecognized because it is silent and all but invisible (Moola & Suzuki, 2010). While species extinction has always been a part of the bio-web of Earth, it is currently thought to be occurring at a rate 1,000 to 10,000 times greater than the background rate. The World Wildlife Fund equated this to the extinction of between 10,000 and 100,000 of the estimated 100 million existent species each year (World Wildlife Fund, n.d.). It is directly linked to habitat degradation and destruction by humans. The majority of these species are microorganisms, upon which all other bio-species are dependent, including humans. Wilson (n.d.) has argued, “We should preserve every scrap of biodiversity as priceless while we learn to use it and come to understand what it means to humanity.”

The David Suzuki Foundation reported that

the unraveling of food webs that have taken millennia to evolve is happening all around us. With every patch of forest cut, wetland drained, or grassland paved over, our actions are destroying wildlife habitat at an unprecedented rate. Scientists warn that we are in the midst of a human-caused catastrophic wildlife crisis. Of known

7 France’s ecology secretary and the World Resources Institute’s vice-president of science and research argue that “unlike the impacts of climate change, biodiversity—and the ecosystem services it harbours—disappears in a mostly silent, local, and anonymous fashion. This may explain in part why the devastation of nature has triggered fewer alarm bells than a hotting-up planet.”
species, some 17,000 plants and animals are facing extinction, including 12% of birds, nearly a quarter of mammals, and a third of amphibians. Some of the species most vulnerable to human impacts are iconic, well-loved creatures. (Moola & Suzuki, 2010, para. 4–5)

The Atlantic salmon is such a creature for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents of the Restigouche watershed and for those anglers who journey there each summer seeking to entice it to their flies.

### 2.6 The Atlantic Salmon and Species Extinction

The Atlantic salmon is an *anadromous* species, spawning in fresh water, where it lives through the early stages of its life, before migrating to salt water as a smolt, to travel, in the case of most Canadian MSW salmon\(^8\), as far as the west coast of Greenland. There it grows to a weight of between 2.5 and 10 kg, depending upon how many winters it remains at sea before returning to its natal stream to spawn.

Atlantic salmon, like most species, suffer a high mortality rate. This occurs naturally in both fresh and salt water; however, Jonathan Carr, Director of Research and Environment at the Atlantic Salmon Association, has noted that “it is safe to say that at-sea mortality has doubled” over the past 30 years (Personal communication, 2016)\(^9\), increasing fears of another human-induced specie collapse, following the cod, in Atlantic Canada. Some Atlantic salmon, unlike Pacific salmon, survive spawning and return to the ocean. Should they survive there, upon their return they are able to spawn again. A very small number repeat the cycle to spawn a third, or even fourth time. These repeat spawners reach weights in excess of 15 kg, earning for the species the title “King of Fish.”

The Atlantic salmon is also known as the “Fish of Kings,” since access to the salmon in its freshwater habitat has been and is limited by the privatization of fishing rights and the

---

\(^8\) Some salmon return to their natal streams after a single winter in the ocean. Known as *grilse*, they typically weigh between 1 and 2 kg and are sexually mature.

\(^9\) Private communication. Until late in the 20th century smolt returns were estimated to be at 8%. Current returns are estimated to be at 4%, although there is variance from watershed to watershed.
costs and time limitations of accessing rivers remote from the homes of people able to afford to fish for them. People able and willing to fish for Atlantic salmon are therefore often, but not exclusively, from among the world’s economic, social, and cultural elites and are well travelled and highly informed. Through their education and participation in the discourse of conservation, the majority are fully aware that Atlantic-salmon populations have declined dramatically in almost all parts of its range (see Appendix B and for a map showing populations of Canadian salmon rivers see http://asf.ca/endangered-populations.html), and that threats to this game fish are but a small part of the larger story of species loss. Thus, these world-travelling anglers are able to locate the plight of their own prey within a fragile world.

2.7 The Ethnosphere and Cultural Extinction

The anthropologist, writer, and filmmaker, Wade Davis (2009) has coined the word *ethnosphere* to echo *biosphere* and to draw attention to “this extraordinary matrix of cultures that envelops the planet” (Davis, 2009, p. 224). In his work he links language loss to the loss of cultures. *Ethnologue* counted 7,105 languages in the world in 2013 (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2014). *Ethnologue* described various levels of threat to these languages and therefore their cultures, estimating that six languages are lost in their entirety each year. This is linked to the fact that “no one retains a sense of ethnic identity associated with the (lost) language” (Lewis et al., 2014). Other languages are under threat because “intergenerational transmission is in the process of being broken” (Lewis et al., 2014). These languages are in trouble, but, since parents can still use the language, it is not too late to restore natural intergenerational transmission in the home. It is possible that revitalization efforts

---

10 There are exceptions to this, such as Nova Scotia, where all rivers are publicly accessible for fishing. Commercial camps on rivers such as the Miramichi in New Brunswick provide access for visitors with $700 a day to spend. Crown Waters in New Brunswick and the publicly owned and managed rivers of Quebec provide provincial residents and visitors with more modestly priced fishing. However, fishing rights in the Restigouche River watershed are largely privately held by non-residents. The membership of the oldest club with the most pools is reputed to consist of leading industrialist-businessmen, with 10 from each of the United States and Canada.
could achieve this by focusing on the motivations of parents. We report this to be the condition of 1,481 (or 21%) of the 7,105 known living languages. (Lewis et al., 2014)

Languages are said to be *dying* where

the child-bearing generation is no longer able to transmit the language to the next generation, since the only fluent users (if any remain) are above that age. Revitalization efforts would need to develop mechanisms outside the home in order to transmit the language. We report this to be the condition of 906 (or 13%) of the 7,105 known living languages. (Lewis et al., 2014, para.)

### 2.8 Listuguj First Nation

The language of the Listuguj First Nation is Mi’gmaw, one of over a third of the world’s languages threatened by extinction. The census of 2011 showed slightly over 8,000 speakers in an ethnic population of 14,000\(^{11}\), or four out of seven Mi’kmaq speak their traditional language. *Ethnologue* described the language as “threatened.” (Lewis et al, 2014) The Listuguj First Nation has recently established a school on their territory in which the language is taught. A “mechanism outside the home” has been established “in order to transmit the language.”

Just as the loss of language threatens the survival of the culture of the Listuguj First Nation, so does the loss of their Atlantic-salmon fishery. Their cultural memory of the salmon is counted not in decades or centuries but in millennia. Its importance to their culture has been recognized by Canadian courts, and it is an important part of their present discourse.\(^{12}\) The re-establishment and defence of their fishing rights constitute significant accomplishments in their struggle to protect their culture.\(^{13}\) The Atlantic

---

\(^{11}\) Mi’gmaq communities are present today (2016) from the Gaspé through Eastern New Brunswick, throughout Nova Scotia, and in parts of Newfoundland and Maine.

\(^{12}\) See the Marshall decision of the Supreme Court of 1999 (Appendix A) and the Listuguj Mi’gmaq Government website: www.listuguj.ca

\(^{13}\) Utility poles in their community carry banners depicting the “Incident at Restigouche” in which members of the Listuguj First Nation, fishers, and their families, were attacked by Quebec provincial officials in 1981, describing it as a significant event in the re-birth of their self-identity and culture.
salmon is as indispensable to Listuguj First Nation culture as is the Mi’kmaw language.

2.9 Non-Indigenous Residents and Sport Fishers

A similar claim may be made for the link between the survival of the salmon and the continuation of the subculture of the sport-fishing community of the private camps of the watershed and their employees. The link between the salmon and the culture of the larger non-Indigenous population is, perhaps, more tenuous but none the less real.

2.10 Cultural Survival: Tolerance, Equity, and Appreciation

The survival of cultures within multi-cultural populations in which there is competition for limited resources, such as in the Restigouche watershed, goes beyond the concept and possible practice of equity. Beside being difficult to determine, attempts at equitable sharing of a resource, such as the salmon, hide the underlying issue. The survival of competing cultures of unequal power requires acceptance of the value of cultural diversity. For instance, the attempted assimilation, of the Listuguj First Nation into the settler cultures of the watershed, represents a rejection of the value of their culture. Similarly, to allow non-resident sport fishers to monopolize the salmon through the market and their economic power, without regard to the role that access to salmon plays in the cultural well-being of residents, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, represents an indifference to these cultures. Mutual acceptance and, beyond that, appreciation of one another’s unique culture would seem to be essential for cultural survival and for the biological survival of the salmon. Failure to appreciate the legitimacy of one another’s culturally derived claims upon the resource would seem to explain their failure to resolve their differences. In the contexts of evolving interpretations of First Nations’ rights and self-understanding and non-Indigenous responses to the Listuguj fishery, recognition of the complementarities of cultures would appear to be necessary.

2.11 Global Responses to Environmental Conflicts and Indigenous Peoples

According to Milligan, Ashley, and Kenton (2012), environmental conflicts involving
Indigenous Peoples are being addressed internationally by similar initiatives in which Indigenous people and local communities focus participatory processes around two rights-based tools: community protocols and free, prior informed consent (FPIC). This activity is reported from countries as diverse as China, India, Ghana, Columbia, and Canada and is chiefly concerned with non-renewable resource extraction. However, it is claimed that community protocols and FPICs “have the potential to

- claim and protect their rights over their resources and traditional knowledge\(^\text{14}\), using national and international law;
- build on and strengthen communities’ own rules and regulations for conserving biodiversity and promoting sustainable community-led natural resource management; and
- strengthen community cohesion, organization, and confidence to take action to improve livelihoods and defend rights.” (Milligan et al., 2012, p. 3)

Although “The Spirit of FPIC: Lessons from Canada and the Philippines” recognized that Canadian law

...does protect the right of Indigenous peoples to be consulted through deliberative processes (i.e. “meaningful consultation” ensuring all parties are better informed in decision making)... it does not require that decisions accommodate feedback given in participation processes... Aboriginal groups continue to petition against this and for the rights to “consent. (Buxton, 2012, p. 69)

Buxton (2012) generously affirmed that Canada acts “in the spirit of FPIC,” while noting that

Canada’s constitution and case law does not allow for FPIC where consent is equated with a right to veto. In effect, the government prioritizes benefits to the wider population over the impacts on local communities near or on the mining site. (p. 69)

\(^{14}\) Interestingly examples of how Traditional knowledge is incorporated into environmental assessments given here are written in terms of Indigenous practices such as berry picking, fishing, trapping and Indigenously sourced information about weather, water, and vegetation, all positivistic forms of knowledge, with no reference given to Indigenous ways of knowing, with their intimate epistemologies. See p. 21ff, below.
Hence there is continuing conflict and uncertainty over a wide range of resources in contemporary Canada.

However, on May 10, 2016, Canada changed its status as an “objector” to the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. “We are now a full supporter of the declaration without qualification,” said the Minister of Indigenous Affairs, Carolyn Bennett. Its implementation will breathe “life into Section 35 [of the Constitution], recognizing it as a full box of rights for Indigenous People in Canada.” (Fontaine, 2016) This was in keeping with the new Liberal federal government’s declared policy of making relations with Canada’s Indigenous peoples its top priority.

The final report of Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, formed to respond to the aftermath of the assimilation policy of government sponsored and church administered residential schools, described by the Commission as “cultural genocide,” concluded, “We remain convinced that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People provides the necessary principles, norms and standards for reconciliation to flourish in twenty-first Century Canada” (Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, Volume One: Summary, 2015, p. 21.)

It remains to be seen how this new policy will play out in individual cases, but there are current “treaty based” negotiations between the LMG and Fisheries and Oceans Canada, (DFO) over fisheries, including the Atlantic salmon. (Personal communication)

2.12 Colonization, Exploitation, Management, and Conservation in the Contexts of Evolving Interpretations of First Nations’ Rights and Self-Understanding

The history of the impact of human activities upon the Atlantic salmon, since the arrival of Europeans in North America half a millennium ago, echoes that of other human impacts on “resources,” such as open-seas cod fishing, forestry, and mining. Exploitation, management, and conservation have evolved in response to successive perceptions of plenty, declining stocks, and emerging environmental ethics. The place and role of First-Nations people in this European trilogy of perception of what for them is “home” (Booth
& Skelton, 2010), has been problematic throughout the period. It is important to note that the concepts of “resources,” “exploitation,” “management,” “conservation,” and “environment” all belong to the European mindset of objectification of nature and models of political economy that are alien to the Traditional Environmental Knowledge and practice of First Nations (Notzke, 1994). “Conservation,” for instance is seen not as a management strategy but as a relationship with the non-human world that enables “survival” (Notzke, 1994). It is a way of knowing and being in relationships that will later be described as an “intimate epistemology.”

Furthermore, the participation of Atlantic First Nations, principally the Mi’kmaq, in this evolving relationship between a fish and humans cannot be understood outside the reality of colonial control, exemplified by the imposition of British, provincial, and federal regulations and controls designed to marginalize and exclude them and, more recently, by conflicts over law and resource management.15

The Restigouche watershed, its Atlantic-salmon fishery, and its human actors have been encapsulated in this habitat-wide16 process of colonization. For a number of reasons, not least the unusually large size of its multi-winter salmon and its accessibility, since the 1880s, by railway from Ottawa, Montreal, Boston, and New York, the river, its tributaries, and surrounding land and its Indigenous people, the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj17, have been subject to a double colonization. French, British and provincial governments privileged commercial inshore netting by seasonal and then permanent settlers and encouraged settlement of the watershed for agriculture and forestry, systematically excluding the Mi’gmaq people from their traditional fishery and marginalizing their place

---


16 The historic range of the Atlantic salmon in North America is disputed at its northern, southern, and western extremes but the Restigouche watershed lies close to its geographic centre.

17 The Eel River Band of Mi’kmaq on the Southeast shore of the Baie des Chaleurs also conduct an Indigenous fishery for Restigouche Atlantic salmon.
in and use of the land. Beginning as early as mid-century but increasing greatly after Confederation in 1867 and American expansionism following the conclusion of their civil war, provincial and federal officials expedited the colonization and privileging of the salmon sport fishery through the imposition of fishery regulations and the implementation of leases to foreign anglers and non-resident Canadians (Parenteau, 1998, 2004).

Although there were occasional conflicts between those charged with fisheries management in the federal and provincial governments and the federal Department of Indian Affairs, the cumulative effect of their regulatory powers resulted in the exclusion from the fishery of not only the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj but also upriver settlers (Thomas, 2001).18

The power of capital to leverage political decisions favourable to its owners, together with the racism endemic to the period, ensured the privileged position of the sport fishery and the exclusion of the economically and politically disempowered Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents from the upriver fishery (Anderson & Bone, 2003). In his 1972 book, Let’s Save our Salmon, the Matapédia hotelier and Restigouche salmon fisherman, Jean-Paul Dubé, located the threat to the salmon of the Restigouche entirely within the commercial net fishery both along the shores of the Baie des Chaleurs and around the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Although noting the deleterious effect of poaching by non-Indigenous residents, he made no mention of the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj, or their fishery.19 He argued in favour of the sport-fishing camps on both economic and conservationist grounds (Dubé, 1972). In 1984 pressure from the now conservationist sport-fishing community to close the inshore commercial fishery succeeded. Among non-Indigenous

18 Thomas (2001) described the process by which the province’s salmon fishing was colonized first by British military officers stationed in the Maritimes and then, through promotion by vested interests, by tourist Americans. Issues of class and race are central to Thomas’ argument.

19 This omission may reflect the suppressed and therefore “unlawful” nature of whatever fishing was being done by Mi’gmaq at Listuguj at that time. For Dubé the fishery at Listuguj was not a conservation problem in the early 1970s.
users of the salmon resource, the sport fishery alone was now, in the name of conservation, privileged.

In a single century the non-Indigenous Atlantic-salmon fishery of New Brunswick had gone from open exploitation of a resource, through management preferential to the commercial fishery and non-resident sport fishers to a near absolutist, no-kill conservation ethic. Non-Indigenous residents, on the New-Brunswick side of this boundary watershed, were effectively no longer consumers of the resource\textsuperscript{20}, except as the beneficiaries of economic spin-off from the sport fishery. Meanwhile, non-resident anglers were paying richly to catch, albeit in diminishing numbers, and then release a species their predecessors had slaughtered for sport from the mid-19th century until diminishing returns, regulated catch limits, and a new conservation ethic had modified their behaviour in New Brunswick waters.\textsuperscript{21}

In the Quebec rivers of the Restigouche watershed (the Matapédia, Patapédia, and Causapscal), catch and release, more recently described as live release, was not followed, either through regulation or in practice. In each of the five seasons from 2010 to 2014, Matapédia anglers caught an average of approximately 2,000 grilse and 1,000 large salmon. Of these approximately 80\% were harvested (MFFP, 2016).\textsuperscript{22}

However, in parallel with the failed attempt to assimilate Indigenous Peoples there had occurred a failure to fully and finally exclude them from use of resources such as the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche. Notjke (1994) noted that Aboriginal peoples in

\textsuperscript{20} There is limited “Crown Water,” available to resident New Brunswick anglers on a draw basis and the Little Restigouche, above Kedgwick River is open to New Brunswick anglers.

\textsuperscript{21} Until the season of 2015, when no tags were issued with licenses, NB regulations allowed the killing of a small number of grilse (single-sea-winter fish) but no MSW fish. Many camps promoted and practised voluntary “live release” of all fish hooked and landed.

\textsuperscript{22} This happened despite encouragement by ASF and the Fédération Québécoise pour le saumon atlantique to practice “live release.” Quebec’s allowing a limited harvest of MSW salmon, as well as grilse was seen by some as being essential to tourism in the region and as biologically defensible. It was also cited by members of the Listuguj community as justification for their own harvesting of large salmon. In 2016 there will be a no-kill regulation for MSW fish until a mid-season stock assessment shows sufficient returns to meet escapement requirements for Quebec Restigouche watershed rivers.
Quebec “derive their [fishing rights] from Indian rights as well as from the occupation of reserve rights”. She also noted, “Information on the reality of Indian fishing rights and Indian fishing activities in Quebec, on- or off-reserve, is rather sparse.” The following account of confrontation between the Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj makes it clear, however, that they continued to exercise these rights, even before the Marshall decision of the Supreme Court re-affirmed them.

One incident, involving salmon fishing rights of the Micmac [sic] Indians of Restigouche, on the border to New Brunswick made the headlines in 1981, and was documented in a film by Alanis Obomsawin (Incident at Restigouche, National Film Board of Canada, 1984). While presenting a vivid picture of the violent confrontation between Restigouche Micmac Indian fishers and Quebec provincial police and fisheries officers, the film understandably leaves us with numerous questions. The incident in question was apparently not the first since previous confrontations with the province seem to have taken place in 1972 and 1973. The Restigouche Micmac Indian Band appears to occupy a rather prominent position among Atlantic native fisheries since, according to the film commentary, of the 22 tons fished by east coast Indians in 1981, the Restigouche Micmac took 6 tons. (Notjke, 1994, pp. 63-64)

Notjke continued by describing jurisdictional issues such as the dispute over the extent to which the Listuguj Reserve includes the areas of the river in which the Listiguj community conducted their fishery; whether or not the fishery was restricted to a “food fishery” for “economic necessity,” or encompassed, as the community believed and continues to practice, the right to sell their catch.24 The situation was and is further complicated by the fact that a federal-provincial agreement of 1922/23 had given Quebec regulatory control and management responsibility over Atlantic salmon, while on the south shore of the Restigouche, in New Brunswick, the federal DFO continued in that role.

24 The latter was, presumably, made redundant in terms of sales to non-indigenous people, when the non-indigenous commercial fishery was closed by Federal law in 1984, making it unlawful for non-indigenous persons to possess untagged Atlantic salmon. Such sales appear to constitute a grey area and do not currently result in prosecutions of non-indigenous purchasers.
The “incident at Restigouche” was triggered when the Quebec Minister of Fish and Game, Lucien Bussard, requested that the Listuguj community restrict their activities to three 24-hour periods per week, rather than the accustomed six 12-hour night fishing periods. This occurred at a time when DFO had lifted their restriction on commercial fishing in the same area. Non-compliance was met by violent intervention, as depicted in the NFB film. Arrests, trials, and convictions of Listuguj community members followed, but in 1983 the Quebec Superior Court overturned the convictions, noting that “had it not been for serious errors in fact and law, the accused would most likely have been acquitted in 1982” (Notzke, 1994, p. 64). Even at the time of the incident, the then Indian Affairs Minister, John Munro, “had visited the scene, stating that the band by-laws on fishing on a reserve override provincial legislation. He also called for a review of the federal-provincial agreement giving Quebec control over its fishery” (Notzke, 1994, p. 64). This demonstrates the historic fragility of intergovernmental relations at the federal level, between DFO and Indian and Northern Affairs; at the federal-provincial level, between Ottawa and Quebec; and at the interprovincial level, between Quebec and New Brunswick. These dysfunctional relationships continue to constitute part of the context in which understandings of place and the cultural meaning of the salmon to the three communities who share both are played out.

Nevertheless, in 1982, in the immediate aftermath of the 1981 conflict, a fisheries co-management plan between the Micmac Band of the Restigouche (Listuguj) and the government of Quebec was signed. An internal DFO memorandum asked, “Does it provide a useful model for similar agreements between the Government of Canada and Indian Bands?” (Notzke, 1994, p. 64). The fact that conflict continues in Canada over both access and title to resources by First Nations suggests that it did not.25

It is ironic, but telling, that the continuation of the net fishery, together with court

25 Conflict over fishing is not limited to that between indigenous and non-indigenous Canadians and non-resident foreigners. An examination of the discourse of “traditionalist” and “modernist” First Nations salmon fishers on the Miramichi, Fish Talk, by Robert G. Adlam, “Anthropologica” 44.1 (2002): 99-111, makes this clear. For further comment on this issue, see Chapter 3.
decisions of the 1990s (R v. Marshall, 1999; R v. Sparrow, 1990) re-affirming the fishing rights of Mi’gmaq, occurred in the same period in which the commercial net fishery was being restricted and, finally, closed and in which the sports fishing community was changing its mentality and practice from one of “numbers of fish caught” and “trophy” or “wall-hanger” fish to “catch and release” and, most recently, a no-kill conservation ethic. Predictably, as with other conflicts over a limited resource, this has resulted in conflict, albeit non-violent, between the sport-fishing “conservationist” community and the Indigenous fishery of the Listuguj community, with non-Indigenous residents free to take sides or to play Mercutio.

Far from reducing conflict between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians, the landmark Supreme-Court decisions of Sparrow and Marshall (Appendix A) were themselves contentious, sparking, for instance the violent conflict at Burnt Church, New Brunswick, in 2000–2001, over lobster fishing rights. Donham (2003) claimed that the conflict was overblown and misrepresented by the media but made it clear that overt racism and hysterical misrepresentation of the extent of the “threat” the Mi’kmaq exercise of their newly affirmed fishing rights posed, revealed a serious misreading of the Marshall decision. The court had responded to the fact that the late 18th-century treaties in question had been “negotiated orally,” the Mi’kmaq having no written language in a European sense and that the British had taken “meticulous notes.” The court concluded that “it would be ‘unconscionable’ to limit the scope of the treaty to its written version, when one party was illiterate, and we know the transcription did not include all the agreed-upon-items” (Donham, 2003, p. 367 and Booth and Skelton, 2010, p. 112).26

On the critical issue of the meaning and limits, if any, to the recognized “treaty-enshrined

right to trade the fruits of their hunting and gathering for what the treaties called ‘necessaries,’” Donham commented, “It interpreted ‘necessaries’ to mean more than ‘subsistence’ but less than a ‘right to trade generally for economic gain.’ It means ‘sustenance,’ or ‘a modest livelihood’” (Donham, 2003, p. 367). Given the fact that it would appear to be unlawful for non-Indigenous persons to purchase Atlantic salmon, the extent to which sales to non-Indigenous persons constitute an abrogation of Canadian law is unknown.

A further issue, however, is the extent to which federal regulations may be used “to contain the right within those limits and further still in the name of some overarching social concern like conservation.” (Donham, 2003, p. 367). Limits to these rights “can only be precisely defined through negotiations. In keeping with earlier decisions of Aboriginal and treaty rights, those negotiations would have to be conducted in a manner consistent with ‘the honour of the Crown.’” (Donham, 2003, p. 367).

This issue of “conservation” lies at the heart of conflict between the sport-fishing community of the Restigouche watershed and the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj. The sport-fishing community feels that the use of gill nets is indiscriminate as to size of fish harvested, including MSW female fish capable of spawning large numbers of fertilizable eggs. Further, because they suspect that the catch is inaccurately reported, they argue that the Listuguj fishery is not conducted according to their science-based ideas of species conservation. The Mi’gmaq of Listuguj exercise their undoubted rights, including the court directed right to consultation over the implementation of any management planning beyond their own.

Resolution of the implications of treaty rights of the Mi’gmaq, in the context of management responsibilities of the federal (DFO) and Quebec governments, has been the subject of meetings and negotiations since 2008 (Personal communication).27 This process has continued under the new Liberal federal government, which, as noted above,

has prioritized its relations with Canada’s Indigenous Peoples and has committed to full adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The implications of this state of affairs will be discussed below under “Governance.”

In parallel with intergovernmental negotiations, there has been a growth in the role of civil society, embodied in the RRWMC. As of February, 2016, charter members included both Eel River Bar and Listuguj First Nations governments, Corporation de gestion des rivières Matapédia et Patapédia, Gespe’gewaq Mi’gmaq Resource Council, the Kedgwick and Ristigouche Salmon Clubs, Restigouche Camp Owners Association, and the RCMP, together with members-at-large elected to represent resident and user constituencies. By its inclusive membership and through its on-the-ground presence, managing picnic and campgrounds, doing extensive habitat restoration work, and collaborating in scientific and Mi’gmaq Ecological Knowledge–based research, the RRWMC offers an example and the future possibilities of community-based resource management.

Both the current intergovernmental discussions and the growth of civil collaboration recognize the incubus of the colonizing and exploitative history, discussed above: “the conflicted role of the state as the guardian of Aboriginal and treaty rights, and the promoter and protector of capitalism” and its responses to the perceived interests of the electorate, as well as the “uncertainty, confusion and evolving nature of” (Anderson & Bone, 2003, p. 25) resource and environmental management resulting from court decisions and First-Nations activism of the past 30 years, by contributing to what Notjke called a “restructuring of relationship,” including a recognition of “Traditional Environmental Knowledge” (Notjke, 1994, p. 3).

In keeping with this insight and the epistemological foundation of this research, a 2012 cooperative initiative, Fish-WIKS, managed from, among other universities across Canada, the Marine Affairs program of Dalhousie University, Halifax, announced that it was seeking to explore “distinct Indigenous knowledge systems to inform fisheries governance and management on Canada's coasts,” noting that:
fisheries decision-making processes, influenced primarily by western science-based knowledge systems, have been unsuccessful in managing Canada’s fisheries effectively…. Canada’s current hierarchical governance regime is at odds with stakeholder demands for involvement in decision-making and the growing legal recognition to Aboriginal and treaty rights and Title. This approach to fisheries governance is also in conflict with the government’s goal of implementing a holistic, place-based ecosystem approach to fisheries… In contrast to the current federal regime, Indigenous knowledge systems are based on a world view and values that is place-based and personal, rooted in a shared history, holistic, experiential and transmitted in oral language that is culturally dependent.

(Retrieved from: http://marineaffairsprogram.dal.ca/MAP_Projects/Fish_WIKS/)28

Such a perspective and initiative have obvious implications for governance of the Restigouche Atlantic-salmon fishery.

In a rapidly changing socio-political climate, the inclusion of Indigenous Traditional Knowledge in emerging systems of resource management might, as the Fish-WIKS initiative suggests, be possible within Canada and, specifically, within the civil society of the Restigouche. It is also “on the table” in current intergovernmental talks (Treaty implementation table, personal communication, February 24, 2016).

Booth and Skelton concluded their review of First Nations’ access and rights to resources:

Complicating matters are the differences between Aboriginal cultures and the Western culture by which they are surrounded: a culture that continues to consume resources at an increasing rate even while the Nations struggle for access, leaving us with uncertainty regarding the future of relations between Aboriginal peoples and other Canadians. The problem is complex and difficult… While we must continue to deal with ongoing uncertainty and conflict, understanding and interest are the first steps in solving these problems. So too is our willingness to learn.

(Booth and Skelton, 2010, p. 112)

28 This link is no longer active. The current explanation for the program is less dismissive of Western science. I include the original because it makes the conflict between traditional and Western knowledge systems explicit and reveals a willingness on the part of the Canadian government to entertain alternative knowledge in its management of fisheries.
Conflict over resources leads to further fragmentation within and between communities, exposing social, economic, class, and cultural divisions. Conflict disables conservation and management of natural resources, further threatening their survival. This study describes a single place, in which communities are in conflict and in which their survival and that of a natural resource, the Atlantic salmon, is in question. It describes and examines emerging opportunities for collaborative management and its benefits for conservation of the salmon and of healthy communities, through resolution of conflict based on the intentional building of mutual appreciation and respect.

This dissertation will seek to examine the processes, reasons, and differences in practices behind the meanings each community finds in their common space and species. It will also seek to apply theories of knowledge, learning, social capital, practice, place, symbolism, and governance to possible solutions to present conflicts and through this process to increase the chances of survival of the communities and of the salmon.
 chapters 1 and 2 have introduced a case of intercultural conflict over what settlers and anglers know as a natural resource, the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed. Since, in Traditional thought and practice, there is no differentiated and objectifying distinction between the salmon and themselves, the third party, the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj, may be better said to be in a cultural and political conflict with the settler communities and the angler-conservationist community. For the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj the conflict is grounded in their human existence, as well that of the salmon.

The case lies within the larger contexts of a global decline in both biological species and human cultures. The North American Atlantic salmon has declined in population by some 70% in the 45 years between 1970 and 2015 (see Appendix B). The salmon of the Restigouche have declined and continue to decline in numbers of fish returning to the watershed (RRWMC Science Committee, 2016). A decline in the size and health of rural populations (Statistics Canada, 2016) and an ongoing struggle on the part of the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj to revive their language, to establish agency over their lives and governance, including fisheries management and settlement of territorial claims, together constitute a wicked problem (Waddell, 2013), requiring all the actors to change their mind-sets and behaviour.

In terms of managing the salmon to protect and conserve them, it is a wicked problem because there is no agreement as to what constitutes the problem. For instance, there is disagreement between Quebec and DFO, on behalf of the federal government and the

29 The 2016 census showed a decline of 6% in the population of Campbellton since 2011. New Brunswick reported an overall decline in population.
30 “Wicked problems have cause-effect relationships that are difficult or impossible to define, cannot be framed and solved without creating controversies among stakeholders and require collective action among societal groups with strongly held, conflicting beliefs and values” (Waddell, 2013). For a fuller discussion and definition see Rittel and Webber (1973).
LMG as to what extent stocks are threatened. Furthermore, there can be no final solution since the operative social systems of the three communities, individually and in interaction, are “open,” ever changing.

Moreover, possible solutions are neither “true” nor “false,” but, in various degrees dependent upon the perspective of the judging stakeholder, “good,” or “bad.” In this case the sport-fishing, angler-conservationist solution of total “no kill” is “good” but for those anglers who wish to keep fish, for settlers dependent upon tourism, and for the people of Listuguj, this a “bad” solution. Since the Atlantic salmon is an anadromous species, subject to changing conditions and threats during its time in salt water, there can be neither an immediate nor an ultimate solution but only conditional solutions to its health and survival in the freshwater environment of the Restigouche.

Furthermore, there is insufficient trust between rights and stakeholders to allow opportunities to learn by trial and error, and management mistakes are costly in terms of future willingness for cooperation, let alone collaboration. It is also a wicked problem because management for conservation of the salmon is construable as a symptom of another wicked problem, namely First Nation rights in conflict with the perceived solutions of both the settler and sport-fishing communities. Ritter and Webber (1973) captured this dimension of this wicked problem:

The choice of explanation is arbitrary in the logical sense. In actuality, attitudinal criteria guide the choice. People choose those explanations which are most plausible to them. Somewhat but not much exaggerated, you might say that everybody picks that explanation of a discrepancy which fits his intentions best and which conforms to the action-prospects that are available to him. The analyst's “world view” is the strongest determining factor in explaining a discrepancy and, therefore, in resolving a wicked problem. (Rittel & Webber, 1973, p. 166)

Indeed, to use another simile, the Restigouche, its peoples, and its salmon are like the patterns seen through the eyepiece of a kaleidoscope, ordered and superficially satisfying at any frozen moment but subject to being re-ordered and confused by movement from one eye to another. There are multiple perspectives from which to view the issue, each
yielding a different picture. How, then, might literature help to stabilize and inform our understanding of what is going on in such a way that this wicked problem may be interpreted to assist in bringing about change in decision-making by rights and stakeholders and which will allow for the survival of its peoples and its salmon?

The following literature review takes as its centre natural-resource management and examines literature connecting it to social learning, social capital, and identity; to models of cooperation, collaboration, and co-management for governance; to place, community, identity and symbolic interaction; and to linking, bridging, bonding, and alliances between conflicted communities. It concludes with an examination of differences in ontology and epistemology within the context of an ongoing search for treaty fulfilment and reconciliation.

3.2 Social Learning

3.2.1 Bourdieu’s Habitus Theory of Behaviour and Learning

How do people learn? Why do people behave in the ways they do? How do they learn to behave in some ways and not in others? The French social theorist Pierre Bourdieu addressed these questions. (Lizardo, 2004; Swartz, 2002) In contrast to American sociologists since John Dewey, for whom “obedience to some external structure…or to some subjective conscious intention” were the alternatives, Bourdieu addressed habituated forms of conduct (Swartz, 2002, p. 615): “I can say that all my thinking started from this point: how can behaviour be regulated without being the product of obedience to rules” (Bourdieu, as cited in Swartz, 2002, p. 615). His answer, in brief, was *habitus*, which he defined as

systems of durable, transposable dispositions, *structured structures* predisposed to function as *structuring structures*, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes

---

31 The discussion, which follows, is based on Lizardo (2004) and Swartz (2002).

32 The assumption here is that action based solely on “subjective conscious intention”, on the part of an individual, or group, is, necessarily, unregulated.
without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively “regulated” and “regular” without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor. (as cited in Lizardo, 2004, p. 7)

Can Bourdieu’s theory help to explain the “practices” and “representations” of the three communities, which impact the salmon of the Restigouche watershed? Before attempting to answer this question, two other concepts, drawn by Swartz (2002) from Bourdieu and necessary for Bourdieu’s model of human practices, need to be described.

The disposition to act according to internalized and external structures needs “power resources” or capitals. Bourdieu identified “economic, cultural, social and symbolic” capitals, “unequally distributed across the social classes” (as cited in Swartz, 2002, p. 655). The addition of environmental capital would provide a lexicon of capital appropriate to the three communities discussed in this paper. The types and amounts of capital available to each community affect the disposition of their habitus (p. 655). They are widely different.

The second concept, fields, is necessary to explain how “habitus generates action not in a social vacuum but in structured social contexts.” Swartz (2002) went on to say, “The concept of field posits that social situations are structured spaces in which actors compete against one another for valued resources” (pp. 655). The salmon of the Restigouche are a resource valued by each of the three communities. They compete against one another in fields associated with the salmon, such as the legal field, the cultural field, the political field, and the environmental field. In this sense, fields may be likened to systems.

As with systems theory, complex interaction between Bourdieu’s habitus, capitals, and fields contributes both to stability and predictability of behaviour and to unpredictability.

33 Bourdieu’s theory of habitus is grounded in a social, as opposed to individual, understanding of behaviour and in the objective reality of class. These are contested perspectives but seem to be particularly pertinent for the subject under discussion in this paper.
Although habitus, with its powerful combination of primary and subsequent, experiential socialization, “structuring structures” is, like habit, difficult to change, Bourdieu’s theory allows for change “as individuals enter fields in which a certain manner of behaviour does not work” (as cited in Swartz, 2002, p. 665). Again, threats to the survival of the salmon may be experienced as “a certain manner of behaviour [that] does not work” and thus provoke change. Practices and their attendant representations may change. For Bourdieu, however, this is not the result of conscious thought or intention. Habitus contains the capacity “to think with the body” and to “know without concepts….there is a mutual complicity between objective structures and embodied structures, which accounts for the sense of ‘belief’ and legitimacy of socially produced structural orders.” Then “this possibility that two ontologically distinct structural orders (external and internal) come to a state of temporary equilibrium” and “produce the reality of society, or the tacit ‘taken-for-grantedness’ of the social world,” opens the possibility that “when these two structural orders come out of phase…then sudden calls for transformation and questioning of the existing order can be produced.” This is not the result of agency but rather the consequence of the adaptability “of the same system of embodied structures that would have resulted in unproblematic accommodation had the objective structures remained in line with the subjective structures” (Lizardo, 2004, p. 22). Such an understanding of the roots of human behaviour may account for the apparent “failure” to change on the part of one community, when, in the experience of another community “structural orders come out of phase.” Bourdieu’s “sense of ‘belief’ and legitimacy of socially produced structural orders,” therefore, differs between communities and may be the source of conflict between them. How change can be orchestrated, either from within or from outside a given community, when, in Bourdieu’s theory, there is no conducting actor, or agency, remains problematic.

34 This may well describe the social learning context for both indigenous and non-indigenous Canadians in the period since the 1980s, as they struggled with resource management, land claims, court decisions as to indigenous rights and conservation.
When socially produced structural orders from one community are imposed upon another community in a field, such as law or resource use, and despite unequal distribution of capital, or because of it, then a period of stasis may ensue. This may have happened at various times between the first European encounters with the Mi’gmaq of the Restigouche and the present. What is clear today, however, is that there has been “a rejection of arbitrary objective structural arrangements,” such as various iterations of the Indian Act and fishery regulations, by the Mi’gmaq.

The shift in the angling community from a habit of killing salmon caught on fly, rod, and reel to releasing all MSW salmon, in New-Brunswick waters, is the result of both a sense that “a certain manner of behaviour does not work” (habitus) and also of a conscious process of observation and deduction, linking the killing of salmon to a decline in their populations and changes in fishery regulations.

Bourdieu’s theory may go further as an explanation of the transformation of the resident, non-Indigenous population of Campbellton and of Restigouche County, in which the salmon has become, since the closure of the commercial fishery, a uniting symbol and potential means of attracting tourists, rather than a direct source of food and employment for the majority. There has been an exchange of capitals, resulting in a new habitus.

3.2.2 Wenger – Situated Learning in the Context of Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems

The work of Lave and Wenger (Lave & Wenger, 1991) can be understood as operationalizing Bourdieu (J. FitzGibbon, personal communication, 2013). By situating learning in the social realm of communities of practice, Lave and Wenger assist in the explication of the complex grammar of the behaviour of the three Restigouche communities and their formation of meaning. Meaning is constructed, they argued, through a complex participatory process of negotiation between the practices of the community and its reification of external realities. “Practice is, first and foremost, a process by which we can experience the world and our engagement with it as meaningful.” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 49) Practice requires both participation and
reification. Practice is necessarily embodied through participation, while reification—“aspects of human experience congealed into fixed forms and given the status of an object” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 59) such as the Law or the Fishery—makes the construction of meaning possible. “Still, in the end, it is the meanings we produce that matter” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 51).

Communities of practice may be as small as the family, as sizeable as a profession, or as extended as a nation. As the size of the community expands, its commonality of practice is diluted, and it comes to contain within itself an increasing number of smaller communities of practice. Most individuals belong to several communities of practice.35 Wenger argues that it is “doing in a historical and social context that gives structure and meaning to what we do” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 47). Practice is always social practice.

Lave and Wenger argued that although participation is done by people and that reification has to do with objects, the process of the interaction between people and their environments blurs the distinction between them and between private and public realms: “in this interplay, our experience and our world shape each other through a reciprocal relation that goes to the very essence of who we are” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 71). They used the metaphor of a river and a mountain to illustrate the duality of learning within communities of practice:

River and mountain shape each other, but they have their own shape. They are reflections of each other, but they have their own existence, in their own realms. They fit around each other, but they remain distinct from each other. They cannot be transformed into each other, yet they transform each other. The river only carves and the mountain only guides, yet in their interaction the carving becomes the guiding and the guiding becomes the carving. (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 71)

35 Wenger’s primary community of practice is that of health insurance claims adjusters in one company, who interact with other communities of practice, primarily the health professions and management.
The metaphor of the river and the mountain illustrates how Bourdieu’s dualities of structure might work. Lave and Wenger put Bourdieu’s pieces, structures embodied through primary socialization and external social structures, showing how they work in a process of learning and meaning construction through a participatory dialectic of practice and reification. Both Bourdieu and Wenger were social, embodied, situated, and action based. Wenger, however, connected his central insight of communities of practice to ideas and understandings of cultures, an epistemology of learning, boundaries and brokering between communities of practice, localities, and identity. Each of these factors is potentially revealing of the processes, reasons, and differences in practices behind the meanings each of the three Restigouche communities finds in their common space and species.

Wenger further explored his concept of communities of practice, noting that “a community of practice itself can be viewed as a simple social system. And a complex social system can be viewed as constituted by interrelated communities of practice”. Both are marked by “emergent structure, complex relationships, self-organisation, dynamic boundaries, ongoing negotiation of identity and cultural meaning” (Wenger, 2010, p. 179). Communities of practice as a concept does not exist by itself but is part of a broader conceptual framework for thinking about learning in its social dimensions…. It is a perspective that locates learning, not in the head or outside it, but in the relationship between the person and the world, which for human beings is a social person in a social world. In this relation of participation, the social and the individual constitute each other. (Wenger, 2010, p. 179)

Recognizing that social learning is but one dimension of learning, Wenger listed “biological, psychological, cognitive as well as historical and political (dimensions) in the broad societal sense” (p. 179) and concluded that communities of practice “need to be combined in a plug-and-play fashion with theories that address these other dimensions to explain specific situations where they are salient” (p. 188) In this way, Wenger endorses a bricolage approach to the explanation and understanding of social phenomena.

Responding to critiques of communities of practice theory, Wenger acknowledged that
the self-generating character attributed to communities of practice may seem to obscure the degree to which they are influenced and shaped by their context, be it institutional, political, or cultural. The formation of identity in practice may seem to make slight of broader discourses of identity such as class, gender and race. (p. 189)

Wenger countered by claiming that

learning and power imply each other…. Conflict can be a central part of practice… its practice exists as a claim to knowledge… a claim that may or may not be accepted…. there is no guarantee that a success claim to competence inside a community will translate into a claim to ‘knowledge’ beyond the community’s boundaries. (p. 189)

He added that “reification is a process by which power can be projected across the landscape. Institutions, laws, are examples of such projection of power through reification.” (p. 189)

Wenger argued that “the pairing of identity and community is an important component of the effectiveness of power” (p. 190, and “because identification is a source of nourishment for the self, modulating it can be difficult and painful. It can also be caught in conflicting demands that make it counterproductive” (p. 190).^36 Wenger concluded his response to whether or not communities of practice theory is grounded in the realities of power and politics by acknowledging that

communities of practice [are] inherently political but also participatory and therefore agency plays a role in the negotiation of meaning…. This provides a small opening, a crack that represents a limitation to the application of power: the creation of a practice takes place in response to power, not as an outcome of it. Similarly, the concept of modulation of identification locates relations of power in the active production of identity…. the negotiation of meaning allows for an experience of agency in learning. (p. 190)

^36 See below on the connections between social learning and issues of identity, bonding and bridging, especially Davis.
Responding to the critique that “the notion of community seems almost quaint,” while “networks seem more adapted to a world where learning needs and connections are becoming increasingly fluid,” Wenger described community and network as “two types of structuring processes. Community emphasizes identity and network emphasizes connectivity. The two usually coexist” (p. 191). In a community there is “identification with a domain and commitment to a learning partnership…not necessarily present in a network” (p. 191). However,

if a community becomes too much of a community, too strongly identified with itself, prone to groupthink, closed, or inbred, then fostering connectivity to generate some networking energy is a good way to shake it up and open its boundaries…. developing [a network] identity as a community is a good way to give it shape—to endow it with an ability to project a collective intention and commit to a learning partnership. It is inspiring to discover others who share a concern and to let this joint caring become a bond of identity. This is the power of community. (pp. 191–192)

While acknowledging that “most organisations are interested in communities of practice to be more effective at what they already do, not for a more profound transformation” (p. 192), Wenger nevertheless reported that he wanted to “distinguish practice from prescription” and locate “learning as inherent in practice rather than reified in an educational setting” (p. 192). However, “self-governance, voluntary participation, personal meaning, identity, boundary crossing, peer-to-peer connections, all these concepts are slowly reshaping the discourse on knowledge and learning… it does have a transformative potential for the future of learning” (p. 192).

Despite this claim, Wenger admitted that “communities of practice still do not fit very easily within traditional hierarchical organisation” (p. 193) To address this issue Wenger emphasized that “learning capability may be one of the most important characteristics to cultivate in social systems” (p. 193). To enable such learning he proposed a social discipline of learning, combining analytical and instrumental concepts, the ability to address issues of power and to focus on networks and communities, where communities
of practice are “the simplest social learning system,” engendering “mutual engagement” for a “learning partnership” (p. 193).

Such a social discipline of learning would encompass disciplines of domain, community, practice, and convening. Although a partnership based on these disciplines could be “full of conflicts,” Wenger believed that focusing on practice together creates high learning potential: “I can see the practitioner in you from the concerns you express, from the way you behave, and from the stories you tell.” There is a kind of trust that arises out of this mutual recognition…. it is trust in the learning capability of a partnership. (p. 194)

Expanding his concept of social learning systems, Wenger described governance as “the process by which a social system becomes a learning system: it is learning that drives governance, not the other way around” (p. 195). Contrasting two types of governance, stewarding, which “is a process of seeking agreement and alignment across a social system in order to focus on definite concerns,” and emergent, which “bubbles up from a distributed system of interactions involving local decisions,” he concluded that “it is the combination of the two that can maximise the learning capability of social systems” (p. 195).

Paralleling stewarding and emergent governance, Wenger returned to the issue of power in social learning systems, which he said “works along these two axes of” vertical and horizontal “accountability” (p. 195). Vertical accountability can be found in “traditional hierarchies, decisional authority, the management of resources, bureaucracies, policies and regulations,” while horizontal accountability may be found in “engagement in joint activities, negotiation of mutual relevance, standards of practice, peer recognition, identity and reputation and commitment to collective learning” (p. 195).

Wenger warned that “a common mistake is to demonise vertical accountability and romanticise local engagement in practice. A self-governed community of practice is not heaven.” It can embrace “racism, corruption, mediocrity, and systematically counterproductive patterns” (p. 195). Horizontal relationships do not “lack
accountability,” where “participation in a community of practice can give rise to very strong horizontal accountability among members through a mutual commitment to learning partnership” (p. 195).

However, when systems become too complex for negotiating governance issues, horizontal accountability is not always the best means of fostering systemic learning capability… It is useful to have certain things that are non-negotiable across a social system to limit the effects of local dysfunctions and myopia. Vertical accountability can help structure and simplify local engagement…. Not everything has to be negotiable and decided anew every time…. Vertical accountability works across levels of scale. It tends to favour tools that travel easily across a landscape of practice. Numbers are a good example… (p. 196)

On the other hand, “horizontal accountability tends to favour processes that focus on substance in the context of mutual negotiation” (p. 196). Finally, the two types of accountability are “not easily visible to one another… the intersection between them is just a thin line” (p. 196).

Wenger’s theory of communities of practice as one form, among others, of social learning systems might offer insights into both the practices and the relationships between the communities of the Restigouche watershed and the challenges they face in learning for their own survival and that of the Atlantic salmon.

### 3.2.3 Managing Systemic Change – A Synthesis

Blackmore (2010a) attempted a synthesis of “the main points made” for the relevance of two social learning systems, one described by the Australian Hawkesbury Group’s contributors, and the other Wenger’s concept of communities of practice, to managing systemic change. The emphasis was on change, which Blackmore summarized as “appreciating situations with others, recognizing what actions are desirable and feasible and for whom, and getting organised in order to affect or respond to change in a positive way” (Blackmore 2010a, p. 201).
The Hawkesbury Group is identified more strongly than Wenger as being grounded in critical theory. Its focus on areas such as ethics and epistemology offer insights into our different traditions of understanding…raises questions about what should be done, the role of epistemic learning in bringing together our different kinds of knowledge and ways of knowing and how social learning might help us to engage with institutional dilemmas concerning the unsustainability of modern societies. (p. 202)

Communities of practice theory, as elucidated by, Gobbi, Polin, Snyder and Wenger, [highlights] the importance of engagement at a local level, to gain access to larger scale learning systems. Insights into the importance of boundary interactions, discourses associated with practice and multi-membership of communities of practice are offered. They focus on identity and interpersonal relationships and highlight a range of conceptual and practical tools for social learning. (Blackmore, 2010a, p. 202)

Blackmore emphasized that there is “a need to learn how to learn our way together to bring about improvements in various situations and practices” (p. 202).

The emphasis of the Hawkesbury Group on social learning as a means by which to effect societal change was demonstrated by Schön, whose constructivist view of learning where “knowledge is developed rather than transferred,” and Bawden (2010), who described a learning system as

- An organised and coherent group of people
- Collaborating purposefully together to achieve high quality transformations and transactions
- With a deep appreciation of their own integrity
- A keen sense of emergence
- An acute consciousness of their shared perspectives, levels, and states of learning
- As they design and create new and responsible futures together

This description comprises “several of the characteristics…for a critical social learning system” that could also apply to communities of practice” (Blackmore, 2010a, p. 204).
Two Hawkesbury Group authors, Woodhill (2010) and Ison (2010), specifically addressed natural-resource issues. Woodhill (2010) described social learning in the context of ecology, as the “processes by which society democratically adapts its core institutions to cope with social and ecological change in ways which will optimise the collective wellbeing of current and future generations” (p. 204) Ison linked social learning to issues of sustainability of water, referring to “co-creation of knowledge…to transform a situation” (p. 207).

While recognizing differences between the Hawkesbury Group’s emphasis on social learning systems, whose purpose is societal change towards sustainability in a world that is perceived to be unsustainable, and Wenger’s “social theory of learning”—a distinction without a difference?—Blackmore (2010a) proposed a map of the landscape of social learning praxis, based on the 14 “recurring themes” addressed by the book’s contributing authors.

- **Institutions.** Although there has been a shift on the part of 21st-century governments acknowledging that “other stakeholders beside themselves need to learn, in order for societies as a whole to change,” the metaphor of “rolling out policy” with its imagery of “squashing” all in its path, is still with us. Bawden, Woodhill and Ison identified “certain factors that appear not to have changed, in spite of previous insights,” allowing for institutions to change their focus to take account of systemic factors; to engage with the causes of ecological unsustainability of modern society and for some individuals to relinquish their perceived power and control in the interests of social learning. (p. 208)

- **Ethics.** Echoing critical theory, “beliefs and values” should be “made explicit” and “what occurs” should be compared to “what should be” (p. 209). There is an issue of the responsibility of individuals to other individuals and groups outside their own community of practice, or social learning system.
• **Communication.** “Understanding how communication occurs among humans and how it does, or does not, lead to action is central to developing and understanding of social learning” (p. 209). It is the ability of individuals to represent the contexts, that is to say, the domains and practices of their social learning, to other individuals outside their social learning system that facilitates or impedes communication.

• **Facilitation.**

In complex and messy situations, such as management of scarce natural resources, stakeholders need to develop shared knowledge and understanding and harmonise their actions, drawing on different ways of knowing. This…requires interaction across rather than within levels of a hierarchy… [it] does not just happen as a result of participation but needs active and purposeful facilitation. (p. 210)


• **Managing interpersonal relationships and building trust.** Communities of practice social learning theory points to the necessity of “developing collegial relationships: ‘I trust people trusted by those I trust’” (p. 211). Polin and Ison discussed some of the “challenges in changing actual and perceived power structures that can hinder social learning”. These included the need to build trust, leading back to an emphasis upon communities and networks.

• **Communities and networks.** Wenger took a broad view of community and is, according to Shaw, “in no danger of romanticizing notions of community” (p. 211). According to Wenger, communities and networks coexist, not as different structures but as different aspects of social structuring.... we define who we are by the way we reconcile our multi-membership into one identity” (p. 211). This points to the individual, rather than the community.

• **Levels and scales.** The idea of levels is central to a systems view of the world and also to social learning systems practice. Bawden described three levels of learning: learning, about the matter in hand; metalearning, about the processes of learning; and epistemic learning, about the beliefs and values that affect the other two levels (p. 212).
• **Boundaries and barriers.**

An example (of recognising limitations and barriers in relation to making conceptual shifts) is the way that cultural-historical barriers make it difficult to shift from a transmission conception of university learning to a socially constructed one. Re-negotiating boundaries of systems of interest is an important iterative process for social learning usually indicative of changes. For instance, re-negotiation of roles and responsibilities. (p. 212)

• **Conceptual frameworks and tools.** There is a “wide range of conceptual frameworks” in the book, focused on “systems orientation” and “models of learning and learning to learn” (p. 213). All involve, in Bawden’s words, “seeing the world differently” (p. 214). Polin cited multiple “models of learning” (p. 213). In communities of practice theory, Polin said, “learning is viewed as a kind of enculturation of the individual in a system of practice” (p. 213). Bawden also proposed

> a range of models of learning and [suggested] that meaning emerges as the result of ‘interactions’ between the process of *experiential learning* on the one hand and *inspirational learning* on the other with these processes…involving the concrete world of experience. (p. 213)

• **Knowledge and learning.** Again, in Bawden’s words, knowledge and learning involve “seeing the world differently” (p. 214). In intercultural social learning for change there is a problem: “epistemology, in particular our assumptions about the nature of knowledge and of knowing, has a major influence on our worldviews and in our abilities to learn how to learn…[it is] one of the main factors that constrains social learning” (p. 214). However, “developing and disseminating certain kinds of knowledge depends on informal learning much more than formal—on conversation, storytelling, mentorships, and lessons learned through experience” (p. 214).

• **Transformations.** There are differing types of transformation necessary for change: discourse, practices, systems for collaborative working, world views, nature, traditional society, and roles.
• **Time lag and dynamics of praxis.** There is a time lag between an idea and a change in practice. “Issues concerning time lags and dynamics of praxis are among those that need to be taken into account in design for learning” (p. 215).

• **Design for learning.** This is a strong theme in Wenger (1998): “learning, of itself, cannot be designed but is something that happens, whether designed or not” (Wenger, as cited in Blackmore, 2010a, p. 215). Wenger focused instead on designing “social infrastructure that fosters learning” (pp. 215-216).

• **Stability, sustainability, and overall purpose.** Schön and Vickers pointed to the post–Second World War focus on stability. The Hawkesbury Group’s purpose and focus is on sustainability. Both are dynamic. “It is possible to engage in purposeful design for learning that takes account of a range of dynamics in learning and in situations” (p. 216). Communities of practice pay similar attention to sustainability. But is this of the design, of the communities, or of natural resources? What is the purpose of social learning systems? There is, among the authors of this book, a range of purposes, but from Blackmore’s point of view “all the authors seem concerned in different ways not just with understanding current situations but with making improvements to bring about a better world where we nurture rather than undermine the previously perceived systems on which we depend. (p. 216).³⁷ Blackmore concluded his thematic list of waypoints to his landscape of social learning by saying that he could have added the themes of “meaning,” “governance,” and “power,” and answers his rhetorical question, “What future roles will exist for social learning systems and communities of practice?” by saying,

> In this book, the landscape mapped appears to have been viewed on both sunny and cloudy days. Among the perspectives articulated are: belief that social learning systems and community-based approaches can influence change in a positive way;

³⁷ This observation would seem to be highly problematic in post-colonial societies of domination and erasure.
determination to learn and influence change; and exasperation at what does not appear to be changing, in spite of what we appear to know. (p. 217)

3.3 Social Capital

Farr (2004) found the historical roots of the concept of social capital in Hobbes, Locke, and Marx but without the name. He credited Dewey and Hanifan and their movement of social and critical pragmatism with developing and naming the concept, as they encouraged collectivities to provide “the network of social activities that bind people together” (p. 15). Farr (2004) described Dewey and Hanifan’s linking of social and critical pragmatism as a

relentlessly critical stance towards received traditions in philosophy or public life…. critical pragmatism took a stance against any agency that denied or deprived the democratic goods of sympathy and cooperation—in short, social capital—to individuals, or communities. Whether human beings or social forces, such agencies of denial or deprivation represented “the evils of the present industrial and political situation. (p. 15)

Dewey (as cited in Farr (2004) numbered among them poverty, unemployment, and isolation, as well as ignorance, racism, and nationalism. All these social phenomena combined to deprive their victims of social capital (p. 15).

Farr emphasized that criticism is “never purely negative…. Where social capital is denied, deprived or absent, shared public work via active networking in associations is the only solution or amelioration available” (p. 16). The point of social criticism is to rebuild social capital.

Farr identified Hanifan’s work of social pragmatism as building the capacity for sympathy:

This entailed the ordinary sense of feeling concern or compassion for others, especially those denied or deprived of life’s essentials, including social capital. But, more fundamentally, sympathy was a capacity of the imagination that could be cultivated to understand and identify moral commonalities with others: “more than mere feeling: it is a cultivated imagination for what men have in common and a rebellion at whatever unnecessarily divides them.” (p. 16)
Farr noted that the “projective capacity of the imagination gives us the capacity to judge the trustworthiness of others” (p. 27). This is an important capacity for collectivities engaged in conflict with other collectivities, such as is the case with the Mi’gmaq, settler, and angler-conservationist communities of the Restigouche. “Sympathy hides in the shadow of trust in the contemporary moral psychology of social capital” (p. 27).

Farr acknowledged that the concept of social capital, as currently being engendered as a social practice in, for instance, poor rural African-American communities, has been criticized as “a kinder, gentler means of social control” (p. 27). Social capital as either a concept or as an intentional goal of social practice is not neutral as to either its meaning, or its effects. The issue for Farr, as for Dewey, Marx, and Putnam (1995) and Hanifan, is that “we have a conception that strongly backs practical concerns about ‘making social capital work’” (Farr, 2004, p. 27).

Portes (1998) also warned against applying social capital as a fix-all for communities, questioning its attribution by advocates as both a cause and an effect (p. 19) He also questioned its application to communities, citing Bourdieu’s original use of the term to describe “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance of recognition.” (Bourdieu, cited in Portes, 1998, p. 3), arguing that social capital can be accessed by individuals, as well as communities, for their benefit. Differing conceptualizations of social capital

opened the way for re-labelling a number of different and even contradictory processes as social capital…. Thus, it is important to distinguish the resources themselves from the ability to obtain them by virtue of membership in different social structures.... Equating social capital with the resources acquired through it can easily lead to tautological statements. (p. 5)

In contrast to economic capital, “which is in the bank and human capital, which is in our heads… social capital is intangible and inheres in the structure of relationships” (p. 7). While recognizing, with Farr (2004), that it may be used for social control, as in parent-child relationships (pp. 10-12), Portes (1998) contrasted Granovetter (1983) and Burt
(1999) with Lin, Edsel, and Vaughn (1981). For Granovetter and Burt, “weak ties” and “structural holes” become motivators for the development and use of social capital precisely because there is a paucity, rather than density, of network ties. Lin et al. (1981), without using the term social capital, emphasized “dense networks as a resource” (As cited in Portes, 1998, pp. 12-13). The angler-conservationist community of the Restigouche and beyond represent such a “dense network,” where, as Portes puts it, “identification with one’s own group can be a powerful motivational force…creating sanctioning force” (pp. 8).

Portes concluded, “While I believe that the greatest theoretical promise of social capital lies at the individual level—exemplified by the analyses of Bourdieu and Coleman—there is nothing intrinsically wrong with redefining it as a structural property of large aggregates” (p. 8). He did not, however, attempt to link “large aggregates” to culturally distinctive communities, such as those of the Restigouche watershed or to issues of resource management.

Woolcock and Narayan (2000), writing from their perspective of economic development at the World Bank, defined social capital as “the norms and networks that enable people to act collectively” (p. 2). While advocating “learning by doing,” they concluded that “social relations,” of the kind evidenced in the building of social capital, “are key in mobilizing other growth-enhancing resources” (p. 19). Their principal concern was that the discourse surrounding social capital “helps to bridge orthodox divides between scholars, practitioners, and policymakers” (p. 2). They did not directly address the role of social capital in conflict resolution between conflicted cultures and communities attempting to access a limited resource. They did, however, underscore the possibility of intercommunity synergism in building both social and economic capital.

Lollo (n.d.) attempted to clarify the dimensions of social capital, arguing that “the combination of social capital dimensions results in different types of social capital, [namely,] identifying, linking, bridging and bonding”, each differently influencing “the quality of resources available to individuals, the efficiency within the group, and the level
of trust” (pp. 1-2). Once again, social capital is characterized as a mixed blessing, with harmful as well as beneficial functionality. The most prevalent harmful characteristics are rent seeking, or the seeking of special privileges for an individual or group, using its accumulation of social capital to leverage such benefits. Against this, Lollo (n.d.) credited social capital for functioning as a productive asset enhancing trust and cooperation within the group (p. 1). Again, the complexities of intercultural and community conflict over a limited resource were not directly considered.

In a similar but earlier study, Adler and Kwon (2002), in attempting to “assess its utility for organizational theory” developed a “common conceptual framework…identifying sources, benefits, risks and contingencies of social capital” (p. 17). They identified and differentiated between bonding, which occurs within social structures in which social capital is accumulated, and bridging, which is understood to be between people in differing social structures.

Perkins, Hughey, and Speer (2002) linked concepts of social capital to psychology, which “has been slow to embrace social capital. However, community psychology has invested heavily in related concepts of sense of community, empowerment, citizen participation and neighbouring—ideas with a rich history in psychology and relevance to” (p. 46) social capital. They differ from many other theorists in suggesting that, while both bridging and bonding among individuals and community institutions are important, they are not equally so. An overemphasis on bonding, or developing and maintaining a sense of community, can inhibit dealing with controversial issues and conflict, which is often necessary (Hughey and Speer, 2002). Bonding within groups can, paradoxically, even lead to insularity, alienation of outsiders, and inhibit bridging to other groups (Burt, 1999). There is also danger in overreliance on bridging relationships with outside institutions, which may even come at the expense of community cohesion. It is through those bridging relationships that larger-scale “second order” change occurs…. SC has been largely divorced from political and economic capital and so, conceived in purely social terms, provides no basis for large-scale or structural community change. (p. 46)
This tension between social dynamics within communities and between communities is particularly evident in the case of the communities of the Restigouche watershed, illustrating the relative wealth and paucity of social capital and the ease and confidence with which they are able to expend social capital on bridging. Perkins, Hughey and Speer (2002) concluded with a “Call to Collaborate.” Echoing Wenger (p. 201), they noted that “there is tremendous energy at the boundary of systems” (p. 47).

It is at the boundaries of social capital and social identity that Davis (2014) sought “to explain trust and conflict in social networks” (p. 1). Emphasizing cooperation and trust in social networks, Davis, while acknowledging that “mapping out what actually happens in any particular circumstance is motivationally complex” (p. 10), argued “that broad social conflicts between large, impersonal groups become personal conflicts in face-to-face encounters in role-relational settings, because of the way that relational and categorical social identities are related” (p. 9). Reiterating Putnam (2000), to the effect that “bridging social capital exists between heterogeneous groups of people and bonding social capital exists between homogeneous groups of people” (Davis, 2014, p. 4), so that “bridging capital links islands of bonding social capital, and functions as a kind of connective tissue for society” (p. 8), Davis introduced analogous categorical and relational social identities, “because it will allow us to provide an explanation of their relationship which makes conflict central to social capital analysis” (p. 8). For Davis (2014), both social capital and social identity are expended and experienced in instrumental and non-instrumental ways in the course of both bridging between heterogeneous groups and bonding within homogeneous groups. He described their functions:

*Non-instrumental rationality* is generally explained in terms of rules and values (both ethical and practical) which are taken to be intrinsically meaningful and thus stand on their own apart from the issue of what consequences they may have. (Kant)…. Consider, then, bridging social capital and relational social identities. People can be motivated in an *instrumentally rational* way if they believe that fulfilling their roles improves the efficiency of the group and thereby increases whatever the group’s output is. But people can also be motivated in a non-instrumentally rational way if they believe that they ought to do what their roles
prescribe because they believe that part of the meaning of having a role is that one has a responsibility to do what it entails. Thus, there are two rationality interpretations possible when we explain bridging social capital in terms of relational social identities. (p. 6)

Davis (2014) summarized the relationships between social capital, social identity, and motivation, as mediated through instrumental and non-instrumental rationality, in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Groups</th>
<th>Heterogeneous</th>
<th>Homogeneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinds of social capital</td>
<td>Bridging</td>
<td>Bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of social identity</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Rationality</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Collective action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental rationality</td>
<td>Rules(^{38})</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Describing the centrality of conflict to understanding social capital, Davis linked trust and cooperation to the behaviour of people in social groups, which is “pro-own group and anti-other group” (p. 10). He asked, how do people manage internal personal conflict produced by interpersonal conflict? In his answer, he cited Festinger: by acting “in such a way as to reduce cognitive dissonance…. That is, they simplify their situations and

\(^{38}\) “Rules” here are evolved through intercommunity dialogue and the learning process.
eliminate internal conflict by setting aside or alternatively re-emphasizing some subset of their beliefs, values, or perceptions” (p. 11).

A further social-identity barrier to the growth of aggregate social capital between conflicted groups, especially relevant to the intercultural history and present reality of the Restigouche watershed, is introduced by Davis; namely, stigma. Citing Steele’s stigma identity-threat model, he wrote:

When a social group to which people belong and its associated categorical social identity are stigmatized or somehow devalued (an example of interpersonal conflict generating cognitive dissonance), if that stigmatization creates a burden for the individuals who are stigmatized that exceeds some threshold of coping ability, they are said to respond by either increasing (e.g. Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey, 1999) or decreasing (Ellemers, Spears, and Doosje, 2002) the weight they place on the stigmatized identity. Social conflict that materializes in inter-group social stigmatization, such as racial and ethnic slurs and discrimination, manifests itself in inter-personal conflict in the form of an identity-threat. This in turn can result in dissonance reduction actions which can alter social group identification. (p. 11)

Although, positively, “when people identify with others they replace their individual interests with social interests,” trust and cooperation are increased, Davis warned, “This fails to understand the social forces that undermine trust and cooperation…. This is a question of whether they can still ‘identify with’ one another through their interconnected roles when large impersonal groups of which they are members are in conflict” (p. 13). He continued:

Thus, it is helpful to notice an important difference between identifying with someone categorically and doing so relationally. In the first case, one might be affectively or attitudinally inclined to identify with others, because groups of homogeneous people often share orientations based on shared inherited characteristics which they tend to accept without much reflection (for example, ethnic or national identities). But this affective basis for identifying with others is largely absent in the case of relational social identities where people find themselves paired with people who are different and are often members of different social groups. In this case, rather than an inclination to identify with others, what underlies identification with others is an awareness of the meaningfulness of
occupying interconnected roles. That is, people regard functional interconnectedness as cognitively meaningful, essentially, I suggest, understanding it as an artifact of how human social organization has historically developed. That is, whereas categorical social identities are often rooted more in the emotional side of life, relational identities depend on the ability of people to reason about the world, often when doing so is contrary to what they feel. (p. 7)

Davis (2014) grounded the building of social capital between conflicted communities and cultures in the contexts of stigmatized social identities threatened by the very attempts at bridging necessary for the aggregation of jointly held social capital. He concluded,

Contrary to the view that aggregate social capital might grow by somehow extending what motivates people to build bonding social capital and particularized trust, the argument would be that the growth of aggregate social capital depends on extending people’s relational social identity motivations as a basis for the development of generalized trust. (p. 14)

Davis’ analysis may be useful in understanding the difficulties encountered in bridging between the culturally and politically conflicted communities of the Restigouche watershed.

Brough et al. (2006) addressed Davis’s analytical categories of social capital and identity in the context of their study of Australian urban Indigenous Peoples. They concluded that far from being a “new” panacea for inequality, the challenge to maintain “old” bonds, whilst traversing “new” bridges represents an entrenched daily struggle for many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, particularly those who reside in large heterogeneous cities…. For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people seeking both acknowledgement of their Aboriginality as well as the freedom to participate in the multi-cultural space of a large Australian city, being “bonded” and/or “bridged” provoked among many of the participants in this study deep questions about identity, and the way it is constructed and policed within Australian society. (pp. 14, 15)

There are clear parallels between these victims of colonization and the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj.
3.4 Social Learning and Social Capital in Natural-Resources Management

Pahl-Wostl and Hare (2004) linked social learning and collective decision-making in the context of “a Swiss case study which dealt with the development of new management strategies for urban water management” (p. 193). These strategies aimed to “combine content management as well as social involvement processes to achieve both technical and relational outcomes” (p. 193). In this management-driven case, which required “changes in social practices, roles and responsibilities,” Pahl-Wostl and Hare (2004) offered “examples of how different techniques can be used to establish a process of social learning within a long-term participatory management project using participatory agent-based social simulation” (p. 193).

Following the work of Etienne Wenger, the authors acknowledged that learning is participatory and contextual, “embedded in culture and history,” in which “learning processes confirm and shape the identity of the individual in its social surroundings. They confirm and change social practice and the associated interpretation of the environment” (p. 194). The authors identified the following “key ingredients” as being necessary for “actors” in “social learning for resource management processes” to build capacities:

- Awareness of each other’s sometimes different goals and perspectives;
- Shared problem identification;
- Understanding of the actors’ interdependence;
- Understanding of the complexity of the management system;
- Learning to work together; and
- Trust;
- The creation of informal as well as formal relationships (p. 195)

For “a successful social learning process leading to new resource management ideas” to happen, Pahl-Wostl and Hare (2004) argued, that “‘soft,’ relational, and ‘hard’ factual aspects of managing a human-environment system must be combined.” (p. 195) Techniques by which the soft, relational dimension was encapsulated in a form of social
learning in order to enable a kind of enlightened, more human, form of water management, loosened from its technology–centred tradition, are described in the case study. Presumably these techniques are not an end-goal but a means of increasing public, political, and financial support for the water management project, or soft co-option.

The case described involved a homogeneous society, in which cultural and intercommunity conflict is non-existent, or, at least, ignored. As with water resources themselves, the authors acknowledged that managers who stand outside the participating public actors must manage the social learning process, a contradiction in terms. The goal of the managers was said to be to promote “a solution oriented process…by involving the actors in the design of the research process and in the supervision of progress and by being very explicit about the goal of each step” (p. 204). Pahl-Wostl and Hare added, “One cannot overlook the costs and difficulties of maintaining a social learning process for long periods of time with people who have other work to do.” In this model, social learning becomes relevant to natural-resource management only by being imposed and managed from without. This is a very narrow definition of social learning, technocratic and managerial in its design and intent and hardly likely to prove useful in situations, such as the Restigouche, where communities and cultures are conflicted over natural-resource management. By ignoring deep issues of the actors’ identity and meaning, such an understanding and attempted use of social learning ignores the complex and existential nature of social learning, as described by Bourdieu and Wenger.

Issues of management were also given priority by Smith, Leahy, Anderson, and Davenport (2013) in their study of the degree to which “local community members trust a management agency and their willingness to engage in resource-related public discourse and involvement” (p. 252). Recognizing that resource-management agencies have at least a theoretical interest in attempting to build stronger, more reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationships with stakeholders and community members [in order to] reduce expenditures in both time and money due to litigation or stalled planning efforts and ultimately lead to
the authors addressed the issue as to “whether or not individual’s trust in a management agency is related to their involvement in resource-related planning” (pp. 453-454). Following an examination of dimensions of trust and other variables, including dispositional trust, trust of the federal (U.S.) government, shared values and the moral and technical competencies of agencies, Smith et al. (2013) concluded that although trust is high among members of the public who have knowledge and involvement with management agencies, distrust is an important motivator in “fueling public involvement in resource management and planning” (p. 467). Citing Sunstein and Warren, they noted, “Some research suggests distrust is essential to the continued functioning of modern social systems [while] high levels of trust may, over time, reduce the effectiveness of democratic processes within resource planning and management frameworks” (p. 467). However, dissent over particular planning issues is likely to come from those individuals who do not trust an agency. And, as data from this study illustrate, those individuals are exactly the ones most likely to be involved in resource planning efforts (p. 467).

Acknowledging that their study was limited to the “cognitive” component of the social relationship between individuals and resources management agencies” (p. 467), Smith et al. (2013) wondered if a study of the “structural,” that is to say “associative,” components might “moderate” the relationship.

This question was addressed by Prell, Reed, Racin, and Hubacek (2010), whose study of upland land management in the north of England, showed significant correlations between respondents’ views regarding land management and their social networks, [and] that stakeholders are less influenced by their particular organizational affiliation (e.g., “conservationist” versus “farmer”), and more by whom they speak with on a regular basis regarding land management. (p. 34)
Crona and Hubacek (2010), in their guest editorial for a themed issue of Ecology and Society, placed the work of the contributors, including Prell et al. (2010) in the context of a move away from command-and-control…from government to governance, and from political administrative hierarchy to various types of collaborative structures, noting that achieving this new form of resource governance is dependent on a fundamental understanding of important social processes at play. (para. 3)

Thus, “scholars have recently started to take an interest in how relationships among different actors and stakeholders facilitate and hinder societies in transforming the way they manage natural resources” (para. 2). Adaptive governance, if it is to succeed must recognise and incorporate both collaboration and learning within and between actors as well as “the institutions that structure and influence the processes” (para. 12).

3.5 Governance

3.5.1 Governing the Restigouche

Humans have occupied the land and waters of the Restigouche watershed for many thousands of years. Until the arrival of Europeans, governance was according to the practices and traditions of the Indigenous population. The Mi’kmaq, encountered by seasonal Basque and English fishermen in the late 15th century, were self-governing. The European explorer and founder of New France, Samuel Champlain, was very curious about Indian ideas of law and judged that in a European sense, ‘they are for the most part a people who have no law.’ He meant that they lived by what, from a European perspective, was a primitive system of customary law…He also studied the structure of authority among the Indians, and observed that the chiefs had very little power or authority over others. Champlain noted repeatedly that chiefs would express strong opinions, but the Indians act and judge for themselves. (Fischer, 2009, p. 145)

The establishment of New France and its subsequent conquest by the British brought colonial laws to bear on the settlers, European foreigners and, within the conflicted understandings of the Treaties of Friendship, between the British and the Mi’gmaq, upon the First Nations. The laws of the governments of Lower Canada and of New Brunswick, in conjunction with the colonial laws of Great Britain, applied in their respective territories within the watershed. Following Confederation, the laws of Great Britain became those of Canada.

Today the watershed is governed according to the laws and applicable regulations of Canada (including the colonialist and racist Indian Act), the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick, the towns and counties within the watershed, and the Listuguj First Nation. Even in the absence of overt conflict between these governments and their constituencies, co-operation is difficult. What models of co-operative governance, centred on place, might there be for the three communities?

Since the first nation-states in western Europe emerged, through the growth of capitalism and industrialization and their roles as colonizers and imperial administrators, their governments and those of their colonizing successors, such as Canada, have become ever more complex, bureaucratic and “top-down.” These governments continue to be characterized by centrally controlled, single-authority hierarchies with closed boundaries, judged by their success in managing and delivering policies derived from the legislation of democratically elected majorities (Booher & Innes, 2010, p. 35). There has, however, been a shift from representative government to participatory governance. Governance represents an alternative, parallel, sometimes complementary, sometimes conflicting means of achieving desirable public goals. Its principal mark is public participation in policy formulation, planning, delivery, and management of perceived public goods.

The emergence of governance has changed the institutional frameworks in which governments must operate. Democratically elected governments have fiduciary and legislative responsibility to act in the public interest and not to be found to be negligent. Their authority to act is accompanied by both power and accountability. Civil-society
groups do not necessarily represent majorities and are limited in their accountability. Issues of the distribution of power between elected governments, civil society, stakeholders, appointees, and unelected bureaucracies arise. Civil society shares with other stakeholders the possibility of being co-opted by government and other special interests, such as industry. (See, for instance, Lemann, 2013, pp. 73ff.) Similarly, government may be co-opted by special interests, including civil society, and does not always act in the public interest. The differing capacities of public participants to lobby and influence government is a dimension of this problem in reconciling governance with democratic government.

Because public participation engages individuals at the level of values and meaning, it is necessarily both complex and grounded in specific places. The cases and studies discussed below are suggestive of practices and theoretical understandings potentially helpful to the resolution of conflict within the Restigouche watershed.

### 3.5.2 Adaptive Governance for Complexity and Resilience

Access to and distribution and use of the vital natural resource, water, is contested in virtually all jurisdictions, including in Canada. Within the developed world, California has a long and well-developed history of internal conflict over its water resources. Water is channeled through a complex delivery system from the northern Sierra Nevada into the Sacramento-San Joaquin delta and the San Francisco Bay estuary (Bay-Delta) and from there to the urban populations and agricultural regions of the more arid south. By the late 20th century the long-waged battle between the rival claims of ever-expanding urban communities and the equally expansive and intensive agricultural sector was joined by those who sought to protect what was left of the natural environment for its own sake, as habitat, for fisheries and as part of the cultural heritage of Californians. CALFED was born in 1994 “to address some of the complex interrelated and fast-moving problems, and

---

40 Lemann (2013) contrasted the failure of the American conservation movement to achieve global-warming legislation through co-operation with industry with its successes in the 1970s in achieving the Clean Air and Water Acts, through grassroots political organization.
Arguing that CALFED is an example of a “complex adaptive system,” Booher and Innes noted that “adaptive management of environmental resources presents a challenge to traditional government, with its reliance on bureaucratic procedures, the lengthy processes of legislative deliberation, and often arbitrary nature of judicial decision making” (para. 1). Nevertheless, and despite California’s “bewildering array of overlapping and competing water-rights laws, water contracts, and informal water-use practices,” contesting stakeholders and the “diverse and conflicting mandates” of public agencies, CALFED has been a model for collaborative governance in the context of contested resources (Booher and Innes, 2010, Art 35). CALFED’s innovations in the face of “uncertainty and complexity, fragmentation and diversity, interdependence and new spaces for decision making,” have allowed it to adapt to “the changing context for governance,” combining traditional norms of governance with emergent, self-organizing ones (para. 6).

Booher and Innes (2010) described five features of complex adaptive systems and collaborative practices:

- **Agents.** The system comprises large numbers of individual agents connected through multiple networks.
- **Interactions.** The agents interact dynamically, exchanging information and energy based upon heuristics that organize the interactions locally. Even if the specific agents only react with a few others, the effects propagate throughout the system. (See also Granoveter, 1983) As a result, the system has a memory that is not located at a specific node but is distributed throughout the system.

---

41 Heuristics are experienced based problem solving and discovery. See above Wenger’s descriptions of communities of practice.

42 Is it too much of a stretch to see this process as echoing Bourdieu’s theory of social learning? These echoes of Wenger and Bourdieu continue in Booher and Innes (2010).
- **Nonlinearity.** The interactions are nonlinear, iterative, recursive, and self-referential. There are many direct and indirect feedback loops.

- **System behaviour.** The system is open, the behaviour of the system is determined by the interactions among the agents, and the behaviour of the system cannot be understood by looking at the components. Coherent and novel patterns of order emerge.

- **Robustness and adaptation.** The system is potentially resilient, as it has both the capacity to maintain its viability and the capacity to evolve. With sufficient diversity, the heuristics evolve, the agents adapt to one another, and the system can reorganize its internal structure without intervention of an outside agent (para. 12).

CALFED’s success in making operational these principles and practices was cited as evidence of its robust and adaptive response to complexity through a resilient form of emergent governance. Current threats to both people and the Atlantic salmon within the Restigouche watershed are similarly complex, while present forms of government seem ill-adapted to the challenge.

### 3.5.3 Evaluating Watershed Partnerships in California and Washington

Leach, Pelkey, and Sabatier (2002) reported their findings in evaluating 44 watershed partnerships in California and Washington. Using “interviews, surveys and documents to measure each of six evaluation criteria” (p. 645), they concluded that “the data suggest that each criterion makes a unique contribution to the overall evaluation, and together the criteria reflect a range of partnership goals—both short-term and long-term, substantive and instrumental” (p. 645). The criteria were (a) perceived effect on watershed, (b) perceived effect on human and social capital, (c) restoration projects, (d) education projects, (e) monitoring projects, and (f) level of agreement. They also concluded that “partnerships have been most effective at addressing problems that can be managed at a local, or regional scale” (p. 665). However, in “about one-third of partnerships, the average stakeholder believes that the partnership has aggravated problems related to the economy, property rights and regulation” (p. 665). They further warned that
“stakeholders may subconsciously overestimate their partnership’s effectiveness on serious problems to avoid the emotional discomfort produced by discrepancies between the partnership’s priorities and its actual effects” (p. 665). Nevertheless one “sanguine finding is that partnerships apparently have the most positive effect on the most serious problems in the watershed, which suggests that partnerships devote more effort to serious problems” (p. 665). The degree to which these findings might apply within the context of watersheds in cultural and community conflict over a natural resource remains to be explored.

3.5.4 Partnership and Place in Networked Governance

Healey, de Magalhaes, Madanipour, and Pendlebury (2003), echoed Booher and Innes (2010) and offered some insights into the transformation of governance practices. Beginning with the “widespread agreement across Europe on the need for innovation in the forms and practices of contemporary governance” and asserting that the challenge “is to recast governance agendas and practices around new foci and new relations,” these authors examined “the micro-social relations of such transformative efforts through a particular case of ‘partnership’ relations to promote ‘place qualities’” (p. 60).

In the mid-20th century welfare state model of governance, policy agendas were divided into sectors, whose responsibility it was to provide services such as education, health, and welfare and support for economic sectors, such as industry, fisheries, and agriculture. National governments designed and financed initiatives, while local governments had “to work out how to coordinate these programs and to regulate the activities of firms and citizens” (p. 61). This created policy communities, which were made up of political representatives, officials, consultants, and lobby groups, with “distinctive discourses and practices”, communities of practice, in Wenger’s (2010) terms.

It is these divisions, discourses and practices which now seem to trap government in modes of thinking and acting which lack the flexibility to respond to new ways of living, new ways of doing business in a globalized context and new cultural awareness of the significance of environment and place qualities…. As many now articulate the challenge is to develop relations between the spheres of civil society,
the economy and the state which are less hierarchical and less paternalist, which are sensitive to the needs and aspirations of diverse groups (and especially those who tend to get marginalized) [emphasis added]and which have a capacity to learn from diverse knowledge resources. (p. 61)

Identifying “new place-focused policy rhetorics,” in which “‘place’ is understood as more than a physical locale or a collection of assets to be ‘positioned’ in a new geography of competing places,” Healey et al. (2003) examined an attempt to greatly broaden the inclusiveness and participation of individual, civil, and sectoral actors in the revival of the 19th century core of the northeast English industrial city of Newcastle43. In addition to the three levels of government (national, regional, and local) and special governmental agencies, members of civil society, property owners, businesses, and local residents were co-opted to implement the Grainger Town Project. A central idea in this initiative was to use place, rather than any of the traditional governmental sectors, as the focus of transformation of the town core and of governance itself. The goal was to move away from sectoral and paternalist patterns of government to deliberative government within a place-focused, participatory, network society, with expanded horizons creating healing and deepening structures within the city. To achieve this degree of change was difficult.

“There is now a rapidly developing literature which argues that the quality of the social relations of a locality has an important effect on social life and business performance” (p. 62). Citing other literature, these authors identified institutional capacity that has a rich “institutional thickness” as necessary for a “territorial innovation milieux” to be created. They “develop a relational view of institutional capacity, rather than treating it as a stock of assets” (p. 63). Institutional capital is further refined as intellectual, social, and political, defined as “knowledge resources,” “trust and social understanding, through face-to-face encounter,” and “the capacity to act collectively to develop local qualities and to capture external attention and resources” (p. 63). Echoing Bourdieu and Wenger, the authors argued that “meanings and actions are actively constructed in social contexts

43 Shorn by regional government of its historic, descriptive and mellifluous suffix, “upon-Tyne.”
through relational dynamics” and proposed the “conception of policy analysis as a deliberative, action oriented practice in which meanings and values are socially constructed” (p. 64). Drawing on “social constructivist conceptions of knowledge”, Healey et al. (2003) further refined the dimensions of institutional capacity building, as illustrated in the table below (Table 2):
Table 2

The dimensions of institutional capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge resources</th>
<th>The range of knowledge resources, explicit and tacit, systematized and experiential, to which participants have access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The frames of reference which shape conceptions of issues, problems, opportunities and interventions, integrating different spheres of policy development and action around place qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which the range and frames are shared among stakeholders, integrating different spheres of policy development and action around place qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The capacity to absorb new ideas and learn from them (openness and learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational resources</td>
<td>The range of stakeholders involved, in relation to the potential universe of stakeholders in the issue or in what goes on in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The morphology of their social networks, in terms or the density (or ‘thickness’) of network interconnections and their ‘route structure’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent of integration of the various networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The location of the power to act, the relations of power between actors and the interaction with wider authoritative, allocative and ideological structuring forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization capacity</td>
<td>The opportunity structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institutional arenas used and developed by stakeholders to take advantage of opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The repertoire of mobilization techniques which are used to develop and sustain momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The presence or absence of critical change agents at different stages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a rich list of potential capacities for change. Applying their analysis to the Grainger Town Project, the authors described both levels of success and difficulty. Impediments to changing the culture of governance in Newcastle’s traditionally working-class, Labour-dominated city council and its entrenched civil servants were many. They included the difficulties inherent in micropolitics, contested political territories, established local practices, and the identification and recruitment of change agents. Both potentialities and impediments encountered in Newcastle find equivalents in the Restigouche watershed. Its complexities of government and of cultures point towards the importance of the concept of place as an organizing principle for governance

3.5.5 Limitations of Management and of Collaboration:

California is the most populous state in the United States, and its economy is larger than that of all but a few of the world’s nation-states. Newcastle is an ancient city, with a long history of economic integration into the rest of the British economy. Government is centralized in London, with no intermediary levels between it and local counties, regions, and cities such as Newcastle.

By contrast, Canadian loci of natural-resource management and governance issues tend to be both geographically and governmentally peripheral. They involve several layers of government, including federal, provincial, and local county and municipal governments. The Restigouche watershed is not unique in being situated in two provinces, one of which (Quebec) has a special relationship to the federal government, and in being both the traditional territory and current home of First Nations, who have their own governments, functioning under the federal Indian Act. These governments, in turn, are in a direct, conflicted, and changing relationships with the federal government. What are the implications of this governmental complexity and geographic peripherality for collaborative governance?

Nakashima, Gibson, and Vodden (2015) focused on new regionalism as a response to “the complexity of territorial development and mitigating the negative impacts associated with both political and industrial restructuring” and the importance of collaborative
governance in that response. After Ansell and Gash, the authors defined collaborative governance as an “arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage none-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage programs or assets” (Ansell & Gash, as cited in Nakashima et al., 2015, para. 2).

As in the California water plan and the redesign of the Newcastle city centre, collaborative governance here implied a shift from hierarchical structures to “co-constructed networks,” with stakeholders collaborating at “multiple points throughout a multi-phased governance process,” resulting in consensus building (para. 2). The authors identified five components: (a) starting conditions, (b) collaborative process, (c) institutional design, (d) facilitated leadership, and (e) outcomes. Their research and analysis focused on the collaborative process component of collaborative governance.

Findings revealed that close to a quarter of key informants interviewed reported “the absence of any collaboration or service sharing with another organisation within their region” (para. 5). Follow-up interviews in the four provinces in which regional collaboration was under study showed that, despite the starting conditions of collaboration, willingness, and incentives being present, there remained “an absence of collaborative activities” (para 4). The reasons given for this varied but included (a) the absence of dialogue, relationships and understanding between communities and (b) a lack of commitment to process and recognition of interdependencies, or sense of community. Such stumbling blocks to collaboration may well exist in the Restigouche watershed, where even the starting conditions of willingness and incentives may prove to be elusive and where the multiple levels of government have not yet initiated collaboration between themselves and other stakeholders.44 The researchers promised further analysis of the “collaborative governance conundrum.” The insights of Davis (2014) into the inherent

44 The federal government Department of Fisheries and Oceans has recently made overtures to First Nations to collaborate on fisheries management based on treaty rights and obligations. Personal communication.
tensions in negotiating collaboration, through bridging, between heterogeneous, bonded, communities, might be of assistance.

The Atlantic salmon, an anadromous fish, whose adults spawn and juveniles grow and mature in fresh water, spend from one to several years in the ocean. For millennia they shared this habitat with very large numbers of Atlantic cod (Gadus morhua). From as early as the 15th century, these fish drew European fishermen west across the Atlantic to the Grand Banks, where their catches were dried, salted, and exported to European markets. Cod were a major motivator for European settlement of what is now eastern Canada and a foundation for much of its economy until the latter part of the 20th century, when cod stocks collapsed, together with their dependent economies and communities. It is true to say that those who seek to conserve and re-build the existing stocks of Atlantic salmon and the communities dependent upon them do so in the shadow of the cod collapse.

Bavington (2010) examined the role that management had to play in this unnatural disaster: “unlike the demise of passenger pigeons, the plains buffalo and contemporary species, the northern cod was scientifically managed out of existence” (p. 2). While not questioning the “usefulness or appropriateness of the idea of management itself,” Bavington (2010) argued that it is a mistake to assume “the inherent worth of management” (p. 2). For, as Ralston Saul has argued, “Management is a tertiary skill—a method, not a value. And yet we apply it to every domain as if it were the ideal of our civilization” (Saul, 1994 as cited in Bavington, 2010). In doing so, Bavington argued, our “thought and action are therefore constrained by management and end up reinforcing existing political, economic and environmental inequalities” (p. 128). He located these inequalities in the context of capitalist resource extraction, in whose service, “fisheries,

---

45 Unlike Pacific salmon, Atlantics have the biological capacity to survive spawning and to return to the ocean and to reproduce a second, or more times.
46 However, while “management in and of itself is not a value, it may be a process that enhances value and it may be structured in such a way as to provide added value (beyond economic value?) to a resource.” (J. FitzGibbon, personal communication.)
science technology and management have all been aimed at creating and sustaining this context of capitalist resource extraction by transforming fisheries around the world into an industrial sector” (p. 128).

Writing from the perspective of small, local, and, often, peripheral Newfoundland fishing communities, Bavington (2010) offered an alternative to industrial resource extraction in the socialist-communitarian school of thought, which is marked by three characteristics:

- integration of local ecological knowledge into fisheries science and management;
- maintenance, encouragement, and recovery of local control, based on community-stewardship ethics, and nested governance, rather than top-down, state mandated rational control; and
- allocation of fishery resources to place-based communities through the adjacency principle to address equity concerns (p. 10).

In looking towards local, communal control of resources, including the notion of collective property, Bavington (2010) challenged the tragedy-of-the-commons thesis. He also challenged the reductionist impulses of capitalist industrial and scientific ontologies, arguing for an ontological complexity, which “raises the problem of how to live within complex ecosystems as opposed to how to manage them” (p. 121). Furthermore, to live well “within the ecosocial systems means recognizing that there can be no externally formulated objective solution or calculation that can achieve a universally acceptable outcome” (p. 121). This is because

ontological complexity obliterates the certainty of “objective” scientific solutions, freeing up possibilities for both discussion on and conflict over opinions, norms, and interests rather than straightforward consensus based on facts. This is the opposite of the understanding of knowledge that dominates under managerial ecology. From a managerial perspective, increased scientific knowledge leads to the identification of causal levers and laws that can be manipulated and used to achieve predictable outcomes. Thus, management sets the conditions for bargaining over quantitative trade-offs and the establishment of consensus-based decision-making processes among interested stakeholders. What management does not encourage, or
permit is a deliberation among citizens striving to define, judge and co-create a common good. (p. 122)

Quoting Nadasdy, “Management is best done on a set of underlying assumptions about the world that are rooted in the political and economic context of capitalist resource extraction,” Bavington concluded that “thought and action are therefore constrained by management and end up reinforcing existing political economic and environmental inequalities” (p. 128).

Bavington’s (2010) radical critique of ecosystem management and the normative economic and political world view that it imposed on the cod fishery might offer insights into understanding the present plight of the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche and the underlying conflicts between the its dependent communities.

The hegemony of scientific management, as described by Bavington (2010), with its attendant world view is explored in Stevenson (2004), as he discusses the marginalization of “Aboriginal systems of management, knowledge, authority, and responsibility [by] the state-sponsored institution of environmental resource management” (para 2). Noting the failure of attempts “to insert the traditional ecological knowledge of Aboriginal peoples into established knowledge and data sets constructed by Western scientists and the imposition of natural resource management concepts and procedures on Aboriginal peoples,” Stevenson concluded that co-management, as practised in northern Canada, is an “insidious form of cultural assimilation” (para. 2).

He attempted to address these “systemic inequities in the Canadian co-management experience” in order to create “space for the ‘real’ inclusion of Aboriginal peoples and their knowledge and management systems into co-management practice”. In the context of land claims agreements, Stevenson described a process by which, on the face of it, Indigenous values are preserved, while they share in the economic benefits of resource development and gain “greater control over their future” (“Land Claims Agreements,” para 1). Large portions of Indigenous traditional territories are ceded to federal Crown title in exchange for cash settlements. These settlements are intended to “address pressing
economic, social, health, education, capacity, and other needs;” legal title to portions of
their traditional territory, together with “an increase in management authority on both
Aboriginal and Crown lands” (“Land Claims Agreements,” para. 2). The latter is effected
through “the creation of cooperative wildlife, water and environmental management
boards whereby decision-making is shared between representative of the state and the
Aboriginal signatory” (“Land Claims Agreements,” para. 2). However, Stevenson
asserted, Indigenous Peoples

are commonly forced into negotiating specific resource management agreements on
an ad hoc basis with provincial, territorial, and federal governments in order to
protect their rights of access to specific resources (such as caribou, fish, sheep, and
whales) and habitats, and to sustain their traditional land-use activities, lifestyles,
and economies. (“Crises-Based Agreements,” para. 1)

Furthermore,

these agreements arise as a consequence of some perceived crisis by wildlife
biologists, renewable resource managers, or some other government bureaucrats
whereby Aboriginal peoples are implicated in either creating or contributing to the
problem through overhunting or misuse. Subsequently, restrictions are unilaterally
placed on Aboriginal uses of these “threatened” resources, negatively impacting
Aboriginal communities and, arguably, even the resources and ecosystems upon
which they depend. (“Crises-Based Agreements,” para. 1)

In discussing multi-stakeholder agreements, Stevenson uncovered further limitations to
cooperative management structures “entrenched in the institutional and epistemological
values, assumptions, and structures of the Canadian state and western European cultural
traditions…a fabric that is virtually impossible to penetrate from an Aboriginal
perspective” (“Multi-Stakeholder Agreements” para 2). In this process, *Traditional
Ecological Knowledge* is appropriated, “cherry picked,” and incorporated into Western
science to inform environmental-resource management. The methods used to gather
Traditional Environmental Knowledge are themselves embedded in Western science and
culture, and specific elements of such knowledge processed in such a way as to separate
them “from the broader social and cultural context where they more properly reside”
Thus, “holders [of Traditional Environmental Knowledge] are increasingly separated from knowledge that they constructed and once owned, controlled, and were responsible for, effectively excluding them from any meaningful role in decision-making” (“Appropriating Traditional Ecological Knowledge,” para. 2). Stevenson quoted an Inuit leader, Rosemarie Kuptana:

Our traditional ecological knowledge is too often taken out of context, misinterpreted, or misused. What wildlife managers, biologists, and bureaucrats understand, or think they see, is interpreted within their own knowledge and value systems, not ours. In the process, our special ways of knowing and doing things [for example, our local systems of management] are crushed by scientific knowledge and the state management model. What many Qallunaat [white people, roughly translated as ‘big noses’] fail to appreciate is that our traditional ecological knowledge exists in a larger frame of reference that is very different from theirs. (“Appropriating Traditional Ecological Knowledge,” para. 3)

Both Stevenson and Kuptana were objecting to the appropriation of the kinds of Traditional Environmental Knowledge that can be interpreted as information and facts, capable of being incorporated into Western science and useful for Western, state environmental-resource management. To do this without considering the broader socio-cultural contexts, understandings, functions, values, needs, rights, and interests of Aboriginal peoples is ethically and scientifically bankrupt, irresponsible, and politically, culturally, and ecologically unsustainable. Through its progressive sanitization, or “dumbing-down,” the ecological knowledge of Aboriginal peoples has assumed the role of “handmaiden” to Western scientific knowledge in Environmental and Resource Management (ERM), and alternative ways of knowing, seeing, and relating to the natural world are devalued and dismissed. This process not only reflects the predominant positions of Western science and ERM in co-management decision-making, but it strengthens the existing institutional arrangements and power relations that support them. (“Appropriating Traditional Ecological Knowledge,” para. 5)
The language of the environmental-resource management paradigm, which speaks of “resources, stocks, harvest, quotas, replacement, growth, and death rates” is alien to the language and conceptualization of traditional hunting cultures. Egede is quoted by Stevenson: “So ban the concepts of ‘managing stocks,’ the concepts like ‘harvesting,’ the concepts of ‘wildlife’ [and] through the process of changing your vocabulary, you may better understand the people you serve” (“Imposition of State Management on Aboriginal Parties,” paras. 5–6).

Telling examples of this epistemological disconnect are the place of animals and stewardship in the two cultures. Traditional cultures contradict the Western objectification of animals, believing them to “exist on an equal footing with humans and[to] deserve the same respect and treatment,” denying that “control of the relationship is entirely in human hands” (“Imposition of State Management on Aboriginal Parties”, para. 7). Similarly, stewardship “is an Eurocentric construction that fails to accurately capture most Aboriginal people’s relationships with the animals and plants upon which they have depended for centuries” (“Imposition of State Management on Aboriginal Parties,” para. 7). Indigenous resistance to the cultural hegemony implicit in environmental-resource management has taken the form of non-engagement, such as not attending co-management meetings. Stevenson concluded that strategy is ineffective and counterproductive insofar as it fails to allow Indigenous “participants to get their view points across, or to affect change in co-management discourses” (“Aboriginal Resistance to Co-Management,” para. 2).

Stevenson ended by proposing the Two-Row Wampum Approach as a basis for reformulating co-management relationships. Pointing out that Traditional Environmental Knowledge had not evolved for the purpose of informing Western science and may have little to offer environmental-resource management; nevertheless, “the knowledge of Aboriginal peoples may have much to contribute to understanding and developing sustainable relationships with the natural world” (“Two-Row Wampum Approach,”
In the two-row wampum⁴⁷ are embodied “the principles of mutual respect, recognition, and partnership…based on a nation-to-nation relationship that acknowledges the autonomy, authority, and jurisdiction of each nation” (“Two-Row Wampum Approach,” para. 2). The nations are depicted as two canoes travelling on parallel streams, “each with its own laws, customs and traditions, neither trying to steer the other’s vessel” (“Two-Row Wampum Approach,” para. 2). Admitting the difficulty of operationalizing such a concept, Stevenson nonetheless concluded,

Perhaps by focusing on relationships in addition to resources, a rightful place will be created for Aboriginal peoples and their knowledge and management systems in co-management processes. We have much to learn about developing sustainable relationships with the natural world by empowering Aboriginal peoples to rebuild and apply their systems of management, and the knowledge that informs them. But we must create the space for this to happen. We have nothing to gain, and much to lose, by jumping into each other’s canoes (“Two-Row Wampum Approach,” para. 2–3).

Indeed, Bedford (2010) has argued that there is much to be lost. The Marshall decision (1999) was implemented between DFO and Maritime First Nations by Indian Affairs and DFO, using the Canadian federal government’s management and governance practices and assumptions, resulting in the continuation of colonialist practices and preventing the adoption of Indigenous practices of fisheries governance based on consensus and direct access to resources. Indian Affairs and DFO ensured that implementation of agreements was devolved to First Nations chiefs and councils, themselves creations of the colonialist Indian Act. Thus finances, policy, management, and jobs have fallen under the control of elected chiefs and councils, a system of governance imposed upon First Nations by a paternalistic and racist state [that] interfered in almost every minute aspect of life on reserves, undermining traditional life by banning spiritual ceremonies, forbidding the use of Indigenous languages, imposing patriarchal customs and

⁴⁷ Such a symbolic “belt”, conveying the intent of “Peace and Friendship treaties between the British Crown and the Mi’gmaq people, is said to reside within the Vatican.
practices, and forcibly taking children from families to educate them into “Whiteness.” (Bedford, 2010, p. 214)

While the intention may have been to further self-government by First Nations,

the profound irony that underlies all Aboriginal politics for the past 35 years is that self-government, which is seen as the institutional means of preserving autonomy and cultural integrity, has been the important transmission belt whereby the tension between Whiteness and Aboriginality, between tradition and modernity, has been largely resolved in favour of modern, “White” forms of life. (p. 213)

Bedford quotes Taiaiake Alfred, who stated that “the imposition of elected politics in place of consensual models, and the emulation of Western politicians, has made Native (sic) [Indigenous] politics just as much a matter of cynical manipulation of power as any other kind… people have been turned into the tools of their own oppression” (as cited by Bedford, 2010, p. 213). Bedford concluded that “if the first Marshall case showed our justice system to be a farce, the second reveals the tragedy in the refusal to create an honourable place for Aboriginal persons and Aboriginality as a way of living in the world” (p. 218). As Chapter Five will show, this failure constitutes a significant part of the current dialogue between the Listuguj Mi’gmaq First Nation and the Canadian government.

3.6 Place

As Healey et al. (2003) stated, “a central idea in this initiative was to use ‘the concept of place,’ rather than any of the traditional governmental sectors, as the focus of transformation of the town core and of governance itself.” These authors invoked “the possibility of place as a ‘congelation of meanings and experiences which accumulate around locales through the daily life experience of people living their lives’” (pp. 61-62). The emphasis on meaning as the key to defining and understanding place is expressed in Vodden, Gibson, and Baldacchino (2015): “the very definition of a place is that it is a centre of meaning” (Tuan, as cited in Voden et al., p. 9).
Cheng, Kruger, and Daniels (2003) sought to relocate natural-resource management within a politics of place: “Natural resource politics is, at a fundamental level, the politics of place” (p. 99). Such a perspective, they argued, “invites the social scientist in natural resources to turn a conceptual corner and look at natural-resources politics in a different way” (p. 99), giving voice to “meanings and values” (p. 87). They asked the natural-resource social scientist to “take a closer look at place itself”:

Place is not an inert physical container for biophysical objects and human actions. Places are, in and of themselves, social constructs that defy ready definition, categorization, and measurement. Each place has a unique history among its inhabitants and visitors. Personalities, partnerships, feuds, compromises, out-migrants and newcomers make a place what it is. In turn the place brings people into relationship with one another in incomparable ways, thereby affecting the biophysical attributes and processes in incomparable ways.

Each place, then, embodies and gives rise to its own set of political and social processes and, as a result, social and cultural meanings. These processes and meanings are emergent properties of particular places. That is, social and political behaviours and place meanings are not discernible by looking solely at biophysical attributes or individual inhabitants of the place; they emerge as the result of the interaction between biophysical attributes and social and political processes. Meanings assigned to a place are unique to that place and do not readily transfer to other places, even if the biophysical attributes are identical. (p. 99)

The convergence of biophysical attributes and processes, social and political processes and social and cultural meanings in “place” is illustrated in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Biophysical, social, political and cultural dimensions of place. Adapted from Cheng, A. S., Kruger, L. E., & Daniels, S. E. (2003). “Place” as an integrating concept in natural resource politics: Propositions for a social science research agenda. *Society and Natural Resources, 16*(2), p. 90.

Linking both self-identity and social-group identity to place, Cheng et al. (2003) considered the implications of bringing a place-based perspective to natural-resource politics: “Conducting place-based social research provides more than data for decision makers. It transforms the decision-making process itself by redistributing power to voices and meanings that may not otherwise be expressed” (p. 100). Their intention was to shift the conversation away from the use by “dominant groups in natural resource politics [of] narrow sets of place meanings to legitimate existing power,” towards “the meanings people assign to places and connections people form with places” (p. 101). In this way, the authors claimed, “place-based interpretivist research uncovers and brings to the fore these meanings with the goal of enhancing dialogue and deliberation that may not otherwise occur in natural-resource decision making” (p. 101).
Cheng et al. (2003) set out six propositions for place-based, natural-resource social-science research (pp. 96-98):

- **People’s perceptions and evaluations are expressions of place-based self-identity.**
  “Uncovering and understanding people-environment connections requires diversity of methods to ‘unpack’ the layers of identity and meaning that connect people to places.”

- **People perceive and evaluate the environment as different places rather than an assemblage of individual biophysical attributes.**
  When people articulate their concerns for and interest in the environment, they are expressing meanings that extend beyond the value of the biophysical resources. They are conveying their values for the legitimacy of social and political processes that shape and are influenced by special places, and for the viability of significant social and cultural meanings…far more than the trees are at stake.

- **Social groups that seemingly emerge around using, protecting, or altering the physical attributes of a location may be engaging in more fundamental processes of defining significant social and cultural meanings to that place.**
  Hence a piece of land can give rise to different groups who have different definitions of what is considered ‘appropriate’…. It is not simply the utility of biophysical attributes of the parcel that unites individuals into these groups; they are also united around certain meanings of place. Debates among different social groups must therefore be understood at this more fundamental level.

- **People’s evaluations of, and responses to, natural-resource management proposals are influenced by their identification with social groups organized around particular meaning of the places involved.**
  “Place-based group identity is but one of several group identities one can assume in a natural resource controversy.”

- **Groups intentionally manipulate the meanings of places hoping to influence the outcome of natural-resource controversies.**
  Every physical setting has multiple layers of meaning…. a number of resource controversies revolve around competing place meanings that are deeply held,
vigorously defended and applied in ways that border on religious conviction. Groups skilled in manipulating place meanings can direct political action and eventual resolution of the controversy in their favor.

- **The geographic scale of a place can change people’s perceived group identifications and therefore influence the outcomes of a natural-resource controversy.**

  “While there may be differences [at the local level], individuals may have common sentiments of, and concerns for, what happens to a shared place.”

In discussing their six propositions, Cheng et al. (2003) stated that natural resource politics is as much a contest over place meanings as it is competition over the allocation and distribution of scarce resources among interest groups. Natural resource management actions create, transform, and destroy place meanings—meanings around which individuals develop a sense of identity. Hence, some groups will vigorously defend place meanings. There is no objective middle ground; each group—even natural resource scientists and managers—advocate certain place meanings. However, place-based group identities are more complex than labels typically used in the study of natural resource politics, such as “environmentalist” or “logger.” Indeed, stereotypical in-group-outgroup labelling tends to mask people-place connections—connections that may in fact be shared in common by opposing groups. (p. 100)

The six propositions “are highly suggestive of an interpretivist approach as they centre on the nuances of people-place connections; the social and political contests that define what place meanings are significant; and how these meanings are created, protected, transformed, and destroyed” (p. 100). The researcher is to abandon group affiliations and to “uncover place-based connections” (p. 100). The implications of this will be further explored in Chapter 6 of this dissertation, taking into account not only the complexity and richness of place in relation to people but also the complications inherent in the multicultural, natural resource–community conflicted place that is the Restigouche watershed.
3.7 Symbolism – Symbolic Interactionism and Identity

The Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed is an animal, a fish, a food, a commodity, a natural phenomenon. It is, in and of itself, a thing. It is, however, also more than itself. It is a symbol for all three communities: Indigenous, settler, and “come-from-away” sport fishers and conservationists. Just as the communities, in various ways, share the salmon as a thing in and of itself, so they share it as a symbol. As with all symbols, its meaning differs within and between communities and cultures. For some it is a sport fish, carrying all the baggage intimated by the cultural appellation “sport.” For some it is the chief gift of the Creator, a sentient being with whom they are in an intimate, I-Thou relationship. For some it is a reminder of their past and a hoped-for future prosperity. For all it is a lightning rod for cultural, community, and intergovernmental conflict. How might the symbolic nature of the salmon affect the ability of the three communities to cooperate, collaborate, build bridges, and form alliances that will enhance the possibilities of survival for the salmon and themselves? Symbolic interactionism offers some insights into this question.48

In common with other social theories discussed in this chapter, social interactionism is grounded in the conviction that “human beings are best understood in a practical, interactive relation to their environment” (“Symbolic Interactionism”, 2015, “History and Orientation”, para. 1). The concept of the self, and therefore identity, is formed through three core principles: meaning, language, and thought (“Symbolic Interactionism,” 2015, paras. 1–5).

Meaning is held to be central to human behaviour. Language is symbolic and, in speech, allows meaning to be negotiated in conversation with others. Thought, in turn, allows symbols, embedded in language, to be interpreted between individuals with different

48 “The term ‘symbolic interactionism’ is a somewhat barbaric neologism that I coined in an offhand way in an article written in Man and Society (Emerson P. Schmidt, ed. New York, 1937). The term somehow caught on and is now in general use” (Blumer, 1986, p. 1). Blumer was a social psychologist, successor to, and interpreter of George Herbert Mead. Symbolic interactionism has had many other interpreters, some of whom are discussed in Turner (2012).
points of view. The exercise of language and thought around meaning requires that the individual self is formed as it interacts with others, in the community of which they are a part, and “where our generalized other is the sum total of responses and expectations that we pick up from the people around us” (“Symbolic Interactionism”, 2015, para. 5).

Symbolic interactionism is focused on human actions. Actions towards things are based on the meaning “things” have for human actors. These meanings are, in turn, generated by social interaction and are then interpreted on the basis of the experience persons have of the things encountered. Society, its structure, and organization, exists as the result of the process of “fitting together actions” both within a person and between persons. This requires the capacity to first form a self-conscious idea of the self as an object and then of the other as a self-object whose position can be understood, so that each self can imagine itself to be in the position of other selves. Joint action is the result of “a societal organisation of conduct or different acts of diverse participants.” It is “repetitive, stable and yet evolving,” leading to the systems of connected actions that “make up much of human life” (J. FitzGibbon, personal communication, 2014, summarizing Blumer, 1986.)

Symbolic interactionism has tended to focus on the dynamics of self more than either symbols or interaction…. Self serves as a sort of gyroscope for keeping behaviours consistent and in line…. individuals are motivated to verify their sense of self in the eyes of others. (Turner, 2012, p. 331)

To the extent, however, that the theory of symbolic interactionism describes the processes by which individuals and society make meaning through the symbolic nature of language and interpretive thought, differences in the constructed meanings that result between both individuals and societies, communities, and cultures may easily result in difficulties in communication. When the shared symbol of the Atlantic salmon is mediated through different languages, literally as in English, French, and Mi’gmaw, as well as in both traditional and Western cultures, and its interpretation through thought is also conditional on culture and history, it becomes apparent that far from being an easily accessed symbol
of unity and mutual comprehension, it can be experienced as being a source of divisiveness and conflict.

The methodological implications of symbolic interactionism include participant observation, qualitative interviewing, and interaction and context analysis. These will be reintroduced in Chapter 6.

3.8 Intimate Epistemologies

While the symbolic meanings attributed to the same thing vary according to who, how, where, and when that meaning is being made, so also ways of knowing differ between cultures. Lauzon (2012) described Intimate epistemology, in which knowledge is constructed in specific cultural conditions, defined by time and space and is therefore social, situated, and dialogical, necessitating participation and reification, embodiment and action. When these sets of conditions exist a particular kind of knowledge is constructed. Intimate epistemologies are characterized by “reverential thinking,” “empathetic imagination” the “intrinsic value [of the] other,” including their habitat (reified as “nature”), and I-Thou relationships. Intimate epistemology is iterative, with ongoing learning, through open participation. It is based on a cycle of action-reflection-action informed by reflection, echoing many of both Bourdieu’s and Wenger’s understandings of habitus and communities of practice. It is the epistemology of traditional cultures and continues to be practised by Mi’gmaq communities today.

Intimate epistemologies would seem to be particularly suited to understanding First-Nations societies. To the extent that recent attempts to recover Mi’kmaq traditions, values, language, and practices requires rejection of Western science and its positivistic objectivism, holistic ways of knowing and of being human are embraced. Intellect, the body and its habitat, the affections, and spirit are equally allowed and affirmed, without privileging any one over the others.

If an intimate epistemology seems to be useful in understanding one of the three Restigouche communities, what of the others? While the practices of fisheries managers,
conservationists, and anglers are often necessarily highly positivistic—“Facts” are, after all, their friends—the idea that, from a constructivist perspective, their facts are themselves constructs of a largely positivist culture remains. Yet it is clearly possible to demonstrate, through social and economic history and their own, angling, literature, that the meanings they have attributed to the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed are the result of the changing conditions and perceived needs of their own lives, their communities of practice (see, for example, Halverson, 2010)\(^49\). Their representations of the Restigouche and other similar places are not, despite their habit of objectifying nature, the “thing” itself. Wenger (2010) would describe this as an act of reification in the process of participatory practice, giving meaning to place, through a community of practice.

Indeed, for Restigouche anglers, theirs is a community of meaning, made so by the participation of their intellects\(^50\), bonding affections, physical activity, and liberated spirits. This, in time, has given meaning to place in the form of the Restigouche River and their camps. Why else spend so much of their various capitals in this field? Their commitment to place is based on an intimate epistemology, socialized through habitus and reified through such objectifications as “conservation” and “sustainability” in a participatory community of practice, situated in a single watershed and focused on a

\(^{49}\) See, for instance, Halverson (2010). See especially Chapter 6, “Define me a Gentleman”, in which Halverson discussed the cultural conditions that made sport angling so attractive to post–Civil War American men, including the “fear that success and wealth generated an effete ruling class that would easily and inevitably be overrun by the uncivilized hordes,” the loss of the frontier, escape from pestilential and filthy cities and the perceived degeneracy of the Nordic races and their need for the re-invigoration outdoor life would bring. Perhaps the most interesting insight from the point of view of constructivist research is the idea, originating with T. J. Jackson Lears, in No Place of Grace, cited by Halverson, that American culture had become “weightless” and that a new sense of meaning was required. Could it be found in the “Great Outdoors”?

\(^{50}\) Angling claims the largest literature of any sport and numbers among its literati men of great distinction in politics, science, art and literature. One of the early writers on the Restigouche, Henry Van Dyke, was a Princeton Professor of English, Woodrow Wilson’s American ambassador to postwar Europe, a Presbyterian cleric and hymnodist, whose Joyful, joyful, we adore thee is a transcendental celebration and representation of nature.
single species. The application of Bourdieu, Wenger, and Lauzon to the resident non-Indigenous community of Campbellton and Restigouche County remains to be explored.

### 3.8.1 Indigenous Environmental Values as Human Values

Gratani, Sutton, Butler, Bohensky, and Foale (2016), writing from the perspective of the values used in Australia to effect decisions in natural-resource management offered an ecocentric, as opposed to anthropocentric, set of values, they found among Indigenous Australians. Gratani, et al. captured the perceived need for a shift from a utilitarian way of seeing the natural world and its “resources,” associated with Western science and colonization, by quoting David Suzuki:

> The way we see the world shapes the way we treat it. If a mountain is a deity, not a pile of ore; if a river is one of the veins of the land, not potential irrigation water; if a forest is a sacred grove, not timber; if other species are biological kin, not resources; or if the planet is our mother, not an opportunity — then we will treat each other with greater respect. This is the challenge, to look at the world from a different perspective. (as cited in Gratani et al., 2016, pp. 1–2).

In examining Indigenous environmental values, the authors were seeking alternative environmental values grounded not solely in resource use and extraction but in sustainability and an holistic understanding of the place of humans within their environment.

Referencing the universal human values” proposed by Schwartz, Gratani et al. (2016) linked “biospheric values” to Indigenous traditions and holistic world views (p. 4). In-depth, semi-structured interviews with 0.1% of the Indigenous population of a Native Title community, “seen as fairly representative of the Indigenous population of the Wet Tropics,” were conducted (p. 6). The interviews generated five guiding principles that drive the way the participant community’s members think about the environment and act upon it and its resources:

- The environment is important because it is connected with the people, with present and past generations.
• It is important to follow the teaching bestowed from ancestors, so as to respect traditions and take adequate care of the environment.

• We are the environment and the environment is us: we are united and identify with nature.

• Our health and well-being are intimately connected with the environment and dependent on it.

• The environment provides sustenance, in terms of subsistence and wage-based activities, but we need to use it appropriately, and so in sustainable ways. (p. 13)

Indigenous peoples of Australia believe that they are connected to the environment in what amounts to a symbiotic way:

The river is us! We protect it more and want to protect it more, and we want to make sure that whoever uses this river uses it properly, we want to take few plants and put them back there, come down and stop the damaging of places, because we have sites on the river, we have burials, men’s and women’s places, it’s the connection to us I think. (p. 8)

This desire to protect their environment is grounded in what Gratani et al. (2016) described as “unity and self-identification with nature” (p. 9). Despite intrusion by settlers the Aboriginal interviewees pointed to their continuing presence on the land and by the waters: “If we have rangers to look after our country, and people can see them, it shows that we are still there, we are not gone!” (p. 10).

Respect for their story-based traditions and for the teachings of their ancestors are strong motivators in the expressed Aboriginal desire to manage their lands and waters in time-honoured ways. In keeping with their holistic way of being (ontology), they perceive the river and the surrounding rain forest as being vital to their health and well-being. At the same time, they recognize the economic value of the land and waters in sustaining them but that their use of them has to “be sustainable and not result in ‘raping the land’” (p. 13).
Gratani et al. (2016) emphasized not only the Aboriginal ethic of environmentally sustainable human activity and the values it implies but also the link between the restoration of Indigenous values and environmental justice for the colonized peoples of the world. Interviewees showed an understanding of quality of life as provided through harmony with the environment, and acknowledged humankind’s dependence on it, rather than materialistic possessions that derive from environmental exploitation. Indigenous environmental values, therefore, support sustainability by promoting reverence towards the environment instead of its commodification. (p. 14)

The Indigenous values described by Gratani et al. (2016) echo those implicit and explicit in the intimate epistemologies of Lauzon (2012). Parallels between the environmental and human values of the Aboriginal people of the Wet Tropics of Australia and those of the Mi’gmaq people of the Listuguj First Nations will be drawn in a later part of this dissertation (Chapter 6).

3.8.2 Bridging Epistemologies for Coexistence and Collaboration – The Mi’kmaq Case in Nova Scotia

Addressing the epistemological divide between the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia and the federal and provincial management regimes, Denny and Fanning (2016) explored the possibility of co-management within the contexts of existing fisheries governance, differing concepts of conservation and management, treaties, and the objective of maintaining and improving abundances of salmon populations. They proposed “a collaborative coexistence approach for effective salmon governance in Nova Scotia” (“Abstract,” para. 1).

Noting that since conservation is a “critical issue” for Aboriginal- and state-managed fisheries, that it has been set by the courts as “a valid legislative objective,” justifying infringement on existing Aboriginal and treaty rights, and that it is a philosophical approach shared by both Mi’kmaw communities in Nova Scotia and the provincial and federal governments, Denny and Fanning identified
the power of the state to evaluate stock status, allocate shares of the resource, and implement conservation and management measures for fisheries, as specified in section 91(12) of Canada’s Constitution Act (1982), [as] a source of debate and tension between the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia and the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans. This tension and debate is evident in Atlantic salmon management, particularly when it comes to issues of access and allocation of salmon for food, social, and ceremonial … needs in Nova Scotia. (para. 1).

Insofar as these are governance issues, the authors sought to make recommendations “on how to further develop governance initiatives relative to Atlantic salmon,” by comparing Mi’kmaq perspectives of “concepts of conservation” with those of the controlling conceptions held by the non-Aboriginal state, namely Nova Scotia and Canada. (para. 2)

Denny and Fanning (2016) rehearsed the Mi’kmaw conceptions of Msì no’kmaq and Netukulimk. Msì no’kmaq, literally, “all my relations,” indicates responsibility to all “nature’s gifts,” the ubiquity of “spirit life,” and the physical and metaphysical interconnectedness, dependence, and equality of value and status of humans, plants, animals, water, and earth. All are gifts from the Creator, linking Mi’kmaq people to one another and to the land, the source of their life. (“Relationship between Mi’kmaw and Mother Earth,” para. 3) This ontology underlies and implies that Mi’kmaq people lived and died within the constraints of the world as they found it. They made no attempt to change the natural order to suit the convenience of human beings, for man was only one part of a totally interdependent system that saw all things, animate or inanimate, in their proper places. (Upton, as cited in Denny and Fanning, 2016, para. 3)

Netukulimk, literally “avoiding not having enough,” or by implication, “take only what you need,” addresses sustainability and is used to describe both Mi’kmaq practices and what Western culture would call an environmental ethic. Within this ethic, the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia knew plamu, the Atlantic salmon, as “a staple food that was dependable, predictable, and could be found in most rivers in Nova Scotia (Parenteau, as cited by Denny and Fanning, 2016, p. 2). It sustained them for the winter and replenished them upon their return to the coast in the spring. Now, Denny and Fanning noted, “because of a
lack of abundance and concern for local populations, it is reserved (though not exclusively) for pow-wows or other large gatherings” (p. 2). In this way Nova Scotia’s Mi’kmaq practise both *Netukulimk* and a form of conservation, described below.

In discussing the legal framework in which governance issues are to be worked out, Denny and Fanning cited three court cases describing “the legal relationship between the Crown and the Mi’kmaq, and the Aboriginal right to fish (and hunt): R. v. Simon (1985) confirmed that established treaties with the Mi’kmaq did not extinguish Aboriginal rights; thereby confirming the coexistence of Aboriginal rights with treaty rights, including the right to hunt and fish. In 1990 before the Nova Scotia Supreme Court, Denny, Paul, and Sylliboy were acquitted of illegal fishing and possession of salmon, since the regulatory regime for fisheries management was inconsistent with their Aboriginal right to fish. The outcome of the case prioritized Aboriginal fishing—after needs related to conservation had been met—over other interest groups” (p. 3). In other cases cited, the “duty to consult,” on the part of both federal and provincial governments, as far as their actions may impact on Aboriginal rights and title, has been established.

While acknowledging that current natural-resources management in Nova Scotia is based on Western science, with its assumptions of objectivity and certitude and its focus on “single sector and single species assessments to inform decision-making (Hollings, cited by Denny and Fanning, 2016, p. 4)”, Denny and Fanning noted, “Under this world view, decision-making is generally hierarchical, “command and control,” and paternalistic” (p. 4). They questioned the absolutist claims of Western knowledge systems: “Yet, like all knowledge, scientific practices are similarly governed by values and beliefs” (p. 4). The importance of this challenge to Western natural-resources management in Atlantic-salmon management is that each of the remaining Maritime watersheds with significant returns of Atlantic salmon is shared by both Mi’gmaq and settler communities and non-

51 It is noteworthy that they do not cite the *R. v. Marshall*. See Appendix A.

52 *R v. Sparrow*, 1990 1 SCR 1075. See Appendix A.
resident anglers. Each is concerned that stocks be assessed in order to assure their protection and conservation, but they do not agree on the knowledge that should be used in that assessment. Denny and Fanning cited the federal “Policy for Conservation of Wild Atlantic Salmon” (Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 2009), with its commitment to incorporate Aboriginal knowledge in the assessment process but noted that “while the intent is to use Aboriginal traditional knowledge and local knowledge to inform management decisions, it has been a challenge to make such knowledge fit into current quantitative assessment frameworks and advisory reports” (p. 5). In the meantime, conservation of this ever-declining resource, using science-based assessments, has seen allowable retention of salmon (grilse) by sport fishers reduced to zero.\(^{53}\) (There is no commercial fishery.) In the absence of agreement between DFO and Mi’kmaq First Nations as to the appropriate means by which to assess stocks, the only salmon fisheries in the Maritime Provinces of Canada in which salmon are intentionally harvested are those of the Mi’kmaq people.

How did Denny and Fanning describe the fishing and management practices of Maritime Mi’gmaq? Quoting Ladner (2005, p. 941), they emphasized the traditional nature of both Mi’kmaq governance and practice, locating it in a “complex system of territorially defined relations and responsibility, multilevel governance, ethics and law [that] was and remains an effective means of managing a people, a territory and the relationship with other beings” (p. 7). This relationship with the land, animals, and people continued until well after contact with Europeans. However, in the 19th century, as salmon populations declined, Mi’kmaq were “‘legislated out of the fishery’ through harvesting bans and the creation of a licensing system.” As with other Maritime Mi’kmaq fisheries in New Brunswick and Quebec, some food fishing continued despite its illegality, until the court decisions of the 1990s forced the federal government to implement the Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy. Under this strategy, Denny and Fanning described a situation in which

---

\(^{53}\) DFO sport-fishing regulations for the 2017 season called for zero kill, live release of both grilse and large salmon.
“agreements are negotiated with Mi’kmaq communities…‘without prejudice’” (p. 8). While there are differences in the means by which agreements are reached and in the agreements themselves, “harvest of Atlantic salmon by the Mi’kmaq is regulated, for the most part, through the use of these agreements” (p. 8). The Mi’kmaq fishery in Nova Scotia follows Netukulimk “as the guiding principle and fishers govern themselves in accordance with their interactions and relationships with their environment. Selective harvesting is practised with the use of snares, spears, seines and “angle and fly,” that is to say, hooks. Denny and Fanning reported that no usable part of a harvested salmon is wasted and that unusable parts are buried in order to recycle both the body and the spirit of the fish and that both grilse and large, MSW salmon are harvested, as are kelts, post-spawning salmon.

Mi’kmaq management is characterised by “balance” in both nature and spirit and is more concerned with ceremony than with efficiency, while “fishing strategies are individualistic” (p. 9). Traditional knowledge goes beyond knowing about animals and their habitats, it embraces nature in such a way as “to ensure coexistence and survival for humans and animals” (p. 9). For Mi’kmaq, conservation implies the possibility of extinction and is, therefore, practiced more for the benefit of the salmon than for humans, but nevertheless their management connects the level of fish stocks with the economic, political, and spiritual health of their communities. The stocks are determined on a pool-by-pool, observational basis:

Once a certain number of salmon will be harvested from a pool and, once fished, the pool will not be fished again that season. Fishers move from pool to pool, carefully selecting their catch and moving on to a new pool if more salmon are required. There is no set removal rate. There is an understanding that not all salmon are to be removed from the pool, only to remove what is needed. (p. 10)

This suggested to Denny and Fanning that Mi’kmaq fishers were (and are?) practicing for sustainability, rather than being “conservationists,” unless they deemed salmon stocks to be in crisis. Their conservation was (and is?) “holistic,” including habitat maintenance and “ensuring food availability” (p. 10).

There are two beliefs and attendant practices expressed here that raise the hackles of science-based fisheries technicians and managers. First, assessment of salmon stocks by
observation of numbers in individual pools and subsequent selection of fish to be taken, while complementing traditional knowledge and practice, contradicts evidence-based assessment because salmon travel upstream stopping in pools along their way to the spawning beds. A pool that holds salmon one evening may be empty the next. Scientific assessment is based on counting spawning, not resting fish. If the pools in question are upstream spawning pools and the observed salmon are intent on spawning there, then these are the very fish most in need of protection, since they will spawn subsequent generations of salmon. Second, this practice implies that Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq believe that salmon feed in fresh water. Although this question was debated in the United Kingdom, Europe, and North America during the late 19th and earlier 20th centuries, scientific evidence has shown that adult salmon do not feed in fresh water. The suggestion that human intervention can increase the availability of food in the hard-stone rivers of Nova Scotia in a sustainable way is, according to scientific knowledge, equally egregious.

Denny and Fanning acknowledged that Mi’kmaq epistemology and practice preclude reconciliation with Western, science-based practices, policies, and management. They described attempts to reconcile federal and provincial government notions of salmon management and assessment with Mi’kmaq perspectives as being a “square peg in a round hole” (p. 10). While acknowledging the continuing decline in adult salmon returning to their rivers to spawn, Mi’kmaq differ with federal and provincial ways of approaching the problem both by limiting catches and by the angler-promoted means of catch and release. The latter is “at odds with the Mi’kmaq belief and practice of respectful treatment of animals” (p. 10). How then, Denny and Fanning asked, “do groups move forward to reconcile perspectives and still retain values of conservation, the need for consumption, and recognition of spirituality and cultural identity through salmon harvesting?” Can “a mutually beneficial solution…be expected?” (p. 10).

Acknowledging that this is a “wicked problem,” Denny and Fanning nevertheless suggested conversation is the key to further understanding on both sides of the differences between them. Furthermore, the pluralism of understandings and resulting
conflicts demand that conversation be engendered. Citing the tri-partite agreement between the Mi’kmaq, Nova Scotia, and Canada and its terms of reference for consultation on treaty rights as respecting land, water, and natural resources, they acknowledged that so far as issues of Aboriginal rights, conservation, allocation, and governance “remain unresolved,” they called for a re-focusing through negotiation of power and responsibility, with “clearly defined conflict resolution mechanisms” (p. 15). This is seen as a step towards self-governance through co-management. Again, while acknowledging the history, motivations, and limitations of co-management involving Indigenous Peoples, Denny and Fanning (2016) argued for its continuing development in Nova Scotia as an innovative approach, able to accommodate “the multiple realities related to views on allocation and access, provincial and customary laws, traditional knowledge, and science, values and economics, and natural and legal relationships to salmon” (p. 16). Indeed, this pluralism, they argued, deepens potential insights into the ways in which co-management might develop.

Essential to this development of co-management are two-eyed seeing, with its opportunity for social learning through dialogue between Western and Traditional ways of knowing, and the Peace and Friendship treaties. The latter are to be understood on their own terms, not diminished by subsequent non-Indigenous laws and management frameworks. (p. 16)

Interestingly, from the point of view of this study, Denny and Fanning described the history of the Listuguj fishery, emphasizing the failure of Listuguj-Quebec agreements, including quotas, compensation, and provincial financing of Listuguj wardens and proffering the assertion by the LMG of “its right to fish and govern its people, land and waters in its own ways as an example of collaboration and co-management” (p. 17). In their account, Listuguj developed its own fishing law of 1993:

> It outlined the territory, beneficiaries, responsibilities of the management regime, issues related to compliance, resource allocation, use of the resource, and created fishing plans, identified special areas for protection, mapped fishing and non-fishing areas, and set rules governing monitoring by the rangers.…. Without federal jurisdiction over the Mi’gmaq, there was little the provincial body could do.
However, there was willingness by both parties to collaborate to establish conservation targets. The law provides for co-management agreements with the federal and provincial departments. (p. 17)\textsuperscript{54}

Denny and Fanning concluded that this almost 25-year-old step in establishing Indigenous self-governance is

an example of the willingness to collaborate while respecting Aboriginal rights and responsibility, cultural and legal pluralism, and co-management. Based on the practice demonstrated by the province and the Mi’kmaq in the Listuguj example, it would appear that the state would benefit from learning to be pluralistic, which involves a recognition of multiple realities, the Mi’kmaq right to self-determination, and confidence in the capacity of the Mi’kmaq to “manage” salmon. (pp. 17–18)

For Denny and Fanning (2016), the Listuguj fishery is an example of the roles both Traditional Knowledge and Peace and Friendship treaties can and should play in achieving effective co-management of Atlantic salmon in other jurisdictions, such as Nova Scotia. This begs the question as to how assertion of rights, whether derived from the Peace and Friendship treaties, the Marshall decision, or constitutional Indigenous rights or based entirely in Mi’gmaq law, followed by a self-policed fishery, can be said to represent either co-management or collaborative coexistence?

3.9 \textbf{Wenger on Citizenship.}

Wenger (2010) introduced in the first section of this literature review, linked the process of social learning through communities of practice to the larger issue of the responsibilities and opportunities afforded to individuals as learning citizens. “How we invest our identities as we travel through the landscape” is key to citizenship of learning (Wenger 2010, p. 197).

Examples of learning citizenship include:

\textsuperscript{54} The Listuguj Mi’gmaq Government fishing law and current Listuguj fishery practices have already been touched upon and will be discussed further in Chapter 5 and beyond.
• Managing one’s membership in existing communities: how do I contribute to communities I belong to or could belong to?
• Seeing a boundary to be bridged and becoming brokers, using multi-membership as a bridge across practices;
• Being in a unique position to see the need for a community with the legitimacy to call it into being and becoming conveners;
• Connecting someone, like a patient or a student, to a community that will enhance their learning capability; and
• Providing transversal connections in a context where vertical and horizontal accountability structures are disjointed. (Wenger, 2010, p. 197)

For Wenger, “learning citizenship is the personal side of a social discipline of learning,” in which membership in a community of practice entails an inherent challenge, “to see ourselves as the learning contribution we have to offer” (Wenger, 2010, p. 197). Such a learning citizenship challenges members of all three of the communities of the Restigouche watershed.

3.10 Framework for Understanding the Contexts in Which Decisions Are Made

Addressing the admittedly wicked problem of how the conflicted practices, values, and beliefs of the three communities interacting within the Restigouche watershed affect their ability to make decisions that are most likely to ensure the survival of the Atlantic salmon and that of their own communities and cultures, the literature review has encompassed a wide range of disciplines and ideas. These have included

• social learning theory
• social capital theory
• identity
• linking through bonding and bridging
• place
• governance
• natural-resource management: co-management, collaboration, and limits
• symbols and symbolic interactionism
• epistemologies,

all in the context of evolving human and natural regimes.

Figures 2 to 7 represent an attempt to present the topics discussed in the cited literature in a logical framework upon which to base the analysis (Chapter 6) of the results (Chapter 5) of this dissertation.

*Figure* 2. Framework for understanding decision-making contexts - A. Restigouche River watershed.
Figure 3. Framework for understanding decision-making contexts - B. World views, governance, learning.
Figure 4. Framework for understanding decision-making contexts - C. World views: Ontologies and epistemologies.
Figure 5. Framework for understanding decision-making contexts - D. Learning/Linking/Revival.
Figure 6. Framework for understanding decision-making contexts – D2. Learning/Linking/Revival.
Figure 7. Framework for understanding decision-making contexts - E. Governance.
CHAPTER 4 – METHODOLOGY

The research was qualitative\textsuperscript{55}, participatory, grounded (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rowlands, 2005), interpretivist, emergent (Geertz, 1973) and cross-cultural (Bedford, 2010; Denny & Fanning, 2016; Gratani et al., 2016; Latulippe, 2015; Lauzon, 2012; Stevenson, 2004; Wilson, 2008). Within those parameters, it was both exploratory, asking what is going on, and explanatory, asking how might the “whats” be explained?

The research attempted to be a pedagogy of both the privileged and the de-privileged, with all parties engaged in a reiterative process of gaining new knowledge of themselves and the “others” through storytelling and sharing of perspectives, and it was intended to link respondents’ various kinds of knowledge with empowerment for conciliatory change.

4.1 Participatory Nature of the Research

I am an active member of one of the three communities I have been investigating; seeking to deepen my knowledge and understanding of all three communities. I have also sought to be an agent of change through the exchange of information and perspectives between the three communities, a catalyst and a facilitator of understanding and reconciliation. My role as an active participant was known, made known, and reiterated publicly, in meetings and privately, in the interview process, and in conversations, throughout the research period. I was on an emergent learning journey, subject to change.\textsuperscript{56}

It was and continues to be participatory, both in the sense of my active participation with all three communities and in the sense that those who have assisted in the research, informed sponsors, interviewees, and those with whom I have engaged in informal conversation, formal meetings, feedback of interviews and summary narratives, socially,

\textsuperscript{55} The context of the research, however, is replete with quantitative data such as fishery, economic, and demographic statistics. These are found in the appendices and footnotes where appropriate.

\textsuperscript{56} See Etienne Wenger’s comments on learning citizenship, above, p. 91. For Wenger, “learning citizenship is the personal side of a social discipline of learning”, in which membership in a community of practice entails an inherent challenge, “to see ourselves as the learning contribution we have to offer”. 
and in my activities to encourage intercommunity dialogue\textsuperscript{57}, have contributed to its emergent design.

In regard to the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj, it was participatory in that the original design called for tight control over my presence and activities within the community. I was and have continued to be guided by my informed sponsor as to whom I would interview, with whom I would meet, and in what circumstances. The original design was for a single meeting between members of the community to listen to their reflections on salmon and place in a ceremonial/spiritual context. The gathering was not to be recorded electronically, or by hand. My “data” would need to be transcribed from memory. However, by the time the interviews took place, my informed sponsor had decided that I could meet with individuals, a couple, and a small group of community members and that electronic recording was permissible. The result was that this step in creating summary narratives for the communities was the same as that for the settler and sport-fishing communities.\textsuperscript{58}

By that time, however, I had met with my informed sponsor on several occasions, shared my research proposal with him, and maintained regular contact through electronic means. He had also facilitated my applications for permission to conduct the proposed research to Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch and the then Chief of the Listuguj First Nation, on behalf of the LMG. These permissions were shared with the University of Guelph Research Ethics

---

\textsuperscript{57} Both the research for and writing of this dissertation took place within the context of the project of seeking reconciliation and common ground for conservation of their communities and the salmon between the sport-fishing and indigenous communities. The project continued in 2017, when 12 representatives of the camp owners and angler-conservationist community attended a day of “Learning Together”, at Eel River Bar, organized and led by Mi’gmaq teachers in a traditional ceremonial context and, again, in 2018, when representatives of the camp owners’ association met with the LMG Chief and staff at the Restigouche Experience in Campbellton. An agreement was reached to work together with the City of Campbellton to ensure that the Restigouche Experience, a welcome centre for Campbellton on the banks of the Restigouche overlooking Listuguj better represent Mi’gmaq presence and culture.

\textsuperscript{58} The manner in which they were used for testing and feedback differed. The narrative summary was shared within an LMG Fisheries end-of-season salmon forum. Some of those present were interviewed. All those who were interviewed were informed of the meeting. Not all chose to attend. Others present were not among the interviewees.
Board, from whom I also received permission. Throughout the research process I have worked in close consultation with my informed sponsor, always making him aware of my presence within the community and of my contacts and activities. In this way I have been enabled to ask, “what is going on?”

I have been able to do this in both the formal interviews and informally through conversations with community members such as chiefs, council members, fisheries technicians, law-enforcement personnel, Elders, spiritual leaders, and managers working within both Western scientific and Mi’gmaq ecological-knowledge frameworks. I have participated in three Salmon Summits (twice as a presenter), an LMG Fisheries end-of-season salmon meeting (as a presenter and participant), and in three summer-solstice sunrise ceremonies and feasts. In the summer of 2017, together with my Listuguj informed respondent, I organized an event in which 12 representatives of the camp owners and angler-conservationist community attended a day of “learning together” at Eel River Bar, New Brunswick, facilitated and led by Mi’gmaq teachers in a traditional ceremonial context. This dialogue continued in 2018 with a second meeting resulting in agreement to work together for better representation of Mi’gmaq presence and culture on the Restigouche at the site of the Restigouche Experience, Campbellton’s welcome centre.

I have become known to a significant number of the Listuguj community. Implicit in this process has been a building of trust, and explicitly, within the permissions requirement, an obligation to make the results of my research both available and useful to the community, who maintain ownership of it. In the event, I have had a number of occasions during Salmon Summits held in Listuguj to be able to say, “I have been speaking to others. I can tell you how other people see it.”

However, Geertz (1973) offered a salutary warning about the limits and dangers of participant observation:

   So far as it has reinforced the anthropologist’s impulse to engage himself with his informants as persons rather than objects, the notion of “participant observation”
has been a valuable one. But to the degree that it has led the anthropologist to block from his view the very special, culturally bracketed nature of his own role and to imagine himself something more than an interested (in both senses of that word) sojourner, it has been our most powerful source of bad faith. (p. 20)

As my informed sponsor commented, when I asked how I would know if my behaviour was acceptable to the community, “We are watching you.” Bad faith on my part would lead to disengagement on theirs.\(^{59}\)

### 4.2 Grounded and Interpretivist Nature of the Research

The research was emergent in both design and conduct, grounded in the three communities and their common place. In describing the conventional view of field research, Miles and Huberman (1994) noted,

> Many social anthropologists and social phenomenologists consider social process to be too complex, too relative, too elusive, or too exotic to be approached with explicit conceptual frameworks, or standard instruments. They prefer a more loosely structured, emergent, inductively ‘grounded’ approach to gathering data. (p. 17).

However, I did not enter the field entirely free of possible explanatory theories or of a theoretical framework. I had been living, to various degrees, in the field for 30 years and brought experiences, conceptualizations, and opinions to the research. The research process was defined in regard to respondents but not the substance. It was intended to create what Geertz (1973) has called a “thick description”\(^{60}\) of the three communities, their place, and their conflicted practices in regard to the Atlantic salmon. Geertz noted,

> Although one starts any effort at thick description, beyond the obvious and superficial, from a state of general bewilderment as to what the devil is going on—

---

\(^{59}\) My active engagement with the Listuguj community began at a time when they had judged the behavior of the Executive Manager of the Restigouche River Camp Owners Association, in observing their salmon fishery to have been in “bad faith”. Since I was known to belong to that organization, I assume that they were especially watchful.

\(^{60}\) Summarized as being “not merely descriptive or referential, but to reveal the way facts, events and actions that occur in a particular place exist not in isolation but in a contextual web of significance” (DeMott, 2014/2015, p. 63).
trying to find one’s feet - one does not start (or ought not) intellectually empty-handed. Theoretical ideas are not created wholly anew in each study; as I have said, they are adopted from other, related studies, and, refined in the process, applied to new interpretive problems. (p. 27)

Rowlands (2005), summarizing Klein and Myers, outlined the principles of interpretive field research as follows:

- **The fundamental principle of the hermeneutic circle.** This principle suggests that all human understanding is achieved by iterating between considering the interdependent meaning of parts and the whole that they form. This principle of human understanding is fundamental to all other principles.

- **The principle of contextualization.** Requires critical reflection of the social and historical background of the research setting, so that the intended audience can see how the current situation under investigation emerged.

- **The principle of interaction between researchers and subjects.** Requires critical reflection on how the research materials (or “data”) were socially constructed through the interaction between the researchers and the participants.

- **The principle of abstraction and generalization.** Requires relating the idiographic details revealed by the data interpretation through the application of principles one and two to theoretical general concepts that describe the nature of human understanding and social action.

- **The principle of dialogical reasoning.** Requires sensitivity to possible contradictions between the theoretical preconceptions guiding the research design and actual findings (the story which the data tell(s)) with subsequent cycles of revision.

- **The principle of multiple interpretations.** Requires sensitivity to possible differences in interpretations among the participants as are typically expressed in multiple narratives, or stories of the same sequence of events under study. Similar to multiple witness accounts even if all tell it as they saw it.

- **The principle of suspicion.** Requires sensitivity to possible “biases” and systemic “distortions” in the narratives collected from the participants. (p. 90)
The research followed these interpretivist principles, not least in the constructivist sense that it recognized that the various types of discourse gathered from the respondents, including data accessed through interviews, conversation, ceremony, literature, and art, are instruments by and through which meaning is made about themselves, the salmon, and the place.

Moreover, the research took place in an environment of unfinished business. There is increasing awareness that Canada, and Mi’kmaki in particular, is a land of broken treaties (Battiste, 2009; Poelzer & Coates, 2015) and recent cultural genocide (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015). There is a need to build relationships and seek, find, and deliver justice, healing, and reconciliation. As Rowlands (2005) wrote, “more attention should be paid to the development of new theory more fully specified through grounded research that is better able to account for the phenomenon under investigation” (p. 84). This research, which includes First Nations and the conflicted phenomena of the communities, place, and the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche, is of such a kind.

4.3 Cross-Cultural Nature of the Research

At the core of the conflict is, in the phrase of King (2012), “the inconvenient Indian”. Without the continuing presence and recent cultural and economic revival of the Mi’gmaq people of the Restigouche watershed, conflicts over the practices and management of the Atlantic-salmon fishery would be limited to the remaining communities, whose cultural differences do not include epistemic difference. Their conflicts would be and are over the ways in which fisheries data is and is not acquired and over its interpretation within a positivist, empirical, scientific framework.

The epistemic issues present in the Restigouche salmon conflict have been described and discussed in the literature review in Chapter 3. They suggest a methodological tension between research conducted in a Mi’gmaq community, Listuguj, and among the settler communities of Anglophone and Acadian, Francophone, New Brunswick and Quebec’s Anglo and Québécois communities and the sport-fishing communities, both local and non-resident.

---

61 The settler communities of Anglophone and Acadian, Francophone, New Brunswick and Quebec’s Anglo and Québécois communities and the sport-fishing communities, both local and non-resident.

Latulippe (2015) reflected on two questions that arise for non-Indigenous researchers working within a Western paradigm among Indigenous Peoples: (a) “To what extent are non-Indigenous researchers invited to engage the knowledges of Indigenous peoples?” and (b) “What is an ethical approach to traditional knowledge?” (“Abstract,” para. 1). Indigenous research methodologies provide guidance since they imply “reflexive self-study,” which “subtends to an ethical approach.” This, in turn, makes “relational, contextual and mutually beneficial research possible” (“Abstract,” para. 1). Latulippe’s (2015) research focused on “contested fisheries knowledge and decision-making systems in Ontario,” as does mine in New Brunswick–Quebec or, better, Gespe’gewaq. The “parallel rows” of the title, refers to the two-row wampum belt, symbolic of the duality of cultures represented in the researcher and the researched and of the treaties between the colonizers and the Indigenous people of the land. In the case of my research, it would also represent the Peace and Friendship treaties between the Crown and the Mi’gmaw.

The methods employed in this research were intended to honour, at least in principle and ethical imagination, the idea of researcher, settlers, and non-resident anglers being in a treaty relationship with the People of the Last Land (Gespe’gewaq); plural ways of knowing; ownership of knowledge, its discovery and its creation by its subjects; and accountability to the Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj.

Wilson (2008) wrote from his own autobiographical perspective, tracing the process by which he came to affirm Indigenous research methodology and to reject the dominant academic notions of objectivity and verification. The authenticity of Indigenous

62 Naming is a methodological, epistemological and ethical issue in this study, in Canada and in multi-cultural colonial and post-colonial societies.

63 At one level I was accountable to the Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj because of the implied contract under which I was given permission to conduct the research. At a deeper level, non-indigenous Canadian researchers are accountable because the first Europeans neither discovered an empty land (Terra Nullius) nor conquered the inhabitants of Mi’kmaki but entered into treaties with them, creating a relationship of mutual accountability.
methodology is, for Wilson, grounded within himself, his family, his own Indigenous community, and those of Australian Aboriginals. Paralleling the constructivist and narrative-based approach to knowledge used in this research, Wilson argued that we are the stories we tell others and ourselves about ourselves. Further, knowledge belongs to the community from which it arises and stands alone and is un-critiquable from the outside, since it can only be “known” through existent, inviolable relationships (Wilson, 2008, n.p.)

Indigenous ways of knowing (epistemologies) and ways of being (ontologies) are inseparable from one another and from ethics, aesthetics, values, and methodologies themselves, since they are all self-referent to their originating communities and the matrix of relationships they represent. This relational motif is not only between members of the communities but also between them and the “environment” and, indeed, the cosmos. For Wilson (2008), the purpose of Indigenous research is, then, to build and strengthen the sense and experience of connectivity between individuals, communities, and the cosmos. It is openly spiritual but, again, to differentiate between the spiritual and the material misses the point, as does differentiation between humans and the “environment.” These are research purposes repeatedly emphasized to me in conversation by my Mi’gmaq informed sponsor during the course of my research and as colleagues forwarding engagement between the three communities of the Restigouche.

Ceremony becomes the best metaphor for the Indigenous research paradigm described by Wilson (2008). That is because, like ceremony, it is based on frequent gatherings of the community, storytelling in sharing circles, listening, reflection, reiteration, and an admittedly hard-to-describe transformation. These are the components of Indigenous research, ceremony, and, not least, the process of reconciliation. They include elements of intimate epistemology (Lauzon, 2012) and of Lave and Wenger’s (1991) and Wenger’s (2010) communities of practice, and they are complementary to the principles of interpretive field research outlined above. (Rowlands, 2005)
4.4 Interviews

In order to discover what stories there are about the salmon, the place, and the communities of the Restigouche watershed, among non-Indigenous community leaders and camp staff and among camp owners and their guests, I engaged in conversations with my informed sponsors, who are knowledgeable, experienced, and committed. Each sponsor was known to me before I began the research for this dissertation. Lists of persons to be interviewed were prepared with their advice. As noted below, in the case of the informed sponsor for the settler community, this led to a further—“snowball”—number of interviewees, identified by other interviewees. For the sport-fishing community, I added persons known to me but benefitted from my sponsor’s reputation within the community to gain access to some camp owners who might not otherwise have made themselves available to me. Both settler and sport-fishing-camp owner-and-guest communities are numerically small. In the first category, I included persons from the government and commercial sectors, as well as retired fisheries managers and lower-level current employees. As noted below, they were representative of both Anglo and Franco linguistic groups and included a significant number of women in male-dominated communities. I stopped interviewing when I no longer encountered new perspectives, as I sought convergence of experiences and understandings within each community.

I worked with the informed sponsor to design the research instruments of introductory letters, appointments and meetings (see Appendices C, D, E and F). I sought grounded narratives, revealing representations of both “self” and “other,” in order to tease out stories of the meaning of their community, of the place, and of the salmon from which to construct compound narratives for sharing and analysis.

For non-Indigenous resident respondents, I sought to ask open-ended and interactive questions, refined in detail in conversation with interviewees. These interviews, or conversations, were semi-structured in the sense that I told my respondents that I was trying to understand issues around the conservation of the Atlantic salmon in the Restigouche and asked, “Can you help me to understand this?” Responses revealed
issues, providing a map for further questioning and elaboration, prompted, as necessary by inquiries about my respondents’ practices, their length of involvement, and the nature of their interactions. As information emerged, the semi-structured monologues became conversations. Respondents readily addressed the “what?” questions, leaving me to tease out the “why?” from their perspective. Respondents needed and were given time and space in order to think through their ideas and reasons and to express them in a discursive form as they assembled already constructed ideas and expressed them as grounded narratives.

A similar process was followed in conversations with camp owners and their guests. My informed sponsor suggested interviewees and wrote letters of introduction.64 The discourse of the sport-fishing community on this subject also includes a large written literature, with which I am familiar and from which I drew in compiling the compound narrative and in a number of my presentations.

The number of interviews conducted was determined by the number of cooperating respondents I was able to identify and interview and, beyond that, by having reached a significant level of redundancy in information, including substance and possible meanings, explaining the “What?” of their discourse.

All interviews were recorded electronically, coded according to community, respondent,65 and date to preserve confidentiality. Respondents’ identities were known to me and, indirectly, to my sponsors and therefore were, not anonymous. Confidentiality was promised and kept. Some respondents expressed indifference and others a degree of dissent from confidentiality and therefore, from their perspective, anonymity, wanting their participation and contributions to be known. In this their wishes were dishonoured.

64 Since I belong to this group and know and have access to respondents less well-known, or unknown, to my informed sponsor, we compiled this list collaboratively.
65 S1-25 – Settler; SF1-21 – Sport Fishing; FN1-14 – First Nation.
Wilson (2008) takes issue with not revealing the names of research participants on the grounds that the researcher is denying their relationships and, therefore, their humanity.

All interviews were transcribed according to the extent to which the correspondents addressed the key issues of community, culture, and conservation and the degree to which their comments were judged to contribute to their understandings of themselves and the other communities in terms of place, practices, identities, and meaning. These transcriptions were then edited into compound narratives by identifying commonalities within each community in their perspectives on their own community, culture, and conservation and on those of the other two communities. The narratives were “thickened” by close attention to the respondents’ comments on the importance they ascribed to place, practices, identities, and meaning. Specific quotations were chosen for inclusion in the compound narratives when they captured commonly held views. The construction of the compound narratives took place in conjunction with my direct engagement, as a participant researcher, with all three communities.

Each interviewee received a copy of the compound narrative for their community. They were asked to read it and to offer corrections, comments, or suggestions for amendment. They were also asked for their permission for me to share it with the other communities. Following a sufficient period of time for such responses to be made, the compound narratives, as amended, were shared with each of the other communities. The exception was with the Listuguj interviewees, who were informed of the summary narrative and invited to its presentation at an open community meeting. This was in keeping with community protocol favouring group discernment and learning.

In all cases I sought permission and co-operation in the triangulation of information by checking back with an appropriate number of respondents, who were willing to act as mentors of my learning, in order to have my interpretations reviewed and, where necessary, corrected and completed. Interpretation of these results follows in Chapter 6.

Although the interviews attempted to elicit open-ended storytelling and reflection, I listened to the recordings and read from the transcribed interviews, searching for
information contained in the respondents’ stories in the key areas of community, culture, and conservation: How did they represent (construct) their own practices, identities, and meanings in relation to their representation of their own community, culture, and conservation? How did they represent (construct) the practices, identities, and meanings of each of the other two groups, in terms of community, culture, and conservation? This information generated knowledge as to how each group understands itself and interprets and learns about the others.

4.5 Direct Engagement

As was noted above in the discussion of the participatory nature of the research, I have, as an angler and member of a camp-owning family, been directly engaged with elements of two of the communities, settlers, and sport fishers, for over 30 years. I first directly encountered representatives of the Mi’gmaq Listuguj First Nation at the 2010 meeting of the RRCOA. This was repeated in 2011, when I met the person who became my informed sponsor within the community of Listuguj.

My intentional engagement focused on “what is going on?” with all three communities in regard to their relationship with the Atlantic salmon, the Restigouche watershed, and with one another began in the summer of 2012. Since that time, beyond the semi-structured interviews I conducted, I have been engaged in the following ways:

4.5.1 Sport-Fishing Community – Anglers-Conservationists

- Annual fishing visits to our own camp, where I have interacted with the settler staff and entertained Mi’gmaq and settler guests;
- Visits to eight camps, where I have met with owners, guests, and settler staff, including managers, guides, and housekeeping staff;
- Fishing on the Matapédia River, guided and unguided;
- Spring kelt fishing;
- Annual attendance at and presentations to the Restigouche River Camp Owners Association in New York, at which I represent a family camp. (General topics have
included stocking of fry, habitat restoration, protection, and law enforcement, but also the controversial proposal to establish a provincial wilderness-waterway park through much of the watershed, affecting riparian-rights holders and leasees. Guests have included the chief financial officer of Gespe’gewaq Mi’gmaq Resource Council (GMRC), as well as a chief of Listuguj First Nation and his advisors, a Deputy Minister of the Government of New Brunswick and the Executive Director to the RRWMC. Employment for Mi’gmaq as guides at the camps has been discussed, with a representative from Gespe’gewaq present.);

- Attendance at and presentation of research results to the annual general meeting of the Atlantic Salmon Association in New York;
- Presentation of research results to the staff of Atlantic Salmon Federation (ASF) at their headquarters in St. Andrews, New Brunswick;
- Frequent attendance at the Anglers’ Club of New York, many of whose members fish salmon in the Restigouche and are familiar with this research; presentation of the research;
- Consultation with ASF staff on this research and on community engagement, in regard to First Nations; and
- Webinar presentation sponsored by the Atlantic Salmon Conservation Fund and Canadian Rivers Institute with over 70 participants from the scientific and conservation communities logged on, in Fredericton, New Brunswick.

4.4.1 Settler Community

- Meetings in Campbellton, New Brunswick, and New York with my informed sponsor for discussion of research design, implementation, and results;
- Development of a collaborative relationship with the staff of the RRWMC, with frequent person-to-person and telephone exchanges of information;
- Presentation of research results to the RRWMC, which included Mi’gmaq and camp representatives;
• Attendance at a public meeting in Campbellton at which plans for a “wilderness parkway” were presented;
• Attendance at the official opening of the Restigouche River Experience Centre, Campbellton;
• Attendance at Upsalquitch Appreciation Day, organized and run by river residents, many of whom work in the camps on the Upsalquitch and Restigouche rivers, in Robinsonville, New Brunswick; and
• Continuing relationships and discussions with some interviewees and knowledgeable persons not interviewed who are familiar with my research.

4.4.2 Mi’gmaq Listuguj First Nation

• Annual attendance at and participation in summer-solstice ceremonies, 2013–2018;
• Annual attendance at salmon feasts held in Listuguj, Quebec, and in Eel River Bar, New Brunswick, 2013–2018.
• Attendance at and presentation to LMG Fisheries end-of-season salmon community meetings;
• Discussion and correspondence with two chief financial officers and staff of GMRC;
• Wilderness-river-parkway proposal meeting, in Listuguj;
• Frequent meetings with informed sponsor in Listuguj, Quebec; Campbellton, New Brunswick; Halifax, Nova Scotia; and New York;
• Participation in salmon fishery, as an observer.
• Participation in the 2017 River Walk and feast commemorating the anniversary of the 1981 resistance, Migwite’tm.

4.4.3 Intercommunity

• Attendance at annual Salmon Summits organized by GMRC and LMG, held in Listuguj and attended by settlers, representatives of the camps, and local, provincial, and federal fisheries managers and scientists; presentation at two Salmon Summits;
• Attendance at and presentation on epistemologies to the Science Committee of GMRC;
• No interviews with current employees of the Quebec and New-Brunswick provincial governments, or of the federal government\textsuperscript{68} were conducted; however, at the Salmon Summits and at the Science Committee meeting of GMRC, I have had the opportunity to hear several presentations by government fisheries scientists and managers, as well as by scientific researchers from universities and non-governmental organizations, and to engage with them in discussion. (Retired fisheries managers were included in the interviews.);

• Co-organization of and attendance at a day-long “Learning Together” event at Eel River Bar, attended by 12 representatives of the sport-fishing, angler-conservationist community and led by Mi’gmaq teachers and leaders in a traditional ceremonial context;

• A second meeting between representatives of LMG and ERB First Nations and of the RRCOA, held at Experience Restigouche, Campbellton, in 2018, followed by a late 2018 meeting between representative of RRCOA, RRWMC, LMG and the City of Campbellton to finds ways to better represent Mi’gmaq presence on the river and in Listuguj;

• Boundaries between the communities were sometimes crossed by individuals who were sport fishers and Mi’gmaq, settlers and angler-conservationists.

4.4.4 Place

• A guided float trip from the beginning of the Restigouche at the confluence of the Kedgwick and Little Main, over 60 km to Matapédia;

• Upriver guided trip to the Twelve-Mile protection pool on the Northwest Upsalquitch; and

• Frequent in-and out-of-season visits to Campbellton, NB, Listuguj, Matapédia, QC and upriver to Mann Mountain and Upsalquitch, NB.

\textsuperscript{68} When the research began, federal DFO employees were effectively banned from discussing policy.
Information gathered during this process of engagement has been enfolded into the results presented in Chapter 5 and analyzed in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 5 – RESULTS

The following compound narratives were constructed from semi-structured interviews conducted with members of each of the three communities of the Restigouche watershed. In their initial form the narratives of each community were sent to that community’s interviewees for their comments. These comments were incorporated into revised narratives. The interviews were conducted in 2014; the original feedback over the winter and spring of 2014–2015, and presentations to the three communities and to other knowledgeable groups were made from 2014 to 2017.

Presentations including—with permission—the compound narratives of all three communities were made to each community, to joint meetings of the communities, and to other interested parties for further feedback.69

Throughout that period, I was a frequent visitor to the watershed, participating in three Salmon Summits, meetings of executive and scientific committees of the RRWMC, an LMG Fisheries meeting, public meetings in Listuguj and Campbellton on the proposed wilderness river parkway, settler community events, and Mi’gmaq summer solstice ceremonies, Migwite’tm (the commemoration of their 1981 resistance to the attack on their community by para-military Quebec forces), and salmon feasts. These activities culminated in late July 2017, in my co-organizing a gathering of representatives of the RRCOA with Elders and leaders from both Listuguj and Eel River Bar on Mi’gmaq territory. The gathering was conducted in a ceremonial fashion, including a smudge, talking circle, a water ceremony, and sweat. I was also privileged to be invited to observe the Mi’gmaq practice of net fishing on the water as nets were checked, salmon harvested, and nets re-laid.

69 PowerPoint presentations summarizing these results were made at Listuguj Mi’gmaq Government Fisheries, 2015; Listuguj Salmon Summits of 2015, 2016; Restigouche River Watershed Management Council, 2015 and 2016; Restigouche River Camp Owners Association, 2015, 2016; Atlantic Salmon Association Staff, 2015; Atlantic Salmon Association, New York Regional Affairs, 2016; Atlantic Salmon Conservation Fund – Canadian Rivers Institute Webinar, 2016; St. Mary’s University, Geography, 2016; Canadian Water Network, 2016; Canadian Rural Revitalization Foundation Conference, Guelph, 2016.
I have engaged in informal conversations with members of all three communities both in the watershed and, with the sport-fishing community, outside it. Throughout the research period I was in direct communication with my informed respondents. Information gathered in this process was incorporated into the narratives. I remain an active participant in the sport-fishing, angler-conservationist community and in the search for reconciliation and a path ahead for the survival of the salmon and its three dependent communities.

The following compound narratives represent my direct experience of the individuals interviewed and their responses and of the communities encountered directly during my presence among them and indirectly through personal communication. Direct quotations are used to capture particular perceptions of individual interviewees, representative, unless noted, of more widely held views. Summary statements represent the information I received in the course of the interviews and during my presence in the watershed and at meetings about the watershed held elsewhere. The narratives are expressions of my interpretation of “what is going on” in the watershed, incorporating both the semi-structured interviews and my ongoing, emergent learning from my contact with a far larger number of people from all three communities.

5.1 **Settler-Community Compound Narrative**

The Restigouche River is a hell of a nice river but take the salmon out of it and what’s left? Sightseeing? I don’t think it’s going to be that beautiful after that. Nothing is going to bring money to the Restigouche River the way the salmon does.

—Settler interviewee

5.1.1 **People Interviewed**

Interviews were requested of 25 members of the settler community. All agreed to be interviewed\(^{70}\). Of these, 23 were non-Indigenous people who live permanently in the

\(^{70}\) One interviewee died before the summary of the interviews was completed and submitted to those interviewed. His widow requested that his interview not be included in the research.
Restigouche watershed. One was a semi-permanent resident, and one was of First-Nations heritage, living off reservation. Of the 25, three were women. Five are, or were, associated with local government, including three mayors, a town manager, and a town planner. Five were active fishing guides, working for camps and/or, independently, during the black-salmon season. Three were active managers of salmon camps, while one was a retired camp manager. Seven were, or are, employed as fisheries and wildlife managers, scientists, and staff by the New-Brunswick provincial government, the RRWMC, the Corporation de gestion des Rivières Matapédia et Patapédia (CGRMP), the LMG, and GMRC. Three were independent business people. Some fell into more than one category, e.g., a past mayor, who is a provincial government employee and past camp manager. The majority of the interviewees were suggested to me by my informed respondent for this community. Others were suggested by other interviewees or were people whom I met during my visits to the Restigouche.

Nineteen were, or were before retirement, actively involved in the salmon fishery, while five were neither employed directly in the salmon fishery and its conservation nor fish for salmon.

Of the 25, 18 spoke English as a first language, while seven spoke French. Half were fully bilingual, with the remainder functionally bilingual. Quebec is a unilingual province, French being the official language, while New Brunswick is officially bilingual. However, while one-third (8) of the interviewees spoke French as a first language, all were bilingual and were interviewed in English. Two-thirds (12) spoke English as a first language. Of these I estimate that four were fluently bilingual, while all lived in places where French is spoken and heard in stores and on the street on the New-Brunswick side of the river, the Restigouche, that in its lower mileage demarcates the boundary between the provinces. I estimate that nearly all Anglophone interviewees were, to varying degrees, functional in French. The Campbellton High School offers education in both English and French; the École des Deux-Rivières in Matapédia, in French.
Several of the interviewees came from families with both Anglophone and Francophone parentage and lineage and/or were married to a member of the other linguistic group. There is therefore a very high degree of linguistic and, presumably, cultural integration. With one exception, there appeared to be no personal, or cultural hostility between Francophone and Anglophone residents of the watershed with whom I spoke but rather a commonality of concern for the place that they share, albeit with differing levels of belonging.

Interviewees represented an above-average level of educational achievement, including people with professional qualifications, up to the doctoral level. In my estimate, most were high-school graduates.

Six were seasonally employed in sport fishing or by government. It is reasonable to suppose that they, together with most camp employees, relied upon employment insurance in addition to their seasonal earnings. Four were retired.

The people who constituted the settler community of this study, were diverse. Interviewees lived as far apart as Saint-Quentin, New Brunswick, in the west to Charlo, New Brunswick, in the east and on both the Quebec and New-Brunswick sides of the river.

The watershed covers 10,000 sq. km, with 60% in New Brunswick and 40% in Quebec. The population of the watershed is approximately 50,000. This includes the largest city, Campbellton (7,385), with its suburbs of Atholville (1,237), Tide Head (1,036), and, across the river in Quebec, Pointe-à-la-Croix (1,472), as well as Kedgwick and St. Quentin, upstream in New Brunswick (3,000), and MRC de La Matapédia (18,573) and MRC d’Avignon (15,246) in Quebec, and the Mi’gmaq First Nation of Listuguj (1850). Outside Listuguj, which enjoyed a 25.4% population increase between 2006 and 2011, populations are either static or in decline, against an average national population increase of 5.9%. (Statistics Canada, 2016).
The watershed is an economically poor part of an economically challenged part of Canada. Campbellton is a regional centre, with health care being the principal driver of the local economy. Provincial- and federal-government and educational services are also present. Once a major service centre for Canadian National, employing over 1,000 workers with several mills operating in the region. The CN yards are closed, and there is one highly automated mill remaining. The average income of people with full-time employment in 2007 was $19,159, 8.9% below that of New Brunswick. Unemployment at 13.16% (2007) is similarly greater than New Brunswick as a whole at 9.5% (2011) and Canada at 7.5% (2011) (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Most of the interviewees were either born within the watershed, or had migrated there from other parts of New Brunswick or from other parts of the Gaspé. None had lived for any more than short periods of time outside New Brunswick or the Gaspé region of Quebec. Many were from Restigouche multi-generational-resident families. Given the proximity and interdependence of the settlers and Mi’gmaq communities, there has been a long history of intermarriage, which continues to the present day. However, with one exception, all settlers interviewed self-identified as being non-Indigenous, Anglo, Acadian, or Quebecois.

5.1.2 Place, Identity, and Survival

We all live off the river...Everybody has a tie to the river...It has a meaning for everybody...a spiritual place...The day I can pack the Restigouche River in my suitcase is the day I’ll leave.

—Various settler interviewees

All interviewees professed their love of the place in which most were born and where they continued to find work and identity.

72 La Baie des Chaleurs was first explored by Jacques Cartier in 1534, where he traded with the resident Mi’gmaq. French settlement of this region of the Gaspé dates from the eighteenth century. Scots, Irish and English settlers began to arrive in the watershed following the British “conquest” of New France in 1760. The area received an influx of residents from the Miramichi after the great fire of 1825 and subsequent devastating forest fires.
However, because of the limited access to Atlantic-salmon fishing created by private ownership of all but one of the New-Brunswick camps, fishing opportunities for residents are limited in New Brunswick. As one respondent explained,

Only 12 km of the 300 km of salmon fishing water in NB’s portion of the Restigouche is Crown Open Water. The label Crown Open refers to water on which license holders may angle on any day they wish. In order to fish on the remaining 288 km, the general public needs to either enter a draw for specific dates on Crown Reserve Waters or be one of the fortunate very few invited to fish on privately owned water. There is greater access to black salmon fishing in the spring and fishing in the tidal water below Tide Head is open.

The Quebec tributary rivers offer daily tickets at a reasonable cost, and both New-Brunswick and Quebec residents interested in fishing take advantage of this. But there remains a memory within the Francophone community of the not-so-distant days when they were excluded not only from the fishery but from recreational access to privately held and Anglo-controlled water.

All expressed the importance of the Atlantic salmon to the region: “It pulls it all together.” Its symbolic importance is shown in the 10-metre sculpture of an Atlantic salmon on the Campbellton waterfront, its depiction on the city’s light posts and murals portraying upriver sport fishing in the town business district. Long-standing plans to build a salmon interpretive centre on the Campbellton waterfront came to fruition in 2017. It underlines the importance to residents for a salmon-based identity and as an economic driver through tourism. The symbolic power of the salmon is evidenced in its prominence in signage throughout the watershed.

The salmon also functions as a talisman for the health of the region, whether from a biological or socio-economic point of view. Fisheries managers and biologists spoke

---

73 The exception is a camp owned by the Province of New Brunswick but managed, as of 2017, by the Ristigouche Salmon Club. A daily rate for fishing, with accommodation, is approximately $1,000. A second camp operates on a semi-commercial basis, with fishing available at the same approximate rate.

74 It is a seven-mile stretch on the lowermost section of the Little Main Restigouche at Kedgwick River village and the one mile from Morrissey Rock downstream to Tide Head Beach.
predominantly of the first, while business and government representatives spoke largely of the second, and those directly involved in the fishery spoke of both. A healthy river was seen as generating a healthy economy, which translated, in the view of residents, to healthy communities.

There appeared to be real differences in the attitudes of upriver (Kedgwick) Acadian interviewees, where their relationship to the land and the river found explicitly historical, economic and political expression. One interviewee told me that here was a time, during the log drives, when the river was known as “a place to die,” but today there is a new sense of ownership. This finds expression in what another Acadian interviewee described as the rural revolt movement - “We have a right to rurality”. It is a political expression of the belief that “the dream” of creating a new woodland society, which has motivated Acadians through the centuries since Champlain, lives in the watershed. Bumper stickers read, “Notre forêt est-elle la nôtre?” This feeling of affinity with the land and waters of the region is also found among Anglophones, but my interviewees did not give it political expression.

Francophone and Anglophone people engaged directly with the fishery shared a sense of foreboding about their ability to generate sufficient income to maintain their way of life:

    The sad part is, and we hate to think about it or even talk about it, how long it’s going to go, if you look at the conditions that are at hand as we speak. There are so many issues that have to be dealt with. You try and find the most important issue to be dealt with and then bring the others in but the trend it’s in now…. we hate to even discuss the issue, because it’s our livelihood. [We are] not sure it’s going to take care of the next generation.

One Quebecois spoke of an epidemic among rural settlers of “taking the lead pill” (a bullet in the head) and feared for the survival of their way of rural, river-based life:

    “Without the right scientific choices, we are going to die.”

Some respondents spoke of spring fishing for black salmon. Black salmon (kelts) are adults who have survived spawning and winter in the river and are returning to the ocean. Their fighting qualities and the sportsmanship of fishing for them is contested but it is
allowed by regulation and, since much of the lower watershed is open to those who
would fish for them, it provides additional income for guides who are not yet, in late
April and early May, employed at the camps. All landed kelts must be released.

This is also expressed in terms of dismay about the destruction clear-cut logging is
believed to do to the feeder streams and the rivers themselves:

The mountains look good but go to the top and you see clear cut from one end to
the other…. the water is warmer…. we used to run our motors right through the
summer, now for a month and then, after that, no water, just wade fishing. (Settler
camp manager)

5.1.3 What They Say About Conservation.

We live in a paradise, but the paradise has been abused…. the government
underestimates the capacity of the river…. We are mainly managing people and
behaviour rather than salmon.

—Settler interviewee

Conservation is the principal focus of fisheries managers and biologists, but their
attitudes and approaches are by no means unanimous: “We don’t always get along…
there’s something to be said for protecting the watershed… we don’t agree on the means
to do it.” There is, however, agreement that there is no single cause for declining stocks
but that does not mean that they do not have preferred perceived causes. These include
(a) predators (cormorants and seals are the current favourites); (b) the impact of logging
in the headwaters, with ever more rapid cycles of flood and drought and their influence
on stream morphology, resulting in the filling-in of salmon pools, and (c) the black hole
in the ocean, a term used to cover the apparent fact that although there is an adequate
escapement of smolt\textsuperscript{76} into the bay to maintain minimal returning adult salmon for
spawning, such returns are below predicted numbers.

\textsuperscript{76} The stage at which young salmon migrate from freshwater to the ocean.
Those directly involved in the fishery—guides, staff, and camp managers—echoed the concerns of fishery managers and scientists but for many of them the Mi’gmaq fishery at Listuguj was seen as a frustrating obstacle to protection of stocks: “How long is it going to go? There are so many issues but the first and foremost that needs to be dealt with is the natives” Except for the Mi’gmaq themselves, this is the group with the most to lose should the salmon become endangered to the extent that DFO closes the sport fishery. They would lose their way of life, as well as employment and income.

There was a time when I thought I’d never see the end of it in my lifetime. Now I’m not so sure I won’t…. As far as the prosperity of the region goes, we need salmon…. not sure it’s going to take care of the next generation.

For those not directly involved in the practice of sport fishing, declines in the salmon run are seen as being part of the general decline in ecological health, resulting from, as one interviewee put it, “the fact is that we are in this area, but we don’t like this area…. by our behaviour we challenge what this area has been built on”

One resident reflected a less engaged attitude: “We gave up the commercial fishery. We have done our part.” This was not, however, a universal view: “At the end of the day, everybody is intertwined” captured the more common perception.

5.1.4 What They Say About Their Knowledge of and the Practices of Listuguj First Nation in Regard to the Atlantic Salmon

I don’t think buying them off does justice. There’s room for everyone to share the salmon resource.

—Settler interviewee

All interviewees were familiar with the people of Listuguj. Many had gone to school with Mi’gmaq. They are frequently seen in Campbellton, and its troubled economy is increasingly dependent upon their spending in the city. Intermarriage appeared to be not uncommon, and friendships were spoken of. Two biologists interviewed work or have worked for the GMRC and the LMG. Acadian interviewees made reference to their historic dependence on Mi’gmaq for survival.
Reactions to the Mi’gmaq fishery were similarly differentiated according to the practices and perceived interests of the interviewees, although none contested the Mi’gmaq “treaty right to fish,” but with that right “comes the responsibility to ensure that the stocks are maintained for future generations.” There was also a feeling, although not often expressed, that although

we are trying to correct a historic injustice… people will complain of the unfairness of having people living side by side, with different rights to the fishery. Non-natives must pay a permit and hefty access fee to fish the river, while natives can fish with a net. Your rights are related to the amount of “Indianness” in your blood. Intermarriage over generations means the notion of Indian blood is mixed. Rights are also not related to the amount of time or interaction on the land. For the most part, Mi’gmaq live a North American lifestyle, just like non-natives.

As noted above, guides and camp employees understood the Listuguj net fishery as a direct threat to the upriver fishery and therefore to their own livelihood and the continuation of their way of life. Fisheries managers and scientists wanted to and do work cooperatively with the GMRC and LMG but often in essentially Western ways. Some business and government interviewees expressed indifference to Mi’gmaq fisheries practices, regarding them as an issue between the sport-fishing community and the First Nation. This may be a reflection of Campbellton’s ever-increasing economic dependence on revenue from the Listuguj community.

When questioned about Mi’gmaq Ecological Knowledge, most respondents expressed either ignorance, or a passive acknowledgement of, the value of traditional knowledge in the sense of information but had difficulty with it as a way of knowing distinct from their own. However, one interviewee noted, “We are at a place where the two ways of seeing can merge together for the benefit of the salmon.” Nevertheless, while acknowledging that “we have to work alongside one another,” respondents said that “numbers are important…. we need numbers…. you can’t argue with numbers.” It was also acknowledged that “we have done a poor job of educating the native community on the science of salmon.”
The RRWMC and the GMRC are addressing this issue through the joint appointment of a biologist, who assists the GMRC with both research and education. The cost is shared between both organizations. Speaking of the Listuguj Salmon Management Plan, a respondent commented, “The Mi’gmaq plan could work, if we use Mi’gmaq techniques to make it work.” However, he went on to say, “20% [of the fishers] catch 80% of fish and are commercial fishermen.” He added that “food and ceremonial use in the 1994 fishing plan is OK with Listuguj residents but [the practices of] commercial fishermen aren’t approved of by residents.”

Disputing the not infrequently held opinion that the Mi’gmaq fishery is the overriding issue, an interviewee familiar with both fisheries science and Mi’kmaq Ecological Knowledge said “Definitely not! There are so many factors.... it’s holistic management…. you can’t just point your finger at one factor and say, ‘that’s where we have to intervene, that’s where we have to go.’” On integrating Western science with Mi’kmaq Ecological Knowledge, another interviewee commented,

I realized that there is no step one and step two to integrate those two knowledges…it was the fact that we had to build that relationship together, every day working together…I feel like they have the missing piece of the puzzle…we looked at the data, we looked at a trend and we are still missing something…we’re not understanding it fully…without their piece of the puzzle, we can’t have the whole story.

In understanding Mi’kmaq Ecological Knowledge and establishing a relationship between settlers and Mi’gmaq, trust building was cited as being essential.

However, beyond interviewees directly engaged in salmon science and conservation, there appears to be little consultation, cooperation, or the building of social relations between non-Indigenous residents and their Listuguj neighbours around the salmon and fisheries practices. In the words of one interviewee, “That is a conversation yet to be held.” When speaking of the new multi-million-dollar salmon interpretive centre, the Restigouche Experience, located immediately on the New Brunswick side of the interprovincial bridge, in Campbellton and looking out to Listuguj, a leader in that
process assured me that there would be displays showing the pre-contact fishing practices of the Mi’gmaq but no mention of the current fishery and its practices.77

5.1.5 What They Say About Their Experiences of the Sport-Fishing Community.

It can be tough to watch your river be controlled by an outside interest if that outside interest isn’t friendly.

—Settler interviewee

Interviewees from government and business, with the exception of one interviewee, recognized the economic contribution made by sport fishers, but in the larger context of the closing of mills and the CN yard, increasing perceived wealth of Listuguj, and the drive to greatly increase tourism, it was not regarded as critical to the future. There was, however, a sense of regret that Campbellton had not been able to connect with those in the sport-fishing community who are understood to have the capacity to contribute to the economic and social development of the city and the region.

I don’t think there is a good dialogue…. a lot of people come here who could add value, could really become intertwined with it, could probably support development of this community…. lots of knowledge and financial capacity.... that is sad…. if we are not able to leverage all that capacity that is sitting on our horizon…. this industry [sport fishing] has never been connected with the area.

No one suggested that the practice of sport fishing was a cause of the decline in Atlantic salmon returning as adults to New Brunswick, where all large salmon have, by regulation, been released for decades and where grilse must now also be released. However, regret and dismay were frequently expressed in regard to the sport-fishing practice of killing large MSW salmon in the Quebec part of the watershed. Against this, the argument was made that returns to the Matapédia, where anglers have been permitted to kill MSW fish, have held up as well as those of the Restigouche and its New-

77 Built in imitation of the New-York-architect-designed 19th century upriver salmon camps, it opened in May 2017 as Restigouche Experience. The salmon displays portray the Mi’gmaq in solely historical terms. There is no mention of contemporary Listuguj, or its salmon fishery, clearly visible from the Campbellton building.
Brunswick tributaries. This argument, sometimes used against the practice of live release, was disputed by those who argued that Quebec’s Ministère des Resources naturelles et de la Faune (MRNF) uses metrics to gauge estimated spawning escapement different from those used by DFO in New Brunswick. There remained, however, a feeling that this issue was clouded by anti-Quebec sentiment within New Brunswick: “When people complain about it [mandatory release] and are told, ‘Matapédia salmon stocks are healthy, so why not kill a few?’” That logic did not sway the New-Brunswick critics: “Quebec’s not doing the same as everybody else, so it must be bad—that’s the logic that prevails.”

Boating access to the Restigouche River has increased greatly in the last 20 years as provincial camp grounds have been built on the otherwise inaccessible sections of the river. Local outfitters have made day and overnight floats practical for visitors, and more and more local residents have purchased powered canoes and other craft, allowing them to “day trip.” The camps and their “come-from-away” anglers no longer have the river to themselves and their admittedly escapist pastime. Conflict between guides, customers of river-tripping outfitters and locals was cited as an irritant and evidence of an unjustified sense of “ownership” of the river by the camps and their staffs. (Judging by the aggressive posture of some camp owners on this subject, guides may well be reflecting the values of their employers.)

In Quebec there was a fear that declining runs, or a decision to remove large (MSW) fish from the allowable catch, would result in a precipitous decline in visiting anglers, although this fearful prediction was not unanimously held. However, during the 2016 season when the killing of MSW fish was disallowed, there was a 50% decline in fishing permits sold.

Fisheries managers and biologists are in a codependent relationship with the sport-fishing community. Their mandate is to protect the salmon, in the context of provinces dependent upon fishing tourism, or they work directly, or indirectly, for the principal conservation organization, the ASF, which is funded by the sport-fishing community—60% from the United States. One retired fisheries manager expressed the opinion that the camps did not
want to get involved in management issues that were seen as pitting the province against local inhabitants. No criticism of sport-fishing practices was expressed, and indeed support for live release was expressed. Several respondents were, themselves, sport fishers.

Guides and camp managers were clearly in a position of dependence upon the sport-fishing community, including those guides who operated independently and were not employed by the camps but whose clients journeyed to the watershed and hired them for black salmon in the spring. Their perceived interests and those of the sport fishers were expressed in virtually identical terms.

Appreciation for sport fishing and their way of life went beyond mere employment: “It’s my life… One of the worst days is the last day of the season on the river. Everything is over.” Long-term relationships between some guides and some clients have been established, dependent upon mutual respect for their respective skills and experiences and upon confidentiality—the canoe becomes the confessional—and based on their common love of the salmon and the place they share for a few days each year.

The river will keep running. Maybe we’ll find some other way [than salmon fishing] of utilizing the river system.

—Settler interviewee
5.2 Listuguj-First-Nation Compound Narrative

Hear the story. Accept the story. Understand the story. Deepen the story.

—Mi’gmaq interviewee

5.2.1 What They Say About Place, Identity, and Their Practices in Regard to the Atlantic Salmon

Of the 15 interviewees, at least seven had spent periods of time outside the community of Listuguj. Almost all were born there. There is a tradition of iron working, which takes young Mi’gmaq men to cities such as Montreal and Boston to work on steel construction. For instance, one interviewee had lived and worked for 20 years in Boston. All but one of the interviewees resided in Listuguj. (It is estimated that there are 2,000 residents and a further 1,000 members of the Listuguj First Nation who live outside the community.) For all of them, this is their home and territory and it remains unceded. They identify as Mi’gmaq, not as Quebecers, Canadians, or Americans.

To be a Mi’gmaq from Listuguj is to be in relationship with the land and waters, animals and fish. They are “our life.” Differentiation between self and other, be that another person or natural phenomena, is alien to their thought. Similarly, differentiation between past and present is not central to their thought, although some interviewees spoke of changes through time and of what had happened in the past. Nevertheless, the past lives in their present, not least in their experiences of racism, residential schools, and exclusion from the economic benefits realized by others from occupation and use of their territory. Ten millennia of presence in this territory and events since European contact are not “history” but “memories,” embedded in the present moment.

Central to that memory is the belief that the Creator sustained and sustains them with the gift of the salmon. It is their principal food, the source of their health and to fish for it is their right and their responsibility to their families and to the community. The current
practice of their ceremonies, celebrating and giving thanks for water and the salmon, constitutes pre-contact practice and goes together with the revival of their salmon fishery, which pre-dates Canadian Supreme-Court decisions in their favour. The vociferous assertion of their rights to fish have been accompanied by a re-telling of the period of exclusion, when they were not legally permitted to practise their traditional fishery in the vicinity of Listuguj. (This attempted repression of their fishing practice appears to have reached a climax in the period immediately following the Canadian government’s closure of the commercial Atlantic-salmon net fishery in the Baie des Chaleurs, i.e., the 1970s.) Tied as it is to ancient memories, recent injustices, and current practices identified with cultural revival and the health of the community, it is non-negotiable. The right to fish is sometimes expressed as stemming from the Supreme Court’s Marshall decision but alternatively, as an inherent right embedded in Mi’gmaq law, tradition, and practice and therefore not dependent on Canadian law.

The 2001 words of Chief Alphonse Metallic, “Sure we’ll still be fishing. You can’t stop the water from flowing; well, neither can you stop the Indians (sic) from fishing. Nobody will deny us that right.” are engraved on a stone tablet that stands outside the LMG Natural Resources office. Those interviewed were quick to point out that their fishery was either not the only problem—in terms of declining runs and size of salmon—or it was not a problem at all. Everyone recognized that there are numerous probable causes for this decline, including the remaining commercial fisheries in Greenland and Saint Pierre et Miquelon, high-seas “incidental catch,” predators (such as seals and cormorants), loss of smolt at sea, changing temperature and rainfall regimes, and loss of spawning habitat. But, as the quotation suggests, there is what Westerners would call a mythical belief that the return of the salmon is inseparable from the river’s flow and the

78 The sunrise ceremony of the summer equinox is centred on the salmon and its return to the river and their community. It is followed by a feast. All the public events I attended in Listuguj and Eel River Bar were begun with a spiritual ceremony, led by an elder. This included the Salmon Summits, where the majority of participants were non-Indigenous.
salmon’s annual return and presence. In this way the undifferentiated Mi’gmaq conviction of the oneness of all things finds expression.

This belief may be embedded in Mi’gmaq Ecological Knowledge. The GMRC, a cooperative initiative of the First Nations of Listuguj, Eel River Bar, and Papineau, works to promote two-eyed seeing, a bi-focal marriage of Western and Mi’gmaq world views. Staffed by Mi’gmaq, it partners with the RRWMC (of which the Listuguj and Eel River Bar First Nations are members), governments, and conservation groups (the Atlantic Salmon Conservation Fund and the ASF).

Most interviewees spoke of “conservation,” and understood it to be a responsibility of Mi’gmaq. It would appear, as a practice, to be limited to voluntary enforcement of fishing times, monitoring catches, and some cooperative contract work with DFO on the counting and tracking of smolt. There seemed to be no community-based limits on the numbers or sizes of catches currently in operation. No interviewee mentioned Netukulimk, the Mi’gmaq concept and practice of taking only what you need, as a guide for conserving salmon stocks.

There is, however, a Listuguj Mi’gmaq fishing law, developed in response to the re-opening of their fishery in the 1980s and ratified in 1995. It includes a fisheries plan, fishing regulations, and laws under which the LMG Rangers operate. Co-management with DFO and Quebec, monitoring of the condition of the resource, setting of harvest limits, special protective areas, and enforcement are covered in the law. However, by 2015, neither the staff of LMG Fisheries or their Rangers were familiar with the law, and there was agreement that it was not in effect and that it “needs to be revised” (As reported and discussed at the LMG Fisheries salmon meeting, 2015, at which I presented the results of my research in Listuguj and with the settler and angler communities).

Driven by the recognition that stewardship of salmon is a community responsibility, LMG Fisheries has held a series of community events, Let’s Talk Plamu. The focus has been on bringing those who fish for salmon and the larger community together for
dialogue and discussion, in accord with traditional Mi’gmaq practice. Persuading the active fishers to attend these events has been challenging.

This impasse within the community has been captured in the metaphor of a broken basket. Citing the multiplicity of elements, including Mi’gmaq culture, values, and traditions; Mi’gmaq law; agreements; levels of government; and the leadership of chiefs and councils, elected and traditional, in developing a single, coherent, management strategy, an LMG presenter asked, “Where is community involvement?” (Salmon Summit, Listuguj, 2016.)

Salmon Summits were held in Listuguj in November of 2014, 2015, and 2016, and in the Spring of 2018, sponsored by GMRC and attended by representatives of the Listuguj and Eel River Bar First Nations, the RRWMC, DFO, Natural Resources New Brunswick, and the sport-fishing camps. As a symbol of openness and cooperation, the Salmon Summits are a powerful commitment to conservation. In 2015 the then chief stated,

I acknowledge research and science is crucial now more than ever… Through our partnerships with the federal and provincial governments, we will aim to establish internal structure and policies so that our Fishery operations support both our right to harvest and our obligation to protect the salmon, for future generations to come” (“Chief’s opening remarks,” copied to me by his staff, 2015).

There was, however, no offer on the part of the First Nations that they could, or would, share accurate catch counts, let alone further consider limiting their catch by such means as a shorter season, or the use of trap nets, as opposed to gill nets, allowing release of large female spawners. Many members of the community regard requests for such information, or change in practices, as yet another form of control.

There is a conviction among Listuguj fishermen that they practice conservation by waiting until the end of the first week in June before putting their nets in the river, thus allowing the large fish that “are going to spawn” and provide “80% of the fry” to migrate upstream to their spawning beds. This, together with rules around the practice of netting, is thought by many, but not all, to be sufficient. Failure of DFO to sign annual
agreements in a timely manner, as in 2014, has resulted in unregulated fishing. In this way, assertion of rights would appear to trump conservation practices.

As one interviewee said, “There is no single narrative.” Interviewees therefore differ in their expressed understanding of the salmon. A small minority have adopted Western scientific epistemology and support much reduced catches. In conversation, few invoke Mi’kmaq Ecological Knowledge as a basis, or defence, for the present gill-net fishery or its catches. The argument heard is that of rights and tradition.

Not everyone in the community fishes, although there is a sense that everyone would defend that right against any outside attempt to limit it. There is an ambiguity around the possibility of being paid not to fish. Some seem to be open to putting much more severe limits on the number of fish killed, in return for cash compensation, while others reject this outright. The Listuguj government is paid by Quebec and by DFO to run their Ranger law-enforcement and biological-research programs, to the amount of more than $600,000 per year. These payments come with agreements as to when the fishers may fish—dates and hours. They provide employment for Rangers and for the researchers, who do tagging and smolt counts and check sample catches for size and health.

There is a conviction that Mi’gmaq can contribute to the management of the salmon fishery through a combination of Western management and science and Mi’qmaq Ecological Knowledge. Staff would be provided by them, following education and training and would extend beyond the estuary, upriver to the tributaries and sources of the watershed. Mi’qmaq Ecological Knowledge would be disseminated to both anglers and settlers through the employment of Mi’gmaq as guides in the fishing camps. Against this, reservations are expressed about the commoditization of this knowledge and of the limits, or even appropriateness, of managing resources. There remain issues of injustice in both historical and present management: “the equitable treatment of marginalized peoples is simply not a management issue” (Barrington, p. 132). However, an LMG spokesperson reported that DFO are seeking to re-enter negotiations with them on a treaty-based plan.
for fisheries management. The present situation in regard to intergovernmental relations and management responsibilities is extremely fluid.

**What They Say About Their Knowledge of and the Practices of Sport Fishers in Regard to the Atlantic Salmon**

**5.2.1.1 Contact.**

There is and has been very little direct contact between those interviewed and members of the sport-fishing community. Only one camp employs Mi’gmaq guides, from Listuguj and Eel River Bar. Three interviewees have been involved directly with the camp owners, as guests of the RRCOA in New York, and two were involved in a confrontation between a representative of the camp owners and fishermen at the Listuguj fishing dock. At least one had encountered camp owners and sport fishers in his work as a fishery technician. There is a history, on the part of some camp owners, of attempting to achieve a reduction in netting through financial incentives, negotiated between themselves and Listuguj chiefs. A co-operative initiative between GMRC and RRCOA to train Mi’gmaq as salmon guides was begun in 2014 but appears to have petered out. A desire to enter into a “relationship” with sport fishers was expressed. There was an attempt to engage the RRCOA in an alliance with LMG in their opposition to the train shipment of Canadian oil sands bitumen through their territory and that of Eel River Bar First Nation. This is now in abeyance, due to uncertainty as to the project’s future. Meetings in the watershed between RRCOA and LMG in the summers of 2017 and 2018 have resulted in a joint initiative with the City of Campbellton to properly represent Mi’gmaq presence on the river and in the watershed at the newly opened Experience Restigouche welcome centre.

**5.2.1.2 Money**

Camp owners are perceived as “millionaires,” whose camps are run for profit. Surprise or disbelief was expressed when I contradicted this. The recreational nature of sport fishing is recognized and passively accepted or questioned on the basis that anglers use and damage a resource that is to them a source of food, well-being, and cultural survival. The fact that in the recent past they were prohibited from fishing, while anglers were
enabled, is perceived as an injustice. Now the Mi’gmaq assert their rights, while questioning the legitimacy of sport fishing. There is, however, recognition that the loss of the sports fishery would negatively impact employment and the economies of the settler communities.

5.2.1.3 Live Release

When asked about the practice of live release, interviewees questioned its efficacy as a conservation tool and also the morality of “playing with fish.” The universally expressed opinion, based on some observation, is that released salmon die and are, therefore, wasted.

In summary, there are two serious misunderstandings between the community of Listuguj and sports fishers, namely, the financial structure of the sports fishery and the practice of live release and its effects on conservation of the salmon. Both misunderstandings occur in the context of virtually no contact between the two groups at formal or informal levels. The latter is a consequence of the historical marginalization and exclusion of Mi’gmaq.

5.2.2 What They Say About Their Experiences of the Non-Indigenous Communities of the Watershed

While acknowledging the long history of contact, including intermarriage and shared schooling, those interviewed reported a history of racially based injustice, including exclusion from the salmon fishery, loss of the use of their land and waters, segregation on and off the reserve, poverty, and unemployment based on racial exclusion from job opportunities. The symbol of fighting the government and of tension with the settler communities, especially Campbellton, remains the events of 1981, when Listuguj fishermen were attacked on the river by Quebec fisheries enforcement officers, and their community was invaded by the Quebec Provincial Police (Obomsawin, 1984). This 30-year old event was mentioned and discussed by every interviewee. For the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj it remains the event that marks the beginning of their “comeback.” Migwite’tm is commemorated each year on June 11 and is also remembered on community lamppost standards.
Local threats to the salmon fishery are expressed in terms of river and estuary pollution, the long-term effects of the historic commercial fishery and the past and present sport fishery. Poaching of spawning salmon upriver by non-Indigenous residents was mentioned as a concern, since it impacts potential salmon stocks and, therefore, the Listuguj fishery.

Questions were raised about the health effects of pollution from the mills on the bay and on the river in Atholville, with respondents expressing a sense of being victims of settler industrial activity. With all but one mill now closed, this concern is extended to upriver logging practices and their detrimental effects upon the river and its salmon.

Resentment remains over their exclusion from their own resources, especially the salmon, but including participation in the economy of the region, remains. Ironically, although unemployment and poverty are seen as major problems, Listuguj gives every appearance of being prosperous, relative to Campbellton, which has suffered severe cutbacks in employment and population and is increasingly dependent upon business the people of Listuguj bring across the interprovincial bridge.

Once again, a desire to be in “relationship” with their neighbours was expressed. However, “they [the people of Campbellton] don’t come here. They just watch us from across the river.” One younger member of the community told me that her Campbellton high-school friend was not allowed to visit her in Listuguj. As one person put it, “We are conflicted and entangled, but we need to be untangled and rewoven.”
5.3 Sport-Fishing, Angler-Conservationist Compound Community

It’s about conservation.

—Camp-owner interviewee

5.3.1 What They Say About Place, Identity, and Their Practices in Regard to the Atlantic Salmon

The more than 20 anglers79, both camp owners and guests, interviewed, expressed a strong affection for and attachment to the watershed, regarding it as an important part of their yearly activities. All travel to the Restigouche watershed and most live in urban places, although they visit other rural places in their extensive travels. Fishing, occurring in a rural place and involving participation in what is a social activity, is understood to contribute in greater or lesser degrees, to their identities. It is contrasted with their otherwise largely urban and complex lives. Time spent in the camps is understood as “escape” or, as one camp owning respondent put it, “lightweight goal orientation in a beautiful environment.”

Everyone interviewed has fished on one or more of the rivers of the Restigouche watershed for at least several years, some for close to a lifetime. The “place” of their attachment is probably better defined as the particular camp, where they stayed and its stretch of river. They were, of course, cognizant of the larger watershed—some have fished at several camps—but it is unusual for sports fishers to spend much, if any, of their fishing time away from camp, and their experience of the larger watershed was usually limited.

Although all the camps are privately owned, not all own the riparian rights. Some are on water that is leased on a 10-year basis, from the province of New Brunswick. These camp owners are lobbying the provincial government for longer leases, reflecting their desire to

79 Of those asked to participate, only one declined; the reason being a desire for and a tradition of family privacy.
secure their place in the place. Quebec camps operate on a different system, providing access to the pools of the Matapédia through the local river authority, the CGRMP. Fishing access is more open in Quebec, but nevertheless multi-year visits and anglers returning to the scenes of their youth are common, with visitors coming principally from Quebec, the Maritimes, and the United States.

There is an element of perceived tradition to the practice: “My father took me fishing.” “I bought this camp 30 years ago.” “We have been coming here for 40 years.” “This is something our family does” (Camp owners). Many were cognizant of being part of a sporting tradition that dated at least as far in the past as the mid-19th century. Camps are decorated with sporting paintings representing an idealized view of angling practice and with framed salmon flies, themselves objects of beauty as well as memory. The practice has a strong aesthetic. Despite recognizing that the fishing, in the sense of the numbers and size of fish caught, has declined and that it is not unusual to fish for days without hooking a salmon, the practice persists. Visits vary from as little as three days to as long as two months, but most visits are for from four to seven days.

There is an irrational element to the practice, especially when the costs involved are not insubstantial even for paying guests and are large for camp owners, one of whom told me, “This is a $50,000 week”. Some anglers expressed a desire to pass the practice and the enjoyment of outdoor recreation onto their children, while others doubted that there is sufficient family interest to continue their camps into another generation. One angler, who fished in many salmon rivers, went so far as to say, “There is a sense that it is coming to an end”. This view is the result of general pessimism about the future of the species, and it contradicts the expressed emotional attraction to the place, despite its cost and often “poor” fishing. But, as one frequent returnee remarked, “There is no such things as poor fishing, only poor catching.”

5.3.1.1 Conservation

A high proportion of those interviewed are playing, or have, played major roles in the Atlantic-salmon conservation movement. They do this through active volunteer
leadership and through major funding of the ASF, support for the RRWMC, the employment of wardens, and their own organization, the RRCOA. As one interviewee put it, “It is about conservation.”

The Atlantic salmon is perceived to be in serious decline throughout its range. It is recognized that salmon returns are cyclical, with large year-to-year differences. The 2014 season, when I was doing this research, was felt by sports fishers and the conservation community to have been the worst in memory. The next year, 2015 appeared to be a “rebound” year for returning fish, and smolt counts in the spring of 2015 reflected the high numbers of returning fish in 2011, the year in which these smolt were spawned. Nevertheless, the perception of those interviewed reflected a concern that the salmon is in decline.

Most knew a great deal about the history and current status of threats to the salmon and attempts to conserve it. Their responses ranged from lobbying government, to support for scientific exploration of the ocean stages of the salmon’s life cycle being conducted by ASF, to the achievement of near universal voluntary adoption of live release, now made mandatory in New Brunswick by DFO regulations. This is the practice by which anglers reconcile their expressed concern for the survival of the salmon with their practice of attempting to get it to take a fly, be hooked and played, but then released back into the river. In the words of one interviewee, “I can fish for them without hurting them.” Bielak and Tufts (1995) suggested that mortality of released fish, when properly played, handled, and released, is 10% or less (Bielak and Tufts, 1995, pp. 10–15) 80. This opinion is in stark contrast to the Mi’gmaq view that all released salmon subsequently die and to doubts among some non-Indigenous residents as to the efficacy of live release.

In New Brunswick, by law since 1984, all large MSW salmon have been released. Since 2015, all salmon, including grilse, must be fished for with single, barbless hooks and

80 Against this, more recent research into the effects of luring fish to move from their lies to inspect passing flies and pioneering work in epigenetics, might shed new light on the traumatic effects of sport fishing, including live release.
released. This is a regulation widely supported by camp owners and their guests. Angler-conservationists had pressed for a similar change in Quebec, which did allow both grilse and large MSW salmon to be killed in its waters, under normal conditions of water temperatures and flows and subject to mid-season estimates of spawning escapement requirements. These regulations changed in 2016, on a river-by-river basis, dependent upon midsummer stock assessments. The American idea that a trout, or salmon is “too valuable to be caught only once” has become the controlling ethic, not to say ideology, of the angler interviewees.

Frustration was expressed over the perceived failure of the federal DFO and the province of New Brunswick to manage the salmon fishery for conservation, “politics” being cited as taking precedence over science. Despite the apparent triumph of live release, there remains a vocal section of resident New Brunswick and Quebec anglers and outfitters who are calling for the re-introduction of a limited kill.

With the perception that there is increasing pressure on the remaining stocks of the Restigouche watershed, American and Canadian anglers, associated with the camps, continue to be strong advocates of live release. This is not only because live release is believed to be important for the Restigouche itself but because the killing of salmon in Canadian rivers by anglers undermines attempts to persuade the Greenlanders and the French, at Saint-Pierre et Miquelon to limit their commercial take and Indigenous fishers in Labrador, Quebec, and New Brunswick to limit their kill.

There is a strong desire on the part of non-resident anglers to maintain the mandatory release of grilse within New Brunswick by resident anglers. This is a source of some friction between New Brunswick–resident anglers and the non-resident angler-conservationists whom I interviewed.

Again, the Quebec situation differs from that in New Brunswick, where the Matapédia is famous for its large salmon and, until 2016, for not requiring that they be released. (There were limits on the numbers that could be taken, however.) In a 2014 conversation in which, as is the habit of fishermen everywhere and at all times, the lack of fish was being
bemoaned, I told one Matapédia angler from Nova Scotia that a 40-pound fish had been caught the previous day on the Kedgwick. He replied, “But you can’t kill them there.” When challenged about killing fish, he added, “I’ll stop killing them, when they do.” By “they” he meant the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj.

Another aspect of these conflicted views and practices is the fear expressed by some Quebec residents directly involved in the sport fishery, that should the province require live release, there would be a swift and large drop in the number of fishermen and the business they bring to the region. This proved to be the case in 2016, when mandatory release of MSW salmon was imposed on the Matapédia and license sales declined by 50% (Private communication).

While interviewees understood the complexity of possible causes of the salmon’s decline, including river and bay predation, changes in riverine habitat, changes in sea temperatures, and commercial fisheries in Greenland and off Newfoundland, their major focus of conservation concern for Restigouche salmon was the Mi’gmaq fishery at Listuguj. While recognizing the right of the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj to fish, they universally agreed that a way should be found to either stop it, or severely restrict it. There is a history of attempts by some camp owners to achieve this through cash payments.

The issue is usually framed in terms of “conservation” and is discussed in an ahistorical context. However, one respondent commented, “I don’t think it’s an economic thing. I think it’s a cultural thing.” Nevertheless, as another respondent put it, there is

universal strong agreement that the Listuguj salmon fishing practice should be done in a sustainable way in conformance with current best practices as concerns conservation…. [and that] the native fishing “right” has to show some awareness of the fishing as a “sustenance” not commercial fishery and for truly ceremonial purposes.
5.3.2 What They Say About Their Knowledge of and the Practices of Listuguj First Nation in Regard to the Atlantic Salmon

There had been very little direct contact between those interviewed and members of the Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj. Only one camp employs Mi’gmaq guides. The RRCOA and its predecessors have made attempts to deal with the First Nation through meetings with chiefs and, in 2014, on a joint initiative, with GMRC, to train Mi’gmaq as guides to be employed by the camp. However, the relationship has been testy, driven as it is by a conservation agenda on the part of the camp owners, who are apparently unaware of the larger, social, economic, cultural, and justice-driven agendas of the First Nation. The Listuguj fishery is understood to be a problem to be solved, isolated from its present and historical contexts.

Virtually no acknowledgement is made by anglers of the place of the Listuguj First Nation within the place that is the Restigouche. I am aware of only one sporting illustration that depicts “Indians” on the river. That drawing dates from 1888 and depicts Mi’gmaq “burning” the river to spear salmon for the entertainment of Camp Harmony’s guests, both ladies and gentlemen. Mi’gmaq are largely unrepresented in recent Restigouche-watershed sporting art. Neither is there any acknowledgement in angler discourse of their own historic and present role in excluding Mi’gmaq from access to the watershed beyond their present fishing grounds.

While all interviewees acknowledged the right of Mi’gmaq to fish, they expressed the common understanding of the Listuguj fishery as an unregulated blockade of the river mouth, with nets stretching clear across the river. Large and smaller fish were being caught and killed in drift nets, sold, and bought, unlawfully by non-Indigenous persons or wasted. This was a picture far from their understanding of a court-endorsed sustenance and ceremonial fishery. There was also bemusement at the apparent contradiction between the stated importance of the salmon to Mi’gmaq cultural survival and their actual fishing practices that appear to sport fishers to be destructive of the salmon resource. Frustration and anger were often expressed.
5.3.3 What They Say About Their Experiences of the Non-Indigenous Communities of the Watershed

For most anglers their only contact with non-Indigenous residents was during their stays in the camps, where local people are employed as camp staff. The numbers of staff vary according to both the size and opulence of the camps, ranging from around 20 to as few as three, or four. The exception is the Ristigouche\textsuperscript{81} Salmon Club, which maintains several camps upriver, as well as a base camp in Matapédia, where 50 or more people may be employed on both a full-time and a seasonal basis. In the camps all cooking, housekeeping, maintenance of buildings and grounds, and guiding is provided by staff.

While recognizing this employee-employer relationship, interviewees expressed combinations of respect, admiration, and affection for their staff. There were stories of long-term relationships between guides and sports fishers, of invitations to visit sports fishers in their urban homes, of assistance for education through active scholarship funds such as that of the Ristigouche Salmon Club, and the past building of a school for English-language education for the children of Anglophone staff in an otherwise Francophone community. The skills of guides in handling the canoes used in fishing and in knowing the salmon’s lies in ever-changing river conditions were often remarked on with gratitude and respect.

Contact with local residents beyond camp staff was very limited: a visit to a bank, for instance. This is reflected in the frustration expressed by members of the Campbellton business community about their lack of contact with people, many of whom have skills and contacts of potential local value, who visit the camps. (See Section 5:1:5, p. 122) The cultural richness of the region was never mentioned. Neither were the unique identity, articulated aspirations, and relationship to the land of Acadians mentioned by those whose camps are in the Francophone parts of the watershed.

\textsuperscript{81} Spelled with an “i”, not “e”. Ristigouche is an earlier Anglicization of “Listuguj”.
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Great emphasis was given to the impact of the camps on the local economy, directly and indirectly. This was universally understood as beneficence and a reason for the resident community to exercise its political influence in favour of conservation practices deemed by sports fishers to be important to the survival of the salmon and, therefore, of the camps. There was some sense of frustration that the larger settler community appeared not to be politically engaged on behalf of what anglers regard as conservation. Camp employees echoed this argument and sentiment. It was acknowledged that the large majority of camp employees are seasonal, but camp policy is to keep staff employed long enough—usually 12- to 14 weeks—for them to qualify for employment insurance payments for the remainder of the year. No one commented on the apparent subsidy the camps receive in this way from the Canadian taxpayer.

In an area where, by provincial and national standards, unemployment is high, employment and spending by the camps was cited as a positive contribution. The RRCOA commissioned a study (Lantz, 2010), which showed annual cash expenditures of $10 million and 535 part-time equivalent jobs. The author concluded that the camps’ contribution to the economies of the watershed was significant both in terms of cash infusions and as an economic driver. This perceived major economic benefit to the region was thought to provide a sufficient motive to change resident-angler opposition to longer than 10-year leases for the established camps.

Frustration and dismay were expressed when the subject of poaching by residents was raised. There was a strong feeling that local authorities should do more to control this illegal activity. There was, however, little appreciation for the nature of rural communities and their internal dynamics. One camp reported having had one of its heritage buildings destroyed by fire, a traditional means of settling scores in the north woods, but the personal-security concerns of local wardens were not acknowledged in sports fishers’ discourse on poaching.

The most prominent and at the time of the interviews currently active issue between anglers and residents was the proposal to establish a wilderness-waterway park for the
watershed. This initiative was being led by the RRWMC and had the support of the RRKOCA. It was intended as a response to the greatly increased level of river traffic, principally on the Restigouche from Kedgwick to Tide Head. The river is, by law, a provincial highway, with free access. Boaters in Restigouche freight canoes (often with powerful engines), kayakers, canoeists, float tubers, and rafters use it for recreation. Jet boats are not unknown. Anglers and many local residents experience this traffic as being inimical to their enjoyment of the river. Damage to spawning beds, the riverbank, and to islands subjected to large crowds of unlawful campers and anti-social behaviour on the part of some recreational boaters all combine to make the protection such a park would provide attractive to residents and sports fishers alike.

However, there was resistance to a park designation on the part of some camp owners, who felt that the marketing of the river implied by the project would increase traffic through “their” pools and negatively impact them and their guests. These members of the sports fishing community wanted to separate the park proposal from the enforcement of current laws against the consumption of alcohol while operating a boat and trespassing on private land. The danger of a law enforcement only strategy by the RRKOCA is that camp owners will be perceived by residents as unwilling to work cooperatively with them and therefore to develop new relationships appropriate to our changing world.

On this issue, as on many others, camp owners relied upon paid staff of the RRKOCA to develop and maintain contact with the resident communities. Outside the camp experience, there were few, if any, personal relationships, with residents. The notion that non-Indigenous residents might regard what camp owners understand and articulate to be “our waters” as their heritage and birth-right, to be enjoyed in their own ways, seemed to be hidden from some owners.

Food and sport are two different things…I fish to feed my soul, not my body.

—Salmon angler, in conversation
CHAPTER 6 – ANALYSIS

6.1 Introduction

If the thick description constructed in Chapter 5 has revealed some of “what is going on” in and between the three communities of the Restigouche watershed, this chapter will attempt to answer the following questions:

- To what extent does the literature explored in Chapter 3 help understand what was said by the interviewees and what I have heard and observed in and between the three communities of the Restigouche?
- How might we understand it? Which of the interpretive tools described in Chapter 3 fit the case of the Restigouche and support the participant author’s knowledge and direct experience, enabling a deeper comprehension and empowerment for conciliatory change?

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the complexity of the ever-changing social, political, biological, and environmental factors at play, together with a multiplicity of ways of constructing reality and meaning, resemble the view down a kaleidoscope. If held stationary, one sees many-hued patterns of intrinsic interest and beauty. The slightest movement, however, re-orders the pattern, refocusing one’s interest. The interpreter of what is going on in and between the communities of the Restigouche watershed is in danger of emulating the man who, in the humorist Stephen Leacock’s imagination, “jumped on his horse and rode madly off in all directions”.

Recognizing the complexity of this wicked problem, this analysis will take as its starting point the admittedly reductionist, single-word summaries intended to describe the central narrative current in each of the three communities. These single-word summaries were used and tested in the presentations made to each community and to other interested parties during the course of this research project. They are

- for the angler, sport-fishing community, conservation;
• for the settler community, survival; and
• for the Indigenous Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj, revival.

How have these characterizations come to summarize and capture their narratives, and how might the theories discussed in the literature review (Chapter 3) help to understand what is going on today? To what extent are social learning, social capital, bridging and bonding, natural-resource management, place, epistemologies, symbols, and historic and present inequalities disabling and enabling conflict, cooperation, and collaboration?

6.2 Angler-Sport-Fishing – Conservation

The rapid growth of engineering expertise and manufacturing capacity that marked the Victorian era (1837–1901), providing reliable fishing tackle suitable for the capture by angling, with rod, line, and fly, of fish strong and fresh from their ocean feeding and weighing upwards of 20 pounds (9 kg). This technology, together with safe and swift transportation by steam rail from the metropolitan centres of such cities as Montreal, Boston, and New York, made the great rivers of eastern Canada a mecca for men and women privileged with the time and money necessary for this annual pilgrimage. Freed from the enervating effects of urban life (see. for example, Halverson, 2010; Van Dyke, 1895), living “rough” on their houseboats and in their architect-designed log camps, they proceeded to catch, to kill, and to ship by canoe and rail millions of tons of

---

82 In this they were emulating their Victorian British counterparts of the new leisure class, who were quick to follow their monarch, Victoria and her Prince Consort, Albert, taking train to the Highlands of Scotland to stalk a stag, kill salmon, or shoot grouse.

83 The duality between life in the city, locus of power, politics, and corruption and life in the country, idealized as the locus of pastoral peace, independence, self-reliance, and contemplation, is at least as old as Roman civilization (cf. Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics*). It found expression in the English “Father” of recreational fishing, Izaak Walton and continues to be a constant theme in Anglo-American angling literature to this day. For an example of this conceit contemporary to the Golden Age of Restigouche salmon fishing, see Van Dyke (1895). See also Halverson (2010) on the perceived threat to manliness posed by postbellum urban life and the antidote of the great outdoors.

84 Camp Harmony, the first permanent camp, was built at the confluence of the Upsalquitch and Restigouche rivers in 1879. Others quickly followed. When Camp Harmony was later expanded a frequent guest, the famous New-York architect, Stamford White, was its designer. His firm, McKim, Mead, and White also designed the Kedgwick Salmon Lodge and the camp at Brandy Brook.
Restigouche Atlantic salmon to the awaiting kitchens of their homes and those of their friends, relatives, social dependents and clubs (Irvine, 1981; Ristigouche Salmon Club, 1953). Their practice of killing their catch for consumption was and remained in harmony with that of all sport fishers and, of course, commercial fishermen, until the latter part of the 20th century.

Indeed, until this day, the idea of fishing for a fish that one intends to “let go” is hard for most people to understand. A multi-generational settler and camp manager told me in 2016 that he had not fished that season: “What’s the point?” he asked, if he could not keep his catch for consumption? For others, live release is of dubious morality. What justification can there be for inflicting presumed pain on a fellow creature, if it is not to be consumed? Despite scientific research establishing that a high proportion of released fish live to spawn successfully (Bielak & Tufts, 1995), several settlers voiced their skepticism, and, more important, most Mi’gmaq interviewees expressed their belief that all caught-and-released fish subsequently die. A further gap was exposed between sports fishers and Mi’gmaq who characterized live release as “playing with your food.”

However, the outstanding fact is that between the 1960s and the second decade of the 21st century those who continued to catch and kill the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche became a distinct minority. A similar change towards live release has occurred in most of its natal rivers around Atlantic Canada, even where a limited kill is permitted by regulation (Mills & Piggins, 1988). The new practice of angling with the intent of

---

85 In 1962 the Ristigouche Salmon Club reported to its small membership a total catch of 81,052 MSW salmon, weighing 1,381,810lbs, an annual average of 1,397 MSW salmon, weighing 17lbs each taken over 83 seasons. By their hundredth season, 1980, over one and half million pounds of salmon had been caught and killed by their members and guests. Although it was and is the club with the most riparian rights, all other private clubs in the watershed were practicing catch and kill during the same period. A settler respondent told me that in the 1950s and ‘60s he worked for the Ristigouche Salmon Club running a freight canoe from the base camp in Matapedia to the upriver camps with daily mail and returning with ice boxes filled with the previous day’s catch. These fish were then packed in Matapedia and shipped out by rail for private consumption.

86 That is to say, in Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador rivers. The live release of MSW fish has been required by regulation in the Maritime Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island since 1984. This regulation was extended to grilse in 2015. The numbers of fish permitted to be killed has
releasing any fish caught to continue its journey to spawn, is _de rigueur_ among the now conservationist sport-fishing community of the private camps of the Restigouche watershed and increasingly so among those who fish the public waters in Quebec. How did this radical change in practice come about?

The connections between angling and conservation, rooted in medieval regulatory regimes designed to protect fish stocks (Hoffman. 2016)\textsuperscript{87}, continued into 19th-century provincial and federal regulation of the Canadian Atlantic-salmon fishery, including that of the Restigouche watershed. However, the paradigm shift in the way in which sport-fishing angler-conservationists re-constructed their angling practice from catching and killing to live release, thereby finding new meaning and identity in their sport, can be located in a Depression-era dictum: “A game fish is too valuable to be caught only once” (Wulff, 1939, n.p.).

In the post–World War II era of reliance upon hatchery trout, raised to satisfy the expectations of expanding numbers of sports fishers, this notion that caught trout were, on their release, re-usable, became embedded in a generation of American and Canadian anglers whose environmental ethic was formed by the new consciousness of the damage and dangers that human, industrial-scale, activity poses for the natural world. A postwar generation of angler-conservationists came to practice catch and release on trout streams both north and south of the 49th parallel. The use of spinning tackle, lures, and natural bait was challenged by a boom in the practice of fishing with a fly, which allowed for the safer capture and release of trout hooked in the cartilaginous areas of the mouth.

Fly fishing and catch and release together formed a practice based on a moral and aesthetic conviction well suited to continuing participation in a rural sport at a time when

\textsuperscript{87} Hoffmann pioneered the rediscovery and historical reconstruction of late medieval European sport fishing. He provided a fuller discussion of the regulatory regimes underlying the transition from fishing conceived and practised solely as work to fishing, especially with the fly, conceived and practised as play, with its own instructional and apologetic literature.
the fragility of the environment and the threat and reality of species loss informed the consciousness of many sports fishers. What began as an economically motivated practice became a conviction promoted with close to religious fervour by cold-water conservation organizations such as Trout Unlimited, whose tag line in the late 1960s was “Limit your kill. Don’t kill your limit,” and individuals imbued with this new conservationist ethic. The extensive literature of the sport bears witness to its transfer from trout to their sea-going cousins, the Atlantic salmon, providing a case study in social learning and social capital expended to enhance a conservationist agenda through regulatory change and example.

Growing environmental consciousness, the rise of conservationist non-governmental organizations (such as the Atlantic Salmon Association, which would become the ASF, uniting volunteer salmon-conservationist groups throughout Atlantic Canada and the American Northeast, and the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization), the rapid growth of the Greenland inshore commercial fishery (Chase, n.d., p. 85)\(^88\) and declining catches\(^89\), all contributed, through the 1970s and into the 1980s, to a sense that if the Atlantic-salmon sport fishery was to continue the salmon must be “saved” (Dubé, 1972)\(^90\). This required that salmon anglers adopt the trout-angler ethic of limiting their kill, rather than killing their limit. Catch and release, or as it has been more recently described, live release, was the technique that would enable the sport to continue but within a conservationist framework. Here was a practice that allowed salmon anglers to continue to fish for Atlantic salmon “without doing them any harm,” as one respondent

\(^88\) The discovery that Atlantic salmon from both Eastern and western Atlantic watersheds travelled to western Greenland to feed led to an increase in harvest off Greenland from the 40-tonne level in 1958 to 1585 tonnes by 1973. It had become the largest of all the commercial fisheries around the Atlantic.

\(^89\) In the five seasons from 1975–1979 the annual average catch of MSW fish reported by the Ristigouche Salmon Club, dropped to 635, against an average of 988 MSW fish caught between 1880 and 1962, a decrease of over 30%.

\(^90\) Dubé was a prominent angler and owner of the Restigouche Hotel, Matapédia, Quebec, an historic refuge for anglers. He was writing principally about the Restigouche watershed.
claimed, while at the same time being strong lobbyists in the fight against commercial harvesting and the catch-and-kill practices of less enlightened anglers.

Although Canada’s inshore commercial salmon fishery had been regulated since the first fisheries act was promulgated, shortly after Confederation in 1867, it was a century before, in 1966, “a series of new measures involving closure of various commercial fisheries, license requirements and transfer restrictions, bans on drift nets, reduced seasons and other measures progressively became implemented” (Chase, n.d., p. 4). In 1971 the Restigouche became an early beneficiary of such a closure. Chase (n.d), correctly in my view, attributed these actions on the part of the government of Canada to the pressure brought on it by conservationist anglers, represented by Wilfred Carter of the ASF and Austin Buck of North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (p. 4). Similarly, angler-conservationists and their organizations have been and are at the centre of efforts to control and limit the fisheries of West Greenland, St.-Pierre-Miquelon, the Labrador-resident food fishery, and that of First Nations such as Listuguj. It is only because of the adoption of the practice of live release that such a stance is morally or politically viable.

If the adoption of a new practice and ethic is explainable in the context of attempts to halt the decline of the species, what elements of the social context of the sport-fishing, angler-conservationist were necessary for this transformation to have taken place. How was it learned?

6.2.1 Social Learning

The change from a practice of catch and kill to live release on the part of that section of the sport-fishing public I have described as angler-conservationists and which comprises the Atlantic-salmon anglers who own and visit the private camps of the Restigouche watershed can be partially understood as an answer to Pierre Bourdieu’s question, “How can behaviour be regulated without being the product of obedience to rules?” (Lizardo, 2004, p. 7) Given that the cornerstone of their self-identity as conservationists is advocating for the external imposition by government agencies, federal and provincial, of
live release⁹¹, how can their own behaviour be said to have been “regulated” without having been “the product of obedience to rules”?

It might well be thought that anglers have changed their practices from killing to releasing any salmon they catch only because of regulations imposed by DFO, Quebec, and the Atlantic Provinces and not because of a self-regulating impulse independent of external governmental authority. The very fact that angler-conservationists have for a generation advocated for the imposition of these regulations upon their fellow sport fishers points to an understanding that practices only change as a result of the imposition of rules to be obeyed. It is my contention, however, that angler-conservationists of the Restigouche watershed have responded to the realization that “a certain manner of behavior,” namely the killing of angled fish, “does not work” (Swartz, 2002, p. 665), both by changing their own practices and by simultaneously attempting to change that of others through education, advocacy for the practice, and, if necessary, the imposition of regulations requiring live release.

6.2.1.1 Bourdieu

Bourdieu’s concepts of fields, defined by Swartz (2002), as “structured spaces in which actors compete against one another for valued resources” (p. 665) and capitals, defined as “economic, cultural, social and symbolic” resources, “unequally distributed across the social classes” (p. 665), would appear to describe the habitus, that is to say, the way of being, of Restigouche-watershed angler-conservationists. They operate within the physical and social space of the watershed, competing with other non-resident sport fishers, the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj and Eel River Bar, and non-Indigenous settler residents, who express the wish for more opportunities to fish and freedom from regulations prohibiting the taking of salmon for food. They also have at their disposal the capitals of, literally, money, as well as cultural, social, and symbolic resources, located in

---

⁹¹ Other conservation measures supported are research, habitat protection and restoration, protection from poaching, improved regulation of open pen salmon aquaculture and control and curtailment of ocean fisheries, especially West Greenland and Labrador.
their participation in a well-established conservation movement throughout both the western and eastern Atlantic ranges of the Atlantic salmon, an ever-growing salmon-conservationist literature, and species-focused conservationist organizations, both non-governmental and governmental.

Contrary to Bourdieu (as cited in Swartz, 2002), the history of these organizations and of the learning and consequent change of practice on the part of angler-conservationists would not appear to have occurred without self-conscious conducting actors, such as Lee Wulff, and agencies, such as the ASF, described above.

However, Bourdieu’s insights contribute to understanding that the present conflict between angler-conservationists, other sport fishers, and the Indigenous communities is exacerbated by the fact that they operate in a common field but with widely different capitals, in which the imposition of external regulations on the First Nations and on other sport fishers fails to satisfy what Bourdieu called their “sense of belief” and therefore their legitimacy.

6.2.1.2 Lave and Wenger

As was noted in Chapter 3, Bourdieu’s social learning theory has been operationalized by Lave and Wenger (1991) in their theory of communities of practice. Meaning, presumably located in Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, in the interplay between the loci of exterior social fields and the varied capitals available to allow construction of self-regulated life, is understood by Lave and Wenger (1991) to be generated through practice. “Practice is, first and foremost, a process by which we experience the world and our engagement with it as meaningful.” (p. 49). Practice, Wenger emphasized, is embodied through participation and reification. The latter gives individuals “human experience congealed into fixed forms and given the status of an object” (p. 59). Sport fishing, or angling, as it is practised in the private salmon camps of the Restigouche watershed, is participatory in both a proximate sense of something done on the water and—by a discourse consisting of literature, social interaction, and tradition—extended
through time and space. Both are forms of iteration, creating the “object,” salmon angling.

The meaning and identity ascribed to their participation in salmon angling by sport-fishing interviewees provides support for Wenger’s (1991, 2010) theory. People are shaped by their worlds, and, by their participation and reifying, they shape their worlds. This interplay is exemplified in the case of the angler-conservationists of the Restigouche by the evolving nature of their own successive practices of catching and killing, catching and releasing some fish (according to size), and total live release, and also by their role in lobbying for the ending of the commercial fishery, in education and advocacy for limited kill in the sport and Indigenous fisheries, and in the imposition of regulations limiting harvesting of Restigouche salmon. Each of these stages in changing practices reflects a response to a perceived reality in the world of the Atlantic salmon, namely declining stocks. This has been an iterative process, encompassing experience, reflection, action, and further reflection. It is an epistemology of learning reminiscent of Indigenous practice, but defining boundaries between communities and cultures, necessitating and limiting possibilities of brokering between them.

Lave and Wenger (1991) described communities of practice as simple social systems, while interrelated communities of practice may be said to constitute a complex social system. Both are marked by “emergent structure, complex relationships, self-organization, dynamic boundaries, ongoing negotiation of identity and cultural meaning” (p. 179). The concept of communities of practice is “part of a broader conceptual framework for thinking about learning in its social dimensions…. it is a perspective that locates learning, not in the head or outside it, but in relationship between the person and the world, which for human beings is a social person in a social world. In this relation of participation, the social and the individual constitute each other” (Blackmore, 2010, p. 179). Again, the process by which angler-conservationists developed as proponents of live release and zero harvest and came, in the words of one of them, to fish “for my soul and not my body,” implying a significant change not only in practice but in sense of self, encompassing meaning and identity, is captured in Wenger’s characterizations of
communities of practice. The application of his theory and the issues of power, boundaries, and brokering between the sport-fishing and the settler and Indigenous communities of the Restigouche watershed will be considered later in this analysis.
6.2.2 Social Capital

Bourdieu’s (as cited in Swartz, 2002) capitals encompassed the concept of social capital. As an analogue of financial capital, it has played a significant role in the change in practice of angler-conservationists. Farr (2004) described the social pragmatists Dewey and Hanifan as having the critical goal of providing otherwise deprived social collectivities with “the network of social activities that bind people together.” (p. 15) In this sense Social Capital has implications for the settler and Indigenous communities of the Restigouche watershed, and these will be explored later in this chapter. Suffice it to say that, in regard to the sport-fishing community, such networks were already in place, locally in the camps, more broadly in the conjunction of social, educational, business, and sporting associations shared by these anglers for a century before their transformation into angler-conservationists. Portes (1998), applying the concept of “dense networks” of Lin, Ensel and Vaughn, concluded, “Identification with one’s own group can be a powerful motivational force …creating sanctioning force” (p. 8).

Lollo (n.d.) echoed Farr (2004) and Portes (1998) in drawing attention to the negative dimensions of social capital as a means of social control. Social capital’s capacity to be used for social cohesion is, in her view, limited by its potential to be used to leverage and secure special privileges. The process by which riparian rights passed from settlers to private-camp owners and their influence on regulatory regimes, both for fishing and property protection, has been demonstrated by Thomas (2001) and Parenteau, (2004), providing case support for Lollo’s (n.d.) contention.

6.2.3 Bridging and Bonding

In attempting to clarify the dimensions of social capital, Lollo (n.d.) named “identifying, linking, bridging, and bonding,” as factors influencing “the quality of resources available to individuals, the efficiency within the group and the level of trust” (pp. 1-2). Adler and Kwon (2002) differentiated between bonding and bridging. Bonding, they argued, occurs within social structures in which social capital is accumulated. Bridging occurs between people in differing social structures. Perkins et al. (2002), (citing Burt, 1999), pointed to
the tension between the two: “Bonding within groups can, paradoxically, even lead to insularity, alienation of outsiders, and inhibit bridging to other groups”, while bridging relationships with outside groups “may come at the expense of community cohesion” (p. 47). They added, “SC has been largely divorced from political and economic capital and so, conceived in purely social terms, provides no basis for large-scale or structural community change” (p. 47). Together, these insights help us to understand how and why angler-conservationists have been able to change their own practices, while at the same time encountering resistance to live release on the part of some other sport fishers, failing to garner support for their conservation agenda from non-fishing settlers and further cementing opposition to change on the part of the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj in their food fishery.

Perkins et al. (2002) concluded by echoing Wenger (2010) in pointing to the energy at the boundary of systems (p. 46). Davis (2014), Bogardus (1925), Granovetter (1983), and Wenger (2010) addressed issues of trust and conflict in and between social networks. Their insights will be considered later in his chapter, where intercommunity relationships are discussed.

6.2.4 Natural-Resource Management and Governance

The process by which angler-conservationists within the sport-fishing community changed their own practices from harvesting to limited harvest (grilse only) to total live release was, I have argued, enabled by their rich resource of social capital used to achieve social learning and a transformation of identity grounded in their changed practice. In light of their perceived need for further extensions of their conservationist philosophies and practices to other sport fishers and to the remaining commercial and Indigenous fisheries of the Western Atlantic, it would be encouraging to be able to say that the partial achievement of their goal is the result of parallel changes in natural-resource management and governance. However, this is not the case.

Interviewees repeatedly expressed frustration with both provincial and federal governments and their perceived failure to protect the resource. Angler-conservationists
found it necessary to establish, support, and use their own non-governmental organizations\(^\text{92}\) to pressure governments to implement more and more restrictive harvest regulations for the sport fishery and to be the agents of control over the Indigenous fishery of the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj. Despite occasional efforts to secure public input before making regulatory changes, DFO is still understood by the sport-fishing community to operate on a top-down model of governance. Alternative models of natural-resource management and governance describe dimensions of adaptive governance that require collaboration, learning, and trust between agencies and actors (Booher & Innes, 2010; Cona & Hubacek, 2010; Leach et al., 2002; Pahl-Wostl & Hare, 2004; Prell et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2013). Apart from learning that they must use their social capital to effect change in government regulations and resources for research and enforcement through education, lobbying, and political and economic pressure, the angler-conservationists and the larger sport-fishing community of the Restigouche watershed represent themselves as being alienated from and in opposition to the government agencies responsible for the protection of the Atlantic salmon. However, this is not the result of a lack of faith in science and evidence-based management in and of itself.\(^\text{93}\)

Bavington (2010), writing about the collapse of the Canadian East-Coast cod fishery, characterized the failed management model as “reinforcing existing political, economic and environmental inequalities” (p. 128). This was the consequence, he argued, of scientific management being practised in the context of capitalist resource extraction. Sport fishing may be understood as having developed in conjunction with that context, which allowed the growth of a leisure class free to use their economic and social capitals in a parallel process of dominance and control of fields such as hunting and fishing. In

\(^{92}\) Principally, the Atlantic Salmon Association and la Fédération Québécoise pour le saumon atlantique.
\(^{93}\) Some voices in the Atlantic-salmon sport-fishing community may be heard to question the “science” upon which DFO and Quebec base their annual regulations, arguing that such knowledge is, because of the complexity of the issue, incomplete and therefore unreliable. DFOs seemingly conflicted dual role as both the Federal agency responsible for the protection of wild fish stocks and the promotion of aquaculture has made many in the sport-fishing community believe that DFO’s management decisions are politically, rather than scientifically motivated.
Bavington’s view, “fisheries, science technology and management have all been aimed at creating and sustaining this context of capitalist resource extraction by transforming fisheries around the world into an industrial sector” (p. 128). The historical and present privileges enjoyed by the angler-conservationists, who fish for the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed from their private camps result from past and present political, economic, and environmental inequalities. They have transferred their faith in scientific management regimes, which serve them so well in Bavington’s “industrial sector” to their play-world, characterized by one camp owning angler interviewee as “lightweight goal orientation in a beautiful environment,” reifying it as conservation, for they believe that they can “fish for them without hurting them.” Whether and to what extent the exercise of their privilege has and does hurt other less privileged sport fishers and the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj is not articulated by angler-conservationists.

6.3 Settlers – Survival

In her pioneering study of Canadian literature, *Survival*, Atwood (1972) asked, “What have been the central preoccupations of our poetry and fiction?” Her answer was “survival and victims”. The first preoccupation, “survival,” is the single word which captures the responses of interviewees from the settler communities to my inquiries discussed in Chapter 5. Survival is the central preoccupation of their lives. The Restigouche watershed may no longer be a dangerous sea passage from the varied assurances of France and Britain, as it was for the first European settlers, but it remains a

---

94 As of November 2017, a government of New Brunswick deputy minister journeyed to Manhattan to present her government’s proposal to establish a provincial waterway park to the Restigouche River Watershed Camp Owners Association. The Minister was subjected to a hostile cross-examination by some members of the Association and told that they had, within their group, the means to stop passage of the necessary legislation and implementation of the necessary regulations.

95 In July 2017 representatives of the Camp Owners Association (RRCOA) met with members of the Listuguj and Eel River Bar First Nations in Eel River Bar. This was the first time that such a meeting had taken place on Mi’gmaq territory, following Mi’gmaq cultural conventions. Although the meeting was thought by the camp owners to have been worthwhile and their chairman expressed gratitude for being able to enjoy their sport in a place they share with one another, there was no acknowledgement that sport fishing has always taken place at the cost of exclusion from their traditional fishery for the Mi’gmaq.
place peripheral to the metropolitan and political centres where decisions and policies
directly affecting their survival are made. 96

Survival for these distinctive and threatened cultures is not simply a question of
economics, expressed in various kinds of subsidies or the closing or opening of a mill or a
hospital or a government office, but also the survival of ways of life associated with
rurality and the consequences of living on the periphery. Speaking of employment in the
camps, one Anglophone interviewee said,

The sad part is, and we hate to think about it, or even talk about it. How long it’s
going to go, if you look at the conditions that are at hand as we speak. There are so
many issues that have to be dealt with. You try and find the most important issue to
be dealt with and then bring the others in but the trend it’s in now… we hate to
even discuss the issue, because it’s our livelihood. [We are] not sure it’s going to
take care of the next generation.

One Quebecois spoke of an epidemic among rural settlers of taking the lead pill and fears
for the survival of their way of rural, river-based, life: “Without the right scientific
choices, we are going to die.” The Acadian call for a right to rurality echoes these
anxieties.

The contexts of this central preoccupation of settlers with survival have been discussed
above. To restate them briefly, they are: economic decline, resulting in high rates of
unemployment and out migration; and concern over the environmental health of the
watershed, focused on declining salmon runs perceived to threaten both employment and
an important element of a rural way of life. The following comment by a settler captures
these fears:

96 The capital of New Brunswick, Fredericton, is five hours away by road. Decisions affecting management
of the Atlantic salmon are made in Moncton, Halifax, Ottawa, and Quebec City. Decisions affecting the
camps upon which many of the interviewees and their families rely for employment, are made in New York
and other metropolitan centres. Decisions affecting the one remaining mill are made in India.
The Restigouche River is a hell of a nice river, but take the salmon out of it and what’s left? Sightseeing? I don’t think it’s going to be that beautiful after that. Nothing is going to bring money to the Restigouche River the way the salmon does.

How might the literature discussed in Chapter 3 help in understanding why it is that, after centuries of struggling to survive on the periphery, this remains the central preoccupation of the settler communities? In particular, this section will examine the models of managing systemic change, presented by Blackmore (2010a, 2010b) issues of social capital and its effect on the settler communities’ identities and capacity for bonding and bridging, and the importance of place.

Although for convenience I have referred to the settler community, in relation to the sport-fishing community and Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj, of the three nominal communities, settlers are the most diverse. Their diversity is found in their location within the watershed, covering as it does the towns of Campbellton and Atholville; villages such as Matapédia, Upsalquitch, and Kedgwick; and those who live in the woods. Location, language, and culture also identify them as Québécois and Québécers, New Brunswickers, and Acadians. Both French and English are spoken in most parts of the watershed, but the predominant language differentiates communities. In this sense identity is strongly held and, as with their Mi’gmaq neighbours, the past is always present.

While it is the past that has led to the present diversity of settler communities, cultures, and social networks within the watershed, their present strengths and weaknesses in the context of their survival and that of the Atlantic salmon can be understood in terms of social capital, identity, bonding and bridging, and place. An analysis of the social dynamics of the totality of the settler community is beyond the scope of this chapter and dissertation; therefore, two cases of recent responses to the theme of survival will be discussed: the CGRMP and that of settler camp employees.
6.3.1 Corporation de gestion des Rivières Matapédia et Patapédia

As has already been discussed, ownership, management, and regulation of the Atlantic-salmon fishery of the Restigouche differ greatly between the Quebec and New Brunswick parts of the watershed. In part, this distinction goes back almost a century to the 1920s agreement between the Canadian federal government and Quebec, which made Quebec solely responsible for the management of Atlantic salmon within its boundaries. More recently, it dates from the 1970s, when Quebec revoked hunting and fishing leases on 60,000 square miles of public land, mostly held by non-resident Anglo-Canadian and American sportsmen and created zones d'exploitation contrôlée (ZEC).

This process was empowered by a province-wide determination to establish Quebec as a distinctive society, either within the Canadian federation or outside it as a sovereign nation. It was closely allied to preservation of the French language and Québécois culture. It was also motivated by demands of Quebec residents for access to public lands and waters for hunting and fishing. ZECs operate as co-operatives, managed by locally elected representatives, including local business interests and representatives of local municipalities. They are economically self-sustaining through user fees, and they generate income for government and both direct and indirect employment in often small rural communities, as well as being engines for local economic development.

How might the changes in the Quebec part of the Restigouche watershed be explained? The settler theme of survival is writ large in Quebec’s resistance to absorption into the Anglo dominated cultures and economies of Canada and the United States. Following the cultural revolution of the 1960s, Quebec embarked upon a legislative program of economic independence and protection and preference for the French language, powered by investment in Hydro Quebec and its massive hydro-generation construction projects. This nationalist agenda further embraced the place that is Quebec when hunting and fishing resources were effectively nationalized by the termination of leases and the creation of ZECs. Insofar as this was accomplished through provincial legislation, it was top-down governance, but it also enjoyed grassroots support.
Within the Matapédia and Patapédia, tributaries of the Restigouche, and their Quebec sub-watersheds, management devolved to the CGRMP. This locally managed organization makes sport fishing available to both resident and non-resident anglers. Multi-day exclusive access is managed through a provincially run annual lottery, while day tickets are available locally at CGRMP offices and by telephone. The fees vary from as little as $40 to several hundred dollars per day for the traditionally best sections, with Quebec residents paying a lower rate than non-residents. A few private fishing camps remain, but these provide accommodation and guiding only. Their right to fish is purchased from the CGRMP. Anglers, resident or non-resident, are not required to hire guides, but they are available, operating as independent service providers. In this way and through the need for accommodation for visiting anglers, local employment is generated, and local businesses benefit from the purchases of visiting anglers.

6.3.1.1 Governance
The shift from privately held leases to locally managed ZECs and, in particular, to local control of the Matapédia and Patapédia rivers through the CGRMP resulted from a concept originating in a department of the provincial government and required provincial legislation and finance, as well as widespread public support and the cooperation of anglers, guides, hoteliers, local businesses, and municipal governments. As such, it must surely be an outstanding example of collaborative governance and natural-resource management (see, for example, Booher & Innes, 2010; Healey et al., 2003; Leach et al. 2002; Nakashima et al., n.d.). Almost two generations since inception, no Quebec interviewee questioned either the existence or the efficacy of the CGRMP. There is, however, one glaring anomaly; namely, the total absence of the government of the Listuguj First Nation, through whose traditional territories these rivers run, in the management of the corporation.

Contrast the literature of English-speaking jurisdictions describing attempts at collaborative governance and natural resources management in such authors as Booher and Innes (2010), Leach, Pelkey and Sabatier (2002), Healey, de Magalhaes, Madanipour and Pendlebury (2003), Nakashima, Gibson and Vodden (n.d.).
6.3.1.2 Learning for Social Change

The achievement of converting sporting leases into ZECs represents a convergence of, in Bourdieu’s terms (as cited in Swartz, 2002), both capitals and fields in such a way as to allow a whole nation, Quebec, to regain control of its sporting capital, while devolving its management and benefits and collaborating at local and provincial levels in the governance of that capital. When the leasing system was seen not to work, it was replaced, resulting in what is now, by the witness of contemporary Matapédia-valley Quebecers, the “taken-for-grantedness” of the corporation. There is no questioning of the existing order.

Within the Quebec sector of the Restigouche watershed there are a number of groups which could be construed as communities of practice. Guides, canoe outfitters, business people, and corporation managers and staff all operate in environments that at least hold the potential for social learning through interaction between themselves and their political, social, and physical environments. Beyond the staff of the corporation, such learning opportunities are entirely informal, with the important exception of the RRWMC, which will be discussed in Section 6.4, below.

Blackmore (2010a), citing Bawden (2010), characterized a social learning system capable of effecting societal change as:

- An organised and coherent group of people
- Collaborating purposefully together to achieve high quality transformations and transactions
- With a deep appreciation of their own integrity
- A keen sense of emergence
- An acute consciousness of their shared perspectives, levels, and states of learning
- As they design and create new and responsible futures together. (p. 203)

This summarizes the intent and, to a large degree, the present practice of the CCRMP.
6.3.1.3 Natural-Resource Management

None of the above analysis utilizing insights from social learning, social capital and governance theories and practices, however, addresses the present crisis in declining salmon stocks, perceived and discussed by interviewees. The CGRMP manages access to salmon fishing. It does not promulgate the regulations controlling fishing, such as seasons, daily and seasonal allowable catches, and the thorny issue of whether it is permissible to kill and keep salmon. This is the jurisdiction of the Quebec provincial government and its Ministère des Resources naturelles et de la Faune (MRNF). It is at this level of governance that doubts about the sustainability of the salmon fishery and of the ways of life it supports were voiced by interviewees. The CGRMP alone cannot guarantee the survival of either. Further research into the degree to which provincial-scale management (MRNF) and local and regional-scale management (ZECs) are able to navigate the treacherous waters between rural prosperity and ecological sustainability is needed.

Specific concerns were (a) a perception that both DFO and MRNF allow politics, rather than science, to dictate their management plans: “Without the right scientific choices, we are going to die;” (b) the unknown and—by their measure—uncontrolled harvest of salmon by the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj, leading to a zero sum game: “When they [the Mi’gmaq] stop killing them, I’ll stop killing them;” and (c) the belief that not allowing anglers to retain any salmon, as was the case during parts of both the 2016 and 2017 seasons, will result in a severe drop in the number who visit and who buy permits from the CGRMP. This last concern was borne out: when no-kill regulations were imposed, permit sales declined significantly.

6.3.1.4 Place

Voden et al. (2015) defined place as “a centre of meaning” (p. 9) Cheng et al (2003) argued, “Natural resource politics is, at a fundamental level, the politics of place [where] meanings and values are to found to be found” (p. 99). Quebec as a whole and those places within it that are managed as ZECs, or by public corporations such as the CGRMP, are not
inert physical container(s) for biophysical objects and human actions. Places are, in and of themselves, social constructs that defy ready definition, categorization, and measurement. Each place has a unique history among its inhabitants and visitors… Each place, then, embodies and gives rise to its own set of political and social processes and, as a result, social and cultural meanings. These processes and meanings are *emergent properties* of particular places. That is, social and political behaviors and place meanings are not discernible by looking solely at biophysical attributes or individual inhabitants of the place; they emerge as the result of the interaction between biophysical attributes and social and political processes. (p. 99)

This insight into the importance of particular places for natural-resource management illuminates the history and present strength of Quebec’s approach to managing its sporting resources and into the successes and strengths of the CGRMP. Cheng et al. (2003) sounded a word of warning and explanation for differences between the Quebec and New Brunswick sides of the “border river”\(^98\) that is the Restigouche: “Meanings assigned to a place are unique to that place and do not readily transfer to other places, even if the biophysical attributes are identical” (p. 99).

### 6.3.2 New-Brunswick Camp Employees

Despite the physical and biological commonality of the watershed, New Brunswick stands in sharp contrast to Quebec. In New Brunswick, the present ownership, leasing, and management regime has evolved directly from the 19th-century colonization of riparian rights by non-resident anglers, changing little in the process, with the consequence that public access to sport fishing is severely limited. (Parenteau, 1998, 2004; Thomas, 2001) On the New Brunswick side of the boundary section of the main Restigouche, on both banks of the Restigouche above its junction with the Patapédia, and throughout almost all of the Upsalquitch and Kedgwick, fishing access is limited to the camps. All but three are privately held and offer no fishing on the open market.\(^99\)

According to Lantz (2012), the camps and clubs provided part-time equivalent

---

\(^98\) A term commonly used by residents of the watershed.

\(^99\) Restigouche River Lodge and Glen Eden are privately owned but advertise fishing in the angling press. Larry’s Gulch is owned by the province of New Brunswick and also offers fishing.
employment for 535 people. Interviews with representatives of camp employees revealed a high level of apprehension as to the future survival of the camps, their continuing employment, and the continuation of their way of life. This understanding was linked to doubts about the survival of the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed. Their fears were justified by the observation by a prominent club member and current scion of a multi-generational camp-owning family at the 2017 New York meeting of camp owners that “our camps are on the edge.” How does the literature reviewed in Chapter 3 help us to explain the self-described fears of this segment of the settler community?

Clearly, in the language of Bourdieu (as cited in Swartz, 2002), the camp employees are keenly aware that “a certain manner of behaviour does not work”, but they feel powerless to change the behaviours that they identify as causing their problem: the viability of the camps in the face of perceived threats to the Atlantic salmon, which draws the camp owners and their guests to the Restigouche.

Listening to camp guides and staff describe their predicament, it becomes tangibly and existentially clear that Bourdieu’s economic, cultural, social and symbolic capitals are “unequally distributed across the social classes” (p. 655). In the competition for limited resources—the salmon—they understand that the “taken-for-grantedness” of the old social world driven by plentiful fish has passed. They represent themselves as being powerless to be agents of the necessary changes: minimal harvest by the net fishers of Listuguj, better forestry practices, predator control, and the high-seas fate of Restigouche salmon.

The one behaviour they have adopted and become strong advocates for is live release by their anglers. Here they have adapted to the exchange of capitals from fish caught and killed to fish caught and released. They have been able to do this, however, only within the limited field of their practices on their own camp owned, or leased, stretches of the rivers, not within the watershed as a whole. Not surprisingly, given the fragility of their economic capital, this change exactly mirrors that of their employers.
It might appear to be difficult to apply Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concept of communities of practice to camp employees. The great majority come from the villages and small settlements of the watershed. Their relationships are often familial as well as local, and although some of the camp managers meet annually, they do not constitute a single group of individuals in regular and open contact, which could enable a process of learning and adaptive change.

However, Wenger did describe a process by which the meaning revealed by camp employees has come to be. Their practice of spending three months (June, July and August) in the camps, participating in and serving the owners and their guests has become embodied and reified into the meaning-giving object of a way of life. This is especially apparent in the skilled role of guides, who handle large freight canoes, know the places where salmon lie and when they might take which of the very many available fly patterns, and are able to assist the sport in playing, landing, and safely releasing the fish. As Wenger described it, the distinction between the public and private aspects of their lives becomes blurred through their interaction: “In this interplay, our experience and our world shape each other through a reciprocal relation that goes to the very essence of who we are” (p. 71). As one guide put it, “It’s my life…. One of the worst days is the last day of the season on the river. Everything is over”

To the extent that these extended families and loosely connected communities might be described as a community of practice, it is very small one. Within their community of practice and in interaction with the angler-conservationist community of practice for whom they work, camp employees have learned to change their practice from catch, kill, and proudly display, to hook, play, and proudly release their fish. To this extent, they have played a role in changing the practices and prejudices of all sport-salmon fishers and in reifying the change through changing fisheries regulations and management. Wenger’s (2010) insight that community emphasizes identity, while networks emphasize

100 By contrast, a Mi’gmaq, when told that a bell is rung to alert camp kitchen staff that guests are ready for the next course, described it as “slavery,” adding that he would never submit to such treatment!
connectivity, explains the link between the strong sense of identity revealed by interviews with camp employees and the limits of their power to achieve networked change beyond mirroring the newly learned practice of their employers. Frustration over their seeming inability to change the practices of the net fishermen of Listuguj or the management practices of DFO reveals the limits of their communities of practice to exercise power outside their own limited worlds and communities.

This inability to effect political change in the management of salmon within and beyond their own watershed is explained in the literature of the Hawkesbury Group (Blackmore, 2010b), which examined the relationships between learning and change from a socially critical perspective. Blackmore’s (2010a) map of the landscape of social learning praxis revealed a continuity of disconnections between his recurring themes and the camp employees’ capacity to achieve goals that would enhance their chances of survival, illuminating their “exasperation at what does not appear to be changing, in spite of what we appear to know” (p. 207). ¹⁰¹

While it is true that camp employees participate in networks of social activities that bind them together,¹⁰² the foundation, according to Farr (2004), of social capital, these activities have not resulted in the accumulation of sufficient of “the democratic goods of sympathy and cooperation” (p. 15). They have been unable to gain influence and political power independently of the angler-conservationist camp owners and guests for whom they work and upon whom they are economically and culturally dependent, to alleviate their vulnerability to a collapse of the sport fishery. Whatever limited social capital they may have is powerless without matching political and economic capital (Perkins et al.,

¹⁰¹ Blackmore (2010a) listed 14 “recurring themes” identified by the contributors to this volume (Blackmore, 2010b), which either enable social learning, or, in their absence, make social learning and praxis difficult or impossible. None of these is operational for the settler communities in their relationships with Listuguj.

¹⁰² These would include their extended families, living as neighbours in the small settlements and villages of the watershed, participation in camp culture and events such as Upsalquitch Appreciation Day, a locally organized spring fair in which residents dependent upon the camps, and therefore the river(s), gather to celebrate the coming season with food and drink, music, displays, renewed acquaintances, and conversation.
2002, p. 47). The literature on social capital as an agent of social change serves to underline the paucity of such capitals among and between camp employees.

Despite what would appear to be a strong social identity among camp employees, their lack of social, political, and economic capital, beyond that exercised by their employers, makes bridging between themselves and the larger settler community and the Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj problematical. The underlying reasons for this will be further explored in Section 4 of this chapter.

6.4 Listuguj First Nation – Revival

The eagles returned “because we are singing our songs again.”

—Listuguj Elder

If the dominant themes revealed in interviews, my persistent presence, meetings, and conversations with sport fishers and settlers were, respectively, conservation and survival, the underlying theme informing the Listuguj Mi’gmaq First Nation is that of revival. This is not to suggest that concern for survival and conservation are absent. Indeed, their millennia-long survival in Gespe’gewaq is a source of pride and strength, as is their survival over the past four centuries of contact, domination, and various forms of suppression by Europeans. They link conservation, expressed in terms of Msi no’kmaq and Netukulimk—“all my relations” and “take only what you need”—to their survival (Denny & Fanning, 2016).103

However, the theme of revival captures both their pride in having survived and the recognition that the revival of their culture, captured in language and the practice of fishing for salmon, is based on their resistance to attempts to suppress both. One interviewee expressed the centrality and importance of their resistance when their village was raided by para-military Quebec police, “‘Where were you when the raid happened?’

103 Denny and Fanning were writing about the Mi’kmaw of Cape Breton, but these phrases capture the values of the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj also.
is the Listuguj equivalent of the American ‘Where were you on 9/11?’” 104 Their repeated calls for better relationships, not mere accommodation, are concrete expressions of their current revivalist mode.105

My grandfather was given five barrels of fish, and they got that land [Pointe-à-la-Croix, immediately adjacent to the Listuguj First Nation]—that’s how they got that land…. we weren’t allowed to fish…. over the years we lost out on a lot of our territory and today we are fighting to regain our territory…. looking into the future for our children and our children’s children…. they’re going to learn how to fish and hunt…. the salmon will come and we will fish. (Listuguj resident respondent)

I’m Mi’gmaq. I speak English. There’s something wrong with this picture…. I grew up Mi’gmaq, living in this community but always felt lost…not having that language, always something missing in my heart…. that was hard…still hard today…. when I look at the mistrust, when I look at what my family went through….knowing people who survived residential schools…. we had our own culture, our own beliefs, our own idea of who a higher power was…. what was wrong with that? When you take a culture, a language away it’s like you are extinguishing [sic] the people…. when we see ‘you have a right to cut, wood, you have a right to [use] these resources’…people have been making money out of [our] resources and only now are Mi’gmaq going out to cut, the same way they [used to] cut…. [there is] a lot of conflict about it [but] we are only accessing the resources now…. for 500 years it has been exploited…. when non-natives see us exercising [our right] they don’t like it…. [there is] fear…. DFO throw a document on the table and say, “This is what you are going to do.” It should be the other way around…. It’s about managing compliance…. [We need] conversation but not at the price of compliance…. we have to have a clearer vision of what we want. (Listuguj resident respondent)

This process of rediscovery of their own identity as Mi’gmaq, with their own beliefs and ways of knowing, conditions rather than precludes relationships outside the community: “We cannot operate in a silo.” Partnerships with organizations such as the Atlantic

104 This event, Migwite’tm, was mentioned by almost all those interviewed and is commemorated annually through ceremony, a river walk, and a feast. It occurred on 11th June 1981.
105 Saul (2014) used the term “comeback” in describing a Canada-wide movement among indigenous peoples. The people of Listuguj are well aware that they are part of that movement.
Salmon Conservation Fund and the RRWMC were cited as being important elements in their revival: “At the end of the day, we all have the same [goal], to protect the salmon” (Listiguj resident respondent).

Any attempt to analyse what the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj said and say about themselves, their place, and the salmon and their relationship to it must be approached with a degree of fear and trepidation. Why? Because the imposition of such conceptual frameworks as social learning, social capital, and natural resources management, among others discussed in Chapter 3 to interpret the meaning of their self-representation runs the danger of cultural domination and assimilation, involving, as it does, the imposition of ways of being (ontologies) and ways of knowing (epistemologies) alien to their culture and witness (Wilson, 2008, among others).

Finlay (2009) has challenged Western academic and professional academic cultures to “become truly ethical [through] the vigorous promotion of Aboriginal pedagogy and knowledge across academic disciplines” (p. xii). Introducing the work of Indigenous scholars addressing the reasons for this challenge, Battiste (2009) asserted that they “represent the thoughts and experiences of the people of the Earth whom Europeans have characterized as primitive, backward, and inferior—the colonized and dominated people of the last five centuries” (p. xvi). She described the “cognitive prisons” of Indigenous Peoples, created by the “cognitive imperialism” that is endemic to the “systemic nature of colonization” (p. xvii). This Eurocentric discourse dominance “led to historical and contemporary immunity to understanding and tolerating Indigenous knowledge” (p. xx). The essays collected in *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* all addressed the “fundamental concept that Indigenous knowledge exists and is a legitimate research issue” (p. xix). This would seem to suggest that Indigenous knowledge should not be scrutinized through the lens of Western ways of knowing and the ontological assumptions of a dominating, colonizing culture. As well, scholars and researchers should “avoid falling into the trap of applying the colonial strategy of difference between worldviews,” used to delegitimize non-Western world views (Henderson, 2009, p. 56).
Of the literature discussed in Chapter 3, that of the concept of intimate epistemology would seem to offer a way out of this dilemma. Lauzon (2012), citing Skolimowski (1994), identified intimate epistemologies as being characterized by “reverential attitudes,” “empathetic imagination,” the “intrinsic value” of the “other,” including their habitat (reified as “nature”) and I-Thou relationships (p. 256ff). Such epistemologies encompass ways of knowing in which the spiritual is re-privileged. This is particularly evident in Listuguj, where, with very few exceptions, all public events are conducted in the context of spiritual exercises. These include some, if not all, of drumming, singing, smudging, the offering of tobacco, prayers of thanksgiving and intercession, talking circles, and sweats. These practices extend to meetings with non-Indigenous people, hosted by LMG and GMRC. Reverential thinking, including an open acknowledgement of dependence upon a Creator, is grounded in such practices and stands in sharp contrast to the absence of any such ceremony in all but a handful of public events in the dominant secularized settler culture. These Indigenous practices were suppressed and outlawed by both church and state in the early part of the colonial period. Their re-introduction is evidence of persistent resistance and the conscious, intentional revival of their own culture. Speaking of her own spiritual teacher, a current Grandmother/spiritual teacher said, “She taught me how our water is so sacred, important to our survival, physically, spiritually, and emotionally.” Describing her relationship to the water, she continued, “

I go down to the water with [a] spirit plate—a little bit of rice, a little bit of berries, a little bit of medicines, a little bit of spring water…. I offer it and I do a ceremony by the water…. [This has] helped me and my family heal.

She is a residential-school survivor. If you offer tobacco before hunting, she said, “the moose will come to you and offer its life.” This reflects the conviction that animals are conscious agents in I-Thou relationships with people. They offer themselves, as opposed to being shot, trapped or netted by human artifice alone. The distinction European culture

106 I have also experienced this to be true in neighbouring Eel River Bar First Nation.
makes between humans and their habitat and its animals, was frequently contradicted in the interviews, in conversation, and in ceremony. Speaking of fishing, one respondent put the relationship this way: “The Creator put everything here for a reason…. We are related to everything the Creator put here. [We] depend on everything. [The] Creator will reward me for doing something that I can feed my family [with].”

Lauzon (2012) further described intimate epistemologies as being iterative, with ongoing learning, through open participation, based on a cycle of action-reflection-action informed by reflection. Again, such a learning cycle was either implied or, in conversation, explicitly cited by Mi’gmaq respondents: “Hear the story. Accept the story. Understand the story. Deepen the story” (Listuguj resident respondent). Wilson (2008) described this process as foundational to Indigenous methodology. He suggested that it provides a model for reconciliation, simultaneously becoming an act of both resistance and of reconciliation. Taken out of the contexts of colonial oppression, resistance, revival, and a hoped-for reconciliation, it finds echoes in Bourdieu’s and Wenger’s understandings of habitus and communities of practice, respectively.

On the other side of the world, Gratani et al. (2016) have described Indigenous ways of being and knowing that parallel those of the Mi’gmaq. They described an ecocentric, as opposed to anthropocentric, set of values to be applied in natural-resources management and listed the five guiding principles that drive the Aboriginal community they studied:

- The environment is important because it is connected with the people, with present and past generations.
- It is important to follow the teaching bestowed from ancestors, so as to respect traditions and take adequate care of the environment.
- We are the environment and the environment is us: we are united and identify with nature.
- Our health and well-being are intimately connected with the environment and dependent on it.
• The environment provides sustenance, in terms of subsistence and wage-based activities, but we need to use it appropriately, and so in sustainable ways. (p. 13)

These Australian Aboriginals believe that they are connected to the environment in what amounts to a symbiotic way:

The river is us! We protect it more and want to protect it more, and we want to make sure that whoever uses this river uses it properly, we want to take few plants and put them back there, come down and stop the damaging of places, because we have sites on the river, we have burials, men’s and women’s places, it’s the connection to us I think. (p. 8)

This desire to protect their environment is grounded in what Gratani et al. (2016) described as “unity and self-identification with nature” (p. 9).

Despite intrusion by settlers, the Listiguj interviewees pointed to their continuing presence on the land and by the waters: “If we have rangers to look after our country, and people can see them, it shows that we are still there, we are not gone!” (Listiguj resident respondent). The witness of the Indigenous population of the Wet Tropics, a Native Title community, is virtually identical to that of the Listuguj Mi’gmaq First Nation, revealed through semi-structured interviews and my presence at formal and informal meetings, ceremonies, and feasts. Both communities see the world from a perspective grounded not in resource extraction but in multi-generational sustainability and an holistic understanding of the place of humans within their environment:

Salmon fishing…gives us power, gives us strength, gives us vitamins, does everything for us…. If the salmon could talk [they would say] “we’ve been through hell”… the salmon are for us, the Creator put them there for us…. we have everything for us…. the best food in the world…. without the white man, we would live to be 200! (Listuguj resident respondent)

These two communities are not alone in the continuing struggle of Indigenous Peoples worldwide for recognition not only of their rights—variously understood by colonial and settler governments, by the United Nations (2008) and by themselves—but also of their world view. As one Mi’gmaq interviewee put it,
We’re not all hocus-pocus bogey men because we have a different language, culture, and ways of thinking. We can enrich the process of management and protection of the resource…. imagine planting those seeds…. where are we going to be in 20 years when we look back?

Henderson (2009) offered the concept of natural contexts of inquiry,

which allow those who move within [them] to discover everything about the world that they can discover…. Such contexts make available to people all the forms of practical collaboration or passionate attachment that they might have well-founded reasons to desire. (p. 256)

For the Mi’gmaq, Henderson argued, it is the natural context that “establishes the vantage point from which they construct their worldview, language, knowledge, and order” (p. 257).

Fred Metallic, of Listuguj Mi’gmaq First Nation has given an articulate voice to the frustration expressed by interviewees and in informal conversation with members of the community. Metallic (2008) argued that,

for our People, as Mi’gmaq, the European methods of inquiry have built a very limited understanding, space, and place for our life ways, knowledge systems, ta’n teliangweiasultieg (ways of governing), and gtplutaqann (laws). Our stories, Mi’gmaq ways of living, can be traced much further back than to Europeans’ arrival to our shores. (p. 61)

Contrasting Mi’gmaq practices with those of European settlers and their descendants, Metallic (2008) wrote,

In Indigenous ways of knowing, teachings and traditions (songs, prayers, stories) are not treated as “sources of information” that can be accumulated for personal gain. Rather, teachings are often shared with the intent and understanding of strengthening our family systems, communities and our nations…. As we travel along in this journey of rebuilding our nations, we often forget what our Elders

107 Metallic, Fred (Gopit) (2008, 2016) and in numerous private discussions and public meetings.
108 The settler population of the Restigouche watershed is still overwhelmingly descended from French and British colonizing settler stock.
have taught us, that the territory is alive and continues to provide all the necessities of life. We need to listen and hear what needs to be done in order to move forward in a healthy and respectful manner. (p. 61)

Emphasizing the primary importance of rivers, for Listuguj, especially the Restigouche River, named by and after them, Metallic (2008) said, in our “struggle to rebuild our nations out of the shadow of colonialism…the rivers [are] their lifelines—to their ancestors and to the future of their children” (p. 62).

Relationships within their territory are central to their way of knowing and of being, which are not to be understood separately. “The land has always taken care of our People…the land is a gift given to us from the Creator. By acknowledging the land in this way, we affirm a relationship with all of its beings” (p. 62). Linking the cyclical nature of their relationship to the land, through “occupation and use of different parts of the territory, at differing times of the year” to governance, Metallic (2008) argued that *ta’n teliangweiasultieg* (governance) in this manner can be seen to be evolving cyclically rather than in a progressive linear path as we humans move to more complex ways of organizing. The understanding behind the cyclical journey is to build relationships along the way, thus strengthening governance capacity” (p. 63).

“Learning to read the environmental text,” Metallic (2008) said, is how they learn and “how we continue to live in accordance with the flux of Creation” (p. 63). The Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche [plamu] provides a guide that “reminds us of the importance of balance and of good order in our relationships with and within ‘*Gm’iginu, our territory*’” (p. 64). Quoting himself, Metallic described the ways in which their relationship to the salmon acts as a guide, providing “balance and good order”:

> We know when the salmon is going to arrive by the changes in the environment…. We know that as soon as the ice leaves the river, the gaqpesaq will flow, then the fiddleheads will blossom, we know that the pqalmawj (black salmon) that have been here all winter spawning are on their way out [to the North Atlantic]. Even though we know that they are ‘‘good eating fish,’ we don’t generally fish those because they are going out to sea, and they will have to come back home at some time. We know that not long after that the big males and females will come. We
don’t generally fish those because they have to spawn…. they have to continue with their life cycle. We know that you have to pay attention to the moon, moon tides, the birds, and the wind. All this has an effect on when the salmon decide to move up river. When the bugs are out in June, and the pugwalesg (swallows)—when they are around in the afternoon and the wind starts picking up: there’s certain times when you know it’s good fishing, you just know. You know that’s an indication: the salmon are on their way in, the salmon are coming. And when the salmon arrives, you know it’s on its way back from Greenland, up in [the] northern Atlantic, so it comes back home, when it arrives back, depending on the size of the salmon you can tell where they are in their cycle, where we are in ours. (p. 64)

For Metallic, “resistance to colonial imposition is very much part of our history,” however, stories “with regard to our rights, the historical injustices of our people, and the struggle to arrive at a just and meaningful relationship between the Mi’gmaq and non-Mi’gmaq settler governments [do] not go far enough” (p. 65). Because the territory is “integral to our knowledge system—our ways of knowing, perceiving, and understanding the world around us,” it is necessary to go beyond resistance to answer the question, “As Mi’gmaq, what do we believe in?” (p. 66)

From his childhood experiences fishing with his family and against the colonial laws barring Mi’gmaq from the river, he learned not only about his “rights and responsibilities to the fish and to the waters” but also that those rights were expressions of an integral and inseparable set of relationships, to the salmon, the waters, the land, and to each other:

I remember fishing with my Uncle Danny’og, my aunt’s husband, Isage’jo’g, and my uncle’s son, Wayne’og, many of them have passed away now. But I remember going fishing and even though we knew there were wardens out there, and people out there who didn’t want us to fish, we never once felt like we had to be afraid of them. I never sensed from them that we ought to be afraid, as though we were doing something wrong. (p. 66)
More than rights are at stake, Metallic argued: “Life ways, *ta’n getu telmimajultieg*, are taught, practiced, and shared from one generation to the next” (p. 67).109

Just as rights cannot be understood outside the contexts of the Mi’gmaq knowledge system, neither can they be separated from the “obligations that need to be respected in order to maintain our relationship—in balance and good order—with the salmon” (p. 67). This finds expression in sharing, “an integral principle of governance,” applied to “fish, moose, money, or teachings… I would ask my mother ‘Wen nuta’mat pamueiwei? Who needs the salmon?’ I understood that we would be sharing and distributing the fish among our relatives” (p. 67).

Noting that the Mi’gmaq language is verb based, Metallic observed,

> It is possible to concentrate on the relationships rather than the objects of our exchanges…. The language emphasises relationships and the processes that are needed in order to live in and with the environment: social, political, spiritual, and physical. From our teachings we learn to consider the many interconnected processes associated with the salmon. Through the salmon it is possible to reconcile, strengthen, maintain, affirm, and build new relationships. Through the salmon, it is possible to balance the diverse roles and responsibilities that are all necessary in order to live with, and to respect, the many gifts of Gm’tginu, our territory. (p. 68)

Offering thanks to the salmon is concomitant with Mi’gmaq life ways, *ta’n getu telmimajultieg*. “In our beliefs,” Metallic wrote,

> the salmon has a life, it is not an object…. We are connected to each other. We live in and from the territory; the salmon, through the water, keeps us connected. The land and the water are no different, just as the salmon and I are no different. (p. 69)

Acknowledging that the Mi’gmaq people of Gespe’gewa’gi discuss issues of self-governance and the validity of their traditional systems of governance, as opposed to the currently imposed colonialist system, together with their environmental concerns over

109 During the course of my research I was privileged to accompany this author, as an “observer”, while he and his teenage daughter tended their nets, sharing from one generation to another.
land and water quality and the need to “listen to and pay attention to what the land is saying,” Metallic has sought to give voice to the salmon, concluding, “If the salmon are to have voice in the dialogue, then we would understand the direction that we need to take in order to arrive at a sustainable form of governance” (p. 70). Governance, the salmon, the people, and their language are conceived to be in an organic relationship. At the heart of the revival of the Mig’maq people of Listuguj lies the re-discovery and rebuilding of these relationships:

In our communities, many are learning the ceremonies for Gm’tginu and all parts of Creation. We need to acknowledge and celebrate the knowledge that the salmon allows us to have. The salmon has taken care of us for so long; this way of life has been passed on for thousands of years. This way of life is sustainable. (p. 70)

Metallic is my Mi’gmaq mentor. He told me that as my research progressed I would reach a point where I would need to ask myself, “How have I come to know what I know?” The implication was that I would come to know about the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj, their history, stories, and culture in ways that cannot be reduced to objective data and were not dependent upon my colonizer’s world view. The implied hope was that I would be freed from my own “cognitive prison,” no longer a prisoner “in the depths of [my] own language” (MacLeod, 2001, n.p.).

This challenge to think in ways beyond our own default conceptual frameworks in order to build our capacity for empathetic imagination looms large for Western researchers rooted in science and social-science modes of thought and understanding. Added to a persisting neo-colonial governmental structure, it makes management of the Atlantic-salmon fishery in a collaborative, or even cooperative, manner a continuing conundrum.

The “catch-22” nature of the researcher’s conundrum is but one side of the paradoxical nature of the management issue facing the LMG. Their own scientific research, conducted by LMG Fisheries staff in co-operation with GMRC, together with their observation of salmon migration and harvests, suggests that there is a problem. Numbers of fish harvested vary from year to year, as they have throughout their memory. However, the observed size and, some suspect, health of fish harvested is feared to be in decline.
These have been recurring themes at the Salmon Summits, organized by GMRC and LMG and held in Listuguj in 2014, 2015, and 2016. There are voices within Listuguj questioning the viability of present harvesting levels: “We’ve come a long way since the ‘80s…. I’ve turned into a conservationist myself…. I don’t fish anymore, not that I can’t…. I feel it so important for the salmon to survive…. if I do a small part.” However, as one community leader put it,

You have to be careful when you say you want to cut back because it has to be a community-driven project…. we want to do the right thing but there’s no price on earth that we will continue being seen as the bad people in this…. so, what we did was [to] organize our own laws in fisheries as being used as examples of how fisheries should work…. unilaterally, as a community [we] decided that we will fish only one side of the river, only five days of the week, from 4 pm. to 8 a.m. [This] passed [the people] with flying colours. [It was] sent to the government, only to be rejected.

Openness to discussion with DFO and representatives of the RRCOA is muted by an historically well-grounded apprehension that new DFO management plans will scapegoat the Listuguj fishery and impinge on their rights under Canadian law. At the same time, implementation of their Listuguj Mi’gmaq fishing law, drafted in 1993 and ratified in 1995, is hindered by the acknowledged limited capacity of their Rangers, by a community reluctance to impose a Western form of regulatory enforcement, and by the presence of multiple actors and influences conspiring to create apparently insurmountable management challenges. These include various levels of governance, including LMG Public Security Directorate, Natural Resources Directorate, and Tribal Council; agreements with the Canadian federal government, and partnerships with other Mi’gmaq communities. These have been summarized as the need to “balance the exercise of the right with the responsibility to manage and protect the resource” but characterized as a “broken basket” (Presentation at Salmon Summit 3, Listuguj, October 6, 2016. Privately communicated to me as a PowerPoint presentation.)

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it is the failure of non-Indigenous stakeholders to engage the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj First Nation on the level of their belief system
that makes implementation of science-based management plans problematic at best: “We can’t always be in a knowing mode. We need to reflect, contemplate, replenish. That is what winter is for.” A contemporary example of the apparent impasse between the urgencies of science-based management and Mi’gmaq ways of being and knowing and the urgencies of Mi’gmaq ways of being is discussed in the next section of this analysis.

6.5 Relationships Between Settlers, Sport Fishers, and the Mi’gmaq People of Listuguj.

“What we have here is a failure to communicate.”


When the Van Horne interprovincial bridge was opened in 1961, linking the communities of Pointe-à-la-Croix, Quebec, and Campbellton, New Brunswick, it provided a faster and higher-capacity transportation link across the mouth of the Restigouche River at the head of Baie des Chaleurs than the ferry it replaced. The bridge also provided an 805-metre-long, landscape-dominating symbol of the human capacity to reshape the physical environment for potential economic and political benefits. As the centenary of Canadian Confederation approached, the perceived principal challenge facing the nation was to build Canada’s resource-based economy. Industrial mills still thrived on both sides of the river, Campbellton was a major CN service centre, and federal policy and popular approaches to Indigenous peoples prioritized assimilation and cultural extinction, not recognition and reconciliation.

Over the next half-century, the bridge brought not only economic benefits but also social and cultural changes and challenges. Today, in 2018, with the revival of Indigenous communities on both sides of the bridge, one might wonder if it might not have been better named “The Listuguj Bridge,” for the Indigenous community that lies at its northern terminus and for the Mi’gmaq name of the river. The once Anglophone city of Campbellton is now, like its province, bilingual: patrons of its downtown Tim Horton’s coffee shop may be heard conversing simultaneously in French and English, and the customers may be seen to include their cross-river neighbours from Listuguj. A bridge
has been crossed. The coffee may be the same, but old conflicts and different ways of understanding their common place and its resources remain. The physical link has not yet brought social and cultural accommodation. “Come-from-away” anglers are rarely seen, preferring the privacy of their camps and, as has been explained, intentionally indifferent to the larger contexts of their sport.

In this section, the literature of symbolism, place, bridging-bonding, and managing systemic change will be discussed as they might apply to what members of the three communities say about themselves and their relations with the other communities and in the ways in which they represent the challenges they face.

6.5.1 Symbolism

The importance of symbolism for the interaction of the settler, Mi’gmaq, and sport-fishing communities has been described in the physical representations of salmon, seen on the streets of Campbellton and Listuguj and in the art displayed in their homes, clubs, and camps by anglers (see Chapter 2). The theory of symbolic interactionism transforms the salmon as a “thing” to a meaning-giving symbol (Turner, 2012).

The meanings ascribed to the salmon as a symbol differ between the communities. For anglers it is a sport fish, carrying all the baggage intimated by the cultural nomination “sport” (Halverson, 2010; Hoffman, 2016). As one angler-conservationist put it, “I fish to feed my soul, not my body.” For the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj the salmon is the chief gift of the Creator, a sentient being with agency and with whom they are in an intimate, I-Thou relationship. The running waters of the river, the returning salmon, and their own practices are timeless and inextricably linked: “As long as the waters run, the salmon will return, and we will fish for them.” For settlers the salmon is a reminder of their past and a hoped-for future prosperity. Referring to fishing on the river, one settler gave it and, by extension the salmon, symbolic meaning: “We all live off the river.... Everybody has a tie to the river.... It has a meaning for everybody…a spiritual place…. The day I can pack the Restigouche River in my suitcase is the day I’ll leave.”
The construction of these meanings out of a shared thing is mediated through different languages (English, French, and Mi’gmaw) and by traditional and Western world views and is interpreted through thought, which is conditional on culture and history.

The ways in which individuals and groups act towards things is, according to Blumer (1986), theorist of social interactionism, based on the meaning things have for them. Between individuals and within groups, social interaction links things to their meaning as symbols and to subsequent actions. When these actions are processed through “fitting together” within societies, by and through repetition, an evolving and stable system of connected actions results. This suggests that there is a logical, self-confirming process through which symbols, such as the salmon, can bond individuals within their own communities, while creating conflicted meanings, identities, and actions between communities. (The effect of symbolic interaction on bonding and bridging is discussed below.)

Symbolic interaction finds complementary support in social learning theory. Bourdieu’s insight that “when a certain manner of behaviour does not work,” learning, resulting in change, occurs (as cited in Lizardo, 2004; Swartz, 2002), suggests support for the symbolic interactional notion that it is the fitting together of things, that creates meaning-laden symbols. Both help in understanding the change in practice from catch and kill to live release among angler-conservationists and the adoption of the salmon as a tourist-attracting identity, as opposed to a renewable natural resource, on the part of settlers, while both groups maintain the salmon as a symbol and source of meaning though a new “fitting together.”

For the Listuguj community to differentiate between “things” and symbols must be problematical since they, the land and waters, their creatures (including the salmon), and the spirits of each are held to exist in an inseparable unity.

The perspective of symbolic interactionism helps to explain why, instead of being an easily accessed symbol of unity and mutual comprehension, the symbolized salmon is experienced in the Restigouche watershed as a source of divisiveness and conflict. In the
words of one Listuguj leader, “We are entangled and need to be untangled and then rewoven.” To reweave would be to fit things together in a new way, giving new meaning to a shared but uncommon symbol and resulting in complementary rather than conflicted actions.

6.5.2 Place

In place, as distinguished from space, which is an abstraction devoid of culturally constructed content, meaning, and identity are inseparable. As Tuan (1977), as cited in Vodden, et al, (2015) put it, “The very definition of a place is that it is a centre of meaning” (p. 9). In this sense, the Restigouche watershed is redolent with meaning for members of all three communities.

The Acadian affirmation of their right to rurality, the fulfilment of Champlain’s dream of a woodland society free from the conflicts of 17th-century Europe, “Notre forêt est-elle la nôtre?” (The forest is ours, isn’t it?), is grounded in their place in the Restigouche watershed. It is older than the Anglophone affirmation of the river as having “a meaning for everybody” and to which “everybody has a tie,” a “place we all live off.” Presence and acculturation together convey the transformation of space to place through the processes of settlement and colonization.

Sport fishers and angler-conservationists expressed a parallel but different construction of place through their use of it. Escape from the perceived pressures of their professional lives in urban environments, creating opportunities for “lightweight goal orientation in a beautiful environment.” “This is something our family does.” These naïve transformations of space into a special place, in which the other is largely absent, with its assumption of entitlement to ownership and control, stand in contrast to both settler and Mi’gmaq senses of place. For the latter, it is, in terms of their relationship to the settler and sport-fishing colonists in their midst, un-ceded. It is a gift from the Creator and therefore inalienable. Their very existence is dependent upon their continuing presence in their territory, for the territory is “integral to our knowledge system—our ways of knowing, perceiving, and understanding the world around us.”
As is apparent from these typical interviewee affirmations of the meaning of their place, the meanings given to the same place differ and, at the level of territoriality, become conflicted in terms of access to and use of the Atlantic salmon. Place, as with symbol, divides the communities more than it unites them, making partner-shipped place as an alternative to top-down governance a step too far (Healey, et al., 2003). Similarly, more recent Canadian experiences of motivating regional collaborative governance through shared places has proved to be problematic because of inertia, lack of prior relationships and understanding between communities, and lack of commitment or a sense of community (Nakashima et al., 2015). If this is the case between culturally and politically similar and geographically contiguous communities situated between British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador, the difficulties inherent in using place as a unifying basis for conflict resolution in the Restigouche watershed, with its diverse cultures and often polarized politics, can be understood to be questionable.

However, Cheng et al. (2003) supported the research and methodology of this dissertation, in which “the meanings people assign to places and connections people form with places” have been sought and described: “Place-based interpretivist research uncovers and brings to the fore these meanings with the goal of enhancing dialogue and deliberation that may not otherwise occur in natural resource decision making” (p. 101). They also acknowledged that a piece of land can give rise to different groups who have different definitions of what is considered ‘appropriate’…. It is not simply the utility of biophysical attributes of the parcel that unites individuals into these groups; they are also united around certain meanings of place. Debates among different social groups must therefore be understood at this more fundamental level. (p. 97)

Further, Cheng et al. (2003) observed, “Every physical setting has multiple layers of meaning.... a number of resource controversies revolve around competing place meanings that are deeply held, vigorously defended and applied in ways that border on religious conviction” (p. 98). They added, “Groups skilled in manipulating place meanings can direct political action and eventual resolution of the controversy in their favor” (p. 98).
This describes both the importance assigned to place by the three communities of the Restigouche and the tensions between them as angler-conservationists and settlers associated with the salmon fishery link their love of place to their conservation agenda, while the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj link their continuing existence to the land and waters of their territory and their continuing and traditional access and use of its resources.

Conflict between the communities over place meanings should not, however, foreclose dialogue between them. The irreducible fact that they share the same geographical space, together with the mutual acknowledgement that each community has found and expresses its identity through the transformation of that space into a value-laden place, can be and, for some, has already become a basis for dialogue.

### 6.5.3 Bonding and Bridging

The social construction of symbols and of place described above (Blumer, 1986; Turner, 2012), in which communities find their identities and give meaning to themselves and to the places they occupy, are components in the processes by which bonding occurs within communities. They are also, as interviewees reported, impediments to the bridging between communities necessary for the resolution of conflict among them. Meaning-laden places, populated by strong symbols, provide the setting in which social capital is accumulated by homogenous communities (Adler and Kwon, 2002; Lollo, n.d.). Burt (1999) pointed to the seeming paradox that where there is strong bonding within groups, insularity and alienation from outsiders inhibits the establishment of bridging relationships. Conversely, those same bridging relationships can occur at the expense of community cohesion. (Perkins, Hughey & Speer, 2002). As was noted in Chapter 3, the three communities of the Restigouche watershed exhibit strongly divergent levels of social, political and, economic capital, and therefore the relative ease or difficulty with which they are able to expend these capitals on bridging.

Davis (2014) discussed trust and conflict within and between social networks, such as those of Listuguj First Nation, camp-owning angler-conservationists, and camp-employed settlers. He differentiated between relational and categorical types of social identity,
applying the first to heterogeneous groups and the second to homogeneous groups. Within the three communities of the Restigouche, Davis’ categories describe personal relationships, where individuals are known to one another as persons within each homogeneous grouping and the objectification of members of the other groups as, for instance, “camp owners” or “Indians,” in the heterogeneous grouping that is made up of all three communities.

Davis (2014) also differentiated between instrumental rationality and non-instrumental rationality. Both are at work within homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings. When exercised within homogenous groups, instrumental rationality enables collective action, while non-instrumental rationality confirms and strengthens the group’s values. Between homogenous groups, as in the heterogeneous grouping made up by the three communities of the Restigouche, instrumental rationality would seek and achieve efficiency, while non-instrumental rationality, would dictate adherence to rules. Given the often-heard complaint, on the parts of both sport fishers and settlers, that the Mi’gmaq salmon fishery is irrational, this kind of analysis provides a helpful counterpoint.

The sport fishers’ and settlers’ resort to accusations of irrational behaviour on the part of Mi’gmaq fishermen and their support by the larger community of Listuguj are further understood in the context of Davis’s citing of Steele’s stigma threat model. Davis wrote,

> Social conflict that materializes in inter-group social stigmatization, such as racial and ethnic slurs and discrimination, manifests itself in inter-personal conflict in the form of an identity-threat. This in turn can result in dissonance reduction actions which can alter social group identification. (p. 11)

Brough et al. (2006) described the destructive effects of stigmatization among Aboriginal and Torres-Strait-Islander peoples in Australia, reducing their capacity to bond internally or to bridge externally. Similarly, First Nations across Canada, including Listuguj, continue to struggle with the impacts of stigmatization, which the research of Brough et al (2006) and the analysis of Davis (2014) suggest affects their capacity to go beyond internal bonding to build trust and to engage other communities. Davis concluded that
contrary to the view that aggregate social capital might grow by somehow extending what motivates people to build bonding social capital and particularized trust, the argument would be that the growth of aggregate social capital depends on extending people’s relational social identity motivations as a basis for the development of generalized trust. (p. 14)

What “relational social-identity motivations” are there for sport fishers, with their conservation-focused agenda, or for camp-employee settlers, with their fear of losing their employment and their identity, or for Listuguj salmon fishers, exercising their traditional and constitutional rights to fish? After five years of interviews, conversations, and presence among members of all three communities, I have uncovered only the barest glimpses of such motivation and that in just one leader from each of the communities. Social capital is invested in strengthening internal bonds, straining the will and capacity to build trust between communities.

However, there remain sets of interpersonal relations that exist between two of these small and contiguous communities of the Restigouche. Sharing, as to some extent they do, schooling, a common space, and anxieties about both their own future and that of the salmon, there exists among a small number of the Listuguj and settler communities the potential for the building of trust based on what Granovetter (1983) described as the strength of weak links. In his analysis, if a single member of a homogenous, bonded group is known to trust a member of another homogenous, bonded group, the group as a whole is inclined to trust that person. Since this can be replicated in the other direction, should both individuals express trust for one another, the two different homogenous groups can build trust despite their heterogeneous nature. Alternatively, a weak link could exist between two other individuals from each of the homogenous groups. Granovetter’s (1983) insight points to the significance of nurturing weak links in and between each community. As noted above, however, the evidence suggests that this dynamic is, as yet, too weak to enable trust-based relationships between the three communities of the Restigouche.
6.5.4 Managing Systemic Change

In 2009, responding to widespread and consistent criticism by salmon conservationists, Fisheries and Oceans Canada unveiled *Canada’s Policy for Conserving Wild Atlantic Salmon* (Fisheries & Oceans Canada, 2009). This was subsequently integrated into a multi-species Sustainable Fisheries Framework, said to be “ecosystem based,” “adaptive,” and “flexible.” (Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 2016.) A fourth key element of the framework is the *precautionary principle*, which “recognizes that in the absence of scientific certainty, conservation measures can and should be taken when there is knowledge of a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the environment and/or resources using best available information” (Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 2018, “Guiding principles, Precautionary Principle”, para. 4). These principles offer the prospect of watershed-based management of salmon stocks. Since watershed-base management is currently perceived by cold-water conservationists to be best practice, DFO’s announcement was enthusiastically received by conservation organizations. They, together with the public were invited to attend consultations and to provide input as the policy is developed, in accordance with DFO’s (2009) stated policy that “resource management decision making has to be shared and undertaken using open and accountable public processes that are collaborative, inclusive, and comprehensive” (“The Wild Atlantic Salmon Conservation Policy – A Snapshot,” para. 2).

A second requirement for implementation of the “Sustainable Fisheries Framework,” the federal *Policy for Conservation of Wild Atlantic Salmon*, and the precautionary approach principle involves sharing of activities. The Department must adopt better cooperative arrangements and agreements with provinces, other government departments, First Nations and other Aboriginal organizations, other stakeholders, and volunteers, collectively, for program delivery. It is clear that DFO cannot do it alone. No matter what DFO’s commitment is to implementing the *Wild Atlantic Salmon Conservation Policy*, success will demand better collaboration with all of the groups and individuals having an interest in wild Atlantic salmon. (DFO, 2009, (“Implementation – ‘Making It All Work’”, para. 4)
In the fall of 2017, as the precautionary, watershed-based management plan approached implementation for the 2018 season, the LMG made strong representations to the Moncton, New Brunswick, office of DFO that they send staff to inform them of the plan. Moncton DFO responded by sending fisheries scientists and managers to Campbellton, where they met with representatives of LMG, who professed themselves not to have been informed by DFO of this impending change in salmon management. The meeting revealed that despite DFO’s expressed commitment to a “collaborative, inclusive and comprehensive” process for developing and implementing policy, this had not happened between the Mi’gmaq community of Listuguj, whose salmon fishery harvest is seen by government as potentially harmful to stocks. It also revealed the admitted incapacity of those representing DFO to engage with the LMG on anything other than a Western, scientific, and objectifying level.

Bedford (2010) observed that the Marshall decision was implemented between DFO and Maritime-Provinces First Nations by Indian and Northern Affairs and DFO together, using the Canadian federal government’s management and governance practices and assumptions, resulting in the continuation of colonialist practices and preventing the adoption of Aboriginal practices of fisheries governance, based on consensus and direct access to resources. The adoption of sport-fishery, angler-conservationist-driven managements plans, such as the precautionary, watershed-based approach under discussion at that meeting, raised the spectre of LMG once again becoming a partner in its own oppression.

Stevenson (2004) warned of the failure of the Canadian government to develop sustainable relationships with Aboriginal communities as a precondition of resource-management planning:

---

110 Representatives of the Restigouche River Watershed Management Council, present at the meeting, expressed surprise at the shortness of time allowed by DFO for their scientific input into the necessary data base for management of the Restigouche watershed salmon. I was present as a guest of LMG.
We have much to learn about developing sustainable relationships with the natural world by empowering Aboriginal peoples to rebuild and apply their systems of management, and the knowledge that informs them. But we must create the space for this to happen. ("Two-Row Wampum Approach," para. 3)

This was clearly not happening in 2018 in the Restigouche watershed, where the November 2017, meeting between DFO and LMG revealed a top-down rolling out of a management plan, made in ignorance of and indifference to Indigenous knowledge and capacity for self-management and governance.

Commenting on the various perceived threats to the survival of the Atlantic salmon, a camp owning respondent said, “What has confounded me is the fact that conservation is a very important factor for the Mi’gmaq and the anglers. What is dividing us is mistrust in this basic element. I do believe that the governments, both Federal and Provincial, are not as caring about conservation. They are much more interested in the typical political scene, which is votes and how to spend money, which is scarce. Very little money gets to the concept of conservation in this area. If we – the camp owners and the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj - could find a way to talk about it, a common language about conservation, I believe we would have a stronger bond and a way to deal with both Federal and Provincial governments and be much stronger in our dealings with them”. The latest encounter between DFO and LMG illustrates the potential for developing an as yet fledgling alliance between LMG and the RRCOA.

In concluding this analysis of the symbolic significance of the salmon, a shared place, social capital, the limits of bonding within and bridging between the three communities of the Restigouche, and the managing of systemic change, the case of “The Restigouche Experience” provides significant insights.

Two older respondents from the settler community spoke to me about their hopes and plans for the erection of a salmon museum on the bank of the river at Campbellton. This project was many years in gestation and was, according to these respondents, in its final form, construed more as a welcome centre for visitors crossing the Inter Provincial Van Horne Bridge than as a museum. This transformation in concept was confirmed to me by
a member of Campbellton’s government shortly before construction was begun. The ensuing “Experience Restigouche” was opened in the spring of 2017. It is owned by the City of Campbellton and monies for its construction came from both Provincial and Federal sources. It is also the registration point for a newly opened park for recreational vehicles. The building is in the style of a nineteenth century upriver fishing camp, derivative in design, of such McKim, Mead and White buildings as the Kedgwick Salmon Lodge and Camp Harmony. The interior provides an atmosphere of hospitality, with a restaurant focused on local cuisine. The museum intent finds expression in a large panel display depicting the river and its famous and private fishing camps and in smaller panel displays of historic fishing tackle and flies. There is a wall devoted to the biology and life cycle of the Atlantic salmon. Sport fishing aside, human presence in the watershed is represented in three smaller panels depicting the Scottish commercial fishery, begun in the late eighteenth century, the French habitants of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and an historicized portrayal of an apparently pre-contact Mi’gmaq village. There is no representation of contemporary human presence! Most importantly, from the perspective of this analysis, there is no mention of the Listuguj First Nation and the fact that visitors to the “Restigouche Experience” are looking directly across the river at this community of two thousand people! The historicizing of Quebec, Acadian and British settler communities, is similarly bemusing.

The failure of the settler communities, represented by the City of Campbellton, to use the design and construction of the “Restigouche Experience” as an opportunity to engage Listuguj First Nation was recognized and discussed by the Restigouche River Camp Owners Association during their July, 2017, Eel River Bar meeting with indigenous leaders and they undertook to lobby the City of Campbellton for greater recognition and participation in the “Restigouche Experience” by Listuguj.111

111 Out of this and a subsequent meeting in New York in early November 2017, I promoted and facilitated the Campbellton/LMG meeting, initially acting on behalf of RRCOA and, at the meeting, as an RRCOA ally of LMG and joint facilitator.
In November of 2017, a meeting was held between representatives of the City of Campbellton and of the LMG. The absence of contemporary representation of Listuguj was discussed and ways of correcting this were reviewed. It was agreed that the film “Plamu”, showing contemporary fishing and conservation practices and posters giving historical timelines and critical events would be made available by LMG for the “Restigouche Experience”. It was also agreed that LMG would be given an opportunity to participate in the hiring of a new director. The need for reconciliation between the two communities was acknowledged and it was agreed to move forward on the agreed initiatives and to meet again. In the event, the city’s consultants recommended that the hiring of the new director be completed without LMG participation. The current status of this initiative remains unclear. As with the contemporaneous dialogue between DFO and LMG, described above, the settler practice is to act first and to consult later, presenting a fait accompli. The invitation to the table comes after the menu has been chosen and the best seats are occupied.
CHAPTER 7 – CONCLUSION

“We shall not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time.”
— From Four Quartets - Little Gidding by T. S. Elliot, 1888-1965

7.1.1 Origin of the Research Project

The exploration described in this dissertation began at a meeting between the author, a Mi’gmaq chief, and his colleague in the unlikely confines of a Fifth Avenue, New York social club. As a fire alarm curtailed the presentation of the visitors from Listuguj First Nation to the RRCOA annual meeting, I wondered if their conflict—over the Listuguj practice of gill netting adult Atlantic salmon at the mouth of the Restigouche River—signaled a gulf between two communities operating out of widely different assumptions about the nature of their worlds, their ways of knowing, their pasts, and their capacities to find meaning and identity through their presence in that place. For me this was the beginning of attempting to hear the voices of the Mi’gmaq of the Restigouche and their settler neighbours.

7.1.2 Research Goal

As stated in Chapter 1, the research goal was first descriptive: to gain an understanding of “what is going on” within and among the three communities in terms of their relationships to the salmon. How does each group construct its own relationship with the salmon and how do they construct and understand the other groups, their relationships with one another, and with the salmon? Second, it was interpretive: how might “what is going on” be understood and used to enhance the chances of survival for the three communities and the Atlantic salmon?

7.1.3 Results
A “thick description” was constructed through a multi-year\textsuperscript{112} process of participatory research, including semi-structured interviews with members of all three communities, frequent and repeated visits to the watershed, presentations of research results to each community (individually, to outside groups, and to meetings where each group was present), participation in formal and informal meetings and in Indigenous ceremonies, nurturing of trust-based relationships in which information and perspectives have been shared, and familiarity with the literature of the watershed’s history and current dynamics.

7.1.4 Commonality of Place, Salmon, and Survival.

The “thick description” revealed that although the three communities share a common place (the Restigouche watershed), a common animal (the Atlantic salmon) and a common threat (namely, to their survival), they remain conflicted. Their commonalities form an insufficient basis for agreement as to best practice for interacting with the salmon; namely, live release or an inherent and rights-based gill-net fishery for food.

The intractability of this conflict is grounded, on the one hand, in a history of exclusion of Listuguj Mi’gmaq from the fishery, linked to systemic attempts to eradicate their culture and, on the other, to a history of privileged access for riparian owning and leasing sport fishers. Concomitantly, those non-Indigenous residents who remain connected to the salmon fishery have been marginalized by severely limited access\textsuperscript{113}, or are economically and existentially dependent on their employers, the camp owners. Other non-Indigenous residents, in the region’s largest town, are increasingly economically dependent upon Listuguj First Nation, effectively neutralizing whatever opinions they might have about the Listuguj gill-net fishery. Still others are indirect beneficiaries of the multi-million-dollar seasonal boost the camps provide for the watershed’s economy.

\textsuperscript{112} The researcher’s exposure to both the camp owners and members of the Listuguj First Nation began over a decade ago. Active, intentional, participatory research began in 2013 and continues today, in 2018.\textsuperscript{113} The Quebec parts of the watershed represent an exception to this.
Even more intractably, contrasting—and to a large extent exclusive—world views make dialogue problematic, at best. I have characterized these as scientific and intimate ways of knowing and understanding. When management and conservation agendas and strategies are based on the first, the task becomes conservation, sometimes expressed as “to save the salmon.” Valuable though the salmon is, it remains an object amenable to human manipulation and control. Governments, researchers, managers, and sport fishers define themselves as agents in a quasi-evangelical struggle, which pits them against Indigenous people, for whom the very idea of humans “saving” salmon is logical nonsense and moral anathema. Their intimate epistemologies and spiritually based ontologies give agency to the salmon as well as to themselves. Far from being in a position of control, they express frustration over unacknowledged past and present injuries to themselves and the salmon and a refusal on the part of the other communities to acknowledge complicity in these injuries and a failure to nurture empathetic and integrative relationships between their peoples and the created world.

CONCLUSION. Commonality of place, an animal, and issues of survival form an insufficient basis for resolution of the conflict because all three are experienced and understood in different and conflicted ways.

7.1.5 Social Learning and Social Capital

Theories of social learning (Blackmore, 2010b; Bourdieu, as cited in Swartz, 2002), Lave and Wenger, 1999, Wenger 2010) and social capital (Farr (2004), Portes (1998) and Lollo (nd), were explored in relation to the three communities. There appears to be a strong correlation between social capital and the capacity for social learning for change.

The relative ease with which the sport-fishing community has been able, within a generation, to move from a practice of catch and kill to live release, exhibiting a learning response to “a certain manner of behavior [that] does not work” (Bourdieu, as cited in Swartz, 2002) exemplifies the necessity for and pre-existence of constituent factors of social capital, such as high levels of social status, economic means, education, mobility,
contacts and influence with governments, leadership and participation in non-governmental conservation organizations, and articulate advocacy.

By contrast, the non-Indigenous communities of the watershed have been forced by top-down government closure of the commercial fishery and declining economic opportunities in industries, principally forestry, to accept change in their ways of life, both rural and urban. Tourism is the present best hope. For the minority who continue to be invested in the Atlantic salmon through employment in the camps, their learning leading to vigorous support for the changed practice of live release reflects their dependence upon the sport-fishing community.\(^{114}\)

The Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj report and continue to emphasize in their discourse and in their public celebrations and ceremonies, the centrality of Migwite’tm, “the event that strengthened our community”\(^{115}\), in their revival and renewal. This event preceded the affirmation of Indigenous fishing rights in \(R v \text{ Marshall}, 1999\) 3 S.C.R. 456, \(R v \text{ Marshall}, 1999\) 3 S.C.R. 533 and \(R v \text{ Sparrow}, 1990\) 1 SCR 1075, by the Supreme Court of Canada. Migwite’tm can be understood as a response to “a certain manner of behavior [that] does not work” (Bourdieu, as cited in Swartz, 2002) and therefore an example of social learning. Nevertheless, there is evidence that social capital, as understood by Western theorists, is limited. The continuing effects of residential schools, ongoing racism, fractious and confrontational relations with governments, and a “broken basket” of institutional incapacities continue to hamper the possibility of finding community commonality for fishing management and practice.

**CONCLUSION.** All three communities evidence social learning for change and survival but are strongly contrasted in social capital. Neither concept is easily, or appropriately, applied to Mi’gmaq culture.

\(^{114}\) Again, the exception to this is in the Quebec parts of the watershed.

7.1.6 Governance and Natural Resource Management

While there are myriad models of place-based governance and management (Bavington, 2010; Booher & Innes, 2010; Cona & Hubacek, 2010; Healey et al., 2003; Leach et al., 2002; Pahl-Wostl & Hare, 2004; Prell, et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2013), collaboration between stakeholders for sustainability and resilience, community, and place-based governance and management have yet to be incorporated into government of Canada–First Nations governance. In terms of Listuguj First Nation and DFO, the latest, initiative for conservation of the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche, the precautionary approach, was presented to LMG in 2017, in the word of one DFO staffer, “regardless” of LMG knowledge or position.

CONCLUSION. Top-down management, described by a Mi’gmaq respondent as “managing compliance” persists, as, therefore, does resistance.

7.1.7 Dialogue and Relationships

A theme consistently expressed by members of all three communities throughout the research has been the need for dialogue and the building of relationships. Response to this need began before the research began and has continued throughout it. It has taken two main forms: co-operative research and joint conferences.

7.1.7.1 Research Scientist

GMRC and LMG have cooperated with RWMC, of which they are members, through the cross-appointment and funding of a resident research scientist, who directed and coordinated the research work of all three agencies. This individual is herself a lifelong resident of the watershed, fluently bilingual in French and English, whose work colleagues are predominantly Mi’gmaq. She embodies both bridging and bonding between and within multiple communities and now works for GMRC, while maintaining her relationships with LMG and the RRWMC.
7.1.7.2 Salmon Summits
These conferences were originally sponsored by GMRC and supported by LMG and by RRWMC and its staff. Attendees have included members of LMG; Mi’gmawei Mawiomi Secretariat; scientists and managers from DFO and New Brunswick Fisheries and Wildlife, CGRMP and of the Matapédia upriver-water conservation group, Organisme de bassin versant Matapédia-Restigouche (but not the provincial government of Quebec), representatives of camp owners and resident sport fishers, salmon conservation non-governmental organizations, and members of Eel River Bar First Nation. Participants met in 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2018 to discuss stock assessment, habitat conditions, and restoration, research, and relations between the communities. This has contributed to ongoing dialogue and the building of personal relationships of increasing trust116.

7.1.7.3 RRCOA and LMG
A third form of dialogue and relationship building has, during this research, taken place where it began, namely between the camp owners and LMG. This has taken the form of the researcher’s presence in the watershed for interviews, follow-ups, informal conversations, presentations to both communities, and as an ongoing person of contact between the two. This resulted in the first meeting of members of the RRCOA and Mi’gmaq people in the Gespe’gewaq territory, at a July 2017, event conducted according to Indigenous protocols. Agreements to continue the dialogue and to seek concrete actions towards the formation of an alliance were acted on in the summer of 2018, with a second meeting held at Experience Restigouche and a subsequent gathering late in 2018 to assist the City of Campbellton in assisting Experience Restigouche in the telling of Mi’gmaq presence and their story.

116 This was evidenced at the February 2018 Summit, when the topic was the human dimension of natural resource management and the process was designed to enhance dialogue, trust, and the building of relationships.
7.1.7.4 Bridging and Bonding

The literature of relationships between unequal and conflicted communities has revealed the risks involved for individuals whose identity is grounded in the bonds they have within their own community when they seek to be bridges between communities (Burt, 1999, as cited in Perkins et al., 2012; Davis, 2014; Perkins et al., 2012). The process of stepping outside one’s own community to find a degree of commonality with those of another community brings into question one’s continuing identity within their own community. So far, to do so is a bridge too far for most members of the settler and Indigenous communities and a challenge for non-resident sport fishers unfamiliar with the complexities of the history and cultures whose lands and waters they enjoy for “lightweight goal orientation in a beautiful environment” (Camp-owning angler).

CONCLUSION. Cooperation between local non-governmental organizations, RRWMC, GMRC, and LMG is embodied in a cross-appointed research scientist and her collaborators, reinforced by ongoing dialogue at annual Salmon Summits and between RRCOA and LMG. Issues of bridging and bonding continue to limit dialogue to community leaders.

7.1.8 Domain, Identity, and Harvest:

Despite ongoing attempts to build relationships and increase dialogue between the three communities, accommodation based solely on the salmon—understood as resource by sports fishers, Canadian governments, and most settlers and understood as synonymous with their existence by Mi’gmaq—remains problematic because

- Maintaining the practice of gill-net fishing is an expression of the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj’s survival, revival, and renewal of their culture and refusal to be assimilated.
- The Listuguj inherent fishery is an expression of presence, as much as an exercise of a right.
- The Listuguj fishery establishes the mouth of the Restigouche as their place of power, giving them a seat at the table and a voice in present and future negotiations over
other fisheries, territorial claims, and an as-yet-undetermined treaty relationship with Canada and their immediate neighbours.

- Full acknowledgement of their presence, past and present injustices, present unresolved conflicts over territory, legal frameworks, and self-government are all understood to be dependent upon the continuation of the Listuguj fishery. To abandon it would be to concede both their power and their identity.

CONCLUSION. The Listuguj salmon fishery cannot be isolated from the larger context of Mi’gmaq presence and power to survive.

7.1.9 Present State of the Research: Where We Are Now.

In April 2018, a decade after the beginning of the research project, I interviewed three principal contacts, two of whom had been present at the RRCOA in Manhattan in 2007, from the communities of the Restigouche watershed. They reflected not the end of a journey but a waypoint revealing changes in which all three communities understand and approach their relations with one another and with the Atlantic salmon. Insofar as the research topic is by its nature subject to change and is iterative, they provide insights beyond those provided by the interviews conducted in 2014 and 2015 and are further evidence of the evolving nature of the various dialogues that are in progress within and between the communities.

The cross-cultural participatory-action nature of the research is reflected in these interviews with these principal contacts, with whom I have worked over the duration of the project, none more clearly than in the way in which I have been described by my Mi’gmaq mentor, as being “embedded in interacting realms.” The importance of the role of the participatory researcher has been confirmed by my principal contact in the sport-fishing, angler-conservationist community when he says I have the respect of the effective representative of the Listuguj Mi’gmaq community: “You can have a conversation about important issues without a wall going up between the two of you.”
7.1.9.1 Listuguj Principal Contact

When asked to identify what has come out of the dialogue between LMG and the RRCOA, my Mi’gmaq mentor pointed to my role as researcher and to my education over the course of the research:

The way you defined the problem and conducted the research process meant that you learned how to come into communities and the challenges that brings. You learned that the transformation needed at the societal level applies at the micro, community level.

When asked to identify where changed had occurred, he focused again on my role and conduct as a researcher. By being present over a protracted period of time, “there has been an influence on how research needs to be conducted. Being embedded in relationships enables our being able to do a better job of protecting research.” The research project has allowed me to “enter a conversation,” to “become knowledgeable” and “skillful at navigating between groups.” I am “trained as an apprentice.” I am not a “knower” but “a part of the community,” able to act as “the runner” between Listuguj and the other communities. This was done “not to elevate me but to stand me up to speak appropriately.” The purpose of my presence and education has not been to “make me into a knower,” as in the Western understanding of the researcher, but “to meet people with other ways of knowing and being” and, through my embeddedness in “interacting realms,” to “counter only one-way relationships.”

For Dr. Fred Metallic, speaking for Listuguj, its government, and its people, the research, its appropriate conduct, and the change it has brought to the researcher, are the principal hoped-for outcomes.

- Resolution of presumed conflicts between his own people, their salmon fishery, and its practices and the sport-fishing, angler-conservationist community, principally represented by camp owners, follows from right research enabling right relationships.
7.1.9.2 Principal Sport-Fishing, Angler-Conservationist Contact

Reflecting the conservationist agenda of anglers, the remarks of the principal sport-fishing, angler-conservationist contact in response to the question “What has come out of the dialogue between the RRCOA and LMG?” was “Nothing material.” He was referring to his perception that neither of the non-Indigenous communities, sport fishing and settler, had observed “any kind of restraint” in the Listuguj fishery. This is consistent with the position of LMG that their fishery and its practices are subject, if they are subject to anything, only to government-to-government (LMG-DFO) agreements and not to the wishes of groups such as the RRCOA or the RRWMC. While acknowledging the “research has given texture and context to these tensions,” he added, “but I do not see that we have created a different place. Unfortunately, the differences are pretty stark, and the fact is that there is no change in the practices of Listuguj” or in their understanding of “our position.”

However, the process by which the agenda is changing from a focus on changed practices leading to empirical conservation of the salmon stock to mutual understanding and the building of relationships was acknowledged: “It has been and is a very difficult effort. We knew it would be slow and time-consuming. Trying to understand one another’s cultures is part of the battle of reaching understanding of how to manage the resource. It has been helpful but not ground breaking at this stage. It takes forever. There is a big gap [in our] learning.”

Commenting on the first-ever meeting between anglers and Mi’gmaq representatives of Gespe’gewaq, held in the summer of 2017, he said, “People were appreciative of the effort, of time spent with us, of the openness and the opportunity to talk [and the] familiarity. [It was] revealing.... [We are] all human beings, but attitudes have not changed significantly.” While “there is appreciation of time spent learning a little bit about each other, beyond that there still is a big gap.... differences are stark.” However, he acknowledged, “relationships have changed.... divisions have disappeared a bit [and] we are in a better place than we have been.... The gathering gave us a chance to “get it out in the talking.”
When asked “How will dialogue will make for change?” his response was, “Talking is all good.” “If we can agree that salmon are our common interest [we] ought to be able to come up with what is it that the communities can do to ensure the future of the salmon.” However, “we are just at the edge of it. [We are] not really getting into anything that would be that helpful.” Again, this reflects the conservationist conviction that Restigouche salmon stocks are declining, threatening both the future of the sport fishery and the Listuguj fishery, and that it makes biological sense to limit the Listuguj harvest.

Acknowledging that what “Indigenous people hear from us is, ‘It’s all your fault,’” he repeatedly asked, “What can we do?” and “How can anglers support and create a better outcome?” Confronted with the fact that the Listuguj salmon fishery is just one part of the larger issue of resolving Mi’gmaq relations with settler communities and the provincial and federal governments, he noted that the “RRCOA has little power” and asked, “What is the way to handle this? I don’t think anyone has the answer.” However, his conclusion echoed the responses of Metallic and the Mi’gmaq perspective on building relations between the communities, in which I, as the researcher play a crucial role:

It is a process. We are certainly not at the end. I don’t even know if we are the beginning…. I think all of it is really because of you. Your willingness to understand these differences and trying to express them so that we get it out on the table. It is at the very heart of coming to anything of benefit to the three parties here.

7.1.9.3 Principal Settler Contact

The responses of a principal contact from the settler community were in stark contrast to those of either the Mi’gmaq or angler-conservationist respondent. He cited specific, concrete actions and events that have resulted from “various dialogues between the communities.” Each has been the result of the work of the RRWMC, in conjunction with its Indigenous partners:

- The appointment and work of the cross-appointed (GMRC, RRWMC and LMG) science director, encompassing ongoing bicultural work on both salmon and other
species stock and habitat assessment, resulting in capacity building and involvement of an Indigenous science crew in GMRC, LMG and RRWMC joint science program.

- Four Salmon Summits in Listuguj with “great dialogue between fisheries staff and other local groups and government representatives…. newcomers are impressed by lack of friction” as they “join the family.”
- A first Salmon Summit at Eel River Bar First Nation in 2017.
- The first-ever meeting of representatives of the RRCOA and Listuguj and Eel River Bar First Nations on Indigenous territory and using Indigenous protocols and ceremonies.
- The contribution of LMG to a joint LMG-DFO guardian program at the Kedgwick Forks pool, including personnel and $5,000 of a $40,000 budget.
- Involvement of four Indigenous women in the fall spawning count conducted by RRWMC.
- The Harmony Project., which teams 10-year-old children from the Listuguj school with their non-Indigenous watershed peers in tree planting.

He also pointed to changes in relationships, principally “integration of new people appointed by participating NGOs and governments in the dialogue,” citing the Salmon Summit of February 2018, where “new people were welcomed easily into the dialogue.” The signing of the salmon fisheries agreement between LMG and DFO before the opening of the 2018 season was also cited as a positive change.

However, acknowledging the parallel with DFO’s priorities, the Listuguj salmon fishery is not a priority in comparison to their commercial snow crab and lobster fisheries.

Elements of the puzzle still missing focused on gaps and misunderstandings between Listuguj fishermen and community members and Listuguj fishery staff—the broken basket to be fixed and “the different decision-making levels” within LMG. Similarly, there needs to be “better understanding of the Listuguj Rangers program’s importance on the part of the Listuguj Public Safety department.”
These issues are being addressed in the short term by a new committee made up of Listuguj Elders and salmon fishers, charged with addressing the gap between the salmon laws and policies of LMG and Band Council and the practices of the fishers. For the longer term, the settler contact expressed optimism based on the presence of younger people in positions of leadership in LMG Fisheries.

The final three observations of the principal settler contact summarized three types of unresolved conflict between the Listuguj First Nation and the settler and sport-fishing communities: economic, governance-related, and ideological (ways of knowing and being). He suggested that there needed to be more Indigenous employees in the sport-fishing industry, joint LMG-Ranger and DFO patrols on the river, and management decision-making that encompasses the “true implications of Mi’gmaq ecological knowledge.” Specifically, how should this knowledge be incorporated into the soon-to-be implemented precautionary approach to salmon management.

7.1.9.4 Conclusion

From the above interviews it can be seen that although there has been no change in the practice of the Listuguj salmon fishery, there has been a change in the level and quality of relationships between representatives of the three communities and within the three communities. Some of this is attributed by the Listuguj and angler-conservationist contacts to the presence of the participatory researcher. More of it is attributed to the ongoing work of the RRWMC, (of which the RRCOA is an active member), LMG, and GMRC.

- Social learning and accumulation of social capital are enabling bridging between bonded communities to address the appropriate ways of being in relationship with one another and with their common icon, the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed.
CHAPTER 8 – CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE, THEORY, AND PRACTICE

This is the first and only study of the relationships between the original people of the Restigouche watershed, the Mi’gmaq of Listuguj, Gespe’gewa’q; resident settlers of European ancestry with their two languages and three governments, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Canada; and non-resident land and riparian-rights owners and leasees, as they relate to the culturally and economically dominant, but declining, fish, the Atlantic salmon and to each other.

The theoretical literature examined in Chapter 3 was used to provide structure for the framework guiding the research project. Chapter 4, “Analysis,” describes linkages between what I discovered to be “what is going on” and the theories used to build the framework. In this way social processes, including social learning and social capital, bridging and bonding, NRM paradigms, symbolism and the centrality of place were described, understood and linked to grounded experience, described in Chapter 5, “Results”, within and between the three communities. The case examined and described is small, but nevertheless stands within the larger contexts of rapidly developing social, political, and legal understandings of the relationships between Indigenous peoples and the Government of Canada and non-Indigenous citizens. In this sense it provides insights into the current discourse among them, while falling short of providing a general explanation, covering the width of these relationships.

It is an example of research centred around the human, sociological dimensions of conflict over a “resource” expanding the literature of natural-resource management. It has the additional and vital element of a strong and apprehensible cultural conflict, which it reveals through rich description of the three communities. Most important, it attempts to answer Finlay’s challenge to Western academic and professional academic cultures to
“become truly ethical” through “the vigorous promotion of Aboriginal pedagogy and knowledge across academic disciplines” (Finlay, 2009. p. xii).  

- The presence of a known, self-identified, and identifiable participatory researcher in all three communities has acted as a catalyst for contact, dialogue, strategies, and trust-based alliances between elements of all three communities. The researcher’s articulation and representation of the salmon as not only a resource, commercial or sport, but also as a symbol shared by all three communities, and as a spirit-endowed being, has engendered a new level of mutual understanding and discourse. Improved intercommunity understandings such as this may result in benefits to the salmon supported by all three communities. Given the multitude of unresolved conflicts between settlers, their governments, and Indigenous Peoples across Canada and around the world, it contributes to a growing discourse in which resolution may be tempered by deepening understandings, justice and reconciliation.

---

CHAPTER 9 – LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

9.1 Limitations of the Research

The principal limitations of this research have been its focus on the sport-fishing community, as represented by camp owners and their guests, within the New-Brunswick parts of the watershed. As has been noted, Quebec has an entirely different management regime for its principal branch of the Restigouche, the Matapédia and for the Patapédia. There are significant differences in the upriver culture of its settler community from that of New Brunswick and Campbellton. Furthermore, non-resident anglers in Quebec largely represent a different socio-economic group from that of the New-Brunswick camp-owning group. As well, although they were acknowledged, this research did not focus on New Brunswick–resident anglers who avail themselves of the limited amount of Crown Water, both open and reserved. More could be learned about their perspectives on the preservation of the salmon, access to fishing, and relationships with both Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents.

No interviews were conducted with current employees of the Canadian (DFO), New Brunswick (Fisheries and Wildlife), or Quebec governments. This was intentional because no DFO managers or scientists were based in the watershed. Further, during the Harper government, 2006-2015, DFO employees were prevented from communicating directly with the public. During the research, however, I had many opportunities to talk informally with government fisheries managers and scientists and to hear their presentations on stock assessments, habitat renewal, and risks to the salmon. I also had access to DFO public communications. Interviews were conducted with retired employees of DFO and New Brunswick Fisheries and Wildlife.

9.2 Further Research

This research would neither have begun nor been possible without the permission of the Listuguj First Nation. The cooperation, personal support, counsel, and sharing of Mi’gmaq knowledge afforded by the Listuguj First Nation government, its chiefs, council
members, and staff, lie at its heart. That engagement is itself reflective of a Mi’gmaq value: collaborative, grounded, participatory research is understood as an agent-catalyst for future understanding and change. This mirrors Indigenous methodology, rooted as it is in a relationship-based praxis (Wilson, 2008). The research belongs to the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj and will continue to be shared with them.

They, together with the RRCOA and the RRWMC, have encouraged me to continue to be an active participant in their common life, as they continue to seek various forms of presence for survival within their common place for their benefit and for that of the Atlantic salmon. Reconciliation and survival are iterative. The work of telling a new, deeper, more inclusive story goes on.
REFERENCES


Denny, S. K., & Fanning, L. M. (2016). A Mi’kmaw perspective on advancing salmon governance in Nova Scotia, Canada: Setting the stage for collaborative co-


R v Sparrow, 1990 1 SCR 1075.


Wilson, E. O. (n.d.). We should preserve every scrap of biodiversity as priceless …” Retrieved from http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/e/eowilson164833.html#qw7Ry3brOMdsztED.99


APPENDICES
Appendix A


The Sparrow Decision
In 1990, the Supreme Court of Canada issued a landmark ruling in the Sparrow decision. This decision found that the Musqueam First Nation has an Aboriginal right to fish for food, social and ceremonial purposes. The Supreme Court found that where an Aboriginal group has a right to fish for food, social and ceremonial purposes, it takes priority, after conservation, over other uses of the resource. The Supreme Court also indicated the importance of consulting with Aboriginal groups when their fishing rights might be affected. “Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy”. Fisheries and Oceans Canada. www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca.

The Marshall Decision
In August 1993, Donald Marshall jr., a member of the Membertou First Nation, was stopped for fishing in Pomquet Harbour in Antigonish County, Nova Scotia, and his equipment was seized. Marshall caught 210 kilograms of eels, which he sold for $787.10 and was then charged with fishing without a licence, selling eels without a licence and fishing during a closed season. He claimed he was allowed to catch and sell fish by virtue of a treaty signed with the British Crown. Marshall said he was catching and trading fish just as the Mi'kmaq people had done since Europeans first visited the coast of what is now Nova Scotia in the 16th century.

In September 1999, the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed that Donald Marshall Jr. had a treaty right to catch and sell fish. The Court found that Mi'kmaq and Maliseet people on the East Coast continue to have treaty rights to hunt, fish and gather to earn a moderate livelihood. These rights flow from the Peace and Friendship Treaties signed in 1760 and 1761 between the British Crown and the ancestors of the Mi'kmaq and Maliseet. As the Supreme Court described it, earning a "moderate livelihood" didn't mean an open-ended accumulation of wealth, rather it was securing the "necessaries." Further, the Supreme Court noted that these treaty rights are held by the community as a
This is because the treaties were negotiated by groups of Aboriginal peoples, not by individuals.

On November 17, 1999, the Supreme Court provided further clarification of its first ruling. The Court stated that Mi'kmaq and Maliseet treaty rights were not unlimited and the fishery could be regulated, including Aboriginal fishing activities. This means regulations can be introduced, if they can be justified for conservation or other important public objectives.

The Supreme Court also stated that the "gathering" referred to in the September judgment was not meant to include logging, minerals or offshore natural gas deposits, but that Aboriginal groups could continue to present these arguments in other court cases. There are 34 Mi'kmaq and Maliseet First Nations in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and the Gaspé region of Quebec who are potentially affected by the Marshall decision.

Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. www.aand-aand.gc.ca
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Appendix C

Letter of Introduction to Potential Interviewees from the Sport-Fishing/Angling Community

Letterhead of Principal Sponsor

Date

Dear:

I am writing to introduce you to a project aimed at conserving the salmon of the Restigouche watershed.

You will be hearing soon from Stephen Booth, who will be seeking your assistance in understanding what has and is going on in terms of your fishing experience, as well as your knowledge of the fishery conducted by the M’gmaq people of Listuguj and of the non-indigenous residents, whom you employ and encounter on your visits.

Stephen, who has fished the Upsalquitch for over twenty years, has recently retired and now has the opportunity to explore issues of the connections between culture, community and conservation. He is a doctoral candidate in Rural Studies at the University of Guelph, where his research is specific to the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed and its three communities, namely, the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj, the non-indigenous residents and those of us who constitute the non-resident sport fishing community.

It is in your role as a member of the sport fishing community that he would like your assistance. Might it be possible for him to meet with you, for a period of one to two hours, within the next few months to hear your reflections on these issues?

The results of his conversations with other camp owners, sport fishers, residents and the Mi’gmaq people of Listuguj will be shared among all participants in the research and you will have the opportunity to correct, or add to, Stephen’s account of your reflections as
you choose to continue, before he completes his thesis. Your comments will, of course, be confidential, unless you advise him otherwise.

You may reach Stephen at sbooth01@uoguelph.ca, or 902-275-2375. Alternatively he will contact you in the near future.

Sincerely,

XXX
Appendix D

Letter of Introduction Addressed to Members of the Settler Community

Letterhead (University of Guelph)

Date

Dear :  

I am writing to you at the suggestion of xxx, who has suggested that your knowledge and experience of the Atlantic salmon, the Restigouche watershed and its people will be of help to me in understanding what has and is going on in terms of both the fish and those for whom it holds value and meaning.

Your participation will help me to explore the cultural and community contexts of conservation, the subject of research I am conducting through the University of Guelph, where I am a doctoral candidate in Rural Studies. My research is specific to the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed and its three communities, namely, the Mi`kmaq people of Listuguj, the non-indigenous residents and the non-resident sport fishing community.

It is in your role as a resident of the watershed that I would like your assistance. Might it be possible for me to meet with you, at a place and time of your choosing, for a period of one to two hours, (within the next few months) to hear your reflections on the Restigouche and its salmon?

The results of my conversations with camp owners, sport fishers, residents and the Listuguı́ will be shared among all participants in the research and you will have the opportunity to correct, or add to, your reflections as you choose to continue, before I complete my final report. While your participation will be much appreciated, you will, of course, be able to withdraw from the research at any point and to have the information
you have provided discarded and withdrawn from the research results. Your comments will, of course, be confidential, unless you advise me otherwise.

I shall be contacting you shortly, or alternatively, should you wish, I may be reached at 902-275-2375, or sbooth01@uoguelph.ca.

Sincerely,

Stephen Paul Booth

Prof John FitzGibbon,

902-275-2375

Academic Advisor

sbooth01@uoguelph.ca
Appendix E

Oral Consent Form

Oral Consent Script for research – “Troubled Waters: The Restigouche, its Salmon and its People.” Stephen Booth, graduate student researcher, for the University of Guelph REB. To be used at the time of the initial interview and at all subsequent interviews with members of the non-resident sport fishing community and with the non-indigenous resident community.

Researcher:

Did you receive and have the chance to read the Letter of Introduction, explaining the research I am undertaking and your part in it?

Respondent:

Yes. (If not, researcher gives the respondent time to read the letter.)

Researcher:

Do you have any question you would like to ask me?

Respondent:

Yes…followed by questions, or No.

Researcher:

As I have stated in the Letter of Introduction, I am here to seek your assistance in understanding your experience and practices in regard to the Atlantic salmon of the Restigouche watershed. Do you consent to having our conversation recorded and to my use of it for the purposes of the research?

Respondent:

Yes. (If not, the respondent is not interviewed and there is no record of the meeting.)
Researcher:

You should know that, unless you say otherwise the information you provide will be confidential. There are a number of others (sport fishers/non-indigenous residents and Mi’kmaw from Listuguj) participating in this research. Your and their responses will be gathered together into single accounts for each community, without identification of the individuals who participated, unless they have consented to be identified both directly and indirectly.

You should also know that you may withdraw at any time and for any reason, without explanation and that whatever information you have already given will be destroyed and not included in the research.

I shall ask you to read and to respond to the transcript I shall make of this conversation. You will be able to correct it, delete any parts you do not want me to use and to add to it. You will also receive the compound narrative I shall make from the conversations I have had with members of your community. You will also receive the accounts I receive from the sport fishing community and the Listuguj community, subject to their approval.

Of course, you may decline to respond to any particular questions that may arise. May we begin?

Respondent.

Yes. Begin interview. No. Thank the respondent and withdraw.
Appendix F

Consent Form

I ____________________________ do give my consent to:

a. The sound recording of this interview for the purposes described in the Letter of Introduction, which I have received and read, describing the research being conducted by Stephen Booth, and explaining my part in it.

b. I understand that, unless I say otherwise, the information I am providing will be confidential.

c. I understand that I may withdraw at any time and for any reason, without explanation and that whatever information I have already given will be destroyed and not included in the research.

d. I understand that I will be asked to read the single account of the responses provided by my "community", non-resident sports fishers/residents, and will have the opportunity to make further comment.

e. I have been given an opportunity to question the researcher about this project and my part in it.
Appendix G

Timeline of Research and Writing Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Begun</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence among communities of the Restigouche watershed</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in communities of the RW, their relationships with one another and the Atlantic salmon: “What is going on?”</td>
<td>November 11, 2010 and November, 2011</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Met Chief of Listuguj First Nation at a camp owners’ meeting in New York City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Studies PhD program, SEDRD, OAC, University of Guelph</td>
<td>September, 2012</td>
<td>Winter, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Project” of understanding “what is going on” pre-dated PhD program, but I only began conscious practice of the hermeneutic (interpretive) circle—(experience, reflection, feedback, experience, reflection towards an emergent, convergent understanding)—during research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemble relevant literature and theory</td>
<td>September, 2012</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design methodology</td>
<td>Winter term, 2013</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Begun</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain ethics approvals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listuguj First Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph ERB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify informed sponsors</td>
<td>Fall, 2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify interviewees</td>
<td>Fall, 2013</td>
<td>Fall/Winter, 2013–2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Spring, 2014</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct compound narratives</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute compound narratives for feedback</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise compound narratives</td>
<td>Winter, 2014–2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute revised compound narratives to informed sponsors for review</td>
<td>Spring, 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to communities and others for feedback</td>
<td>September, 2015</td>
<td>May, 2017 (most recent)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Presentations to LMG, RRWMC, RRCOA (2) were used to gather responses and feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write dissertation, with suggested edits from advisor</td>
<td>September, 2012</td>
<td>June, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>The PhD program is constructed to allow students to focus on their area of interest from the beginning of their course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee approval</td>
<td>June, 2018</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Begun</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting and editing Defence</td>
<td>Summer, 2018</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor revisions and final formatting</td>
<td>January 29, 2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passed with “minor revisions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating dialogue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My continuing presence in all three communities, recognized as that of a “messenger,” continues to facilitate dialogue and opportunities for cooperation and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July, 2017, Eel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Bar First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July, 2018,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restigouche,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campbellton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revisioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restigouche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>