

Working Through Conflict: Two Examples of Agreement in Community Forestry

by

Joselin Corrigan
Bachelor of the Arts, University of Victoria, 2000

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTERS OF THE ARTS

in Dispute Resolution
Faculty of Human and Social Development

© Joselin Corrigan, 2009
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

Working Through Conflict: Two Examples of Agreement in Community Forestry

by

Joselin Corrigan
Bachelor of the Arts, University of Victoria, 2000

Supervisory Committee

Dr. James C.B. Lawson, Political Science
Supervisor

Dr. Patricia Mackenzie, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, Social Work
Co-Supervisor or Departmental Member

Dr. Karena Shaw, Environmental Studies
Outside Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. James C.B. Lawson, Political Science

Supervisor

Dr. Patricia Mackenzie, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, Social Work

Departmental Member

Dr. Karena Shaw, Environmental Studies

Outside Member

Developing a community forest in British Columbia involves multiple stakeholder agreements; negotiating agreement within diverse communities can be especially complicated. In this study I use the constant comparative method from grounded theory to compare data from two case studies and examine the conflict resolution techniques used by community forest developers throughout their development initiatives. Data were collected through interviews with community forest developers with a focus on the process of development, the conflict resolution strategies used, and the successes and failures throughout the process. The findings from this thesis indicate that community forest developers engage in a process that I call Developing a Community Forest. This process includes five categories of action: Building an Idea of Community Forestry, Being Aware of the Box, Coming Toward Conflict, Using Dispute Resolution Strategies, and Practicing Community Forestry. By articulating this process future community forest developers can access the methods of conflict resolution described in this thesis in their attempts to successfully develop community forestry in other local forest areas.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	v
Acknowledgments.....	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
Community Profiles	2
Research Design and Methods.....	5
Researcher Background	7
Thesis Overview	8
CHAPTER ONE – CONTEXT AND THEORY.....	9
Conflicts in Forest Policy.....	9
History of Community Forestry in BC	12
Definition and Description of Community Forestry.....	15
Environmental Conflict Resolution	19
CHAPTER TWO – RESEARCH DESIGN.....	39
Purpose and Questions.....	39
Participant Identification and Recruitment	39
Research Method	41
Data Coding	43
Data Analysis	50
Ethical Considerations	52
Limitations of the study and other issues.....	54
CHAPTER THREE – FINDINGS.....	56
Developing a Community Forest - An Introduction to the Categories.....	57
Building an Idea of Community Forestry – The Findings.....	68
Being Aware of the Box	77
Coming Toward Conflict	81
Using Dispute Resolution (DR) Strategies	93
Practicing Community Forestry	104
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	110
Discussion	110
Conclusion	132
Bibliography	135
Appendices.....	140
Appendix A - Invitation to Participate and Informed Consent Form	141
Appendix B - Question Sheet	143

List of Tables

Table A – Open Codes to Axial Codes.....	44
Table B – Axial Codes to Selective Codes.....	45
Table C – Selective Coding Process.....	47
Table D – Developing a Community Forest.....	62
Table E – Comparison Chart.....	94

Acknowledgments

Producing this thesis has been a long, arduous road walked in relative isolation, but I would like to acknowledge those who have helped me along, making it much less lonely. Thank you to my family, especially my mum and dad for being so supportive and encouraging, my friends who watched me suffering through distance education and were always a little afraid to ask after my progress, my first supervisor, Pierre, who signed the paperwork to move me along, my current supervisor, Jamie, whose whole hearted enthusiasm for my thesis topic gave me strength and confidence to continue when I was sure all was lost, Pat Mackenzie whose wisdom and experience has been a light in the darkness all the way through, Lois Pegg who was a never ending resource trying to straighten my crooked path, my cohort from Dispute Resolution, Carly (and Aaron), Carol, Rhiannon, Cecilia, Kari, and Stacy, who suffered with me using mugs of beer and plates of chicken wings to sooth our souls and have supported me from far and wide, my wonderful girl friends Andrea, Amelia, Tanya, Liz, Sue, and Elly, and to the participants in this research (you know who you are) for engaging with me in a topic that is interesting to all of us who live in the forest. And most of all to my lovely, loving partner Brett. I couldn't have done it without you. Thank you all for your support and encouragement. I never thought I would finish. Whew!

INTRODUCTION

Community forestry is a recent and growing phenomenon in British Columbia (BC), beginning in 1999¹ with the development of eleven community forest pilot projects and establishing itself in the BC Forest Act Community Tenures Regulation in 2004.² The concept of community forestry can be described as “any forestry operation managed by a local government, community group, or First Nation for the benefit of the entire community.”³ A community forest agreement exists between the province of British Columbia and legal entities representing community interests.⁴ For example, “a first nation, a municipality, a regional district, a society incorporated under the *Society Act*, an association as defined in the *Cooperative Association Act*, a corporation, or a partnership.”⁵ Following a successful 5 year probationary agreement, long-term agreements “of not less than 25 years and not more than 99 years are entered.”⁶ A community forest describes an area agreed upon by the minister, or a person authorized by the minister, in an area of crown land, land that includes a reserve as defined in the *Canadian Indian Act*, or private land.⁷ In British Columbia, community forests are most often established when the government grants forest management rights to a community as a tenure arrangement, or timber license. Examples include: community forest agreements, forest licenses, and tree farm licenses. The agreement gives the tenure holder the rights to harvest crown timber on a specific land base and

¹ “Harrop Procter Society gets a Community Forest,” Ministry of Forests, BC, (June 2001), <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/pscripts/pab/newsrel/mofnews.asp?refnum=1999%3A081> (accessed Jan 2007)

² Community Forest Tenure Regulation, Ministry of Forests, BC, (July 2004), <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/legislation.htm> (accessed March 24, 2008)

³ “What are community forests?,” Ministry of Forests, BC, (July 2007), <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/> (accessed March 24, 2008)

⁴ “What is community forestry?,” British Columbia Community Forest Association (BCCFA), <http://www.bccfa.ca/about/what-is-community-forestry.html> (accessed January 18, 2009)

⁵ “Statutes and Regulations” in the Forest Act, RSBC 1996, c.157, division 7.1, Community Forest Agreements, Application for Probationary Community Forest Agreements, 43.2 (3) http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/legsregs/forest/foract/part3.htm#part3_division7-1 (accessed January 18, 2009)

⁶ “Statutes and Regulations” in the Forest Act, RSBC 1996, c.157, division 7.1, Community Forest Agreements, Content of Community Forest Agreement, 43.3 http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/legsregs/forest/foract/part3.htm#part3_division7-1 (accessed January 18, 2009)

⁷ *ibid*

harvest, manage and charge fees for non-timber botanical forest products and any other prescribed forest products.⁸ Although required to pay the designated government stumpage, stipulations “are flexible enough to accommodate innovative and unconventional forest management practices.”⁹ Expressions of community forestry range within this general model due to the diversity of reasons for wanting a community forests, the stakeholders involved in community forests and the varied community approaches to timber harvest.

As with many land-based issues, diverging interests often get in the way of a successful community forest development initiative, especially without the skills of conflict resolution.¹⁰ Even in successful cases of community forestry, conflict occurs. The focus of this research is to explore community forest developer experiences of conflict throughout the development process and their methods for gaining resolution in a successful community forest initiative. Throughout this research I asked the following questions: Does conflict resolution play a role in community forest development? What is that role and what impact does conflict resolution have in the success of community forest development? These key questions led me to a greater understanding of the detailed process of community forest development and the specific role of conflict resolution in the development process.

Community Profiles

To gain a better understanding of the ways community forest developers perceive and approach conflict and resolution, I researched two cases of community forestry by interviewing four community forest developers from two rural communities of less than 1000 people. I interviewed four individuals involved in the development of community forests from two communities - two people from each area - and examined supporting documents outlining the process of gaining support for their initiatives.

Although within the same region, these two community forest initiatives experienced the development process quite differently. Community forest A is an isolated rural community residing in a narrow valley. A ferry boat ride is required across a lake narrows to access the twin towns and the community forest. The community forest is 10,500 hectares

⁸ *ibid*

⁹ “What is community forestry?” British Columbia Community Forest Association (BCCFA), <http://www.bccfa.ca/about/what-is-community-forestry.html> (accessed January 18, 2009)

¹⁰ James E. Crowfoot and Julia M. Wollondeck. *Environmental Disputes: Community Involvement in Conflict Resolution* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1990): 2

of land that is primarily steep terrain containing three domestic watershed areas - the area that surrounds creek water sources tapped for drinking¹¹.

Community Forest A has been practicing forestry since BC first granted community forest licenses. It was one of eleven community forests to initiate what could be considered a forestry experiment in BC.¹² In 2006 community forest A was granted a long-term, 25-year tenure agreement after the completion of two short-term, five-year tenure agreements.¹³ Their approach to forestry is unique in the world of community forestry; community forest A applies a management strategy called ecosystem-based management.¹⁴ The two main goals of community forest A are: 1. to protect local water sources; and 2. to generate jobs per cubic metre of wood harvested and provide regional and community employment opportunities and economic growth.¹⁵

Community forest A was established before the current template for community forest licenses was established. Recent concerns about the effect of a new template for community forests designed by the Ministry of Forests (MOF) designating the Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) and placing restrictions on cutting strategies have caused ripples within community forest A. Now that community forest A has received their 25-year agreement, they will continue to use their current approach with confidence. This loose template for community forests licensees is used to guide both District Managers and community forest developers throughout their planning and implementation process. Unlike case A, community forest B began their project working with this template, yet another factor affecting their outcomes.

These developers established their community forest under the auspices of a watershed protection society to spearhead the issue of logging in the community watershed. An incorporated community cooperative holds the community forest agreement with the

¹¹ Throughout this thesis domestic watershed is defined as the area within 30 metres of a creek, above or below ground. Domestic watershed refers to watershed areas that provide drinking water to local homes. This definition is debated and can expand to include entire creek systems as they flow towards a lake or major river.

¹² "Jobs and timber accord pilots new community forests tenure," Ministry of Forests, BC, (June 2001), <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/history.htm> (accessed July 5, 2006)

¹³ "Province to Issue Long-term Community Forest Agreement," Ministry of Forests, BC, (Aug 11, 2006), <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/news.htm> (accessed Sept, 2006).

¹⁴ "Introduction to Ecosystem Based Planning," Silva Forest Foundation, (2002-2003), <http://www.silvafor.org/index.htm> (accessed September 12, 2006)

¹⁵ "Organization and Mission Statements," Organization website, (2001), <http://www.hpcommunityforest.org/about/mission.html> (accessed March 2004)

Province and the watershed protection society acts as a watchdog organization for the community cooperative holding 50% of the board seats. Although both organizations are volunteer-driven, there is money derived from private benefactors and profits from the community forest to pay staff members including a directing manager and a licensed forester.

Community forest B varies from community forest A geographically and socio-economically. The proposed community forest is in a long and narrow valley consisting of approximately 339,936 hectares (840,000 acres) of land and water. It is a larger community forest initiative in comparison, with multiple domestic watersheds flowing within the area and emptying into the large central river system. There are many sub-valleys or spurs off of the main valley thereby expanding the area for potential timber supply, enabling more access to timber and making it lucrative for industry to stay involved in the area.

In addition to a vastly different geographic set-up from community forest A, the socio-economics of community forest B contrast markedly. Community forest area B is home to many industrial loggers, tree planters and forestry professionals, as well as to a strong environmental contingent whose interests include protecting domestic water, animal habitat and preventing forestry from happening where they live. In contrast, community forest A's primary goal to protect domestic water and wildlife habitat is reflected in their more homogenous population base, primarily non-forest related professionals. The diversity within community forest B is revealed by their broader purpose which places emphasis on current and future employment as well as other mixed-use values and interests including continued forestry. The protection of domestic water is only one of many values.

Case B's surrounding valley has been industrially logged for over 30 years. Currently the area for the community forest is held by a tenure agreement between a locally owned logging company, the Province, and by BC Timber Sales (BCTS), "an independent organization within the BC Ministry of Forests created to develop Crown timber for auction to establish market price and capture the value of the asset for the public."¹⁶ Previous to the locally owned company, Triangle Pacific, Slocan Forest Products, and CANFOR held tenure licenses for the area. All three companies including the current holders have been involved

¹⁶ "Welcome to BC Timber Sales," BC Timber Sales, (July 2007), <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/bcts/> (Accessed December, 2007)

in resident disputes and the target for direct action protests against their work in forestry for the last three decades.

Community forest B received approval for their five-year probationary agreement in January 2008.¹⁷ The proposed area is 15,850 hectares (39,166 acres).¹⁸ Community forest developers from case B have requested an invitation to place a proposal with MOF twice over the past ten years, the first time in 1995 when the government first initiated the idea of community forests. At that time, similarly to community forest A's proposal, the management strategies for the initiative were ecosystems based; the invitation was denied for many reasons, but most significantly lack of consensus about the proposed plan. The downfalls of the first attempt were reflected in the strategies used in the second approach. A new development team began a second proposal in 2006, this time meeting with support from their community and by the government.

Similar to community forest A, case B developers submitted an application under an incorporated community cooperative. Years of civil disobedience targeting local logging has inhibited the progress of industry in past years to the frustration of the MOF Chief Forester and District Manager; one contributing factor to the success of community forest development B may be found in Provincial and Regional support for a project that has potential to allay forestry related conflicts involving industry and the Province.

Research Design and Methods

This research began as an exploration of activist perceptions of environmental conflict within the context of community forestry. However, when melding two interests, conflict resolution and activism in community forestry, I contemplated the potential difficulty in gaining a balanced, or neutral, perspective when interviewing only forest activists. However, a concentration in conflict resolution applied to community forest development focused this examination on community forest developer perspectives and their use of conflict resolution in the development of community forestry. In two case studies, community forest developers were involved in activism for most of their lives, in some cases forest activism and in others social activism. Yet through their involvement in

¹⁷ "Slocan Issued a Probationary Agreement," Ministry of Forests, BC, (Feb 13, 2008), <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/Documents/news-release-slocan-issued-cfa-feb-13-2006.pdf> (accessed April 21, 2008)

¹⁸ *ibid*

community forestry they were living a paradox; after standing against conventional logging and being involved in anti-forestry activity they were now lobbying to become foresters themselves. It is this paradox that came into focus in the interviews; it exemplifies the complexities of community forest development, brings contextual depth to community relationships with forests, and broadens current definitions of the mediator.¹⁹

The difficulty of interpreting conflict based on this paradoxical, singular perspective testimony continued to arise through the research. Community forest developers are self-appointed, or community appointed, mediators, sometimes lacking conflict resolution skills. Often their work goes against the values of the environmental community, with whom they may have close relationships, who have been working to prevent logging in domestic watershed and delicate habitat areas. Community forest developers work in the conflict resolution field aiding in the development of a community forest vision to satisfy a range of interests. Both cases are examples where individuals previously committed to one side of a dispute over forest management initiated a community forest development; they were in situations where they were expected to be neutral and advocate at the same time. How did they reconcile themselves with these two often oppositional tasks? Did they use conflict resolution to do it? If so, in what ways did it lead to the success of the initiative?

I focused on the struggle for activists turned community forest developers in order to discern their success and reveal the complexity of their role, rather than looking to the role of industry or government or other specific interest groups in the development process. In place of interviews from other sectors, I conducted thorough document research to corroborate data from the interviews. Future research into these local processes could include any or all of the following interest groups: First Nations, environmental organizations and direct action activists, unions, forest industry, and government.

¹⁹ Definitions of mediation and negotiation vary widely in conflict resolution literature. For this research I am using the definitions of mediation according to:

Andrew J. Pirie. *Alternative Dispute Resolution: Skills, Science and the Law*. (Toronto, Ontario: Irwin Law Inc., 2000): 50

Dean G. Pruitt and Paul V Olczak. Beyond Hope: Approaches to Seemingly Intractable Conflict. In *Conflict, Cooperation and Justice* edited by Barbara Benedict Bunker, Jeffrey Z. Rubin and Associates. 59-92 (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995): 67

Alan C. Tidwell. *Conflict Resolved: A Critical Assessment of Conflict Resolution*. (London: Continuum, 1998): 153-158

I used the constant comparative method most commonly used in some grounded theory research and initially developed by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss²⁰, to examine the interview data and clarify the role of community forest developers, their use of conflict resolution, and its part in the success of community forest development. The constant comparative method offered flexibility around the issue of participation explained above, while engaging the development of ideas about community forestry and conflict based on emerging data rather than pre-existing theories, of which there are few.

Researcher Background

An educational background in Women's Studies and Dispute Resolution, in addition to a personal interest in social activism, influenced my decision to examine environmental conflict resolution and its role in the development of community forestry in BC. An exploration of environmental conflict resolution stemmed from an awareness of the role of change agents in negotiating compromise within forestry, environmentalist and activist communities. Finally, my experience as an environmental activist, educator and rural resident has enabled me to perceive the important role that community-managed forest initiatives play in bringing awareness to the issues of forestry, drinking water, and potentially, environmental conflict resolution processes.

In 1999, during the inception of community forests in BC, I worked in a youth environmental education organization, a non-government organization located in one of the communities in this study, a town that was imbued with forest politics and close to several communities applying for community forest tenure. It became clear that community forestry is an alternative approach to corporate or woodlot directed forestry. Community forest B's initial failure to attain a community forest license piqued my interest in this topic and its relationship to conflict resolution. As I looked for strategic approaches to community forest development, it became clear that the current literature on community forest development and planning lacks a holistic approach to community forest development in its failure to address conflict resolution strategies.

²⁰ Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (New York, NY: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967)

Thesis Overview

As stated in the introduction, this research investigates the role of conflict resolution in community forest development. What is that role and what impact does conflict resolution have in the success of community forest development? In addition, on examination of community forest developers and their often conflicted role in their communities, I asked myself, how did they reconcile themselves with these two often oppositional tasks? Did they use conflict resolution to do it? If so, in what ways did it lead to the success of the initiative? I wondered what led them to community forestry. How did they know how to negotiate conflict? And why did they use a particular approach? With these questions in mind and with the goal of further understanding conflict resolution in community forestry, in the following chapter, Context and Theory, I lay out historical conflicts in forest policy, the theoretical roots of community forestry and pertinent theory from the field of conflict resolution. This chapter is followed by a description of the research design which outlines the use of the constant comparative method in this research to uncover the social process of community forest development. The final chapter, the findings, explores the emergent concepts from this research and then in the Discussion and Conclusion considers the implications of this research on the field of conflict resolution in community forestry,

CHAPTER ONE – CONTEXT AND THEORY

In this study, I explore interdisciplinary perspectives on forestry. In doing so, I put into context the emergence of community forestry in 1995. In addition, an examination of dispute resolution theory and the constant comparison research method used for this study is integral to this research. The following chapter examines the forest policy history in BC since 1948, how it perpetuated forestry conflict throughout the province and its impact on the development of community forests. Following this I define and describe community forestry through the work of influential theorists and show how conflict resolution is relevant in the field.

Conflicts in Forest Policy

Understanding the history of forest policy in BC is significant to any analysis of conflict about forest practices and an understanding of community forest agreements. Historical policy conflicts in BC forestry have played an integral part in the conflict over logging practices and subsequent development of community forestry. In BC, forest policy has often conflicted with the values of ecologists and environmental activists. For the last 30 years there have been intractable conflicts about forest harvesting practices that have resulted in direct action, arrests and occasionally violence.

In 1948, the solution to securing a sustained income from lumber, favoured both by the chief forester and the province's chief justice, Gordon Sloan, came to be known as “cooperative sustained yield management,” a management plan that placed emphasis on three aspects of forestry that continue to dominate the industry.²¹ These are first, continuous timber supply for export or domestic use, second, the Annual Allowable Cut (AAC), and third, governance of Forest Management Licenses (FMLs).²² These three pillars of forest management exist today and continue to determine industrial standards. Significantly, 95% of forested land in British Columbia is publicly owned, endowing the

²¹ Jeremy Rayner. Fine-Tuning the Settings: The Timber Supply Review. In *In Search of Sustainability: British Columbia Forest Policy in the 1990s*. Edited by Benjamin Cashore, George Hoberg, Michael Howlett, Jeremy Rayner, and Jeremy Wilson. (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2001): 145

²² *ibid*, 145

tenure system with considerable economic power.²³ The triumvirate of tools used to calculate exports of timber and the amount of cut happening in the province over a five-year period is compounded by almost complete control by the provincial government over BC forests, leaving the public to rely on the Chief Forester's interpretation and utilization of these tools.

To give a picture of how unaware the early generation of foresters were of their impact on ecological systems, Jeremy Rayner, cites Sloan as stating that, "the future disappearance of large old trees was a problem that could be safely left to 'the men of that time' to solve."²⁴ Unfortunately, Sloan's inability to conceptualize the problem of over-harvest and short-term policy development had many negative impacts on forestry in BC including the 'falldown'²⁵ affect, an unanticipated cost for the Province and traumatic reality in the lives of forest workers, their families, and the environment.²⁶

Royal Commissioner Peter Pearse (1975-1976),²⁷ was the first to suggest that the setting of the AAC should be a policy decision based on involvement and direction from the public. Pearse's idea for public input regarding the AAC never came to fruition; his other policy ideas addressing sustained yield policy remained the point of focus for years to come delaying meaningful community consultation and the development of community forestry several decades.²⁸

²³ Noba Gmeiner Anderson and Will Horter. *Connecting Land and People: Community Forests in British Columbia* (Victoria, BC: Dogwood Initiative, 2002): ix

²⁴ Rayner, 148

²⁵ 'Falldown' describes the gap in timber supply that occurs when "only second growth trees are available for harvest. The historic rate of old-growth logging and the anticipated rate of sustained-yield rotation cycles have ensured that the average ages of second-growth stands, and therefore the volumes of wood per acre, are far less than for the old-growth timber they replace." According to academic forestry commentators Jeremy Rayner and Jeremy Wilson, Sloan misjudged the gap of time between the first and second cut which left forestry communities bereft of jobs and with no sure sign of future income from the next harvest.

²⁶ Jeremy Wilson. *Talk and Log: Wilderness Politics in British Columbia 1965-1996* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 1998): 124 and

Rayner, 148

²⁷ Compiled by Christopher Hives, Vancouver, BC: UBC archives, 1998 (Accessed May 12, 2008) http://www.library.ubc.ca/archives/u_arch/pearse.html

²⁸ Rayner, 152

Two Royal Commission inquiries, Justice Sloan's commission in 1945 and the second completed in 1976 by Pearce,²⁹ centered around four key issues resulting from the invention of the AAC. Rayner captures them succinctly: first, "how quickly to liquidate the existing forest; second, how to plan for the disappearance of the characteristic large, old trees the existing forest provides; third, how to deal with the onetime 'falldown' in volumes from older to younger stands when the second rotation begins; and, finally, how to best determine the present state of the forest and to predict its future characteristics."³⁰ The approach was not focused on environmental sustainability and would not be impacted by environmental debates until after the completion of the second commission. Around this time, community forest activists began to see a place for community organized forestry.

Gordon Sloan's cooperative sustained yield management strategy established forest practices in BC, in the form of continuous access to and harvest of timber material. This strategy based on a method of yield regulation with the purpose of promoting a variety of harvesting goals: "the objectives that yield regulation is supposed to promote under the general concept of sustained yield are many and varied, including sustainable flow of wood fibre, a sustainable flow of revenue, a sustainable industry, and sustainable communities."³¹ However, the additional objective of ecological sustainability put in place by the late 80s put increasing strain on this system³². With so many objectives placing pressure on the yield regulation system, inevitably there have been disputes about the AAC -- the amount of timber harvested per tenure area per five-year period-- and whether it has been set too high or too low. Around the time that ecological sustainability was introduced as a priority, concerns about the sustainability of forest practices entered the discussion publicly and politically. According to Rayner, due to a "general level a lack of confidence in the process by which the AAC is calculated, focusing on lack of transparency and accountability" there

²⁹ Jennifer Gunter, editor. *The Community Forestry Guidebook: Tools and Techniques for Communities in British Columbia. FORREX Series Report No. 15.* (Kamloops and Kaslo, BC: FORREX – Forest Research Extension Partnership and BCCFA - British Columbia Community Forest Association, 2004): 3

³⁰ Rayner, 147

³¹ Rayner, 140

³² Rayner, 153

has been an increased political will to address concerns through the Timber Supply Review (TSR),³³ the first of which was initiated in 1992³⁴.

The TSR is an auditing process in which the theory and mandate of provincial forest practices is tested against the practices on the ground. The auditing body reviews the various goals of sustainability in community, timber supply, environment etc. to gain a sense of success in all areas. The implications of the TSR are many; of primary concern is integration of all public concerns about sustainability. Yet, integration of all of the pertinent areas of concern can be difficult. In some cases, one concern is exclusive of the other, for example economic sustainability in communities and sustained harvest, or, on the flip side, environmental protection and sustained harvest, making it very difficult for forest practices to meet policy and economic demands. In both cases timber supply radically decreases over the short term and both environmental and economic sustainability are compromised. Provincial forest policy continues to reflect the sustained yield practice that prioritizes flow of timber in the market place, a practice that, according to the Ministry of Forests, maintains economic sustainability within the province as a whole without examining the implications for individual communities.

However, emergent policy exceptions, including community forestry, resulting in part from the TSR process allow for the public input and control that both communities and Pearse intended. After years of protest, consultation, and dialogue with government the pilot projects of 1995 were initiated as an experiment giving communities control over their resources and the sustainability of local forestry. This was the beginning of community forestry in BC.

History of Community Forestry in BC

Before the government formalized community forestry in 1999, some attempts were made to placate residents' demands to be included in decision-making about forest management without significant success. The first of these was the previously mentioned

³³ The timber supply review (TSR) program began in 1992 as a way to assure the public that the effects of forest practices on economic, environmental and social factors within BC communities were being considered. Reviews were conducted in 37 timber supply areas in BC to forecast the amount of timber available for each harvest period. A second round of reviews was completed in 2002. The third round of TSRs is in progress. For further information on the Timber Supply Review process go to: <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hts/pubs.html>

³⁴ Rayner, 140

Royal Commission on Forest Resources of British Columbia in 1945,³⁵ when Gordon Sloan made a recommendation that municipalities manage forests. The result was Mission Municipal Forest.³⁶ The second Royal Commission led by Peter Pearse in 1976, pushed the idea of community input into the development of AAC. Three communities were granted industrial licenses.³⁷ According to historical testimony, token public consultation resulted in resident disillusionment, further distrust of the government, and very little change for most communities.

Another example of this can be seen through an analysis of the 1995 Commission on Resources and the Environment (CORE). According an anonymous participant, “[l]ocal planning groups were to be the [central] working groups in land use planning [alongside] regional planning groups, with an option to act as coordinators.”³⁸ Instead of following the proposed process where community members led decision-making and planning, CORE became a regional planning group of the government employees in charge of making land-use decisions for four regions. This occurred without the consent of the non-government participants and furthered already depleted confidence in government agreement processes.

The government’s attempt to include the public in land-use planning through CORE failed. Jeremy Wilson critiques the CORE processes explaining that “CORE was not in a position to lead the kind of political bargaining needed to resolve land use issues” because crucial involvement by “those with authority to make binding decisions” was absent throughout the process.³⁹ To the dismay of many participants, documented by Anne Wilson, Mark Roseland and J.C. Day, “British Columbia supported the process from a distance, preferring to adopt a ‘wait and see’ attitude - shared decision-making [was] neither legislated nor mentioned in the act.”⁴⁰ In addition to passivity while the process was co-opted by bureaucrats, the Province did not bring pertinent information to the table in a timely manner, thereby disabling consensus. To add insult to injury, “there was no mention

³⁵ Gunter, 3

³⁶ Gunter, 3

³⁷ Gunter, 3

³⁸ Community Forest Pilot Agreement Proposal A

³⁹ Jeremy Wilson, 129

⁴⁰ Anne Wilson, Mark Roseland and J.C. Day. “Shared Decision-Making and Public Land Planning: An Evaluation of the Vancouver Island Regional Core Process.” *Environments* 23(2) (1996): 79

of priority issues within the final [CORE] report...and little direct guidance to the table on methods of moving towards a sustainable society.”⁴¹

In spite of CORE’s obvious failures, there was a silver lining to the process. This significant example of the government’s failure to meet public needs through collaborative process had two positive effects: first, by “promoting better understanding of others’ perspectives, they helped clear the path to compromise”⁴² and second, it brought together people interested in developing an alternative to conventional forestry - community forestry.

As government-directed processes like CORE failed and logging in resistant communities persisted, public attempts to gain control over watershed protection and logging activities continued to meet with opposition from both government and industry. While community forest developers pursued community forestry, direct action against forestry continued to play a role in influencing the government. Around the time of the Royal Commission of 1976, environmental activists stepped up action against logging to new levels of intensity. Direct action, combined with other forms of public resistance to conventional forest practices, pushed the idea of community forestry to the forefront. BCCFA documents state that: “[i]n 1998, over 80 communities let the provincial government know of their interest in establishing community forests” indicating a strong public interest in local control over forest management.⁴³

As mentioned, several government consultation processes happened that were unsatisfactory to people living in forestry communities across BC. Although these processes were indicators of change to come, it was in 1998 that amendments were made to the *Forest Act* and the government introduced the Community Forest Agreement. Additionally, the government’s inception of the Community Forest Pilot Projects offered community forest tenure with the potential to quell community conflict over forest management.⁴⁴ Interested communities were informed by radio and ministerial press releases to apply to be invited to take part in the pilot. At this point, interested community leaders and organizers gathered resources, gauged community support, and collected forest and community data to aid in the development of a community forest pilot proposal in order to gain an invitation. Eighty-

⁴¹ ibid

⁴² Jeremy Wilson, 291

⁴³ Gunter, 3

⁴⁴ www.for.gov.bc/hth/community/history.htm, viewed 2007.

eight communities expressed interest in participating in this project, and 27 developed full proposals.⁴⁵ What began with four approved pilot projects, swelled to 12 by 2006 due to an overwhelming response from communities throughout the Province.⁴⁶

This brief historical contextualization of community forestry in BC reveals a few of the attempts by the public to access and influence forestry policy by demanding consultation, through direct-action, and in the CORE process. These attempts have resulted in some forms of forest policy change - community forestry is one. The number of communities who applied for a community forest license agreement indicates an overwhelming interest by BC residents to participate in decision-making about resource extraction, specifically forestry.

Definition and Description of Community Forestry

The concept of community forestry is still fresh in BC and there is an evolving definition of how community forests function within the larger system of forestry. As illustrated above, community forestry emerged from dissatisfied community members who wanted more control over logging happening in their areas. Within the sphere of academia, academic ecologists have also suggested changes to logging practices in BC.⁴⁷ A range of practices are the result of progression towards community forestry happening throughout the province with a variety of stakeholder arrangements including community-run forests, government-managed forests, and municipal and corporate managed forests. Practices may range from ecosystems-based management where logging is barely detectable and emphasis is placed on water protection to conventional forestry where cutting is severe and replanting is relied upon for long-term continued income. Ecosystems focused forestry may supplement the community forest yearly income with wild-crafting, value-added sales, and grants. It is, as the BCCFA states, “because all community forests are different [that]

⁴⁵ Gunter, 3

⁴⁶ (www.for.gov.bc/hth/community/history.htm chart of current community forest licensees, 2007).

⁴⁷ Burda, Cheri, Deborah Curran, Fred Gale, and Michael M’Gonigle. *Forests in Trust: Reforming British Columbia’s Forest Tenure System for Ecosystem and Community Health* (University of Victoria, BC: Eco-Research Chair Environmental Law and Policy, 1997)

Ken Drushka, Bob Nixon, and Ray Travers, eds. *Touch Wood: BC Forests at the Crossroads* (Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing, 1993)

Alan Drengson and Duncan Taylor, eds. *Ecoforestry: The Art and Science of Sustainable Forest Use* (Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers, 1997)

providing a “recipe” or “blueprint” is not advisable.”⁴⁸ However, within BC, a template for community forests has been designed that both helps and hinders community forests in their development process.

Within BC, “community forests are most often established when the government grants forest management rights to a community as a tenure arrangement, or timber license.”⁴⁹ Community forest licenses are approved by the BC Ministry of Forests as long as the following additional criteria are fulfilled: first, support by local residents and businesses; second, financial sustainability; and third, forest practices from the BC Forest Act are maintained. The government is working within a system of forestry that depends upon the theory of sustained yield as described in the first section of this chapter for continued employment and profit. Within this forestry paradigm, community forests have been inserted as a possible area for alternative forest harvesting practices to flourish.

Some of the theorists who have heavily influenced the development of community forestry previous to BC’s government adopting the idea included Hammond, M’Gonigle, Drescher, and Burda, among others. Their conceptualizations of community forestry are based on an ecosystem-centred model and have provided a goal for which communities focused on protection of water, wildlife and resource can work towards. This approach is very specific and, in practice, represents only one aspect of community forestry. It may also be considered a community forest ideal that does not fit well with the template provided by the BC government which designates the AAC for each land base.

Within the current conceptualization of community forestry, and as defined by the BCCFA, “community forestry involves the three pillars of sustainable development: social, ecological, and economic sustainability”.⁵⁰ This definition broadens the scope of community forest practices locating community forestry somewhere between an ecosystem-based model and current forest practices.

Yet, there are contradictions between the theory of community forestry described as ecosystems-based forest management and the practice of community forestry. The gaps between the two are evident when examining community forest practices throughout the Province. Ecosystems based forestry barely exists within the practice of community forestry

⁴⁸ Gunter, 9

⁴⁹ Gunter, 2

⁵⁰ Gunter, 2

in BC. Although heavily theorized, the ideals of ecosystem-based forestry management – prioritizing wilderness values - are realized in very few forestry situations. The main concerns in community forestry remain economic resulting from the necessity to pay employees, stumpage fees and retain their licensing agreements. Fulfilling government economic requirements ensures a community forest initiative can continue forest management practices intended to protect their watershed area. In the case of ecosystems-based management this is a delicate balance.

The source of the contradiction lies both in the process of development and the external pressures by the government to conform to recognized standards of forestry. Community forest development is a collective process. Everyone living within the region of a proposed community forest is invited to develop the forest practices that will be adopted. These choices are then presented to and negotiated with the MOF District Manager. Then they are approved, revised or rejected from within the Ministry according to the theory of sustained yield management.

Prior to meeting with the Ministry, developers negotiate within the community to solidify a community forest plan. When conflict within a community occurs over timber harvesting methods, opinions usually divide around priorities: profit, where to place roads, the cost of road building, erosion prevention, protection of wildlife habitat and domestic water, human recreation space, timber removal methods, continued employment, value-added opportunities and the AAC. Ecologists and foresters alike roundly debate these elements of forestry. In some cases, there are multiple interests at stake in the community forest development process. The need to find a balance within a divided community and gain approval from the government to establish a community forest outweighs the graceful intelligence of an ecologically focused plan.

In theory, ecosystem-based management as envisioned by Hammond, M'Gonigle, Drescher, and Burda is idyllic – a vision of forestry where wilderness values are the priority. Within this theory of forestry, watershed and habitat protection are emphasized. Most communities remain far from this theoretical vision of forest management due to a combination of diverse community interests and the government's policy. Within those constraints, creating a community forest requires another type of theory altogether: conflict resolution theory, and even then the results are never guaranteed. What is relatively absent from literature about the benefits of community forestry from the ecological perspective is

the extent to which varied community interests intervene in the process of community forest development preventing an ecosystem-based management perspective from being realized.

Community forest developers need a range of conflict resolution methods and analytical tools to manage the conflict-saturated issues of forestry and development. The theory of ecosystem-based management offers no solution to seemingly intractable conflicts over forest practices, but rather an ideal for which ecologists involved in community forestry can aim.

More promising is a guidebook published in 2004, *The Community Forest Guidebook: Tools and Techniques for Communities in British Columbia*, that outlines the community forest development process, offers information about the application process and provides organizational tools for community forest developers.⁵¹ Based on testimony by community forest developers and research of community forests throughout BC, the guidebook sketches the crucial elements to which community forest developers must attend throughout development including: the rudimentary characteristics of a successful community forest, strategic planning, working in a group, developing policy, communication and outreach, business planning, generating revenues, multiple use solutions, and evaluative processes.⁵²

Although the guidebook suggests conflict resolution as one part of the development process, it does not address conflict resolution in a thorough fashion. In part this is due to only five pages being dedicated to the vast topic of conflict resolution. The portion devoted to conflict resolution and decision-making includes brief descriptions of interest-based negotiation, board principles, options for group decision-making, and mediation. The methods for analysis, techniques and tools for conflict resolution offered in the guidebook are limited in their scope. Community forest developers require skills beyond basic facilitation or an understanding of consensus decision-making as offered in the manual to respond to conflict as it occurs. The complex nature of forestry conflicts implies that a specific skill set may be integral to success. This is not to say that grassroots community organizers should not attempt community forest development on their own; rather, seeking out resources to help them further analyze conflict and apply a variety of methods for resolution will enable a preventative approach to conflict. Especially in the case of land-

⁵¹ Gunter

⁵² Gunter, 27-31

based disputes, more analysis and applicable techniques for conflict resolution are necessary in order that the conflict is not worsened by intervention.⁵³ It remains that further information about applicable conflict resolution analysis and techniques are necessary for developers wanting community forestry in their area. What is clear from a study of community forestry and related literature is that there is no prescriptive method for community forest development due to the variety of stakeholder arrangements and wide range of often competing interests.⁵⁴ Development of analytical and practical community forest specific conflict resolution tools and techniques are needed.

Environmental Conflict Resolution

Within the field of community forest development there are dominant themes that arise during the process of coming up with a community plan for harvesting in the local forests: control over decision-making, employment, recreation, protection of domestic water and ecologically sustainable harvesting practices. All of these depend on stakeholder support and agreement. Community forest development encompasses a variety of approaches in order to meet multiple needs, often emerges from grassroots movements, and depends on the values of individual community forest developers and their surrounding community members. As the process of community forest development is further institutionalized through government regulation, it is clear that current approaches to community forest development do not always adequately address the need for conflict resolution strategies and practices. A variety of factors determine the success or failure of a proposed community forest, but having skills and tools for conflict resolution is integral to any hope of success.⁵⁵

Discussing conflict resolution in the context of community forestry requires the examination of two key concepts, first, the limits of interest-based conflict resolution and second, the role of neutrality. Before further examination of analytical tools and typologies of conflict for achieving resolution in community forestry, I describe the significance of interest-based conflict resolution theory and neutrality within environmental conflict resolution, and more specifically community forest development.

⁵³ Crowfoot, 254

⁵⁴ Emily Jane Davis. "New Promises, New Possibilities? Comparing Community Forestry in Canada and Mexico," *BC Journal of Ecosystems and Management* 9-2 (2008): 18

⁵⁵ Gunter, 27

Conflict resolution is often associated with separating the people from the problem and focusing on interests and needs rather than staying stuck in positions, generally called interest-based conflict resolution.⁵⁶ Although many of the values in mediation hail from democratic liberalism - adherence to fairness, legitimacy in process and procedures, voluntary, and efficient⁵⁷ - the approaches to conflict resolution that are prescriptive, step-by-step roads to resolution fail to consider cases where multiple parties or complex historical factors intervene and prevent resolution from occurring.

Many of the established lay beliefs about the nature of conflict and its resolution are not reflected in academic literature or in the nature of conflict itself: “[t]hese popular texts seem to suffer from the same three criticisms: they trivialize conflict, routinize methods of handling conflict, and undervalue the role that situation and context play in handling conflict.”⁵⁸ Pop culture presentations of conflict resolution, for example scripted processes and non-dynamic processes, have not been popularly critiqued; the risk is that participant and facilitator expectations for win/win outcomes, mutual agreement, cost effectiveness, and expediency will be disappointed.⁵⁹ There is little evidence and not enough research data to confirm these much-touted qualities⁶⁰ and, in the cases of community forestry, few of these tools are adequate on their own, especially when consideration of historical factors, complex relationships, and multiple parties is necessary. However, when conflict resolution is mentioned these are the tools and techniques that are suggested; even the limited literature examining conflict resolution in community forest development recommends interest-based techniques to the exclusion of others.⁶¹

Academic literature within the field repeatedly recommends that negotiators use a variety of analytic tools and techniques to resolve social conflicts: “There is no one intellectual tool or framework from which conflict can be analysed and resolved.”⁶² This is not to say that interest-based conflict resolution techniques are not useful, but rather that

⁵⁶ Fischer, Roger and William Ury. *Getting To Yes*. (Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Books, 1981).

⁵⁷ Tidwell, 158

⁵⁸ Tidwell, 25

⁵⁹ John Winslade and Gerald Monk. *Narrative Mediation: A New Approach to Conflict Resolution*. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2001): 34

⁶⁰ Tidwell, 26

⁶¹ Gunter, 27-31

⁶² Tidwell, 39

they should not be used to resolve social conflicts to the exclusion of all other techniques. There are many models, analytical tools, categorizations for conflict, and typologies of resolution beyond interest-based negotiation and mediation that focus on transforming relationships. These techniques, although more complex and intensive to learn and use, are valuable to the effort of resolution. Failure to resolve cannot be blamed on lack of techniques for there are many from which to choose.

In addition to a close look at the theoretical frameworks existing in conflict resolution, a deconstruction of the concept *neutrality* – the most emphasized aspect of popularized mediation – is essential. Conflict resolution literature reflects, “mediators manage the social construction of disputes and settlement; yet the existing rhetoric about neutrality does not promote reflective critical examination of discursive processes.”⁶³ Neutrality is touted as a significant quality for a mediator or leader to possess and display; it lends credibility to the outcomes. Within the field of conflict resolution, “[Cobb and Rifkin] describe neutrality as a discursive practice that actually functions to obscure the workings of power in mediation, and forces mediators to deny their role in the construction and transformation of conflicts.”⁶⁴ The notion of neutrality implies that the mediator is free of bias, which is false and misleading to the conflict parties. Identifying this misnomer within the field opens up opportunities for advocates to take a place in the process and for mediators or change agents to raise awareness within the group about the reality of their role, their own agendas and other biases that may come into play over the course of the process. By acknowledging bias they can gain credibility in that they recognize that their own life experience has shaped the way that they perceive the world. On the other hand, the role of neutrality in gaining participant confidence in the process is significant. If a mediator, or in the case of community forestry, a developer, acknowledges their bias, evidence that the bias is managed and not interfering with the process must be demonstrated or the respect of the conflict parties may be compromised.

Susskind explicates neutrality within the role of “activist mediator,”⁶⁵ a mediator who actively pursues an equitable, durable, and wise outcome by ensuring all parties are at the

⁶³ Sarah Cobb and Janet Rifkin. “Practice and Paradox: Deconstructing Neutrality in Mediation.” *Law and Social Inquiry* 16 (1991): 41

⁶⁴ *ibid*, 41

⁶⁵ John Forester. “Lawrence Susskind: Activist Mediation and Public Disputes.” In *When Talk Works*. (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1994): 317-354

table, by questioning the scope of the agenda and suggesting its expansion where appropriate, by providing skill-building training for all parties to maximize joint gains, and by pushing parties to consider their best alternatives to a negotiated agreement (BATNA) thereby clarifying attitudes towards the possibility of no agreement.

Susskind describes the significant role of the activist mediator and their accountability to the process and stability of the outcomes. For an activist mediator, “a potential neutral, a neutral who may potentially be acceptable to all parties, to go out...and round up representatives, or even help groups coalesce, to become enough of a group to name a representative, to know that their interest is at stake. That’s activism on recruitment.”⁶⁶ This concept stretches the limitations of neutrality by engaging advocacy and acknowledging power imbalances. In the case studies to follow, it is evident that several methods are used to maintain neutrality, some more effectively than others. This integral concept to conflict resolution will be discussed in further detail in the discussion chapter.

In addition to an analysis of interest-based mediation and the concept of neutrality, I introduce a range of analytical typologies for conflict that are relevant to the study of conflict resolution in community forestry. This chapter explores considerations for developers from the field of conflict resolution. These considerations include the following:

1. the importance of a broad contextual analysis i.e. historical, socio-economic, political (Tidwell, Kolb and Putnam, Thorson),
2. the implications of multiple tools for analysis (Burton, Tidwell, Rubin, Kreisberg, Thorson),
3. analytical tools to gauge tractability i.e. struggle group definition, institutional involvement in the conflict, cooperative versus competitive tactics (Thorson, Kreisberg, Rubin),
4. the role of perception in the perpetuation of a conflict (Deutsch, Esbjörn-Hargens, Rubin, LeBaron, Diamond, Isaacs, and Winslade and Monk),
5. subjective contextual analysis and its relationship to ripeness (Rubin,),
6. the dynamics specific to conflict resolution in forestry including:
 - a. identity politics (Hanisch, Humm, McKinnon)

⁶⁶ Forester, 327

- b. the implication of three conflict response typologies on forestry conflict (Thorton, Burton, Rubin, Tidwell),
 - c. the role of institutions and the implication of power-dominance dynamics (Tidwell, Burton and Dukes, Kreisberg, Esbjörn-Hargens, Anstey),
 - d. introduction of the problem-solving workshop: pros and cons (Burton, Volkan and Harris)
7. distinguishing features of current environmental conflict resolution, specifically the role of government (Tidwell, Crowfoot and Wondolleck, Emerson, O'Leary and Bingham, Dukes).

As little literature addresses environmental conflict and even less is focused on community forestry, these specifically chosen aspects of conflict resolution are significant because of their applicability to community forestry. The topics above correlate in their relationship to each other and their application to conflict resolution. In the following section I describe each topic and their relationship to one another.

To begin, a contextual analysis is crucial to any attempt at conflict resolution. Tidwell explains that attempts at resolving conflict are inadequate when the process neglects to consider context: “the societal and structural constraints imposed on a given conflict situation” including beliefs, values, history, culture, race, gender, class and power.⁶⁷ Kolb and Putnam emphasize that analysis of context shapes process design with their focus on gender: “the enacting of the negotiation, the way the elements are constructed and changed through the interaction, and the meanings and co-construction of meaning that surface from negotiation” all affect outcomes.⁶⁸ Community forest development is one such conflict-ridden territory where structural, societal and historical analyses are integral to any understanding of conflict, as opposed to, for example, interpersonal or work related conflicts where less emphasis will be placed on these constraints. The significance of a contextual analysis applies to each case of community forestry; the process design must be specific to inspire particular outcomes.

⁶⁷ Tidwell, 2

⁶⁸ Deborah Kolb and Linda L. Putnam. “Through the Looking Glass: Negotiation Theory Refracted through the Lens of Gender.” Paper presented at *Harvard University Conference: Gender Issues and Negotiation and Conflict Resolution* (October 12-15, 1995): 11

Secondly, utilizing multiple tools for analysis of conflict significantly affects the range of possible outcomes. The lack of any single prescriptive approach to conflict resolution in environmental conflict implies that each approach depends on a distinct skill base for successful implementation:

This is reflected in the manner in which conflict resolution draws on such a breadth of intellectual traditions: no one tradition by itself is sufficient, though each may bring to bear some useful and important information. As the various theorists are discovered, one should consider what assumptions they employ⁶⁹

That multiple perspectives are necessary to resolve conflict, especially complex social conflict, like environmental conflict, is reinforced in current, academic, interdisciplinary programs for conflict resolution so that all aspects of a conflict are covered. If many perspectives are not considered the durability of the agreement will most likely be compromised. In addition to having an interdisciplinary approach to conflict, applying a variety of analytical techniques will benefit resolution. This is in part due to the variety of ways that people integrate new concepts into their daily lives, but also because specific techniques will apply appropriately to specific conflict situations.

In addition to Burton, Tidwell, Rubin, and Kreisberg, foremost scholars in the field of conflict resolution, Thorson has touted the importance of multiply-applied analytic techniques for resolving conflicts. Thorson draws attention to the significance of both a social-historical contextual analysis and an interdisciplinary approach, especially in cases where intractability – a topic covered in depth below - is or has been an issue: “if such conflicts are to be transformed...it is important to attend to the distinctive historical and social features of the particular conflict...there exists no single most promising technical approach to the study and transformation of intractable conflicts.”⁷⁰

Wilber’s Integral theory also emphasizes a diverse approach to conflict. Integral Ecology, an approach inspired by Ken Wilber’s Integral Theory, has been successfully applied to community forestry in Case B in this research, although it is little acknowledged in conflict resolution literature. This thesis outlines some of the positive effects of Integral theory, the theoretical framework used in case B, on community forest development,

⁶⁹ Tidwell, 77

⁷⁰ Stuart J. Thorson. Introduction: Conceptual Issues. In *Intractable Conflict and Their Transformation*. Edited by Lois Kriesberg, Terrell A. Northrup and Stuart J. Thorson. (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1989): 9

however further study of Integral's impact on phase two is necessary to assess its successful applicability.

According to theorist Esbjörn-Hargens, Integral Ecology is a holistic approach to environmental conflict, thereby of great appeal to the community forest developer from case B. Esbjörn-Hargens asserts that Integral Ecology provides a comprehensive strategy to environmental conflicts without the ensuing fragmentation resulting from ideological differences. This is achieved through an "understanding of how the myriad eco-philosophies and strategies can be brought together...informing and complementing each other" and relieving "the difficulties that can arise from an over-dependence on any single approach divorced from an understanding of developmental dynamics in both individuals and cultures."⁷¹

A third consideration in the analysis of conflict is one of the key distinctions made within conflict resolution literature: between intractable conflicts and disputes. Intractability implies that there is no easy solution, that the conflict is "irresolvable or resists attempts at resolution," whereas a dispute is a conflict where an effective solution exists⁷². However, to avoid the binary quality which divides conflicts into either intractable or tractable, it is desirable to consider ripening tactics posed by Kreisberg as a method to avoid intractability or shift an intractable conflict⁷³. Kreisberg suggests utilizing power through an analysis of the role of government and other institutions in intractable conflict situations. Within another typology "intractability can be thought of as existing in degrees along some conceptual continuum"⁷⁴. This approach focuses on the potential of shifting contexts, specifically social, political and economic factors, that when undergoing any change can render a conflict more tractable, for example recognition of a specific group, a shift in political power, or an economic crisis or boost.

There are many reasons why a conflict is intractable and although solutions may seem salient, individuals or groups may have a vested interest in maintaining conflict. For

⁷¹Esbjörn-Hargens, S. "Integral ecology: The what, who, and how of environmental phenomena," In *World Futures* 61 1-2 (2005): 3.

⁷²Thorson, 2

⁷³Lois Kreisberg. "Conclusion: Research and Policy Implications." In *Intractable Conflict and Their Transformation*. Edited by Lois Kriesberg, Terrell A. Northrup and Stuart J. Thorson. (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1989): 215

⁷⁴Thorson, 3

adversarial or struggle groups, such as the environmentalist and union groups often involved in forestry conflicts, their identity may be supported by maintenance of the conflict; resolution would alter the identity or dissolve the group. A fear of becoming irrelevant to the conflict situation may prevail over a desire for resolution. The change function of the conflict resolution process may intimidate the group or individuals within the struggle group and resolution will be blocked. Where there are cross-cutting ties amongst and between groups it may be easier to break the barriers of identity grouping, or the process of othering, and shift conflict dynamics. However, in situations where ties are absent between the conflicted groups it is likely that resolution will be difficult to construct.⁷⁵ In community forestry the role of opposing struggle groups in maintaining conflict can be significant deepening the intractability of a conflict.

An example of a likely intractable conflict where “the outcomes sought by each side threaten the adversaries’ basic interests”⁷⁶ can be found in forestry between activist groups and forest corporations over water rights and protection. By contrast, in cases where there is a clearly established institutionalized method for conflict resolution, as between unions and management, the contentious issues are bounded and essential identities are not threatened. This is not to say that resolution will be easier. Bounded conflict can further entrench identity politics. However, without institutionalized processes issues and identities are less clearly defined, or unbounded. This is the case in many environmental disputes where “the parties are still in the process of defining themselves and trying to characterize their protagonists.”⁷⁷ The lack of structure can be viewed as an opportunity to define the relationship in positive ways.

The literature is divided about how a shift in conflict occurs to make a conflict more tractable. With so many factors there is little evidence that mediators coerce parties to resolve, rather there are a plethora of contextual factors to consider. There is a call for research addressing “how the balance between those cooperative or complementary aspects and the competitive or conflictual aspects shift.”⁷⁸ The presumption is that as the importance of the cooperative or complementary issues increases so does the tractability of

⁷⁵ Kreisberg, 215

⁷⁶ *ibid*, 216

⁷⁷ *ibid*, 216

⁷⁸ *ibid*, 217

the resolution.⁷⁹ This seems to follow for the community forest development initiative. Important to the development of a community forest is discovering how to ensure the best possible chance at success. This means discovering which elements need to be in place before community negotiations begin.

A fourth aspect of conflict to consider is the role of perception in the perpetuation of a conflict. Do the various parties truly understand one another? Is it a priority that they do? Deutsch states that the correction of perception is central to all conflict resolution.⁸⁰ Similarly Esbjörn-Hargens' Integral Ecology places emphasis on skills that "increase [people's] capacity to inhabit various worldviews and coordinate between them."⁸¹ Deutsch states, "[i]mpoverished communication, hostile attitudes, and sensitivity to differences – typical effects of competition – lead to distorted views that may intensify and perpetuate conflict; other distortions commonly occur in the course of interaction."⁸² In attending to the skills needed to overcome conflict and encourage resolution, those that "enhance accurate perceptions and stimulate communication between the two parties" are skills that are most valued.⁸³

A significant feature of Integral theory is the concept of "mutual understanding," similar to Deutsch's description of accurate perception.⁸⁴ Esbjörn-Hargens defines mutual understanding as:

the cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal capacity to hold perspectives that are contradictory to one's own position and to do so as if they were one's own position. In particular, mutual understanding requires one to inhabit an approach that is considered to be at odds with their personal, political, or professional viewpoint⁸⁵

According to Esbjörn-Hargens, the Integral framework "allows individuals to become proficient at identifying how various methods focus on specific ecological concerns, and

⁷⁹ *ibid*, 217

⁸⁰ Morton Deutsch. *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. (New Haven: Yale University Press Inc., 1973): 71

⁸¹ Esbjörn-Hargens, 3

⁸² Morton Deutsch. "Subjective Features of Conflict Resolution," In *New Directions in Conflict Theory*. Edited by Raimo Vayrynen. (London: Sage, 1991): 27-28

⁸³ Tidwell, 69

⁸⁴ *ibid*, 3

⁸⁵ *ibid*, 3

from which perspective those concerns are being explored.”⁸⁶ He specifically promotes this theoretical framework for “anyone who wants to better understand the interconnection between environmental approaches and is especially useful for change agents at all scales of action and concern: environmental leaders, community organizers, educators, and social activists.”⁸⁷

Integral Ecology is a fresh theory to the field of conflict resolution explicating a complex typology with many tiers of ecological analysis. The eight ecological selves, a focus of the theory, “embody the various value systems that individuals can hold in relation to the natural world.”⁸⁸ Esbjörn-Hargens explains how use of this typology enables change agents to gauge the worldviews of others on a specific ecological issue and therefore perceive their interests more easily.

Esbjörn-Hargens places emphasis on perception in conflicts where ideological issues are standing in the way of resolution. In-line with transformative conflict resolution theorists (LeBaron, Diamond), Esbjörn-Hargens emphasizes “further development of our individual consciousness,”⁸⁹ thereby linking the transcendence of individual differences to success in conflict resolution. Significantly, Esbjörn-Hargens offers an approach to environmental conflict – a field where resolution can seem impossible, or intractable.

A fifth significant aspect of conflict to be considered is if the personal conditions exist for resolution; is the conflict ‘ripe’⁹⁰ for resolution. This aspect of contextual analysis includes assessing the following three subjective factors: will, capacity and opportunity to resolve conflict.⁹¹ In contrast to objective, structural contextual circumstances such as socio-economic and historical factors that contribute to intractability and prevent conflict resolution, these subjective factors rely on individual and group characteristics.⁹² These

⁸⁶ *ibid*, 61-62

⁸⁷ *ibid*, 61-62

⁸⁸ *ibid*, 34

⁸⁹ *ibid*, 4

⁹⁰ Rubin, Jeffrey Z. “Some Wise and Mistaken Assumptions About Conflict and Negotiation.” In *Negotiation Theory and Practice*. Edited by J. William Breslin and Jeffrey Z. Rubin. 3rd ed., (Cambridge, Mass., The Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School, 1995):10

⁹¹ *ibid*, 4-5

⁹² *ibid*, 3

individuated factors are of course affected by the broader context, but should be looked at on their own terms.

In the case of environmental conflict resolution, specifically community forest development, developers must ask whether the conditions exist, or to what degree they exist to facilitate resolution.⁹³ If there is no capacity to build a community forest, or will to agree on forest practices, or opportunity through community consensus or government interest to develop a community forest, then any conflict resolution attempt is futile.⁹⁴ This brings us to the concept of ripeness as a subjective determinant for resolution.

Rubin's concept of "ripeness" can be defined as "a stage of conflict in which all parties are ready to take their conflict seriously, and are willing to do whatever may be necessary to bring the conflict to a close."⁹⁵ This concept opens a conflict situation, such as a forestry conflict, to multiple levels of analysis to determine if it is the right time to negotiate or introduce new opportunities, like a community forest initiative. If the contextual elements are in favour of resolution then analysis of the conflict and strategizing about approaches will aid in development. To test for "ripeness" in the case of community forestry, developers gauge the willingness of stakeholders to participate in a community forest initiative in order for the first stages of development to begin. Once a developer initiates a community forest in a "ripe" situation, that situation is likely to become bounded.

A sixth consideration for an analysis of conflict specific to forestry conflict involves an investigation into the following topics: struggle group identity, the three conflict response typology, the role of institutions, the implication of the power-dominance approach, and the potential of problem solving workshops for the resolution of conflict. All of these topics offer analytical considerations or tactics for the conflict practitioner when approaching conflicts, like forestry conflicts, where the government plays a large role alongside small interest groups. A closer examination of struggle groups in local forestry and their emergent relationships to involved institutions, i.e. government and corporate interests, reveals more about how unbounded conflicts can become bounded conflicts in a community forest project. Local forests can be immersed in conflict. In response developers initiate a community forest plan and enter into an institutionalized relationship with the government

⁹³ *ibid*, 5

⁹⁴ Rubin, 10

⁹⁵ Rubin, 10

by forming societies, cooperatives, or becoming incorporated. In these cases community forest members develop policy, procedures and a clear identity with communication protocols enabling a transformation of their relationships with each other, industry stakeholders, and the Ministry of Forests. Albeit not necessarily harmonious relationships, they are newly defined.

Identity politics are innately tied up with beliefs, values, religion, spirituality and, sometimes, behaviour.⁹⁶ Community forestry is an example where, as Kreisberg explains, the transformation of relationship dynamics can happen without fundamental in-group changes: “even under those circumstances [when ontological differences in adversarial views make resolution of conflict difficult], however, the adversaries may settle a particular dispute, without a change in their ontologies and recognized identity.”⁹⁷ Conflicts in community forestry, like other environmental conflicts, share characteristics with cultural conflict - value systems that define one’s identity are debated and critiqued. This can be challenging to mediate even with conflict resolution skills; successful community forest developers rather than challenging personally held beliefs, respect and integrate them into a collaborated plan. In addition to Esbjörn-Hargens’ more recent work, specific typologies have been defined in conflict resolution literature to pinpoint the differences in theoretical approach to conflicts that address transformative change.

Thornton, Burton, and Rubin have utilized a typology of conflict that indicates the use of analytic tools to guide process: conflict settlement to allocate responsibility (child custody, landlord-tenancy agreements), conflict management to maintain operations within a conflicted situation (i.e. management and staff relations), and conflict resolution “requiring a level of intellectual rigor” that is not used in settlement and management type procedural modes to negotiate agreements about complex, historical, identity-based conflicts

⁹⁶ The Personal is Political - a phrase first coined by Carol Hanisch, and published in *Notes from the Second Year* (1970) - became the main slogan of second wave feminism. Radical feminists used the slogan to argue that distinctions between the personal and the public realms are fallacious. In addition, radical feminism argues that women's personal experience, revealed in consciousness-raising groups, could provide the inspiration and basis for a new politics. “The personal is political” stresses the psychological basis of patriarchal oppression. Catherine MacKinnon argues that the phrase directly relates sociality and subjectivity, so that to know the politics of women's situation is to know women's personal lives. For further information see: Maggie Humm. *Dictionary of Feminist Theory*, second edition. (Ohio, Ohio State University Press, 1995): p. 204

Catherine MacKinnon "Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory," In *Feminist Theory*, Keohane, N.O. et al (eds). (Brighton, Harvester, 1987)

⁹⁷ Kreisberg, 216-217

(international conflicts, ethnic conflicts, environmental conflicts).⁹⁸ According to this typology, conflict resolution concentrates on internalization or profound change in underlying attitudes and behaviours (ethnic conflicts, environmental conflicts, resource disputes)⁹⁹. Community forest development initiatives fit the framework of environmental conflict where values and beliefs play a large role in the conflicted relationships and behaviours involved; overcoming these personal socio-political obstacles is a heightened priority. Analysis of community forest development as an environmental conflict with social implications results in an examination of analytical tools to address their complexity and procedural details.¹⁰⁰

These types of social conflicts – environmental conflicts - can be differentiated from interpersonal conflict: social conflict is broader in scope therefore having greater complexity and carries with it the likelihood of institutional involvement.¹⁰¹ Integral to this mix is the influence of the institutional sector, in the case of community forestry, the Ministry of Forests: “Institutions, though, do not move easily, they are not altered with great ease, and so become important players in the process of resolving social conflict,”¹⁰² contributing to the complexity of the resolution process. The number of stakeholders, the size of the land base, the involvement of two governmental departments and First Nations groups adds up to a conflict with the potential for intractability, the need for conflict resolution techniques and an applied analysis.

According to Burton’s theory of conflict resolution, institutions often make resolution difficult due to their reliance on a power-dominance framework played out through bargaining strategies.¹⁰³ The bargaining-compromise strategic approach blocks attempts at further understanding human social relationships and their development; the process of relationship transformation is not built into the process.

The field of conflict resolution has been dramatically changed by acknowledgement of recurring evidence revealing human’s inability to effectively coerce and impose order

⁹⁸ Tidwell, 38

⁹⁹ *ibid*, 38

¹⁰⁰ *ibid*, 39

¹⁰¹ *ibid*, 40

¹⁰² *ibid*, 40

¹⁰³ John Burton and Frank Dukes. *Conflict: Practices in Management, Settlement and Resolution*. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1990):147-48

through use of power.¹⁰⁴ According to Burton's interpretation of needs theory,¹⁰⁵ conflict arises from people's attempts to fulfill their human needs. Humans will do whatever they can to fulfill those needs regardless of the coercion tactics or power-over attempted.¹⁰⁶ Burton argues that the power-dominance framework is obsolete and ineffective in negotiations where long-term, transformational changes are desirable, such as local forestry conflicts.

Burton's approach is to problem-solve when traditional power-bargaining is not effective. He experimentally facilitated a series of workshops involving a panel of conflict resolution experts and conflicting parties, Palestinian and Israeli, representing the various sides or sectors. The objective was analytical rather than outcome-driven with the hope that a new type of relationship would be established. Within these workshops he explored values and belief systems with participants chosen from each sector of the cultures imbedded in conflict, who he felt wielded influence, who were knowledgeable about the conflict and the group from which they came, and who could carry their experience into their various social sectors.¹⁰⁷

Similarly, Volkan and Harris hosted an unofficial workshop series that employed four key ideas: first, "events have more than one meaning" and occasionally the hidden meaning is more significant than the superficial; second, "that all interactions... are meaningful and analyzable"; third, "that initiation of a process in which problems become 'shared problems'... is more essential than 'logical' or 'quick' answers"; and fourth, "that creating an atmosphere [where] expression of emotion is acceptable can lead to the recognition of underlying resistances to change."¹⁰⁸ The impact of these observations is significant to intractable conflict, including environmental conflict, as it offers insight into the types of processes that will successfully break barriers between conflicting parties.

The conflict resolution workshop format piloted by Burton pushes participants to go beyond the superficial and unearth the deeper sources of conflict by looking at the layers, for

¹⁰⁴ Burton, 11-12, 90-91

¹⁰⁵ Burton, 145

¹⁰⁶ Tidwell, 76

¹⁰⁷ Tidwell, 162

¹⁰⁸ Vamik Volkan and Max Harris. "Negotiating a Peaceful Separation: A Psychopolitical Analysis of Current Relationships between Russia and the Baltic Republics." *Mind and Human Interaction* 41, 1 (1992): 20-39

example, historical ‘facts’, past communication, symbolic meanings, and emotion.¹⁰⁹ By digging deeper into conflict situations, there is no guarantee that solutions will follow, only a greater understanding and ability to analyze.

Several theorists have criticized the problem-solving approach associated with Burton, Volkan and Harris involving non-formal approaches to conflict due to the role power can play through the process:

The issue of power realities in relationships, the problem of scarce resources which prohibit integrative solutions...and the fact that meeting needs of identity, recognition, and development may have very real and negative implications for the security and identity of other groups, not to mention their economic welfare¹¹⁰

Struggle groups may feel stronger in an adversarial role than in a negotiation especially when their coercive tactics have effectively enabled them to reach their goals, for example union striking for wage increase. The decision to avoid informal problem-solving processes is also affected by perceptions of the other party in terms of education, skills, and available resources.¹¹¹ This understanding of struggle groups and their involvement in conflict resolution processes is relevant to the community forest development process when direct environmental activist groups have been involved in the struggle for change. Once the group has gained access to the alternative process, “[i]f the process takes away a group’s means of empowerment, then that struggle group will leave the process.”¹¹² For community forestry to be successful, developers must negotiate power dynamics and find a way for struggle groups to participate without having to sacrifice their values and beliefs. The process will be transformative inevitably in some ways, but will occur only if there is a willingness and confidence to participate.

This brings us the final topic for consideration: the distinguishing features of current environmental conflict resolution and its implications for community forest development. Analysis of environmental conflict resolution processes reveal that generally they are termed alternative processes, even within the institutional setting. This is meant to distinguish environmental conflict resolution from processes like arbitration, legislation, administrative

¹⁰⁹ Tidwell, 165

¹¹⁰ Mark Anstey. *Practical Peacemaking*. (Kenwyn, South Africa: Juta and Co.,1993): 77-8

¹¹¹ *ibid*, 166

¹¹² Tidwell, 166

decision-making or ministry rules and regulations. However, this distinction is faulty in the sense that environmental conflict resolution processes “are less often alternatives and more often one part of a complex and interdependent system of legal, legislative, or administrative process.”¹¹³ As a result, one of the biggest challenges is narrowing down a systematic approach to environmental conflict resolution focused on essential determinants for complex multiparty agreements.¹¹⁴ Some of the characteristics of environmental conflict resolution processes are direct communication, consultation or discussion for a mutually educational benefit and understanding, inclusion of multiple sectors representing diverse and often conflicting interests, open, flexible process, consensus or some variation other than unilateral decision making as the basis for agreement, and with or without the aid of a mediator or facilitator.¹¹⁵

Environmental conflict resolution cannot stand-alone; it operates within the context of policy development, planning, rulemaking, enforcement or litigation. Anecdotal evidence shows that when conflict resolution is independent of formalized processes it is more difficult to enforce agreements, implement them and ensure durability.¹¹⁶ Ironically, although the government can advance agreement durability and implementation, its institutional criteria and hierarchical, bureaucratic structure can stand in the way of a community planning process.

The role of government in environmental conflicts involving the public is significant: “It is government that has the ability and capacity, more so than other groups, to destabilize an agreement, or create inefficiencies in the face of unacceptable agreements. Thus most attempts at resolving community conflicts are within the established and political elite framework.”¹¹⁷ Crowfoot and Wondolleck explicate that negotiation and mediation have recently become formalized within government, previously happening within “a long-established practice of informal negotiation among differing interest groups and

¹¹³ E. Franklin Dukes. “What We Know About Environmental Conflict Resolution: An Analysis Based on Research.” *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 22, 1-2 (2004): 193

¹¹⁴ Kirk Emerson, Rosemary O’Leary and Lisa B. Bingham. “Commentary: Comment on Frank Duke’s ‘What We Know About Environmental Conflict Resolution?’” *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 22, 1-2 (2004): 222

¹¹⁵ Dukes, 192

¹¹⁶ Emerson, O’Leary and Bingham, 223

¹¹⁷ Tidwell, 78

individuals.”¹¹⁸ This change significantly affects community group organizing and has implications for participating in institutionalized processes, for example stipulated policies, procedures and guidelines that may limit negotiated outcomes or affect separate community agreement processes. As adjuncts to existing forms of governance, alternative analytical approaches to conflict can be implemented only within the existing political system, consequently limiting possible outcomes.¹¹⁹

The last section of this chapter touched on a handful of theorists relevant to the field of conflict resolution and its implications for community forestry. The theorists emphasize issues that are significant to community forestry including the importance of broad contextual analysis, multiple approaches from diverse disciplinary fields, tools to gauge tractability in conflict, the impact of perceptive communication, personal and group context, frameworks of analysis for environmental conflict, and specific consideration for conflict involving the government.

This theoretical review provides an encompassing framework that draws together many of the salient approaches to conflict resolution with a focus on forestry conflict. It offers insight into aspects of conflict that can hinder resolution or promote positive outcomes. These concepts applied to a case of forestry conflict will illuminate the prevalent issues enabling a wise approach for each unique situation.

Forest conflict in British Columbia is centred primarily in rural areas where economic opportunities are generally limited. Conflicts have plagued the industry sometimes for decades depending on the demographics of the immediate area or the significance of it to the global environmental community. These macro contextual aspects of a conflict scenario are a starting point for analysis as stated by Tidwell, Kolb and Putnam, and Thorson. Additionally, personal capacities to find alternatives to the current situation may be limited by these broader structural elements like education, economics, class divisions, racial prejudices and/or ideological clashes as can be seen in both cases albeit more obviously in case B.

Each conflict scenario is unique, although certain features will be similar. Having a diversity of tools helps practitioners to find their own style and application and raises the

¹¹⁸ Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990, 13

¹¹⁹ Tidwell, 161

likelihood of success. Rubin's comprehensive framework for analyzing conflict to determine whether parties are ready to negotiate – gauging ripeness – is a starting point. Once this has been determined the various conflict resolution frameworks mentioned can be applied, from interest based mediation to transformative conflict resolution techniques depending on the preference and willingness of the participants, the style of the practitioner, and the determining context.

The observation that perception of the other, for example the activist versus the forester, is a stumbling block to resolution is a topic of focus within transformative conflict resolution and explicated in the work of Deutsch, Esbjörn-Hargens, Rubin, Diamond, LeBaron, Isaacs¹²⁰, and Winslade and Monk. The techniques outlined increase the durability of agreements by deeply examining conflict triggers and working to build positive ongoing relationships across diverse and conflicted groups. As can be seen in these two cases, within community forestry the initiation of positive, long-term relationships sets the tone for the following twenty-five year period. Any difficulties that arise and are not dealt with hang around until they are resolved, often building and worsening. As can be seen from these two cases, personal histories are not forgotten within small communities especially between opposing interest groups and must be considered in conflict management. The education and communication components within these frameworks offer long-term solutions for resolving complex social conflicts like forestry conflicts. As briefly explored in this section, these theorists offer a range of models intended to stimulate collaborative negotiation processes with intended durable outcomes.

Although conflict resolution inevitably contains an element of surprise as people are dynamic, especially in their relationships to one another, understanding the context as fully as possible through the application of the analytical tools mentioned in this chapter is advisable. An examination of the micro groups involved in the forestry conflict, – union and non-union forestry workers, neighbourhood groups, domestic water user groups, recreation groups, and environmental protection groups – the broader context of their lives, and their investment in the continuation of the conflict will, as emphasized by Rubin, further an understanding of conflict dynamics.

¹²⁰ William Isaacs. *Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together*. (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1999)

With regard to conflict dynamics specific to forestry, Hanisch, Humm and McKinnon offer an analysis of identity politics which when coupled with Esbjörn-Hargens' eight ecological selves framework can be used to unearth the diversity of interests within each segment of the population involved. This understanding and acknowledgement of the variety of perspectives on one issue is imperative to successful resolution in community forestry, which is illustrated well by case B's practice of Integral theory.

Additionally, Thorton, Burton, and Rubin explicate a three response typology to narrow an approach to conflict that is context dependant, again addressing the issue of a comprehensive contextual analysis so as not to miss any details that may instigate future conflict. To further explore the broad set of interests that dominate forestry conflicts, Tidwell, Burton and Dukes, and Kreisberg examine the role of institutions in general – the government or corporate interests. Understanding power dynamics is vital in community forestry where public interest groups work with institutionalized government bodies and corporate entities. A fourth technique that is effective specifically for forestry conflicts, but could be applied to a variety of social conflicts, is the problem-solving workshop as developed by Burton, Volkan and Harris to building relationships, discuss controversial issues in a group, ease tension and increase mutual understanding. This practice was used in case B through the core group development process. The core group being the problem-solving workshop group, a group of hand-picked participants from a variety of interest groups and perspectives. Finally, understanding the role of the government specifically as a powerful interest group in the resolution of forestry conflict is integral to any work within the field of environmental conflict resolution.

Much of this theory was not applied in the cases described in this thesis, however some has been applied and can be identified in each case. I propose that further use of these theoretical frameworks, would help community forest developers smooth out rough edges throughout the process of development, cope with adversity within their organizations, and meet the desires of their constituents.

In conclusion, this chapter offered an overview of the following: forest policy conflicts in British Columbia, a historical look at the development of community forestry in British Columbia, a definition and description of community forestry in this province, and conceptual and technical tools for conflict resolution practitioners, especially those working

in forestry conflict. In any attempt to address forestry conflict in British Columbia the factors touched on in this chapter must be considered.

Chapter two will briefly describe the methodological roots of grounded theory and the constant comparative methods used in this thesis to uncover an emerging local theory of community forest development.

CHAPTER TWO – RESEARCH DESIGN

In this research, I used the constant comparative method of data analysis proposed by Glaser and Strauss in their early work on grounded theory. Through this method I unearthed the course of action for community forest development and conflict resolution practices used by community forest developers. This chapter begins with a description of the purpose and questions used in this study, followed by an explanation of the recruitment process and the research design. Then, I describe the data collection and analysis techniques used during this study. I conclude with a discussion of ethical issues.

Purpose and Questions

There have been two purposes for this study: first, to explore the various conflict resolution processes used by community forest developers to gain stakeholder agreement in community forestry, and second, to analyze the difficulties, challenges and successes experienced by community forest developers in their process of community forest development. The research was directed by four questions:

- what processes do community forest developers use to prevent conflict and ensure success?
- how has conflict resolution theory aided in community forest developers success?
- what strategies have developers used that have led to successful results in community forest development?
- what strategies were used that produced unsuccessful results?

Participant Identification and Recruitment

Once approved, I spoke with past contacts involved in community forestry to discover significant contributors to the community forest development initiatives, the key informants for this research. Drawing on newspaper clippings, publicly available community forest records, and government documents, I developed a history of the two community forests, determined who was involved at the initial stages of development and developed a

criterion sampling¹²¹ based on each participant's level of involvement in the project, acknowledgement of them as an expert in their field, and gender diversity.

Two perspectives and, ideally, gender balance was desirable from each community forest to gain a balanced perspective. Women's experiences of conflict and negotiation processes differs from men's due to gendered experiences of societal norms and the impact of patriarchy on our daily lives. Due to these factors in women's lives, their experience of conflict significantly affects the interpretation and negotiation of conflict. Kolb and Putnam make the claim that gender is a privileged social divide in understanding conflict:

we argue that negotiation analysis is gendered because it sustains and reinforces dichotomous thinking in which masculine attributes dominate those associated with the feminine, because it also fails to consider how the material conditions of different negotiators shape their understandings of negotiation and their abilities to participate, and because it makes invisible alternative ways of conceptualizing and acting in negotiation".¹²²

For these reasons, gender diversity was included in the criteria.

According to the criterion sampling directed by my main research question and exploratory research about community forest development from the two sites, the participants chosen were closely involved throughout the process of community forest development in their area from beginning to end, could offer a general overview of conflicts in community forestry, were considered experts in the field of community forest development, and could identify changes they had experienced and observed throughout the process. I proposed interviews to one man and one woman from each region, all community forest developers, initially contacting them by phone or email, telling them about the research and requesting a meeting. Drawing on public documents, online newsletters, the community forest websites, and government documents it was clear who had been integrally involved in the community forest development initiatives. Corroborating the written evidence were the leads from a variety of community members. I asked a sampling of people who to ask to about community forestry and the same four continued to be mentioned. They were the target for this research. Thankfully, they agreed to participate and signed a consent form according to the guidelines for ethical human participant

¹²¹ Michael Quinn Patton. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods - 3rd Edition*. (London, United Kingdom: Sage Publications, 2002): 238

¹²² Kolb and Putnam, 3

research.¹²³ We met at their convenience, in most cases in their homes and in one case in a public house. I proposed an initial interview with a follow-up interview where necessary; in one case follow-up was necessary, for the other three one interview, one and a half hours was adequate.

This study provides limited anonymity to participants due to the small number of community forest-involved people living in BC. However, I have made every effort to respect their anonymity throughout the writing of this thesis. After transcribing the interviews into password-protected, Microsoft Word documents, but before initiating coding, I sent the participants their interview transcripts to edit or amend for clarification. One developer heavily edited their transcript for grammar, but the thematic content remained unchanged. Checking-in with participants about the accuracy of their transcripts assured that the data remained grounded in the experience and testimony of the participants and their context.

Research Method

I used constant comparison in this study, a technique from the grounded theory method outlined by Glaser and Strauss.¹²⁴ Constant comparison between codes and concepts was the initial phase for analyzing interview transcripts from four community forest developers. Throughout the data gathering process, I coded and compared emerging themes. Previous to embarking on each primary source - the interviews - I re-examined the questions to discern new queries that were pertinent and new directions implied by the emergent themes.¹²⁵ The progression of the interviews can alter the research direction as the researcher narrows down sequences or clusters of themes.¹²⁶ However, the overarching sequences and codes that emerged were generally expected. Smaller moments of surprise did occur, for example, the reasons why the first proposal in case B was unsuccessful. I had assumptions about why this may have happened that were revealed as simplistic and inaccurate; however, discoveries like this one did not alter the direction of the research. Rather, this discovery was exciting and served to deepen the research process.

¹²³ Refer to *Appendix A - Invitation to Participate and Informed Consent Form*

¹²⁴ Glaser and Strauss, 45

¹²⁵ *ibid*, 45

¹²⁶ *Ibid*, 45

Constant comparison distilled themes from the data itself, rather than imposing my hypothesis on the subject of study. The choice of questions, coding process, and labelling of experience through specific choice and use of language molded the study; however, the data directed the flow of out-coming themes. ‘In vivo’¹²⁷ codes, rather than researcher constructed codes¹²⁸, were used wherever possible further emphasizing the connection between the data and the developer experience. This method honoured the specific knowledge of the community forest developers interviewed.

Grounded theory emphasizes theory development. The aim of this study has been to add to a body of knowledge about community forest development, to aid community forest developers in identifying the processes and conditions required for a successful community forest development, and to highlight areas of challenge in the development process. The purpose was not to create a prescriptive practice for individual community forest developers; rather, I was concerned about the discovery of a process already occurring. Without the focus of theory-building, I approached these case studies using the method of constant comparison outlined in grounded theory to examine the phenomenon of conflict resolution evident throughout the process of community forest development in two cases in BC.

To be sensitive to potential concepts and themes, I examined the data from various perspectives, continually compared codes, categories, and finally, themes, and remained open to emergent ideas. Throughout the coding process gerunds were used, which, according to Charmaz “fosters theoretical sensitivity because these words nudge us out of static topics into enacted processes.”¹²⁹ The use of gerunds pushed me into thinking about action-oriented processes.¹³⁰

¹²⁷ Kathy Charmaz. *Constructing Grounded Theory* (London: Sage Publications, 2006): 55

¹²⁸ Researcher constructed codes are codes created by the researcher to describe a concept embedded in a segment of data, whereas “*in vivo* codes are the words and phrases used by the informants themselves” because of their ability to accurately describe the concept under study. The word or phrase of those interviewed becomes the code, rather than the researcher using other words or phrases to describe the concept.

Anselm L. Strauss and Juliette Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques* (New York, NY: Sage Publications, 1990): 69

¹²⁹ Charmaz, 136

¹³⁰ *ibid*, 49

Data Coding

Interviews

The interviews were scheduled over the course of a month. I alternated case studies through the interview process to immediately highlight differences in approach by each development team. This effectively stimulated comparisons between each case. Follow-up interviews for the participants to further flesh-out concepts and thematic categories, where necessary, occurred directly after the initial interviews with no others in between. The questions were developed with the help of my first and second supervisors, but without input from the participants. They had a general description and idea of my topic area and questions, but no copy of the questions until immediately before the interview. These questions aimed at discovering which conflict resolution techniques community forest developers used throughout the process of community forest development. In order to get to this question, I delved into the history of community forestry in each area, past forestry conflicts, and current relationships. In accordance with Glaser and Strauss' method, the interviews were largely unstructured.¹³¹

I fielded questions and comments about the questions before beginning. Each interview was about an hour and a half long. They were recorded and then transcribed by me into Microsoft Word. Following each interview and after coding, I reflected on the questions and amended them according to the general question of my research. Although the interview participants were prepared for the possible need for a second interview to deepen the conceptual fields, as the final interviews drew nearer, 'saturation'¹³² of the local situation made it unnecessary.¹³³ Although every interview built upon the last, repetition throughout the coding process became evident. By the last interview the data revealed nothing entirely new. With each interview the questions focused more clearly on the research question.

Coding Process

¹³¹ *ibid*, 25-34

¹³² "theoretical saturation of categories is said to be achieved when no new data about those categories emerges during further data collection and analysis".

Rosalind Bluff. Grounded Theory In *Principles and Practice of Research in Midwifery*. Edited by Elizabeth R. Cluet and Rosalind Bluff, (Sydney, Australia: Churchill Livingstone, 2006): 162

¹³³ *ibid*, 96

Using open coding technique, I coded each line of the interview text by making two columns in each transcript in Microsoft Word.¹³⁴ The open coding process explores the first level of conceptualization in detail line-by-line in the second column. As illustrated below in Table A-column B, many codes emerged through open coding. Initially, all codes were considered as potential categories. The second set of comparison narrowed the codes further – axial coding – considering their significance to the original research questions.¹³⁵ Here they are shown in a third column C.

Table A - Open Codes to Axial Codes

A	B	C
Interview quote	Open Codes	Axial Codes
Well it's been a wild ride. Just to go really general, really broad based, [this area] has been a very contentious area for the last 35 years. When we started the project we started it as a case study because we didn't really believe that we would be able to bring it to fruition that we would actually get to a community forest because the divides were so big between the different segments of the community. Bringing all the sides together seemed like a very optimistic thing. Personally, when I started the whole project, it was interesting for me to initiate something like that in a place like the Valley because of my interest in mediation. [Interview 1, page 1, November 20, 2006]	Experiencing community forest development History of conflict Analyzing the cultures in community forestry Doing a case study Not believing in possibility of success Noticing multiple divides between cultural groups/value systems Difficulties of bringing all sides together Pursuing an interest in dispute resolution	Experiencing community forest development History of conflict Analyzing the cultures in community forestry Not believing in possibility of success Noticing multiple divides between cultural groups/value systems Pursuing an interest in dispute resolution

Table B below illustrates the next level of coding - six codes clustered within one category all from one interview transcript. The code becomes a category when it encompasses the qualities of other codes beneath it.

‘Analyzing the cultures in community forestry’ is a selective code for the actions described by the six codes in Table B - column D. All selective codes can be tied back to the descriptive axial codes. The selective code ‘analyzing the cultures in community forestry’

¹³⁴ Strauss and Corbin, 62

¹³⁵ *ibid*, 99-109

encompasses the meaning of the axial codes outlined in column D using broader dimensions. This method adds density to the emerging top category.

Table B - Axial Codes to Selective Codes

<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>
Axial Codes from throughout interview	Selective Code encompassing meaning from axial codes in column D
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Difficulties of bringing all sides together 2. Noticing multiple divides between cultural groups/value systems 3. Comparing historical conflict to present conflicts 4. Acknowledging importance of personal histories 5. Listening to locals with history in community forest area 6. Utilizing personal history in creation of community forestry 	Analyzing the cultures in community forestry

After the initial open coding process, the second and third level coding began - axial and then selective coding - according to Strauss and Corbin.¹³⁶ I narrowed down themes from within each interview, cross-compared interviews and memoed about the significant evolving themes.

An early example of a memo reflecting on the process of interviewing about the topic of conflict is found below:

May 25, 2007

I have found that the words dispute resolution and the topic conflict resolution are charged with specific associations: mediation, unpleasantness, even the potential violence. Finding another way to conceptualize conflict to garner the response I was looking for could have helped me get deeper into the main question more quickly. In asking questions about conflict, it seems as though no one wants to admit to or remember any conflict; however, as the interviews progressed conflict scenarios

¹³⁶ *ibid*, 121-141

arose that were not conceptualized by the participant as conflict per se. There is a reluctance to think about conflict in association with either themselves or the community forest development, except when it comes to obvious foes i.e. corporate power and the government. Therefore, it was difficult to uncover how these smaller organizational level conflicts were resolved. When we did discuss internal conflicts it was in a roundabout manner using drawing out questions rather than having one question that did the work.

Later in the process of analysis I memoed using charts and diagrams like the similarities/differences table above. Comparing and contrasting codes and concepts focused the meaning of each category. Below is an example of a later memo that further explores conflict within community forestry:

June 28, 2007

Imbedded in this issue of gaining support from both government and the community is the concept of “CF as a site of conflict”. All CF developers attested multiple times to the amount of work and stress that is involved in CF development – including the stress of the CFs financial stability. One of the CF developers from CF A attested to the challenge of financial projections considering the multiple variables affecting a successful harvest and profitable year. Contributing factors mentioned were personal and community inexperience with logging, finding available contractors to do the large, specialized machine work, having dry weather for logging and hauling to minimize road damage and erosion, keeping the community abreast, and supportive, of the logging happening in their areas, and meeting government criteria with the AAC. In addition to working hard at maintaining community support for the CF development, once the proposal is in and logging begins, the CF developer from CF A discussed the challenges on-the-ground and with working in community as a representative for the CF.

Once I reached the point where I had narrowed down the categories according to core themes and continued to selectively code according to specific concepts that had emerged, it took some time to ensure that the core themes reflected the data accurately. I continued to go back and forth between the data and my memos and then to the original interview transcripts.

A filing system in Microsoft Word helped me keep track of the links between codes, themes and concepts and to encompass the thematic categories and stages of comparison. Each theme had its own page or multiple pages in an individual folder. The folders were divided according to the level of analysis – first level, second level and third level thematic coding. This ensured that the origins of the data as it moved from general to specific was not lost. This was a complicated method without the use of computer software. I would

recommend researchers using grounded theory use a software program specifically designed to help in the organization of codes, categories and themes.

Table C-column F below illustrates how ‘analyzing the cultures in community forestry’ was compiled with other categories from the same interview that had been similarly narrowed-down into selective codes. ‘Analyzing cultures in community forestry’ was added to the larger pools of categories compiled from the all of the interviews and used to describe the core category ‘developing an idea of community forestry.’ In total one hundred and forty-four categories with twenty-nine categories on average per interview were narrowed to five core categories.

Table C - Selective Coding Process

<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
Selective codes from table B-column B grouped with other selective codes from all interviews	Core Category developed from codes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of acrimony • logging becoming personal • talking to other community forestry developers • Fulfilling specific government criteria for diverse community involvement • Analyzing the cultures in community forestry • Finding a way for diverse perspectives to be included – defining a dispute resolution approach • Acknowledging success of community forestry initiative so far • Considering the community forestry development process • Having strong beliefs about community forestry development tactics and what works • Analysis of ecosystems based plan and current attempt at community forestry • Meeting people where they are at • Deciding what to do about logging in domestic watershed area • Deciding on approach for community forestry • Defining watershed • Fulfilling government criteria • Finding out about community forestry’s 	<p><u>Building an idea of community forestry</u></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community forestry as a political movement • Observing where community forestry has fallen down • Describing community forestry beginnings • Being involved in community forestry development • Making a proposal 	
---	--

After narrowing the collected categories to twelve, I returned to the transcripts to ensure the categories had retained their meaning throughout the process of compression. I associated each category with quotations from the transcripts to ensure their validity.

The quotation from Table A-column A describes several themes that emerged from ‘building an idea of community forestry’ including acknowledgment of the historical context, fearing that it would fail due to historical conflict, concern about the impact of current conflict within the community, and the intersection between community forestry and conflict resolution.

Below are the twelve categories. The five final core categories are printed in bold text.

DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST

- 1. Building an idea of community forestry**
- 2. Being aware of the box**
 - a. Having a working relationship with industry, local mill and MOF
- 3. Coming toward Conflict (Noticing community forestry as a site of conflict/being close to conflict)**
 - a. Being tired
 - b. Control versus no control
- 4. Using dispute resolution strategies**
 - a. Organic Processes
 - b. Culture w/in the core group/staff group/board group
 - c. Deciding who participated
 - d. Doing outreach/working with community
- 5. Practicing community forestry (“Hitting the Ground” versus Considering community forestry)**

Each category encompasses a broad spectrum of descriptive elements in the process of developing a community forest; however, not all of these subcategories fit beneath only one major category. As can be seen in the following chapter, the findings reveal that a few

subcategories fit within several core categories. While associating categories with one another and the quotations from the original transcripts, the difficulty of rationalizing each subcategory within the top level core categories without any cross-over became increasingly complex.

Ideally each category is externally heterogeneous and internally homogenous. The division was initially unclear in some cases. In the cases where crossover meanings and associations clouded the categorization process, I hierarchically organized the data by prioritizing the category association according to meaning and its significance to the research questions. According to this rationale, the subcategories were situated with the core category they best fit. That they could exist across the categories indicates that the process of community forest development is complex, fluid, and non-linear. Actions occur back and forth as circumstances including relationships, communication, conflict, and forestry plans flux.

According to grounded theory described by Strauss and Corbin, “[f]irst interviews and fieldnotes should be entirely transcribed and analyzed before going on to the next ones.”¹³⁷ The early coding and memoing gives guidance to following observations and interviews. As described, once open coding had been completed on one interview, I scheduled the next interview.

With the first and second interviews, I collected and analyzed data simultaneously. It took the second interview to realize that at least a few days were necessary to complete the open coding process. At the beginning, the first interview was not entirely coded before I embarked on the second one. As a result I was unable to rework the questions. In retrospect, more time between interviews to code, compare and check back with the questions to ensure they were driving at the general question thoroughly would have been beneficial. Systematic comparison before moving on to the next interview questions, specifically of themes addressing conflict, allowed clarification of terms and framing questions in new ways for a different response or more relevant information.

However, having a couple of interviews back to back gave me information about which questions to prioritize and which ones to change. For example, in the first and second interviews I attempted questions that drew out the personal narrative rather than the

¹³⁷ *ibid*, 30

historical sequence of events i.e. “what was your experience of developing a community forest?” rather than “tell me about the development of the community forest?” I generally got the same result with both questions; the subtle difference was lost, perhaps because it is difficult to launch into talking about feelings and personal experiences right away. Everyone went straight to a description of the objective facts. Knowing that there might be an automatic reaction to avoid the meat of this question, I got more specific for the following interviews with the result that I got clues to what was really happening more quickly.

The emphasis throughout this method is “theory as process.”¹³⁸ Within this guideline, after open coding and clustering of themes within each interview, the comparison of codes between interviews, as previously described, uncovered crossover themes. I compared the interviews for recurring themes. Direct quotations were clustered under themes; they were labelled so that the origins of the quotations were not lost. The process of comparison, constant memoing about areas of congruency, contrasting testimonies, differing strategies, and various properties and dimensions of each theme unearthed further themes and concepts.

Review of historical data and secondary data sources

As mentioned, in addition to comparing themes from each interview, secondary data was used to further cross-check, contextualize and support the findings from the interviews. These documents were found through recommendations from the participants, by perusing the websites of the two community forest cooperatives and by looking through public documents at the offices of the community forest cooperatives.

Data Analysis

As previously explained, I began the data analysis collecting and transcribing each of four interviews. To begin, a thematic scan and memo for each interview was accomplished to accent the themes that addressed issues of conflict. Each interview was then cut and pasted into a separate Word document and divided into two columns - one side for the interview and one side for the line-by-line coding. After coding each line, the two-column document was cut and pasted into a third Word document and reviewed again, this time amalgamating similar codes and grouping others together using color and bolding to highlight the dominant emerging categories. Reviewing the results from this phase, I went

¹³⁸ Glaser and Strauss, 21

through the list of categories, copied the highlighted themes and put them into a fourth Word document. In this document, all of the themes from each interview were labelled clearly to indicate their interview origins.

Through a process of diagramming and writing, I discerned five major conceptual categories and seven sub-categories from over 400 original codes. Using these categories and sub-categories, I went back to the interviews and began a fifth Word document, one for each major category with excerpts quoted from the interviews to illustrate each concept. Each quotation was clearly labelled to indicate which interview they came from; in cases where discrepancies, difference, contrast or gaps remained the context remained clear and traceable.

Throughout the constant comparison process I wrote memos about my impressions and areas of confusion, fleshed out conceptual codes, explored personal interests, and recorded other observations. I asked: What is going on here? How did they deal with this particular situation? How did they talk about it? What is the social process they are trying to convey? What are the categories suggested in this excerpt? Where is the conflict in this story?

In vivo codes were used to encapsulate the meaning of the participants' descriptions and stay close to the data throughout the process. Charmaz' advice on determining which *in vivo*'s deserved attention was considered throughout:

When you scrutinize carefully, three kinds of *in vivo* codes prove to be useful, those general terms everyone 'knows' that flag condensed but significant meanings, a participant's innovative term that captures meanings or experience, insider shorthand terms specific to a particular group that reflect their perspective¹³⁹

Toward the end of the comparison process when categories had been narrowed, I compared the general and specific aspects of each case in various chart formats, comparing similarities and differences, contextual elements and the conditions and dimensions of each category, in an attempt to further understand the categories and unearth the meaning of the concepts.

Once the analysis phase was complete, I designed a historical timeline based on the primary data, second hand information and secondary data. The timeline offered an alternate factual perspective, one reliant on outside resources, corroborating and clarifying the material from the interviews.

¹³⁹ Charmaz, 55

Memoing

The memo-writing process “is the pivotal intermediate step between data collection and writing drafts of papers.”¹⁴⁰ This was especially true; it gave me time to reflect on the codes and conceptual categories. Memos “pertain to the concepts that represent abstractions of incidents, events and happenings.”¹⁴¹ Memo-writing helped me decide on the hierarchy of categories, which would be core categories, which would be sub-categories, and which codes were descriptions of a larger concept. Tools designed by Strauss and Corbin were used to delve into the properties and dimensions of each category leading to further understanding of the process of community forest development.¹⁴² Each memo was categorized chronologically, but not categorically or systematically. This happened in a fifth dedicated Word document. As the analytical process progressed, the memo-writing process became more interesting and the conceptual categories clearer.

The interviewees were not involved in the coding process. The emerging theory came from a detailed and rigorous comparative process directly linking it to the primary data source, the interviews, and compared with information from secondary data sources explicating other experiences of community forestry including documentation from the Ministry of Forests, articles about specific aspects of forestry policy in BC, recommended readings from the participants, and documents from the offices of the community forest cooperatives.

Ethical Considerations

After proposing the research idea to my supervisor, I completed an Application for Ethics Approval for Human Participant Research which was approved by the University of Victoria’s Human Research Ethics Board in April, 2006. I followed the procedures and data collection plan set out my approved proposal for ethical human participant research. The consent form, offered participants three options: one, confidentiality with no anonymity, two, limited anonymity using pseudonyms for individuals, and three, a higher level of limited anonymity using individual pseudonyms and pseudonyms for associated third-parties,

¹⁴⁰ *ibid*, 72

¹⁴¹ Strauss and Corbin, 102

¹⁴² *Table E, Comparison Chart* from Chapter Three – Findings explicates the use of conceptual tools in memo-writing.

including individuals or organizations mentioned in the interviews. The third and highest level of protection meant that the best efforts to avoid identification throughout the thesis would be made. However, because of the small-scale context for the research the second option – anonymity through individual pseudonyms – was essentially the same as the first confidentiality option. It offered no protection if contextual elements were mentioned, for example associated third-parties, names of the cooperatives, and sourcing for cooperative documents.

Even with the highest level of protection offered, anonymity in the strictest sense is limited by the small-scale context; it could be possible for the interviewees to be identified by indirect means within their field. Totally removing identifying terms from the thesis removed the capacity to write about context, but it did not provide total anonymity.

At the time of the application, I anticipated identifying the community forests under examination for a contextual analysis and providing pseudonyms for individuals where desired. However, every participant requested a pseudonym, demonstrating the ethical necessity for the highest level of anonymity possible in this research. To do otherwise would have exposed people to identification in ways that I could avoid. To maintain the highest level of protection for the participants, all data including the names of associated third-parties was anonymized and protected according to the University of Victoria's Human Research Ethics Board standards.

The level of anonymity desired created a unique dynamic in the writing process that emerged in the introduction of the cases. Careful consideration of a detailed context on the overall impact of this research and the integrity of participant-informed consent was necessary for a conclusive decision about anonymity. Upon review, I decided a detailed, specific context was of limited importance and it would be unethical to offer anything but the highest level of anonymity possible, regardless of the request for only individual pseudonyms.

Unfortunately, the structure of the consent form made the levels of anonymity confusing.¹⁴³ The form requested that participants check a box if they wanted a pseudonym and to request anonymity for third-parties if they wanted it. The process for requesting third-party pseudonyms was not clear. The impact of the phrasing in the consent form

¹⁴³ See *Appendix A – Invitation to Participate and Informed Consent Form*

about the various levels of anonymity available was evident in the interviews. In the interviews, participants wanted to protect themselves from community scrutiny and potential criticism. Without having a completely clear idea about the level of anonymity available, they were not comfortable being completely candid. This was evidenced by statements made during interviews and the reluctance for people to talk about anything conflict-oriented – a difficulty seeing as that is the focus of the research. In several cases requests for ‘being off the record,’ not wanting to go into detail, and not wanting to ‘get personal’ were expressed as an indicators that there was some discomfort in discussing the conflicts that had occurred throughout the process of development. Although the inconsistency in the consent form was only one factor that caused this dynamic, in addition to general discomfort in admitting conflict, comprehension of how few possible community forest developers exist in BC, and the small size of their communities, I believe it compromised the confidence of the interviewees. In retrospect, congruence within the consent form and clarity about the level of protection available are preferable.

Due to the small number community forest developers working in British Columbia and concern for the confidentiality of the interview participants, prior to submission of this thesis the community forest developers have reviewed and agreed to findings and quotations used.

Limitations of the study and other issues

The term conflict and the topic of resolution are charged with specific associations: high levels of emotion, outbursts, potential violence, and generally unpleasantness, in addition to mediation, negotiation, arbitration or legal consequences. An issue that became immediately evident was garnering a candid response about conflict from the community forest developers being interviewed. In asking questions about conflict, developers were initially reluctant to admit to being in conflict or remembering any conflict. More often it would be expressed as miscommunication, difficulty, a hurdle, obstacles, challenges etc. However, as each interview progressed, conflict scenarios arose that were not conceptualized by the participant as conflict per se. I observed resistance in the developers to frame issues throughout the development process as conflict and, therefore, in some circumstances, neglect to prepare for conflict resolution in various aspects of their work. Interestingly, the mediation theory, especially coming from the field of psychology, places emphasis on

reframing conflicted issues. This may be another reason why conflict was conceptualized by the developers in manner that avoided naming it conflict.

Regardless of the lack of direct discussion about conflict per se, conflict as a phenomenon in community forestry is threaded throughout all five major categories; small points of conflict were met and resolved continually. However, there are several categories where significant conflicts are described in more detail, for example the conflict between the Ministry of Forests, the logging company and locals supporting the community forest initiative during the transition period, to be found in the Findings chapter under *Having Problems with Transition Period*, a sub-category under **COMING TOWARD CONFLICT**. Other conflict scenarios that were not manifest, but remained latent, requiring skill and intervention to manage, are explored under the category **BEING AWARE OF THE BOX**, the sub-category *Using Organic Processes*, and the category **USING DR STRATEGIES**. Similarly, on initiation of the development process while **BUILDING AN IDEA OF COMMUNITY FORESTRY** and again when the community forest is *Hitting the Ground*, latent conflicts constantly threatened the initiatives and made work stressful and tiring for the community forest developers. They were regularly called upon to mediate conflict, if not directly, then indirectly. Strategic communication and the use of dispute resolution strategies were emphasized during these phases. The category **USING DR STRATEGIES** focuses on the effects of different approaches in these latent conflict situations.

When conflict was discussed in the interviews, drawing out questions rather than a direct approach did the work of discovering conflict scenarios. It was post-interviews that a student peer suggested looking for synonyms for ‘conflict’ or asking the participants about their definition of conflict to enter into the discussion alternatively for a different, more expedient response. Persistence and genuine interest in each story aided me in finding data about conflict in community forestry; however, it made the transcripts longer and less focused.

CHAPTER THREE – FINDINGS

In this chapter, I present my findings, grounded in the data collected from the interviews, about the intersection between conflict resolution and the process of community forest development. Although the process of community forest development has been documented in a guidebook¹⁴⁴ and in government guidelines, the theory of action described by the interviewees in this study reflects a detailed process of developing relationships, maintaining clear communication, and negotiating conflict with the purpose of supporting the development and sustainability of community forests. Unveiling this process clarifies techniques for conflict resolution in community forestry. Throughout this thesis the process is called **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST**.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the emergent categories in detail drawing on quotes from the interview transcripts to elucidate various aspects of the intersection of conflict resolution and community forest development. The Discussion and Conclusion chapter further examines several of the key concepts that emerged from the process of data collection and analysis from both the interviews and secondary sources. The data from these interviews is rich with information about community forest development and relations with the BC government. This Findings chapter explores many aspects of the conflicted relationship between the government and community forest developer as they relate to the specific categories that emerge; however, further conclusions about the impact of government on community forest development can be found in the Discussion and Conclusion chapter of this thesis.

By contrast, discussion of First Nations involvement in community forest development is minimal in the interview data. This small mention sparked a deeper examination of First Nations involvement, or lack of involvement, in these two cases. This exploration can also be found in the Discussion and Conclusion chapter.

The Findings chapter begins with a brief description of the main categories, subcategories and strategies used by community forest developers that emerged from the interview data. Then I describe each category in detail, link them with other categories and subcategories, reveal the process of emergence throughout the data gathering process, and describe the strategies used by community forest developers.

¹⁴⁴ Gunter

Developing a Community Forest - An Introduction to the Categories

The process identified in this research study is Developing a Community Forest (CF). This includes: Building an Idea of Community Forestry (CFry), Being Aware of the Box, Coming toward Conflict, Using Dispute Resolution (DR) Strategies, and Practicing CFry. This section is an overview of the process of development, explains the classification system, and relates each of the categories to the overall process.

Various fonts distinguish between categories, subcategories, strategies and influences. The social process, **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST (CF)**, is identified by bold print, uppercase and underlined. The main categories (i.e. **BUILDING AN IDEA OF CFry**) are identified by bold print and uppercase. The subcategories (i.e. *Looking at History*) are italicized, bolded and capitalized. The strategies used to enact the subcategories (i.e. *meeting people where they are at*) are in italics. Finally, the influences on the various processes are in regular font (i.e. interest in protecting domestic water). To depict a process each category is labelled with gerunds.

Although concepts and categories are described linearly, this does not indicate the manifestation of the process. The categories explored interlink and share common characteristics. They influence one another, occur simultaneously and interrelate. In addition, the experience of each community forest developer is unique. The context of the community forest - geography, culture, and socio-economics - and the capacity of the community forest developers and their board members influence the experience of each community forest developer.

The process of **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST** consists of four main categories. The first category, **BUILDING AN IDEA OF CFry**, entails designing a plan to accommodate diverse community needs. By *Looking at History*, *Considering CF Development*, and *Discovering Government Criteria* community forest developers are more equipped to approach stakeholders successfully. Some strategies for **BUILDING AN IDEA OF CFry** include: *finding a way for diverse perspectives to be included*, *meeting people where they are at*, *finding out about CFs*, *talking to other cf developers*, *making a proposal*, *having CF development tactics*, *deciding what to do about logging in domestic watershed*, *deciding on approach for CF*, and *observing where CF has fallen down*.

A second main category **BEING AWARE OF THE BOX** is an *in vivo* code. ‘The box’ is a symbolic expression of constraint or restriction because of external forces. In the case of community forestry, developers must negotiate the interests of many other groups and individuals, for example stakeholder interests, the interests of the Ministry of Forests, and corporate interests, throughout the development process. This box describes the needs of these groups that determine the mandate and protocols for the community forest initiative. Whilst **BEING AWARE OF THE BOX**, community forest developers work within their organizational mandate in addition to meeting government criteria. Often this is a tightrope walk during which a variety of communication strategies are used to build interest groups’ confidence in the project. *Fitting into the Box* and *Working outside the Box* comprise this category. *Having working relationships with Industry, local mills, and/or MOF, meeting government criteria, getting an invitation and considering AAC in domestic watershed areas*, are strategies for *Fitting into the Box*, which involve gaining access to a government process for project approval. *Fitting into the Box* involves strategizing ways to work with groups that do not have a similar vision to that of the community forest. Usually for this category the other interest group has determining power over the community forest initiative. It is necessary for the community forest developer to *Fit into the Box*, even if temporarily, to strengthen the relationship and build alliances.

Working outside the Box includes *having a certain ethic of CF development, getting funding, challenging the status quo, and sticking with community-designed CF mandate versus government mandate*. *Working outside the Box* involves community forest developers defining and maintaining a community-derived organizational mandate, defining their beliefs about CF development and logging in domestic watersheds, and strategizing about communication with all stakeholders. As opposed to *Fitting into the Box*, *Working outside the Box* involves sticking to the community forest mandate which may come into conflict with the status quo or the interests of the other party, may it be the government, a corporation, or the union.

COMING TOWARDS CONFLICT is the third main category. **COMING TOWARDS CONFLICT** describes the awareness of a conflicted context and the action taken either to avoid or address the conflict. This category is characterized by *Being Tired*, *Wanting Control* and *Having Problems with Transition Period*.

Making decisions about logging in domestic watersheds; defining a watershed area; shifting from consensus/organic decision-making to hierarchy; dealing with non-support, questioning, not blocking, not supporting; acknowledging conflict; and overcoming obstacles are activities that are at the root of the experience of **Being Tired**. The category **Being Tired** describes the experience of working to make an initiative happen. The title of this subcategory describes an emotional association that constantly arose in relation to all the implementation work. According to participants, the process requires an incredible amount of unpaid and paid work often to the detriment of the community forest developer and their inspiration to continue in the field.

Wanting Control of the process describes developer goals that are achieved by *negotiating with First Nations for support, engaging in conflict prevention, addressing scepticism, noticing benefits of pre-community meeting, caucusing with non-supporters, and identifying power from a woman's perspective*. The complex issues concerning First Nations and community forest development are explored only to a limited degree through the category **Wanting Control of the Process**. This is due to a noted lack of data about First Nations involvement throughout community forest development process in the interview transcripts despite them being a significant stakeholder in both cases. Due to this absence in the data, this discussion is not included in the findings chapter; however, a more account occurs in the Discussion and Conclusion chapter of this thesis.

The second subcategory of **COMING TOWARDS CONFLICT - Having Problems with Transition Period**— includes several linked strategies. During the transition period from industrial to community forestry, but before the community forest is granted their community forest license, developers negotiate agreement by *working with direct activists, using DR techniques to gain support, and mediating between industry and resident activists*.

USING DR STRATEGIES is the fourth major category. The subcategories include **Using Organic Processes** and **Developing Culture within the core group, staff group, or board group**. *Organic* describes developers' experiences due to unstructured or unplanned methods used during the initial stages of development. It means spontaneous, intuitive, happening previous to any cooperative policy development, made in trust, or by hoping for the best outcome. In their words, the activities happened “organically.” Developers particularly used this phrase in response to questions about conflict prevention, policy development and decision-making during the inception of the community forest initiative. As the project gained structure these aspects became less organic. **Using**

Organic Processes involves several approaches for resolving or preventing conflict including *addressing skepticism, mediating between industry and resident activists, facilitating meetings, and doing outreach/working with community*. The second subcategory, **Developing culture within the core group/staff group/board group** is characterized by: *deciding who participates, communicating strategically with community segments, approaching with inquisitiveness, finding a way for diverse perspectives to be included, defining a dispute resolution approach, defining “integral forestry”, and using specific dispute resolution techniques to gain support*. **USING DR STRATEGIES** is integral to the creation of a supportive community group, a strong, core decision-making group, and positive relationships between board, staff and management within the cooperative business structure.

PRACTICING CF is the final, major category. During this process, developers continue outreach to their membership while practicing forestry on-the-ground. Ongoing use of conflict resolution techniques maintains project momentum. **Gaining community support** and **Hitting the Ground** are the subcategories that characterize this process.

Gaining community support happens continuously while developers work on the details of the initiative. **Gaining community support** is typified by the following strategies: *figuring out financial sustainability, using specific DR techniques to gain support, communicating strategically with community segments, and feeling confident about external impressions of CFry*.

Hitting the ground is the final stage in the community forest development process. **Hitting the Ground** is another *in vivo* code that describes the experience of practicing forestry after a community forest license has been granted. At this point community forest developer are involved in a new set of activities including: *deciding on approach for CF, understanding pine beetle and developing tactics/opinions to combat, strategizing around pine beetle, framing the pine beetle issue, using strategy to negotiate low AAC, getting a ‘reality check’, balancing organizational health with operations on ground, understanding forestry in BC, establishing CF objectives, determining management strategies to reach CF goals, deciding what to do about logging in domestic watershed area, operational versus theoretical, dealing with financial uncertainty, community forest not self-informing, and figuring out the first five years*. **Hitting the ground** describes the details of community forest practice. Before this stage, everything related to forest management as such is theoretical. The concepts previously explained include approaches to forest management, water conservation, wildlife protection, recreation, and value-added components. As the community forest is **Hitting the ground**, the extraction planning and implementation

begins, the AAC becomes firm, community dynamics emerge, and the community forest initiative is practicing forestry.

The following table exemplifies the process **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST**. The table identifies the five core categories, the secondary categories or subcategories, the strategies used, and the influencing factors and consequences. Influencing factors and consequences affect all aspects of the core category rather than associate specifically with each subcategory and strategy section.

Table D – Developing a Community Forest

1 – Building an idea of Community Forestry (CF)		
Subcategories	Strategies	Influencing Factors and Consequences
1. Looking at history	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Finding a way for diverse perspectives to be included – defining a dispute resolution approach ➤ Meeting people where they are at ➤ Finding out about CF's ➤ CF as a political movement ➤ Being involved in CF development 	<p><u>Influencing Factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Motivation of CF developers to make the initiative happen ➤ CF developers are local and live in watershed areas affected by current logging ➤ CF developers having connections within community - knowledge about the issue ➤ Interest in protecting domestic water ➤ Interest in community controlled logging in their neighbourhoods ➤ Interest in an alternative approach to logging and non-hierarchical community agreement processes <p><u>Consequences</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development of a community outreach plan that is inclusive and offers community an opportunity to respond ➤ Involvement by entire community in the plan through community meetings, mapping, forest walks, on the board, or through surveys
2. Fulfilling government criteria (for diverse community involvement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Analyzing the valley cultures of forestry ➤ talking to other CF developers ➤ Analysis of ecosystem based plan and current attempt at CF in CF B ➤ Making a proposal 	
3. Considering CF development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Acknowledging success of CF initiative so far ➤ Having strong beliefs about CF development tactics and what works ➤ Deciding what to do about logging in domestic watershed area ➤ Deciding on approach for CF ➤ Defining watershed ➤ Observing where CF has fallen down 	

2 - Being aware of the box		
Subcategories	Strategies	Influencing Factors and Consequences
1. Fitting into the box	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Having a working relationship with industry, local mill and MOF ➤ Getting an invitation ➤ Considering AAC in domestic watershed area ➤ Meeting government criteria 	<p><u>Influencing Factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Type of working relationship with government officials in control ➤ Level of diverse interest groups within community ➤ Level of interest by government in success of initiative ➤ Local and global community support/pressure for CF approval through use of media ➤ Flexibility of CF plan ➤ Funding sources
2. Working outside the box	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Having a certain ethic re: CF ➤ Getting funding ➤ Challenging gov't/status quo ➤ Sticking with CF mandate 	<p><u>Consequences</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development of a positive working relationship with government ➤ Development of a CF plan that works for community and protects domestic water ➤ Gaining an understanding of government process

3 - Coming toward conflict (CF as a site of conflict, Being close to Conflict)		
Subcategories	Strategies	Influencing Factors and Consequences
1. Being tired	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Deciding what to do about logging in domestic watershed area ➤ Shifting from consensus/organic decision-making to hierarchy ➤ Defining watershed ➤ Dealing with non-support or questioning/not blocking, not supporting ➤ Acknowledging personal satisfaction of being challenged ➤ Acknowledging conflict ➤ Overcoming obstacles 	<p><u>Influencing Factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Not having enough time between deadlines ➤ Not having enough money to pay for adequate studies and research ➤ Having to be neutral and hear other perspectives that may be different from ones own ➤ Being in conflict or coming towards conflict ➤ Coming up against obstacles for success ➤ Working with board and community and staff ➤ Having to negotiate with industry working in CF area ➤ Having to run everything through government before moving forward <p><u>Consequences</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Successful caucus meetings and a show of
2. Wanting control (versus having no control)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Negotiating with FN for support ➤ Engaging in conflict prevention – role of dispute resolution ➤ Addressing scepticism ➤ Noticing benefits of pre-cm caucusing with non-supporters ➤ Identifying power from a woman's perspective 	

<p>3. Having problems with transition period</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Working with direct action ➤ Using specific conflict resolution techniques to gain support ➤ Mediating between industry and resident activists 	<p>support or non-interference in CF initiative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Confidence about community support for CF initiative ➤ Personal satisfaction for a job well done ➤ Successful mediation between activists and industry/government thereby building further support for CF initiative from those camps ➤ Board – staff divide resulting in non-support for staff and bad feelings within the CF ➤ Having to accept a financial loss due to transition period harvesting ➤ Confirmation that conflict resolution tactics (i.e. Integral Theory) are an effective way to gain community agreement ➤ Realization that a strategic approach to the board/staff relations is necessary
---	--	--

4 - Using DR strategies		
Subcategories	Strategies	Influencing Factors and Consequences
1. Using Organic Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Addressing scepticism ➤ Mediating between industry and resident activists ➤ Facilitating meetings ➤ Doing outreach/working with community 	<p><u>Influencing Factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Level of experience and skills within the field of DR ➤ Previous experience with conflict within CF development
2. Developing Culture w/in the core grp/staff grp/board grp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Deciding who participated ➤ Communicating strategically with community segments ➤ Approaching with inquisitiveness ➤ Finding a way for diverse perspectives to be included – defining a DR approach ➤ Defining community forestry ➤ Using specific DR techniques to gain support 	<p><u>Consequences</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Successful agreement within community regarding CF plan ➤ Successful proposal and government support for CF plan ➤ A positive board dynamic with diverse representation from community segments (CF B) ➤ Conflict arising over time between board and staff due to shift in decision-making process (organic to hierarchical – “point of contact”) (CF A) ➤ Awareness of a successful method of addressing conflict within the CF development process in a diverse community

5 – Practicing CF (“hitting the ground” versus theorizing about CF)		
Subcategories	Strategies	Influencing Factors and Consequences
1. Gaining community support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Figuring out financial sustainability ➤ Using specific DR techniques to gain support ➤ Communicating strategically with community segments ➤ Feeling confident about external impressions of CF 	<p><u>Influencing Factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Amount of money available to pay contractors and staff ➤ Amount of time available for planning is limited ➤ Learning curve – CF ➤ Weather affects harvest or road building ➤ Community neglects to keep themselves informed and then is reacts in surprise when a plan is implemented in a certain way ➤ Pine beetle affects planned harvest ➤ Board members are not committed for various reasons – tired, no time, lost interest, not taking responsibility seriously
2. “Hitting the ground” (Logging in domestic watersheds (DW))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Deciding on approach for CF ➤ Understanding pine beetle and developing tactics/opinions to combat ➤ Strategizing around pine beetle ➤ Framing the pine issue ➤ Using strategy to negotiate low AAC ➤ Getting a “reality check” ➤ Balancing organizational health with operations on ground ➤ Understanding forestry in BC ➤ Establishing CF objectives ➤ Determining management strategies to reach CF goals ➤ Deciding what to do about logging in domestic watershed area ➤ Operational versus theoretical ➤ Dealing with financial uncertainty ➤ CF not self-informing ➤ Figuring out the first five years 	<p><u>Consequences</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Logging or road building doesn’t go as planned ➤ Community members respond critically or with frustration towards the CF ➤ CF developers/staff are stressed out, over worked ➤ CF developers/staff are unsupported in decision-making by board ➤ The CF goes into debt and becomes financially less stable ➤ Government puts on pressure for a pine beetle plan

Building an Idea of Community Forestry

“You have to approach people in an inquisitive manner, not so much as ‘this is what we going to do’”. [Interview 1, page 3, November 20, 2006]

BUILDING AN IDEA OF COMMUNITY FORESTRY is the first stage in **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST**. Community forest developers seek allies within their communities to begin the process of development. This can happen spontaneously, as in case A, where a largely homogenous population supported the initiative, or more deliberately, as in case B, where a diversity of opinions and ideas about managing a community forest exists and were gathered together by a few focused individuals. Either way, alliances are sought to form a group, board or core group. This group spearheads education, surveying, facilitation, and community-based research. Although ‘the idea’ is the starting point of the process, each subsequent stage feeds back and impacts how ‘the idea’ is shaped.

The first subcategory within **BUILDING AN IDEA**, *Looking at History*, is integral to conflict resolution - the discovery process. As explained in Chapter two, understanding the historical context is crucial to an analysis of conflict dynamics.¹⁴⁵ Historical alliances, political dynamics, ownership, agreements and past discovery processes impact development. It is likely, as in case A and B, that developers have personal and professional history in their areas. They are privy to local, historical, contextual knowledge. According to the developers interviewed for this study, their insider status fostered rather than detracted from their comprehension of the issues in their communities and the process of **BUILDING AN IDEA**.

Looking at history involves developers investigating stakeholder perspectives, past and present, to discover the levels of support in their communities and ensure inclusiveness. An approach is designed to locate people on the spectrum of support and embrace diversity in the plan.

In case A, the approach by the community forest developers was structured according to qualitative and quantitative research methods using grassroots outreach, specifically surveying for interest in and support for the community forest and discovery of

¹⁴⁵ Tidwell, 119

the various forest user groups. An awareness of history was crucial - who is opposed and has historically been opposed, the impact of opposing groups, and how to do outreach to encourage community input.

For example, one of the major debates in case A was about the name of the cooperative. In an attempt to reach a diverse base of support, some board members wanted the name to indicate neutrality rather than express a political perspective; others wanted the name to carry their primary goal –water protection - to the public as reminder of their struggle to protect their domestic watersheds. Both of these perspectives represented a historical conflict over watershed protection. A community forest developer describes the dynamic that the debated topic created:

When we were picking a name we were very conscious of the people that were excluded, some of us were. And others didn't care; they wanted to fly the flag of eco-forestry. And so, the need to be inclusive then comes into conflict with the need to express your values. So, we had an uncomfortable situation with regard to the name of the coop. [Interview 4, page 6, September 11, 2006]

The historical struggle to establish protection for their domestic watershed areas heavily impacted the discussion about the name of the cooperative. Although conflict over naming the cooperative may seem minor, the name symbolized powerful ideological perspectives within the group. In this circumstance, the idea that a neutral name would draw a diverse group to support the initiative was false. The name was only one small gesture towards neutrality; there were very few other attempts to be neutral. The cooperative's philosophical underpinnings are very clearly ecosystems-based and disseminated as such throughout the community.

All along anybody had a chance to be on the board, but the name likely excluded people who didn't want to be professionally or socially identified with a watershed protection group. [Interview 4, page 4, September 11, 2006]

The context for this development initiative allowed for this kind of heavy bias. However, conflict about the name surfaced the need for a faster way to make decisions. Lack of consensus prevented expediency in decision-making over the name and deadlock prevented the group from progressing for days.

I could see both sides, but the conversation went and went and went and we needed to get the proposal completed. And I remember that's one time that out of frustration, and trying to bring the conversation to closure and there was one person

holding out and it was, you know, saying the same thing over and over again and everybody had heard, listened and were not agreeing, and so I said, "Can we cut the crap, we've decided already." And it was not a good thing to do. It was quite a painful thing for the person who was continuing to try and see that through. [Interview 4, page 6, September 11, 2006]

The laborious resolution of this conflict ultimately resulted in policy to hasten decision-making in future situations where dichotomy dominates discussion and heightens frustration for those under pressure with external demands. Having a systematic approach to decision-making also aids in future conflict resolution¹⁴⁶.

Historical context also significantly affected the second attempt at establishing a community forest in case B. The failure of a previous attempt in 1998 heavily influenced strategies in the second try. According to developers, several plausible explanations for the failure of the first initiative exist: corporate pressure on the government to continue conventional logging practices in the area, residents reluctant to have any logging within their watersheds, residents preferring to continue with direct-action as a prevention method for conventional logging practices, fear amongst many groups of people of an unknown economic model that may not be successful, and community members supported by the logging industry afraid of job loss. One developer explains that respecting the unique historical context of the region was a necessary consideration:

One of the main criteria to succeed in securing a community forest is to get broad-based community support. And when government says broad-based community support they have really specific segments of the population in mind, although they don't specifically say it that way. They're thinking the union, the logging company, the recreation enthusiasts, First Nations, environmental organizations and the residents. So, for us, that was our main mandate when we started. Was it possible for all these people to come together under one vision or one idea of what a CF would look like? This was the main challenge that we looked at. Then of course there's identifying a land base, identifying business strategies and all that. But the principal mandate that we gave ourselves to begin with was to find out if there was a way for people to all stand behind one vision, and this after the last 35 years of social division, conflict and over 120 residents being arrested in this struggle. [Interview 1, page 1, November 20, 2006]

Because of the contentious historical context in case B, developers approached their community stakeholders strategically aiming to be perceived as neutral as possible. In

¹⁴⁶ Jamie Chicanot and Gordon Sloan. *The Practice of Mediation: Exploring Attitude, Process and Skills*. (Victoria, BC: ADR Education, 2003): 27-40.

contrast, developers in case A utilized discourse focused on protection of water rather than meeting diverse interests to gain the confidence of their community. When comparing the two community forest cooperative mandates, case A's has one main component - protecting water - whereas case B has multiple components which reflect their diverse population. Their mandates echo the historical contexts alive in these communities.

Fulfilling government criteria is the second subcategory of **BUILDING AN IDEA**. At this point, developers gather data about their community including the measure of support within stakeholder groups. As evidenced in the previous quote, the success of the initiative depends on the measure of support. Measuring support involves developers gathering information and promoting the initiative. Their research focuses on the cultural groups within the proposed area and their standpoints on community forestry, water protection, recreation activity, logging, road building, and other forest-related issues. As developers engage with their constituents, the feasibility of the project is determined.

This initial phase involves what one developer called "curious inquiry." Developers discover if the land base is appropriate, if the government is supportive of the idea, and if the majority of the community is interested in the idea. This most likely involves the use of conflict resolution skills for the ensuing discussions. For example, in case B, there was hope that two villages could be integrated into the community forest. It soon became clear that one village did not have consensus within their own village about joining the initiative. Some members in the village demanded autonomy within the collective, while others wanted nothing to do with it at all. If included, this village's internal conflict could jeopardize the entire proposal. In the end, the government restricted the amount of land made available through the tenure reallocation process, which resolved the conflict and avoided feelings of exclusion.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁷ Ministry of Forests and Range. "Opening up New Opportunities for British Columbia." <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/mof/plan/frp/03.htm#b> (accessed July 25, 2007).

According to the Ministry's website, several factors influenced Provincial legislation to reallocate tenure throughout BC including critiques that the current tenure system shields stakeholder timber companies from market forces, blocks opportunity for new operators to get involved in the sector, and a concern that BC's timber industry lacks creativity. Reallocation required licensees to return twenty per cent of their replaceable tenure to the Crown. Half of this AAC was planned for redistribution for woodlots, community forests and First Nations. The other half has been sold at auction to increase the portion of timber going through open markets and assist in setting stumpage rates. Frequently characterized by innovative approaches, area-based community forests often hire locally and ensure local management and development of forest resources. Community forests can also be a source of timber for local value-added manufacturers. However, there have

When the government first announced this whole community forest part of the reallocation...when they first made the announcement and they started talking publicly about the fact that community forests were going to be a part of this reallocation, it took months and months to get details out of them. So, when we first started talking, we were talking area-wide. Why not unite? You know, it's always been a dream to some people. Unite the whole area under one community forest umbrella. The mayor of the village at the time had had a phone call with somebody in another local village and had said, "Should we invite them down to talk. What should we do with this?" We had already established our visions and were closely aligned. We decided if we're going to do this big then we've got to start talking to other people as well. I can't remember the details of the timing, but it took awhile before we got a perspective on really just how little tenure they were talking about. [Interview 2, page 6, September 7, 2006]

Another aspect of *fulfilling government criteria* involves liaising with both the media and the government to garner support. One developer particularly enjoyed this task because of the strategy involved in getting the government to agree to a low AAC:

At the beginning it was really exciting because there's the idealistic type vision and then there's the reality of what it takes to do something. So, in a sense that was the easiest time, trying to get the license and that was a lot of work, but on the other hand the reality came to be such that the work actually started when the license came about. My favorite time was the politics and the strategy. It was like a chess game with the government...like we're going to do this and we're going to do this and how do we want to play that in the media and on the radio. I really enjoyed that. And it brought people together a lot in the community. [Interview 5, page 1, November 22, 2006]

In case A, the government was the primary strategic target. Pressure tactics were used on the government to gain approval for a lower than usual AAC for their community forest plan through support garnered from outside the local community i.e. international environmental agencies, environmental funding bodies, eco-certification groups etc.

There was no template on which to base their plan – they were one of the first. The motivation for the initiative - clean drinking water and protecting their forest - was the starting point for planning. Ecosystem-based management strategies guided the process and were vaguely influenced by government criteria. However, in this case, government norms dominated only the format of the proposal. Answering the government's queries about a forest management approach, community support and budgetary requirements was

been relatively few of these area-based tenures available until now. Through the reallocation of replaceable tenure, more timber is available to community forest licensees, therefore the programs are being expanded.

compulsory; however, their approach to forest management remained uncompromised by these standards. A developer describes how they negotiated around government forestry standards in favor of an ecosystems-based management practice:

It was like a chess game with the government...like we're going to do this and we're g[oin]g to do this and how do we want to play that in the media and on the radio... [Interview 5, page 1, November 22, 2006]

[Politicians in Victoria] basically had to meet with us because we were playing it into the media arena pretty heavily and so they had to respond...we used the media to our advantage and got them to meet with us...

[Interview 5, page 2, November 22, 2006]

I really enjoyed that. I think that the underlying strategy was to really propose, to say what we wanted rather than what we didn't want. So, here's a community that wants to log their watershed, albeit in a gentler way. I think the fundamental thing was that it was a positive message of doing something proactive rather than in the activist world people are fighting against something rather than for something. That's a generalization, but it's like: "we don't want logging here", or "we don't want that mine". Here we were saying, "we acknowledge that you're going to log here, but we want to do it". And that worked really well in the public arena, in the public eye, because we were seen as really positive. [Interview 5, page 3, November 22, 2006]

Case A proposed a demonstration site for eco-forestry, globally and locally. To get approval for their development plans, local support was significant; however provincial, national and international support played a large role.

The particular issue of AAC is salient to the debate in Case A because of its relationship to the purpose of the community forest – protection of water. According to the development team, approval of the proposed AAC would make community forestry an effective method to protect the water supply. Without a low AAC, protection of water through community forestry would not be as effective. From the perspective of the community forest cooperative, this was their most significant negotiation with the government for the plan and it required advocacy from several fronts, in addition to local support.

Case A used a number of research tools to gauge support including door-to-door surveys, community planning meetings and the media. Also, an open-door policy at a central office location, contact through watershed groups, and stakeholder membership enhanced integration. One developer describes what happened:

What we did actually was community questionnaires so that we could get some hard numbers on where peoples' thoughts were together and where they were more distant. So we used tools. The entire community was sent invitations to come to

meetings always, not just members. The entire community questioned and the [board] group was elected from a meeting where the entire community had been invited to come to the meeting. All along anybody had a chance to be on the board, but the name likely excluded people who didn't want to be professionally or socially identified with a watershed protection group. [Interview 4, page 4, September 11, 2006]

Fulfilling government criteria is one of the hurdles to be leapt to gain an invitation to propose a community forest. Once the invitation is extended more criteria arise and the process of gaining community support intensifies. It's at this point the negotiations over AAC really began for case A. Evidence of a high percentage (above 85%) of community members supporting minimal logging in the area and highlighting protection of water as a priority was essential to this negotiation. Evidence of financial stability was also necessary to show that the initiative would provide revenue and employment in the area. Additionally, strong negotiators with connection to the forestry sector, eco-forestry sector and within the political structure itself locally, provincially, nationally and internationally with personal charisma, strong presentation skills, and scientific backing significantly added to the chances of success. Case A possessed these strengths and the Provincial government granted their pilot project with the low AAC requested.

As explained, foresters from case A utilized media and drew on support from various community groups, statistics, individual testimony, and activism to pressure the District Manager to allow an alternative approach in the community forest. Fortuitously, this forest agreement was made when public focus on forest practices in BC was at its height. Unregulated practices were being exposed, an auditing board for the newly developed Forest Practices Code had been established and the public was more aware of issues in forestry than ever before.¹⁴⁸ While forestry was highlighted in the media, developers placed pressure on the government to lower their AAC. Additionally, the land base was largely inaccessible except through costly road building efforts making it less appealing to corporate interests. These factors influenced approval for a plan that was unusually low impact for a forest initiative. In case A, the conflict resolution and negotiation strategies were aggressive, competitive and successful.

Considering CF development involves discovering who is willing, has time and has the capacity to be a core group member. As explained, the core group developed

¹⁴⁸ Jeremy Wilson, 326-32

differently in each case, spontaneously and then put to a vote versus methodically and chosen internally according to specific criteria. In case A, volunteers spearheaded the initiative, then, once the community forest was granted additional funding for the proposal, a board was voted in by the membership. The structure of the group increased through the development of policy, procedures and agreement processes as the initiative established itself. After founding the board, one of the original developers was hired as manager creating a new dynamic of hierarchy.

Alternately, the core group development was controlled in case B. The members were recruited according to the theoretical framework discussed in chapter two - Wilber's Integral Theory. This framework emerged from one developer's interest in conflict resolution and experience of acrimony around forestry issues in their area. Although not all of the core group members are as versed about Integral theory as one of the community forest developers interviewed, clearly Integral theory influenced all aspects of the process from the core group establishment, to their interactions with each other and other stakeholders, to their presentation of ideas within community meetings and caucuses, to their relationship with the District Manager. For this particular community forest development Integral was especially valuable for its focus on mutual understanding. The community forest developer applying the theory found it extremely useful especially to approach people whose feelings about forestry conflicted with his own.

The core group was selected according to a predefined criteria based on personal qualities or characteristics rather than values, beliefs or ideas related to forestry, with the intention to include each cultural segment from the area. The developer spearheading the initiative recruited people based on her personal judgement of people with these specific qualities: a wide range of support from a diverse population base, people open to new ideas that could let go of past issues, people over the age of 35 with wisdom and experience, and people who could focus on the success of the community forest rather than being stuck on their personal ideas of how it should be. Although the group was developed strategically rather than by vote, according to the developers, the result was similar – a diverse group of widely supported community members representing each segment of the population. The diversity of the group presented a face of neutrality. Ideally everyone in the community could relate to someone in the core group, thereby building community confidence in the process.

Although focused on the success of the community forest, the group included people with a range of values and beliefs about forestry. Each member represented one or more stakeholder groups, but remained flexible in their ideas to promote their work with the other people in the group representing different perspectives. Two people represented each watershed group to total of eight people.

During the theoretical stage, both case studies focused on the desires expressed by the community forest membership – those people living within the proposed area. In case A, this was done through a process of community mapping and planning processes alongside individual consultations with various stakeholder groups. Developers were available on an individual basis in their central office located in the village. This is a description of the mapping process:

In ecosystem-based planning you start out with maps and the community gets to map the areas that are important to it. They get to tell you what values they want to see protected or where they think that resource extraction can happen... and that's your first layer of the consultative process. [Interview 4, page 1, September 11, 2006]

In case B, the group caucused with stakeholder groups individually to discover their thoughts about the initiative and their priorities in its implementation. Caucusing individually in private negotiations with historically oppositional groups prevented developers from having to mediate inter-community conflict during curious inquiry. People could be honest without losing face and feeling insecure.

Finally, community meetings filled out the process of *Considering CF development*. In case B, community meetings were held in the three, affected geographic locations to reach all stakeholder groups. The success of the meetings hinged on demonstrations of mutual support within the core group. By showing support for one another, the core group gained the confidence of the public that they could work together and agreed with what was being planned in principle. This went one step further to ensure the success of the project.

To fully understand why one method of *Considering* was chosen over another in each case we must reflect on the different historical contexts in these two communities. In case B, agreement was tentative due to historical forestry conflicts primarily between forest industry workers and supporters and anti-logging environmentalists. By contrast in case A, membership agreement was not as much of an issue as conflict with the Provincial

Government. The community in case A would only accept an ecosystem-based plan; higher levels of cutting were unacceptable. In case B, ecosystem-based management was not a good option as it did not fulfill the needs of all segments of the population. A developer from case A explains why ecosystem-based planning fit for their community:

So we decided to pursue ecosystem based planning because it was something we could all conceptually identify with. There's a mapping system, there's a community input system through the maps, through community consultations and conversations. So basically that was where we took our marching orders from, was from community meetings. [Interview 4, page 2, September 11, 2006]

While **BUILDING AN IDEA OF CF**ry developers assessed their community history and specific contexts to develop an inclusive community outreach plan and bring together a cohesive core group. Developers involved community members in the plan through community meetings, mapping, forest walks, board membership, surveys, and one-on-one meetings. This process set the stage for future relationships, communication patterns, educational protocols, and personal investment in a successful community forest initiative.

Being Aware of the Box

“There's this box that every person has to fit into. It doesn't matter how much you want something you have to fit within the box.” [Interview 3, page 8, January 25, 2006]

BEING AWARE OF THE BOX, the second major category of **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST**, is the process through which community forest developers discover where they fit within the criteria of the government and define their own terms. In each case developers describe how they fit into the box to achieve approval for their community forest from the government, their stakeholders, and their own defined forestry plan. Once developers are invited to submit a proposal, they establish crucial elements in their forestry plan including timber harvest methods, road building, fire hazard plans, pine beetle plan, AAC, and financial projections. Each developer described the government process and communication in a slightly different way. For some it was frustrating, intimidating, baffling, and others exciting, “like a chess game.” **BEING AWARE OF THE BOX** involves satisfying government criteria, continuous and consistent communication with stakeholders, and staying within the membership-defined forest mandate.

Developers constantly work with members of the provincial government, specifically the local District Manager from the Ministry of Forests. This relationship is cooperative, competitive or somewhere in between. The relationship may involve political figures lobbying on behalf of the initiative, the media placing pressure on the District Manager, or working collaboratively to come up with solutions to conflict issues. In case A, due to enormous community support for the initiative, placing pressure on the District Manager and political figures was a strong option. Developers utilized media and supportive data from the community highlighting eco-forestry practices and certified timber – both popularly supported ideas of the time - to pressure the government to grant them a community forest license. Case B’s situation required collaborative negotiation tactics; personal relationship building was emphasized. The media did not play as large a role in the process because the nature of the project was different, without goals toward eco-certification or touting eco-forestry. In both cases the type of relationship developed with the District Manager was integral to the success of the project.

Developers are **AWARE OF THE BOX** as soon as they begin working toward an invitation. Having *Fit into the Box*, i.e. being invited to submit a proposal, the progression toward *Working outside the Box*, i.e. negotiating community-defined management prerogatives, begins. The *in vivo* code, “outside the box,” emerged from every interview as a commonly understood descriptive term describing various aspects of life, but especially their work in community forestry. I understood it to mean work that takes one outside of organized social systems i.e. economic, political, cultural, gendered, and religious norms. In each case, the developers had a personal experience, for example social justice work or environmental activism, that aided them in their work ‘outside the box’ in community forest development.

Developers related their experience of **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST** as being forced into a box, and one in which they did not necessarily fit very well. *Fitting into the Box* describes working within a specified social and economic structure enforced by the Ministry of Forest, the BC Forest Act, and heavily influenced by industrial forest practices. Once familiar with the ‘rules’ developers described a period of testing the boundaries to see how far they flex. The latter phase I labeled *Working outside the Box*.

Ultimately the Ministry of Forest is a machine and it runs a certain way and it's just not going to change. It's not going to change until government changes. Those are huge issues. The best thing for us to do at this time is to understand how the

machine works and how we can actually fit into the program without compromising our ultimate values and our ultimate reason of why we're doing this community forest. And, ultimately, if there could not have been a meeting place that would have been a breaking point. The reason why we're still at it is because we believe that 'the box' (i.e. the MOF) and its inherent limitations that are imposed on us is still a box that we can fit in. And once we fit in this box, we can then extend beyond the box, but first we have to fit in the box. And that was the first thing. [Interview 1, page 4, November 20, 2006]

In case A, the boundaries of the box were pushed quite far to the astonishment of some in the environmentalist community:

Our forest agreement actually says that the community asks the District Manager to change the cut. We've had lawyers from Sierra Defense asking, "How the hell did you get that in there?" I believe there's an interest in removing that. And so there are now template agreements for community forestry¹⁴⁹, which when we negotiate our 25 year it will be interesting to see what we can keep. [Interview 4, page 17-18, September 11, 2006]

In this quote the developer is referring to the extraordinarily low AAC granted by the District and written into the license agreement. This circumstance is unusual even by community forest standards.

In addition to challenging the status quo within the government system, developers work with stakeholders to articulate priorities. In case B, relationship building required a strategic approach; the failure of the previous community forest, and history of acrimony between loggers and environmentalists and amongst other stakeholder groups, impacted every conversation. The developers were systematic when confronting belief systems and strong opinions. They applied Wilber's Integral Theory - accepting and listening to other perspectives, including all perspectives in the solution, developer diversity, and general awareness of language use - to build relationships and trust. Building trust created space for sharing ideas. Utilizing Wilber's Integral Theory, the developers were able to gain the support of each group. This is a test case for the application of Wilber's theory.

¹⁴⁹ The community forest template mentioned here was developed after the initial pilot projects were introduced in 1998. The template standardizes agreements between the MOF and community forests by setting general limits on AAC, among other things, primarily preventing AAC's from being above or below a certain level. This is problematic for some community forests, especially those initiated by First Nations or located in environmentally-focused communities.

For more information about problems with AAC and First Nations look to:
 Claire Hutton. Exploring Aboriginal Forestry and Ecosystem-based Management: A Case Study of Cowichan Tribes. Masters of Resource Management (Trent, Ontario: Trent University, 1997): 25

Integral theory influenced all aspects of the development process. Every stakeholder group held a different view of forests and forestry, some more similar than others; regardless, each had bounded concerns and desires. To ensure each group felt their concerns were included and appreciated, the developers' communication approach was methodical and deliberate. This approach was used to compile a list of priorities and eventually the mandate for the community forest. This process can be viewed as *fitting into the box* - someone else's - or *working outside the box* - your own - depending on the perspective.

Working outside the Box involved staying with the community-designed mandate, once it was developed. This meant defining bottom lines during negotiations with the government. In some cases this could be tricky:

This isn't the first or only time we've all walked away from the table going, "ok, this is it!" It's happened a dozen times only [the District Manager] just doesn't see it because he's sitting on the other side of the table. It's been multiple times we've been sitting at the table saying "Jeez, this is a deal breaker" or "how are we going to handle that?" [Interview 3, page 8, January 25, 2006]

The developers assess what their communities will and will not agree to. They represent community interests during the negotiations with the District Manager and the MOF knowing that if they take an unsatisfactory agreement back to their community it will be rejected. In both cases, negotiations require patience, perseverance, and a strong sense of community-driven mandate.

Negotiations were difficult in each case for different reasons. In case A, the majority of the community wanted to see less cutting and more preservation. Most members of the community forest wished that their watershed had been included in the adjacent park preservation area so that no logging would happen at all. In case B, more division amongst community members influenced divergent views about the logging. As a result, community forest developers relied upon the community-driven mandate gathered from the interests and concerns of stakeholder groups to direct their negotiations with the government.

While **BEING AWARE OF THE BOX** community forest developers engage with the government to be invited to submit a proposal – *Fitting into the Box*. Once invited to submit, the process shifts toward *Working outside of the Box* - pushing its boundaries - to meet the interests and concerns of community membership. This involves continuous communication between developers, stakeholders and government representatives to build

and maintain confidence and trust from each party in both the process and the developers themselves.

Coming Toward Conflict

“[C]onflict is harder too when things are a struggle. So when there's no money and not enough time and everyone's taxed, things get amplified.” [Interview 5, page 7, November 22, 2006]

The third major category in the process **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST**, involves community forest developers using a variety of organizational and conflict resolution techniques to cope with, prevent or resolve conflict. In some cases conflict is predictable and in some cases unexpected. In **COMING TOWARD CONFLICT**, the CF developer observes conflict and attempts mitigate it to further the community forest initiative. In some cases, the conflict is out of their control entirely. There are times when developers are at a loss to know what to do. They observe the problem but may not know how it can be avoided or changed and attempt to address it either effectively or ineffectively. Both the effective and ineffective mitigations are useful to highlight to further understand manifest conflict in community forestry. **COMING TOWARD CONFLICT** is characterized by *Being Tired, Wanting Control*, and *Having problems with Transition Period*.

As a result of **BEING AWARE OF THE BOX**, a community forest developer has a heightened awareness of contention between the ideas in their core group, their stakeholders, government representatives and the Forest Act. The sub-categories mentioned for **COMING TOWARD CONFLICT**– *Being Tired, Wanting Control* and *Having problems with Transition Period*–result from these areas of contention. For example, conflict during the tenure transition, figuring out which areas are included in the community forest plan, devising a board structure, the move from grassroots organizing to a hierarchical structure, negotiating an agreement with government, dealing with non-support within the community, and finding a way for diverse perspectives to be included. These sub-categories, *Being Tired, Wanting Control*, and *Having Problems with Transition Period*, are expressions of periods during the process that happen iteratively rather than in linearly or

just once. *Being Tired, Wanting Control* and *Having Problems with Transition Period* happen in response to circumstances of conflict.

Various factors influence the state of *Being Tired*, including 1) not having enough time to do the work; 2) having to be neutral; 3) not having enough money for the project to run effectively; 4) running into obstacles; 5) being in conflict; 6) having to work with a board, the community, and other staff members; 7) negotiating with industry representatives logging in the community forest area previous to tenure transition; and 8) requiring government approval. All of these factors affect developers due to their high level of involvement at all levels and the associated stress. Although there are many expressions of the rewards of being involved in the community forest process in the interviews, expressions of *Being Tired* were emphasized because of their close tie to conflict.

Because community forest development emerges from a grassroots initiative, many hours of volunteer work, in addition to paid work, is required. Accountability to various groups, being the public face of the community forest within a small community, financial strain and responsibility are linked to the category *Being Tired*. Here is one developer's explanation of *Being Tired*:

Quite honestly part of conversation was: "I don't want to do a community forest. (laughing) Do you want to do a community forest?" It's a lot of work. It's a lot of work. And it's especially a lot of work when you're working in the context of a very divided community with a really pro logging faction and a really environmental faction that are a long way from each other in terms of ideals and values and strategies for how logging should happen in domestic watersheds. [Interview 2, page 2, September 7, 2006]

Even at the inception of the initiative she was aware that engaging in this project would be a huge commitment and might result in burn out, a condition that other resident activists experienced in their attempts to influence logging practices and management in their area.

In case A once the initiative had established their first five-year timeline, the work load increased: educating about community forestry, establishing transparent practices, switching from a grassroots structure to a hierarchical one to satisfy funders, and making financial decisions about forest management all contributed to the symptom of *Being Tired* in the development team. Once developers entered the management role and became accountable to their board, community membership and funders, *Being Tired* was an emphasized theme for developers.

Another component to *Being Tired* actually aids developers benefiting their cause and involves potentially oppositional stakeholders. Community watershed activists have become tired of the acrimony, the divisiveness, and the need for vigilance. Other groups are tired of the conflict and politics dividing their families, friends, infesting their schools and making local events unpleasant. One developer describes how it became her turn to work on the issue of local forest management; instead of direct action against logging in the watershed, her role was as a community forest developer:

I have friends and neighbours who have been really in the watershed stuff and they burned out. I'm a firm believer that we all take turns. That's just how it happens. So, when this opportunity came up, my kids are [grown up], I don't have a school thing happening in my life, a bunch a people had burnt out, it was my turn. I looked around and I said, "Ok, who else?" The 30 years of acrimony and difficulty, it tired people out. [Interview 2, page 4, September 7, 2006]

One developer described how *Being Tired* benefited the development initiative. In Rubin's terminology, the conflict was *ripened* by stakeholder tiredness:¹⁵⁰

One of the things that have worked in our favour in that respect is that nothing else has worked, from any perspective, whether you're an industry person or whether you're an environmentalist. The community involvement processes that the government has initiated have all been perceived, generally across the board, as pretty bogus. They're consultations after the fact, they don't really empower people, you know, workers or residents or the logging companies. So that's one of the things that in a way worked in our favour. People are tired. They want some stability. They want the divisiveness to stop and if we can provide that... [Interview 2, page 8, September 7, 2006]

The developers explain that when alternatives to current forestry practices including direct action, use of media, or through preservation had disappeared or become saturated, having no control over logging and no energy left to try something new actually enhanced their ability to define common goals and interests amongst varying local groups. After years of fighting for domestic watershed protection, disagreeing about tactics, opposing the need for protection, the majority of people in these two communities agreed that community forestry was a good option.

Being Tired focused community members on the benefits of community forestry. A developer from case A linked emerging conflict to the structure of the group which had changed from the a grassroots, consensus-practicing group of volunteer activists to a

¹⁵⁰ Rubin

hierarchy of democratically elected board members, paid staff, and a manager – a structure required by banks, loan organizations and the government. Whether the new power structure was real or perceived, hierarchy incited emotional outbursts, jealousy, and criticism from within the group and within the community. The core group was unprepared for the change in dynamics that hierarchy brought to their group and so it remained unchecked. Although attention was drawn to the emerging issues of power struggle from various corners, for the most part the dynamic was denied and thereby sustained. It is only now, several years later that work is being done to ensure a positive board-staff-management dynamic prevails.

It's that very first group breaking away from board to employees. It's that grass roots splitting. To do it over again, I probably wouldn't have taken a management role. I would have kept my old job, been a board member and brought in somebody from the outside. But then the tendency is to eat [the outsider] for lunch too, and devalue them. So, if that is going to take place in an organization then it's not healthy in the first place. [Interview 4, page 12, September 11, 2006]

In addition to negative professional dynamics, being overwhelmed, feeling the pressure of immense scrutiny, and dealing with financial insecurity contributed to one developer leaving the field in the face of changed conditions related to the onset of mountain pine beetle damage in the area:

So, it was the downward slide for me because I was just like holy crow! (Laughing) The stakes are so high and we're starting from ground zero - we're coming out of a year where we had no revenue because we couldn't get into the bush because of the forest fires. I was just like, well, what doesn't kill you will cure you. Well, maybe I'm getting cured of community forestry! (Laughing) It was just crazy. So, we did finally put forward a strategy and we had to take it to the public. And then they're agitated ahead of time because we haven't done our whole public work-up on the areas that we're having to report about beetles. So then, the first time they hear about [the 25 year forestry management approach] beetles are involved. "Beetles are just a justification for getting to timber," [the community is] saying. I tried calmly to say, "Ok, this is our history. We've harvested 22% pine. There was an oversight between our forester and the district beetle person. They looked at the area and said there was no need to fall and burn". That was last April. By October we had such a bad problem that we were suspect of not handling it properly. Of course, I didn't make any friends by articulating these things, but how do you go to the public and say, "Well, they're re-evaluating our community forest application for 25 years and pine beetle is going to be a part of the evaluation, and the largest amount of pine is in the drainage that we haven't planned yet, but we've had to put a strategy forward to plan for this with no financial prowess" [Interview 4, page 17, September 11, 2006]

Waiting for government regulatory measures to be clarified and implemented while anticipating approval for their 25-year agreement created insecurity for the developers in case A. In addition to the other factors mentioned, this contributed to *Being Tired*; all decisions regarding long-term, forestry-related plans were put on hold. The struggle to develop the business side of the community forest within the framework of ecosystems-based management was compounded by the five-year pilot format imposed on the initiative by the government. The cooperative members feared long-term commitments that could incur debt. From a short-term perspective this was sensible, but within the concept of ecosystems-based management where logging plans consider seven generations, it was infinitely frustrating. Without the financial security, short-term plans were implemented, but the long-term vision was stifled. The financial insecurity and non-profit status of the community forest led to internal conflict:

We wanted to get our five-year agreement extended to a 25-year agreement, because having a five-year pilot agreement has been a huge psychological barrier to investment. It's been a huge psychological barrier to the board of directors letting me develop the business. I'll see an opportunity and it'll be a good one and [the board] will go, "oh, well maybe when we get our long term residence". "Well, no! The [community] sawmill¹⁵¹ will be gone then!" [note: that sawmill is now closed] [Interview 4, page 16, September 11, 2006]

Being Tired is heavily affected by *Working outside the Box*. A developer from case A describes community forest development as “conflict ridden” because “there’s no money and not enough time and everyone’s taxed, things get amplified...it was just the nature of the beast.” This is largely because their vision of eco-forestry was “outside the box.” Within eco-systems based management making a profit is difficult and seed funding is tough to access. There is very little government subsidy making additional funding necessary. The community forest management must ensure multiple community needs are met and balance financial security. This difficulty is made easier with a supportive community of like-minded people whose main priority and agreed upon mandate is

¹⁵¹ The term community sawmill used here describes a small, locally-owned sawmill for small-scale logging operations and mill wrights to supply a local wood market. These smaller sawmills offer opportunities to local carpenters and other trades people. Through sawmills local people have access to wood that would otherwise be unavailable to them from the larger industrial mills who have often pre-sold the majority of their raw logs for export.

For more information about community sawmills and competitive log markets see:

Cheri Burda and Michael M’Gonigle. Innovative Forestry Versus the State(us) Quo. (University of Victoria, BC: Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, 1997): 16

protection of water; however, lack of paid work and anxiety about the financial viability of the community forest creates undue stress.

Wanting Control is the second significant sub-category under **COMING TOWARD CONFLICT**. Situations out of the developers' control far outweigh those times when it is within their control both during the development phase and on-the-ground. Although negotiations with the government and stakeholder groups can be planned; outcomes cannot be controlled. Once initiated, they can only hope to reach agreement and find allies in stakeholder groups and within the government. There are many factors that are out of developers' control on-the-ground including weather, costs of labour, and availability of appropriate machinery. In both the development phase and during forestry practice developers strategize to gain some level of control and predictability throughout the process.

The strategies used to gain some level of control and manage personal expectations during development include: negotiating (defining levels of opposition or support) with First Nations and oppositional groups - i.e. environmental groups - previous to community meetings or other public engagement processes; engaging in conflict prevention with all segments of the population - especially non-supporters - using techniques like pre-community meeting caucusing; and directly addressing scepticism about the viability of the community forest instead of avoiding concerns coming from various parties. During the practice of community forestry, strategies for gaining control over the process include: using media and community planning processes to ensure transparency in decision-making, making a business plan, doing financial forecasting, and working with a professional forester to strategize harvesting.

Development and practicing forestry are two distinct phases; the first primarily involves defining and planning an approach to community forestry while the second occurs after final approval of the plan and focuses on the practice of forestry. Of these two cases, only case A has reached phase two, case B has gained approval - December 2007; however, logging has not yet begun.

Negotiating with First Nations involved working with several bands who claim territorial ownership to the proposed areas. One band expressed disapproval of logging in the area even at the low-level of cut involved in ecosystem-based forestry. Their representative expressed that they would not participate or negotiate with the community

forest, but rather witness the practice and management of the forest and report back to her community. According to a developer this was what she said:

"We as a People oppose logging in watersheds. We feel that they should just be put aside and not logged at all. And I don't want to get involved in something because I don't think it's going to work. I won't stand in your way. But I will witness." She made a point of saying, "I'm going to be watching what you do." [Interview 2, page 9, September 7, 2006]

If one of the bands opposed the agreement due to a land claims issue with the Province it is likely that the proposal would not be approved. First Nations and established environmental groups opposed to logging in watersheds decided to witness, rather than actively protest the proposal. Community forestry may be considered a more positive option than conventional forest practices. At one point, an environmental activist similarly against any logging in domestic watersheds lamented that these communities had to protect their forest, water and wildlife habitats by logging; however, she did not block the initiative either. Caucusing with First Nations and environmental activists was integral to gaining a sense of their stance without pressuring them publicly. A private and informal arrangement promoted honesty and relationship building and prevented a conversation steeped in controversy. Further exploration into issues with First Nations in these cases can be found in the Discussion and Conclusion chapter.

The third sub-category of **COMING TOWARD CONFLICT** is *Having Problems in the Transition Period*. This category shares characteristics with *Wanting Control*, but has a heightened intensity due to the closeness to manifest conflict. The developers describe negotiating with protesters, pre-caucusing before large group or community meetings, mediating between forest companies and independent community members, and working with the District Manager to formulate a licensing agreement.

In case B, developer conflict resolution skills were especially salient during the time period when the license had not yet been transferred to the community forest from the local corporate licensee. Impending cuts threatened a particularly contentious section of the ridge, which had also recently been assessed for pine beetle, causing conflict between local activists, foresters and the MOF. Relentless direct-action for over 20 years had successfully prevented cutting in this area, and, to add to the dynamic, the proposed cut was planned for the future community forest tenure area. All road building and cutting for the block before the tenure transfer affected the feasibility of the community forest: their choice of access,

then, once the road was established, their decision to use the new road even though it posed several logistical problems including neighborhood safety and short term, expensive access through private property, and finally, the amount of profitable lumber left after the cuts. All of these factors affected decision-making for the community forest core group.

When diverse values are applied to the land-base as opposed to conventional cutting methods where a variety of values do not have to be considered the margins for error are narrower and even more restrictive. Industrial logging would likely leave the land-base in worse condition, with less viable timber and a potentially unsatisfactory road then before the community forest submitted their application. This means the land-base has different values to design a plan around. Here is one developer's description of what happened:

So, people decided to start a blockade. At which point, the CF said this is between [the company], the Ministry and the people. The CF is trying to emerge as its own entity. None of this was ever of our making, we didn't create this cut block, we didn't recommend this road, we've been doing what we could to make something work so that things didn't explode again, but at this point we said, "Look, you guys figure this out. This is not our job." And then [the District Manager] phoned and said, "I'm willing to come up and meet with the blockaders and I really want you guys there. You guys are part of the solution." So, ok we're back in. [Interview 2, page 7, January 25, 2006]

Knowing the history of conflict around this particular section of forest, the District Manager was eager to avoid further delays and conflict. He approached the community forest developers requesting they get involved in making an agreement plan. Getting involved meant mediating between community forest constituents, - including protesters - the government and the company. The developers had to garner the trust of the District Manager and the people involved in the protests, a difficult task due to the developers' own interests in the piece as a community forest initiative and their desire to be perceived as neutral within their diverse community.

As one developer explained, this was a problem created by a lack of policy development on the part of government to address issues of license transition from conventional forestry corporations to a community forest tenure agreement. One of the suggestions from a developer is encapsulated here:

So, why doesn't government take the simple step of deciding that once the land base is agreed upon there is a moratorium on the land base until it's transferred over? That would be the simplest thing. Because they're not doing that then the

companies, you know, they're businesses.¹⁵² [Interview 1, page 14, November 20, 2006]

The situation described is a difficult one to mediate and required strategic planning involving several groups. The binding agreement with the company ensures that the Province receives their stumpage fees which are higher than what they would receive from the community forest, the company profits from the remaining timber according to their original business plan, and the pine beetle assessed risk area is taken care of in a timely manner. In addition to these considerations, the company deadline to get the pine beetle affected trees out could not be met by the community forest even if they received confirmation of their agreement immediately; they could not mobilize to cut the affected trees to meet the deadline. These factors, among others, influenced the decisions of the logging company, the District Manager and the Chief Forester for the Province. In this case, the community forest agreement did not prevent the road building and cutting, but came up with a list of community concerns and ways to work with the company to alleviate them.

The developers concern for the future of the community forest was how much the loss of timber will affect their profit margin. The question remained: will the community forest prosper when much of their tenure area has been clear cut? The removed trees, although pine beetle affected, are assets. A second concern regarded the road location and construction. The road was built according to the MOF standards and guidelines, but the community forest will decide if this road works for them based on their own guidelines and concerns for neighborhood safety, ecosystems and water. These factors were not considered in the short term by the company. The community forest is considering different, long term goals that are quite different. For those concerned about the impact of logging on their local water sources, the hope was that the government would act to control the logging company's decision, that the blockade would be effective and that the community forest would take over the tenure for the designated cut blocks paying out the current tenure holder. This is not how the agreement rolled out. Consistently, community members seek more control over the process.

¹⁵² The implication here is that businesses practicing industrial forestry will take out timber from any cut block that has been approved before the transition occurs to make the access road and other forestry operations financially viable.

In this situation, the District Manager did not block the cut, rather developers assisted community activists in drawing up a list of priorities for the company to consider. Developers mediated between the District Manager, local activists and neighbours concerned about the road access issues and cutting. This meeting was successful; there was dialogue and agreement about what would be avoided and protected. Many of the same strategies and tactics from Integral theory were applied during this mediation period as had been previously including caucusing, communication across difference, and facilitator diversity.

In case A, the transition period was difficult, for entirely different reasons. The challenges highlighted were administrative; the problems arose from lack of experience and mechanisms for dealing with internal conflict. As previously mentioned, the shift away from grassroots, consensus, non-hierarchical structure divided the paid manager, the staff and the volunteer board members.

On-the-ground, difficulties included getting the right machine and operator interested in the small contract in time to meet financial and ecological goals. As a new manager for the community forest, with little to no forestry experience, the developer-turned-manager found the learning curve especially steep. In addition to the on-the-job learning, intense scrutiny by the membership and stress from the financial pressures of running a non-profit added to *Having problems in the Transition Period*.

A second transition period occurred in case A. The initiative began as a pilot project with a five-year term to assess the viability of the concept. It was one of eleven community forests ever to occur in BC. After the first five-year period a second five-year period was granted. Finally, after the second five-year period, the community forest was offered a long-term tenure of twenty-five years. During the pilot period and the second five-year period, the coop membership had been paralyzed in their long-term financial planning due to a perceived insecure future.

Once this twenty-five year license was offered, a new policy was introduced by the government requiring a pine beetle strategy. The transition from a five-year to a twenty-five year agreement became a source of stress. A twenty-five year agreement had not been made with a community forest in BC before and the government was developing the process as the applications were being submitted. The application manifested into a communication breakdown between government representatives and developers. Once again case A was

Working Outside the Box and the process was fraught with the characteristics of that category. Some of the features of this particular situation included misinformation by the government regarding criteria, lack of adequate instruction from the government about the proposal process, insecurity about potential changes to the previously agreed upon AAC, and uncertainty about the government's current pine beetle policy and how it would fit into case A's overall ecosystems-based management approach. Case A – an initiative which took an ecological approach to forestry - faced concerns about changes to the AAC and raised their level of outreach to alleviate fears about the newly imposed pine beetle requirements. One of the developers talks about the stress caused by the twenty-five year tenure application:

So, [MOF] asked us to do a pine beetle strategy. Well, no one else had done one. We didn't have a template for one; we had no idea what criteria to use. So here we are. Our twenty-five-year agreement is hinging on the fact that the people haven't evaluated us yet that are now worried that we're not going to get to the pine quick enough, we've got a five-year license, it's a \$650,000.00 road [to get to the pine], all these pieces. I think that was just the beginning of the end for me. I just went, "we've made it through a forest fire year, our main forester that we've been with all this time has left, we have to do this [the twenty-five-year tenure proposal], I've got a new forester, a new forest tech, and these requirements are being put on us that haven't been put on anyone else in the district because they will apply for salvage permits¹⁵³ and stuff like that. There's a lot of areas with roads, there's a lot of areas without roads, major licensees aren't gonna be hitting all of these areas at once either!" It really felt isolating.

So, we put a pine beetle strategy forward. I wasn't happy with it because we had so much on our plate and different ways of viewing the request within the organization that I don't think we put our best foot forward in some ways. And then they sent it to a PhD entomologist and he ripped it up. You know, he criticized it heavily, so it came back to us. We redid it and it seemed like the goalposts changed on what they wanted - like at one point they were asking for three different scenarios complete with financials. You know what that is?! It's like three business plans. And I did it, but there's a whole bunch of other things I should have been doing, like looking for money, marketing wood... [Interview 4, page 16-17, September 11, 2006]

Some of the differences between case A and other community forests lie in their designated AAC. The AAC for case A is unusually low due in part to, first, community pressure on government, second, an innovative solution to community concerns about

¹⁵³ A salvage permit allows the operator to harvest dead or damaged trees, for example pine beetle stands. The implication here is that within the ecosystems-based management model a salvage permit may not be appropriate. Regardless a proper assessment from the ecosystems-based model must be applied before a decision about the pine is made.

water, third, the lack of lucrative, accessible lumber in the community forest area, and fourth, that particular government's perspective on forest practices during development. Because of these factors, the coop negotiated a low AAC, much lower than the standardized AAC's suggested by the government for community forests today. Community reluctance to allow any cutting implicates developers in potential conflict every time logging is scheduled. Additionally, financial constraints and pine beetle damage pressures cutting. When the community forest applied for their twenty-five year tenure, the developers feared that the AAC would have to change to meet new standards. This did not happen; however, the MOF demanded a pine beetle strategy for which the criteria changed several times. Coming up with a pine beetle strategy with such short notice was stressful:

It was all coming at us over the issue of pine. An issue we didn't know we had. I mean, we know there's pine out there, we know we were going to go get it, we know we're going to have a problem financially going into that next drainage regardless of the pine. But the amount of pine that we have to take has financial implications because it's a low value species. So, to go in and take it all within a two-year period isn't going to pay for that road. It has to be metered out. So the kind of hysteria that we were having pushed on us... We felt because our long-term agreement hinged on it. It was excruciating. It was just terrible. [Interview 4, page 17, September 11, 2006]

For both community forests transition periods were difficult due to unforeseen circumstances, poor communication from the government, structural elements (i.e. the issue of land tenure transfer and pine beetle) and inter-community conflict.

When developers **COME TOWARD CONFLICT** generally they have past the initial phases of development and are well aware of the problems in the development process having experienced some of *Being Tired, Wanting Control*, and *Having Problems in Transition Period*. At this point, developers are confronted with conflicts in organizational development, community development, education processes, opposition groups, industry and the government. Awareness of their inability to control circumstances is evidenced by testimonies stating: "I think you have to live with a certain amount of disapproval," "decisions about how we proceed are actually out of our hands" and "you've got to just absorb it and respond to it". These statements indicate the strain developers endure, their efforts to acknowledge their successes and their insight to let go of control.

Using Dispute Resolution (DR) Strategies

“Each time we've just worked our way through it and again, it's always fraught with are we doing the right thing? Are we making the right moves? Are we making the right decisions? Are we portraying ourselves in the right way?” [Interview 3, page 8, January 25, 2006]

USING DR STRATEGIES, the fourth major category in the process

DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST, entails developers using conflict resolution techniques to prevent conflict from slowing or stopping the community forest. Conflict resolution strategies are implemented to manage interest groups, direct organizational development and plan an approach to forestry. In case A, the approach was linear and transparent. In case B, the approach was complex, carefully controlled, and less clearly communicated to the general membership. A description of **USING DR STRATEGIES** further explicates Integral Forestry theory and practice. **USING DR STRATEGIES** is characterized by *Using Organic Processes* and *Developing Culture within core group/board group/staff group*.

The approaches in each case indicate that each had different obstacles and a different skill set to approach them. In the chart below, I outline in each column the similarities and then the differences in approach between case A and B in further detail. The columns are distinct and do not correlate across the double line directly.

Table E – Comparison Chart - similarities and differences between cases A and B

SIMILARITIES between case A and B	DIFFERENCES between case A and B
Outreach through community meetings and caucusing	Deciding who is involved in core group/board membership according to group representation and individual characteristics (B) versus having transparent core/board member nomination process without preconceived structure or controls(A)
Liaising with MOF – experience with working with government and the type of communication strategies utilized.	Having a specific conflict resolution based theoretical approach in addition to the government mandated process (B) versus having an ecosystem based management directed approach in addition to the government mandated process (A)
Getting overwhelmed by amount of work	Working with a diverse community with conflicting values (B) versus having a homogenous community with generally unified values (A)
Organic decision-making process within board/core group	Negotiating a transition period with current industry foresters (B) versus not having industry working in your planned CF area (A)
Educating community about forestry	Having to integrate a variety of different values (B) versus following an ecosystem-based management plan (A)
Framing pine beetle issue and educating community about pine beetle	Meeting people where they are at (B) versus people meeting the forest plan where it is at (A)
Caucusing with individual segments of community	Using DR strategies to prepare for and prevent conflict, i.e. Integral Theory, (B) versus accessing DR strategies as conflict arises (A)
Dealing with financial stress	Meeting with government to create a relationship of understanding and cooperation (B) versus using a confrontational/challenge approach with government (A)
Having a history of acrimonious relationships with forest industry companies working in the area	Little utilization of media, in large part due to of lack of interest on part of media (B) versus using the media as a tool to place pressure on government (A).
Discussing protection of domestic watersheds	Large and accessible terrain (B) versus small area of difficult to access timber (A)
Following a government mandated process of community outreach and agreement	

As can be seen in the table above, there are significant differences in approach to conflict in each case. In case B, developers used conflict resolution preventatively, whereas in the case A, conflict resolution was utilized as it was needed or not at all. One explanation for the approach in case A is the developers' confidence that disputes could be avoided because of the high percentage of support for an ecosystem-based initiative. In this case,

similar values and perspectives were shared within the board group and amongst wider membership. However, as evidenced by the findings congruency of values did not guarantee harmonious or collaborative communication styles. The sub-category *Using Organic Processes* explores the intuition and spontaneity inherent in the term ‘organic’ and the positive and negative effects on the resolution of conflict of practices labelled organic practices.

Using Organic Processes emerged as an *in vivo* code. As described in the introduction to this chapter, *organic* means spontaneous, intuitive, happening previous to any cooperative policy development, made in trust, or by hoping for the best outcome. Specifically, agreement processes with the board, role development, communication, decision-making, public image-making, and community meetings, and, in case B, the areas involved in the community forest occurred *organically*. The developers interviewed from case A regretted the absence of a comprehensive conflict resolution policy and practice during development.

As illustrated in the comparison chart, case A nominated their board. The only criterion was membership in the community forest. Bottom-up, participatory process, in large part, determined the group dynamic and outcomes without setting any criteria for membership based on a specific capacity for communication, conflict resolution, or organization. Here’s how a developer reflected on his experience with the initiative:

I know that part of it is that I was too sensitive to the human dynamic. Part of it was just that it wasn't fun anymore. I was too affected by...I would get knots in my stomach before I'd go to meetings...I think when [recognition of one another] didn't happen is when things really fell apart. I know if I was being pigheaded and not willing to look beyond my belief system then that's when I really got into trouble. In that sense, dispute resolution was a tool, but also I would say that there were a lot of people that just backed down and just didn't say anything...I think we could have done with more facilitation. [Interview 5, page 6, November 22, 2006]

Another challenge brought up in an interview on the topic of *using organic processes*, or unstructured development, related to inter-community information sharing. A developer reflects on her frustration with leftover issues from the early development process that she had to deal with in her new role as manager:

There was a little bit of a split at the director level. What I felt is that we should have each creek represented by at least one director so that there was somebody was responsible for reporting back what's going on. And you've got a direct link from the table to each of the watersheds. My environmental colleague felt that I was

trying to control the process too much, so we didn't do that. But it just kind of organically worked out that there was representation from [the three watershed areas]. And at times it's been heavy one-way or the other, a little, not really though. It's sort of maintained that balance all through time, but the requirement to report back wasn't built in and that's where with privilege comes responsibility, responsibility to keep people in your area informed with what's going on. [Interview 4, page 6, September 11, 2006]

The manager was overloaded with multiple tasks covering both outreach and logging logistics. Having a grassroots, community-driven system for disseminating information would helpfully reassign the work load from the manager back to the community membership. Although a limited communications plan exists to make membership aware of logging in a particular watershed area or near their homes, it does not promote community interest in the initiative. Developers observed that without a community-driven communications plan from the inception, the responsibility to self-inform erodes rapidly. The results are that membership expect staff to keep them informed about community forest activities. The burden of outreach remains with the manager and the staff group, rather than board members. This burden was not apparent at the outset. Once someone was 'in charge' the dynamic changed entirely and earlier 'organic' agreements fell through. These agreements were unrecorded; they lost their legitimacy and staying power. As a result, dissemination of information became another problem for the management position.

It's very tricky in a community because we all have other relationships [outside of the community forest] with one another. And so I found it harder than I had ever expected. We made decisions in a circle; there was no manager. There were stronger personalities, but most of us stronger personalities also had a good ability to listen to other people, so it worked fairly well. But, when we needed to go and get a loan - we had excellent lenders, very, very supportive - but they wanted us to have a general manager and that set up a chain of reactions. My friend called it "point of contact" because it changed our organic decision-making process. And it allowed devolution of responsibility at the board level: "Somebody's doing that." Whereas before we were all engaged, [we were] all really bought in. [Interview 4, page 10, September 11, 2006]

The quote above describes the development of a negative dynamic due to structural elements that has been previously mentioned. The quote below further explicates the issue of board members taking their role seriously:

There needs to be a set of expectations and it's not ok when you're running a business to say, "well, I'm just a volunteer, so don't push me" because you're holding a space that has to be consulted with and if you abdicate your responsibility then you

leave someone else holding the bag and it's not fair criticism afterwards. So, I think that the work of the board in any organization like that where the board is representing a wide group of people it has to taken seriously whether it's volunteer or not. And in a Society it has to be volunteer work, you cannot be paid for being a board member. So, the clear definition of the expectations of the board we have written, not a problem, but it's the self-monitoring to ensure that people are actually living up to that. And that's really key in my mind. [Interview 4, page 8-9, September 11, 2006]

A further issue that arose around board-staff relationships relates to decision-making and having clear roles:

[I]f staff and management all have different ideas between themselves, that's where the board comes in and the board has to have an idea so that it can mediate these things. If they don't have an idea themselves they are very easily lobbied by the strongest personality and it might not be the outcome that we're all looking for because it's only part of the picture there. So, that whole dynamic of the board being focused on our expectations, for example, "that you will have these financial outcomes and that you will work from this date to this date to have these financial outcomes," that was missing. The ability to manage, which was my role, in that void, it became personal all the time because it would be me deciding on something or me listening to what was decided by others and those people not agreeing. [Interview 4, page 10, September 11, 2006]

Her suggestion for prevention is doing it differently from the beginning by setting up protocols and practicing them, consciously encouraging a dynamic of responsibility, and advocating and framing the idea of community forestry being community-driven, instead of *using organic processes* and trusting the best outcomes will follow. This approach insists on deeper collaboration at the board level and perhaps choosing board members based on specific criteria, for example skill sets, to ensure congruent communication customs. Several approaches were offered to the cooperative board and staff to repair the harm caused by negative organizational dynamics, but until recently, all attempts were rejected for reasons that were unclear to the developer. However, with a new staff group and manager the dynamics are slowly being changed with effort and willingness.

It's a lack of education and awareness of organizational psychology or dynamics and maybe an unwillingness to take a look at it. Not everybody's into therapy. It's all of that. Because over time people have tried to help us with that, offered us appreciative inquiry or that kind of thing, and the time set aside to do it isn't what people want to spend their time on. And so we go through these incredible painful situations. It's a real curiosity. [Interview 4, page 11, September 11, 2006]

By *using organic processes* a non-formal and non-hierarchical structure was created in case B as well. However, there is a difference in that the group was chosen based on their skills rather than democratically, based entirely on popular opinion. It is too soon to judge the effect of the transition into forestry on the core group dynamic. There have already been some members paid versus volunteers without any obvious consequences. It is unclear if the core group structure will change from grassroots, consensus style to hierarchical as dramatically as in case A. Throughout the interviews there was no mention of outside funding designating board practice or structure, only the constraints of their cooperative status. In a recent conversation with a developer, he expressed readiness to “move on” once the initiative has begun. According to him, his part in the project is almost complete. How that will affect the dynamic and where it will go is unforeseeable. Hopefully, with care, the harmony that has been carefully fostered in the core group may survive the forestry initiative’s growing pains:

I don't think we had a conflict in two and a half years. It's been a surprisingly smooth ride. We've had to understand each other's viewpoints and appreciate what each person brings to the group, but from my perspective it hasn't been difficult. I mean we haven't even had a formalized process because of that. In some groups you say, “We need to try to reach consensus and if not, then 60% of the vote, or whatever.” We've never gone there because we've just talked to each other and it all made sense and we just keep going. We've also trusted each other a lot in terms of each of us really representing the group. So, different people have different roles, and sometimes some of these people don't necessarily have to check in with everyone in order to fulfill their role because everyone trusts them and understands that they're actually representing the group in what they're doing. [Interview 1, page 9, November 20, 2006]

The two cases are in different stages of development, a factor which affected the data for **USING DR STRATEGIES** significantly, especially the developers’ reflections on *using organic processes*. In case A, the organic processes were retrospectively viewed as problematic, whereas in case B, the term described a benchmark measurement of success in the group dynamic indicating positive relationships based on trust and mutual understanding. These outcomes were expected due to the contrast of experiences in community forest development, but also the amount of time spent doing community forestry together to date. Additionally, the use of a dispute resolution theoretical tool greatly affected both *Using Organic Processes* and, the following category, *Developing Culture within the core group*. Clearly an organizational plan with a strong component of conflict

management and agreed upon communication strategies can cultivate internal organizational success.

Developing Culture within core group, board group and staff group, describes the creation of the governing group including interpersonal dynamics and structural organizational factors. These two cases utilized different strategies to structure this development process. For this reason a contrast between the categories *Using Organic Processes* and *Developing Culture* is notable. Positive expressions of *Developing Culture* are largely dominated by the experiences of the community forest developers from case B. Although there were examples of *Developing Culture* from case A, they were mostly regretful – community forest developer wishing that there had been more interest in developing a positive group culture - the data reveals that much time and consideration was put into the development of the core group by a key community forest developer interviewed from case B. Due to the high potential for conflict and a personal investment as watershed users, developers in Case B utilized conflict resolution theory, specifically Wilber's Integral Theory and Esbjörn-Hargens' application of Integral theory to ecology, to gain access to all groups and develop a compatible, diverse, core group. The theoretical frameworks posited by Wilber and Esbjörn-Hargens and applied to case B influenced all forest plan decisions and management strategies.

Integral tactics include: curious inquiry, welcoming diversity, transcending and including difference, understanding motivation, and utilizing language to respond to alternate worldviews: "In any situation, Integral Ecology strives to honour all niches of environmental concern, all selves of environmental worldviews, and all modes of environmental inquiry."¹⁵⁴ Again, the integration of multiple interests rather than focusing on one community imperative differentiates this approach from the approach in case A. Without a strategy that encompassed diversity, the chances of failure were high. Although failure was also possible in case A it would more likely come from the government's rejection of the proposed AAC; the diversity in case B demanded garnering support rather than surveying for proof of already existing support.

In case B, the developers were also concerned about domestic water; however, for the initiative to succeed the discourse focused on collectivity - humans and their desired

¹⁵⁴ Esbjörn-Hargens, 22

activities - rather than protection of forests, wildlife and water. Participants in the community meetings voiced their priorities and expected to find their interests reflected in the community forest plan. The developers used Integral strategies to meet widely varying desires for the forest. In order that residents knew their concerns had been heard, understood, and respected, the developers reflected community members' words back to them in the written proposal and integrated diverse understandings of forest management and forest ecology whenever promoting the idea of community forestry. Outreach consisted of listening to opinions and experiences, rather than recruiting support for an already existing plan. Each conversation revealed more about overlapping interests, desires and concerns coming from varying perspectives: "Integral Ecology recognizes that different value systems can support the same behaviour. This is why it is so important to know an individual's motivations based on their exterior behaviours."¹⁵⁵ For example, union members were concerned about ongoing employment in the forestry sector while environmentalists were concerned about over-cutting. Both groups' desires were met by a plan which considered forest ecology and sustained jobs in forestry. Conveying respect for each person's ideas about community forestry was essential to the development of the proposal. Without gaining the trust of community members the proposal would surely have failed.

The diversity of the core group and their varying discourses regarding forest practices, ecology, recreation, economy and other aspects of community forest development significantly helped build trust amongst community groups. The core group is self-reflexive and has a heightened awareness about community differences. Their demonstrated skill at negotiating difference within their group meetings and in community meetings assured members of their collective neutrality and that the various sector interests would be represented in the final plan. A plan to meet diverse expectations was successful, to the surprise of many. This practice of inquiry, listening and respecting alternate world views was derived from Wilber's Integral Theory, but can be found in conflict resolution theory that focuses on inter-cultural communication and sensitivity¹⁵⁶:

¹⁵⁵ Esbjörn-Hargens, 48

¹⁵⁶ For further information about cross-cultural, transformative conflict resolution theory and practice see: Michelle LeBaron, *Bridging Cultural Conflicts: A New Approach for Changing the World*. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2003)

[V]arious worldviews will understand and respond to environmental issues for completely different reasons. It is essential that individual and cultural perspectives be taken into consideration when searching for viable solutions to complex environmental issues. It is not effective to take the value set of one worldview and try to force it upon another worldview...What needs to happen is a process of translation of meaning from one value set to another, so that the terms of one perspective can be assimilated into another perspective¹⁵⁷

Although there were some processes that were less structured, for example decision-making within the core group, the core group composition was controlled. As described earlier in this chapter, each member was asked to join based on their support from a range of constituents, but also because of their ability to listen to and integrate other perspectives. Other criteria include age, affiliation with two or more community groups, an inquisitive nature, and the ability to integrate and hold space for other perspectives. Here's how one community forest developer describes the process of core group recruitment:

We were looking for people who are naturally inquisitive, people who are interested, people who ask questions, people who are not cemented in their own perspectives, people who, although they might see things a certain way, are willing to hear and listen to other perspectives, people who see a change in perspective not necessarily as a negative thing, but as something that could be positive, people who are respected within their own segment of the community, not necessarily as leaders, but just as individuals, people who generally bring a voice of reason to their segment of the population. So, that was our first exercise: to identify these individuals. And this was the most critical step and probably the most important one to remember if someone wants to attempt something similar somewhere else. Then what we did is we looked at the different segments and we approached them individually as opposed to all together. [Interview 1, page 1-2, November 20, 2006]

Early in the process, developers did not seek core group members, but rather put out feelers for who was appropriate. At this stage, they were gathering information about “what each segment of the population was seeing, perceiving, understanding, and hoping for” from the community forest initiative.

We were not necessarily seeking people that would become part of the core group, but somewhere in the back of our mind was the knowledge that the core group would need to represent a broad spectrum of the community. And so we needed to go to these different individuals to see whether our assessment of them was true, and if it was, then whether there was a real potential for them to become part of the core group. I think that the main aim was that at the end of each meeting those we met with would leave feeling that we, who were interested in bringing this project

¹⁵⁷ Esbjörn-Hargens, 50

forward, valued their perspective and the gifts, skills and insights that they could bring to this project. [Interview 1, page 2, November 20, 2006]

Developers from case B talked to affiliates from various community groups to sense each group's interests. The interests were considered throughout the process and were included in the final mandate. Every person that brought forward interests from each group was considered in the final proposal:

I'm always amazed. Sometimes we go to meetings with stakeholders and I listen to someone else saying something and I think, "Holy smokes, I would never say that!" But then I say what I've got to say, and others say what they have to say and because there's that diversity there, you know, the people we are meeting with relax. They go, "Well, these guys are coming from all over the spectrum obviously, and there are some of them that we can relate with in there, so it makes sense for us to have a relationship with them." Everywhere we go someone can relax because there is always one of them, if you wish, represented in our group. [Interview 1, page 9, November 20, 2006]

Developing a culture in the core group in some cases took its toll on personal relationships, for example, persons who wanted to be a part of the core group, but who did not fulfill the criteria in some way. For example, perhaps they were not open enough to new ideas. The priority was to maintain the integrity of the core group culture in the hope that they could be perceived as neutral or having a balance of biases within the community. It was essential to maintain group strength and unity while facing potential intercommunity conflict.

I knew that if this was going to be successful it needed people with certain qualities to come the table, and some people were really interested in being a part of the group and we had to say no. Quite a few, about a handful, again, coming from different backgrounds and value systems, and we had to say, "No it's not going to work, sorry. We value what you have to bring and we're going to make sure we're going to include your perspective, and we're going to make sure we call on you when we need your specific expertise, but we think that at this stage your perspective is too strong to find a medium ground. And your perspective is very valuable and it needs to be included and we want to make sure you stay involved". [Interview 1, page 12, November 20, 2006]

This feeling that a unique and tender core group culture is necessary has prevailed. In one interview a developer explained the need to integrate a new member to the core group in preparation for the proposal approval so that there was an even number. After approval, when the core group becomes the governing body for the cooperative there must be two people from each represented watershed group to total eight. This meant integrating

a new person. Group trust was high, emphasizing mutual respect and a practice of inquiry. The group was nervous about integrating a final member so late in the process without disrupting the positive dynamic created:

Wow, another person is going to come in. Are they going to fit in? Are they going to work? I think we've created a bit of a culture within the organization. I think that the work and challenge will be to introduce new people to this 'culture' – that is, what is going to make the whole thing be an actual success, will make the ongoing success of the organization possible. Introducing them to the culture, to the Integral perspective, is almost introducing them to a level of respect, a level of inquiry, a way of approaching relationship and communication, which comes from a non-divisive kind of way of being and interacting. [Interview 1, page 9, November 20, 2006]

Below is a further description of the qualities that the core group in Case B was looking for:

And that's why at the onset, at the very beginning of this interview, I said who is in the room is very important. Because the qualities I outlined in the beginning, being a naturally inquisitive person, being someone that sees that there's value in understanding other people's perspectives is key. We needed people that are naturally into evolution for this to work. People who want to grow. It's part of their individual makeup. They are interested in transformation. And people who really care about the whole, they really care about the community. Those qualities are not value or perspective dependent. And that's very important. You'll find such people at every stage of consciousness, in each group, in each segment of the population. And if you're able to bring those people together then suddenly you've achieved the most important step, the rest can be a breeze. That's why it's so important. [Interview 1, page 11, November 20, 2006]

This conscientious and systematic way of creating a core group was the most noticeable difference in tactics between the two cases. It is still to be decided how effective this working group will be once logging begins; however, already they have conquered innumerable obstacles to gain approval from the government and support within their diverse community. The predominant theoretical framework, Integral Forestry, and the alternative dispute resolution mechanisms imbedded within the Integral approach clearly influenced outcomes for this community forest initiative.

The sub-categories of **USING DR STRATEGIES**, *Using Organic Processes* and *Developing Culture of board, staff or core group*, are methods that the developers utilized in their work towards **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST** with a range of success. Although similarities link the processes in each case, clearly there are differences resulting from alternate contexts. In some situations even the meaning of 'organic' is conceptualized differently based on contrasting outcomes.

USING DR STRATEGIES developers navigate the final stages of development after months of working with the government, doing research, discovering community interests, and gaining support for their initiative before embarking on logging. Forming a decision-making group happens early in the process, while hiring occurs after proposal approval. Case A developers describe their experience of both parts of development; whereas, case B developers have yet to experience *Hitting the ground*.

Practicing Community Forestry

“And anybody who works in the logging industry knows that planning doesn't happen overnight.” [Interview 3, page 3, January 25, 2006]

The fifth and final category in **BUILDING A COMMUNITY FOREST** is **PRACTICING COMMUNITY FORESTRY**. This category primarily focuses on post-proposal acceptance, although there are administrative, managerial and board tasks that are ongoing before and after. As explained, case A is practicing forestry while case B is still in the planning stage. This final section spotlights experiences from case A.

This category integrates activities from other categories including continual use of dispute resolution strategies, strategic communication with community groups, the media and the government, in addition to working on the details of the initiative, for example, financial sustainability, forest practice approach, and pine beetle strategy. The sub-categories of **PRACTICING COMMUNITY FORESTRY** include *Gain community support* and *Hitting the ground*

Developer and board initiatives to *Gain community Support* involve a variety of educational techniques. Developers from case A consulted with ecosystem-based management specialists who design specific educational opportunities for the community forest cooperative members. The community maps - a global positioning system mapping process applied in conjunction with local knowledge about the area - include information about animal habitats and trails, human recreation areas, creek-side slopes, unused roads, domestic water-boxes, and other sites of interest. A developer describes the community mapping process:

In ecosystem-based planning you start out with maps and the community gets to map the areas that are important to it. They get to tell you what values they want to see protected or where they think that resource extraction can happen, and they [the consulting company] give you a bunch of anecdotal information that they know

from walking around the ground. And that's your first layer of the consultative process... They gave us blank maps with all the attributes, you know, with all the terrain maps. They gave us all the base maps and we went from community group to community group and also invited the whole community into our office. So the maps were out in the community with the horse club, (some people chose not to participate, a couple groups) the water users, the seniors - we got it out to all of the community groups and then individuals were free to come. That was our first map layer and it was called community use map. As much as possible, all the community uses were organized on that map, and also notes taken at meetings about concerns and opportunities. So, then that goes to the consultants and they start doing all the timber typing; there is high elevation forest and there's non-productive brush harvesting and there is steep terrain. They separate terrain 60% slope and less and that's sort of if it doesn't have any other constraints on it, for example if it's sensitive or water. You look at that and that's what's available for timber. So that's the method that they use. [Interview 4, page 2, September 11, 2006]

In addition to the maps, educational forest walks were scheduled to spread awareness about the coop's forestry goals and community forest mandate. Developers solicited a green economist to give community lectures about alternative economic values to gain the confidence of those concerned about financial stability. As one community forest developer explains, it was "education and consultation, education, consultation, continuously." This mapping process was a major piece to ***Gaining community support***.

In case A, the largest problem area currently is the maintenance of this cycle of education and consultation. Now that the project is full-time *on-the-ground*, keeping up with community outreach has been difficult. As explained, the burden of continual outreach places extra pressure on staff.

For case B, ***Gaining Community Support*** is currently ongoing; however, their outreach contrasts with the methods from case A in several ways. As previously discussed, individual caucusing was emphasized as opposed to community meetings, open meetings, and use of the media, there were fewer community meetings when they did happen, less general outreach, rather more specific and controlled outreach, no community mapping or focus on one forestry approach, rather Integral theory's emphasis on many voices with many interests. As explained, much of this difference lies in the differing demographics of the areas.

As mentioned, during the transition period, case B developers mediated discussions between the District Manager, the company and various community members. This process was significant to the development of the community forest. Through the experience,

developers gained support from local residents, the District Manager, and industry representatives. Additionally, circumstances of conflict became an opportunity for community education in communication, developing community trust, preparing residents for future conflict resolution practice, and familiarizing residents with an alternate process of negotiation. This was unplanned, but an effective mode of outreach that fostered the support of diverse interest groups.

Hitting the Ground - an *in vivo* code describing the practice of community forestry after a license has been granted - describes the sudden independence, responsibility and stress caused by practicing community forestry for the first time. Developers described the learning process as very difficult, personally and professionally. This phrase ***hitting the ground*** elucidates the experience – implying a hard impact and residual bruising. ***Hitting the ground*** involves establishing community forest objectives for a five-year or twenty-five year period and deciding on a detailed forestry approach including road planning, where to log first and how much timber to harvest in order to meet budgetary requirements, consideration of habitat and water, and a pine beetle strategy.

Some of the issues from case A include harmonizing financial stability with a low AAC, balancing organizational health with the focus on forestry operations on-the-ground, dealing with financial uncertainty, working and learning in a new field under immense pressure to succeed, strategizing and framing the pine beetle issue for the public and the membership, and keeping the public informed and supportive of the initiative.

The “reality check” of practicing community forestry from an ecosystems-based perspective has been largely financial - the community forest cooperative has barely scraped by from year to year. Running a minimal-extraction forestry operation requires intensive strategic planning with little margin for error. Recurring obstacles including preventative weather, failure to find a machine to work a specific job for a small amount of timber extraction, and government pressure to deal with pine beetle in an area where road building had not been planned and timber harvest would not be profitable; all this, in addition to, not having enough paid hours to complete tasks, contributed to the challenges of ***Hitting the Ground***.

As well as intra-organizational pressures, the idiosyncrasies of practicing community forestry in a small area with few residents often led to inaccurate information about forestry plans being disseminated throughout the membership and causing undue stress with

residents and staff. According to one developer, the lack of connection with and structure within the membership enabling them to be self-informed added significantly to professional stress:

There have been some really, what I call irrational conversations. [For example], we're logging in an area and you have to decommission your skid trails, put the drainage patterns back so that water flows normally when you're moving out of an area. So, we have the machine there because it's been logging, it's the right machine, small buckets, small impact, small footprint, and it's decommissioning the skid trail. Somebody comes along; they want firewood from the area. They're P.O.ed and they're saying, "Couldn't you bring him back and do it a month later and give the community an opportunity to get firewood?" Well, the expense of that! It's several thousand dollars to trailer in a big machine like that, if they'll even come, because they [may be] on a job that's paying them real money. And you'd be doing it in the rain, which is just terrible for the environment. So, we had the perfect machine, the perfect time, the perfect weather and somebody's ticked off about that right? And what will they go out and say, "There's no benefit from this community forest." How do you handle that? It's not rational. And what measures could we have gotten the machine to go in. But there's a cost, so somebody's coming to get free firewood, so, it's going to cost the community forest money - same person drilling us because we have a debt. That where with privilege comes responsibility. It's a very, very hard concept to bridge. [Interview 4, page 13, September 11, 2006]

Later in the interview, the developer talked about their desire for more community education, membership taking more initiative to self-educate and structured outreach to include the membership in decision-making.

Pressure from the community to ensure the success of the community forest was significant especially in the initial years of forestry practice. In addition to frustration about misinformation, constant scrutiny and critique by community members – a kind of watch-dog involvement - was taxing:

We had to stretch find resources where there are none, in ourselves and in the world. Right? And also the level of expectation placed on us or that we placed on ourselves. And in order to seek protection when you're doing something outside the box that maybe some people don't want to see done, or they have concerns or that they don't think is going to work or they have baggage. You're in a fish bowl because you go for protection from the people around you, who appreciate what you're doing and contribute to it monetarily or contribute to it with energy and expertise, but then you're in a fish bowl and then you're trying to stretch beyond your own level or expertise. You have the capacity to learn it because you know the subject matter, but it's going to be a learning process and everybody's watching. Right? So it's been very stressful for all staff and management and to some extent board. [Interview 4, page 8, September 11, 2006]

Hitting the Ground running - salient in the first year of forestry - involves quick assessment and expedient decision-making. The quick decision making, learning curve and need for individuals to take initiative involved in *hitting the ground* formed the basis for potentially negative community dynamics, especially for an organization that preferred an egalitarian collectivity, not hierarchy.

Stretching resources was the most frequently mentioned cause for stress. In case A, developers solicited outside funding to cover set-up costs and supplement the minimal income from timber harvest, value-added timber products, and non-timber, value-added products, for example wild-crafted goods, produced within the cooperative. Even with additional funding, staying on budget remained a constant source of stress. The financial responsibility for the interests of the cooperative, the board and the community without enough support at every level became too much pressure for one developer to handle, and led to her eventual resignation:

That's a very interesting piece, the whole business plan and that whole set of criteria that the outside world has. If you're going to borrow money you need a business plan. To do a business plan you need to do your best guess at forecasting what's going to take place. In forestry it's just like farming only it is bigger plants. You're not in control. And you can't dictate. There's all kinds of issues with being ecosystem-based and small in that you don't command the attention of logging contractors if they've got better places to go so you may not be able to get a contractor in the year that you need it and then you've got all your overhead of staff sitting there who've been planning the thing and you can't financially recoup for them. It was huge; between weather, contractors, our own internal issues, and that sort of thing. [Interview 4, page 9, September 11, 2006]

Part of the reason for this added pressure in ecosystem-based community forestry is the limited extraction of timber in contrast to the costs of road-building and running a forestry operation. In most cases, the cooperative focused on paying wages and breaking-even, which according to an alternative economic model is considered profit, i.e. employment for local workers, fresh drinking water, value-added products, local milling opportunities, protected wilderness recreation areas etc. However, the stress of staying on top of the budget took its toll especially throughout the first years.

Financial instability has been a concern for developers in case B as well. Reflecting on the proposal ten years previous, a developer described his discovery of and subsequent concern about the financial challenges of an ecology-focused plan, which had been a desirable course to him then. After financial forecasting, he expressed doubts about how

such a project could be feasible. Case B will strive to maintain standards and log within the mandated values, whilst meeting the financial expectation of the community. He expressed some doubt about whether this balance could be found, but a willingness to try.

Interestingly, it has been found, if precariously in case A. Community forest A is constantly under pressure financially; they make very little, if any, profit other than the through the employment of people locally.

PRACTICING COMMUNITY FORESTRY is divided into two parts: *Gaining Community Support* and *Hitting the ground*. Pressure on developers is heightened as new activities are added to the process of *Gaining Community Support*. These new factors add a great amount of additional work to the already over-burdened community forest developer. *Hitting the ground* describes the dimension of new factors suddenly emerging when the community forest become operational.

Developers **PRACTICING COMMUNITY FORESTRY** experience the stress of making quick decisions with limited knowledge or expertise, dealing with logistical problems and keeping the interest and support of their membership. Case A community forest developers are currently logging, whereas case B has yet to experience this aspect of **PRACTICING COMMUNITY FORESTRY**.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

This thesis describes two rural communities in BC who developed community forests, thereby gaining control over logging in their neighbourhoods. Their process for development and the method by which they resolved conflicts played an important role in their success. The focus of this research has been to explore community forest developer experiences of conflict throughout the development process and their methods of gaining resolution for a successful community forest initiative using the constant comparison method. To better understand how developers perceive and approach conflict and resolution, I asked the question: How did conflict resolution aid in the development of community forests? The conclusions outlined in this chapter are derived from concrete data distilled from the interviews through constant comparison, then amalgamated with relevant theoretical frameworks from the fields of conflict resolution. The emergent categories indicate that the process described in chapter three – **DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FOREST** – is heavily influenced by the conflict resolution approach or lack of approach as illustrated by the varying success in case A and B in areas of gaining community support, communication with diverse interest groups including the government and corporate interests, and inter-organizational health. Significantly, the success of community forest development is proportionate to the emphasis placed on conflict resolution processes within each case.

The above conclusion is supported by both the data and the literature in several ways. Although case A could be viewed as a successful case without the benefit of a conflict resolution approach, a closer look reveals the difficulties that arose and may have been avoided if conflict management was built into the development plan. In comparison, both with their initial failed attempt and with case A, case B successful use of Integral theory as a method to approach and manage conflicted situations is evident both in the data and in comparison with the conflict resolution literature. Looking at these two cases through constant comparison it becomes clear that conflict resolution could increase the success of a community forest initiative.

In this chapter I highlight conflict resolution techniques for community forest developers, suggest changes to BC's Community Forest Act and explore the complexity of First Nations involvement in these two community forests.

Building conflict resolution into community forest development

As the emerging categories explicate, a primary consideration for any community forest development is a conflict resolution plan. To ensure the success of community forestry, the plan must be built into each stage of development, not only into the post-approval phase when a formalized structure is in place, but before board or core group development¹⁵⁸. The reason for starting this plan so early in community forest development is evident in case B. Case B's deliberate construction of the core group is one example of how conflict management played a role in the smooth organizational development process for this group. In contrast case A did not approach their organizational development with a conflict management plan; the first benchmark conflict event is described under *coming toward conflict* in chapter three. The "grassroots splitting" described by the community forest developer from case A significantly affected the ongoing health of the organization after it became an incorporated cooperative. As explained, the change from collective decision-making to a hierarchical structure was a shock to the board members and incited conflicts that were never entirely resolved. In comparison with case B, the conflict conscious set up of the board and use of Integral theory throughout the process to pattern communication and conduct outreach about community forestry facilitated a smooth beginning and ongoing positive relationships. The conclusion that a conflict resolution plan must be built into every stage of development stems from the evidence in the data of success when this occurred in case B linked with recommendations from conflict resolution literature for a thorough contextual analysis before interference in a conflict situation. With each stage of development different conflicts arise; the result is ongoing contextual analysis and response.

To begin, a developer must perform a close contextual analysis for each development initiative. The following contextual factors must be considered: geography, public land use issues past and present, land based interests of each community group and their alliances, history of logging in the area, relationship with government agents and representatives including politicians and the MOF District Manager, and financial viability.

¹⁵⁸ Gunter, 30

As this thesis has shown, the context of each community forest dramatically affects the conflict resolution approach, application and outcomes.

As indicated by Pirie¹⁵⁹, Isaacs¹⁶⁰, Winslade and Monk¹⁶¹, and Gunter¹⁶², developing agreements early in the development process, even within a loose organizational structure, is integral for the success of conflict prevention, especially if each person is representing the community forest. These agreements about approach toward conflict and its prevention can take many forms ranging from a problem solving approach to a transformative approach. Whatever the theoretical framework, having a conflict management plan promotes smooth communication, manages expectations and designates roles. The discussion may include a general approach to conflict resolution or address specific communication or development strategies that will be utilized by all members. For example, diverse pairings for meetings and presentations evidenced in case B built confidence in various social partners, thereby acting as a conflict prevention strategy.

Further, coordination of conflict resolution theory and practice throughout the development process among team members is a necessary part of an initiative. The development team includes board members or core group of developers, incoming staff, and general membership. Each person, especially developers, but also board members or core group members, representing the community forest initiative must understand the theory and methods behind the development process and, more importantly, have skills to deescalate conflict. If not, the success of the initiative is at stake every time a conflict arises. Having a conflict resolution procedure is important for both general and specifically-involved individuals as it greatly affect the success of meetings where contentious issues such as road building, AAC, and other details related to forest management are to be discussed.

Forestry-oriented conflicts tend to be protracted and intractable conflicts. To establish and maintain tractability and resolve conflicts expediently a theoretical conflict resolution approach must be a central element in all community forest development documents accompanied by the skills to apply it. This can be evidenced in the approaches used in each case to establish the community forests. In case A the development team did

¹⁵⁹ Pirie, 41-43

¹⁶⁰ Isaacs, 80-183, 291-299

¹⁶¹ John Winslade and Gerald Monk, 57

¹⁶² Gunter, 30

not anticipate inter-organizational conflict; as conflicts surfaced they were unable to address the conflicts adequately. The conflicts festered, causing dysfunction between the board and staff. In case B, the expectation for future conflict was the impetus for developing conflict management strategies. The group assembled with the intention to alleviate conflict over forestry; they promoted the community forest using a theory that emphasized conflict management and communication. One of the necessary skills for conflict resolution in community forestry is the developers' ability to collaborate with the other members of the team regardless of differences of opinion. Case B is an example where differences of opinion about forestry are a potential site for conflict; instead this diversity became an advantage.

The role of neutrality within community forest development

A coordinated approach to forestry conflict must involve collaboration between people from multiple perspectives on the development team, thereby ensuring balanced representation to the public. Illustrated by case B in *theorizing core group development* and *using DR strategies*, neutrality can be achieved in this way by broad representation of the community forest leadership. When members of different stakeholder groups see their perspective represented by someone they consider an insider to the community forest area, who uses their linguistic cues, perhaps looks like them, lives where they live, has maybe even worked in their field or a similar field, and shares similar experiences they are more likely to be confident in the process and the organizing group's ability to represent them.

Lack of neutrality *can* become problematic when insiders mediate conflict¹⁶³; therefore, in the field of community forestry the impact of a diverse, collaborating core group on building trust with stakeholders is significant. In community forestry, where there may be multiple stakeholders with varied perspectives who need assurance that their interests are being heard and will be met, authenticity may be difficult to convey through one person or a group of people from within the same interest group.

Diversity amongst conflict resolution practitioners will aid in the development of a community forest so long as collaboration is possible, i.e. various needs are being met

¹⁶³ Burton, 186 and

Robert Folger, Blair H. Sheppard, and Robert T. Buttram. Equity, Equality, and Need. In *Conflict, Cooperation and Justice* edited by Barbara Benedict Bunker, Jeffrey Z. Rubin and Associates. 59-92 (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995): 272 - 287

through the same goal. Case B is a perfect example of the importance of this principle. As mentioned in chapter three, the first community forest development attempt in area B failed despite best efforts, in part due to the narrowness of the development team. In the early attempt, developers had a strong environmentalist bias and designed the forestry plan with the primary objectives to protect water and wildlife, along the same lines as case A's development plan. The developers failed to build alliances from all of the socio-cultural contingents in the community forest area. For example, people whose priority was recreation, people employed by logging and the mill, and people worried about the financial viability of the project were alienated due to lack of neutral ground. The demographic was not reflected in the plan.

One aspect of developing a conflict resolution approach involves deliberating about neutrality. The question to ask is: can an insider to the community forest area gain the trust of diverse community groupings or would someone from outside the community forest area be more successful? Perhaps a combination is the best idea. Below I explore the considerations of both options.

A developer who is an insider to the proposed area has the potential to either benefit or detract from the process, as can be seen through these two cases of development. On the one hand, financial insecurity and the need for volunteer effort during early development may require an insider to initiate the development process; on the other hand, neutrality is impossible if the developer has a personal interest or specific vision, as explicated in case B's first attempt to establish an ecosystem-based managed community forest and case A's managerial issues. As shown, residents are attempting to gain control over logging in their area and want to be a part of the decision-making.

Developers from outside may more easily break social barriers and create alliances without being blocked by personal issues, relationships or stereotyping. Additionally, their skill set is hopefully specific to development, i.e. land management planning, conflict resolution, negotiation and facilitation. One developer interviewed for this research intends to apply his theory of conflict resolution – Integral - to other community forest initiatives in the future; they will gain much from his experience with other successful development initiatives. However, this set-up is uncommon. Most often personal investment in the success of the community forest inspires developers to donate unpaid work – a necessity in the early stages.

As explicated in Susskind's description of the activist mediator,¹⁶⁴ specific expertise or knowledge of the issues and players involved can enhance durability and fairness of an agreement. In community forestry, insider status is beneficial in ways other than financial: knowledge of the social sectors needing representation and support, information about the geography, local activities and needs of the area, and established relationships and reputation within the proposed area. In case B, the criteria used to select the core group members was established to attract a specific skill set and, some might say, personality, to the core development group while catching an array of values. In so doing, they ensured that the group could garner support and respect from a variety of networks, in addition to having a broad base of informants about community interests.

As explained, the lack of neutrality of individual group members was offset by the diversity of opinions and perspectives represented within the group, thereby giving confidence to the public being asked to support the initiative. In addition to collaborating across diversity, developers with differing views about community forest development must be able to work through difference and set aside smaller disputes in the name of the wider compromise.

In other circumstances, lack of neutrality amongst the key community forest developers can be to the detriment of the initiative, especially if community forest organizational structures are altered in a way that takes away from the overall balance of representative voices in the process, as seen in case A. In this case the shift from consensus to hierarchical decision-making reallocated power from the group to one person. Previously, representation for the community forest was generalized; more people were accountable to the initiative and each other. The developer's insider perspective backfired following reorganization. Over time the manager became a target for conflict within the cooperative rather than one of a group of developers responsible for the successes or failures of the initiative and disgruntlement from the membership.

As explained by *being tired*, the organizational fallout after the cooperative was established can be firmly linked to the transition from lateral to hierarchical decision-making. When the division of labour changed within the organization – the core group moved from consensus, broad-based, decision-making to a hierarchical, management-dominated structure

¹⁶⁴ Forester, 330-331

– insider status became individualized with the manager. He no longer represented the community as a whole, but was driven by the community forest mandate – protection of domestic water and wildlife – and responsibility for the business side of the cooperative. The priority was protection of water, not, for example to make firewood available to community members at the cost of the organization. Placating dissatisfied members became his problem, rather than a shared task. Additionally, his responsibility for the cooperative was heightened. He was seen as an authority. Shared responsibility wavered and eventually crumbled.

This obvious lack of developer neutrality, where power and information is held by one person, led to distrust and resentment. Lack of confidence from the membership in the manager's neutrality in the face of conflict was perpetuated by a hierarchical decision-making structure. The manager became a target for public complaint and was ultimately unable to mediate internal conflict on behalf of the community forest with success.

Adding to the manager's isolation, when the burden of responsibility was redistributed unevenly the core group's capacity to be responsible for communications, education and outreach, forest practices, and decision-making, was diminished and the community forest functioned less effectively and enthusiastically. When the details of the community forest were managed by one person instead of dispersed amongst the group, an understanding of their ecosystem-based management practices became focused at the top. Conflicts were managed unsuccessfully by one individual, in part due to lack of neutrality.

In addition to the manager's inability to mediate internal conflict, the board group was resistant to criticism and help from someone outside of the community forest area. The situation continued until staff, alongside the manager, demanded that something shift. This shift eventually came about through a change in leadership and outside assistance through consultations with an organizational management expert. The role of contested neutrality in case A was intertwined with the emergence of hierarchical structure and power.

Neutrality affects not only internal organizational power relations and therefore the ability to negotiate agreement, but is also linked to external power relations in the form of approval from the District Manager. Developer neutrality is pertinent to building a positive relationship with the District Manager for the proposed area. This is especially true where the circumstances have been historically conflicted. In case A, neutrality exhibited by the core group directly affected membership confidence in the initiative; evidence of community

confidence determined the government's approval. A show of community confidence and advocacy for the project was significant to gaining support from the District Manager of the MOF and a lower than average AAC. Developers from both cases proved their ability to alleviate conflict by facilitating contentious meetings diplomatically, gaining agreement on forestry principles within diverse and previously conflicted communities, working with activists and logging companies to negotiate agreement and mediating conversations between the District Manager, activists and logging company representatives.

A specific skill set is required to facilitate smooth communication between government, activists, logging company representatives, amongst membership and within the organization. Descriptions of the skills required for these situations – including establishing neutrality and developing a rapport, facilitating group discussions, reframing, neutralizing language, developing innovative solutions - can be found in many contributions to mediation and conflict resolution literature, but especially in Chicanot and Sloan¹⁶⁵, and Pirie¹⁶⁶. Wilber also explicates a skill set in his Integral theory which can be found to parallel much of the transformative conflict resolution literature, for example Diamond¹⁶⁷, LeBaron¹⁶⁸, and Bush and Folger¹⁶⁹. Discovery and the methodological use of these skills and processes are not new to the field.

With evidence of skilful and successful management of a decades-old conflicted situation the District Manager supported a second attempt at a community forest initiative in case B. The developers' success can be partially attributed to their ability to demonstrate both neutrality and local representation to gain the support and confidence of their community members. However, having the specific skill set to facilitate positive communication and agreement between logging companies, the District Manager with MOF and activists, and other conflicted groups was essential to this success. Success is more likely if everyone engaged in the negotiation has an opportunity to be trained. Conflict resolution

¹⁶⁵ Chicanot

¹⁶⁶ Pirie, 92-211

¹⁶⁷ Louise Diamond. *Beyond Win/Win: The Heroic Journey of Conflict Transformation*. (Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, 1996)

¹⁶⁸ Michelle LeBaron. *Bridging Troubled Waters: Conflict Resolution from the Heart*. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2002)

¹⁶⁹ Robert A. Bush and Joseph Folger. Changing People, Not Just Situations: A Transformative View of Conflict and Mediation. In *The Promise of Mediation*. Edited by Jeffrey Z. Rubin. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994): 81-95.

training can greatly enhance the process and is one way to level the playing field between various involved parties.¹⁷⁰

Local credentials and insider status are impossible to gain as an outsider; based on this study of community forestry the benefits of insider status outweigh the negatives. In light of this, intensive training for potential community forest developers, specifically in the areas of conflict resolution, financial forecasting, and forest management – areas highlighted by interviewees throughout this research – would greatly aid the success of community forest development and other land-based development initiatives. The establishment of a training and advisory body independent of the MOF would ensure prioritization for assisting community forest developers rather than advancing the government’s agenda for forestry in the Province. As evidenced by case B’s experience with the District Manager for their area, support by the government to enable community management of their resources builds trust in industry-oriented communities; thereby making future resource-oriented negotiations less conflicted.

Problematizing transition to community forestry

As explained earlier in this thesis, community forest developers interviewed in this study have been tactical in their development of positive relationships with the MOF. For example, case A developers utilized the media to educate the public and place pressure on the government, they appealed to their allies in government to advocate for their perspective, and they recruited experts in the field of ecosystem based forestry to back up their claims. Then they persevered to build a working relationship with the District Manager in charge of their tenure. With this in mind, the maintenance of positive relationships with the MOF in both cases was made difficult by the transition period described in chapter three. In anticipation of this transition, I suggest the MOF develop a procedure for transitioning from private tenure to community forest tenure in the interest of supporting the community forest initiative.

In the interest of protecting the proposed area from being logged before a community forest framework is established, community forest developers must have a community plan that involves negotiations with government and private corporate representatives to manage conflict during the transition period as best they can with a limited

¹⁷⁰ Forester, 327, 332

amount of agency in the situation. Case B struggled with this particularly as area B was slated for logging previous to the community forest agreement being approved; in contrast, logging in area A was not imminent. As in case B, during the approval stage of development, logging companies may continue to harvest tenure blocks slated to become the community forest to the surprise of community members.

As indicated by the findings in chapter three, developers who manage community expectations and ensure a clear designation of roles in the process, both theirs and local membership, may avoid this kind of conflict, and maintain their neutrality, during the transition period. By keeping the membership informed they may be privy to information about other tactics being used to prevent corporate logging from happening, including direct action, letter writing, and lobbying, which may help them to understand the context of conflict more fully. Developers must make a concerted effort to remain neutral during this period.

As described, several tactics to manage community expectations include public meetings for information sharing in an open-forum, pre-caucusing with individual interest groups previous to public meetings where opposed groups may be attending, and finally, facilitating meetings between concerned community members, government agents and corporate interests. Of primary importance is communication with each interest group. Developers can do this both through blanket announcements and privately caucusing with significant influential members of the community forest agreement area to let them know how the tenure transfer may roll out, indicate the role of a community forest developer in the tenure transfer process, and give them some options for action in which the community forest can be involved, for example meeting with government and logging company representatives to voice concerns and negotiate terms. The facilitation skills that developers bring to this process and their ability to get the District Manager onside with the negotiations are integral to the success of the tenure transfer.

The ability and will of the MOF District Manager to negotiate with corporate interests and even advocate on behalf of the community forest will have a great impact on the outcomes during the transition period. This leads to further discussion of the role of the Provincial government in the success of community forest development.

Role of the Provincial Government in community forest development in BC

In this thesis, I have explored some of the ways in which the Province of BC has control over the process of community forest development. Based primarily on the findings described by the core categories *being aware of the box* and *coming toward conflict*, although *using dispute resolution strategies* is also implicated in accounts of avoidance as a tactic for conflict resolution, in this section I critique the MOF's approach to community forestry and offer suggestions for change, specifically addressing the 'tenure transfer' or transition period, the AAC, and the acceptance of alternate economic models.

As shown in this thesis by the testimony of the developers interviewed, a large part of the responsibility for developing a community forest lies with the MOF's Chief Forester and District Managers. These MOF representatives can aid in conflict prevention by advocating for community forest agreements that are in the second stage of approval - meaning they have been invited to submit a formal proposal, are working in their communities and have been in communication with the MOF about their community forest plan.

Advocacy by the MOF is especially necessary during the tenure transition period when logging tenures overlap. The MOF's material support for community forest development during the transition process, for example by setting moratoriums on cutting in specific tenure blocks for the period before official approval, can protect the future income and financial success of a community forest, prevent inter-community conflict and alleviate conflicts between the MOF and community members. Corporate logging interests may be inspired to alter their tactics and place more emphasis on community outreach before logging in domestic watershed knowing that moratoriums could be imposed by the MOF as a possible solution to the tenure transfer problem. MOF District Managers who protect the proposed community forest area from being logged before the agreement has been officially approved would be supporting the success of community forests and would gain the confidence of local community members doing much to strengthen ongoing relationships. With the example of case B, the fragility of agreement in that community depended on the willingness of the District Manager to negotiate with community members and get involved with the private company logging in the proposed community forest area. Without his involvement and support the viability of the community forest was at risk. Additionally by involving the community forest developers in the negotiations, the District Manager engaged

trusted community members with conflict resolution skills increasing the chances for success.

The MOF's interest in maintaining positive relationships and open communication with community forest developers must also be backed by policy adjustments to the Forest Act as opposed to the current practice of answering to the Minister or person authorized by the Minister for their friendly application of the rules. Although flexibility about forest practices enables District Managers to use their own discretion, this can act against the interests of the community forest development. Education, training and enforcement of conflict resolution and management, behavioural and communication protocols may be necessary in order that District Managers with specific forest management orientations cannot dominate the field. Several of the developers interviewed expressed frustration about their experience negotiating with their District Manager due to the multiple levels of bureaucratic agreement he was required to navigate before he could respond to their request. Outcomes for the community forest can be adversely or positively affected by the attitude of the District Manager at the time and the way in which he conveys information to his superiors. Although supportive District Managers answer to their superiors, a District Manager promoting conventional forest practices with a focus on forest profitability based on main stream economic concepts will be less likely to consult up if they disagree with the principles of alternate forest management theories. Several developers from this study described their tactics of avoidance to push through their ideas without having to consult with the authority on every aspect of the plan as described in the category *being aware of the box*. The strategy of avoidance resulted from the attitude of the District Manager and the developers' need to *work outside the box* to gain community agreement for the plan. Open discussion resulted in deadlock conversations with the District Manager where differences could not be averted, whereas avoidance and more general conversation about touchy topics such as the proposed AAC allowed the development initiative to move forward to the next stage without confrontation. Developers observed this cultural practice within the MOF generally and learned it as one method to navigate the system.

In addition a non-partisan, experienced conflict resolution practitioner with knowledge of community forest development would be a worthy addition to the current BC Community Forest Association to advise community forest developers on their conflict management plans, conflict scenarios, communication strategies and other related issues. As

the data reveals, community forest developers are generally local community members and volunteers who are passionate about protecting their domestic water, local jobs, ending forestry feuds in their neighbourhoods, and more generally, gaining control over forestry in their area. They may or may not have skills relating to forestry or conflict resolution and they need them. Funding for such a position could appropriately be supplied by the government.

For successful relationships between District Managers and community forest developers proposing an alternate, more ecologically oriented forest plan, cutting limits must be revisited. In addition to the MOF addressing problems in the transition period through use of the Forest Act, for example by authorizing moratoriums and setting protocols for communication, policy that explicitly lays out adjustment options to the AAC for community forests larger than the area-based hectare limit¹⁷¹ or who want a lower AAC, as seen in case A, is desirable. If larger areas were dedicated to community forestry, local forestry communities would have more control over their levels of timber harvest and widen the possibility for an agreed upon forestry plan. This was proposed in case B, but was later shut down and the area reduced¹⁷². As explained, due to logging during the transition period, much of the community forest area was logged before the tenure transfer took place instigating further inter-community conflict.

¹⁷¹ **Annual allowable cut (AAC)**—the volume or area that may be harvested annually under existing regulations; the term “allowable annual cut” is used in British Columbia.

Volume-based tenure—a license agreement based on a specified volume of wood to be harvested.

Taken from the National Forest Database Program at:
http://nfdp.ccfm.org/compendium/harvest/terminology_e.php
 (accessed on: July 17, 2007)

For an area-based tenure, the cut is determined for that area by the best current information regarding inventory and productivity at that time. AAC is adjusted periodically, separately from the Timber Supply Area (TSA) and Licensees are responsible for keeping up the inventory.

A volume-based tenure is a share of the TSA’s AAC. The areas assigned to licensees known as chart areas are intended to be long-term areas to provide certainty and facilitate development planning. These areas are assigned with the intent of providing the appropriate area on which the licensee can maintain their share of the TSA’s cut. Periodically these areas get adjusted to take better inventory and productivity information into account and to more equitably distribute the TSA’s timber profile among the TSA’s licensees.

The proposed Probationary Community Forest Agreement (PCFA) area must be suitable to meet the management objectives proposed by the applicant and must represent an area no greater than that which will produce an AAC of up to 20,000 cubic M.

Taken from: www.district.sechelt.bc.ca/pdfdocuments/cfi/areavolumebasedtenure.pdf (accessed: July 17, 2008)

¹⁷² Davis, 19

As described by developers in case A, successful cases of community-directed AAC through ecosystem-based management can be found in BC. For case A, practicing forestry was not an initial goal and continues to be a side benefit to the maintenance and protection of their forest. Multiple attempts at including the area in other preservation projects were unsuccessful; the establishment of a community forest was a successful attempt to gain control over resource extraction. This indicates that some communities desire a low AAC and have been able to achieve it¹⁷³, however lobbying was a primary factor in the setting of the AAC in this case as described in *working outside the box*. This category described the public pressure applied using the media, educating the public, and utilizing the power of their political allies to pursue a community forest plan that was *outside the box* defined by the MOF.

Publicly pressuring the government for an ecological plan is not advisable for all community forest contexts as can be seen in case B where presenting a united community opinion would have been counter productive and probably backfired; however that does not mean that a broad range of options should be unavailable to those communities. Various tactics would be inappropriate for specific conflicted contexts, but the same outcomes may occur with a different approach. For example, a low AAC and accommodating management plan could be agreed upon within the conflicted community in case B with the right kind of communication, outreach, education, and discovery; however, labelling their initiative an ecosystems-based plan would impede diverse involvement and therefore the success of the initiative. Contextually appropriate methods, as outlined by the developers in the findings of this thesis and explicated in an exploration of conflict resolution theory, allow for higher success in community agreement. The problem lies with navigating and negotiating with the MOF to get a lower desired AAC.

Current restrictions mandate that specific amounts of timber be extracted per year if the area is over a set amount of hectares. For example, case B initially proposed an area larger than the regulated size of tenure for a community forest agreement. With this size tenure they hoped to have an area-based AAC set. This was untenable under the current limitations for area-based tenure for a community forest. Instead a volume-based tenure would be used for the extra land being added on. The extraction numbers for a volume-

¹⁷³ Hutton, 25

based tenure are based on conventional forestry practices and are well above the accepted AAC in case A's ecosystem-based management plan, and unacceptable even to the plan proposed in case B. Making a change to allow community forestry to truly be community-driven rather than driven by conventional, provincial logging standards is necessary.

The government's support of community-initiated constraints on logging must be encouraged. Applying corporate industrial logging standards to community forests presuming that they share the same interests undermines potential community forest development successes. The current template for community forestry currently prevents ecosystem-based management from being utilized widely as a management approach without lobbying for recognition. As mentioned, case A negotiated an agreement before the template for community forest initiatives was established. Due to the precedent that they had for their agreement with the government they were able to gain a long term 25-year agreement. Under the established template it is unlikely for other community forest initiatives across the Province who have an interest in establishing an ecosystems-based approach or a similar low level cutting plan to follow case A's example to do so. Templates for community forestry designated by the government must consider the desires of the community managing the initiative and allow for flexibility in approaches. In all cases policy must err on the side of environmental caution rather than pressuring a conventional approach to forestry with emphasis on clear-cutting and meeting minimum AAC requirements. As long as the community forest is able to meet their financial and employment goals government support of diverse, including ecology focused, community forest approaches is desired.

Alternate concepts of finance and profit could also be integrated into the community forest template making it more inclusive. For example in case A, a broader view of profit viewed through the lens of ecological and community value, in addition to the small economic outputs is accepted. Local employment through the production of value-added products including locally-milled value added wood, locally-made furniture, wild-crafted forest herbs, tinctures, salves and other health products, are considered profits within the community because the money, skills and jobs remain in the extraction area. Ecological values that are considered benefits to community forestry are clean water, wilderness protection, and outdoor recreation sites for tourist and local enjoyment. Based on findings from this research, I recommend that the government consider these ecological benefits in

any financial assessment of community forestry and based on these calculations of profit consider ecosystems-based management type plans, or plans that similarly err on the side of lower AAC's and cautionary extraction, as viable for community forest development if it is indicated as desirable by the membership.

Working with First Nations throughout community forest development

Throughout this thesis I have delved into some aspects of agreement versus non-agreement and described the levels of support that occurred in each case from various community segments. Lack of agreement could have posed a problem for these two community forest initiatives if they were not negotiated previous to large member meetings by caucusing, primarily with First Nations, environmental and conservation groups. Although data emerged revealing the complexity of doing community forestry development with the approval of these two sectors of the population, there was very little data about First Nations involvement. The findings section, above, reflects this reality. I choose to look at this absence as significant. This section explores the complex relationship with First Nations and the agreements that must be navigated for a successful community forest development.

As shown through these case studies, defining and negotiating levels of non-support, non-participation and non-interference with First Nations aided in the success of the community forest initiatives. When consulted, First Nations chose not to be involved in either case beyond consultation for the initiative. The lack of ongoing relationship and input is, in part, due to the fact that neither of the proposed tenures for the community forests are located on a reserve or within 150 kilometres of established reserves.

The community forests are located in the heritage territory of several bands; one band is considered an "extinct people" by the government and is therefore not recognized officially, but has a strong local presence. This band does not have a reserve established in Canada. Regardless of their "extinct" status with the Canadian government, the People have a strong influence on local politics and are one of two influential bands represented in the area. The other hails from a reserve located over 200 kilometres away; they also claim the community forest proposed tenure as their traditional territory.

The Federally-recognized First Nation bands approved the proposed plan in case B. The extinct status people voiced their opposition to any logging happening in their territory or domestic watersheds. They did not participate in the development of the initiative;

however, they did not actively oppose the initiative. They did voice disapproval, but did not block it through protest or direct action instead calling themselves witnesses or watch dogs. If recognized by the Canadian government this group could hypothetically block the proposal by asserting their right to be consulted and to consent to all uses or dispositions of Crown land within their territory.

Although the community forest has no obligation under the Forest Practices Code to consult with the extinct band, to avoid conflict and maintain a respectful relationship, the developers consulted. Both in support of this First Nations' group and to preclude the potentially divisive issue, the developers acknowledged the People as a First Nation with rights to their traditional territory in the forest management plan that was submitted to the Province. Regardless, lack of government recognition for this band's right to consultation set up a power imbalance between the band and the community forest initiative.

From this thorny situation emerges the complex issue of power between the government and First Nations, between different First Nations bands and between community forest initiatives and First Nations. This band's situation is unusual in that they are struggling with oppression on many levels, including levels that most other First Nations do not face, and it is unclear if their lack of involvement in the development of the community forest is voluntary. It is probable that prejudices within the larger community against First Nations and fear about the current BC Treaty process could prevent attempts by the group to block the community forest based on their unrecognized claim to the land. Without government recognition for their claim to the land it is unlikely that they would be met with support within the immediate community in any attempts to block the community forest.

Abiding by the will of the public and First Nations - recognized or not – the priority for the developers in both cases is to sustain support for the initiative. Recognizing the People officially in the proposal document has been positive for each party in several ways regardless of the actual backing from the group about the details of the community forest initiative. For the People, being recognized by the community forest membership – also majority colonial settler descendents - can be used in their case with the government proving that they exist and are recognized by local membership as having tribal territory. From the community forest perspective, naming an unrecognized First Nations group as a supporter

lends credibility to the proposal amongst the other interest groups, especially those supporting First Nation sovereignty.

Consulting with First Nations has integrity on the surface; it acknowledges the historical inequality resulting from Canadian colonial culture, the violent acquisition of land through genocide, and immaterial attempts by the Federal and Provincial governments to respect the rights of First Nations' territory. A deeper look at the role of First Nations in these community forest developments reveals that the consultation process is superficial and bureaucratically necessary, but not meaningful. The reasons for this are complex and beyond the scope of this research. Lack of involvement in the development process is in part due to issues associated with First Nations' sovereignty. Recognition of independent nationhood by the Federal and Provincial government is prioritized above negotiating at a local level. Nation to Nation recognition is desired. Not much time or resources from these bands are focused on community forestry initiatives unless they are spearheaded by First Nations on their own reserves.

On the part of community forest developers', further integration of First Nations' ideas or interests into a community forest plan is difficult work, maybe impossible due to the fundamental issues in an already conflicted situation. Based on the responses from developers interviewed, further involvement from First Nations is not a priority for either the First Nations or community forest developers. However, failure to address the issue of involvement risks the possibility of a sharp confrontation over unresolved issues in the future. Consultation with First Nations about community forestry happening within their territory is respectful and right thing to do, however in these two cases it resulted in a form of non-involvement. With that in mind, further issues with First Nations may arise as Treaties continue to be negotiated in BC and First Nations' desire more involvement and benefit to their People from the Land. How this will affect established community forests is still to be determined.

Applicable resources for conflict resolution in community forest development

This thesis addresses several theorists whose approach to conflict resolution can be readily applied to community forest development. I briefly review the key resources for understanding community forest development, the pertinent conflict resolution literature, and Wilber's Integral Theory as an example of a typology for conflict used successfully in community forest development.

As explained in chapter one, the literature addressing conflict resolution and its impact on the success of a community forest development is scanty. Literature focused on the history and development of community forestry in BC can be found in Gunter¹⁷⁴, Burda, Curran, Gale, and M'Gonigle¹⁷⁵, Howlett¹⁷⁶, Harshaw¹⁷⁷, and the BC government forestry site¹⁷⁸. Of these Howlett¹⁷⁹ and Harshaw¹⁸⁰ attend to problematic policy development and its institutionalization in the BC Forest Act, which have played a role in preventing the success of sustainable approaches in community forestry. Hammond¹⁸¹ and Burda, Curran, Gale, and M'Gonigle outline routes towards implementing community forestry based on eco-systems based management models. The BC Community Forestry Association guidebook touches on the importance of a context-specific conflict resolution plan, but has limited advice for developers. These resources give a broad spectrum perspective from the origins of community forestry in BC to the integration of community forestry in the BC Forest Act without offering on methodological approaches to conflict resolution.

However, literature within the field of conflict resolution explicating multi-party mediation and land planning do address the types of conflict that arise in community forest development - multi-party conflict about land use, resources and values – and the techniques to resolve or avoid them. The research explicated in this thesis specifically examines the principles of the conflict resolution approaches used in two community forest cases (case A and B), the developers' techniques and the areas where lack of conflict resolution skills and practice detracted from the success of the development.

¹⁷⁴ Gunter, 3-7

¹⁷⁵ Burda et al. *Forests in Trust*, 49, 99

¹⁷⁶ Michael Howlett. The Politics of Long-Term Policy Stability: Tenure Reform in British Columbia Forest Policy. In *In Search of Sustainability: British Columbia Forest Policy in the 1990s*. Edited by Benjamin Cashore, George Hoberg, Michael Howlett, Jeremy Rayner, and Jeremy Wilson. (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2001): 94-115

¹⁷⁷ H.W. Harshaw. Development of the Community Forest Tenure in British Columbia: An Examination of the BCMoF Community Forestry Initiative, Doctor of Philosophy. (Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia, Faculty of Forestry, Department of Forest Resource Management, 2000): 1-4

¹⁷⁸ Community Forests, Ministry of Forests, 2008. <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/> (accessed on: September 10, 2008).

¹⁷⁹ Howlett, 141, 157-8

¹⁸⁰ Harshaw, 1-4

¹⁸¹ Herb Hammond. Forest Practices: Putting Wholistic Forest Use Into Practice. In *Touch Wood: BC Forests at the Crossroads*, edited by Ken Druska, Bob Nixon and Ray Travers. 96-136 (Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing, 1993)

As has been noted in chapter two, an understanding of conflict involving multiple stakeholders is of primary significance. Theory addressing multiple stakeholder conflicts can be found in Burton and Dukes¹⁸², Rubin¹⁸³, Emerson, O’Leary and Bingham¹⁸⁴, Crowfoot and Wondolleck¹⁸⁵, Thorson, Kreisburg and Northrup¹⁸⁶, Kolb and Putnam¹⁸⁷, Deutsch¹⁸⁸, and Tidwell¹⁸⁹. Burton’s focus on the role of needs theory applied to inter-cultural conflict is explicated in descriptions of his workshops. Constructed similarly to the core group in case B by applying criteria to the membership, these workshops were a medium for shifting conflict dynamics in culturally diverse, conflicted communities; they dissipated the deeper roots of conflict through discussion and mutual understanding. Although not consciously applied, Burton’s techniques can be seen in case B’s approach. For example the problem-solving workshop as a medium for creating dialogue and mutual understanding by gathering specific people with leadership characteristics from each interest group to meet and problem-solve the conflict issues together. The core group could be considered a problem-solving group because of the diversity of perspectives represented within the group and the method used to choose each member. Additionally, his analysis of institutional reliance on the power-dominance framework and its affect on conflicts with struggle groups has been significant to critiques explicated in this thesis of BC’s current approach to community forestry, specifically in the role of the District Manager and the MOF in relation to the Forest Act and its implementation.

Rubin’s concept of ripeness is elucidated in this thesis by the category *Being tired*. His definition of ripeness deepens an understanding of the latent and manifest conflict that occurs throughout the development process as described with community activist groups.

Further description of the affect of institutions on environmental conflicts and their resolution can be found in Burton and Dukes¹⁹⁰, Emerson, O’Leary and Bingham¹⁹¹, Kolb¹⁹²,

¹⁸² Burton and Dukes, 23, 54-74, 136

¹⁸³ Dean and Olczak, 59-92

¹⁸⁴ Emerson, O’Leary and Bingham, 212

¹⁸⁵ Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1-30

¹⁸⁶ Thorson, Kreisburg and Northrup, 1-10

¹⁸⁷ Kolb and Putnam, 11

¹⁸⁸ Deutsch, *Resolution of Conflict* (1973): 67-92, 351-400

¹⁸⁹ Tidwell, 60-85

¹⁹⁰ Burton and Dukes, 11-12

and Crowfoot and Wondolleck¹⁹³. Specifically, the characteristics of environmental conflict resolution processes and their common procedural elements involving the government can be found in Burton and Dukes¹⁹⁴; whereas, the positive effects of institutional involvement on durable agreements in environmental conflicts are outlined in Emerson, O'Leary and Bingham¹⁹⁵, and Tidwell¹⁹⁶. By contrast, Crowfoot and Wondolleck address the limitations that result from the power imbalance between government bodies and the public in environmental conflicts. They offer developers tactics to overcome the divide between government and struggle groups that can escalate conflict¹⁹⁷. Such a potential escalation situation is exemplified in the conflict alleviated by developer intervention between the District Manager and environmental activists in case B.

Kreisburg, Thorson, and Northrup debate the theory of intractability and examine its usefulness as an analytic tool. They advise multiply-applied techniques and an interdisciplinary approach to conflict. Kolb and Putnam¹⁹⁸ emphasize the contextual analysis of conflict, with a specific focus on gender, explaining that context affects the process which therefore affects the construction of meaning and, inevitably, outcomes. Tidwell offers the conflict resolution practitioner a comprehensive, interpretive literature review of significant theorists in the field¹⁹⁹.

These theorists have focused on approaches to society conflicts, conflicts that happen between groups with conflicting ideological or epistemological perspectives, a category in which community forest conflicts belong. There are multiple typologies for conflict discussed in detail in chapter two that can be applied to an analysis of both manifest and latent conflict in community forestry.

¹⁹¹ Emerson, O'Leary and Bingham, 213

¹⁹² John Forester. Lawrence Susskind: Activist Mediation and Public Disputes. In *When Talk Works* edited by Deborah M. Kolb and Associates (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1994): 309-357

¹⁹³ Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 13

¹⁹⁴ Burton and Dukes, 61-74

¹⁹⁵ Emerson, O'Leary and Bingham, 216

¹⁹⁶ Tidwell, 40

¹⁹⁷ Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1-31

¹⁹⁸ Kolb and Putnam, 11

¹⁹⁹ Tidwell, 60-85

As mentioned, one of the case B developers applied Wilber's Integral theory²⁰⁰ in his approach to community forest development and conflict resolution with significant success. A comparison between the success of these developers' second attempt to establish a community forest and their first attempt illuminates the role conflict resolution theory has played in the success of the community forest development.

In addition to theory that specifically addresses conflict resolution a typology of communication from Wilber is significant. Wilber's theory emerges from psychology and, in this case, developers adapted the theory for community forest development relying on Esbjörn-Hargens interpretation for environmental conflict. Esbjörn-Hargens uses examples of environmental conflicts - generally urban conflicts for example waste management conflicts²⁰¹ - to illustrate the ways in which Integral theory can be used to alleviate conflict through communication and mutual understanding. His typology for analyzing conflict was applied to community forestry to gather the core group, enable collaboration across cultural conflict, build trust between the developers and the larger membership, and approach opposing groups and non-supporters successfully.

This discussion focused on the key issues around which conflict manifests during community forest development: the issue of neutrality, considerations for tenure transfer, suggestions for changes to the BC Forest Act to further support community forest development initiatives, and the complexity of relationship building with First Nations. Alongside purposeful contextual analysis, application of Integral theory and other relevant conflict resolution theories, conflict can be mediated successfully and facilitate successful community forest development. More research is needed to flesh out the specific use of Integral theory in the development of community forestry and its relevance to the field of conflict resolution generally, however the success explicated in this thesis indicates it is a promising approach. Without a doubt, the application of Integral theory's in the field of conflict resolution, and specifically to community forestry, is significant.

²⁰⁰ For a full understanding of Wilber's Integral Theory see:

Ken Wilber. *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality* (1995), *A Brief History of Everything* (1996), *Integral Psychology* (1999), *A Theory of Everything* (2000), *Integral Life Practice* (2008)

²⁰¹ Esbjörn-Hargens, 48-57

Conclusion

Through these case studies we have seen incidents in which conflict resolution processes have been used successfully, underused or are completely absent in the development of community forestry. By examining the role of conflict resolution in community forest development, this thesis successfully answers the question of: How can conflict resolution literature and conflict resolution best practices be utilized by community foresters to further community forest development initiatives? Furthermore, this work initiated a journey of discovery about conflict resolution and its effect upon community planning in general. It is clear from this research that conflict resolution has much to offer developers in the field of community forestry, but also those in any field where community input is essential to the success of a development project.

In order to achieve consensus within a diverse population, or even not very diverse as was evidenced in case A of this study, it is essential to have a contextual analysis and approach to potential conflict. For example, in both cases appreciation of the role of First Nations induced developers to consider positive relationships with First Nations as vital to a future, long-term vision of conflict resolution. Consideration of First Nations claim to the community forest land base has affected the current patterns of communication. Without a close contextual analysis this piece may have been missed to the detriment of future negotiations. Demonstrating neutrality is always difficult, but will especially be tricky if First Nations choose to reclaim their land; however case B and Burton's discussion of problem-solving workshops suggest²⁰², including all relevant stakeholders encourages neutrality in the face of diversity for the achievement of resolution. The findings reveal that involvement of all stakeholders – albeit carefully selected members from each cultural group – is integral to successful conflict resolution in a diverse community.

Developers who understand that latent conflict in the form of disagreement or differing perspectives is inevitable, in most cases healthy and necessary to the process of development will integrate structured forms of communication and conflict resolution into resource development initiatives. However, as mentioned in chapter two, latent conflict can be intractable. For it to shift and become manifest may require an event or escalation. This can be simulated to the advantage of the developer. According to Esbjörn-Hargens'

²⁰² Burton and Dukes, 136/137

application of Integral theory, gathering a specific group of representatives and building trust with membership is one way to stimulate change.

At other times, as described in chapter four, different factors can ripen a conflict. As seen in case B the phenomenon *Being Tired* after many years of forestry conflict, with the threat of logging salient, a previously reluctant sector of the community chose to support the community forestry initiative. In this case, years of conflict between logging companies and resident environmental activists ripened the conflict, thereby creating an ideal situation for developers to negotiate agreement. Whether a community forest could have happened with the aid of conflict resolution ten years earlier is unclear. What becomes clear from the comparison of the two situations is that there are multiple factors to consider in a conflict before applying a resolution strategy.

This study has been limited by its scope; the focus is specific to two cases of community forest development in BC. As the Province identifies more exploitable natural resources located in rural communities - including river systems for hydro electric projects and mining projects, in addition to forestry - conflict resolution models developed for community forestry can be applied to other fields of community focused resource extraction and management. Continued study of the role of conflict resolution in community resource development initiatives throughout the Province will benefit community members, developers, corporate interests and government representatives in their journey to agree upon mutually beneficial project plans.

With future resource development on the horizon around the Province, diverse, internally complex communities, a category in which most communities fall, require the government's advocacy to take up the responsibility of managing their own resources. This is evident in both of the case studies examined in this thesis. With the aid of conflict resolution, inclusive processes, and diverse representation at the decision-making level, rural communities can manage their own resources and come up with solutions about the resource extraction in the areas surrounding where they live. Evidence of patterns of conflict over resources can be found in a historical examination of forestry conflicts. Rural communities must control their resources or the risk for manifest conflict is paramount.

As exemplified by both case A and B it is clear that forestry conflicts can be resolved through the establishment of community forests, but the success of such ventures is not a foregone conclusion, even after stakeholders have been worn down by years of conflict.

This thesis has shown the importance of community control over their resources through its examination of conflict resolution practices in community forestry. As the Provincial government exposes public waterways to privatization and deregulation for independent power projects (IPPs) through Bill 30 passed in 2006 and the more recent Utilities Commission Amendment Act, Bill 15²⁰³ by enabling corporate industrial interests and disregarding public opinion or community input, it has become more important for government representatives to listen to voices of dissent and put in place mechanisms for communities to take control over their resources and manage them. This is true especially in areas where people living nearby will be affected by the changes in landscape and do not have a municipal government to protect their interests. Without acknowledging the role of community members in decision-making and including them in resource management, the government of BC will continue to engage in and create intercommunity conflicts by their involvement in resource extraction as seen in cases A and B. The role of the government as a facilitator of change and conflict resolution is an integral piece of the process of community resource management initiatives.

²⁰³ For further information on Bill 15 and Independent Power Projects (IPPs) in BC explore the following accessed September 5, 2008:

http://www.leg.bc.ca/38th4th/1st_read/gov15-1.htm

http://www.bchydro.com/planning_regulatory/acquiring_power/green_ipps.html

<http://pacificfreepress.com/content/view/2515/1/>

<http://www.pej.org/html/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=4659&mode=thread&order=0&thold=0>

<http://www.citizensforpublicpower.ca/node/360>

Bibliography

- Anderson, Noba Gmeiner and Will Horter. *Connecting Land and People: Community Forests in British Columbia*. Victoria, BC: Dogwood Initiative, 2002.
- Anstey, Mark. *Practical Peacemaking*. Kenwyn, South Africa: Juta and Co., 1993.
- BC Timber Sales. "Welcome to BC Timber Sales," (July 2007).
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/bcts/> (accessed December, 2007).
- Betts, Lynne. Betts Inc., Community Involvement and Communications. *Harrop-Procter Community Forest Community Review 2006, Final Report, Summary of Community Input*. Harrop-Procter Community Coop (HPCC), Ministry of Forests (MoFR), and Kootenay Lake Forest District, 2006.
- Bluff, Rosalind. "Grounded Theory," In *Principles and Practice of Research in Midwifery*. Editors Elizabeth R. Cluet and Rosalind Bluff, Sydney, Australia: Churchill Livingstone, 2006.
- British Columbia Community Forest Association (BCCFA), "What is community forestry?"
<http://www.bccfa.ca/about/what-is-community-forestry.html> (accessed January 18, 2009)
- Burda, Cheri, Deborah Curran, Fred Gale, and Michael M'Gonigle. *Forests in Trust: Reforming British Columbia's Forest Tenure System for Ecosystem and Community Health*. University of Victoria, BC: Eco-Research Chair Environmental Law and Policy, 1997.
- Burda, Cheri, and Michael M'Gonigle. *Innovative Forestry Versus the State(us) Quo*. University of Victoria, BC: Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, 1997
- Burton, John and Frank Dukes. *Conflict: Practices in Management, Settlement and Resolution*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Bush, Robert A. and Joseph Folger. "Changing People, Not Just Situations: A Transformative View of Conflict and Mediation." In *The Promise of Mediation*. Edited by Jeffrey Z. Rubin. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.
- Charmaz, Kathy, "Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis," In *Inside Interviewing, New Lenses, New Concerns*. Editors Holstein, James A. and Jaber F. Gubrium, London: Sage Publications, 2003.
- Charmaz, Kathy. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. London: Sage Publications, 2006.
- Chicanot, Jamie and Gordon Sloan. *The Practice of Mediation: Exploring Attitude, Process and Skills*. ADR Education, 2003

- Cobb, Sarah and Janet Rifkin. "Practice and Paradox: Deconstructing Neutrality in Mediation." *Law and Social Inquiry* 16 (1991).
- Crowfoot, James E. and Julia M. Wollondeck. *Environmental Disputes: Community Involvement in Conflict Resolution* Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1990
- Davis, Emily Jane. "New Promises, New Possibilities? Comparing Community Forestry in Canada and Mexico," *BC Journal of Ecosystems and Management* 9-2 (2008): 18
- Deutsch, Morton. *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven: Yale University Press Inc., 1973.
- Deutsch, Morton. "Subjective Features of Conflict Resolution," In *New Directions in Conflict Theory*. Edited by Raimo Vayrynen. London: Sage, 1991.
- Diamond, Louise. *Beyond Win/Win: The Heroic Journey of Conflict Transformation*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, 1996.
- Drengson, Alan, and Duncan Taylor, eds. *Ecoforestry: The Art and Science of Sustainable Forest Use*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers, 1997.
- Drushka, Ken, Bob Nixon, and Ray Travers, eds. *Touch Wood: BC Forests at the Crossroads*. Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing, 1993.
- Emerson, Kirk, Rosemary O'Leary and Lisa B. Bingham. "Commentary: Comment on Frank Duke's 'What We Know About Environmental Conflict Resolution'." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 22, 1-2 (2004): 223.
- Esbjörn-Hargens, S. "Integral ecology: The what, who, and how of environmental phenomena," in *World Futures* 61 1-2 (2005): 5-49.
- Fischer, Roger and William Ury. *Getting To Yes*. Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Books, 1981.
- Folger, Robert, Blair H. Sheppard, and Robert T. Buttram. "Equity, Equality, and Need. In Conflict, Cooperation and Justice" In *Conflict Cooperation and Justice: Essays Inspired by the Work of Morton Deutsch*. edited by Barbara Benedict Bunker, Jeffrey Z. Rubin and Associates. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995
- Forest Act, RSBC 1996, c.157, division 7.1, Community Forest Agreements, Application for Probationary Community Forest Agreements, 43.2 (3) "Statutes and Regulations" http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/legsregs/forest/foract/part3.htm#part3_division7-1 (accessed January 18, 2009)
- Forest Act, RSBC 1996, c.157, division 7.1, Community Forest Agreements, Content of Community Forest Agreement, 43.3 "Statutes and Regulations"

http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/legsregs/forest/foract/part3.htm#part3_division7-1
(accessed January 18, 2009)

Forester, John. "Lawrence Susskind: Activist Mediation and Public Disputes." In *When Talk Works*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1994

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. New York, NY: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Gunter, Jennifer (editor). *The Community Forestry Guidebook: Tools and Techniques for Communities in British Columbia*. FORREX Series Report No. 15. Kamloops and Kaslo, BC, FORREX – Forest Research Extension Partnership and BCCFA - British Columbia Community Forest Association, 2004.

Harrop-Procter Community Forest, "Organization and Mission Statements," (2001), <http://www.hpcommunityforest.org/about/mission.html> (accessed March 2004).

Isaacs, William. *Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1999.

Kolb, Deborah and Linda L. Putnam. "Through the Looking Glass: Negotiation Theory Refracted through the Lens of Gender." Cambridge, Mass: Paper presented at Harvard University Conference: Gender Issues and Negotiation and Conflict Resolution, October 12-15, 1995.

Kreisberg, Lois. "Conclusion: Research and Policy Implications." In *Intractable Conflict and Their Transformation*. Edited by Lois Kriesberg, Terrell A. Northrup and Stuart J. Thorson. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1989.

Kvale, Steinar. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage Publications, 1996.

Lebaron, Michelle. *Bridging Troubled Waters: Conflict Resolution from the Heart*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2002.

Ministry of Forests, BC. "Jobs and timber accord pilots new community forests tenure," (June 2001). <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/history.htm> (accessed July 5, 2006).

Ministry of Forests, BC. "Province to Issue Long-term Community Forest Agreement," (Aug 11, 2006). <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/news.htm> (accessed Sept, 2006).

Ministry of Forests, BC, "Harrop Procter Society gets a Community Forest," (June 2001), <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/pscripts/pab/newsrel/mofnews.asp?refnum=1999%3A081> (accessed Jan 2007)

- Ministry of Forests and Range. "Opening up New Opportunities for British Columbia."
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/mof/plan/frp/03.htm#b> (accessed July 25, 2007).
- Ministry of Forests, BC, "What are community forests?" (July 2007),
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/> (accessed March 24, 2008)
- Ministry of Forests, BC, Community Forest Tenure Regulation, (July 2004),
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/legislation.htm> (accessed March 24, 2008)
- Ministry of Forests, BC. "Slocan Issued a Probationary Agreement," (Feb 13, 2008).
<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/community/Documents/news-release-slocan-issued-cfa-feb-13-2006.pdf> (accessed April 21, 2008).
- National Forest Database Program at:
http://nfdp.ccfm.org/compendium/harvest/terminology_e.php
 (accessed on: July 17, 2007)
- Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods - 3rd Edition*. London, United Kingdom: Sage Publications, 2002.
- Pirie, Andrew J. *Alternative Dispute Resolution: Skills, Science and the Law*. Toronto, Ontario: Irwin Law Inc., 2000.
- Pruitt, Dean G. and Paul V Olczak. Beyond Hope: Approaches to Seemingly Intractable Conflict. In *Conflict, Cooperation and Justice* edited by Barbara Benedict Bunker, Jeffrey Z. Rubin and Associates. 59-92 (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995): 67
- Rayner, Jeremy, Fine-Tuning the Settings: The Timber Supply Review. In *In Search of Sustainability: British Columbia Forest Policy in the 1990s*. Edited by Benjamin Cashore, George Hoberg, Michael Howlett, Jeremy Rayner, and Jeremy Wilson. Vancouver, BC, UBC Press, 2001.
- Rubin, Jeffrey Z. "Some Wise and Mistaken Assumptions About Conflict and Negotiation." In *Negotiation Theory and Practice*. Edited by J. William Breslin and Jeffrey Z. Rubin. 3rd ed., Cambridge, Mass., The Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School, 1995.
- Silva Forest Foundation. "Introduction to Ecosystem Based Planning," (2002-2003),
<http://www.silvafor.org/index.htm> (accessed September 12, 2006).
- Strauss, Anselm L. and Juliette Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. New York, NY: Sage Publications, 1990.

Thorson, Stuart J., "Introduction: Conceptual Issues." In *Intractable Conflict and Their Transformation*. Edited by Lois Kriesberg, Terrell A. Northrup and Stuart J. Thorson. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1989.

Tidwell, Alan C., *Conflict Resolved: A Critical Assessment of Conflict Resolution*. London: Continuum, 1998.

UBC archives, Compiled by Christopher Hives, Vancouver, BC: 1998 (Accessed May 12, 2008) http://www.library.ubc.ca/archives/u_arch/pearse.html

Volkan, Vamik and Max Harris. "Negotiating a Peaceful Separation: A Psychopolitical Analysis of Current Relationships between Russia and the Baltic Republics." *Mind and Human Interaction* 41, 1 (1992): 20-39.

Ken Wilber. *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality* (1995), *A Brief History of Everything* (1996), *Integral Psychology* (1999), *A Theory of Everything* (2000), *Integral Life Practice* (2008)

Wilson, Jeremy. *Talk and Log: Wilderness Politics in British Columbia 1965-1996* Vancouver, UBC Press, 1998.

Wilson, Anne, Mark Roseland and J.C. Day. "Shared Decision-Making and Public Land Planning: An Evaluation of the Vancouver Island Regional Core Process." *Environments* 23 2 (1996). 69-86.

Winslade, John, and Gerald Monk. *Narrative Mediation: A New Approach to Conflict Resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2001.

www.for.gov.bc/hth/community/history.htm, 2007

www.for.gov.bc/hth/community/history.htm chart of current community forest licensees, 2007

<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/mof/plan/frp/03.htm#b>

www.district.sechelt.bc.ca/pdffdocuments/cfi/areavolumebasetenure.pdf

Appendices

Appendix A - Invitation to Participate and Informed Consent Form

Appendix B - Question Sheet

Appendix A - Invitation to Participate and Informed Consent Form

Dispute Resolution in BC Forestry: An examination of the processes used by community forest development initiatives to change local forest management

You are invited to participate in research study entitled, *Dispute Resolution in BC Forestry: An examination of the processes used by community forest development initiatives to change local forest management* that is being conducted by Josée Corrigan. I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Human and Social Development in the department of Dispute Resolution at the University of Victoria and you may contact me if you have further questions by phoning (250) 226-6918 or by email at josecc@uvic.ca.

As a Graduate student working to complete my Master's Degree in Dispute Resolution, I am required to conduct research as part of the requirements for my degree program. This pilot project is being conducted under Dr. James Lawson's supervision and you may contact him at (250) 721-7496 or lawsonj@uvic.ca.

The purpose of this research is to explore the agreement processes community forest developers have used through two interviews with two key informants, you and another person, within a grounded theoretical methodology.

Research of this type is important because the perspectives of community forest developers on watershed/forest communities' agreement processes is key to any critical analysis of community forest development. Much of this information is knowledge that exists and may be known to you. As a Master's student I would like to share this important aspect of your experience as a community forest developer. The focus of this research will enhance the ability of other watershed/forest community members to make choices that will ultimately contribute to implementing community forestry in their own watershed/forest areas and improve an understanding of the barriers that impede CF development.

I am asking you to participate in this study because of your perspective and analysis of community forestry and your perception of the public consultation and negotiation necessary for the success of community forest agreements. Your willingness to help me learn about community forest development is integral to this thesis.

If you agree to voluntarily participate in this research, your participation will include feedback on the process by which data will be gathered and analyzed, initial feedback on the interview question sheet, two interviews in person, and approval of how your data has been represented in the final draft of the thesis. Participation in this study will require a time commitment of up to four hours depending on how long your responses take. There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research.

The potential benefits of your participation are that your experience and perspectives will contribute to the published body of information about community forest development and documenting the successes and failure within the community forest agreement process.

Your participation in this research must be completely voluntary. If you do choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time without any consequences or any explanation. If you do withdraw from the study the data already collected will only be used with your consent. If you do choose to withdraw, then at that time you can assess what is allowable and what is not allowable in the final thesis. If you do not want any of the data in the final thesis then I will dispose of the data by erasing all interview tapes and files, both electronic and paper.

The nature of this research limits anonymity for you. I may want to identify [Case A] and [Case B] when I write about community forestry in BC. However, if anonymity is a priority for you, you may select a pseudonym for me to use in conversations about the data with my supervisor and fellow students, the final report and thesis. I can ensure this limited anonymity if there are any specific concerns that you have by anonymizing the data, both electronic and paper, with regard to these activities. The consent forms will be stored safely in files separate from the data in my office until my thesis is completed and then destroyed.

This data will be used in my thesis, which will become a public document. Data collected by audiotape for this study will be disposed of by erasing tapes within six months of the thesis' completion. Other data will be deleted from files once my thesis is completed. It is anticipated that the results from this study will be shared with others in the following ways: in discussions with fellow students and study groups, in the thesis defence, in discussions with my supervisor and committee members, and in my thesis.

In addition to being able to contact me, the researcher, and Dr. James Lawson, my supervisor at the above phone numbers, you may verify the ethical approval of this study, or raise any concerns you might have, by contacting the Associate Vice-President, Research at the University of Victoria (250) 472-4545.

Please inform Josée that you understand the above conditions of participation in this study and that you have had the opportunity to have your questions answered by Josée. Also indicate if you wish to be anonymous as it's been defined in this document.

Name of Participant

Signature

Date

A copy of this consent will be left with you, and a copy will be taken by the researcher.

Appendix B - Question Sheet

The proposed research will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What are the processes used by CF developers to achieve support from those people living in the watershed/forest for which the CF is intended?
2. What factors enabled CF developers to get their CF development initiatives off the ground?
3. What are the obstacles experienced by CF developers trying to achieve community support?
4. What are the successes experienced by CF developers trying to achieve community support?
5. What strategies/processes promote support for CF development by watershed/forest communities?
6. Did dispute resolution play a role in the transformation of relationships in these two cases?

General questions:

1. Tell me about your experience working towards a CF development initiative here in this watershed/forest community?
2. What factors are/were important in achieving and ensuring that the CF plan was/is successful? What actions need/ed to take place?
3. In your role as a CF developer, how can you/did you try to ensure the project's success? What strategies or supports did you use?
4. What are/were the obstacles to CF development here?
5. What changes are taking/took place within your watershed/forest community as a result of the CF development initiative?

Specific questions:

1. Who participated in the decision-making about the CF management plan?
2. What did participation involve?
3. How were decisions made?
4. What were some of the conflicts that arose?
5. How were they resolved?
6. Did the resolution last? If so, why? If not, why?
7. How was power present in the meetings or discussion?
8. What role did recognition of others play in the CF development plan?
9. How did the two CF plans differ in 1994?
10. How did the [case B] plans from 1994 differ from the current plan?

Specific to 2:

What has the process for preparation for the Community meetings been?

Who have you been caucusing with previous to those meetings?

How have you dealt any difficult patches to date?