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ECOTOURISM DEVELOPMENT THROUGH CULTURALLY SENSITIVE UNIVERSALISM

John B. Read IV and Bryan S. R. Grimwood

Introduction

Ecotourism is often held up as the archetype for ethical and responsible tourism. As the negative social and environmental impacts associated with tourism became increasingly identified and understood (Jafari, 2001; Macbeth, 2005), ecotourism’s profile as an ethically ideal mode of tourism became entrenched within tourism discourse (Fennell, 2003). There has, of course, been much debate over the years about the extent to which contemporary practices of ecotourism are actually able to fulfil their ethical promise and potential. Nowaczek, Moran-Cahusac, and Fennell (2007), for instance, suggest that ecotourism remains largely driven by profit-making ideologies and underpinned by Western philosophical concepts and meanings (e.g., “nature”; see also Grimwood, Caton, & Cooke, 2018). Bianchi and de Man’s (2020) Marxian-inspired critique of UN Sustainable Development Goals and Moore’s (2019) ethnography of small-scale tourism developments in the Bahamas show that these concerns remain central to the provision and management of ecotourism. On the demand or consumption side of ecotourism, critics have asserted that ecotourists are not any more or less ethical than their mass tourism counterparts, but are instead driven by similar desires to satisfy ego interests (Wheeller, 1993).

One explanation for why ecotourism, and other related modes of alternative tourism, consistently fail to realise any ethical ideal is the dearth of moral theory underpinning its practice. Fennell (2006, 2008, 2018) has frequently argued along these lines, suggesting for instance that greater emphasis be placed on contemplating the obligations, consequences, and deeper values and meanings associated with tourism behaviours and development decisions. Similarly, Caton (2012) advocates for enhanced philosophical and theoretical engagement within tourism—a moral turn—as “matters of morality and ethics [are] among the most important [topics to be addressed] in our field” (p. 1912). In recent years, this moral turn has been marked by several philosophically and theoretically informed investigations being advanced within the subfields of ecotourism, and nature-based tourism more broadly. For example, scholars have engaged various ecofeminist (Yudina & Grimwood, 2016), animal rights (Fennell, 2014; Sheppard & Fennell, 2019), ecocentric (Fennell, 2003; Holden, 2003, 2015, 2018), and relational (Grimwood & Doubleday, 2013b; Mullins, 2009) perspectives in ecotourism contexts.
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To supplement literatures on ecotourism and ethics, the purpose of this chapter is to introduce the concept of culturally sensitive universalism and examine its utility in relation to tourism codes of conduct. Culturally sensitive universalism—a concept we borrow from Dower (2019)—is advanced as a bridge linking the emerging fields of global ethics and development ethics. In more specific terms, culturally sensitive universalism represents an approach to ethics that “allows for different forms of expression in different societies and at the same time retains a framework of trans-boundary responsibility towards humans anywhere” (Dower, 2019, p. 19).

Here, ethics is understood as the rules or norms that determine the basis and justification for actions that are deemed right or wrong, good or bad, fair or unfair, or other related value-based distinctions (Fennell, 2018). A key issue we grapple with in this chapter is how culturally sensitive universalism provides a framework for negotiating, if not reconciling, classic tensions in ethical discourse (including the study of tourism ethics) between theoretical and applied approaches and concerns. Indeed, as it will become apparent later, global ethics and development ethics as fields of study blur the conventional distinctions between theoretical ethics or applied ethics. According to Fennell (2018), the former coalesces around two normative principles: either deontological, where moral duties align with principles and rules that embody cultural values of what is morally right or wrong—for example the golden rule—or teleological, where actions are ends-based; that is, maximising pleasure and minimising suffering for the greatest number of people. In contrast, applied ethics emphasises a “[fundamental devotion] to clarifying the ethical meanings of the situations on which they focus” (Lurie, 2018, p. 475); for example, situations within business, tourism, or health care among others. In this regard, applied ethics involves the critical analysis and application of moral philosophical reasoning in real-world contexts (Beauchamp, 2007); or, as Lurie (2018) states, “an interpretive and critical discourse of both ethics and life situation” (p. 475).

In the following sections, we introduce global ethics and development ethics¹ as emerging ethical discourses that bridge theoretical and applied ethics. This chapter—in a manner analogous to Fennell’s (2019) negotiation of ethical pluralisms towards a “comprehensive framework for ethics in tourism” (p. 173)—aims to provide an ideal proxy for scholars, practitioners, and governments to consider how global ethics and development ethics contribute to ethical ecotourism development. Our intent is not to provide a comprehensive or nuanced overview of these literatures, but rather to convey the significance and utility of drawing these fields together in and through the concept of culturally sensitive universalism (Dower, 2019). Our discussion then considers how culturally sensitive universalism might be useful for developing ecotourism codes of conduct. More specifically, by considering a specific tourism geography (i.e., the Sir John A. Franklin shipwrecks in the Northwest Passage of Arctic Canada) and drawing connections to various declarations and codes associated with the self-determination of Indigenous peoples, we illustrate the utility of culturally sensitive universalism as a framework for code of conduct development. Finally, we outline a series of recommendations for the potential use of culturally sensitive universalism towards creating with the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit a code of conduct for tourism to the Franklin shipwrecks.

Global ethics

According to Chadwick and O’Conner (2015), global ethics represents “a distinct field of study, going beyond applied ethics to include insight from political philosophy” (p. 25). First gaining traction in the 1970s through the scholarly works of ethicists like Peter Singer and Onora O’Neill, global ethics’ prominence increased as worldwide connections and mobilities intensified and universal moral issues—like famine, Indigenous rights, and climate change—demanded global
scale deliberation and response. Among the early proponents of global ethics, it was common to apply different ethical theories (e.g., Singer favoured utilitarianism, O’Neill often adopted a Kantian approach) to address the global scale issues at hand. Such an approach effectively situated global ethics as an off-shoot of applied ethics. In the decades of literature since, global ethics has evolved to incorporate both normative and metaethical questions and concerns. Evidence that global ethics has distinguished itself from its applied roots is captured in Widdows’ (2011) succinct observation that “the globe [is seen] as the proper sphere of all ethics” (p. 519).

As global ethics has evolved, scholars have been challenged with articulating both the philosophical basis and substantive concerns that unite the field. Dower (2011b, 2019), a leading voice on these matters, notes that global ethics as a philosophical field of study is principally concerned with:

- “The relationships between nation-states and
- The relations between all human beings in the world and, for some environmentalists, relations with nonhumans anywhere and the planet” (p. 505)

In this regard, global ethics interrogates the ethical underpinnings of human, non-human, and even planetary relationships at a transnational scale, including those relationships that occur across borders and in relation to global bodies such as the United Nations. Dower (2019) clarifies that “Global ethics … is often focused on the nature, extent and justification of ethical values and norms that make up what may be called a ‘global ethic’”, that is assumed to be universal (p. 21). A ‘global ethic’ according to Dower (2011b) embodies:

- the assertion that there are globally, universal values, and
- that actors anywhere have a duty to act towards those values.

In exploring and providing justifications within areas such as conflict and violence, poverty and development, economic justice, bioethics and health justice, as well as environmental and climate ethics (Dower, 2007; Moellendorf & Widdows, 2015), global ethics has advanced arguments towards values and norms that warrant universal acceptance.

A salient example of universal values that are embodied within a ‘global ethic’ can be seen in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). The UNDRIP is grounded upon multiple universal values that exist concerning the rights of Indigenous peoples, and which assert that nations-states—and subsequently their private citizens—are morally implicated as members of the global collective in upholding those values. Indigenous self-determination is one such universal value that is codified within the UNDRIP. The Declaration explains Indigenous self-determination in the following way:

by virtue of that right [Indigenous peoples] freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development…[and] have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous functions.

(United Nations, 2007, p. 8)

Indigenous self-determination is further affirmed as salient to Indigenous tourism practices through the Larrakia Declaration (United Nations World Tourism Organization [UNWTO], 2012). Centred upon six principles including respect, protection, empowerment, consultation, business, and community, the Larrakia Declaration emphasises respectful, collaborative,
sustainable, and equitable tourism practices that align with a ‘global ethic’ of Indigenous self-determination.

Within ecotourism, Indigenous self-determination has been discussed by Johnston (2000) as the understanding that “[I]ndigenous peoples can set the terms for visitation to their traditional territories, as well as other third party uses of their collective cultural property (p. 91). However, Higgins-Desbiolles (2007) identified that in tourism, Indigenous self-determination has often been side-lined, with Indigenous peoples being seen as one of many stakeholders and not central to the tourism development processes. More recently, scholars have argued for the central role of Indigenous self-determination in directing ecotourism development within Indigenous communities (Dowsley, 2009; Hitchner, Apu, Tarawe, Aran, & Yesaya, 2009). While not specifically highlighting global ethics in this research, these articles demonstrate the infiltration that has already occurred within the ecotourism and tourism literature of Indigenous self-determination as a global value and norm.

While global ethics has much to offer, it is important to note that the field has not avoided critique. As scholars of global ethics attempt to tackle a plethora of issues at a global scale—one example being global environmental problems such as climate change—commentators have questioned the field’s grounding within European values and norms that have arisen from traditional academic perspectives and are complicit in maintaining historic disenfranchisement and devaluation of other knowledge systems (Dunford, 2017; Hutchings, 2019). This is salient, for instance, in regard to how Indigenous self-determination is framed within the UNDRIP such that it reproduces an “ethic of self” that is situated within governance structures constructed upon the laws of colonial powers (Franke, 2007, p. 372). Importantly, however, a path forward has been presented within certain critiques that call for the inclusion of pluralist ways of developing global ethics that articulate and implement other (non-European) ways of knowing and being (Dunford, 2017; Mignolo, 2011).

Development ethics

Development ethics is another emerging field of study that equally warrants consideration within ecotourism contexts. According to Marangos, Astroulakis, and Triarchi (2019), development ethics represents an “ethical reflection of the ends and means for any purposeful socio-economic activity towards development and the achievement of a “good society at a local, national and global scale” (p. 257). This has been more simply characterised as pursuing “justifications for judgments about the right and wrong ways of conducting development” (Drydyk & Keleher, 2019b, p. 2) as well as their associated goods and benefits (Dower, 2011a). Initially couched within the ethical discourses of Louis-Joseph Lebret and Denis Goulet, development ethics focused on the scientific, industrial, and socioeconomic growth of underdeveloped areas between the end of the second world war and the 1970s (Culp, 2015; Dower, 2011a; Hutchings, 2010). Development ethics has emphasised attaining “the good life/good living/well-being” or “Eudaimonia” (Marangos et al., 2019, p. 523) within established fields such as Aristotelian, Kantian, utilitarian, and Rawlsian ethics (Dower, 2011a). These philosophical understandings were subsequently built upon through virtue ethics, which “draws attention to the importance of social and cultural practices and institutions for establishing the conditions for human flourishing” (Hutchings, 2010, p. 95). The inclusion of the capability approach furthered development ethics’ normative focus on quality of life (Garza-Vázquez & Deneulin, 2019) emphasising the provision of the “actual freedom of choice a person has over alternative lives that [they] can lead” (Sen, 1990, p. 114). In the decades of literature since, scholars within development ethics have continued to wrestle with the divide between relativist and universalist thought (Dower, 2011a).
Similar to global ethics, the evolution of development ethics has challenged scholars to convey the philosophical and substantive nature of the field. Dower (2011a, 2019) continues to provide significant direction on these matters, noting that development ethics as a philosophical field of study is principally grounded upon the ideas that:

- “Development is Ethical in character;
- Development ethics is multidisciplinary;
- Reduction of poverty is central to authentic development;
- Development is ultimately human development;
- What is appropriate is context-sensitive;
- Conventional development *qua* economic growth [is] part of the problem” (p. 781)

In this regard, development is understood to be locally situated, emphasising relationships that imbue moral and pluralist engagements. This situated approach to development ethics “look[s] at the values and norms involved in development, often comparing different approaches and seeking a justification for what seems the right approach” (Dower, 2019, p. 23). Within development ethics, Dower (2011a) advances that there have been three normative approaches that have been taken up by researchers:

- Through “economic growth as central”, emphasising free markets, equitable distributions, and poverty reduction;
- Through economic growth as conditional, which requires other values and norms in addition to economic growth;
- Through alternatives to economic growth, which calls for “redefinitions of authentic development or rejection of development altogether” (p. 781)

These approaches have each been uniquely embodied in addressing issues such as wellbeing, social and global justice, empowerment and agency, environmental sustainability, human rights, cultural freedom, and responsibilities (Drydyk & Keleher, 2019b).

Distinct from the philosophical manner in which development ethics is discussed, a ‘development ethic’ is a situated set of values and norms that are accepted/embodied by an individual or community (Dower, 2019). Since the turn of the century, these discussions of community values and norms within the ecotourism literature frequently occur as economically oriented. For example, these discussions often appear as *for* alleviating poverty or *for* increasing fairness and equity—through Pro-Poor or Fair-Trade Tourism (Boluk, 2011b, 2011a). Alternatively, in the case of Holmes, Grimwood, King, and the Lutsel K’e Dene First Nation (2016) and this chapter, we consider the potential of tourism development as community driven, specifically for Indigenous self-determination. Holmes et al.’s (2016) research was “guided by community-based, participatory, and narrative methodologies” (p. 1190) to enable Indigenous self-determination through the articulation of developmental values and norms of the Lutsel K’e Dene First Nation Holmes the Lutsel K’e Dene First Nation 2016. As previously discussed, Indigenous self-determination can be conceptualised as a ‘global ethic’. Similarly, Indigenous self-determination can also be conceptualised as a ‘development ethic’ arising from within a community (e.g., the Lutsel K’e Dene First Nation). This conceptualisation at developmental and global scales engages Indigenous self-determination as both a process and outcome that “requires both the transformation of governance and law, as well as space to enable [I]ndigenous peoples to articulate, pursue, and realize lives they value” (Watene & Merino, 2019, p. 143). As such, Indigenous self-determination as a process and outcome of
ecotourism development must be situated within specific communities or peoples. This emphasizes Indigenous expectations of how to conduct authentic ecotourism that generate community-specific understandings of wellbeing.

While there is much that development ethics can offer, it has borne critique of its historical development practices, especially in countries where colonial practices are attributed with the rise of poverty (Hutchings, 2010) (e.g., the United Kingdom influenced the development of many countries from agrarian to capitalist societies which changed existing social structures and increased poverty). Development ethics also experiences critique for its contribution to the proliferation of top-down policies that attempt to address development in a utilitarian manner (i.e., as a tool to achieve development). These critiques appear to arise from development that was centred around or favoured economics as a means to generate well-being for communities where development occurred. Dower’s (2011a) identification of development that seeks alternative means to generate wellbeing outside of economic systems, appears to demonstrate that global values and norms are additionally salient to development ethics.

Towards culturally sensitive universalism

Until recently, the fields of global ethics and development ethics were considered to be distinct. However, as global and development ethics have continued to evolve, their interconnectedness has been explored in multiple ways. Recently, Dower (2019) has advanced culturally sensitive universalism where global ethics must be informed by the philosophical underpinnings of development ethics and, likewise, development ethics must align with universal values and norms that are embodied within a ‘global ethic’. As such, global ethics has been argued as a field that acknowledges “culturally sensitive universal values and norms, which both allow for different forms of expression in different societies and at the same time retains a framework of trans-boundary responsibility towards humans anywhere” (Dower, 2019, p. 19).

Culturally sensitive universalism intertwines global and development ethics within the understanding that individuals and groups have unique views resulting in their acceptance or rejection of universal values and norms (e.g., tourism practitioners and Indigenous communities may have differing views on the values of development). Highlighting Parekh’s analysis of global ethics, Dower (2019) discusses how both global and development ethics are intertwined within the understanding that individuals and groups will either consent or assent based upon their foundational ethical understanding of how development values or global norms might be enacted. This understanding of consent and assent allows for multiple global ethics and development ethics to be taken up by different individuals or groups (e.g., tourism scholars, nongovernmental organisations, tourism associations, etc.) at different times (Dower, 2019). In this regard, global ethics’ transnational quest to identify and validate a set of universal norms and values cannot be successful unless it acknowledges the validity of all worldviews to allow for cultural sensitivity at local/community levels. As such, in a manner that invites pluralistic collaborations at local/community levels (Drydyk & Keleher, 2019a; Dunford, 2017; Hutchings, 2019), culturally sensitive universalism requires “that a consensus of shared values derived from various sources is accepted, [and] the importance of flexibility is underlined” (Dower, 2019, p. 26).

Dower’s (2019) introduction of culturally sensitive universalism provides a philosophically informed argument linking development ethics as the practical application of values and norms within global ethics. This is similar to Fennell’s (2019) “pluralistic, integrated model of tourism ethics” (p. 164) that also provides an alternative to relativism (i.e., “there are no universal moral codes, but, rather unique practices” (Fennell, 2018, p. 86). While Dower (2019) advances
culturally sensitive universalism to critique the development practices of countries and companies globally, Fennell (2019) negotiates the coming together of micro and macro ethical spaces towards moral governance by employing social contract theory. Rather than critiquing ecotourism development practices, we follow Fennell’s (2019) work towards ethical frameworks by illuminating how culturally sensitive universalism might be useful in informing ecotourism development. Using the Northwest Passage within the Canadian Arctic as a proxy, we underscore how a culturally sensitive universalism that embraces Indigenous self-determination embodies a salient universal value for ecotourism development. We further explore how Indigenous self-determination occurs as both process and outcome in creating a code of conduct for the Franklin Shipwrecks.

The Franklin shipwrecks

Within the Northwest Passage, there lays a confluence where the distinctions between water, land, and ice (the Alexandra and Simpson Straights, the Adelaide Peninsula and Qikiqtarjuaq (King William Island)), the Arctic ecosystem, and more specifically the ancestral and sovereign territory of Inuit from Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven, Nunavut) are blurred (ITK & NRI, 2006; Têtu, Lasserre, Pelletier, & Dawson, 2019). This confluence was further blurred in 2018 when Parks Canada and the Inuit Heritage Trust obtained joint management and responsibility of the Franklin Shipwreck (Parks Canada, 2018a). The HMS Erebus and HMS Terror, unseen since 1845, were ‘rediscovered’ in 2014 and 2016, respectively, though the locations of the shipwrecks were never truly hidden. Parks Canada (2018a) attributes Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (the tradition of oral history and knowledge) as playing a pivotal role in supplying the knowledge required for the ‘rediscovery’ of the Shipwrecks. This role in discovery and joint management has resulted in a public commitment where “the Government of Canada will continue to collaborate with Inuit to share the story of the Franklin Expedition, and the important role of Inuit in the discovery and on-going protection of the Franklin wrecks” (Parks Canada, 2018a, n.p.). This commitment was further reiterated by Fred Pederson, the Chair of the Franklin Interim Advisory Committee who stated that “Canada and Inuit will be joint owners of the artifacts going forward which provides a great opportunity for Inuit to be involved with, and guide, how the rest of the story unfolds” (Parks Canada, 2018a, n.p.).

An unfolding plotline in the story of the Franklin Shipwrecks relates to their promotion as an ecotourism destination within the Northwest Passage. There is precedent for this notion as the current Inuit Guardians Program is intended to “play a key role in hosting visitors to the wreck sites—sharing knowledge and Inuit culture and presenting the Franklin story as well as monitoring the two wreck sites” (Parks Canada, 2018b, n.p.). While this potential growth of tourism to sites within the Northwest Passage that “respects both nature and culture” is openly desired by some Inuit (Stewart, Draper, & Dawson, 2011, p. 47), tourism development can contribute to increased vulnerability and decreased resilience, “potentially altering [Arctic] community structure and cohesion” (Sisneros-Kidd, Monz, Hausner, Schmidt, & Clark, 2019, pp. 1270–1271). As such, active local community involvement and coordination must occur in planning for the tourism futures of the Northwest Passage (Stewart et al., 2011). For the Franklin Shipwrecks, this has already begun to take shape as the Inuit Guardians Program further “supports Indigenous land management and oversight in their territories based on a cultural responsibility for the land” (Parks Canada, 2018b, n.p.). Understanding that an intention for tourism to the Franklin Shipwrecks exists and that the Inuit Guardians Program is comprised of community members from Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) who possess inherent rights to the management, oversight, and cultural responsibility in and on their traditional territory, we ask:
how might culturally sensitive universalism usefully inform potential ecotourism development in the context of the Franklin Shipwrecks? To answer this question, we explore an opportunity for a code of conduct for tourists visiting the Franklin Shipwrecks.

**Opportunities for a code of conduct**

As a result of the historic economic, environmental, and cultural damage created by tourism, scholars have recommended that governments/practitioners imbed a code of conduct during the tourism development phase to educate, manage, and raise tourist awareness in regard to acceptable/unacceptable tourist behaviours (Fennell & Malloy, 2007; Mason & Mowforth, 1995). Frequently, this is reactionary as tourists have already begun to flock to outdoor destinations before management is able to clearly set out parameters for the development of tourism. In the case of the Franklin Shipwrecks, the public is currently prohibited from visiting the site (Parks Canada, 2018c) and this provides the opportunity to carefully think through the development and implementation of a code of conduct prior to the arrival of tourism. One strategy for implementing a code of conduct for the Franklin Shipwrecks is to adapt an existing code used in a similar context.

In the Canadian Arctic, we highlight three different codes of conduct that have been used to promote desired behaviours from tourists that visit these areas. First, we look to a code of conduct that is used at co-managed national parks and national historic sites in the Canadian Arctic. This code of conduct—the principles of Leave No Trace (LNT)—is highly promoted by Parks Canada across all park units including those located within the Arctic (Parks Canada, 2019). LNT was produced by non-governmental organisations in an attempt to generate responsible behaviours among those that participate in nature based activities (Leave No Trace, 2019). Designed as an overarching set of guidelines for wilderness etiquette, LNT is general and applicable for environmental protection in outdoor areas around the world.

Second, we look to Arctic specific codes of conduct for tourism like the 10 principles for Arctic Tourism (WWF International Arctic Program [WWF], 2001; see original in Mason & Mowforth, 1995) which were produced by academia and non-governmental organisations like the World Wildlife Foundation (WWF) in an attempt to create overarching moral responsibilities for tourism practices in this transnational region. This code of conduct provides salient concepts that are general in nature and applicable across the Arctic especially in regard to environmental protection.

Third, we turn to other codes of conduct within the Arctic that are community-based, appearing in the form of co-created documents between academia and communities such as Holmes et al.’s (2016) an *Indigenized Visitor Code of Conduct* which provides expectations of tourist behaviours within a localised region of the Arctic. While not the first code of conduct that implores tourists to be sensitive to Indigenous cultures [see e.g., Colvin (1994), as well as the guidelines produced by the Association of Arctic Cruise Expedition Operators], Holmes et al.’s (2016) *Indigenized Visitor Code of Conduct* was developed through processes that adhered to Indigenous self-determination as a value within specific community context. This process for developing a code of conduct provides a relevant and localised understanding of what tourism could look like when centring the narratives of specific Indigenous communities within the Arctic.

In reflecting on these three codes of conduct, we find that LNT and the WWF codes while useful in their overarching contexts would not be appropriate when considering tourism development to the Franklin Shipwrecks. This is due to the LNT and WWF codes of conduct not centring the site management, oversite, and cultural responsibility that is inherent to the Inuit of Uqquqtuuq (Gjoa Haven). Likewise, we find that applying the Holmes et al. (2016) code of
conduct to the Franklin Shipwrecks would be equally inappropriate as this would infringe on the rights of the Uqsuqtuuq Inuit and be tantamount to cultural amalgamation. Given these aforementioned limitations, we consider Dower’s (2019) culturally sensitive universalism as a philosophically grounded and theoretically informed approach to illuminate future ecotourism development of Franklin’s Shipwrecks. To embark on this inquiry we acknowledge Rigney’s (1999) words: “therefore, the Indigenous context of knowledge production and research methodologies is about countering racism and including Indigenous knowledges and experiences for Indigenous emancipation” (p. 119; see also Seale, 1992). As such, we centre this engagement as one that is situated within processes that enact collaboration with the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit or as Holmes et al. (2016) state: an “Indigenist paradigm”, in which the priorities, expertise, control, and benefits associated with tourism research are centred on Indigenous peoples and communities” (p. 118).

**Processes and outcomes**

To embrace an “Indigenist paradigm” and centre culturally sensitive universalism regarding the Franklin Shipwrecks and the blurred confluence within which they exist, we must engage with the ‘global ethic’ of Indigenous self-determination. As a ‘global ethic’, Indigenous self-determination intertwines the understanding that the Inuit Guardians' Program for the Franklin Shipwrecks was always already comprised of community members from Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) who possess inherent rights to management, oversight, and cultural responsibility. These inherent rights built into the core principles of the Inuit Guardians Program further re-inscribe the values within Indigenous self-determination through the UNDRIP and Larrakia Declaration as salient to the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit. In this way, the ‘global ethic’ of Indigenous self-determination becomes both a process and an outcome. The process of Indigenous self-determination occurs through ecotourism development practices that incorporate research methodologies that evoke “a consensus of shared values” (Dower, 2019, p. 26) through morally and culturally significant narratives. This engagement in consensus seeking collaborations fosters space for the elucidation of Indigenous communities understanding of authentic development (Holmes et al., 2016). Indigenous self-determination within these methods are premised upon “prompt respectful dialogue among various actors and avenues toward collectively realising sustainable, responsible, and culturally appropriate visitor behaviours on Indigenous homelands” (Holmes et al., 2016, p. 1190). However, this work must not, as Higgins-Desbiolles (2007) identified, enact Indigenous self-determination as a stakeholder issue but rather Indigenous self-determination as autonomy in the who, what, when, where, and why ecotourism occurs on and within their traditional territory. In this way, culturally sensitive ecotourism development must intentionally combat what Grimwood, Muldoon, and Stevens (2019) identify as harmful narratives and practices within tourism that continue to “obscure, historicize, and essentialize Indigenous cultures” (p. 244) and their self-determination.

We previously outlined that the Holmes et al. (2016) code of conduct would not be applicable within the context of our case study. However, we can glean insights from the narrative and consensus building processes used by Holmes et al. (2016) that would be relevant when engaging Indigenous self-determination through culturally sensitive universalism. Holmes et al.’s (2016) process operationalised collaborative community-based research (CCBR) which as Glass et al. (2018) identify:

> Seek[s] to hear and respond respectfully and with critical care to the voices, truths, and visions of communities long marginalized in the dominant world … [Being]
committed to working with [local] communities to conduct research that mobilizes knowledge so that it can speak with ethical, epistemic, and political force.

(Glass et al., 2018, p. 525)

Holmes et al. (2016) go beyond purely working with an Indigenous community and instead engage in Indigenous-driven research specifically as it “affords opportunities for enhancing [Indigenous] self-determination” (p. 1188). Through a series of consultation workshops, Holmes et al. (2016) demonstrate a process of: first, seeking initial agreement and mutual benefits for both the researchers and community; and second, pinpointing “expectations, priorities, and timelines for the research project, including the various roles and responsibilities of community and university researchers” (Holmes et al., 2016, p. 1182) prior to data collection. This engagement with Indigenous voices prior to the development process enacted by Holmes et al. (2016) did not only contribute to the development of a code of conduct. Rather, the communities self-determined values create the “justifications for judgments about the right and wrong ways of conducting [both research and ecotourism]” (Drydyk & Keleher, 2019b, p. 2) within their context.

For us as authors to speculate exactly on a code of conduct for ecotourism to the Franklin Shipwrecks would, in this case study, seem incongruent with culturally sensitive universalism. Rather—we acknowledge that for the Franklin Shipwrecks—the substantive principles or practices of the code of conduct require the direct involvement and capacities of the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit. As such, we offer a recommended process for creating a code of conduct that embraces culturally sensitive universalism and Indigenous self-determination. We previously highlighted three normative approaches that have been researched within development. These are: development as either economically essential or economically conditional to growth, or growth that is unrelated to economics and development altogether (Dower, 2011a). Further, engaging cultural sensitivity in ecotourism development could also materialise as no development whatsoever. In this manner, integrating culturally sensitive universalism as a foundation for ecotourism development with Indigenous communities engages the process of Indigenous self-determination in the co-creation of (non)development. This additionally forefronts Indigenous self-determination as an outcome generated by the community and enables the potential for other processes and outcomes (e.g., the development of a code of conduct).

Recommendations and conclusions

Abiding the commitment of the Canadian government to empower Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit in the management of the Franklin Shipwrecks and presuming that future tourism is desired to these sites, we recommend that Parks Canada or their assigned agent recall Dower’s (2019) note that to arrive at a consensus of values, flexibility is required. In a practical sense, this is similar to what Grimwood and Doubleday (2013a) identify within adaptive co-management as a space where “differences can be shared for common aims … related to and affecting place, meaning, and management” (p. 13). As such, the Franklin Shipwrecks as a co-managed site requires respect for and commitment to Indigenous paradigms when developing a code of conduct. Similar to Holmes et al.’s (2016) engagement with the Lutsel K’e Dene First Nation, Parks Canada could enact culturally sensitive universalism through the following processes and outcomes:

1. Enact Indigenous self-determination as an inherent ‘global ethic’.
   a. Other universal values and norms must appertain to this ‘global ethic’ (e.g., the other values and norms within the UNDRIP).
2. Non-Inuit stakeholders of the Franklin Shipwrecks must embrace Dower’s (2019) culturally sensitive universalism, understanding that their values must be flexible such that a consensus of Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit community values can be elucidated.

3. Conduct consultation workshops where:
   a. Codes of conduct are determined to be desired and are mutually beneficial.
   b. The research process and outcomes identified by the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit are agreed to by all external parties.
      i. Understand that the process and outcomes will be unique to the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit.

4. Follow the agreed upon processes while researching and developing the code of conduct.
   a. Conduct Indigenous-driven research that engages CCBR and the Indigenist Paradigm of the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit.

5. Verify that the produced code of conduct is a culturally sensitive representation of the desires of Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit.

In this chapter, we’ve aimed to supplement the tourism literature with ethical, moral, and theoretical insights by introducing Global and Development Ethics as salient concepts for ecotourism practitioners, especially those working in ecotourism development. Through articulating Dower’s (2019) culturally sensitive universalism we demonstrate the bridging that can be achieved when the universal values and norms of global ethics connect with local priorities of development ethics to justify development outcomes. In framing our discussion around the Franklin Shipwrecks and the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit, we identify a ‘global ethic’—Indigenous self-determination—as a salient universal concept for tourism practices that engage with Indigenous communities like Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven).

While we emphasised Indigenous self-determination as a salient ‘global ethic’ within this context, the UNDRIP encompasses 45 other articles that are affirmed in the Larrakia Declaration as equally salient to any ecotourism development that might occur in the context of the Franklin Shipwrecks or the Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven) Inuit (United Nations, 2007; United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), 2012). In this way, Dower’s (2019) culturally sensitive universalism enables tourism development researchers, practitioners and governments to embrace “values that are universal and responsibilities that are global in scope” (Dower, 2011b, p. 505) while enacting “authentic development … [that] is ultimately human development; [where] what is appropriate is context specific” (Dower, 2011a, p. 781).

This chapter supplements current ethical and moral discourses (e.g., Fennell, 2019) within ecotourism and enables scholars, practitioners, and governments to think through culturally sensitive universalism. As such, we suggest that engagement with ecotourism and more specifically Indigenous ecotourism should affirm the values and norms of contextually appropriate ‘global ethic’ while maintaining cultural sensitivity that is situated within community realised understandings of development outcomes. In the end, a code of conduct for the Franklin Shipwrecks is not provided, rather, we provide recommendations for how culturally sensitive universalism might be enacted when developing a code of conduct. This work continues the moral turn in tourism, by demonstrating the utility of using global ethics and development ethics to think through culturally sensitive universalism as process and outcome that enables engagement with Indigenous-led approaches.
Note

We use global ethics and development ethics to discuss the fields of study. We use ‘global ethic’ and ‘development ethic’ to discuss codes of ethics or other accepted ethical principles.
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