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Authenticity in Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes

THOMAS D. ANDREWS AND SUSAN BUGGEY

Aboriginal cultural landscapes are living landscapes where authenticity involves authenticating change.

The Western notion of authenticity is considered crucial to the cultural value of heritage places. But what does authenticity mean in relation to places or landscapes valued by aboriginal peoples? The standard interpretation of authenticity, where the focus is on tangible things, on the attributes of material evidences, and on the integrity of physical fabric, does not resonate with aboriginal people and bears little relevance to the reasons for which indigenous communities value certain landscapes.

Measures of authenticity need instead to respect the cultural contexts to which such places belong, the belief systems associated with them, and the related concepts of land, time, and movement that embody meaning in the cultural landscape. Nor is authenticity exclusively about places; rather, it is about the people and cultures — living traditions — that commemorate, recognize, and value heritage places through the daily activities of their lived lives. Using primarily Tłı̨chǫ examples from Canada’s Northwest Territories, this paper explores cultural value in aboriginal cultural landscapes and how the concept of authenticity relates to heritage value in these landscapes. The paper also examines ways in which approaches broached in the Nara Document on Authenticity and the World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines open opportunities for considering aspects and meaning of authenticity in aboriginal cultural landscapes.

The evolution of the concept of authenticity in the past 15 years has expanded understanding of the idea, as well as consideration of how it can be effectively assessed. The recognition of both cultural diversity and heritage diversity in the Nara Document on Authenticity and the World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines has broadened the approach to addressing authenticity in cultural heritage, encompassing different worldviews that relate to place in fundamentally different ways. Aboriginal cultural landscapes are expressions of a worldview that sees land in essentially spiritual rather than material terms and regards humans as an integral part of the land, inseparable from its animals, plants, and spirits. Key expressions of cultural value are primarily immaterial, such as oral traditions, traditional practices, and intense interactions with living and nonliving components of the environment. Growth and change are integral to these living landscapes and their cultural value.

In terms of the World Heritage Convention aboriginal cultural landscapes may be seen primarily as associative cultural landscapes, characterized by “powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than by material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.” The recognition of the
“active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress” in aboriginal cultural landscapes has sometimes led to their being classified as evolved continuing landscapes, but the usual absence of “significant material evidence of its evolution over time” as principal holder of heritage value conflicts with this categorization. As well, associative cultural landscapes — and aboriginal cultural landscapes — do not involve such temporal linearity. Conservation experts working with associative cultural landscapes recognize that authenticity “may mean the maintenance of a continuing association between the people and the place, however it may be expressed through time[,]” and “must not exclude cultural continuity through change, which may introduce new ways of relating to or caring for the place.”

Inspired by the Nara Document, recent changes to the WHC Operational Guidelines with respect to authenticity and integrity have extended explicit recognition to the intangible aspects of cultural heritage. New attributes that recognize traditional practice, language, spirit and feeling of place, and other forms of intangible heritage as truthful and credible expressions of cultural value for assessing authenticity help to focus attention on values that are important in aboriginal cultural landscapes while allowing tradition and cultural continuity in communities to be maintained. In part, these new directions reflect the intense international dialogue that has accompanied the adoption in 2003 of the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, which centers on such expressions of cultural heritage as oral traditions, social practices, and knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe. The Declaration of San Antonio points to the direct relationship between authenticity and identity, authenticity and social value (spiritual meaning manifested through customs and traditions), and authenticity and stewardship. Where cultural identity is the “foundation of our cultural heritage and its conservation” and the values of a site are “an anchor of cultural identity,” aboriginal cultural landscapes are often examples that “sustain communal life, linking it to the ancestral past...manifested through customs and traditions.” Indigenous communities, as the creators and stewards of the heritage related to aboriginal cultural landscapes, value these places as an integral part of their identity. By identifying heritage values within their worldview and cultural framework, communities encompass what long-established heritage frameworks elsewhere recognize as historical, cultural, social, ecological, and spiritual values (Fig. 1).

The dynamic nature of both cultural values and cultural landscapes makes the process of identifying and protecting them complex. While cultural landscapes change, so do the cultures that commemorate them. David Lowenthal’s astute exploration of authenticity across the ages demonstrates that what counts as authentic has continually shifted in form, space, and time: “the criteria of authenticity we choose reflect current views about how yesterday should serve and inform today.” What people value as authentic is an attribute of the here and now rather than the past. As anthropologist Richard Handler elaborates, “The link between living cultural traditions and the past is not a physical one, not even in those cases involving cultural property, or physical heritage objects; rather, the link is a semiotic one. We use objects to refer to, or to think about, the past. But those cultural links to the past can exist only in the present and only within present-day semiotic activities. To save or conserve the past, tradition, or heritage is to do something new, today.” This fundamental aspect of authenticity is not applied well in heritage-conservation practice. However, any test of authenticity relevant to aboriginal cultural landscapes must respect this context.

Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes: The Living Landscape

What are aboriginal cultural landscapes? As archaeologist Denis Byrne and historian Maria Nugent explain in relation to Australia, “the concept of
sites is not sufficient for representing, reflecting and recording Aboriginal post-contact cultural heritage. It is the landscapes themselves that ought to be considered heritage...they are thick with the significance inscribed by those who have lived in them and claimed them as their own."13 Aboriginal cultural landscapes are not sites or relics. They are living landscapes that indigenous people identify as fundamentally important to their cultural heritage, areas that embody their relationship with the land. Dynamic change is inherent in such cultural landscapes. They change constantly as a result of natural and cultural processes; they are always growing. As the British anthropologist Barbara Bender has shown, landscapes, like time, never stand still. They are continuously in the process of being shaped and reshaped by social, economic, political, cultural, and natural forces that have effects upon their features, characteristics, and meanings (Fig. 2).14

The key to the heritage value of aboriginal cultural landscapes lies in a people's relationship with the land. Indigenous peoples around the world value the land. An understanding of the term land extends far beyond the earth's surface to include cosmological relationships with the heavens and the underworld. It also encompasses the earth's waters, animals and plants that inhabit the terrestrial and marine world, and spirits that dwell in the land. Humans are an integral part of this living world, where their lives are interdependent with its other aspects. "The land is an integral part of who we are and how we define ourselves... the land is a part of us, we take care of the land."15 Survival derives from respectful interaction with the land, including sustained observation and appropriate behavior. Places deemed sacred within an aboriginal cultural landscape often underscore the importance of sustained observation and respectful behavior. For example, Tlicho sacred places require travelers to perform geomantic rituals, which augur their future well-being, whenever their travels take them past the place in an appropriate season. Not only can one's past behavior impact the outcome of the ritual, failure to stop — to "try your luck" — is a sign of deep disrespect, threatening the possibility of a positive outcome in a future visit.16 The landscape becomes the arbiter of appropriate behavior requiring sustained observation and continuously respectful actions. In this way, cultural, ecological, and spiritual values are inseparably intertwined in this holistic and dynamic living world. As statesman Tlicho John B. Zoe explains, "Your ability to communicate with the animals themselves, the ability to communicate with The Creator, your spiritual growth, is given to you by the land and animals, every time you go out. Sometimes those things will be replaced by modern spirituality. But the land, history and spiritual growth that comes from the land never changes."17

Thus, the Tlicho "dwell" in their environment, engaged with places, animals, and spirit-beings, where their "togetherness" creates an embodied cultural landscape. Building on the work of anthropologist Tim Ingold, British geographers Paul Cloke and Owain Jones note that "dwelling is about the rich intimate ongoing togetherness of beings and things which make up landscapes and places, and which bind together nature and culture over time."18 The concept of dwelling, finding its foundation in the phenomenology of Martin Heidegger and championed by British anthropologist Tim Ingold, provides an appropriate perspective for contextualizing change in aboriginal cultural landscapes. Ingold defines dwelling as "a perspective that treats the immersion of the organism-person in an environment or lifeworld as an inescapable condition of existence. From this perspective, the world continually comes into being around the inhabitants [as they travel through it], and its manifold constituents take on significance through their incorporation into a regular pattern of life activity."19 For the Tlicho, human-persons and animal-persons are deeply interrelated, and as John B. Zoe's statement above demonstrates, history and personal experience serve to underscore the importance between humans, animals, and place in aboriginal worldview (Fig. 3).

Moving in Landscapes of Knowledge

Humans engage with other organism-persons and places through travel, and therefore movement, or mobility, lies at the heart of aboriginal cultural landscapes. When people live with the land, they move in it and do so in the course of daily and seasonal activities, such as hunting, trapping, trading, gathering, camping, and meeting family. Routes through landscapes are the paths by which people move from place to place,
stone quarries solely by examining the language of the place names. Trails link these named places and, together with the narratives residing in them, create a complex topology of knowledge.

The key for gaining knowledge is through the direct experience of travel. By moving from place to place an individual can collect the stories resident along the way, as the physical form of a named geographic feature triggers memory recall. Thus, children were educated and socialized through travel as parents and elders helped them learn the names and narratives through storytelling. The daily practice of living — setting traps or a net, harnessing dogs, repairing snowmobiles, butchering a caribou, tracking a moose, cooking favorite foods, cutting and sewing hide clothing, framing a birch-bark canoe, lashing a snowshoe, travelling safely over thinning spring ice or rough water — was taught through demonstration as youth watched experienced adults undertaking these activities. Viewed through the lens of personal experience, the storied landscape becomes a repository of information, ready to be called upon when required. Through the daily travel required to make a livelihood and using the mnemonic cue of landmarks to recall the information stored in the landscape, individuals gradually acquired the knowledge needed to dwell in a changing world.

For the Tłı̨chǫ, travel through a cultural landscape today is seen as a component of nation building, reflecting traditional ways that continue to be valued in a modern world. Travel by foot, birch-bark canoe, or dog team over thousands of kilometres of trails has been embedded in the Tłı̨chǫ way of being for millennia; indeed, Tłı̨chǫ oral tradition speaks of mythical beings and giant creatures travelling the very same trails that humans continue to use. Though the birch-bark canoe and the dog team have long disappeared as a form of everyday conveyance, youth and elders continue today to travel these routes using modern Kevlar canoes or snowmobiles (Fig. 4). As part of a school curriculum, these journeys are designed to make students “strong like two people” by providing them with the cultural experience of their traditional landscape as an aspect of the bricks-and-mortar school setting. The first trips, more than a decade ago, overlapped with the period when the Tłı̨chǫ were negotiating a comprehensive self-government and land-claim agreement with the governments of Canada and the Northwest Territories. As a result, the trips came to symbolize the nation building the Tłı̨chǫ were engaged in. As the Chiefs’ Executive Council of the Tłı̨chǫ Government notes, “canoes were significant in charting the history of who we are as Tłı̨chǫ. We continue to keep this history alive by traveling the trails of our ancestors to our annual gatherings, today.”

Anthropologist Jean-Guy Goulet has noted that the “Dene expect learning to occur through observation rather than instruction, an expectation consistent with the Dene view that true knowledge is personal knowledge. The Dene prefer this kind of knowledge since it is the form that has the most secure claim to being accepted as true and valid.” Knowledge, then, is acquired through embodied experience and observation, often in the presence of others, drawing upon, when needed, a codified set of information passed through an oral tradition. Since stories are tied to geographic features, the landscape is both a repository of knowledge and a stage on which actors gain experience through the embodied activities of daily life (Fig. 5).

The fact that the northern aboriginal system of knowledge acquisition differs markedly from that in Western science leads sometimes to distrust and misunderstanding when individuals from these different epistemological traditions interact. Addressing this, anthropologist Colin Scott has argued that aboriginal traditional knowledge results “from intellectual processes not quantitatively different from those of Western science.” More and more, both traditions are seen as sciences, or ethnosciences, to
use the wording of American anthropologist Melford Spiro. As Spiro has noted, “all science is ethnoscience. Hence, since modern science is Western science, its truth claims (and canons of proof) are no less culturally relative than those of any other ethnoscience.”30 In short, to require that oral tradition, a canon of proof in aboriginal society, be subjected to additional tests of authenticity to ensure its veracity smacks of ethnocentrism. Certainly the Tłı̨chǫ have accepted the concept that there is something to learn from people from a different epistemological system. Travelling traditional birch-bark canoe trails in modern Kevlar canoes provides a way for elders and youth to interact in an old setting in a new way. By incorporating a traditional pedagogy of teaching through the experience of travel in a storied landscape within the frame of a bricks-and-mortar school system, the Tłı̨chǫ have turned this into a positive force for their children, creating, in their words, students who are “strong like two people.”

**Authenticity: Conserving the True Essence of the Place**

Some conservation professionals working with places associated with aboriginal peoples have questioned the relevance of applying the concept of authenticity to them. Debate has centered on issues of the historical validity of ethnographic data, the imposition of cultural bias in interpreting them, the impact of historical diaspora and social dislocation on self-reinterpretation of the past, and the significance of transformative roles in cultural revitalization.31 Rather than pursuing these directions, Thomas F. King, an expert in traditional cultural properties, suggests that the appropriate approach to authenticity may be to ask whether the place plays “the sort of role in a community’s cultural integrity that people say it does”; this approach raises the question of how community is identified.32 The Northwest Territories Protected Areas Strategy leaves this complex matter to the community itself to resolve in the course of initiating and carrying through its eight-step process for the identification, evaluation, and protection of areas of significant cultural and natural value.33 With traditional knowledge being lost rapidly through lack of intergenerational transfer of oral traditions and “spatial practices,” as Lisa Prosper terms experiential land-related activities, community engagement is particularly important to the sustainability of aboriginal cultural landscapes (Fig. 6).34 In exploring application of the concept to cultural heritage in Africa, ICCROM conservation experts Jukka Jokilehto and Joseph King see “an invitation to undertake a process where the authenticity of heritage is gradually being revealed as the true essence of the place.”35 As the association between people and land defined by their worldview lies at the heart of aboriginal cultural landscapes, how is authenticity conserved in such landscapes?

Enlarging the range of attributes for meeting the conditions of authenticity in order to encompass several attributes related to intangible heritage opens the way to addressing authenticity in aboriginal cultural landscapes.36 Traditions of respect for the land, traditions of observation and ecological knowledge, traditions of movement in the landscape, traditions of activity related to the land, and traditions of storytelling all root people in the land. Aboriginal cultural landscapes are the expression of this relationship over time. Continuity of traditions is thus a key indicator of authenticity. Currently, identified attributes do not, however, get to the core of the heritage value of such landscapes, which centers on a people’s relationship with the land. That relationship lies in continuity of association with the land. Continuity of access to and activities in the land, continuity of oral traditions and practices bound to the land, respect for the knowledge and skills of the
elders, and engagement of youth and community in continuity of memory and identity through intergenerational transfer and continuing practices — these are some conditions that can conserve the cultural value of aboriginal cultural landscapes. Without them, the landscape loses the traditional knowledge and practices that are essential to its cultural value and authenticity.

Continuity: People, Communities, and Cultural Landscapes

Cultural value in aboriginal cultural landscapes centers on the living landscape, a dynamic world defined by continuity, growth, and change, where human life is interactive with a natural and spiritual world integral to the land. As anthropologist Colin Scott explains, intricate human-animal-plant relationships are central to practical empirical knowledge that guides decision making on the land.37 Considerations of wholeness or intactness, the defining conditions of integrity of the cultural landscape, must situate within this cultural context. Aboriginal groups may consider authenticity to be lost where land management approaches intrude on their access to the land and their continuing relationship with it.

Authenticity is always relative, not fixed, and is negotiated, not imposed. It has to work with the cultural context in which it is being applied. Credibility of information sources is rightly an issue in applying the Western concept of authenticity. Credibility is, however, itself a cultural value that needs to be interpreted within the cultural context to which it is being applied. Considering the authenticity of aboriginal cultural landscapes within their cultural context requires acceptance not only that oral traditions are a valid source of information but also that they are a canon of proof in aboriginal society.

Oral traditions include storytelling and active listening, place names, songs, and kinship relations, all of which continue to grow in response to a changing environment. Embodying knowledge, history, language, and identity, these traditions are the ongoing mnemonic record of a people’s shared experience with the land — historical events, experiential and mythic journeys, dangerous places, rich resources, moral instructions. Documentation of traditional knowledge — including place names, narratives, ecological knowledge, and practices — has been extensively practiced in the Northwest Territories for more than 25 years.38 Manuals related to documenting oral traditions and aboriginal cultural landscapes as Territorial historic sites provide some readily accessible, community-based tools for such documentation.39

Language is an integral part of maintaining a people’s relationship with the land. Numerous culturally specific terms in aboriginal languages are essential to retention of ecological knowledge in cultural landscapes and are also important to understanding nuances of oral traditions. British anthropologist Barbara Bender examines place, memory, and language to show how a word in the language of a person’s experience evokes memory, while that word in another language often fails to engage the meanings and connections associated with memory.40 For example, for most southern Canadians the word caribou evokes a sense of the North, of wilderness, and of a cultural orientation as a northern nation. Yet few would be able to identify the image of the animal stamped on every Canadian 25-cent coin as a caribou. In contrast, for all northern aboriginal peoples the word caribou — eχίχβ in Tłı̨chǫ — especially when expressed in their own aboriginal language, evokes the very essence of life, of an existence living in harmony with other animal-persons embodied in a northern cultural landscape. It represents tools, food, clothing, and habitation, for all of these things were provided by the caribou. Most of all, it does not evoke a sense of wilderness but instead a sense of home, for without the caribou human life could not have existed in the harsh northern environment for the millennia it has.

Intergenerational transfer of oral traditions, language, and traditional practices from elders to youth is a key component of retaining cultural value in aboriginal cultural landscapes. The term tradition by definition means “the transmission of customs or beliefs from generation to generation” and “a long-established custom or belief passed on in this way.”41 Assured long-term access to the land, travel in it, and continuing practice of traditional activities related to the landscape, such as traveling, working on the land, and storytelling, are crucial to transmitting knowledge and experience of the land and the oral traditions associated with it. Continuity of these traditions involves both learning and ongoing practice of appropriate behavior on the land, skills for living with the land, and creation of traditional forms (Fig. 7).

Elders are the knowledge holders, the cornerstone of knowledge about aboriginal cultural landscapes; by mentoring youth in oral traditions, language, and traditional practices, the elders help sustain their culture. Youth are the core of sustainability of oral traditions and aboriginal cultural landscapes. They can learn language, traditions, and practices by listening to storytelling by the elders and by traveling the land with them to learn observation, places, practices, and skills, so they too can participate in sustaining community memory and identity and the landscapes that are integral to them. Engaging youth meaningfully and using new technologies familiar to youth to assist learning continue the cultural tradition of adapting to change. For example, using computer-assisted mapping technologies in school programs to document aspects of traditional land use provides an opportunity for youth to learn from elders while acquiring new skills appropriate to life today. These new technologies also create new ways of learning, as old knowledge is digitized and presented in new ways. For example, Lessons from the Land: A Cultural Journey through the Northwest Territories, developed as a school program, centers on the meaning and experience of the Idää Trail, a traditional Tłı̨chǫ trail from Great Slave Lake to Great Bear Lake. Stopping points in this virtual journey form a web of connected places along the trail that include traditional caribou and fishing places, campsites, places associated with legendary figures, grave sites, portages and abandoned village sites, all important to Tłı̨chǫ identity.42 Learning about the “old days” through projects designed to revisit ancient examples of material culture provides opportunities for youth and elders to interact, while also creating display objects to enrich
the school setting and providing yet other opportunities for learning new skills, such as video recording and filmmaking. The knowledge and skills to continue creating traditional forms — renewal through traditional know-how — holds people together with their cultural heritage and cultural identity. Projects like the Tłı̨chǫ caribou-skin lodge and birch-bark canoe and the Gwich’in clothing project engage communities in retention of their heritage with the cultural landscape.43

As the community-based evidence and community-based projects discussed in this paper make obvious, community engagement is crucial to both identifying values and conserving places associated with aboriginal people. Elders and youth, indeed all parts of a community, are engaged in the continuity of cultural landscapes. They are living landscapes that evolve with the life of the community. The community holds identity and memory and nurtures them from the past through the present into the future. The engagement of youth is critical to this continuity and to conserving cultural landscapes.

Conclusion

To introduce an important article reflecting on Western views of cultural authenticity in the context of indigenous identity politics, Beth Conklin invokes the memory of a Gary Larson cartoon:

Every connoisseur of anthropology department bulletin boards knows this Far Side cartoon (Larson 1984): A grass-skirted native man in a tall headdress stands at the window of a thatched hut. He has just spotted a couple of pith-helmeted, camera-toting creatures coming ashore and sounds the alarm: “Anthropologists! Anthropologists!” His two companions, similarly attired with bones through their noses, rush to unplug their television, VCR, lamp, and telephone and stash them out of sight. The cartoon captures a persistent stereotype about native peoples and cultural authenticity. The first, obvious idea is that outsiders (anthropologists included) tend to see complex Western technology as a corrupting force that undermines traditional cultures. “Real” natives don’t use VCRs.44

Conklin further notes that Larson’s sketch contains a second, more subtle idea: “Hide the television, but keep the grass skirt, and the ‘authenticity’ of the natives goes unquestioned.” Conklin’s analysis demonstrates that Western notions of cultural authenticity require that indigenous people must match a perceived ideal of indigenousness that is ahistorical, unchanging, and pure from foreign influences, and in so doing commits the “error of essentialism,” to paraphrase anthropologist Richard Lee.45 As Conklin notes, this “leaves little room for intercultural exchange or creative innovation, and locates ‘authentic’ indigenous actors outside global cultural trends and changing ideas and technologies.”46

In a similar vein, this paper has attempted to reflect on how the Western test of authenticity is applied to aboriginal cultural landscapes in the context of heritage preservation. For the Tłı̨chǫ, the process of educating children while en route through a storied landscape and engaged in the practice of daily life is an ancient and “authentic” pedagogy. No one would suggest otherwise: indeed, in some ways this process is the perceived ideal that Western notions of authenticity attempt to uphold. However, we argue here that teaching their children today while traveling a storied landscape in Kevlar canoes and as part of a modern school curriculum is just as authentic, because it applies the very same cultural principles and values, albeit in the context of an introduced pedagogy that uses modern transportation technology and while participating in a process of implementing self-government and land-claim provisions as part of nation building.

Today the Tłı̨chǫ cultural landscape is under the jurisdiction of a complex self-government and land-claim agreement that provides control over vast areas important to the Tłı̨chǫ, while other parts remain under Canadian government control, albeit within a joint-management framework. This regime allows the Tłı̨chǫ to pursue joint-venture agreements with multinational mining companies wanting to develop mineral resources while protecting the Tłı̨chǫ right to hunt caribou, an activity that has sustained them for centuries and one that continues today. However, in preparing for a hunt today, a hunter is as likely to refer to a map from the government’s wildlife department showing the location of GPS-collared caribou as he is to reference his own experience of caribou behavior or the stories passed down from his father and grandfather about caribou.46 He may use a truck, a motorboat, a snowmobile, or a plane to reach the hunting area and will surely dispatch the caribou with a modern, high-powered rifle. A century ago, the Tłı̨chǫ landscape was firmly under the colonial control of the Canadian government, and their agents — the church, the

Fig. 8. Youth and elders walk together along an esker in the barrenlands during a "science camp," allowing them to share their knowledge with youth of many cultures and reflecting the changing demography of the Northwest Territories.
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Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and the Hudson’s Bay Company — administered it on their behalf. A century before that, the cultural landscape was subject only to the agency of the Tłı́chǫ. the animals and spiritual entities they shared it with, and physical components of the landscape itself. What might the Tłı́chǫ cultural landscape look like a century from now? Which of these versions of the Tłı́chǫ cultural landscape are authentic? The only possible answer is that while they all are authentic, only the landscape of today is available to us: the others can only be conceived in our imagination (Fig. 8). To seek a sense of authenticity in the past is to search for an artificial construction. As David Lowenthal has noted, in “historic preservation, as in heritage generally, what is sought is apt to be the semblance of authenticity, a search that inevitably yields contrivance.”

Aboriginal cultural landscapes are living landscapes that change as time progresses, where oral tradition is the canon of proof and where changing practices of embodied experience with landscapes grow from generation to generation, all the while being acted out on a global stage. Any test of authenticity, therefore, must recognize, expect, and endorse change. Ultimately, however, the reality that aboriginal cultural landscapes are located in the here and now and are under a process of continuing change challenges the need for a test of authenticity at all. We believe that the Nara Document on Authenticity and The Declaration of San Antonio have made significant advances in this critical area, and we hope this paper stimulates further debate.
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38. The tradition of documenting traditional land use has been linked with land claims negotiations for more than three decades, beginning in the Northwest Territories with the Inuit Land Use and Occupancy project, which was published in 1976. Recent efforts have used the Internet to good effect, presenting educational and informative Web sites focussed on place names, trails, land use, and other aspects of culture. A good example has been posted by the Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute at http://www.gwichin.ca/.
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