Cultural values in sustainable tourism: Conflicts between indigenous culture and recreation in protected areas

Heather Zeppel

James Cook University Cairns, Australia, heather.zeppel@jcu.edu.au

Abstract

This paper evaluates cultural conflicts between indigenous groups, recreation users and management agencies over the appropriate amenity use of protected areas in the USA, Australia and New Zealand. It assesses both social values conflicts and interpersonal conflicts between groups with different worldviews about landscapes, resource use and recreation. This paper identifies six types of cross-cultural conflicts between indigenous peoples and recreation users: Sacred sites/Religious beliefs, Resource use, Land use, Visitor infrastructure, Recreation activity, and Place names. Management strategies to address cultural values in sustainable tourism and cultural conflicts over recreational use of natural areas are presented.

Introduction

Previous studies of recreation conflicts in parks and protected areas focus on conflicts between visitors and managers, between recreational users in the same activity, or in different activities, and between recreation and other non-recreation activities over use of natural resources. There has been little attention given to cultural conflicts between recreation activities and indigenous or ethnic groups. 'Conflicts occur wherever two or more groups compete for similar resources and one finds that another group interferes with its pursuit of a particular goal – such as recreation, indigenous hunting or collecting' (Eagles et al, 2002, p. 56). This paper evaluates cultural conflicts between indigenous groups, recreational users and management agencies over the appropriate amenity use of natural areas. It assesses social values conflicts between indigenous and non-indigenous groups with different norms or values about an activity (direct) and also the cultural meaning of landscapes (indirect). Social values also encompass spiritual values, respect and cultural traditions. Interpersonal conflicts or goal interference between different recreation activity or user groups in direct contact is also addressed. For example, indigenous groups performing ritual ceremonies at sacred natural sites may conflict with mountain climbers, rock climbers or hikers in the same area.

Cultural clashes between indigenous groups and recreational users or land managers involve both indirect social values conflict (land use, meaning) and direct interpersonal conflict (user groups). Well-known indigenous cultural conflicts with recreation include visitors climbing Uluru (Australia), mountaineers on Aoraki/Mount Cook (New Zealand), and rock climbers at Devils Tower National Monument (USA). This paper discusses selected cultural conflicts between indigenous groups and recreation managers/users in the USA, Australia and New Zealand. The six types of cross-cultural conflicts between recreational users and indigenous peoples include: Sacred sites/Religious beliefs, Resource use, Land use, Visitor infrastructure, Recreation activity and Place names. These involve negotiation, consultation and litigation with indigenous groups about recreational use of sacred natural areas. The strategies adopted by management agencies to address indigenous cultural issues and recreational use of natural areas, such as education, zoning and voluntary bans or prohibition of activities, are presented.

Methods: Types of recreation conflicts

This paper is based on a review of published research articles and case studies about indigenous cultural conflicts with recreation users in protected areas. These case studies are assessed using the framework of social values and interpersonal conflicts between park users (Vaske, Needham & Cline, 2007). Recreation conflicts in parks include interpersonal conflict (i.e. goal interference between user groups), social values conflict (i.e. social acceptability of activities) and, in some cases, interpersonal and social values conflict (Table 1) (Graefe & Thapa, 2004; Lewis, 1996; Schneider, 2000; Shultis, 2003; Tranel & Hall, 2003; Vaske, Donnelly, Wittmann & Laidlaw, 1995; Vaske et al, 2007; Watson, 2001). Interpersonal conflicts between different recreation activity groups in direct contact involve competition over resources, physical incompatibility (i.e. noise), and diminished enjoyment. Examples include conflicts between non-motorized and motorized watercraft; cross-country skiers and snowmobiles; skiers and snowboarders; hikers and mountain bikers; 4WDs and horse riders; hunters and non-hunters. Perceived conflicts/problems, both interpersonal and for social values, are higher for non-motorized, non-mobile, non-consumptive recreation activities. Conflicts between tourists and Inuit indigenous hunters in Arctic wilderness areas involve clashes between viewing wildlife species such as seals, narwhales and whales that are still hunted for subsistence although with speed boats and rifles (Buckley, 2005; Hinch, 1998).

Table 1. Conflict evaluation

	Perceived Problem: No	Perceived Problem: Yes
Observed: No	No Conflict	Social Values Conflict
Observed: Yes	No Conflict	Interpersonal & Social Values Conflict
Observed: Yes	No Conflict	Interpersonal Conflict

Notes:
- Social Values Conflict: Individuals perceived an event/situation as a problem and were bothered by knowledge of other users; Interpersonal & Social Values Conflict: Individuals witnessed an event/situation, perceived it as a problem & were bothered by other users, whether seen in the area or not;
- Interpersonal Conflict: Individuals witnessed an event/situation, perceived it as a problem & were only bothered by other users when seen in the area.

Source: Based on Vaske, Needham & Cline, 2007

Social values conflict are between groups not sharing similar norms/values about an activity, from direct contact and/or beliefs about the appropriateness of an activity, such as llama packing trips, horse treks, air tours, and fishing in protected areas. Sport hunters and wildlife tourists have very different value orientations about appreciating and interacting with wildlife. Where two or more activity groups differ in value orientation (e.g. hunter, non-hunter) social values conflict dominates. Among recreation groups with similar values, interpersonal conflicts are higher. For recreation groups with similar goals that differ in mode of activity (e.g. hikers vs. riders) both interpersonal and social values conflicts occur (Vaske et al, 2007).

Variables include the type, intensity and duration of recreation conflict along with specific features of the conflict situations/events and conflict groups. There has been limited examination of cross-cultural conflicts in protected areas between indigenous groups and recreational users. Indigenous cultural conflicts with recreational use of sacred natural areas focus on religious beliefs/sacred sites, the recreation activity, resource use, land use, visitor infrastructure, and place names. These conflicts involve different social values or world views. Tourism needs to consider different aesthetic and ethical values (Smith & Dufy, 2003).

Conflicts in protected areas

Conflicts occur when user groups compete for similar resources and other users may diminish the enjoyment of recreation, or other activities (Eagles et al, 2002). There are

conflicts between visitors and park managers, between recreationists in the same activity, and between recreationists engaged in different activities (e.g. motorized vs. non-motorized recreation; active vs. passive recreation). This paper focuses on *conflicts between recreation and non-recreation activities* in natural areas such as snowmobiles and dog sledding vs. Saami reindeer herders in Lapland (Kluwe & Krumpe, 2003); and rock climbers or hikers vs. Native American rituals on mountains (Taylor & Geffen, 2004). Conflicts between indigenous people and recreation users arise from different social and cultural values for protected areas.

Non-indigenous recreational users of wilderness areas, forests, and national parks are increasingly in conflict with subsistence lifestyles and indigenous religious rituals in sacred natural areas. Tangible or physical conflicts involve recreational users disturbing non-recreational cultural activities while intangible or values conflicts involve user groups with different social values or cultural ethics about expected behaviours in protected areas. Social value conflict involves moral, conventional and personal reasoning about resource use based on subsistence use or wilderness preservation (Dear & Myers, 2005). Conflicts between indigenous culture and recreation users revolve around indigenous rights, traditional values and cultural beliefs about sacred natural areas and subsistence activities (Buckley, 2005; Hinch, 1998; McCorquodale, 1997; Poirer, 2007; Riseth, 2007; Weaver, 2006).

Protected areas as cultural landscapes

There is increasing western recognition that natural areas and national parks are a cultural landscape, modified by human actions and activities and shaped by cultural perceptions of the environment. The US National Parks Service in 1994 defined a cultural landscape as: '...a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity or person, or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values' (Lennon, 2006, p. 455). Ethnographic landscapes include subsistence and ceremonial grounds, sacred religious sites and settlements of Indian groups. For indigenous people, culturally significant landscapes also have symbolic or spiritual meanings associated with specific places (Carr, 2004, 2008; Hay-Edie, 2003; McAvoy, 2002; Taylor, 2000). 'An Aboriginal cultural landscape is a place valued by an Aboriginal group (or groups) because of their long and complex relationship with that land. It expresses their unity with the natural and spiritual environment. It embodies their traditional knowledge of spirits, places, land uses, and ecology' (Buggey, 1999, cited in Lee, 2000, p. 6; Neufeld, 2005; Parks Canada, 2007). In 1992, the UNESCO World Heritage Convention

recognized a new category of associative cultural landscapes based on 'the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element'such as indigenous spiritual beliefs linked with landscape features. In 1993, Tongariro National Park in New Zealand was the first World Heritage Area listed as an associative cultural landscape, based on the spiritual significance of this mountain area for the local *Ngati Tuwharetoa* Maori people (Te Heuheu, 1995). Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park in Australia was also re-listed in 1994 for its cultural and spiritual significance to Anangu Aboriginal people (Layton & Titchen, 1995). The recognition of Tongariro, Uluru and other national parks as indigenous cultural landscapes involves the integration of indigenous heritage values in their presentation and operation (Zeppel, 2009). This includes managing recreational uses and interpreting the indigenous spiritual values of these parks.

Cultural and spiritual values of parks

Cultural landscapes include both tangible sites (e.g. monuments, ruins, tools, archaeological remains) and intangible spiritual beliefs associated with natural places. There are a range of intangible or nonmaterial values associated with national parks, such as recreation, education and science, with a more recent focus on spiritual, cultural and identity values in parks (Table 2). Intangible values are those that enrich 'the intellectual, psychological, emotional, spiritual, cultural and/or creative aspects of human existence and well being' (WCPA, 2000, cited in Harmon, 2003, p. 55). Cultural values connect people 'in meaningful ways to the environment,' spiritual values 'inspire humans to relate with reverence to the sacredness of nature,' while identity values 'link people to their landscape through myth, legend or history' (Harmon, 2003, p. 56). Lockwood (2006) listed culture, identity, spiritual and social wellbeing and bequest as part of community values for parks, while individual values for parks included satisfaction, health and spiritual wellbeing from recreation, but not identity or meaning. Within indigenous societies, culture, nature, spirituality and personal identity are interlinked and indigenous 'cultural-identity values are often transcribed (either figuratively or literally) into an ancestral landscape' (Harmon, 2003, p. 59). That is, tangible cultural heritage sites and spiritual beliefs about creator beings imbue indigenous cultural landscapes with meaning and identity. Interpretation in co-managed national parks highlights the ongoing spiritual, cultural, ecological and historic connections between indigenous peoples and natural landscapes (Carr, 2004; Pfister, 2000; Taylor, 2000; Zeppel, 2003). Cultural interpretation at Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park in New Zealand presents Maori creation beliefs and spiritual links with the mountain, along with traditional use of plants and *pounamu* (greenstone) (Carr, 2001, 2004). Other research examines Maori cultural values in Maori tourism (McIntosh, Zygadlo & Matunga, 2004) and the recreation or cultural benefits

418

for Maori tourism operators leading guided tours of their tribal lands (Carr, 2007), Native American participation in leisure (McDonald & McAvoy, 1997), and subsistence gathering activities by indigenous people as both culture and recreation (McAvoy & Shirilla, 2005).

Table 2. Values of protected areas

Tangible Values (Material)	Intangible Values (Nonmaterial)
Conservation (i.e. wildlife, ecosystem services)	Recreational & Therapeutic
Economic (i.e. tourism revenue, scenery)	Spiritual & Cultural
Land*	Artistic & Aesthetic
Infrastructure* (i.e. buildings, roads, utilities)	Educational & Scientific
	Peace (i.e. equity, social justice)
	Existence & Identity (i.e. symbolism)

Notes: * = tangible values for parks added by the author; Peace values also equate to humanitarian values

Source: English & Lee, 2003; Harmon, 2003

Findings: Indigenous cultural conflicts with recreational use of natural areas

Indigenous stewardship of natural areas and wildlife has contributed to the contemporary recreation and tourism values of lakes, rivers, forests and national parks as 'wilderness' areas. Indigenous cultural and spiritual beliefs about sacred natural sites, however, can create conflicts with recreational users of protected areas (Table 3). This includes tourists climbing Uluru (Ayers Rock) in the Northern Territory (Brown, 1999; Digance, 2003; Head, 2000; Weaver, 2001) and Mt Warning (Wollumbin) in northern New South Wales (Gale & Buultjens, 2007); both considered sacred sites. The Uluru climb was closed for 20 days in 2001 as a sign of respect for a deceased traditional owner, angering tourism operators (Weaver & Lawton, 2002). In 2007, tourism operators at Uluru, Kakadu and Nitmiluk (Katherine Gorge) successfully opposed a Federal government ban against the consumption of alcohol on Aboriginal-owned land in the Northern Territory, including co-managed parks (Squires, 2007). Conflicts between Aboriginal traditional owners of Kakadu and recreational park users such as bushwalkers and non-Indigenous fishing involve contestations over access to park areas and the privileging of wilderness recreation activities or western science over indigenous knowledge and cultural landscapes (Palmer, 2004a, 2004b; Slattery, 2003). The construction of walkways, barriers and signs at sacred rock art sites in the Keep River National Park in Western Australia offended the Miriuwung people who are custodians of the sites (Mulvaney, 1999). In 1983, Aboriginal people blockaded the entrance to Mootwingee Historic Site in western New South Wales (NSW) demanding that a campground be relocated, public access to sacred sites be banned, walking trails realigned away from key cultural sites, accredited tour guides at rock art sites and a Mutawintji Culture Centre to present Aboriginal history. The area was closed from 1983-1989 to implement

419

these measures, with cultural training for non-Aboriginal guides and operators since 1991, an Aboriginal ranger employed in 1993 and local Aboriginal people contracted to provide guided tours. In 1998, it was the first park in NSW returned to traditional owners with the name changed to Mutawintji (Larritt, 1995; Sutton, 1999). In New Zealand, Ngai Tahu Maori people revere Aoraki/Mt Cook and in 1998 mountain climbers were asked to show their respect by stopping just below the main summit and by not leaving litter, food or human waste (Carr, 2004; McIntyre, Jenkins & Booth, 2001; Weaver, 2001). The *Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998* settlement included full title to Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park, gifted back to NZ, dual Maori/English place names for 90 sites and a cash settlement of NZ$170 million used by the Ngai Tahu to acquire commercial businesses including nature tourism enterprises in South Island national parks (MacKay, 2002). In 1992, Ngati Tuwharetoa Maori gained ownership of Lake Taupo on the North Island with rights to charge licensing fees for commercial tourism operators and jetties on the lake (Tahana, 2007).

In the USA, the *Native American Religious Freedom Act 1978* has led to a revival of Indian rituals, ceremonies and cultural practices at sacred mountain areas (Table 3). The *National Historic Preservation Act 1992* also required federal agencies to protect sacred sites and accommodate Indian ceremonial use of these areas (Taylor & Geffen, 2004). At Devils Tower National Monument (Wyoming, USA), rock climbers came into conflict with American Indians who performed sacred ceremonies in June for the summer solstice. Prayer bundles were removed, some climbers were yelling at ceremonies, and Indians took offence at climbers and climbing devices left in the rock face. Stakeholders contributed to a climbing management plan while a US court endorsed a voluntary climbing ban on Devils Tower in June, with an 84% reduction in climbers since 1995 in this month, and park interpretation of Indian religious values for Devils Tower (Dussias, 1999; Dustin et al., 2002; Dustin & Schneider, 2001; Harkin, 2002; Linge, 2000; McAvoy, 2002; Ruppert, 1994; Taylor & Geffen, 2003, 2004). Climbers did not object to Indian rituals, however, the Shoshone and Arapaho wanted climbing banned or restricted (Hanson & Moore, 1999). Ninaitstakis ('Chief') Mountain in the Glacier National Park, Montana, is sacred to Blackfoot Indian people who hold vision quests at this site. Climbers and sightseers disrupted Indian ceremonial activities on the mountain and removed offerings. Conflicts between climbers and Indians performing ceremonies at this mountain led in 1991 to restricted vehicle access while interpretive signs explained the cultural significance of Ninaistakis, asking visitors not to disturb Indian religious activities. After an earthquake in 1992, the Blackfoot banned access on their land to hikers and non-Indian users of Chief Mountain (Reeves, 1994). In Northern Arizona, the Navajo have used litigation, based on religious freedom and environmental degradation acts,

to prevent the expansion of a ski resort and snowmaking with recycled wastewater on top of the sacred San Francisco Peaks (Bauer, 2007; Matthews, 2007).

Table 3. Indigenous cultural conflicts in North American recreation areas

Place/site	Indigenous group(s)	Indigenous use/belief	Management agency, law(s)	Recreation conflicts
Bighorn Medicine Wheel & Medicine Mountain, Wyoming, USA (Price, 1994)	Northern Plains Indians (Crow, Cheyenne, Blackfeet, Sioux, Shoshone, Arapahoe)	Sacred land site Vision quest area Spiritual renewal	US Forest Service 1993 MoA for traditional ceremonial use & Indian advisers	Tourism, hunting, snowmobiling. 1988 site plan for information centre, viewing platform, fence, walking trails, signs, parking lot at wheel site
Ninaitstakis Mountain, Glacier NP & Blackfeet Reservation, Montana, USA (Reeves, 1994)	Blackfoot (Nitsitapi) also sacred to Kutenai, Salish, Cree, Atsina & Assiniboine	Sacred mountain Vision questing Spiritual retreats Stone platforms (dream beds) Offerings, ribbons	US National Park Service Blackfeet Tribal Business Council	Climbers, hikers, sightseers Picnics, litter, buffalo skulls & offerings removed Area closed 1992
Devils Tower National Monument/ Bear Lodge (Mato Tipila), Wyoming, USA (Dussias, 1999; Hanson & Moore, 1999; Taylor & Geffen, 2004)	Plains Indian (Lakota, Eastern Shoshone, Kiowa, Kiowa-Apache, Comanche, Crow, Cheyenne, Arapaho)	Sacred mountain Vision quests, Sun dances Prayer offerings Fasting	US National Park Service Climbing management plan 1995 NPS signs not to remove offerings	Rock climbers climbing bolts Prayer bundles removed, yelling at ceremonies, June voluntary climbing ban Visitor Centre blocked spiritual trail to Tower
San Francisco Peaks, Northern Arizona* (Bauer, 2007)	Navajo, Hopi, Hualapi	Sacred mountain Spirit messengers Medicine plants	US Forest Service Arizona Snow Bowl ski resort *Religious Freedom Restoration Act 1993*	Environmental disturbance Resort expansion Snowmaking with recycled waste water Navajo litigation 2002-07

Notes: *See also Reclaim the Peaks http://www.reclaimthepeaks.com/ & Save the Peaks Coalition http://www.savethepeaks.org/

Sources: Bauer, 2007; Dussias, 1999; Hanson & Moore, 1999; Price, 1994; Reeves, 1994; Taylor & Geffen, 2004

Application of results: Social conflicts between recreation and indigenous culture

Non-Indigenous cultural and identity values for parks comprise secular indicators such as biodiversity, recreation and scenic amenity. Park visitors, recreation users and local people may also have a strong personal affinity with protected areas. Indigenous groups, however, see these protected areas as cultural landscapes and homelands that embody personal, spiritual and community identity (Carr, 2008; English & Lee, 2003; Harmon, 2003; Hay-Edie, 2003, McAvoy, 2002; McAvoy, McDonald & Carlson, 2003; Neufeld, 2002, 2005; Prosper, 2007). Indigenous cultural conflicts with recreation users of natural areas reflect these different social values (Table 4). Indigenous people consider that sacred sites are desecrated by recreational activities such as rock climbing (Uluru, Mt Warning, Devils Tower), mountain climbing (Aoraki/Mt Cook) hiking and sightseeing (Medicine Mountain, Ninaitstakis Mountain), visitor infrastructure (Keep River, Mutawintji), and ski resorts (San Francisco Peaks). Indigenous groups have responded with blockades (Mutawintji), protests, banning access (Ninaitstakis), temporary climbing bans (Uluru), requests for respectful climbing (Aoraki/Mt Cook), and litigation (Navajo). The climbing management plan at Devils Tower implemented a voluntary climbing ban during June, when most Indian rituals were held. Most Indians still opposed climbing but one Shoshone person wanted climbers to be respectful of Devils Tower by removing their climbing devices. Direct interpersonal conflicts between cultures occur where recreational users interrupt Indian religious ceremonies, remove offerings or disturb subsistence activities. Signs were placed at Ninaitstakis Mountain and Devils Tower explaining their spiritual significance, asking visitors not to take offerings.

Temporal or spatial zoning may also reduce cultural conflicts between tribal and recreation users, when ritual ceremonies or subsistence activities take place at defined areas and times. Managing conflicts between recreation users and indigenous groups in protected areas involves addressing disparate cultural and social values of stakeholders, not just physical recreation activities. That is, there is need to manage recreation activities and other non-recreation uses to reduce both physical *and* cultural incompatibility between different user groups in protected areas (Table 4). Tangible or physical conflicts relate to direct interpersonal/intergroup conflicts while intangible or values conflicts relate to indirect clashes between cultural beliefs, world views and socially accepted activities in protected areas. Hence, a research agenda for this topic needs to consider stakeholder perspectives of social and cultural values for natural areas including park managers, visitors, recreation user groups, and indigenous groups. This will help to identify potential conflicts between environmental, social and cultural values and suggest strategies to also manage natural areas for cultural uses.

Table 4. Components of conflicts between recreation and indigenous culture

	Tangible or Physical Conflict	Intangible or Values Conflict
Micro level	Interpersonal Conflict (i.e. goal interference) Interpersonal/intergroup conflict Commercial vs. private recreation Subsistence vs. recreation activities Subsistence vs. sport hunting/fishing	Social Values Conflict (i.e. social acceptability, norms) Societal value conflict Clash of value systems Non-locals don't understand or respect traditional ways
Activity	*Recreation activity, user groups* non-motorized & motorized watercraft (canoes, rafts, kayaks vs. motorboats, jetskis); cross-country skiers & snowmobilers; skiers & snowboarders; hikers & mountain bikers; 4WDs & horse riders; hikers & pack animals (llama, donkey, horse riders); hikers & aircraft; hunters & non-hunters	*Cultural activity, tribal groups* Ritual ceremonies & rock climbers Sacred peaks & mountain climbers Sacred mountains & ski resorts Sacred sites/offerings & hikers Sacred sites & visitor infrastructure Religious practices & natural sites Subsistence hunting, gathering, herding vs. wildlife viewing
Macro level	*Aspects of conflict* Societal level interpersonal/intergroup conflict Use of environment (conflict with agencies, commercial permit administration, zoning) Competition over resources Physical incompatibility Enjoyment	*Aspects of conflict* Societal level value conflict Use of environment (rights issues, land access/ownership, decision making, self-determination) Competition over resources Cultural incompatibility Identity (cultural practices & beliefs)

Source: Expanded from Kluwe & Krumpe, 2003 and Vaske, Needham & Cline, 2007

Conclusions

Recreation conflict in protected areas is due to goal interference based on direct interpersonal conflict or indirect social values conflict. The six types of cross-cultural conflicts between recreational users and indigenous peoples identified in this paper include: Sacred sites/Religious beliefs; Resource use; Land use; Visitor infrastructure; Recreation activity; and Place names. Cultural conflicts between indigenous groups and recreation users highlight the need to manage both diverse physical activities *and* the cultural meaning of

sacred natural areas. There is a need to understand the recreation and social values of different user groups and manage for diverse goal fulfilment like physical challenge or spiritual connection. These cultural values in sustainable tourism highlight the need to understand social groups with different worldviews and meanings about landscapes, resource use and appropriate recreation use of natural areas. It may also involve compromises or conflicts between environmental and cultural sustainability, such as limits on activities or sites in sacred natural areas such as mountains. Protected area managers focus on conserving environmental values of natural areas and still often overlook the social and indigenous values of parks as cultural landscapes. These different world views of protected areas have led to indigenous cultural conflicts about recreation in sacred natural areas. Managers of protected areas with indigenous cultural values are now using education, zoning, and voluntary bans to get recreation user groups to modify their goals and to consider the cultural values of indigenous groups with spiritual connections to natural areas. Managing conflicts between culture and recreation has involved 1) the provision of interpretation and education about indigenous cultural and spiritual values of natural areas on signs and brochures, 2) zoning to separate cultural and recreation users, and 3) prohibition of recreation activities on tribal lands or requests for respectful climbing in public protected areas. The implications for park management agencies are that social and cultural values of natural areas for different user groups must also be considered along with sustaining environmental values. Negotiating conflicts between cultural beliefs and recreation in protected areas thus involves addressing social values conflict between user groups and also recognizing other non-recreational cultural activities in sustainable use of natural areas. Ultimately, both indigenous and non-indigenous users of protected areas seek physical, personal and spiritual connections with highly valued natural areas and/or cultural sites.

References

Bauer, K.R. (2007). Protecting indigenous spiritual values. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice,* 19: 343-349.

Brown, T.J. (1999). Antecedents of culturally significant tourist behaviour. *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(3): 676-700.

Buckley, R. (2005). In search of the narwhal: Ethical dilemmas in ecotourism. *Journal of Ecotourism, 4*(2): 129-134.

Buggey, S. (1999). *An Approach to Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes.* Ottawa: Parks Canada.

Carr, A. (2001). "Locating" culture: Visitor experiences of significant landscape. In *IAA Conference 2001: Biographies, Abstracts and Papers* (pp. 40-45). Collingwood: Interpretation Australia Association.

Carr, A.M. (2004). Mountain places, cultural spaces - interpretation and sustainable visitor management of culturally significant landscapes: A case study of Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 12*(5): 432-459.

Carr, A. (2007). Maori nature tourism businesses: Connecting with the land. In R. Butler & T. Hinch (eds) *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples: Issues and Implications* (pp. 113-127). Oxford: Elsevier.

Carr, A.M. (2008). Cultural landscape values as a heritage tourism resource. In B. Prideaux, D.J. Timothy & K. Chon (eds) *Cultural and Heritage Tourism in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 35-48).London: Routledge.

Dear, C.E. & Myers, O.E. (2005). Conflicted understandings of wilderness and subsistence in Alaskan National Parks. *Society and Natural Resources, 18*: 821-837.

Digance, J. (2003). Pilgrimage at contested sites. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(1): 143-159.

Dussias, A.M. (1999). Cultural conflicts regarding land use: The conflict between recreational users at Devils Tower and Native American ceremonial users. *Vermont*

Journal of Environmental Law, 2. http://www.vjel.org/journal/VJEL10005.html (accessed 20 January 2008).

Dustin, D.L. & Schneider, I.E. (2001). Collaborative conflict resolution at Devils Tower National Monument. *Parks & Recreation, 36*: 80-85.

Dustin, D., Schneider, I., McAvoy, L. & Frakt, A. (2002). Cross-cultural claims on Devils Tower National Monument: A case study. *Leisure Sciences*, 24: 1-10.

Eagles, P.F.J. et al. (2002). Planning for protected area tourism-managing conflict. In *Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas: Guidelines for Planning and Management.* (pp. 56-59). UNEP/IUCN/WTO.

English, A.J. & Lee, E. (2003). Managing the intangible. In D. Harmon and A.D. Putney (eds) *The Full Value of Parks: From Economics to the Intangible* (pp. 43-55). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gale, D. & Buultjens, J. (2007). Mt Warning visitation and indigenous concerns: Visitor's perceptions. In J. Buultjens & D. Fuller, *Striving for Sustainability: Case Studies in Indigenous Tourism* (pp. 247-290). Lismore: Southern Cross University Press.

Graefe, A.E. & Thapa, B. (2004). Conflict in natural resource recreation. In M.J. Manfredo, J.J. Vaske, B.L. Bruyere, D.R. Field & P.J. Brown (eds) *Society and Natural Resources: A Summary of Knowledge* (pp. 209-224). Jefferson, MO: Modern Litho.

Hanson, J.R. & Moore, D. (1999). Applied anthropology at Devils Tower National Monument. *Plains Anthropologist, 44*(170): 53-50.

Harkin, M. (2002). Towering conflicts: Bear Lodge/Devils Tower and the climbing moratorium. *International Journal of Environmental, Cultural, Economic & Social Sustainability, 2*(3): 181-191.

Harmon, D. (2003). Intangible values of protected areas. *Policy Matters* (IUCN), 12: 53-63.

Hay-Edie, T. (2003). The cultural values of protected areas. In D. Harmon & A.D. Putney (eds) *The Full Value of Parks: From Economics to the Intangible* (pp. 91-102). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Head, L. (2000). Identity, heritage and tourism. In *Cultural Landscapes and Environmental Change* (pp. 136-154).London: Hodder Headline.

Hinch, T. (1998). Ecotourists and indigenous hosts: Diverging views on their relationship with nature. *Current Issues in Tourism, 1* (1), 120-124.

Kluwe, J. & Krumpe, E.E. (2003). Interpersonal and societal aspects of use conflicts. *International Journal of Wilderness, 9*(3), 28-33.

Larritt, C.S. (1995). Taking part in Mutawintji: Aboriginal involvement in Mootwingee National Park. *Australian Geographical Studies, 33*(2): 242-256.

Layton, R. & Titchen, S. (1995). Uluru: An outstanding Australian Aboriginal cultural landscape. In B. von Droste, H. Plachter & M. Rossler (eds), *Cultural Landscapes of Universal Value*, Stuttgart & New York: Gustav Fischer Verlag Jena with UNESCO.

Lee, E. (2000). Cultural connections to the land – a Canadian example. *Parks, 10*(2): 3-12.

Lennon, J. (2006). Cultural heritage management. In M. Lockwood, G. Worboys & A. Kothari (eds) *Managing Protected Areas: A Global Guide* (pp. 448-473). London: Earthscan.

Lewis, C.D. (1996). *Managing Conflicts in Protected Areas.* Gland, Switzerland: IUCN Biodiversity Programme, Protected Areas Programme, IUCN Social Policy Group.

Linge, G. (2000). Ensuring the full freedom of religion on public lands: Devils Tower and the protection of Indian sacred sites. *Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, 27*(2): 307-339.

Lockwood, M. (2006). Values and benefits. In M. Lockwood, G.L. Worboys and A. Kothari (eds) *Managing Protected Areas: A Global Guide* (pp. 101-115). London: Earthscan.

Matthews, L. (2007). United States court says no sewage on sacred peaks. World Indigenous News, March 15. http://www.cs.org/publications/win/win-article.cfm?id=2916 (accessed 20 January 2008).

McAvoy, L. (2002). American Indians, place meanings and the old/new west. *Journal of Leisure Research, 34*(4): 383-396.

McAvoy, L. & Shirilla, P. (2005). Indigenous gathering activities as culture (and maybe leisure?): A study of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe in the Chippewa National Forest. In T. Delaware, C. Randall & D. Robinson (eds) *Abstracts of Papers Presented at the Eleventh Canadian Congress on Leisure Research May 17-20, 2005.* Canadian Association for Leisure Studies.

McAvoy, L., McDonald, D. & Carlson, M. (2003). American Indian/First Nation place attachment to park lands: The case of the Nuu-chah-nulth of British Columbia. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 21*(2): 84-104.

McCorquodale, S.M. (1997). Cultural context of recreational hunting and native subsistence and ceremonial hunting: Their significance for wildlife management. *Wildlife Society Bulletin, 25*(2): 568-573.

McDonald, D., & McAvoy, L. (1997). Native Americans and leisure: State of the research and future directions. *Journal of Leisure Research, 29*(2): 145-166.

McIntosh, A.J., Zygadlo, F.K., & Matunga, H. (2004). Rethinking Maori tourism. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research,* 9 (4): 331-351.

McIntyre, N., Jenkins, J. & Booth, K. (2001). Global influences on access: The changing face of access to public lands in New Zealand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 9*(5): 434-450.

Mulvaney, K. (1999). Management strategies and the component of indigenous sacred places. *The George Wright Forum, 16*(4): 37-49.

Neufeld, D. (2002). The commemoration of northern Aboriginal peoples by the Canadian government. *The George Wright Forum, 19*(3): 22-33.

Neufeld, D. (2005). Writing our histories into the land: First Nations initiatives. In R. Cooley, K. MacKay & M. Peniuk (eds) *Parks and Protected Areas: Dynamic Landscape or Museum?*(pp. 10-11). 4th Annual Parks and Protected Areas Research Forum of Manitoba, Winnipeg: University of Manitoba,

Palmer, L. (2004a). Bushwalking in Kakadu: A study in cultural borderlands. *Social & Cultural Geography, 5*(1): 109-127.

Palmer, L. (2004b). Fishing lifestyles: 'Territorians', traditional owners and the management of recreational fishing in Kakadu National Park. *Australian Geographical Studies, 42*(1): 60-76.

Parks Canada (2007). An approach to Aboriginal cultural landscapes. Parks Canada Online. http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/r/pca-acl/index_e.asp (accessed 20 January 2008).

Pfister, R.E. (2000). Mountain culture as a tourism resource: Aboriginal views on the privileges of storytelling. In P.M. Godde, M.F. Price & F.M. Zimmermann (eds) *Tourism and Development in Mountain Regions* (pp. 115-136). Wallingford: CABI.

Poirer, R.A. (2007). Ecotourism and indigenous rights in Australia. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, 19*: 351-358.

Price, N. (1994). Tourism and the Bighorn medicine wheel: How multiple use does not work for sacred land sites. In D.L. Carmichael, J. Hubert, B. Reeves & A. Schanche (eds) *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places* (pp. 259-264). New York: Routledge.

Prosper, L. (2007). Wherin lies the heritage value? Rethinking the heritage value of cultural landscapes from an Aboriginal perspective. *The George Wright Forum, 24*(2): 117-124.

Redmond, L. (1996). Diverse Native American perspectives on the use of sacred areas on public lands. In. B.L. Driver, D. Dustin, T. Baltic, G. Elsner & G. Peterson (eds) *Nature and the Human Spirit: Toward an Expanded Land Ethic* (pp. 127-134). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Reeves, B. (1994). Ninaistakis – the Nitsitapii's sacred mountain: Traditional Native religious activities and land use/tourism conflicts. In D. L. Carmichael et al. (eds.) *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places* (pp. 265-295). London: Routledge.

Riseth, J.A. (2007). An indigenous perspective on national parks and Sami reindeer management in Norway. *Geographical Research*, 45(2): 177-185.

Ruppert, D. (1994). Redefining relationships: American Indians and National Parks. *Practicing Anthropology, 16*(3): 10-13.

Schneider, I.E. (2000). Revisiting and revising recreation conflict research. *Journal of Leisure Research, 32*: 129-132.

Shultis, J. (2003). Recreational values of protected areas. In D. Harmon & A.D. Putney (eds) *The Full Value of Parks: From Economics to the Intangible* (pp. 59-75). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Slattery, D. & B. (2003). Rights of conquest: Some reflections on the cultural obstacles to restricting access in national parks. *Australian Studies, 18*(1): 209-230.

Smith, M., & Duffy, R. (2003). Ethical values. In *The Ethics of Tourism Development* (pp. 7-31). London: Routledge.

Squires, N. (2007). Glass of wine back on menu at Uluru. *The New Zealand Herald,* 11 September, B3.

Sutton, M. (1999). Aboriginal ownership of national parks and tourism. *Cultural Survival Quarterly, 23*(2): 55-56.

Tahana, Y. (2007). Lake operators unfazed by fee. *The New Zealand Herald,* 13 September, A14.

Taylor, B. & Geffen, J. (2003). Battling religions in parks and forest reserves: Facing religion in conflicts over protected places. In D. Harmon & A.D. Putney (eds) *The Full Value of Parks: From Economics to the Intangible* (pp. 281-293). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Taylor, B. & Geffen, J. (2004). Battling religions in parks and forest reserves: Facing religion in conflicts over protected areas. *The George Wright Forum, 21*(2): 56-68.

Taylor, K. (2000). Culture or nature: Dilemmas of interpretation. *Tourism, Culture & Communication, 2*(2): 69-84.

Te Heuheu, T. (1995). A sacred gift: Tongariro National Park, New Zealand. In B. von Droste, H. Plachter & M. Rosser (eds) *Cultural Landscapes of Universal Value: Components of a Global Strategy* (pp. 170-173). Jena: Gustav Fischer Verlag.

Tranel, M.J. & Hall, A. (2003). Parks as battlegrounds: Managing conflicting values. In D. Harmon & A.D. Putney (eds.) *The Full Value of Parks: From Economics to the Intangible* (pp. 253-267). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Vaske, J.J., Donnelly, M.P., Wittman, K. & Laidlaw, S. (1995). Interpersonal versus social-values conflict. *Leisure Sciences, 17*, 205-222.

Vaske, J.J., Needham, M.D. & Cline, R.C. (2007). Clarifying interpersonal and social values conflict among recreationists. *Journal of Leisure Research, 39*(1): 182-195.

Watson, A.E. (2001). Goal interference and social value differences: Understanding wilderness conflicts and implications for managing social diversity. In W.A. Freimund & D.N. Cole (comps) *Visitor use density and wilderness experience: USDA Forest Service Proceedings RMRS-P-20* (pp. 62-67). Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service.

Weaver, D. (2001). *Ecotourism.* Brisbane: Wiley.

Weaver, D.B. (2006). Indigenous territories. In *Sustainable Tourism: Theory and Practice* (pp. 143-146). Oxford: Elsevier.

Weaver, D. & Lawton, L. (2002). *Tourism Management* (2nd edn). Brisbane: Wiley.

WCPA (2000). *Protected Areas - Benefits Beyond Boundaries*. IUCN Online. http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/ (accessed 20 January 2008).

Zeppel, H. (2003). Sharing the country: Ecotourism policy and indigenous peoples in Australia. In D.A. Fennell & R.K. Dowling (Eds.), *Ecotourism Policy and Planning* (pp. 55-76). Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing.

Zeppel, H. (2009). National parks as cultural landscapes: Indigenous peoples, conservation and tourism. In W. Frost & C.M. Hall (eds) *Tourism and National Parks: International Perspectives on Development, Histories and Change* (pp. 259-282). London: Routledge.