

A Comparison of Ideas in the Development and Governance of National Parks and Protected Areas in the US and Canada

Rosalind Warner

Numéro 37, 2008

Canadian Challenges
Les défis canadiens

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/040793ar>
DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/040793ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Conseil international d'études canadiennes

ISSN

1180-3991 (imprimé)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Warner, R. (2008). A Comparison of Ideas in the Development and Governance of National Parks and Protected Areas in the US and Canada. *International Journal of Canadian Studies / Revue internationale d'études canadiennes*, (37), 13–39. <https://doi.org/10.7202/040793ar>

Résumé de l'article

Ce document compare des idées sur l'histoire et la gouvernance des parcs nationaux aux États-Unis et au Canada pour expliquer la raison d'être de la création de parcs nationaux et d'aires protégées. Les comparaisons de l'histoire des parcs nationaux canadiens et américains ont révélé peu de différences importantes, sauf peut-être qu'on met beaucoup moins l'accent sur la préservation dans les parcs canadiens. Ce document utilise deux axes principaux pour comparer des idées sur la gouvernance des parcs aux États-Unis et au Canada : le premier comprend la justification discursive et culturelle de la restriction du développement et l'autre est le degré de leadership gouvernemental et de planification consciente, ou l'étatisme, dans la gouvernance des parcs. Un sondage sur les histoires respectives de la gouvernance des parcs mène à la conclusion qu'il existe des différences entre les États-Unis et le Canada en matière de gouvernance des parcs. Néanmoins, elles résultent en grande partie de l'*interaction* et des relations historiques entre les deux pays plutôt que des différences ou des ressemblances culturelles inhérentes concernant la notion de « milieu sauvage ». Les conclusions portent sur les effets de la tendance des modèles canadiens de développement économique à suivre d'avantage les voies déjà établies et, par conséquent, à restreindre la résistance au développement économique dans les parcs.

Rosalind Warner

A Comparison of Ideas in the Development and Governance of National Parks and Protected Areas in the US and Canada

Abstract

This paper uses a comparison of ideas in US and Canadian national parks history and governance to explain the rationale for the development of national parks and protected areas. Comparisons of the Canadian and US national parks history have either noted few significant differences, or have argued that there has been far less emphasis on preservation in Canadian parks governance. This paper uses two main axes to compare ideas about parks governance in the US and Canada: the first involves the discursive and cultural justification for restricting development; and the second is the degree of governmental leadership and conscious planning, or statism, that goes into parks governance. A survey of the respective histories of parks governance leads to the conclusion that differences between the US and Canada in parks governance exist. Nevertheless, these are largely a result of the historical interaction and relationship between the two countries, rather than inherent cultural differences or similarities in notions of "wilderness." Conclusions centre on the effects of the tendency for Canadian patterns of economic development to produce greater path dependency and hence to restrict resistance to economic development within parks.

Résumé

Ce document compare des idées sur l'histoire et la gouvernance des parcs nationaux aux États-Unis et au Canada pour expliquer la raison d'être de la création de parcs nationaux et d'aires protégées. Les comparaisons de l'histoire des parcs nationaux canadiens et américains ont révélé peu de différences importantes, sauf peut-être qu'on met beaucoup moins l'accent sur la préservation dans les parcs canadiens. Ce document utilise deux axes principaux pour comparer des idées sur la gouvernance des parcs aux États-Unis et au Canada : le premier comprend la justification discursive et culturelle de la restriction du développement et l'autre est le degré de leadership gouvernemental et de planification consciente, ou l'étatisme, dans la gouvernance des parcs. Un sondage sur les histoires respectives de la gouvernance des parcs mène à la conclusion qu'il existe des différences entre les États-Unis et le Canada en matière de gouvernance des parcs. Néanmoins, elles résultent en grande partie de l'interaction et des relations historiques entre les deux pays plutôt que des différences ou des ressemblances culturelles inhérentes concernant la notion de « milieu sauvage ». Les conclusions portent sur les effets de la tendance des modèles canadiens de développement économique à suivre d'avantage les voies déjà établies et, par

conséquent, à restreindre la résistance au développement économique dans les parcs.

The arguments that surround parks and protected areas in Canada are not new, but they have new resonance. In an age of climate change, pollution, and resource depletion, there is growing concern for human–nature relationships generally. Parks exemplify the contradictions and purposes of environmental governance. National parks and other protected areas are constructed from conflicting values, visions, and images and therefore are sites of struggle. Ideas about parks affect their governance in various ways. The language used to describe parks urges different courses of action: if parks are tourist destinations, then governance involves facilitating the visiting infrastructure and this includes maintaining services and amenities. If parks are viewed as biological habitats for wildlife, then governance involves preserving those features of ecological integrity that support that purpose. The ideas and sets of shared linguistic practices that enable governance to have meaning are as important to parks as are the budgets, revenues, and human resources that permit them to be maintained over time.

This paper uses a comparison of ideas in US and Canadian national parks history and governance to explain the rationale for the development of national parks and protected areas. The development of parks in the US and Canada followed parallel paths, primarily because Canadian parks were modelled on the US example. While the pathways of parks development reflected the competitive economic relationship between the US and Canada, Canadian parks governance took explicitly different paths in response to developments in the US. Canadian administrators tried to avoid the problems that they saw occurring in the US, but were also more motivated by US competition to exploit parks for commercial tourist uses. Subtle differences in the context of ideas about parks therefore affected the pathways of parks governance.

Two main axes are used to compare ideas about parks governance in the US and Canada: the first involves the discursive and cultural justification for restricting development. Rationales for restricting development can be distinguished by their focus on the intrinsic value of an area's natural properties or on their instrumental value as sources of material advantage. A second axis of comparison is the degree of governmental leadership and conscious planning that goes into parks governance. Statism refers to the degree of planning involved in governance, and includes the idea of parks as a long-term public trust. This concept draws upon work in the comparative economic development of Canada and the US, especially the work of McDougall, who draws upon W.T. Easterbrook. Easterbrook's argument is that Canadian economic development is distinguished by the greater planning and involvement of the state as a response to the threat posed by American domination and competition. In sum, he argues, the Canadian

pattern of economic development is in general more concentrated, conservative, protective and defensive (McDougall 2006, 78). Correspondingly, the pattern of Canadian development has been more “path dependent” and persistent, referring to the tendency of the “consequences of initial social choices to limit the range of choices available in the future” (McDougall 2006, 79). This, I argue, was as true in the areas of national parks governance as it was in virtually every area of national development, from Macdonald’s National Policy to the welfare state.

Wilderness

With respect to the question of intrinsic or instrumental value of parks protection, existing work that compares the US and Canadian parks system makes some distinction between the preservation of wilderness areas for tourist development and the protection of wilderness for its own sake. However, the history of parks governance in both countries includes hardly any effort to preserve wilderness in a pristine state or to protect areas for reasons having little to do with human needs or interests. In fact, for example, in Roderick Nash’s article on the “Invention of National Parks,” arguments for the intrinsic value of nature are often conflated with arguments for the protection of wilderness, to the point of representing insignificant differences. Rather, Nash makes the point that parks were unique to the US in the way that they worked to protect wilderness in the public interest. Protection of nature for its own sake and for the national good are not analytically distinguished (Nash 1970).

Comparisons of the Canadian and US national parks history have either noted few significant differences, or have contributed to the conventional wisdom that there has been little public support for preservation of parks in Canada, and far less emphasis on preservation in Canadian parks governance. For example, the Canadian parks system is disparaged by Nash as a wholly derivative effort, and Canadian support for nature protection is unfavourably compared to Americans’ sensitivity to the value of nature protection and willingness to confront efforts to develop parks. Similarly, Robert Turner and William Rees’ article in *Nature Canada* in 1973 states: “there was no popular movement for wilderness and national park protection in Canada! Clearly the growing national park systems of the two countries were springing from different soils” (32). They go on to argue that the US focus on nature protection occurred much earlier and was much slower to develop in Canada, where the emphasis was on “tourism and intensive recreational development” (34). This, they argue, was a result of the relative abundance of undeveloped areas in Canada and the impression that protection was, consequently, less urgent a matter. In response, as Karen Jones argues, the literature on Canadian natural parks history has tried to distinguish Canada’s contribution by focusing on the greater role of the state as compared with the rugged individualism of the American

history, and has emphasized Canadians' greater sensitivity to the natural environment (Jones 2002, 12).

While it may be true that differences in the history of parks governance exist, it is not necessary to conclude that these differences are a result of a greater or lesser national culture of protection or awareness of nature. It is not that the US and Canada have different ecological values, or that Canadians value nature less because they "have more of it." Neither country has a monopoly on ecological values. This does not mean that subtle differences in the cultural traditions and patterns of economic and social development are not important to parks governance. It is the historical *interaction* and relationship between the two countries, and the process of learning and reacting to learning, that has produced divergences in the national parks system. In both countries, moreover, the history of national parks development reveals more about the changing human needs, visions, and interests in the natural world than it does about the relative strength of preservationist values.

Although this paper focuses on parks governance, that term is used broadly to include not only the legislative and regulatory history of parks development, but also the cultural ideas that justified both the creation of parks and their continued development and expansion. As well, I make an analytical distinction between different justifications for parks governance as a first axis of comparison. While the language of intrinsic value has never been dominant, the American parks pioneers justified parks using a language of ethical preservationism that invested the state with a public trust to preserve them in as natural a state as possible. In Canada, in contrast, parks were viewed initially as environmental instruments vested with the purpose of assisting in state economic development, including tourism. Over time, the language of intrinsic value has moved closer to the centre of Canadian parks mission, through the concept of ecological integrity. In both the US and Canada, the expression of appreciation for the beauty of natural areas was a strong motivating factor for limiting development. However, this was primarily an instrumental view of the value of protection rather than one based on arguments for the intrinsic value of pristine wilderness for its own sake. In addition, with respect to the second axis of statism, the role of the state as a guarantor of the security of protected areas changed over time and in response to political and social developments. Despite these very different origins and historical trajectories, however, policies in the US and Canada have not been sufficiently divergent to demonstrate that ecological integrity is an innovative, permanent, and deep departure from historical trends in North American practice.

Debates about the historical development of the North American national parks system have focused on the meaning and influence of "wilderness" as an immediate reason for park formation. William Cronon's influential work on the wilderness idea reflects the (now) consensus view

that wilderness is not independent, a “pristine sanctuary where the last remnant of an untouched, endangered, but still transcendent nature can ... be encountered without the contaminating taint of civilization” (1996, 69). Rather, wilderness is a paradox, a “human construct, deeply informed by human values, even if those values alter from one époque to another” (MacLaren 1999, 7).

There is disagreement over whether the wilderness ideal was really a motivation for parks creation. Theodore Binnema and Melanie Niemi articulate well the consensus view that the immediate reasons for parks formation in Canada and the US, and indeed globally, were to facilitate tourism and hunting by Western middle-class and upper-class visitors rather than to preserve wilderness in a pristine state (Binnema and Niemi 2006). Binnema and Niemi argue that the removal of Native people and restriction of Aboriginal hunting in Banff National Park was less an effort to keep the area pristine than an effort to conserve game for the benefit of visiting hunters. Binnema and Niemi’s argument really does not contest the idea that hunters themselves viewed parks as representations of wilderness (as they imagined it to be) with Aboriginal people included as part of the tableau. But the question is less what wilderness represented than it is what the rationale for protection would be.

This argument sparks an interesting contrast between wilderness as an imagined world in which natural processes would be left to occur absent of human habitation and involvement, and wilderness as a feature of parks that would serve as representations of these natural processes for the benefit of visitors. Parks cannot be understood as wilderness in the first sense, and probably were never understood in that sense even from their inception. However, there is more doubt as to whether parks were meant to *represent* wilderness to hunters, tourists, and fishers. In this, the question of intrinsic versus instrumental rationales for parks is more helpful, since it illuminates differences in the rationale for park protection measures, including hunting restrictions, rather than differences in the wilderness imagery that parks represented.

The idea of wilderness was deeply tied up with the colonial project of civilization. Colonial relationships imbued nature with great meaning. The environment and environmental problems were as much about rulers and ruled, as they were about the biophysical qualities that scientists observed in nature. Parks were more about human needs, desires, and interests (including relative to other communities of humans, even “uncivilized”) as they were about their natural properties. As Arnold argues, during the late nineteenth century colonial era, “alien landscapes were often imbued with as much importance as peoples or cultures themselves. Landscapes ... and climate and disease, were endowed with great moral significance” (1996, 141). In some ways, then, the debate over “wilderness” is telling in that it illustrates the very paradoxical nature of the wilderness ideal as a colonial

construct rather than a construct of wilderness. In the colonial imagination, Native people and wilderness were both “uncivilized” and this was the primary justification for instituting colonial regulation and control; but it was also the primary justification for protection of parks through that same system of control.

Building on this insight, another issue concerns the relationship between parks as a public trust and parks as environmental goods, in other words, instruments for the larger ends of state economic development. Protecting areas means effectively removing them from some more economically productive uses, and therefore imposes costs in exchange for non-economic benefits. It is in the nature of a public trust that protection not be asserted only when market forces have failed to find a more productive use, or only when areas are not otherwise viable. This dictates an ecological epistemology based on the intrinsic value of an area. The language of intrinsic value is a means of escaping a colonial relationship to nature, and arguably, is virtually inescapable if parks are to continue to be justified and protected from development in the future. This is not to say that appeals to intrinsic value are *sufficient* to achieve this, but rather, that little can really be done in their absence. For example, in the discussion of Native peoples' exclusion from parks, it is the reduction of parks and Native people to *only* symbolic repositories of wilderness (the “uncivilized”) for the enjoyment of visitors that is to be regretted, not the construction of a pristine wilderness image itself. This instrumental approach is very different from valuing an area for its intrinsic properties. A test of protected areas governance is whether parks achieve the purpose of resisting the tendency for anthropocentric development and growth, and not just compromising, or balancing, among different uses. This highlights the ethical ambiguity concerning the dividing line between parks as a public trust and as environmental goods. The obligation of a public environmental trustee does not necessarily mean linking protection to a romanticized view of wilderness protection, but it does suggest an argument for the intrinsic value of the object of protection.

The view of parks as an instrument and environmental good is pervasive. For example, parks in both the US and Canada are often described as repositories of “natural and cultural heritage” (Auditor General of Canada 1996; see also Baird 1967) and they are closely associated with the national identity (Auditor General of Canada 1996; see also Baird 1967). While parks are such repositories, these statements do not explain the reasons for setting aside protected areas and thus imposing costs. Government statements also sometimes tend to emphasize the commonality of environmental concern within society as the underlying driver of wilderness protection movements and legislation.

The Formation of the US National Parks System: Preservationist Origins

The argument for the creation of national parks in the US drew upon the Romantic notions of landscapes, wilderness, and island paradise; and the idea of pristine and spiritual nature necessarily enclosed within protected geographical zones and separated from “civilized” environments (Grove 1995). Parks creation was (eventually) justified using the language of intrinsic value, and parks were viewed as a public, even sacred, trust. However, in the US the spirited debate between conservationists (who favoured overt management of the natural processes within parks) and preservationists (who preferred to limit human interventions) created a polarization that was not replicated in Canadian debates about parks. Preservationists developed their arguments in response to the conservationist challenge, while in Canada conservationists did not assume that wilderness composed a pristine natural environment worthy of protection until later (Binnema and Niemi 2006, 734). Importantly, preservationists prioritized the educational value of wilderness visiting over the commercial benefits, and so keeping areas pristine was a priority. The idea that appreciation of nature had educational value was not exclusive to the US, but it was given much greater attention.

In classic preservationism, temporary or short-term travel to pristine environments was understood to be a means of fostering and cultivating an appreciation of the non-human world, essentially (and perhaps paradoxically) it was a civilizing educational and cultural activity. The establishment of hiking clubs, mountaineering clubs, and hunting and birdwatching activities in the late 19th century coincided with the cultural association of wilderness with health, leisure, and recreation. The Boone and Crockett Club, formed in the US in 1887, was an influential outdoor club devoted to hiking, fishing, and hunting and counted Theodore Roosevelt among its members (1999, 112). Through these new social activities and networks, collective action became organized around hiking clubs like the Appalachian Mountain Club, formed in 1876, and the Sierra Club, formed in 1892 (Neimark and Mott 1999, 80–81).

It is important to note, as Cronon has done, that this view of wilderness was a radical, if not revolutionary, departure from the centuries of fear, mistrust, and foreboding with which wilderness had traditionally been regarded. Wolves, for example, were the quintessential symbol of untamed, dangerous nature. Along with coyotes, badgers, and other “vermin,” wolves were subjected to organized programmes of extermination coordinated between the wardens of Yellowstone and Banff National Parks. At the same time, wolves were preserved for display inside museums and zoos, where their menacing figures could be safely encountered (Jones 2002, 111–119). This image of danger and adventure coexisted with a process of psychological “taming” of wilderness.

This taming was a result of the confluence of a variety of social, economic, and technological factors. It was an outcome of the industrial revolution, the rise of a socially and economically mobile middle class, and the consolidation of European empires, among other things. Nevertheless, as Cronon argues, “as the frontier recedes, the wilderness ceases to be either an opportunity for progress or an occasion for terror. Instead, it becomes scenery” (1996, 81).

John Muir played a key role in instituting this cultural shift through his very influential writings of the period. His sequence of “Sierra Studies” in the *Overland Monthly* and his articles in the *Century Magazine* gave him a national reputation (Teale 1982, xiv). Although motivated to write about his experiences in the wild to entice others to visit as well, Muir’s wilderness life was far from being the kind of leisurely tour that nature tourism by train or car would become. Muir would set out with only tea and bread, would wander through the high country without a blanket or overcoat, and never carried a gun. To use the words of Teale: “John Muir, faring forth into the wilderness unarmed and alone, was the man unafraid. He was unafraid of danger, of hardship, of wildness, of being alone, of facing death. He was unafraid of public opinion. He was unafraid of work and poverty and hunger. He knew them all and he remained unafraid” (1982, xiii). His conviction of the need for wilderness preservation was almost religious, and his work to establish protected areas where others could experience the same education and inspiration was unparalleled.

Similarly, Cornelius Hedges, one of Yellowstone National Park’s first advocates, was touched by the concern to preserve wilderness so that it was “never to be changed but to be kept sacred always” (qtd. in Marty 1984, 64). Yellowstone National Park was established as a public park under the exclusive control of the Secretary of the Interior in 1872 (National Parks Service). However, from its inception until 1886 when the U.S. Army moved into the park, Yellowstone underwent wholesale destruction by squatters, poachers, bandits, and ranchers. This neglect by the government, which may have been a result of the fact that parks lacked a single departmental overseer, illustrated vividly for preservationists the need for active state control and intervention to prevent abuses by the unscrupulous and avaricious. While the formation of the National Parks Service in 1916 is sometimes heralded as a watershed in protection, as Jones states, its “legislative tenets ... betrayed notable continuities with past acts. The preservation of scenery remained top priority, followed by natural and historic objects, with ‘wild life’ in third place” (2002, 31). Preserving wilderness in its pristine state came to mean, ironically, intervening actively to control both human and nonhuman activities that posed a threat to the pristine state of the park. It was not, however, about preserving the intrinsic value of areas for their own sake.

Beauty, and what Cronon refers to as the “sublime” were extremely important in advancing the discourse of preservation. The beauty of wilderness was graphically depicted by painters, artists, writers and photographers, whose work became widely disseminated and appreciated. These works invited visitors to experience these settings personally and intimately. The pictures that John Muir painted with words were equally powerful. Muir can be directly credited with the creation of the protected areas of the Grand Canyon, the Sierras, and Yosemite National Parks, and indirectly through the Sierra Club, with many others (Hart 1983, 41). However, as the above suggests, the linkage between preservationist discourse, like Muir’s allusions to “the natural cathedral,” and the political processes of parks creation and development, is less straightforward.

The fierce debate over the flooding of the Hetch Hetchy Valley, from 1908 to 1913, galvanized the cleavage between conservationists and preservationists. This debate crystallized the preservationists’ focus on wilderness protection and the intrinsic value of nature in a way that was more blurred in Canada. The city of San Francisco proposed to dam the Tuolumne River within the bounds of Yosemite National Park, sparking a virulent debate that captured the imagination of the public and established the terms for discussion of environmental issues for many years to come. James Phelan, in a letter to *Outlook* in 1909, argued that “President Roosevelt, Secretary of the Interior Garfield, Forester Pinchot, will yield to none in their love of nature; yet they strongly favor this bill” (to flood the Valley as a reservoir for San Francisco). In his book *The Yosemite*, Muir countered, “landscape gardens, places of recreation and worship, are never made beautiful by destroying and burying them” (Muir 1999, 132–133). Against rising opposition, in a letter to *Outlook* in 1909, James Phelan argued that the flooding of the Hetch Hetchy Valley would create a crystal clear lake, “a natural object of indeed rare beauty.” John Muir countered that “the beautiful sham lake . . . would be only an eyesore, a dismal blot on the landscape” (Muir 1999, 132–133; see also Cronon 1996, 72). Muir depicted the lake’s unnatural origins and processes in ways that cast doubt on humans’ abilities to replicate this natural beauty, and so stood in sharp contrast to the conservationists’ favourable view of human intervention, however limited.

While parks and protected areas were a necessary precondition to the kinds of educational appreciation that Muir desired, it is less clear that these were sufficient to achieving the goals that he described. The language of intrinsic value remained secondary to instrumental concerns, especially the well-managed interpretation of the meaning of parks by government and industry. Although interpretation was something that Muir felt was necessary, his focus was always on the direct, personal experience of wilderness, and indeed he viewed writing and discussion as getting in the way of his more important fieldwork. The infrastructure of park access and the dissemination and reproduction of wilderness images made Muir’s

message of direct personal experience subject to discursive revision. This revision found no contradiction in the “use” of pristine natural lands for public enjoyment, but rather it made the form and purpose of that use the central problematique. Images, narrative descriptions of natural beauty, and the wide dissemination of these materials of interpretation framed both wilderness and the parks experience as tamed and accessible, rather than as valuable for their intrinsic properties of “wilderness.”

The enclosure and “taming” of wilderness areas into parks suitable for tourism, hunting, and fishing necessitated their separation from the world of civilization. Preservation at first implied a retreat, an essentially private and “direct personal relationship with the non-human” (Worster 1994, 351). The private contemplation of natural beauty was an ideal that prefigured later Romantic elements of the 1960s environmental populism. The arguments for the preservation of wilderness for its intrinsic value were present, however, the relationship between humans and nature eventually was seen as one worth nurturing for the public good, and importantly, preservationists came to understand natural environments such as forests and rivers as national property (Guha 2000, 27).

The preservationist movement that fostered the national parks system in the US exemplified a patriotism and pride in a natural heritage (see Davenport and Rao 2002, 34) and the sense that (in the case of the US) westward expansion and development threatened the loss of wild areas whose cultural value lay beyond economic calculations. Frederick J. Turner’s essay on the closing of the American frontier by the Census Report of 1890 is an important marking point for this enclosure (Turner 1999, 121) and reinforced the sense that nature’s mysteries, along with the expanse of the frontier, were by this time mostly conquered. Ultimately, these shifts shaped both visitors’ own impressions of their experience and of the value and meaning of nature. Wilderness was seen as a public educational resource, renewable and transferable to future generations through the institutions and governance infrastructure of parks. This view was reiterated with an Executive Order transferring lands to the authority of the National Parks Service in 1933, which emphasized the inclusion of areas of national significance as well as those natural areas to be preserved “for the enjoyment of future generations” (National Parks Service). The geologic wonders of Yellowstone were grouped together with the historical features of presidential residences as national treasures to be preserved intact and unspoiled for their educational value.

In the US, the idea of national parks as a public trust was accompanied by a managerialism that saw greater state involvement in national parks management. The trend away from protection and toward conservationist management deepened through the Depression, as “visits to national parks soared from 6.3 million in 1934 to 16.2 million in 1938” (McCormick 1989, 21). National parks, begun as symbols of “unspoiled” wilderness, gradually

became political and cultural symbols of national pride and the objects of social engineering. While the early values of park management had followed a “scenic wonders” view which held the parks in a kind of historical “art museum,” gradually this was replaced with a “more temporally extended view that included manipulation of successional processes to obtain certain ends, often a more ideal or stable type of biota” (Bratton 1985, 128). Just as the welfare state was an extension of state management and control into the market economy, so parks became extensions of state management of the natural world in general. Conservationist justifications were therefore closely associated with large-scale extension of state powers. Through the 1930s, state management of many aspects of private life was increasingly accepted, and centralized control of parks was no exception. In an era that saw the first large-scale state projects to regulate and manage natural resources, like the Hoover Dam and the Tennessee Valley Authority, statism became the norm. It is interesting to note, however, that this centralization came later than it had in Canada, where statism was far more accepted.

In line with the enclosure of parks and the consolidation of state control, the preservationists’ focus on the pristine beauty of age-old vistas and the intrinsic value of wilderness preservation became challenged by the conservationist value of deliberate management. Although in part driven by the development of scientific ecology and an improved understanding of ecological dynamics, the shift to conservationist management further authorized the development of parks specifically for public recreational uses, and not just for individual civilizational and educational value. The scientific principles of conservationist management held considerable currency in the US until around the 1960s, when an “outdoor recreation crisis” occurred in which visits to national parks began to exceed the capacities of these facilities. Concern began to be expressed over the ecological damage that recreational use was creating (Foresta 1984, 62). However, by this time, to use the words of Bratton, the attitude was that “we think we’ve done it all” (1985, 126).

By the 1960s, the recognition of increasing problems led to a preservationist resurgence and critique of development plans. The response was to return to the idea of promoting nature tourism as an educational activity, one that was accessible to a mass public market rather than simply an elite activity. In the US, Bratton refers to this as the “people plus” era of management, begun with Mission 66, a ten-year program begun in 1956 to “rejuvenate old ... facilities, to improve roads, and to build many new developments, including 130 new visitor centers” (1985, 126–27). Conservation involved the reworking of visiting as an educational activity. Visits were designed to foster appreciation for the need to preserve wilderness, and therefore create the conditions for a popular support base to maintain parks. The idea that state involvement is justified by the need to

protect parks as a public trust had completely overshadowed the idea that parks are naturalistic representations of a pristine wilderness.

Canada Follows Suit (Sort of)

Lessons arising from the haphazard governance example in the US were also noted by the Canadian government in setting down the terms of national parks in its first legislation. As Marty states: "although there were no homilies on the value of wilderness in the Act, one very important word was used in connection with the minister's power in 1887: the word 'preservation'" (1984, 64). Early advocates of parks were also populists, and they marked the national parks with the features of a public good, manageable by the state to ensure "a broader sharing of environmental amenities than the private market could provide" (Hays 1998, 341). Public governance in the public trust was, consequently, viewed by many preservationists as key to protecting wilderness.

In Canada, however, the instrumental value of wilderness was more explicitly projected in terms of tourism, which had a primary goal of aiding in state economic development, with the educational and civilizing value of natural encounters as a secondary goal. The culture of nature tourism was first culturally constructed through the commercial activities of the CPR. The CPR published billboards, brochures and travel diaries, and sponsored artistic and photographic works and exhibits to entice visitors. A culture of nature tourism did not emerge spontaneously or autonomously but was deliberately constructed in the historical context of industrialization, urbanization, and the growth of a new middle class.

Similar to the "closing of the frontier," the "taming" of the wilderness was symbolized in Canada by the completion of the CPR line and the "last spike" in 1885. To paraphrase Pierre Berton, the "CPR became the symbolic linchpin of the nation, and the mountain parks, led by Banff, became part of this national dream" (Banff-Bow Valley Study 1996, 16). The CPR's William Cornelius Van Horne worked closely with the government to advance the cause of national parks creation. Undoubtedly, as Hart has cogently argued, Van Horne's motives were primarily economic. He saw the mountain section as the primary source of tourist revenue to recoup some of the losses incurred in constructing the line through mountains. Nevertheless, when Van Horne approached William Pearce, the Superintendent of Mines, about creating a park at Lac des Arc on the rail line, Pearce expressed misgivings that if the land were given to the CPR it would build power plants at some point in the future and thereby destroy the scenery (Luxton 1975, 54).

The interpretation and dissemination of nature's beauty was a well-managed commercial process. Van Horne's philosophy of "capitalizing the scenery" led directly to a well-orchestrated campaign to promote Canadian

mountain destinations to tourists from Britain and the eastern seaboard of the United States (Hart 1983, 55; see also Marty 1984, 48). This campaign included the production of pamphlets, illustrated train schedules, published testimonial accounts and even billboards depicting the mountain scenery and emphasizing the hunting, fishing, and mountaineering potential of the “Canadian Alps.” In addition, in 1885 Van Horne financed tours by members of Parliament and later, by the Prime Minister and his wife, to the Pacific coast with stopovers at Banff and visits to the nearby Cave and Basin Hot Springs (Hart 1983, 55). Van Horne, an aspiring amateur artist himself, and the CPR, did much to foster the “dedication to nature at its most sublime [that] was affecting Canadian art” (Hart 1983, 31).

The reservation of the 260-square-mile Rocky Mountains Park (later Banff National Park) was given royal assent in 1887, with it being envisioned as a “great place of resort ... there is beautiful scenery, there are the curative properties of the water, there is a genial climate, there is prairie sport and there is mountain sport; and I have no doubt that it will be a great watering place” (Sir John A. Macdonald quoted in Hart 1983, 55). As to this last, the rush for the government to step in and establish the park was borne of the need to protect the Cave and Basin Hot Springs in 1885 (Binnema and Niemi 2006, 728). Ultimately, as can be seen from MacDonal’s words, the goal was to develop these along the lines of, and in competition with, Arkansas Hot Springs in the US (Nash 1970, 734). Under these circumstances, Banff joined Yellowstone and Royal National Park in Australia as the world’s third and largest national park reserved for the preservation and enjoyment of wilderness (Marty 1984, 41).

The “taming” and “encircling” of wilderness is aptly illustrated in the following quote from Agnes Macdonald, wife of Sir John A. Macdonald, during their journey over the CPR rail line:

Every turn becomes a fresh mystery, for some huge mountain seemed to stand right across our way, barring it for miles, with a stern face frowning down upon us; and yet a few minutes later we find the giant has been encircled and conquered, and soon lies far away in another direction (Hart 1983, 24).

At the same time, early travelers would have been familiar with the destruction of wildfires, floods, and avalanches, and so the “taming” of wilderness was, for them, far from complete. The inherent attractiveness of mountain scenery was also not obvious to early visitors. As Marty says “there was little aesthetic enthusiasm for wilderness in the Great Lone Land of the northwest, which was one vast stretch of wilderness punctuated by the lights of isolated villages and farms” (1984, 42). Hazards affected travel to a significant degree through the CPR line, and resulted in frequent delays and discomfort for passengers. In addition, by 1887 with the Park’s inception, the Bow Valley was far from pristine, with the destructiveness reaching a peak with the devastating fires of 1889, caused by the

combination of dry felled timber and sparks from the locomotives. Nevertheless, Van Horne's pamphlets conveyed a very different image:

There will be no hardships to endure, no difficulties to overcome, and no dangers or annoyances whatever. You shall see mighty rivers, vast forests, boundless plains, stupendous mountains and wonder innumerable; and you shall see all in comfort, nay in luxury (Hart 1983, 25; see also Marty 1984, 69).

As with the American parks, the beauty and sublimity of nature were to become important themes of preservationist sensitivities. However, the need for active regulation for the purposes of conservation, as opposed to protection, was relatively uncontested. Binnema and Niemi point out that the park's enabling legislation was more protective than that of the United States to the extent it allowed for the "preservation and protection of game and fish or wild birds generally" (2006, 728). The necessity of protecting the beauty of wilderness was recognized by the government, conservationists, and the CPR. The CPR in particular focused on promoting the mountain vistas. Photographs commissioned in the fall of 1884 were made into reproductions or rendered by artists into engravings for the CPR pamphlets. The engravings were produced by projecting photographic images on the block, which the artist would then follow in their design. Embellishments and enhancement were then usually made to improve the image. For example, artist John Fraser, partner of the photographic firm of William Notman, was commissioned by Van Horne to produce such renderings. Often, Van Horne would instruct Fraser to make the mountains more imposing by using wide-angle views of the photographs (Hart 1983, 35).

Perhaps as a response to the destructiveness observed in Yellowstone, statism was more in evidence in Canada than in the US. Concern for maintaining high standards of services and comfort for tourists, as well as competing with the standards to be found in US parks, was a key motivating factor (Banff-Bow Valley Study 1996, 16). Commissioned by the Federal Government in 1886 to "investigate, report, and make recommendations regarding claims arising at Banff," William Pearce insisted that the government retain control of all park land for the purpose of developing recreation areas for public use, and restricted access only to resources that could be developed if there was no destruction of beauty (Luxton 1975, 56). The Commission of Inquiry set up to settle claims in 1886 in the area ended several seasons of quarrelling among three CPR workers who had stumbled upon the springs at Sulphur Mountain: Franklin McCabe, and William and Thomas McCardell (Marty 1984, 33). Their inability to establish settlement rights or mineral rights resulted in difficulties in their being able to raise capital to develop the springs as a recreational and curative site. Others closer to government saw no such difficulties, recognizing that the provision of a national park would mean the costs of tourist development would be borne by the government. McLeod Stewart, an Ottawa lawyer,

applied as early as 29 August 1885 for a 99-year lease on the area around Banff Springs provided that the government first expend \$50,000 on “buildings, roads, tramways, bridges, paths and other improvements” (Marty 1984, 40). As Marty states “the speculators alone saw one thing clearly: it was to be a private preserve for the protection of investments and the propagation of dollar bills” (1984, 41). The creation of the park ended any discussion of further settlement, squatting, or sale, and these claims were unceremoniously thrown out or settled for nominal sums to recognize what little development had been done.

Developments at the level of British colonial government were affecting Canada, as the emergence of formal international coordination of environmental protection was being standardized. Formal international coordination by colonial powers occurred in 1931, when the International Conference for the Protection of Nature was held in Paris (Mackenzie 1988, 216). A much larger conference was held in 1933, between 31 October and 8 November, in which provisions for game management were agreed, and the first provisions and recommendations for national parks were made. One result was the 1933 London Convention on the Conservation of Fauna and Flora, the first to elaborate the qualities of a “nature reserve,” which included provisions for areas free from “human interventions” and having both national and international value. Although this agreement was ratified by only a few of the attending parties, which included mainly African colonial powers with India and the United States acting as observers, its provisions were incorporated into legislation in British colonial territories (MacKenzie 1988, 216–217).

Informed by the example of the hot springs at Arkansas, and following the advice of P. Mitchell in 1885, Macdonald was inclined to assert the government’s control despite the cost. Following a trip to Arkansas in 1886, John R. Hall strongly recommended that the government assume absolute control over the hot springs near Banff in order to maintain standards of service and cleanliness (Marty 1984, 48; Nash 1970, 734). However private rights to the proceeds of the park were a given and the commercial motives of the government and the private speculators alike were primary. The cozy public–private relationship was contested in Parliament by opposition members who objected to the CPR’s plans to profit from the park given that it was already heavily supported by the Canadian taxpayer (Marty 1984, 61). However, the objection to further government expenditure was overcome by Macdonald’s argument that the government should regulate, develop, and administer the park in the public interest.

There is little doubt that such objections were also overcome by the acceptance of mining, lumbering, and other industrial revenue-generating activities within the park. Enclosure meant the eviction of squatters, the settlement or elimination of their rights, and the imposition of strict governmental control over development. These actions were not seen as

being in conflict with the enjoyment of tourists, such as sport hunting, which was not banned in the park until 1890. The Stoney Indians of the Bow Valley were not given any hunting rights, and as Binnema and Niemi (2006) point out, for reasons that had little to do with the protection of wilderness and a lot to do with the conservation of game for hunter visitors. The enclosure of their land in the park cruelly justified the removal of their rights to hunt in the park (Marty 1984, 57). Enclosure was suited to wilderness lands that were “unspoiled by contact with humans” (Mowforth and Munt 1998, 117), and was wholly facilitated by the simultaneous and parallel enclosure of Aboriginal people onto reservations. At the same time, the protection of “uncivilized” wilderness areas was not viewed, in early discourse, as being in conflict with the idea that Native people should not continue to participate in the development of the park for the enjoyment of visitors. In Canada, the idea that wilderness was unoccupied had less currency, which also allowed for greater levels of industrial and commercial development within Banff, and even, as Turner and Rees point out, the acceptance of development as an attractive feature of the park itself (1973, 32).

In the US, the taming of wilderness was arguably more explicit and the dividing lines between “wilderness” and “civilization” much more differentiated, since the precepts of preservation had to settle with the “practical” arguments of conservation. Both Canada and the US accepted international agreements that stipulated the nature and purposes of protected areas, such as the 1933 Convention, but the wording was interpreted differently. In Canada, physically, the construction of the CPR line had the effect of making wilderness areas more accessible and familiar, and parks were explicitly established with transportation routes in mind (Turner and Rees 1973, 32). This had the effect of creating a kind of “path dependency” in which past development created conditions that made it easier for development to continue, and more difficult to restrict (McDougall 2006, 79). Coupled with the already deeply-established acceptance of the instrumental uses of protected areas as vehicles for national economic development, this “path dependency” was more consequential in Canada, where reform of the parks governance system proceeded with less ambition, than, for example, the Mission 66 program in the US.

Psychologically, in both the US and Canada, the artistic and photographic depiction of wilderness had the effect of constructing it as healthy and pleasurable to experience. Even though it had different forms and effects in Canada and the US, the enclosure of wilderness invested the state with the primary authority to govern, and so limited the types of legitimate activities and claims that could be made with respect to parks. Excluded from this enclosure were: poorer claimants who lacked the capital to develop it; Aboriginal peoples who essentially had their claims nullified by the creation of reservations; and activities that affected the area’s natural

beauty. Integral to the process was the facilitation of tourist visits to parks, at first directed toward enticing the elite, and then later to producing a mass market of wilderness consumers. At the same time, Canada and the US did not follow identical paths, since statism and a more conscious planning process in the interests of national economic development was more accepted from the earliest inception of Banff National Park in response to the need to compete with the tourist draw of Yellowstone and Arkansas. As shown in Appendix B, then, the promotion of parks as an instrumental means of national development was a more prominent feature of Canadian parks governance. In the US, the centralization of management and focus on tourist development came later than in Canada. These differences are attributed to the different paths of economic development that were created by the relationship between the two economies.

Comparison of the Pattern of Parks Development and Governance in Canada and the US

The evolution of ideas on parks governance in the US suggests a series of declines from the height of early Romantic forms of preservationism, and the erosion over time of national parks by economic development and an explosion of tourism. In contrast, at first glance, the story of Canadian parks appears to be quite the opposite, with a gradual shift away from commercial “economic” considerations to increasingly more environmentally sensitive legislation designed by the 1980s to protect the “ecological integrity” of parks, as stated in Canada’s National Parks Policy of 1994. The Banff-Bow Valley Task Force Report, for example, emphasizes the early interest in nature and conservation that affected the National Parks Act of 1911, stating: “while tourism triggered the founding of Banff National Park, interest in conservation emerged quickly” (1996, 16). So, the history in Canada was similar to the United States in that preservationists in Canada were motivated by the concern to preserve and protect wilderness. The political programme of Muir and his Sierra Club, formed in 1892 to preserve the mountain regions of the Pacific Coast wilderness, inspired the national parks movement in many other countries as well as Canada, including New Zealand and Australia (McCormick 1989, 12). Canada’s first Commissioner of National Parks, James Harkin, liked to quote John Muir and was personally inspired by Muir’s example. However, there were a few important differences. Although it is fair to say that in the 1880s, as Hart argues, “the idea of preserving the wilderness for its own sake was, as yet, somewhat in the future for the government of Canada,” the examples of the Hot Springs at Arkansas, Yosemite Park, and Yellowstone Park, which “showed unhappy results” from private ownership, were noted by decision makers (Luxton 1975, 56–57; see also Marty 1984, 29, 64). The lesson was that for preservation to be realized, explicit state management to direct and regulate private uses was necessary.

The specific form of the balance to be struck between protection and conservation envisioned in the first parks legislation in Canada is a subject of some controversy in the environmental history literature. While some argue that a “doctrine of usefulness” was an integral focus of the earliest efforts to establish parks and the tendency toward economic encroachment confirms this (Bella 1987), others have argued that this one-dimensional view obscures the preservationist impulses that guided Parliamentarians present at the establishment of the first park. In fact, MacEachern makes a good case that considerable effort was made to ensure that commercial resource exploitation was specifically excluded from “use.” A concern with preserving aesthetics can even be considered as a deliberate effort to differentiate Canadian practice from the capitalist excesses that had permitted the destruction of some US parks (MacEachern 2001, 17–18).

Canadians did not experience the same level of debate over principles of preservation that shaped the US national parks system. In fact, in 1968 Roderick Nash stated that the “Canadian public’s sensitivity to and enthusiasm for wilderness lags at least two generations behind opinion in the United States” (McNamee 2004, 24). It is difficult to identify clear milestones, like the Hetch Hetchy dam debates, that shaped the Canadian national parks to the same degree as in the US. Rather, there have been cultural tensions that have led to episodic periods of more or less limited forms of intervention and management (MacEachern 2001, 14–15). These tensions have been reflected in the bureaucratic history of the parks, whose jurisdiction has come variously under the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Department of Environment, and the separate agency of Parks Canada. These are embedded, as well, in the inconsistencies of policies of Parks Canada, which has variously worked to balance ecological integrity with public accessibility, revenue generation, and the interests of its employees.

Since the passage of the National Parks Act of 1988, ecological integrity and protecting “intact ecosystems” has been the overarching principle driving governance of national parks in Canada. Informed by the (at that time) new global concept of sustainable development, a 1988 amendment of the National Park Act made the maintenance of ecological integrity the “prime directive” (MacEachern 2001, 16), and established “wilderness zones” within parks that prohibited activities that were “likely to impair the wilderness character of the area” (Auditor General of Canada 1996, 58). These years were also accompanied by a doubling of the areas protected in Canada from three percent of ecosystems in 1989 to seven percent in 2004 (Dearden and Dempsey 2004). Efforts to create, by 2008, at least eight new parks, thereby preserving an additional 100,000 square kilometres, are ongoing (McNamee 2004, 15). Nevertheless, this still falls short of the twelve percent of lands and waters of Canada given as a guidelines by the WWF in their Endangered Spaces campaign begun in 1989 (Hummel 1995, xiii). The expansion of Canada’s national park system continues with the

goal of establishing a system of national parks that represents each of Canada's 39 distinct natural regions. This system is just over 60 percent completed, with a feasibility study currently underway to establish a new park in the South Okanagan Similkameen area, and the withdrawal of 10 million hectares of land in November 2007 near the east arm of Great Slave Lake in Canada's North. Parks Canada's website lists a total of 42 national land-based parks and two marine conservation areas (Parks Canada). Although this does not compare numerically with the National Park system of the United States, which comprises 390 areas covering more than 84 million acres (National Parks Service) the US parks system includes both wilderness parks and national historical sites.

Although the exact meaning of "ecological integrity" is in question¹, the Banff-Bow Valley Report of 1996 solidified the view that concern for ecological integrity should override the demands for tourism. Among the factors contributing to this shift was the incorporation of Banff into the World Heritage Convention of 1983 and Canada's signing of the 1992 International Biodiversity Convention (Banff-Bow Valley Study 1996, 12). In accepting limits to growth and calling for self-restraint and discipline in planning, this Report nevertheless sought a compromise among the many conflicting visions of Banff's future. There is much to applaud from the early days of rampant commercialism and tourist promotion that would suggest a major progressive shift in thinking on the part of the Canadian public, decision makers, and tourists themselves. This would seem to indicate considerable environmental progress has been made in the period between Banff's creation and the consolidation and growth of the national parks system we see today. In one key respect, arguments for the intrinsic value of nature as a necessary component of parks governance have enjoyed a revival.

However, there are some important difficulties with this view. Although the values and principles guiding parks policy have clearly changed, Canadian parks governance continues to move toward the instrumental valuation of nature. In Canada, the shift to ecological integrity has not been particularly antagonistic toward taming wild areas and making parks accessible to widening uses. In other words, the geographical expansion of protected areas does not imply any abatement in the expansion and intensification of human uses of wilderness areas, nor any control on demand for easy access to its enjoyment.

For example, the language of intrinsic value of nature had little or no impact on the restructuring of parks governance in response to deficit cutting during the 1980s. Federal government economic priorities on deficit reduction resulted in cuts to interpretive and public education programs from the 1980s (Searle 2000, 57). Funding for ecological research to manage parks better was also slashed, along with money for infrastructure. At the same time, marketing and promotion were emphasized,

aimed at “attracting more visitors for longer stays over more of the year.” Increases to user fees and privatization of parks services (Searle 2000, 104) were designed to permit Parks Canada to increase revenue. Despite the continuing strength of the public’s commitment to ecological integrity, these trends have reinforced instrumental values by reconstructing the importance of “visiting wilderness” in economic terms.” In the 1990s, Parks Canada approved the *National Business Plan, 1995/96–1999/2000*, which proposed to double revenue from \$35 to \$70 million, through fee increases, user pay policies, and new profit-based enterprise units. In the words of the Banff-Bow Valley Task Force, this represented a shift from a “philosophy of public service to entrepreneurship” (1996, 19). These efforts pointed toward revaluing wilderness in terms of instrumental costs and benefits. In part, this can be attributed to the increasing willingness to assign values to wilderness based on economic methods of measurement. This language frames the value of wilderness in instrumental rather than intrinsic terms. In terms of wilderness visiting, there has been convergence rather than divergence in approaches in the US and Canada. Even when tourism threatened to overwhelm the parks’ wilderness character, as it did in the US in the 1960s, the response was and is to re-educate the public and re-construct visiting in different ways.

While in the US, the historical debate between preservationists and conservationists helped to articulate clearly the intrinsic reasons for preserving natural areas there has been no clear delineation in the Canadian debates. However, the reading of the script of parks development, maintenance, and restoration in terms of progressively more enlightened ecological integrity should be approached with caution. Although the values and principles guiding parks policy have clearly changed, the processes of discursive interpretation and construction continue to produce policies that are halting and inconsistent. The recent focus on ecological education and interpretation follows the patterns in the US, and depends still on ever-expanding visits to facilitate growth of the parks system. The meaning of visiting has changed over time. However, whether the purpose of facilitating visits is to promote health (as in the case of the hot springs), the “civilizing” effects of wilderness, or to build a support base for public valuation of parks, the process is never straightforward. The language of ecological integrity, therefore, should be viewed as less transformative or unique in the context of North American parks development and more likely as transient.

The dilemmas of parks governance were in evidence in the early creation of Canada’s first national park at Banff. In some ways, the history of Banff has made it an anomaly in the larger picture of changing national park values. It has features, like the CPR railway and the Trans-Canada Highway major transportation routes (features not shared by Yellowstone, for example), that have made it difficult to apply the principles of ecological integrity fully. These features are markers of the statism and commercialism

that affected the creation of Banff. The legacy of the close linkage between economic development and parks governance, and the “path dependency” that results, is felt even today. For example, the granting of a pipeline right-of-way through Jasper National Park in 1951 facilitated the expansion of the pipeline route in 2007–2008 to accommodate the rapidly increasing demand for transportation of oil from the oil sands westward to expanding markets in Asia. This has placed limits on the ability of environmentalists to resist development. As one commentator put it, local activists decided not to fully oppose the new development, even though National Parks legislation did not permit any new utility corridors through the parks, because the company had inherited provisions granted in the 1950s that allowed for the looping of the line (Kinder Morgan TMX Anchor Loop Project). The company doing the work on the pipeline was also able to build support for the project by arguing that pipelines present fewer environmental risks than trucks, by undertaking a three-year environmental assessment, and by providing financial support for the ecological integrity of the park (Alain 2007). Such developments signal that ecological integrity is not really considered to be in conflict with economic development under strictly regulated conditions. This project also demonstrates the impact of past decisions to utilize parks as instruments for national economic development, and the path dependency this represents.

At the same time, there is no doubt that many new parks that have been added to the Canadian system represent departures from the Banff model in that these have few or no visitors at all, and few or no transportation routes or lines of development as major features. However, given the historical trends of continued visitor expansion, there are good reasons to anticipate that visitor exhaustion with Banff and other southern parks may affect the willingness of visitors to travel further afield and so increase pressures on more remote parks to increase visitor numbers. In this sense, the parks really do represent a “system.” At any rate, there are few embedded limitations in the cultural construction of the purposes of parks in instrumental terms that might prevent this eventuality. In fact, as discussed below, there are many indications that the trend toward expansion of visitor numbers will continue and intensify.

Conclusion

Park ecosystems are contending with the cumulative effects of unchecked pressure by humans. There has been growth in the numbers of visitors and the relative economic importance of nature tourism. This form of “extensive growth” includes the invention of new forms of nature tourism, like whale watching, heli-skiing, and polar bear watching, that push the physical boundaries outward. In Canada, for example, Ivor Petrak, who led the refurbishing of CP’s mountain hotels in the 1950s, envisioned the park around the Banff Springs Hotel as an all-season destination. The development of skiing in the 1960s led to year-round tourism, and the

resulting increase in visitors meant that humans were increasingly present during sensitive wildlife seasons of mating and birthing (Banff-Bow Valley Study 1996, 16–17). The theme of tourist marketing everywhere, not only in parks, is the “year-round” destination (Aguilar et al. 2005, 123–140). Similarly, humans are now present in some previously inhospitable environments like the polar north.

More important than visions of wilderness is the distinction between a language of intrinsic value and instrumental value as rationales for the continued protection of parks. Using the language of intrinsic value illuminates those properties of nature that cannot be replicated or restored, and reaches to the non-self-interested motivations for protection. This language is a more powerful and deeper motivator for protection because it underlines the fact that parks are not and should not be taken for granted, and that their continued protection relies on the permanent investment of the state with the role of a public environmental trustee. At the same time, using the language of intrinsic value reduces the potential for human interests and values to impinge on governance priorities. This suggests that parks *can be* otherwise, that the colonial history is not determinate. The language of intrinsic value is, therefore, important to underpin the idea of parks as a public trust. Ecksersley argues, for example: “the language of intrinsic value, for all its exasperating hairsplitting, at least represents a rhetorical attempt to resist reducing all our encounters with the world to a crude instrumental calculus ... but the ethical and philosophical resistance remains important” (qtd. in Christoff et al. 2001, 89). The problem with wilderness, to paraphrase Cronon, is really a problem with the colonization and control of wilderness, in other words the failure to appreciate and recognize its ecological and cultural complexity; and to reduce wilderness to little more than an instrumental means to an end.

Canada has learned from and responded to US practice in the past, sometimes to the detriment of parks, but the future course of protection would benefit from a greater recognition of the intrinsic value of nature as a rationale for legislative protection and governance. The tendency for the Canadian pattern of economic development to be more conscious, planned, and even responsive to developments in the US is not necessarily detrimental to the future of parks protection, since the investment of protected areas as a public trust can enable the state to act more strongly. At the same time, the tendency for Canadian patterns of economic development to produce greater path dependency in response to the competitive pressures and opportunities created by the close interaction between the two economies should be recognized as a factor in future efforts to establish and maintain protected areas.

Note

1. Parks Canada defines "ecological integrity" as "a state in which ecosystem structures and functions are unimpaired by human-caused stresses and where native species are present at viable population levels" (Searle, 2000: 31).

References

- Aguiar, Luis L.M., Patricia Tomic, and Ricardo Trumper. "Work Hard, Play Hard: Selling Kelowna, BC, as Year-Round Playground." *Canadian Geographer* 49:2 (Summer 2005): 123–140.
- Alain, Shawn. "In Depth: Pipeline Plans." *The Valley Sentinel*, November 26, 2007.
- Arnold, David. *The Problem of Nature: Environment, Culture and European Expansion*. Oxford, UK, and Cambridge, USA: Blackwell, 1996.
- Auditor General of Canada. "Parks Canada: Preserving Canada's Natural Heritage." Report of the Auditor General of Canada, 1996. www.oag-bvg.gc.ca.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/9631ce.html, accessed: March 15 2007.
- Baird, David. *Nature's Heritage: Canada's National Parks*. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1967.
- Banff-Bow Valley Study. *Banff-Bow Valley: At the Crossroads. Summary Report of the Banff-Bow Valley Task Force*, eds. R. Page, S. Bayley, J.D. Cook, J.E. Green, and J.R.B. Ritchie. Ottawa: Minister of Canadian Heritage, 1996.
- Bella, Leslie. *Parks for Profit*. Montreal: Harvest House, 1987.
- Binnema, Theodore, and Melanie Niemi. "'Let the Line Be Drawn Now': Wilderness, Conservation and the Exclusion of Aboriginal People from Banff National Park in Canada." *Environmental History* 11 (October 2006): 724–50.
- Boone and Crockett Club. Document 57: "Constitution." In *The Environmental Debate: A Documentary History*, eds. Peninah Neimark and Peter Rhoades Mott. Westport, Connecticut, and London: Greenwood Press, 1999 [1887]: 112.
- Bratton, Susan Power. "National Park Management and Values." *Environmental Ethics* 7 (Summer 1985): 117–134.
- Christoff, Peter, John Dryzek, Robyn Eckersley, R. Goodin, and Val Plumwood. "Symposium: Green Thinking from Australia." *Environmental Politics* 10:4 (2001): 85–102.
- Cronon, William. "The Trouble with Wilderness, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature." In *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, ed. William Cronon. New York: W.W. Norton, 1996: 69–90.
- Davenport, Lisa, and Madhu Rao. "The History of Protection: Paradoxes of the Past and Challenges for the Future." In *Making Parks Work: Strategies for Preserving Tropical Nature*, eds. John Terborgh, Carel van Schaik, Lisa Davenport, and Madhu Rao. Washington, Covelo, London: Island Press, 2002: 30–52.
- Dearden, Philip, and Jessica Dempsey. "Protected Areas in Canada: Decade of Change." *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien* 48:2 (2004): 225–239.
- Foresta, Ronald A. *America's National Parks and their Keepers*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, 1984.
- Grove, Richard H. *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism, 1600–1860*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Guha, Ramachandra. *Environmentalism: A Global History*. Longman World History Series, Michael Adas, Series Editor. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 2000.
- Hart, E.J. *The Selling of Canada: The CPR and the Beginnings of Canadian Tourism*. Banff: Altitude Publications, 1983.
- Hays, Samuel P. *Explorations in Environmental History*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998.
- Hummel, Monte, ed. *Protecting Canada's Endangered Spaces: An Owner's Manual*. World Wildlife Fund of Canada. Toronto: Key Porter Books, 1995.

- Jones, Karen R. *Wolf Mountains: A History of Wolves Along the Great Divide*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2002.
- Kinder Morgan TMX Anchor Loop Project. "Frequently Asked Questions." www.tmxproject.com/data/3/rec_docs/FAQ_v7.doc, accessed on: April 10 2008.
- Luxton, Eleanor G. *Banff: Canada's First National Park: A History and a Memory of Rocky Mountains Park*. Banff: Summerthought, 1975.
- MacEachern, Alan. *Natural Selections: National Parks in Atlantic Canada, 1935–1970*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.
- Mackenzie, John. *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- MacLaren, I.S. 1999. "Cultured Wilderness in Jasper National Park" *Journal of Canadian Studies*, Peterborough 34:3 (Fall): 7-45.
- Marty, Sid A. *A Grand and Fabulous Notion: The First Century of Canada's Parks*. Preface by Earle Birney. Toronto: NC Press, 1984.
- McCormick, John. *Reclaiming Paradise: The Global Environmental Movement*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- McDougall, John N. *Drifting Together: The Political Economy of Canada–US Integration*. Toronto: Broadview Press, 2006.
- McNamee, Kevin, J.A. Kraulis, and David Suzuki. *The National Parks of Canada*. Toronto: Key Porter Books, 2004.
- Mowforth, Martin, and Ian Munt. *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Muir, John. "The Yosemite" Document 68: "John Muir, James Phelan, and the Battle over the Flooding of the Hetch Hetchy Valley (1908–1913)." In *The Environmental Debate: A Documentary History*, eds. Peninah Neimark and Peter Rhoades Mott. Westport, Connecticut, and London: Greenwood Press, 1999: 133–134.
- National Parks Service. "History." US Department of the Interior. www.pc.gc.ca/progs/np-pn/system/index_e.asp, accessed April 10 2008.
- Nash, Roderick. "The American Invention of National Parks." *American Quarterly* 22:3 (Autumn 1970): 726–735.
- Neimark, Peninah, and Peter Rhoades Mott, eds. *The Environmental Debate: A Documentary History*. Westport, Connecticut, and London: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Parks Canada. *National Parks System Plan*. www.nps.gov/aboutus/history.htm, accessed April 10 2008.
- Searle, Rick. *Phantom Parks: The Struggle to Save Canada's National Parks*. Toronto: Key Porter Books, 2000.
- Teale, Edwin Way, and John Muir. *The Wilderness World of John Muir*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin: 1982 [1954].
- Turner, Frederick J. Document 60: "On the Disappearance of the Frontier." In *The Environmental Debate: A Documentary History*, eds. Peninah Neimark and Peter Rhoades Mott. Westport, Connecticut, and London: Greenwood Press, 1999: 121–122.
- Turner, Robert D., and William E. Rees. "A Comparative Study of Parks Policy in Canada and the United States." *Nature Canada* 2:1 (Jan./March, 1973): 31–36.
- Worster, Donald. *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Appendix A

List of Canadian National Parks

(Parks Canada, www.pc.gc.ca/progs/np-pn/index_e.asp)

- Aulavik National Park, Northwest Territories – Over 12,000 km² of arctic wilderness on Banks Island.
- Auyuittuq National Park, Nunavut Territory – Baffin Island landscapes containing northern extremity of Canadian Shield.
- Banff National Park, Alberta – UNESCO World Heritage Site and Canada's first national park (1885).
- Bruce Peninsula National Park, Ontario – Landscapes including the northern end of Niagara Escarpment.
- Cape Breton Highlands National Park, Nova Scotia – Home to Cabot Trail, a land blessed with spectacular cliffs.
- Elk Island National Park, Alberta – Alberta plains oasis for rare and endangered species.
- Forillon National Park, Quebec – The “Jewel of the Gaspé” where land meets sea.
- Fundy National Park, New Brunswick – Atlantic's sanctuary with world's highest tides.
- Georgian Bay Islands National Park, Ontario – Captivating islands representing Lake Huron's landscape.
- Glacier National Park, British Columbia – British Columbia's lush interior rainforest and permanent glaciers.
- Grasslands National Park, Saskatchewan – Saskatchewan's rare prairie grasses, dinosaur fossils, and badlands.
- Gros Morne National Park, Newfoundland and Labrador – UNESCO World Heritage Site amid Newfoundland's wild natural beauty.
- Gulf Islands National Park Reserve, British Columbia – An exceptional coastal island landscape in the southern Strait of Georgia.
- Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve and Haida Heritage Site, British Columbia – Haida culture and coastal rainforest on Queen Charlotte Islands.
- Ivvavik National Park, Yukon Territory – Calving ground for the Porcupine caribou herd.
- Jasper National Park, Alberta – UNESCO World Heritage Site and glacial jewel of the Rockies.
- Kejimikujik National Park, Nova Scotia – Nova Scotia's inland of historic canoe routes and portages.
- Kluane National Park and Reserve, Yukon Territory – Yukon's UNESCO World Heritage Site contains Canada's highest peak.
- Kootenay National Park, British Columbia – UNESCO World Heritage Site featuring the famous Radium Hot Springs.
- Kouchibouguac National Park, New Brunswick – Intricate Acadian blend of coastal and inland habitats.

- La Mauricie National Park, Quebec – Lakes winding through forested hills for canoe and portage activities.
- Mingan Archipelago National Park Reserve, Quebec – A string of islands carved out by the sea.
- Mount Revelstoke National Park, British Columbia – Rainforest of 1000-year-old cedars and spectacular mountains.
- Nahanni National Park Reserve, Northwest Territories – Northwest Territories' UNESCO World Heritage Site.
- Pacific Rim National Park Reserve, British Columbia – Pacific Coast Mountains make up this marine and forest environment.
- Point Pelee National Park, Ontario – Most southern point on Canadian mainland.
- Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan – Protects slice of northern coniferous forest and wildlife.
- Prince Edward Island National Park, Prince Edward Island – A protected area with spectacular coast.
- Pukaskwa National Park, Ontario – Canadian Shield's ancient landscape on Superior's North Shore.
- Quttinirpaaq National Park, Nunavut Territory – Most remote, fragile, rugged, and northerly lands in North America.
- Riding Mountain National Park, Manitoba – Protected "island" area in the Manitoba Escarpment.
- Sirmilik National Park, Nunavut Territory – Northern Baffin Island landscape containing Eastern Arctic Lowlands and Lancaster Sound.
- St. Lawrence Islands National Park, Ontario – Established in 1904.
- Terra Nova National Park, Newfoundland and Labrador – Remnants of the Eastern Newfoundland Ancient Appalachian Mountains.
- Torngat Mountains National Park Reserve, Newfoundland and Labrador – The spectacular wilderness of this National Park Reserve comprises 9700 km² of the Northern Labrador Mountains natural region.
- Tuktot Nogait National Park, Northwest Territories – Calving ground for the Bluenose caribou herd.
- Ukkusiksalik National Park, Nunavut Territory – The place where there is stone that can be used to carve pots and oil lamps.
- Vuntut National Park, Yukon Territory – Northern Yukon's unique non-glaciated landscape.
- Wapusk National Park, Manitoba – One of the largest polar bear denning areas in the world.
- Waterton Lakes National Park, Alberta – International Peace Park; where the Rocky Mountains meet the prairie.
- Wood Buffalo National Park, Alberta/Northwest Territories – UNESCO World Heritage Site larger than Switzerland.
- Yoho National Park, British Columbia – UNESCO World Heritage Site in Rockies.

Appendix B

Comparison of Rationales for Protection and the Role of the State

	Canada	USA
Early Rationale for Protection	Tourist promotion, hunting and fishing, the Canadian "Alps"; instrumental means of national development.	Wilderness preservation and protection of natural scenery; protection of wild areas as public trust.
Later Rationale for Protection	Ecological integrity, expansion of parks system.	Development of tourist uses of parks, wildlife protection.
Role of the State	Partner in development, centralized planning, and control of uses; commercial public management and regulation, development of public services and balance of uses.	Overseer of protected areas, defender of public trust against private abuse; public ownership and preservation of beauty.