

Colorado State University Libraries
Center for Collaborative Conservation
Seminar and Discussion Series

Transcription of History - Indigenous peoples and the collaborative stewardship of nature, 2011-10

Item Metadata

Collection: Fall 2011

Creator: Sherman, Kathleen Pickering, speaker; Sherman Richard T., speaker; Unidentified speaker

Title: Indigenous peoples and the collaborative stewardship of nature

Date: 2011-10

File Name: Shermans'_Audio.mp3

Date Transcribed: Apr 2023

Transcription Platform: Konch

BEGIN TRANSCRIPTION

[00:00 - 02:00] Robin: Apologies for interrupting your interesting conversations. You can give us time to have a conversation after they speak. So today we have just a huge honor at this at the Center for Collaborative Conservation of Welcome, Cathy Sherman and Richard Sherman. I'm going to tell you a little bit about both of them. I'm going to go to Cathy first and then talk about Richard. And then I'm going to hold up a book that I think you all need to read if you haven't, and then a few other things. So I have to take my glasses off so I can see my paper. So one of the first things that I noticed about Kathy was the fact that someone said to me right away that she's a lawyer. And I was like, the lawyer? How interesting. And she's also on her faculty here as a professor in anthropology and also chair of the Department of Anthropology. So she's had a very interesting that doesn't describe her whole life. But but some very, very interesting background. And she worked as a, well, it says legal services attorney at Pine Ridge for a number of years. And she also and she has continued to do research there. In fact, the other day she told me that she's considered the data lady by a number of her colleagues. They're doing research on household, subsistence and community based economic development, but her interests are far wider than that. There's a long line here of very interesting things interested in economic anthropology, traditional ecological knowledge, tribal economic development, collaborative ecosystem conservation and natural resources management and the impacts of globalization on indigenous communities. So, gosh, there's a lot there and she knows a lot about all of those things and learns much more. Welcome. Find yourself any place you like to sit.

[02:03 - 04:13] And then Richard Sherman is from was born and raised at Pine Ridge and is a member of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, and he's worked a lot in natural resource management. So on aspects of fisheries, Wildlife and Buffalo management, Ethnobotany and Indigenous stewardship models. And I'm hoping, given the title of the presentation today, that he's going to talk about the model that that really is grown out of his long experience in developing it. He drafted the first comprehensive Fish and Wildlife Code for the for the Oglala Sioux Tribe and created methods of inventory for wildlife conservation reservation wide. So he's a real leader among his people and in this area of natural resources. As wildlife biologist, executive director and board member of Oglala Sioux Parks and Recreation, he actively managed the tribal buffalo herd from more than 30 years, using the values and philosophies of the Lakota people to maintain them in a wild state. He also conducted several studies on Pine Ridge, focusing on subsistence practices and wildlife management, including a study of the importance of home based microenterprise activity for the reservation economy and a study of small scale native bison operators on Pine Ridge, Rosebud and Yankton. He studied wildlife management at Utah State University and has a master's degree in regional planning from University of Massachusetts, Amherst. So before they start, I just want to hold up this book. So if you get a chance to have a look at this book, it's called Indigenous Peoples and the Collaborative Stewardship of Nature. And there's a number of authors here, including both Cathy and Richard. And I haven't had a chance to read the whole thing, but I've been reading various bits and it's it's really a work of art and also a great scholarship and so I encourage you to have a look at that. So we're going to turn it over to you and you run it as you wish.

[04:15 - 04:15] Cathy Sherman: Okay.

[04:16 - 04:17] Robin: Thank you very much for coming.

[04:17 - 04:18] Cathy Sherman: Thank you, Robin.

[04:19 - 06:39] Cathy Sherman: We're excited to be here and also excited to have this summer for collaborative conservation. That is indicative of CSU and the leadership that we've been taking. Except when you turn and make a difference when it comes to environment and also to indigenous peoples. We're going to talk today about the stewardship model. I want to give just a brief overview, maybe 15 or 20 minutes about the book and the context in which we started partnering with Richard and working on the Indigenous stewardship model. These are some of our other collaborators. We really didn't want to just do another collection of isolated case studies saying, Gee, these all seem kind of similar, don't they, in the conclusion. But actually to work integrated on every section of the book. And so in some ways it was horrible. We're very happy with the outcome because we think we have identified some kind of structural and also mental barriers to some of the collaboration that I

think many of you in this room were probably eager to foster. But our big question, the thing that sort of drove the research was can collaboration genuinely integrate indigenous perspectives in global natural resource development and management? And this question had been burning in my mind for many years. My good friend of mine and Rosebud referred to always being the brown face at the table, the person that was invited to attend, not because anyone wanted to hear her even speak or know what her voice sounded like by the end of the meeting, but just to claim that a native person had been included in the process. And so there was something different about the way that the Western managers were perceiving collaboration. Oh, well, we invited Native people and therefore that was a collaboration and the experience of the native people who attended, which was why did they have me come here? I feel used, really. They just wanted my brown skin and not my ideas or my participation in any real way. So when we brought this out and looked at it globally, the experiences of indigenous people, we found two kind of big sets of issues.

[06:39 - 08:50] One, where a one set was around political issues that somehow to collaborate, that both sides had to relinquish the extremes of either scientific positivism while you didn't do your studies our way. So they're not valid and we don't really have to listen to you and really indigenous knowledge as well while you're not part of our culture. So you can't possibly understand and therefore we don't have to work with you, that all of us, I think involved, have been frustrated by that divide and wanted to find a way of working together. And some of the challenges of that I think from the Western perspective, we like to reduce things to manageable boxes that didn't work well at all. How do we holistically integrate all of the aspects that you engage in issues of conservation? Well, that's not just about a particular plant or an animal that's really a worldview. Being able to accept the flaws in both systems. And this is a bit of humility on both sides. Gee, we're not perfect. You know, maybe we did everything we were trained to do, and there's still some shortcomings that's often not easy to admit and not something we even encourage in our academic publishing. The case studies of how I ruined everything really aren't very available and literary. And then I think the hardest thing in the ongoing struggle. How do we acknowledge differences in power. Because as members of the Western dominant society, we have a different relationship to the resources and the institutional structures that control large economic forces in a people do. And if we're not willing to acknowledge that, then we're missing probably the biggest piece of. But then we found there was another set of what you might call philosophical issues, epistemological issues, people who have good hearts and good intentions, who don't realize that they're putting up barriers to integration with indigenous folks.

[08:50 - 10:52] And how does this happen, that we are all embedded in our own cultural frameworks. And so we have a different way of knowing and it's very hard to step back from that way. We know the world and realize that there are actually other ways of knowing that. And so without something

beyond the cultural sensitivity of, Oh, there are still native people in the world, but moving beyond that and saying, the way I frame this question is because of my own cultural background, we all often normalize Western culture as being even not just invisible but absent. We don't have culture. And I actually challenge you all to do some reading about the early Greeks, because I think you'll find we have a very strong continuity of culture, but we treat it as normal because it's the way we're trained and we were raised. So how can we really function outside of our own sort of cultural metanarrative? It's very challenging. It takes conscious work just in and of itself. All right. So initially we started with six field sites. We ended up writing about four of them. But looking specifically at the relationship between indigenous peoples. And these were lands that were managed as national parks or protected areas. What were the commonalities that we could see? What were the reasons that genuine collaboration wasn't taking place? And we were amazed at the commonality of experiences. And so we tried to boil this down into two sets of categories, and one set being these logical barriers. These were virtually invisible to most of the people that we were researching and talking to in our research, that there was a lack of recognition of indigenous knowledge is a thing at all. And I'm sort of ashamed to admit that even at the Society for Applied Anthropology this spring, people came up after our talk and said, Gee, you mean Indigenous people have any knowledge to contribute?

[10:52 - 13:07] I mean, this is still an issue, unfortunately. So I realized our starting point is kind of here, but maybe we should have backed up a few steps. Yes, In fact, there are people who have knowledge about their own communities that we often use things like definitions and the inability to translate experience as a way of marginalizing indigenous perspectives. We're still trying to outgrow the objectivism of the modernist paradigm. And so when people bring up things like spirituality or social relationships, you kind of go a new age runaway. It feels uncomfortable. It's not part of what we take to be serious knowledge. And yet when you erase that, you've already eliminated a very important piece of how conservation is accomplished in indigenous communities, issues about ownership and appropriation. We are all of a post-colonial, if you will, but certainly still an embedded colonial mindset where our drive is to appropriate those things that are most useful to us. Well, I'll fly into an indigenous community and I'll spend a couple of weeks gaining the things I find useful in my own paradigm and pull those out just like apples off a tree and run them home and sell them as my work. This is the colonial mentality that has been embedded into academic institutions. And so this idea of owning knowledge and how to really collaboratively open that piece up is very threatening to the way that we all obtain tenure and obtain master's degrees and become the so-called experts of areas and natural resources and culture. And then this idea of spatial and temporal boundaries where we're very comfortable drawing lines and saying this is the beginning and the end of certain ecosystems or certain areas of control or areas of ownership. And all of this is artificial from our own

institutional perspectives and yet creates a lot of barriers to genuine collaboration. Well, you can take the berries on this side, but not on that side.

[13:09 - 15:17] And then the other set were institutional barriers. And here these are the things, again, that often perpetuate a suppression of different ways of knowing just because it's the way we're used to doing business. And the reason I'm up here running my mouth and not Richard has a lot to do with this very concept. We're comfortable with the expert. We're comfortable with hierarchical forms of knowledge control and dissemination. We don't think it matters that we first all get to know each other as human beings before we start dictating what we think the important agenda items are. There are many ways in which we have meetings and invite speakers and and conduct knowledge transmission at universities that are totally alien to the way that indigenous communities do business, that it's it feels very uncomfortable and has a lot to do with centralizing power and centralizing knowledge that's not comfortable. Not to mention some of the sort of hidden forces, the, the, the little voices in the back of the minds of managers and scholars that we really are smarter and better and know more, that we control these institutions. And therefore, it's kind of up to us whether we open them up to genuine collaboration or not. It feels like too much work or will take too much time or might cost a little extra money. We're free to ignore that collaborative process altogether. So recognizing kind of our own role, both in terms of power and our own assumptions that what we do is good for everybody else in the world, including indigenous people. All right. So having found these commonalities, then, we were looking for a way to bring the lessons we learned together into some kind of a positive framework that would give people a way of moving forward. And so that's when we began our collaboration with Richard, who'd been working for many years on this idea of an indigenous stewardship model.

[15:17 - 17:50] How do you actually operationalize a way of integrating Western scientists with indigenous knowledge holders and implement that collaboration on landscape? So let's see. For those of you who don't know. Pine Ridge is located in South Dakota. It's about a 5.5 hour drive from here, but in some ways, many worlds away. And so what Richards work had identified was in terms of active indigenous stewardship on tribally controlled lands, that there were important elements to making Indigenous knowledge operational onto the landscape, and that rather than some sort of prescriptive model, you need to do A, B and then C will be true for everyone that this was open ended, that it was intended to reflect local cultural differences, local historical differences and then local experience with their own landscape. And that rather than having to adopt the entire model as one monolith that you could enter really in at any one element. But those elements are integrative. So as you begin to look at indigenous ethnobotany, then you're naturally drawn towards what other synergies might there be between that knowledge and management systems. And so it's a

continuum. It's a cyclical process. You may go through all the elements and arrive back at subsistence lifestyles and realize a whole new segment of that subsistence practice that needs to be integrated into your management system. And in another paper we worked on entitled Practical Environmentalism, we found an amazing correlation with some of the work by people like Brooks and Davidson, Brooks and Davidson looking at this idea of what it means to be a dwelt in ecosystem that those people who have practical activities on the land have an important element of resilience in managing the land system and responding to ecological elements that he's come to promote as a way of more resilient ecosystem management. Well, interestingly enough, independently, the indigenous stewardship model have really followed those. You know, independent development there.

[17:51 - 20:17] All right. So to talk about briefly, the indigenous stewardship model, we began looking at the application of indigenous knowledge to national parks and protected areas. This is where there's often the most explicit structural means for having these kinds of conversations, and that's what our book addresses specifically. But ultimately, certainly areas of indigenous historic and sacred significance should be included in these kinds of systems. And we do see some examples of negotiations with that, particularly with National Park Service or other federal and state agencies that now own land that had indigenous more important indigenous communities. But ultimately, if we think of adjusting this paradigm, it really could apply to all lands, any places with human relationships, to the environment. In generally being a guide, not a prescription. And then hopefully the outcome being developing a common language of exchange rather than a language of dominance. And I would say this continues to be a difficult challenge. And I think a paradox we're in right now is can you actually accomplish this with one document or with one narrative? Or is it necessary to constantly translate this in two directions that you need to have, actually. Sense of everything and then adjust that communication back to the audience that I'm almost dialectically constructing a new language. All right. So I want to just briefly go through the elements and then open it up for some discussion and hopefully some of your own experiences and working with Indigenous or local communities around some of these topics. But the first element looks at Indigenous ecology, that is land and habitat maintenance and preservation. And here I think from Pine Ridge in particular, this is a reaction to the incredible degradation of landscapes as we sit happily at home consuming endless amounts of. Goods from Walmarts and superstores. These are having real ecological impacts all around the world, and often Indigenous communities are at the forefront of what this means in Pine Ridge.

[20:17 - 22:43] Cattle production has a huge and negative impact on the kinds of resources that Lakota people are used to. We're used to using, but because they're not commodities in our Western

worldview, they become invisible and therefore are not protected. And Richard can tell you all kinds of stories about these, but there are many, many wild plants that continue to be important to households on Pine Ridge that cattle production completely decimates. And so when Lakota people talk about land management, they see a direct conflict between our overconsumption of domesticated meats and their desire to continue with subsistence practices and have access to the kinds of wild resources. I've always been important to them. This ties directly into economic self-sufficiency. Robin mentioned Richard's early study of Home-based enterprise that these kinds of natural products have been a part of Lakota production and artistic expression and community exchange for generations and generations. And so the maintenance of the land and the landscape has cultural implications and economic implications beyond just, Oh, why don't you go get a job? This is very fundamental to how households survive. And so being able to sustain that. Community connections to land. This is a picture of the stewardship units and how each community then would be connected to stewardship practices in their local area. That by reinforcing these connections to land, you end up tapping into emotional, familial, social, spiritual reasons for being motivated to engage in conservation. I was mentioning this to Robyn. This is often the thing we're lacking in academic institutions. We actually extract people from the land. We bring them into these kind of closed classrooms and say, Oh gee, why don't people want to protect the land? And we're completely disconnected from it. So this is a method of re-tying people to very specific places in social and and spiritual sense. Okay, then identifying and restoring indigenous knowledge.

[22:43 - 24:57] This is where the term humility comes to mind. Again, it's something often absent in the university setting. But for Indigenous people this kind of knowledge is dispersed and that very quiet people in very humble settings are often the holders of the most important kinds of background and information as to how to restore an ecosystem, how to revive a cultural practice, how to put the humans back in balance with their broader environmental context. Community input synergies between Indigenous knowledge and management systems. Here I think the idea of integrating both kinds of knowledge systems becomes important. And where we feel pushed back against this, I think about how ecologists look at diversity and the importance of diversity to ecosystems, health, I think to our own intellectual health. That kind of diversity of perspective gives us better solutions. And again, the conversation in and of itself takes us out of the limitations of our own way of knowing and looking at the world. Intergenerational transfer of knowledge by involving young people at an early age. It becomes part of their emotional make up, part of the way that they look at the world. I think one of the good examples of why that's more needed in the Western paradigm. This idea of familial relationships that we're all related and that includes natural foods, rocks and trees and plants, everything else. So in our own culture, if you were to go visit your grandmother and she said, please come in, make yourself feel welcome, take anything you need. And so the next day you back up with

a lift fan and take all of her furniture and everything in her home. You really wouldn't do that. But because we don't have that familial connection to landscape, then we consider those kinds of appropriation moves completely natural. We don't see the sort of starkness of that.

[24:58 - 25:04] Richard Sherman: That's Cathy, by the way, pointing toward the sky there. something is going on, a large Buffalo bill.

[25:13 - 28:05] Cathy Sherman: And then the piece where I think we all play a role, advocating for reforms, recognizing when we're perpetuating these kinds of oppressive relationships and opening them up to genuine forms of collaboration, that we all are better suited to engaging power structures at all levels than the indigenous communities that we collaborate with. So taking that as a responsibility rather than an option, avoiding appropriation and dominance, this is again, I'm going to say this is difficult. This is like a complete spiritual transformation for us. How it is that we reposition ourself in terms of the dominance hierarchy. In my class this week, we talked about the the principle of symbolic violence and how often are very presence in indigenous communities can inflict wounds on the people that we're supposedly collaborating with. And I think some of my students were a little crestfallen to think about that. But that's the level at which you really have to self-reflect in terms of how you're approaching collaboration. Okay. And then finally, the idea of consensus building and also conflict management. And the only point I want to make here is that this is both an internal and an external dynamic that often indigenous communities themselves have conflicts. And sometimes we use those conflicts as a reason to say, well, we can't work with them, we want to hear one voice. But of course we know that those same kind of conflicts exist in the dominant society, and so managing those in both directions becomes an important element of genuine collaboration. So some conclusions then. Certainly there are cultural constraints around knowledge systems. We need to see our own culture and the role it plays in the way we approach collaboration. Thinking about cross scale institutional linkages, we need to think of new arrangements just because we're comfortable with institutions and we all have the comfort of being affiliated with an institution. We need to open up and be able to work with individuals and work with communities that don't look like our institutional arrangements. You know, stop hunting for the executive officer or the president or the person in charge. That's going to make it easy for us to work with these indigenous communities and really try to think of more organic linkages. And then this whole area of cross-cultural communication, how we go about asking and listening, developing shared languages and concepts, and then really fostering this respect that we have for different ways. So this is Richard's most recent favorite feature that blends.

[28:06 - 28:29] Richard Sherman: Every summer when Cathy's students are out, we take them into the Badlands for a hike. And we're on top of a plateau here about 200ft off the Badlands floor. And it's a place probably the most important breeding area for the big horn sheep and the south of the Badlands, which is on the reservation. So that's where we are there. Anyway, just popped over here.

[28:31 - 28:45] Cathy Sherman: So we'd like to open it up now for your questions and also very much for your experiences that to implement the collaborative approach. We would like to learn as much from you and what you've been through as we probably have to offer from our own experiences.

[28:49 - 31:19] Richard Sherman: So anyway, I came upon this kind of work. Honestly, I guess I grew up a hunter gatherer, which I didn't really know until the Germans had come by the hundreds every year. Told me I was a hunter gatherer. I had no idea. And I had the reservation is something like six hours and square miles. And it was all my hunting and gathering grounds. And in order to do this kind of work, you really have to have an intimate knowledge of the land, I guess. One of the things I've learned over the years is that you never become an expert here. Always a student. And the more you the more you glean from what you do is, the more you realize that you don't know enough. And there's always, always more to learn. You know? So I spent a lot of time up in Alaska with on the Bering Sea coast, with Eskimos, the Europeans, and then inland with. The acid bastard tribes, You know, they're they wrestle with the same problems that we do on the plains in South Dakota. But one of the things that they don't have is everything is managed for them by either the state or the federal government. Whereas at Pine Ridge, we we developed our own management system or stewardship system. And so I think the state of South Dakota would like to manage if they could, but they haven't gotten their hands on it yet. And maybe someday that will happen. But whenever we deal with other entities like the State Fish and Game and US Fish and Wildlife and so forth, there's a lot of conflict because they, they follow the Western model. And then we have our own way of doing things. And with the Lakota people, with most Indian tribes, I guess they everything is interconnected. Nothing is separate from anything else. And a lot of the people that we deal with are linear thinkers, and so they don't do all these things together. So we have to deal with, with, with everything. We can't like the people who when we set up our management system, we give free permits to elders or elders or anyone past 55 because what's the life expectancy of the Lakota persons.

[31:21 - 31:22] Cathy Sherman: And for males, 53.

[31:24 - 32:54] Richard Sherman: Yeah. You know, I'm way beyond that. So for sure. So we have free permits available to elders, people without jobs, maybe a single parent, someone who doesn't

own a rifle and has to borrow, or someone who just doesn't know how to hunt. We you have to have someone hunt for them. It's free, but they have to have the permit on them. So. And they have to indicate who. Who's going to do the hunting for them. We had an elderly man come in and he wanted one of these permits. And we asked him who was going to do the hunting for me, said my wife. So I don't know if she was older than him over here. So anyway, do you have any questions at all? This is meant to be a process. It's not it's not a rigid prescription. I guess it's changing all the time. And Cathy mentioned earlier, too, that if someone wants to look at putting together a system like this and the native people in Australia indicated a strong interest in building something like this for their areas. I guess mainly what I would want to do is give them an idea. They don't have to adopt the whole model, but any parts of it that are of interest to them.

[32:00 - 33:33] Speaker 1: My question. I have working with a couple of indigenous communities in Alaska and Arizona was that the concept of planning was a challenge. I wonder if you can comment on that. Is planning at all a part of this model or and if it's not, how does it work? I guess what would be the alternative to that? To our very kind of rational. We have a goal, we have an objective. First we did this, then we do that.

[33:33 - 35:49] Richard Sherman: No, we have to deal with the tribal council at Pine Ridge and they ultimately make the final decision. They adopted that Fish and Wildlife code and that became a law. And it happened very quickly. I was surprised. I expected a fight from somebody. And of course, one of the council members said, you know, I've been hunting all my life. I thought this fish and Wildlife caught and I'm going to hunt fish anyway, you know, whether it's past or not. So that kind of set the stage. But working with the state and the feds, we try to plan together and create something that create a common language, I guess, is the way we put it here so that we can understand what each is doing. Let me just read you something here? Just a paragraph. And this is kind of a pipe dream. As you can see, it isn't this way, but it would be nice. Imagine, if you will, a scenario in which colonial governments and indigenous indigenous people sit down together in a good faith to develop a cool management system in which both sides are truly equal in their contributions and are willing to make concessions to arrive at a balanced plan of land and resource stewardship. Imagine a society in which all knowledge systems are expected and the insights from each system are implied for the benefit of wild resources and the people who subsist on them. Imagine a management system in which Indigenous people are integrated into the entire spectrum of management, policy, design and implementation, from fieldwork to setting harvest limits and seasons to adopting administrative regulations. So very often in the planning of a management system with the state or with the feds, the indigenous people get to work with them on the bottom rung and not throughout the entire spectrum of management. So I've seen that.

[35:50 - 36:16] Speaker 2: I was just curious if you had any particular experiences that you share that, whether in Pine Ridge or elsewhere, where you've seen this integration of being able to create sort of a common shared language on management and practice, because a lot of federal agencies have they'll talk about adaptive management in their organic assets and that it's just again, it's really hard to make it happen on the ground.

[36:16 - 37:01] Richard Sherman: Sometimes it happens for a while and it's really tied to the politics of the time, too. Sometimes you'll have a person in office who is willing to work with tribes in getting things done, and then when they leave someone else to come in and, you know, everything falls away and it doesn't happen anymore. So there's there's never been, in my experience, a sustained way in which we all work together to manage. I'm hoping that if they understand this better, that that may happen if we create a common language and. By common language. I'm not talking just about the language, but the willingness to accept the ways of the others and getting this done.

[37:01 - 37:41] Cathy Sherman: We had a recent experience with a number of the national parks that's around the reservation and they were very willing to learn more about the reservation work in an integrative way in terms of interpretation and tourism. But then when it came to the actual workshop planning, then they're like, We need it to be on time. You know, we want experts that show up. We don't want any family members hanging around, you know, all of these, again, very cultural constraints in terms of how they see their own work and recognize how that actually violated everything. We just spent like eight hours talking about it. So it's challenging, I think, on that that.

[37:43 - 38:13] Speaker 3: Speaking of the National Park Service, it doesn't have much of a tradition in the United States, unlike other countries with working with indigenous peoples within the areas they manage. But it's my understanding that there was an extension on the south side of the Badlands that goes on to reservation land, and that that section of the national park is actually managed directly by by the Lakota people. Is that true? And how is that experience worked out? Because that might be something that could be replicated elsewhere in the United States.

[38:13 - 39:40] Speaker 1: Well, half of the Badlands National Park is on the Pine Ridge Reservation in the northern part of the reservation. It's referred to as the south. The owner of the Badlands and in the north unit is off the reservation. It was a national monument, actually, when they just had the north unit. And once they included the South unit, then it became the national park. And, well, we had a meeting with the National Park Service back in 1976 and in which the tribe gave them the management of the South unit of the Badlands. And it was for a period of time. But the one of the things we did retain those hunting rights to subsistence activity in the gathering of plants. And so right now they're working on a way to give that back to the tribe. I don't know if it'll it'll happen. Some

people some people are against it. One of the things about the one of the superintendents bought two superintendents ago, he wrote a letter to the tribe and he wanted to adopt the stewardship model for the South unit as a management scheme for the South. And I thought it was pretty good. The tribe didn't run with it and it didn't happen. And so maybe. So So, yeah, it's up in the air right now.

[39:40 - 40:02] Cathy Sherman: If it happens the way it's being planned, it will become the first tribal national park, which is ambiguous about 12 different ways. And so we're going through what that means is the work some of our grad students and colleagues from [inaudible] something 3-5 years about the time the dissertation have been done.

[40:04 - 40:33] Richard Sherman: But it's probably the only semi wilderness area on the reservation left. So it's a beautiful area and much of it roadless which is part of the appeal. Cathy and I sometimes go back, back in and camp out there. Very unique place. So whoever manages it, I just hope they do a good job. I don't know if I answered your question about that.

[40:36 - 40:58] Cathy Sherman: I was wondering if you could speak for a bit of the concept of getting you involved in teenagers and people in their 20s, for that matter. You speak with your experience with that and also your perspectives on issues for motivating these young people to become involved and take pride in their culture.

[40:59 - 42:58] Richard Sherman: Yeah. Well, one of the things that we wanted to do and Cathy showed you the picture of the map or the stewardship units that we created, and we want to get people to adopt these stewardship units. It's kind of like this adopt highway, part of a highway thing where you can keep an area clean. And then part of that would be to go to the school system, maybe have the school be the steward, and they take over a particular area and learn that way and be actively involved in that. And I think a lot of these school kids out on ethno botanical excursions, we got to look at food and medicinal plants and so forth to traditional plants of various kinds. And, you know, they're messing around out there. They're running here and they're all over the place. But then later on, when I talked to them, they remember the stuff that I that I told told them, you know, and it's kind of amazing. Kind of thought maybe it would it wouldn't have any effect, but it does. Sometimes schools would show up with 300 kids on there by myself. I think they just want to get out of teaching. Yeah. But things like that anyway, where they can be directly involved in, these stewards would maybe keep a log of all the things that's going on like, you know, the company funds are born this year. Did we have a hard winter? What does the grass look like? So on and so forth. Various plants and so and then there would be someone who would collect all that that data at a

certain point, and they would discuss it and the way to manage the area. So yeah, the kids are included. It's not just the adults, it's kids as well.

[42:59 - 44:29] Cathy Sherman: And well, just to refer to the practical environmentalism article, one of the interesting things about including youth was that it was the one place in which people who were internally conflicted on almost every layer, mostly because of politics, tribal politics, we're all willing to work together. Everybody agreed that youth and supporting the youth and integrating the youth was important. So in one way, it's almost a natural way of avoiding some of the worst aspects of tribal politics and internal dissension because the future of the youth is something everyone can agree to. The other interesting thing I think is, again, the integrative nature of this kind of work and from indigenous perspectives, another group that we work with, First Peoples Fund, focuses specifically on Native artists, and it's actually the integration of youth into the artwork that takes them back into the health of the porcupine health of the sweetgrass and the health of the deer and the bison populations, because those are all elements of how they are expressing themselves artistically. And so one of the neat things that came out of the First People's Fund, they have a couple of fellowship programs, but was the greater integration of youth into the art and the artistic expression, which then reconnected them to land. So it isn't always just that it starts with a conservationist perspective, but there are many roads in which the young people bring everyone back to the land.

[44:30 - 45:29] Richard Sherman: I've had someone mentioned to me that, you know, so much has been lost over the years with the death of the elders and so forth and so on. And you haven't hunted buffalo for years and years, you know, how are you going to make a management system that's meaningful if you don't have some of that old knowledge? And certainly there's a lot of like the medicinal plant and to be able to be there. But it really doesn't matter if you have a certain values and philosophies and you practice those, the way you manage an area is going to be a reflection on that, you know, on the philosophies and the values. So you don't have to have the specific knowledge you can build on something that is that reflects those values. And so that doesn't hold much credence, I don't think when you say you can never do that again. So we just lost too much knowledge.

[45:29 - 45:47] Cathy Sherman: Right. And it goes back to kind of the Western drive. We want that piece of special knowledge that's going to save us environmentally as opposed to we want to transform the way we think of human relationships with nature so that we can all [inaudible]. That first question is more [inaudible] perspective.

[45:47 - 46:01] Speaker 2: Can you talk about developing a common language of exchange? And I think that's a really interesting concept. Can you talk about that a little bit more like what that would look like?

[46:02 - 47:41] Cathy Sherman: Well, that's where I said it's a big paradox right now in my own mind, because in order to portray information that's accessible to Western audiences, you've automatically eliminated an indigenous approach. And if I were to present the same material for an Indigenous audience, people here would be like yawning and shifting in their seats and looking at their watches because it isn't hitting the point of resonance quickly enough. And so my feeling right now is, you know, in large scale this kind of inter scale or linkages, you probably do need two narratives. And we as people working in this area, the flexibility to translate that narrative almost like you would from Italian to English at the UN so that you are able to re articulate the same point in a way to the audience. And I think ultimately in small groups that are working towards common goals, you can develop a comfort level with what are those things that work for both sets of the people. And what are those things that one group will respect because of the difference. And the other group will tolerate in the a need to move forward together. But it's really difficult. The differences in how people approach this information it's palpable. It's amazing. I mean, this all feels very normal and natural. This is like the weirdest thing ever. You know, when you think about how to discuss these same issues with a group of [inaudible]. It would be alienating to an extent.

[47:43 - 48:37] Richard Sherman: For years, we listen to the criticism from the state Fish and Game and National Park Service and so forth. We would say that. No, you don't manage your game well enough. You're my brother. And that your numbers are low. Your deer numbers are low. And so my staff and I devised the methods of accounting. And we invited them to process the numbers, these officials. And what they discovered is that there were more deer per square mile on the reservation than there was on a state managed area adjacent. So they didn't say anything about it. But they criticize without even having any idea what the really was there. So those are kind of things, misconceptions. You have to break those down.

[48:41 - 48:55] Speaker 5: You spoke before of a scientific positivism. Can you speak a little bit of what the perspective is on that? Is it an alternative or a different thing on. What stands in? What's your culture for that?

[48:57 - 49:05] Cathy Sherman: [crosstalk] Scientific positivism and how that's different from indigenous approach.

[49:11 - 50:55] Richard Sherman: Yeah, well, like I said, the indigenous approach is, is all inclusive, includes everything and then we'll even look at the spiritual aspect of a plant and the healing property of that plant is that spirit is interacting with your own spirit, that sort of thing. If you carry that to a meeting of, you know, the state or federal officials and, you know, it just doesn't apply with them, that sort of thing. So I think reducing things to a study, a question we were talking about the whole process of creating a hypothesis and what does that do in terms of eliminating, you know, social, spiritual, intergenerational elements of that. It really is a, I think, dramatically different way of answering questions now at the same time. It is a way of answering questions and it can provide the kinds of information that, if not necessarily resonant for the indigenous community themselves like Richard was saying, with the deer study can be a way of pushing back and saying, look, the way we're doing it in a non positivist way is actually meeting the goals that you would need in positive terms to say, yes, everything's fine and we don't need to intervene here. So I think the relationship is an important one, but the approach is radically. Just the starting points are different. The time frames are completely different. You know, this idea of producing something to a snapshot and drawing conclusions from that as opposed to a long term intergenerational perspective on that landscape. The two have very little in common at that. But I think they work well together.

[50:56 - 51:38] Richard Sherman: What about the International Whaling Commission? They would come up to the villages in Alaska and tell them just how many whales they could take a particular year. They didn't agree on a lot of things anyway. And sometimes the Eskimos would make them go camp out somewhere away from the village. And what they found out after a time that the Eskimos really knew what they were doing. You know, and they knew just how many whales to take and how to. And it was. So we might be heading in the same direction, but we're taking two very different paths to get there.

[51:44 - 51:45] Robin: They got question.

[51:46 - 52:01] Speaker 6: I think you can have it if you include in your model, your work like cultural resources and history. Or is it that beyond the scope right now, just be [inaudible]...

[52:04 - 52:05] Cathy Sherman: Right. No, not at all.

[52:05 - 52:07] Speaker 14: ...that conversation of archaeology.

[52:07 - 54:28] Cathy Sherman: Right. It's a very good point. I'm glad that you raised that. I mean, we talked a little bit just about how this could be brought into areas of tribal, historical and sacred significance. But certainly this process and this problem isn't just limited to natural resource

conservation. It comes up in areas like education. It comes up in areas like economic development, and certainly it comes up in the whole arena of cultural resource management. Often the again, the Western construction of what it means to conserve a cultural resource isn't as open and integrated with tribal perspectives as it could be. There's some people doing awesome work in this area and often the the kind of rubric of participatory action research or community based integration into research, these are some of the methodologies ways in which Western scientific individuals can actually implement an Indigenous perspective into the research they're conducting. So there's some really nice examples out of University of Arizona, for example, in which the researchers almost take themselves out of the picture. They have the tribe define the places that are important, the methods for gathering that information, and importantly, who owns that information. After the study is over, they actually turn it over to the tribe. It isn't kept in the institution. And we can publish for ten years off of this stuff. You know, it's given to the tribe and then they determine what that cultural resource knowledge is really accessible to the outside world at all because some of these things are inappropriate for other audiences. So again, very much giving that power back to the hands of the tribe to determine what is appropriate, what's not appropriate. What methods are allowed, what people can be involved with different spaces and places and times. So I think that the paradigm issues are exactly the same. Even though we focus. Any questions, comments, your own experiences with some of these matters?

[54:29 - 55:16] Speaker 6: Not my own experience, but the question. I guess when steward thing requires some level of restraint or, you know, I don't know how else to put it or and presumably traditionally in the local context, their norms, their ways that are right to be in their ways that are wrong to me. I'm just wondering in your experience and within this model and interacting with kind of the more outside structures, how do those norms or taboos or the need to set limits on things if there are such a need, how did those get translated, I guess, into...

[55:17 - 56:20] Richard Sherman: Actually, people were dealt with very harshly in the past if they like hunted out of season or at a time when the phones were coming in or anything that wouldn't bode well for the tribe that would put them in any kind of danger or whatever. It was like a police force. I guess he would go around and while they were out hunting, they might tear up the teepee and their belongings and in the worst case scenario, they might just kill them, you know, or casting loose so that they wouldn't be part of the tribe anymore, which is probably worse than dying, I guess. So yeah, it was very harsh. But because we're attached to everything and everything to us, that's all part of the value system, you know, that people act. I had an idea there about what I mean. I'm sorry.

[56:20 - 56:20] Speaker 6: That's okay.

[56:22 - 56:36] Speaker 4: So it is the ordinance, for example, that's now been passed at the tribal level. Does it then codify in a formal way some of those same guidelines that existed?

[56:36 - 59:10] Richard Sherman: Yeah. And part of it is the Western model is included in that as well. I mean, we you know, we have to deal with modern times. And like I said earlier, that this is all a process. Things change all the time, so we don't want to set anything in stone. And so we have to [inaudible] for changes that occurred. And so we're willing to take some of these parts of the Western model and incorporate them into the stewardship management system. And yeah, just the values of the people prevent them from doing things that are really outrageous. I know of one woman who treated a plant badly and it bothered her for the rest of her life. She didn't treat it with respect. Some people are very sensitive about things like that. And there are legends about plants and about how they affect you, too. And it affected me in that way. I'll just mention there's a particular plant that's called the Bush Learning Laureates of the Sweet Potato Family. It's probably the largest root that I've seen on any plants, over £100. Sometimes they look like they have arms and legs. The call by some people is men of the Earth. But according to the Lakota legend, if you're digging one of those up, you break the arm or the leg, will that part of you is going to be affected? And I did that twice. The first year I dug one up, I broke the look like the leg off and I broke my foot. And then the next year I did the same thing. But about three years later and the same thing happened. So I'm not going to dig any more. To show some tourist[laughs] So you're very much tied to the land and, I guess the way the the energy that moves us all, moves the plants and moves us in the same way. And we're no greater than they are and. A lot of animals go back. You know, we're young children according to the Lakota legends, some of the animals have been here a lot longer than us, and they're wiser than we are. They know things that we'll never know. And that sort of thing. So it's way different than than the Western models. So you can see why it might be difficult to work together.

[59:11 - 59:59] Cathy Sherman: Yeah, it makes me think of your bison study, too, where the constant concern is the one in the West. So they'll commercialize the you want to make a lot of money off of it. And we did surveys with people who were producing bison, you know, for the market. But their values and goals, their reasons for being involved were so starkly different than the sort of typical Western cattle ranch. And then it had all to do with culture and integration. And then there was a small element of household subsistence, but it's part of a bigger mix. And so I think that is a place where we feel a lot of concern and discomfort. And yet there are these other methods that are very effective and in making people work with them, their ecosystem. We just don't have those, unfortunately.

[01:00:00 - 01:00:18] Robin: Well, we're getting to the end of our time and I want us all to thank them very much for coming. [applause] Please feel free to come and ask additional questions. We're going to whisk them away in about 10 minutes to go to lunch.

[01:00:18 - 01:00:22] Richard Sherman: I just want to thank Cathy for doing most of the talk.

[01:00:24 - 01:00:25] Cathy Sherman: I did bring some...

END TRANSCRIPTION