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Abstract

Residential summer camp canoe trippers are important. They are agents of socialization who amalgamate their campers into socially constructed accepted regimes of truth (Csikszentmihalyi, 1981; Grimwood, Gordon & Stevens, 2017). In other words, the trippers operate within a field of power to provide their campers with the lens they use to make sense of the world around them, adhering to certain truths and expelling others (Warren, 2002). While scholars have approached the field of outdoor recreation within a critical lens (Culp, 1998; Johnson & Ali, 2017; Whittington, 2018), this research shifts focus onto the residential summer camp canoe trip through Algonquin Park. The purpose of this postcolonial mobile qualitative research is to analyze the environmental discourses summer camp canoe trippers operate within while leading campers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park. Using a postcolonial framework, this research aims to deconstruct how environmental discourses are commonly, both consciously and unconsciously, enacted by residential summer camp trippers and embedded within broader and recurrent social discourses that have been normalized in a religious residential summer camp in Haliburton, Ontario. The qualitative data, collected through semi-structured interviews, participant observations, and a reflexive journaling activity proposed by Mullins (2013), reveals how participants localize environmental discourses, (re)producing their meanings and legacies along the way. This thesis illustrates how negative colonial legacies of land dispossession, the erasure of Indigenous peoples, particular traditional masculinities, and cultural appropriation have uncritically been employed by summer camp trippers to further benefit and ease their own practice of canoe tripping. Together, the data and analysis provide context to suggest alterations to the summer camp canoe tripping program, reconciling tensions between the tripper’s role as beneficiaries of settler colonialism and the privilege they hold to take campers through Algonquin Park.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Paddling the Petawawa

I put on my nice white socks (although they were definitely a murky brown by this point in the summer), laced up my torn apart running shoes, tied the string tightly around my bathing suit, threw on my favourite Toy Story shirt, and zipped up my red rain jacket; I was ready for my first canoe trip. Six friends, with whom I’d spent childhood summers at a residential summer camp, two trippers, and I, walked down our camp’s main path and met the Camp Director in front of a big white van with three canoes tied to a hitch trailing behind. After we piled into the van, the Director poked his head in and said, “everyone, eat well and look up at the stars. We’ll see you when you get home”. The van slowly pulled off our camp’s property and our five-day journey down the Petawawa River began. Our trippers told us stories of the land, showed us ‘spaces no one in the history of the world has ever been’, and pushed us to become, embrace, and find the strongest and wisest versions of ourselves.

Nine years later, I find myself at the same summer camp. The only difference is that now I am one of the trippers who guide the campers through the park. As a tripper, I embed my campers into particular ideologies of nature and I hope to inspire them to become more confident individuals. While I have accepted this job with great pride and responsibility, I recognize that I have lacked reflexivity in my practice. In my eight years of experience as a residential summer camp counsellor and canoe tripper, I have yet to experience a critical and self-examination of the direct and indirect meanings of nature and the environment that I have passed onto my campers. This thesis is my attempt to do so.
This thesis interrogates the truths that continue to be accepted and shared within my summer camp’s Algonquin Park canoe tripping program. It provides summer camp trippers an opportunity to reflexively examine the unseen, unspoken, and often-overlooked meanings associated with nature and the environment that are intertwined with canoe trips through Algonquin Provincial Park.

1.2 Contextualizing the Study

1.2.1 Summer Camps in Ontario

As early as the 1870s, middle- and upper-class residents of Ontario began to raise concerns about urban industrialization (Wall, 2009). More specifically, they were worried about the impact that growing up in fast-paced city settings would have on their children’s social and cognitive development (Wall, 2009). The rise and popularity of summer camps in Ontario came shortly after. In the late nineteenth-century summer camps emerged as “wholesome” outlets for children’s leisure time, protecting them from the very culture by which they were surrounded (Wall, 2009, p. 5). Summer camps were a response to industrialization that brought middle- and upper-class children “back-into-nature” (Wall, 2009, p. 9).

Summer camps emerged as the bridge from the city into nature that provided the ultimate setting for children to “search for the self and [their] identity” through recreational activities (Wall, 2009, p. 255). For many, summer camps were the tool that allowed them to leave the cityscapes behind and enter into a space beyond the realm of modern everyday organization and structure while being exposed to a natural and physical world external to their everyday life. This provided the space in which a religious orientation could be intertwined with the summer camp experience, further socializing campers into a particular worldview (Saxe, 2004). Campers would
go to camp not only to experience nature (Wall, 2009), but also a transformative socialization process (Saxe, 2004).

This research took place at a Jewish non-profit residential summer camp located in Haliburton, Ontario. Founded in 1909, the camp grew into a place where Jewish immigrants could send their children to escape the modernizing Greater Toronto Area (GTA) for the summer (Wall, 2009) while learning about Jewish religious and cultural values (Koffman, 2018). The 750-acre property is located on the northern shores of a private lake and can support more than five hundred campers aged six to sixteen during a single summer. The camp offers an array of land activities (various sports, high ropes, archery, drama, music, dance, arts and crafts) and water activities (canoe tripping, sailing, windsurfing, canoeing, water skiing).

1.2.2 Algonquin Park

The Government of Ontario formally established Algonquin Provincial Park in 1893 (Algonquin Provincial Park, n.d.a). The size of the park is 7,653 kilometres squared and encapsulates over 2,400 lakes and 1,200 kilometres of streams and rivers (Algonquin Provincial Park, n.d.a; Reynolds, 2010). The enclosed park space serves a multitude of purposes: a space of recreation, a sanctuary to protect wildlife and the natural aesthetic beauty of Ontario’s landscapes, and a site of logging whose contributions would serve the Canadian and American timber markets (Algonquin Provincial Park, n.d.a).

Algonquin Park caters to a wide range of visitors, those desiring an intense multi-day adventure in spaces seemingly secluded from all forms of civilization or those who wish to spend the day fine dining at a restaurant while overlooking a clam and quiet lake. There are two distinct experiences that visitors can opt into, known as the front country and the backcountry. In the front country, defined by its close proximity to Highway 60, visitors can hike, camp, bike, swim,
canoe, kayak, snowshoe, and cross-country ski (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). In the evening, front country visitors are encouraged to join park rangers and naturalists as they search for particular species in the park (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). In the backcountry, visitors can participate in the same activities found in the front country while also embarking on multi-day canoe, kayak, and hiking trips (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Tourists who spend the night have the choice between various hostels, hotels, Airbnbs, glamping, and camping amenities in the park and surrounding areas (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Visitors are also welcomed and encouraged to stroll through the art and logging museums along the Highway 60 to enhance their visits (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018).

1.2.2.1 The Algonquin Nation

Algonquin Park is geographically situated on the traditional territory of the Algonquin Nation. The Algonquin Nation refers to a diverse group of Indigenous peoples living in eastern North America who share similar linguistic and cultural underpinnings (Lawrence, 2012). Their heritage can be traced back 3,000 – 10,000 years before present day (Gidmark, 1988). The Algonquin People’s traditional territory is located around the Ottawa River, or Kiji Sibi, watershed, offering a dynamic network of freshwater lakes and rivers (Lawrence, 2012). In the years prior to Samuel de Champlain’s 1603 arrival to what he deemed “New France”, the Algonquin People had dynamic overarching social, cultural, and political systems despite European descriptions that labeled them “primitive…hunter-gathers…lacking territorial boundaries and higher order governance” (Lawrence, 2012, p. 25).

As more European settlers found their way onto the Ottawa River watershed, peace treaties that outlined principles of cohabitation between the Algonquin Peoples and Settler European communities emerged (Lawrence, 2012). A few years later, as settler communities
increased in number and size rendering them larger than the Algonquin communities, the settlers began to conceptualize the lands as their own (Lawrence, 2012). This paved the way for the processes of colonization and domination that ruled over the Algonquin Peoples and their lands by the territory’s newcomers (Lawrence, 2012).

Following a conflict between the established French and English settler communities, the land was divided (using rivers as borders) into distinct sovereign territories (Lawrence, 2012). The English took the land to the west of the Ottawa River, and the French to the east. All who resided on the lands were forced to abide by settler rules of law, despite the fact that members of the Algonquin Nation still practiced their cultures and traditions in their traditional home territory (Lawrence, 2012). The Algonquin Peoples were either forced into the settler communities, adopting their language, traditions, customs, and cultures, or they were forced onto reserves, small enclosed, and often inadequate spaces separate from modern urban society where Indigenous sovereignty operated under settler rule of law (Lawrence, 2012). The settler colonies’ newly established and enforced rules of law, language, and culture tore the common linguistic and cultural threads that held the Algonquin People and their nation together and turned them into the fragmented nation they are today (Lawrence, 2012).

1.2.2.2 Land Claim

On October 18, 2016, the Government of Ontario and the Algonquins of Ontario signed a land settlement agreement (Tasker, 2016). The settlement agreement acknowledges roughly 36,000 kilometres-squared of land in eastern Ontario that belongs to the Algonquin Peoples as the Algonquin traditional territory (Tasker, 2016). The agreed-upon territory (Figure 1) encapsulates the majority of Algonquin Park.
The land agreement was the product of many years of legal cases, fees, and battles between Indigenous Peoples and a powerful settler provincial government (Lawrence, 2012). During the process, the Algonquin Peoples faced hardships navigating complicated provincial bureaucracies and a diminishing unified Algonquin Nation front as their cultures, traditions, and peoples were forcefully homogenized into settler communities and scrutinized by the provincial and federal governments (Lawrence, 2012).

The Algonquins of Ontario are on a “journey of survival,” rebuilding their cultures, communities, and self-sufficiencies (Algonquins of Ontario, n.d.a). Today, the officially recognized Algonquin Peoples can be found in 10 different reserves across Ontario: Antoine, Pikwàkanagàn, Bonnechere, Greater Golden Lake, Kijicho Manito Madaouskarini, Mattawa/North Bay, Ottawa, Shabot Obaadjiwan, Snimikobi, and Whitney (Algonquins of Ontario, n.d.b). However, and important to note, settler provincial and federal governments still do not consider the Algonquin Peoples living off an official reserve as rightful members of the
Algonquin Nation (Algonquin of Ontario, n.d.a; Lawrence, 2012). This limited recognition stripped the heritage and identities away from countless Algonquin Peoples across Ontario and Quebec (Lawrence, 2012).

The Algonquin Peoples are playing an active and growing role in popularizing their presence throughout their acknowledged territory, particularly in Algonquin Park (Algonquins of Ontario, n.d.c, n.d.d). While members of the Algonquin Nation are constantly engaged in negotiations and discussions with the provincial and federal governments, various actors have developed traditional Algonquin cultural and heritage sites throughout the park. For example, there are culturally significant sites labeled and acknowledged around Rock Lake and a totem pole at the East Gate of the park. While the “totem pole is not a traditional way of expressing Algonquin culture…[the] totem pole [is a] way of sharing Algonquin culture with the future generations while honouring the ancestors [and] the hardships they had to face” (Algonquins of Ontario, n.d.c).

1.2.3 Introducing Postcolonialism and Environmental Discourses

This research uses a postcolonial theoretical orientation. Postcolonial inquiries seek the “cultural, economic, and political conditions that exist in the aftermath of colonialism” (Braun, 2002, p. 21). Their goal is to disrupt the generally accepted and unjust systemic discursive practices that have resulted from the ongoing influence of colonial rule.

Postcolonial theory challenges the commonsense and taken-for-granted truths that have normalized within any given cultural group (Castree & Braun, 2001). It illuminates relations of power between the colonizers and the colonized that manifest within cultural representations, practices, and performances (Castree & Braun, 2001). In doing so, postcolonial theory critically
engages with the cultural norms and truths that have legitimized present-day colonial rule and constructed ongoing and recurrent social power relations (Johnson & Parry, 2015).

Braun (2002) makes an important and distinguishing note of his use of postcolonialism within his work, one echoed by this study. The ‘post’ in postcolonialism does not signify a finite temporal period in which colonization has happened and concluded; rather, ‘post’ is used in a conscious and purposeful way that “draws attention to the colonial and neocolonial relations in the [localized] present” (Braun, 2002, p. 21). Postcolonial inquiries explore the “ongoing” (Jazee, 2012, p. 5) effects of colonialism that have shaped the social, spatial, political, cultural, and territorial structures that can be found in present-day settler North American societies (Braun, 2002).

Settler colonialism refers to processes by which colonial intentions and purposes are sustained through an ongoing rule over Indigenous lands, peoples, knowledges, and technologies by European settlers (Veracini, 2011). It is a type of domination that continually exists over an extended period of time and constantly attempts to eliminate Indigenous experiences, cultures, and histories that existed prior to European settlement (Wolfe, 2006).

Postcolonial inquiries often look toward discourses to make sense of normalized social and political power relations. Discourses are a socially specific “series of representations, practices, and performances through which meanings give the world its particular shapes” (Castree & Braun, 2001, p. 86). They establish themselves as truthful accounts of the world, helping users navigate the world and phenomena around them. The truths discourses convey are seemingly innocent, accurate, and socially accepted representations of the world. As a result, colonial powers, injustices, and oppressive legacies are often hidden from present-day settler regimes of truth, or discourses (Braun, 2002).
Environmental discourses are social structures that guide individual thoughts, beliefs, and practices as they pertain to human-nature relationships (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). Environmental discourses are fluid; they reflect the cultural and social norms that they were constructed upon (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). As societies evolve, their truths about nature and the environment do as well.

Using postcolonial theory to navigate a deconstruction of environmental discourses allows me to vigilantly trace how power has been used to sustain hegemonic accounts of truth in Western conceptions of the human-nature relationship (Braun, 2002). It will orient me to seek the cultural, economic, political, and power injustices embedded within the environmental discourses that the canoe trippers use to make sense of their place in Algonquin Park.

1.2 Purpose Statement & Research Questions

The purpose of this postcolonial mobile qualitative research is to analyze the environmental discourses summer camp canoe trippers operate within while leading campers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park. Using a postcolonial framework, this research aims to deconstruct how environmental discourses are commonly, both consciously and unconsciously, enacted by residential summer camp trippers and embedded within broader and recurrent discourses that have normalized in a religious residential summer camp’s canoe tripping program in Haliburton, Ontario. The research questions are as follows:

1. How are environmental discourses perceived and performed by summer camp trippers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park?
2. How are power, privilege, and knowledge circulated and normalized in the environmental discourses?
3. What can summer camp trippers do to reconcile the social and political tensions between taking campers through Algonquin Park and their role as beneficiaries of settler colonialism?

The following chapters, chapter two and three, review the literature associated with this thesis and outlines the methodology and methods used in this research. Chapter four, addresses the first research question and begins by identifying the environmental discourses within which the trippers operate. It shows the truths that have normalized on the summer camp canoe trips and how the trippers (re)produce them while taking campers through Algonquin Park. This is similarly spoken to in chapter five, as it outlines the broader social environmental discourses within which the trippers operate, thus, contributing to answering the first and second research questions. The third research question uses a postcolonial theoretical lens to illuminate hidden legacies of colonialism and settler colonialism within the accepted environmental discourses. It exposes the unjust hegemonic truths that have normalized on summer camp canoe trips by illuminating the silences and incoherencies lodged within the constructions of truth, informing chapter six. The final research question addresses the “corrective” nature of postcolonial inquiries, whose purpose is to begin to alter common everyday interactions and practices (Johnson & Parry, 2015, p. 36). In doing so, it seeks to bridge the gap between the theory and practice of social justice and summer camp canoe trips. These recommendations are given in chapter seven before concluding the thesis. The research questions collectively illuminate the hidden social, cultural, and political notions of truth on summer camp canoe trips and provide the trippers with tangible suggestions to navigate them accordingly.
1.3 Anticipated Contributions

1.3.1 Social Contributions

This research affords camp counsellors the opportunity to understand the truths they (re)produce and perform relating to nature and the environment. The social justice orientation of this research aims to change the way “one thinks [of] and views the world” (Johnson & Parry, 2015, p. 12).

Summer camp trippers may use this research to better their practice. It will be made available and accessible to them during staff training sessions before the summer begins. I will be leading several training sessions to encourage trippers to become cognizant of the inequities and discriminations deeply rooted and hidden within their practice, and how they can meaningfully attend to them. These sessions will be conversational in nature, and they will provide trippers with a reflexive way to think about and engage with their practice. The sessions will be considered successful if the trippers can recognize the injustices they recreate through their practice and express a genuine and willing desire to adjust accordingly.

Castree and Braun (2001) explain that the colonial experience in present-day, despite popular belief, is “partial and situated” and does not offer a complete rendition of the “(post)colonial condition” (p. 85). Castree and Braun’s (2001) explanation of the postcolonial prevalence explains that the postcolonial condition can be penetrated and broken down. Braun (2002) notes that efforts to contest colonialism and its legacies must stem from within colonial power itself. In other words, resistance to present-day colonial injustice occurs through the exploitation, recognition, and embracing of contradictions by those who operate from within. Through critically engaging with environmental discourses, the internal gaps and counter-narratives will become apparent and can lay the foundation for a social justice paradigm on
summer camp canoe trips. This will create the space for trippers to interrogate and breakdown the postcolonial condition and discourses they operate within to make sense of their experiences in the park.

1.3.2 Scholarly Contributions

This research is situated within the field of Outdoor Recreation. Outdoor recreation is a broad field that encompasses various subfields, including, but not limited to, spirituality (Heintzman, 2009), environmental stewardship (Larson, Whiting, & Green, 2011), personal satisfaction (Jacob & Schreyer, 1980), and social justice (Floyd & Johnson, 2002). This research adopts a social justice lens to outdoor recreation and places it over a residential summer camp’s canoe trips. It further exemplifies the environmental discourses that summer camp canoe trippers operate within, and takes a theoretical approach to understanding the cultural, economic, and political power imbalances embedded within the socially constructed discursive truths.

It builds on the works of other scholars to further illuminate how colonial injustices are sustained and perpetuated through summer camp canoe trips. It applies similar theories and approaches used by other scholars to a localized, yet important, context.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In order to better understand the environmental discourses the trippers operate within on the summer camp canoe trips, it is helpful to review the literature that surrounds the topics of the thesis. This literature review begins by highlighting outdoor recreation, the Leave No Trace ethic, summer camps, and critical inquiries. It then looks at social constructions of nature, environmental discourses, and postcolonialism before revisiting summer camps, but with a social justice lens. It concludes with a discussion on the canoe in various social and political contexts.

2.2 Outdoor Recreation

2.2.1 Defining Outdoor Recreation

Since 1960, outdoor recreational programs have been accepted as necessary and valuable programs with a wide variety of outcomes (Clawson & Knetsch, 1963; Plummer, 2009). Scholars have yet to achieve a commonly accepted definition of outdoor recreation. Among many, Margaryan and Fredman (2017) define outdoor recreation as “leisure recreational activities occurring outdoors in urban and rural environments” (p. 85), whereas Kaltenborn (1997) explains that outdoor recreation is “not only a functional means of getting in contact with nature…[it is] also a cultural expression of linkage the past” (p. 178). Outdoor recreation’s interdisciplinary field addresses a wide variety of topics, including spirituality (Peace, 2009), sense of place (Farnum, Hall & Kruger, 2005; Fishwick & Vining, 1992), environmental stewardship (Horwitz, 1996; Stewart, 2004), personal satisfaction (Kulczycki, 2014; Palmer, Freeman & Zabriskie, 2007), social justice (Erickson, Johnson & Kivel, 2009; Warren, Roberts,
Breunig & Alvarez, 2014), youth programming (Garst, Scheider & Baker, 2001; Wall, 2009), and social and cognitive development (Louv, 2005).

Rather than providing a mass overview of the literature associated with the field of outdoor recreation, this review will focus on the subfields relevant and related to this thesis. It will begin by overviewing the literature associated Leave No Trace in outdoor recreation.

2.2.2 Leave No Trace

Leave No Trace (LNT) has become the “benchmark” for responsible travel through the wilderness (Grimwood, 2011, p. 52). Leave No Trace is an international national non-profit organization that operates in various around the world (Leave No Trace, n.d.). Their goal is to provide “innovative education, skills, and research to help people care for the outdoors…by working with the public and those managing the lands” (Leave No Trace, n.d.). They developed a set of seven practices that have been adopted and promoted around the world, the practices are: 1) plan trips ahead of time, packing what is needed and can be carried throughout an excursion, 2) travel and camp on spaces designated for recreation, 3) properly dispose of waste where applicable, 4) leave rocks, leaves, and branches where they lie on the ground, 5) minimize impacts of campfires, 6) respect all forms of wildlife and their natural habitats, and 7) be considerate of others in the recreational areas (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018).

The literature surrounding the LNT practices encourages recreationists to consider the impacts of their recreational pursuits to ensure they have no role in “shaping [the physical and natural] environment” (Mullins & Maher, 2007, p. 408). The LNT set of practices outlines seven key principles that ensure human presence remains alien to wilderness landscapes (Mullins & Maher, 2007).
LNT has been studied in relation to other subjects: place-making (Mullins & Maher, 2007), outdoor education (Simon & Alagona, 2009), social justice (Grimwood, 2011), and collaborative citizen-authority conservation efforts (Cole, 2001). Outside of academia, the concept has grown with tremendous pride among recreationists and has become the official “code of conduct” for parks and natural areas across North America (Turner, 2002).

Important to note, and heavily discussed later on in this literature review, is the emphasis LNT places on maintaining an illusion that nature spaces exist and operate outside of human influence and activity (Grimwood, 2011; Mullins & Maher, 2007).

2.2.3 Summer Camps

The literature surrounding residential summer camp is vast. Similar to the field of outdoor recreation, scholars have approached it through multiple lens: youth capacity building (Garst, Browne & Bialeschki, 2011; Povilaitis & Tamminen, 2017), skill development (Duerden, Witt, Garst, Bialeschki, Schwarzlose & Norton, 2014; Wilson & Sibthorp, 2018), therapeutic recreation (Cheung, Cureton & Canham, 2006; Goodwin & Staples, 2005; Hill & Sibthorp, 2006), and as a facilitator of outdoor recreation (Collado, Staats, Corraliza, 2013; Dann & Schroeder, 2015; Watson, 2006).

Explained by the Ontario Camping Association (1984), summer camp is for the “growth of the body, mind, and spirit through learning to live comfortably” with each other and the environment (p. 65). While the origins of summer camp are contested, scholars agree that their popularization was due to the growing anti-industrialization thought and movement (in response to the modernizing urban way of life) and an increasing societal value imposed on outdoor play (Lorge & Zola, 2006). The popular opinion was that summer camps were able to “rescue” youth
from urban slums while providing an array of outdoor recreational activities that taught campers about life “beyond luxuries” (Wall, 2009, p. 35).

When George Barlett became the second superintendent of Algonquin Park in 1898, he began to encourage the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests to transform the park into a tourist resort for the affluent middle- and upper-classes (Algonquin Park Residents Association, n.d.). Shortly after, other outfitting stores, tour companies, and private youth groups began to capitalize on the Algonquin Park landscapes and use the space to advance their own products and agendas (Algonquin Park Residents Association, n.d.). Currently, there are over 50 summer camps in and around Algonquin Park that take their campers through the backcountry on canoe trips each summer, and countless companies who market an experience with the Algonquin Park landscapes (Algonquin Park Residents Association, n.d.).

Amid the literature positioned around summer camps, there is a looming theme of socialization. The early purposes of camping organizations were to restore and impose particular values on youth (Lorge & Zola, 2006), thus setting the table for Csikszentmihalyi’s (1981) notion of socialization. Summer camp counselors play a critical role as agents of socialization. Scholars have recognized this and studied it accordingly. Sharpe (2005) looked at the important role that outdoor wilderness guides play during the socialization process, noting that outdoor wilderness and adventure guides, much like summer camp counsellors, are responsible for giving their participant cues as to how they should be conceptualizing and performing within wilderness spaces. These cues are embedded within larger cultural contexts and socialize participants into a particular culture and worldview (Grimwood, Gordon & Stevens, 2017).

This inquiry into summer camps has revealed that summer camps stem from an anti-cultural movement that has the ability to provide children with an opportunity to leave the
cityscape, engage with the natural world, and become socialized into a particular culture. It helps untangle the social and historical settings in which this research stems from.

2.2.4 Critical Lens on Outdoor Recreation

While there is an array of literature that discusses the benefits and outcomes of outdoor recreation, various scholars have begun to apply a critical social justice orientation to the field. In short, the research shows that outdoor recreation has emerged as an exclusive and privileged practice (Warren, Roberts, Breunig & Alvarez, 2014).

The roots of many critical pedagogues found in outdoor recreation subscribe to the Marxist school of thought, whose critiques focus on the socio-cultural injustices of modern economic organization (McLaren, 2003 as cited by Warren, Roberts, Breunig & Alvarez, 2014). In other words, participation in specific outdoor recreational activities requires a particular socio-economic status (Owens, 1981). This notion is captured through available empirical research.

In their research of pond hockey in Canada, Johnson and Ali (2017) uncovered inherent inequities of outdoor recreation. While outdoor hockey rinks have become representative of a non-gendered, unorganized, and financially inclusive “quintessentially Canadian” winter activity, inevitable barriers still remain that constrain participation (Johnson & Ali, 2017, p. 261). Other scholars have furthered this notion by identifying and discussing gender and race as additional constraints to outdoor recreation participation (Culp, 1998; Godbey, Crawford & Shen, 2010; Jackson & Scott, 2005).

Outdoor recreation has manifested as a highly gendered discipline. Since the 1980s, scholars have been examining how gender enforces and normalizes divisions of labour and performance in outdoor recreation (Whittington, 2018). Culp (1998) identified gender as a constraint to leisure, particularly noting that women were offered fewer programs than men and
their participation was contingent on whether or not they could maintain the traditional roles and responsibilities they held towards their homes and families.

However, scholars have begun to break down the foundations that have normalized gendered performances in outdoor recreation. Newbery’s (2003) work identified the portage trail as a site for women to resist and challenge traditionally gendered stereotypes. Portage sites can legitimize the presence of women on canoe trips, paving the way for a bottom-up reconceptualization of the norms and knowledges involved in canoe tripping (Newbery, 2003). Newbery (2003) argues that women portaging a canoe and carrying heavy packs are symbolic displays that challenges and redefines taken-for-granted truths and discursive norms in outdoor recreation.

Erickson, Johnson, and Kivel (2009) are among the scholars who took a critical social justice lens to outdoor recreation. They began looking into the social and historical underpinnings of outdoor recreation and found a looming notion of “White culture” in spaces of outdoor recreation (Erickson, Johnson & Kivel, 2009, p. 540). Pierre Bourdieu (1977 as cited by Erickson, Johnson & Kivel, 2009) identified two concepts foundational to White culture in outdoor recreation: cultural capital and habitus. The former, cultural capital refers to the ways in which individuals in particular social groups are socialized, what gear is made accessible to them, and what social boundaries include and exclude their participation (Erickson, Johnson & Kivel, 2009). Cultural capital refers to what is and what is not made accessible to a particular group of people. The latter, habitus, is deeply intertwined with cultural capital and refers to socially ascribed norms that regulate an individual’s leisure habits (Erickson, Johnson & Kivel, 2009). Through habitus, individuals become discursively and habitually aware of spaces and activities they are socially accepted and restricted from.
Martin’s (2004) content analysis similarly uncovered the White culture that surrounds outdoor recreation. Martin’s (2004) study verified the existence of socially White wilderness that spatially and materially excluded non-White races. Rose and Paisley (2012) took a reflexive lens to investigate the legacies of White culture subsumed in their practice. Their reflexive narrative critique illuminated perceptions of outdoor spaces that are subjective to race, gender, and class privileges (Rose & Paisley, 2012). Further, they suggest that outdoor recreation leaders should engage in reflexivity to develop programs that bring a social justice orientation to their practice (Rose & Paisley, 2012).

However, there is an interesting limitation inherent to many articles that speak to the notion of White culture in outdoor recreation. Many of the researchers, as disclosed in their subjectivity statements, are beneficiaries of settler colonialism and come from White and privileged backgrounds. As Rose and Paisley (2012) wrote, “my experiences…came from a racialized experience that rarely, if ever, acknowledged in my upbringing and development as a person, as a professional, and as a white man” (p. 138). They explain that being White researchers allowed them to conceptualize their experiences as “normative” and “without any cultural, social, political, or racial privileges” (Rose & Paisley, 2012, p. 138). While they recognize these privileges and use a reflexive approach to deconstruct and make sense of their own practice, it’s important to recognize many of these scholars, myself included, still come from a privileged position and their works should be evaluated with that in mind.

2.2.5 Revisiting Outdoor Recreation

As an academic discipline, outdoor recreation is vast. A core understanding of outdoor recreation provides insight onto the multitudes of meanings and issues inherent to many outdoor recreational activities. This discussion has shed light on the outcomes of outdoor recreation and
the field’s fractured nature to help situate and contextualize this research as it works to bridge the critical gap between outdoor recreation and social justice in the context of summer camp canoe trips.

This literature review continues with a discussion of social constructions of nature, postcolonialism, and environmental discourses before revisiting summer camps with a critical orientation.

2.3 Social Constructs of Nature

2.3.1 Social Nature

Joseph Rouse (1987) wrote

what things are, and what characteristics they can have, depends in part upon the practical configuration within which they become manifest. There are no essences independent of this configuration of practices and the language involved within it… we encounter ‘nature’ through our practices, as it fits in and is revealed intelligibly in that context. (as cited by Braun, 2002, p. 16)

Rouse’s (1987) passage sets the stage for a discussion of how nature is, despite popular belief, socially constructed. Rouse (1987) explains that our understandings of what thing are in the world depend on the social context in which manifest. Castree and Braun (2001) call this notion “social nature” (p. 10). Social nature takes two concepts as axiomatic: nature has never been natural, and common conceptualizations of nature perpetuate unjust power imbalances (Castree & Braun, 2001). The former suggests that nature is a highly contextualized site whose visibility is only revealed through our material and discursive practices (Braun, 2002). The latter warns that normalized conceptualizations of nature are rooted in an unjust series that reproduces unjust hegemonic cultural, economic, political, technological, and ecological relations (Braun, 2002).
In Cronon’s (1996) heavily cited book, *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, he argues that, despite popular belief, there is nothing inherently natural about nature. Cronon (1996) explains, “nature is a human idea with a long and complicated cultural history which has led different human beings to conceive of the natural world in very different ways” (p. 20). Nature, as a phenomenon, encapsulates human judgments, values, and histories in its multitudes meaning (Cronon, 1996). As such, the ways in which an individual comes to understand and interact with nature is a product of their social lens (Cronon, 1996).

Building off Cronon’s argument of nature as a human construct, various scholars have claimed that nature is understood by the ways in which attention is brought to it (Harrison & Burgess, 1994; Hess, 2010; Nakagawa & Payne, 2011). Their studies have shown that meanings of nature are inherently embedded with socio-cultural, economic, and political structures that guide actors how to conceptualize nature. All of which allude to the multiplicities of meanings ascribed to the natural world, asserting nature as an entity far less universal than typically assumed (Proctor, 2004).

Braun (2002) and Castree and Braun (2001) argue the concept of social nature operates as an attempt to bridge the gaps in the nature/culture dichotomy. The nature/culture dichotomy holds a universal and essentialist truth that nature and culture act in opposition, where one exists the other cannot (Cronon, 1996). While notions of culture are representative of modern urban centers and organizations that entail “waste, garbage, vermin, disease, and depravity,” natural spaces, the binary opposite, are representative of pristine environments that mirror romantic and biblical conceptualizations of the Garden of Eden (Cronon, 1996, p. 314). Social nature urges us to consider the “intertwining of social, cultural, technological, and ecological relations” in the natural and physical world around us (Braun, 2002, p. 10), rather than maintaining nature spaces
as objective ontological entities that exist “out there,” away from human influence (Braun, 2002, p. 87). While Braun (2002) and Cronon (1996) have effectively argued in favour of social nature and against the nature/culture dichotomy, they recognize that social discursive powers lie behind and legitimize the binary dichotomy, rendering it a normalized and accepted notion of Western environmental truth.

Through their works, Braun (2002), Cronon (1996) and Castree and Braun (2001) establish fractures in the discourses that privilege the nature/culture duality. They shed light onto the various histories and social natures embedded within parks and natural spaces whose complexities are often discursively reduced into spaces of either nature or culture. These ideas are further explained in later sections of this literature review.

2.3.2 Environmental Discourses

Environmental discourses are socially specific, regular, and systematic webs of localized ideas that particular members of social groups rely upon to make sense of the world and landscapes around them (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). They are a set of socially accepted and constructed beliefs, knowledges, and truths that pertain to the nature of reality (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999), ultimately legitimizing the ways in which a social group is able to conceptualize and interact the environment around them (Braun, 2002). Environmental discourses can operationalize through sites, practices, language, nature documentaries, magazines, and maps, all of which are developed within, and convey, particular frames-of-reference for thinking about the human-nature relationship (Braun, 2002). To summarize, environmental discourses are socially constructed webs of statements and ideas that actors in particular social groups rely upon to make sense of the world around them. The meanings they convey are presented as truthful
accounts of the world that are factually circulated and embraced, helping individual actors to navigate the human-nature relationship.

2.3.3 Postcolonialism

Various scholars (Jazeel, 2012; Johnson & Parry, 2015) place Edward Saïd’s (1978) text, *Orientalism*, as one of the founding pieces of postcolonial inquiries. *Orientalism* distinguishes social, cultural, and political differences between the occident (Western world) and orient (Eastern world) while addressing the representations of traditions, order, and activities the occident imposes on the orient (Jazeel, 2012). It represents a way of knowing ‘the Other’ through an authoritative socially construction truth based on various social, political, and cultural conceptions, regardless of their accuracies (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2000). This process relies on a series of unjust social and power relations that enables one culture to become the authoritative voice and representation of another (Young, 2003).

While Saïd’s text was developed outside a Canadian context, Braun (2002) takes a look at colonial discourses on Canada’s west coast that have shaped the forestlands around Clayoquot Sound. Through ongoing colonial power and domination in modern Canada, the British Columbia forests have been reimaged from traditional and cultural landscapes to empty wildlife reserves, working forests, recreational zones, and scientific corridors (Braun, 2002). As a result, new discourses of the forests are developed and broadly circulated within settler colonial society as truthful and objective accounts of the world, despite other histories and ways of thinking that blatantly contrast hegemonic settler regimes of truth (Braun, 2002; Wolfe, 2006).

Braun (2002) outlines a common criticism of postcolonial inquiries, noting that they often create a generalized account of the processes of colonialism by referencing “the” particular and common postcolonial experience (p. 21). Despite the fact that many scholars have attempted
to find and define the postcolonial experience, scholars are unable to do so as each process of colonialism is unique to the socio-cultural and geo-political spaces in which they occur (Braun, 2002). Additionally, Braun (2002) warns that postcolonial inquiries often label European methods of representation as the “[sole] agents of history,” in which historical accounts must be documented and communicated in particular ways for them to be legitimate accounts of truth (p. 21). This labels rich and dynamic histories of Indigenous cultures that existed before colonial influence as “prehistories” that could only be understood and studied in regard to, and by, European privileged accounts of truth (Braun, 2002, p. 21). In addressing the latter criticism, it is important to remember that the histories of the Algonquin peoples extend beyond the timeline of European settlement that continually attempt to erase their rich, cultural, and social histories, and that we must seek and appreciate other accounts of history that operate external to Western European ways of knowing as equally truthful documentations (Lawrence, 2012).

With regard to my research, it is important to bear in mind that each Algonquin Nation community experienced colonial processes differently. While some Algonquin Nation communities were formally recognized as members of the Algonquin Nation, others were, in the eyes of the state, landless and identity-less peoples (Lawrence, 2012). These criticisms are important to keep in mind as they contextualize the spaces in which other discourses can be identified and interrogated in relation to contesting postcolonial constructions of nature and summer camp canoe trips.

2.3.4 Authoritative Discourses

Braun’s (2002) text, among others (Braun, 1997; Hess, 2010; Johnson & Murton, 2007) has disrupted Western conceptualizations of nature that justify the marginalization and displacement of Indigenous peoples. Following the work of Edward Saïd, Braun (2002) explains
that colonial powers operate in present-day society, hidden by normalized patterns of truths and beliefs (Braun, 2002).

The settler colonial environmental discourse suggests that there are no truths and knowledges that operate outside of colonial thought and ideas, including that of natural spaces. Operating within the aforementioned nature/culture binary, the settler colonial environmental discourse suggests that nature exists in a world “out there,” absent from human histories, technologies, and were once occupied by “a timeless primitive culture governed by nature and mythology” (Braun, 2002, p. 95). This further establishes the Indigenous actor as the colonial subject, or the “Other”, who exists outside modernized, established, and progressive culture (Braun, 2002, p. 91). Not only does this discourse trivialize Indigenous cultures, evaluating them on the cultural customs and standards of the colonizers, it also discursively labels Indigenous cultures as less than the Europeans for their lack of Western histories, technologies, modernity’s, and government systems (Braun, 2002).

The authoritative settler colonial environmental discourses, as presented by the literature, have the potential to be fractured (Barun, 200; Grimwood, Yudina, Muldoon, Qiu, 2015). Saïd (1978, 1994 as cited by Braun, 2002) presents the colonial and postcolonial environmental discourses as a seemingly all-encompassing truth that appears everywhere to such a point where “it [becomes] almost impossible to imagine its contestation” (p. 24). When, in fact, the environmental discourses operate in a “fractured field” that carry differentiated “levels of engagement and meaning” (Braun, 2002, p. 169). This provides space for various scholars and actors to challenge the all-encompassing nature of environmental discourses, subjecting them and their actors to “constant (re)negotiations of power, place, identity, and sovereignty” (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012, p.1).
2.3.5 Constructing a Summer Camp’s Nature

While many researchers, theories, and ideas have presented summer camps in an altruistic and positive fashion, scholars have also been approaching summer camps with a critical lens. In Moore’s (2001) study of children’s social organization at summer camps, they found that common racialized and gendered patterns of modern society similarly manifested at summer camps, shedding light onto various social injustices perpetuated within summer camps.

Looking at summer camps with the social justice lens, Koffman (2018) evaluates the notion of campers “playing Indian” at Jewish summer camps in North America (p. 413). Koffman (2018) found that the outcomes of “playing Indian” were threefold: it reinforced Jewish urban and modern values, it provided a setting in which to further impose and strengthen national values, and it was used as a lesson to teach campers about their own Jewish spirituality (p. 413). Similarly, it contributed to the ongoing racialization of Indigenous peoples through colonialism (Wall, 2005). Smith (2006) and Wall (2005) attribute the phenomenon of ‘playing Indian’ to the discursive patterns that locate Indigenous cultures in nature and outside of modern and progressive urban societies. Not only does this notion advance to the nature/culture binary divide, but it also reinforces colonial notions that belittle Indigenous peoples by assuming their cultures into an activity that can be played.

In Henderson, Bialeschki and James’s (2007) review of summer camp’s presence in academia, they suggest that summer camps have influenced the lives of millions of people in the past 150 years. While summer camp research faces several limitations—the vast diversity of camps limit the generalizability of results and the decreasing will to have a researcher present during the camp’s sessions—researchers agree that summer camps play a crucial role in
socializing campers into particular sets of world views and discursive truths (Henderson, Bialeschki & James, 2007). Their works help set the stage for an academic inquiry that focuses on notions of socialization, truth(s), and discourses on summer camp canoe trips.

In approaching summer camps with a critical lens, the aforementioned scholarly discussions have contributed to our understandings of social injustices found within outdoor recreation and settler colonial society. The works are important to this study as they begin to shed light onto the injustices summer camps perpetuate. They allow us to consider how oppressive powers and privileges discursively operate within a specific context to strengthen particular effects of truth.

This review continues with a discussion of the canoe: a technology whose use is essential to any canoe trip and deeply embedded in the postcolonial context of this study.

2.4 The Canoe

2.4.1 The Algonquin Birchbark Canoe

The canoe has a much larger social and political history than generally assumed (Erickson, 2013; Newbery, 2012). It has come to represent the “mobilization of power and politics through nature, the nation, and leisure” (Erickson, 2013, xiii).

In Gidmark’s (1988) ethnographic study of the Algonquin birchbark canoe, he found that the Algonquin Peoples’ birchbark canoe was crucial in providing the mobility they needed to engage with everyday subsistence and cultural activities. It would have been impossible to physically move through the land without a lightweight and portable water vessel as their traditional lands were situated on over 500,000 freshwater lakes and rivers (Gidmark, 1988).
Upon European arrival to North America, the canoe became a widespread vehicle for settlers to move about the land, prompting and enabling the fur trade and its acculturation into settler culture. By the end of the twenty-first century, Gidmark (1988) predicted that the traditional handcrafted canoe would be lost to material culture, leaving little to no traditional knowledge of the canoe’s production and cultural importance.

2.4.2 Troubling Symbol of the Canoe in Canada

The canoe has emerged as a symbol of various concepts: Indigenity (Grant, 1988; Ritts, Johnson & Peyton, 2018), Canadian pride and nationalism (Baldwin, 2009; Dean, 2013; Jennings, Hodgins & Small, 1999; Razak, 2018; Smith & Taunton, 2018), and class and power (Baker, 2002). In a post-World Wars setting, the fight to define and understand Canada, as a nation, was prevalent, and national attention turned towards the canoe (Dean, 2013). The canoe became a symbol for the nation on account of its historic role in permitting the fur trade and its ability to allow someone to pass through the diverse uniquely ‘Canadian’ landscape (Dean, 2013; Ritts, Johnson & Peyton, 2018).

Traversing a landscape by means of canoe allows a participant to connect with something bigger than himself or herself, the roots of the nation (Dean, 2013; Erickson, 2013). However, while some describe the canoe as a widespread symbol of Canada, others attribute it to the histories of colonialism, dispossession, and acculturation that have loomed over discussions of Canadian nationalism (Newbery, 2012). Blundell (2002) explains, “too often aboriginal [technologies] are employed as mere props in a universal(izing) narrative of Canadian history that obscures the colonial and postcolonial relations that form part of the context within which tourism practices take place” (as cited by Erickson, 2015, p. 323). The traditional canoe has been lost and replaced with one that fulfills modern economic and technological demands relating to
its weight, speed, and efficiency, all the while making the wilderness a more accessible place amongst Canadians (Dean 2012; Erickson, 2013; Ritts, Johnson & Peyton, 2018). More often than not, the common discourse surrounding the canoe and nationalism lacks the critical perspective that highlights and explores the histories of colonialism and settler colonialism prominent in the development of the Canadian nation (Grimwood, 2011; Newbery, 2012). As explained by Terry Goldie, the canoe is used in two different methods to perpetuate colonization: penetration and appropriation (Dean, 2013). The idea of penetration refers to the constant explorer discourses that legitimize the actions of settlers invading and canoeing through Indigenous territories (Dean, 2013; Erickson, 2013). It normalizes the processes and presence of settlers traversing through traditional territories while discursively claiming to be the ‘discovers’ of new lands (Erickson, 2013). The latter, appropriation, refers to the settler-Canadian acquisition of Indigenous heritage and technologies (Dean, 2013). The adopted artifacts are then embraced as the settlers’ own, erasing the heritage of the peoples from which it was taken (Dean, 2013). This occurs through social, political, and economic means as cultural artifacts and processes enter modern, settler-benefiting, liberal capitalist markets (Dean, 2013; Erickson, 2013; Ritts, Johnson & Peyton, 2018).

Newbery (2013) echos Goldie’s notion of penetration and appropriation by explaining that the canoe was traditionally designed and paddled by Indigenous Peoples, then it was taken over and used by fur traders, and then by explorers, before entering its current state. As for Dean (2012), the canoe is understood as a mechanism in which beneficiaries of Canadian settler colonialism can “respond to their alienation from the land through appropriation, impersonation, and incorporation of Indigeneity” through recreational activities (p. 125). The canoe has
discursively emerged as a common thread that responds to particular settler colonial ideologies while weaving the Canadian nation together.

2.4.3 Using the Canoe

The positive and negative impacts of canoe travel are plentiful and captured within the literature. Travelling by means of canoe provides the participants with an intimate experience in which to explore and emotionally connect with various landscapes (Fredrickson & Anderson, 1999). Canoeing, presented by Peace (2009), is a chance to escape the material world and find inner peace and openness. Others even go so far as to relate canoeing to Daoism, living and being in a state of peace with an individual’s surroundings (Horwood, 1999 as cited by Peace, 2009). Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada (1980-1984), said:

What sets a canoeing expedition apart is that it purifies you more rapidly and inescapably than any other. Travel 1,000 miles by train and you are a brute; pedal 500 miles on a bicycle and you remain basically a bourgeois; paddle 100 miles in a canoe and you are already a child of nature. (Raffan, 1988, p. 10, as cited by Grimwood, 2011, p. 51)

The canoe, with its multiplicity of meanings, has found its way into the national imaginary, where settler colonialists present it as their own technology whose purposes fulfill their own needs (Dean, 2013). The literature notes that the canoe has been incredibly beneficial to the development of the nation and equally as detrimental to the communities, cultures, and peoples from which it was taken (Dean, 2013).

The canoe provides an interesting and critical examination of the ways in which settler colonialism and settler colonial discourses operate. It provides insight onto how lands, technologies, and ideas are reimagined and reworked by those in power to serve particular needs, desires, and seemingly wholesome and objective accounts of truth.
2.5 Conclusion

The literature related to this study presents itself in a web of intersections between social justice, power relations, outdoor recreational activities, summer camps, and canoe trips. This review has been built around the gaps that exist between social constructions of nature, summer camp canoe trips, settler colonial legacies and processes, and environmental discourses.

Although the literature available and presented in this review speaks to various facets of outdoor recreation, canoeing, social constructions of nature, and camps—both qualitatively and quantitatively—there appears to be a gap in the literature in regard to the legacy and impact of summer camp canoe trippers. Henderson, Bialeschki, and James (2007) attribute this challenge to the busy nature of being on a canoe trip, one that Mullins (2013) echoes. The literature positions summer camp trippers as important agents of socialization but lacks a thorough investigation of the environmental discourses they operate within and the hidden social power relations they (re)produce and perform while taking campers on canoe trips.

The available literature lacks empirical multi-dimensional studies that deconstruct how specific cultural groups conceptualize, communicate, (re)produce, and strengthen their particular knowledges of nature and the environment while simultaneously silencing others. This literature review helps situate the research as it shows the gaps between outdoor recreation, summer camps, canoes, social justice, and social constructions of nature to understand and unpack the performed and unperformed truths summer camp trippers (re)produce on canoe trips. This review has begun to illuminate the holes that fracture settler colonial environmental discursive truths and illuminated the spaces in which to further challenge and press against settler colonial conceptions of hegemonic truth and authority.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Postcolonial Mobile Methodology

A postcolonial mobile methodology framework was used to shape this research’s conceptual design. To understand this methodology and how it operates, it important to first consider mobile methodologies.

Mobile methodologies stem from the “mobility paradigm,” which is used to examine the social relations as “people, objects, capital, and information” collectively move through time and space (Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006, p. 1). They address the intersection of people, objects, movements, ideas, senses, and emotions as they are collectively on-the-move (Ferentzy, 2009; Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006; Sheller & Urry, 2006; Spinney, 2014). It adheres to the social relations that manifest as a result of physical movement.

The mobile methodology allows me to investigate how environmental discourses are brought to life by means of a canoe trip through Algonquin Park. It encourages me to move through a landscape with my participants, simultaneously collecting data and exposing myself to the human-nature relationship the participants rely upon while guiding summer camp canoe trips.

Mobility research occurs throughout the mobile journey itself. Any researcher’s ability to speak to and analyze a journey will be profoundly impacted by their participation in the journey itself (McGuinness, Fincham & Murray, 2010 as cited by Mullins, 2013). Being a part of the canoe trips allowed me to subtly observe how the discourses operationalize within the trippers as they pass through the park.

The postcolonial mobile methodology orients itself to power relations deeply intertwined with notions of mobility (Sheller & Urry, 2006; Wolfe, 2006). The mobilities paradigm
“fundamentally affirms” that mobility for leisure sake is a privileged practice (Sheller & Urry, 2006, p. 211), and the postcolonial nature of this methodology illuminates the oppressive histories by which these practices are sustained, normalized (Braun, 2002), and inscribed with “embodied, storied, remembered, and routinized” histories (Rantala & Varley, 2019, p. 5). As the premise of the canoe trip involves mobility, the postcolonial mobility framework orients the research to the social privilege and power imbalances that permit and are inherent to mobilities. It allows me to consider the power relations and injustices that have enabled “people, objects, capital, and information” (Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006, p. 1) to move through time, space, and cultural realms before normalizing into their present-day discursive practices and truths (Rantala & Varley, 2019).

The mobilities framework also looks towards the social networks that enable material and technological mobilities through time and space (Sheller & Urry, 2006, p. 221). Attaching a postcolonial theoretical orientation to this notion enables focus onto the normalized power relations that have continuously allowed material objects to pass through cultures, time, and space to benefit certain actors while marginalizing others. The processes of data analysis used in this research makes sense of the power imbalances inherent to normalized mobilities of people, objects, capital, and information as they pertain to the human-nature relationship.

3.2 The Mobile Fields

The canoe-tripping program offered by the summer camp takes a group of campers and staff—certified emergency wilderness first aid responders and lifeguards—into Algonquin Park for trips that last between four and six days. The canoe routes are decided by the staff and are reflective of the campers’ abilities. In all cases, the routes require several hours of paddling a day.
with multiple portages between the lakes and rivers. Consistent with a mobile methodological inquiry, the data for this research was collected during two canoe trips through Algonquin Park.

The first trip had seven campers (3 males and 4 females) and two trippers (one male and one female). During this trip, I was the male tripper and a researcher. The trip completed a loop route (starting and ending the trip on the same lake). Shown in Figure 2, the trip started and ended on Rock Lake, passing through Galeairy and Pen Lake in the south end of Algonquin Park. The trip lasted four days and three nights.

![Figure 2. The Canoe Route of the First Trip. Adapted from Jeff’s Map, n.d.](image)

The second canoe trip had 38 people, split into five smaller groups that travelled together. Each of the groups had two staff members, a total of ten trippers. Again, this included myself as a tripper and researcher. The trippers took a collective 28 campers through the park for four days and three nights. The trip started on Cache Lake, passed through Head Lake, Harness Lake, Pardee Lake, Lawrence Lake, Rod and Gun Lake, and Lake Louisa, before ending on Rock Lake, shown in Figure 3.
3.3 Subjectivity Statements

3.3.1 As a Tripper

I am a white, fourth-generation Canadian who has had the opportunity to push myself, play, laugh, and grow through countless canoe, camping, and hiking trips. I have held the privilege as an able-bodied, white male, and beneficiary of settler colonialism who has attended the same residential summer camp, located just north of Haliburton, Ontario, for the past fifteen summers. The summer camp that I have attended since I was eight years old is the same camp that provided the canoe trips for this research.

I recognize that that as a white, able-bodied, male tripper, I socialize the campers into the discursive notions of truth within which I operate. In other words, the ways in which I mentor my campers are a product of the discursive realms I am a part of. Ultimately, I have been socializing my campers into same discursive truths that I operate within. I also recognize that my
social location has enabled me to consider the truths in which I operate as the sole objective Truth. Further enabling and contributing to the ongoing erasure and silencing of truths that exist outside my discursive perceptions of nature and the environment. Until pursuing this thesis, I had never been reflexive of my actions as a camp counselor and tripper.

3.3.2 As a Researcher

Having spent the past four summers as one of the oldest staff members at the camp, I have watched many campers grow up to become incredible staff members and trippers (including three of the participants in this study). I held strong relations with the participants before the research began, simplifying the recruitment process. I was able to depend on our previous relationships to openly talk to the participants about the research and its intended purposes. This eased the development of trust between the researcher and participants and inclined them to participate in the study.

The biggest obstacle that I encountered was recognizing that, at the end of the day, I was still a senior staff member at the camp despite wearing the hat of a researcher on the trip. This obstacle carried two distinct realms for me to navigate: the authority that I carried over the other trippers, and the duty I had to the canoe trips.

In every step of the research process, I carried an inherent role of authority from which I could not separate myself. During the summer of the research, I was the Director of the Staff Development and Training Program, a program with which none of the participants were involved. Still, I carried an authority at the camp that the participants did not. To overcome this obstacle, I continuously reminded the participants of the anonymity of their participation, that their wellbeing remained a priority of mine, and that anything they said or did on the canoe trip would not impact their positions as staff members at the summer camp.
While I conducted the research, I also held responsibilities to the campers (ensuring they had an incredible and rewarding trip) and to my co-tripper (ensuring that I carried my weight caring for and leading several campers through the park). There were times where I sacrificed the campers’ and my own experiences in the park to sit down with the other trippers for an interview, and times when I overlooked research opportunities to create memories and experiences for the campers. Ensuring the trippers got the leisure time in the park they deserved, the campers got the fun and exciting trip they deserved and maintaining the integrity of the research was a difficult balance to find, one that resulted in a dynamic, cautious, intentional, and adaptive research process.

The last point I wish to raise is my role as a tripper in shaping the canoe trip. As a researcher and canoeist, or “researcher-canoeist”, my actions shaped the experiences I researched as I performed them (Grimwood, 2011, p. 55). My actions were inseparable from the trips I was a part of and researching. I recognize that my role in guiding the trips through the park inevitably shaped how I, as a researcher, understood, perceived, and captured the events in my data. To work through these obstacles, I used a reflexive research process that engaged with the data throughout the collection and analysis phases of this research.

3.4 Recruitment Process and Participants

Upon receiving approval from the University of Waterloo’s Research Ethics Committee (ORE: 23114), I began the recruitment process. This first stage of the process involved reaching out to the Director of the summer camp, the gatekeeper, to gain the camp’s approval for conducting research. I met with the Director, with whom I have a strong relationship. We discussed my intentions with the research and anticipated outcomes, for both the camp and
myself. Upon receiving his approval for the study, I began reaching out to the potential participants for the study.

For this research, I used selective sampling: the process by which a specific group of people is sought as the population (Tekin, 2015). As this study’s focus is on the camp’s tripping staff and what they do, the trippers became the group of participants desired for the study.

Before the summer began, I sent each potential participant an email outlining the purpose of the research, what their involvement would entail should they choose to accept the offer, and the information and consent form. The trippers, like many of the other staff at the summer camp, return to camp summer after summer, so I already had a strong sense of who the participants would be. Through personal relationships and networks, I was able to reach out to the trippers and ask if they intended on returning to camp, and if they would be interested in participating in the study. All of the returning staff expressed interest in participating. Once the summer started, I sat down with each tripper to address any questions they might have had. I reassured them that their decision to participate in the study would be kept confidential and that this study would have no impact on their summer job or remuneration. I also reminded the participants that I had no professional or work-related authority over their free will to choose whether or not to participate in the research.

The participants for the study were between the ages of 19 and 24 years old. All of the participants were white, middle-class Jewish Canadians who grew up in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). They all came from privileged backgrounds that afforded them to spend multiple summers at the residential camp as campers and staff members. Like myself, they all attribute their experiences at the camp and canoeing through Algonquin Park as fundamental blocks to their identities.
The least experienced tripper had spent the past eight summers at the summer camp (two as a tripping staff member). The most experienced had spent the past 15 summers at the camp (five as a tripping staff member) and had been on upwards of 25 canoe trips through Algonquin Park with over 100 campers.

Table 1 details the participant demographics. It provides a profile of each participant to briefly contextualize the social worlds in which they operate. The participants have been given pseudonyms to maintain their confidentiality.

Table 1

*Participant Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Summers at Camp</th>
<th>Relevant Information/Position at Camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3rd summer as a tripper, lead tripper, more environmentally conscious than the other trippers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3rd summer as a tripper, lead tripper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Was head tripper for 3 summers, currently waterfront coordinator, lead tripper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>In charge of the tripping program, has been a tripper for 5 summers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>In charge of an area of camp not associated with the trip program but is experienced enough to be a ‘tripper on call’ for when extra trippers are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>In charge of an area of camp not associated with the trip program but is experienced enough to be a ‘tripper on call’ for when extra trippers are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joelle</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Junior tripper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Junior tripper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Junior tripper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Methods

This research used three different methods of data collection: active semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and commonplace journaling. The interview transcripts, field notes and observations, and participant journals comprise the data set used in this research.

3.5.1 Active Semi-Structured Interviews

This research used active semi-structured interviews. Active interviews are fluid and dynamic in nature; they capitalize on dynamic conversations held between researchers and participants (Johnson & Parry, 2015). They continuously build upon the “mutual disclosure and sharing of information” (Dupuis, 1999 as cited by Johnson & Parry, 2015, p. 56). During semi-structured interviews, researchers carry a list of suggested open-ended questions (Appendix A) that acts as a loose guide of themes and topics to cover during the interviews (Roulston, 2010). Active semi-structured interviews provide enough structure to ensure a consistent conversation that covers a wide range of topics occur during each interview while providing enough freedom for the researcher to pursue other topics that arise in conversation (Roulson, 2010).

During the interview process, I faced several challenges. Having strong relationships with the participants became an obstacle to the interview process. I noticed that the participants often used common language and slang, leaving much of what they said up to my interpretations. The participants and I share common sense assumptions, resulting in areas of conversation that we quickly dismissed or failed to deeper explore due to an assumed mutual understanding. When I noticed it during the interviews, I asked the participants to take a second and further explain their meanings so I could better represent how the thoughts and ideas they shared with me were socially constructed.
Similarly, having pre-established relationships with the participants proved to be a challenge during the interviews. An obstacle I often faced was asking the participants to put the fun and games of being a tripper temporarily aside for the interviews. As I anticipated, the participants were more interested in spending time with the campers and enjoying their time in Algonquin Park than sitting down with me for an interview. While I think that would happen to any researcher in my position, I often felt placed in an uncomfortable spot having to ask my friends and colleagues to put their limited free time on hold. It was an interesting challenge for me to balance being a friend and wanting the participants to have an incredible time in the park while also depending on them for a rich research process.

The interviews occurred where and when they could. Staying true to mobile methodologies, all of the interviews occurred on the canoe trips. They only took place when the trippers and I could fulfill our duties to the campers and the trips we were leading through the park. I originally anticipated conducting interviews in the staff tent after the campers had gone to bed, leaving the participants and myself in a quiet space while we could still supervise the campers. However, I hadn’t accounted for the levels of physical exhaustion that would overcome us each night. It was an oversight that I was forced to adapt to on the trips. As a result, interviews occurred while the participants and I were preparing meals, watching the sunsets with the campers, sitting under a tarp hiding out from the rain, or enjoying any unaccounted for downtime on the trips. While these seem to be unconventional spaces to conduct interviews for research purposes, they were the best opportunities I had, and they remain consistent with mobilities research. In response to the busy nature of canoe trips, not all the trippers were interviewed. I prioritized interviewing the more experienced trippers over the less experienced,
as they would have a larger pool of insight to draw upon. This allowed me to make the best use of the limited time I had on the canoe trips.

There was a total of eleven interviews, with six different staff members, all of which lasted anywhere between 4:03 minutes and 49:52 minutes. The details of the interviews are provided in Table 2.

Table 2

*Contextualizing the Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interview Setting</th>
<th>Interview Length (Minutes)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>July 19, 2018</td>
<td>While Rebecca and the researcher were making breakfast for the campers</td>
<td>36:59</td>
<td>Lake Galeairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>July 19, 2018</td>
<td>While Rebecca and the researcher were eating breakfast with the campers</td>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>Lake Galeairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>July 19, 2018</td>
<td>In the staff tent before Rebecca and the researcher went to bed. The interview</td>
<td>4:03</td>
<td>Rock Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was interrupted by a camper who yelled the researcher’s name because they had a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>question for the researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>July 19, 2018</td>
<td>Continuation of the interview in the staff tent, post-camper interruption</td>
<td>28:11</td>
<td>Rock Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>July 20, 2018</td>
<td>Last morning of the canoe trip, watching the sunrise over Rock Lake before the</td>
<td>17:24</td>
<td>Rock Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>campers were woken up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.5.2 Participant Observation

The second method this research used was participant observation. During the canoe trips, I carried a small journal with me and recorded within it countless jot notes. Jot notes are brief notes on certain observations that pay particular attention to a variety of details (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 2011). Jot notes were taken on the sensory details of the people and physical sites encountered on the trip, as well as direct quotations, significant or unexpected events, and explanations of how the participants responded to the events (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 2011). After the trip, I used the jot notes to help myself write specific and descriptive notes, commonly referred to as field notes (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 2011). The field notes then became a part of the data set and used in the findings, analysis, and discussion processes of this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>July 30, 2018</td>
<td>On the bus to Algonquin Park, while also supervising the campers</td>
<td>32:31</td>
<td>Highway 30 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan and Alex</td>
<td>July 31, 2018</td>
<td>Sitting in a hammock on the campsite while watching the campers</td>
<td>50:11</td>
<td>Lake Louisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>July 31, 2018</td>
<td>Watching the sunset while sitting on a rock attached to our campsite.</td>
<td>49:52</td>
<td>Lake Louisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>August 1, 2018</td>
<td>Sitting under a tarp in the middle of a thunderstorm making deep-fried Oreos for the campers</td>
<td>44:05</td>
<td>Lake Louisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>August 1, 2018</td>
<td>Sitting under a tarp after the rain storm</td>
<td>30:03</td>
<td>Lake Louisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>August 1, 2018</td>
<td>In a staff tent before going to sleep</td>
<td>23:10</td>
<td>Lake Louisa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.3 Commonplace Journaling

Mullins (2013) designed and implemented a mobile journaling activity for his canoe trip research participants, which he called the commonplace journey methodology. Participants were asked to keep a journal throughout the canoe trip, in which they were provided space to reflect on common discourses, practices, and observations (Mullins, 2013). The journals were then added to the cumulative data set. I adopted this method and slightly altered it (namely removing a common book for the participants to read on the canoe trip) to make this activity more feasible for the trippers while leading campers through the park.

Despite the fact that all the participants were given journals and prompted with reflection cues and reminders throughout the trip, only two participants actively engaged with the journals. The participants who chose not to journal, justifiably so, noted that they had too many other commitments and not enough time or energy to maintain a journal on the canoe trip. The journals were photocopied and added to the cumulative data set.

The following prompt was written in each journal before being passed onto the participants:

The purpose of this journal is for you to have a space to reflect on your canoe trip experiences. The reflections may occur in any form you wish them to be (written text, drawings, poetry…). Please reflect on the following themes, but know you are also welcome to include anything else you want in your journal.

- Your skills
- Place(s) of the trips
- Relationships (to people and nature)
- Your personal journey and story of growth
- Stories or memorable moments
- Anything else you wish to add

An important notion connected with mobile methodologies is the emphasis it places on collaborative reflection. Mobile methodologies “are geared towards enabling participants and
researchers to participate and reflect on practices” while traversing through a landscape (Spinney, 2014, p. 232). The postcolonial mobile methodological framework provided an incredible and unique space for the participants and me to reflect on our perceptions of Algonquin Park while we canoed through it. The reflective notion embedded within the framework allowed us to think about the powers and privileges we possess as privileged beneficiaries of settler colonialism while simultaneously acting upon them.

To reflect on the various notions of power and privilege that we, able-bodied and affluent white trippers, held, I brought a newspaper article onto the trip to help start the conversation. The article, “The shady past of Parks Canada: Forced out, Indigenous people are forging a comeback” (Appendix B) by Graeme Hamilton (2017) details an often overlooked past of parks in Canada, shedding light onto the legacies of colonial displacement in the Canadian park system. The article critically outlines the social and political histories of Canadian parks, allowing me to gently expose the participants to counter discourses and their inherent injustices fundamental to seemingly innocent, pure, and empty park spaces. After the participants read the article, we shared a common foundation on which we could collaboratively reflect on our uses and conceptualizations of the park. This process disrupted our common Western privileged conceptions of nature spaces by naming the Algonquin Peoples as the historical and rightful inhabitants of Algonquin Park, despite what our discursive truths held. These collaborative reflections were recorded, I transcribed them, and added them to the cumulative data set.
3.5.4 Data Analysis

3.4.4.1 Environmental Discourses and Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

This research assumes ontological pluralism, a social constructionist epistemology and uses a Foucauldian Discourse Analysis to interrogate the environmental discourses (the pattern of thoughts, actions, and beliefs that allow for culturally specific understandings of the human-nature relationship) of a summer camp’s canoe trips (Beton & Rennie Short, 1999).

Ontological pluralism accepts that an objective, all-encompassing, Truth does not exist. It adheres that knowledge is socially constructed, and as a result, varies between social groups and settings (Pernecky, 2016). The nature of being of ontological pluralism accepts that multiple realities exist and “that there may be several true interpretations” of a particular phenomenon, but none of the interpretations are any more or less valid than the others (Pernecky, 2016, p. 184).

Social constructionism notes that knowledge is not found or discovered but is constructed (Pernecky, 2016). It holds that what we know to be real and experienced in everyday life is not pre-given, nor specific to a localized subject, rather it is collectively constructed between a group of individuals (Pernecky, 2016). This means that what we experience and interpret to be real is “intersubjective” (Pernecky, 2016, p. 141) and is a result of a collective process that depends on “shared understandings, practices, language, and so forth” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 38). All of which contribute to the development of a discourse.

Discourses are powerful tools that shape collective social practices, ideologies, attitudes, and frames of reference for particular subject matter (Schwandt, 2007). Discourses have the power to create collective ‘facts’ and assumptions of a certain phenomenon that are specifically situated within a distinct cultural realm. This provides a “reference frame or context” through
which an individual is able to understand the world (Pernecky, 2016, p. 161). Therefore, discourses are socially situated and alter between social and cultural groups.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a “particularly useful way in analyzing in-depth meanings under a specific social context” (Qian, Wei & Law, 2018, p. 1). Using CDA to analyze the data allows me to illuminate the meanings and ideas imbedded within the statements the trippers (re)produce to uncover the unjust social relations imbedded within them (Waitt, 2005). While there are many different methods for conducting a critical discourse analysis, this research adopts a Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) approach to the data analysis.

An FDA seeks to deconstruct various socially accepted unannounced, unspoken, and unseen practices, or discourses; to identify the hidden power relations and injustices that are embedded within certain truths and meanings (Johnson & Parry, 2015). Unlike other methods of discourse analysis, its focus is on power and how power is sustained through discursive structures (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). Kendall and Wickham (1999) developed a five-stage process to help scholars make sense of Foucauldian notions of discourses and Foucauldian styled discourse analysis. They explained that every discourse has a discursive structure or complex—an intricate web of discursive and material practices that support common thoughts, perceptions, and knowledges—that lies behind it and is intertwined within social and political histories (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). Through the five-step process, Kendall and Wickham (1999) encourage scholars to identify how discourses are regularly and systematically produced, circulated, and normalized as objective accounts of truth. The steps are as follows:

1. The recognition of discourse as a corpus of statements whose organization is regular and systematic;
2. the identification of the statement’s rules of production;
3. the identification of the rules that delimit the sayable;
4. the identification of the rules that create the spaces in which new statements can be made; and
5. the identification of the rules that ensure that the practice is material and discursive at the same time.

The first step in their process is recognizing the regular and systematic organization of statements (both verbal and non-verbal) that contribute to the discursive complex. Once the statements are recognized, the subsequent steps outline the rules in which discourses are produced. The second step asks scholars to identify the broader social contexts and institutions that have allowed for discursive statements to be socially constructed, normalized, and circulated (Kendall & Wickham, 1999, p. 43). The third and fourth steps complement each other well. The third step asks scholars to identify what can and cannot be said, otherwise identifying the statements that lie within and outside of the discursive complex (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). In doing so, the fourth step is fulfilled, revealing the limits to the discursive complex and the metaphorically enclosed space within (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). Kendall and Wickham (1999) acknowledge that the second and fourth steps are similar in nature but have two distinct foci. While the second step elaborates on social origins of thought, seeking to identify the social and historical foundations of the discursive complex, the fourth step looks toward the present day to identify how new statements that align with and strengthen the discourses are produced (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). The final step in their process is an identification of the rules that ensure practices are material and discursive. This step highlights the link between the discursive and the material worlds, acknowledging their inseparable and seemingly totalizing nature (Kendall & Wickham, 1999).

The draw to disrupt commonly accepted discourses aligns Kendal and Wickham’s (1999) FDA approach with postcolonial theory. The goal of postcolonial theory is to disrupt prominent discourses and the unjust power relations that sustain and enforce them as normal or common sense. Postcolonial theory will allow me to disrupt the ongoing power imbalances that privilege,
circulate, normalize, and sustain certain environmental truths while silencing others. It will fracture the hegemonic discursive complexes the trippers opt into as they take their campers through Algonquin Park, exposing new regimes of truth and the unjust ways in which they have been silenced.

3.5.4.2 Using Kendall and Wickham’s Process

Many scholars have adopted Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) process to aid their Foucauldian-styled discourses analyses. Karababa and Ger (2010) used the five-step process in their investigation of coffeehouse culture in the context of Ottoman Era leisure consumption. They used Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) approach to identify the social and historical constructions of place, practices, and social norms that regulate coffeehouse culture. Similarly, Sam (2019) uses Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) five-step process in an investigation of social media and public policy research. Sam (2019) explained that Kendall and Wickham’s process is designed to help identify the “legitimacy of established assumptions, structures, and social dynamics” in a specific phenomenon (p. 3).

The aforementioned articles were able to effectively convey the social institutions that have legitimized localized discursive performances and silenced others. In doing so, they both touch upon Foucault’s notions of power/knowledge (explained in the following section) to better understand the social and political histories that have authoritatively shaped present-day lived experiences.

3.5.5 Building a Thesis with the Five-Step Process

I used a systematic process to analyze the data. I began by transcribing each of the interviews. This process allowed me to become closer and more familiar with the data. Upon
completing the transcriptions, I engaged with member-checking, sending the transcripts back to the respective respondents to ensure I better represented what they shared with me (Roulston, 2010). None of the participants expressed any desire to change or alter any of their responses. I then read, and re-read the data (the interview transcripts, field notes, and the pages of the participant’s journals) several times to further familiarize myself it.

The first of Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) five-step process is identifying the discourses as regular and systematic collections of statements. In order to complete this step, I used Van den Hooaard’s (2015) manual approach to data analysis. Van den Hooaard’s (2015) approach starts by sorting the data into codes. Codes are labels, assigned by the researcher(s) that allude to various topics, events, and phrases that routinely occur within a data set (Van den Hooaard, 2015). Open coding allows researchers to identify specific, regular, and systematic statements within data sets, all of which contribute to the completion of Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) first step. This research used open coding, broadly searching through the data and making a note of all reoccurring statements (Van den Hooaard, 2015). As oriented by postcolonial theory and a focus toward environmental discourses, I looked for social constructions of the environment that have been embodied and accepted as discursively normal by the trippers. After open coding the data twice and identifying various recurring statements, I then used focused coding, the process of reading the data searching for any overlooked texts that specifically fit into any of the pre-established codes (Van den Hooaard, 2015).

As I read through the data, I colour-coded it—specific colours related to specific environmental discourses. When I colour-coded any bit of data, I added it to a Microsoft Word document that I created to keep track of all the coloured bits of data (Figure 4). The table’s columns explained what the data was, where it could be found in the complete set, and what
meanings the data carried. I used the same process through the open and focused coding phases of the data analysis process, and any other times I noticed something in the data set that I previously overlooked.

Next, I read over the tables of data, several times, and identified any subthemes from each table. All of the data that corresponds to each environmental discourse was then transferred onto a large piece of chart paper to better organize and explore the discursive statements and complexes (Figure 5). Engaging with the Van den Hoonoord’s (2015) process of manual analysis allowed me to address Kendal and Wickham’s (1999) first step to an FDA. Chapter four of this thesis recognizes and explains the regular and systematic corpus of statements that guide the trippers as they take their campers through the park.

The following chapter, chapter five, addresses Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) second (identifying the rules of production), third (delimiting the sayable), fourth (identifying the rules that permit new statements to be created), and fifth (identifying the rules that ensures practices are material and discursive) steps by seeking the discursive rules of production. It identifies the ongoing social and political power imbalances that have normalized in the commonly accepted environmental discourses. To aid this process, I used a checklist (Table 3) provided by Waitt
(2005) to further interrogate the discursive complexes the trippers operated within while situating them into broader social and recurrent discourses. The checklist was developed to help scholars identify the social contexts that enable and limit the production of discursive statements. Waitt’s (2005) checklist has eighteen different components that ask scholars to, among other things, consider the types of statements that are circulated in the discourses, the social events that are included and excluded from the discourses, and the social networks in which the discourses are framed. On a separate document, I answered each of the questions Waitt (2005) proposed, helping me unravel the social contexts that enable and promote the discursive truths.

Table 3

Waitt’s (2005) Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>What pre-existing categories or value assumptions are made? What social constructions are present that set the scene?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding</td>
<td>What discourses are drawn upon in the text? How are the discourses textured together? Is there a mixing of discourses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>Are there any incoherencies within the discourse of your texts? Are there any incoherencies in relationship to previous research? Are there incoherencies in the analysis itself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>What types of statements are there (fact, predictions, hypothetical, evaluations?) How are the statements communicated (orally, encyclopedia, maps, photographs, statistics)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusions &amp; Silences</td>
<td>What elements of represented social events are included or excluded? Which people are represented and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Details</td>
<td>What is/are the genres of the text? Is the text part of a series of texts? Which other texts are included and excluded? Whose voices are included and excluded? Are voices directly reported (quoted), or indirectly reported?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>What social event or chain of events is the text a part of? Within what social network are the events framed? Who is the audience of the text?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foucault’s idea of power/knowledge articulates the complicated and interwoven relationship between power and knowledge. He argues, through the use of power, specific knowledges can be privileged over others, establishing the privileged knowledges as a truth (Braun, 2002). This simultaneously excludes and silences other truths (Braun, 2002). By limiting support to particular notions of truth, the total breadth of knowledge is limited, thus discursively leaving only the knowledge that aligns with what those in power have favoured (Braun, 2002). In other words, power is able to develop forms of knowledge, which in turn strengthens power itself. Engaging with Foucault’s notion of power/knowledge allows me to understand how the knowledges and truths the trippers operate within are intertwined with unjust social and power relations that silence and overwrite other discursive truths and norms. Chapter five outlines the social and historic setting that enable the discursive truths that have been established by those in power. It illuminates the limits to the discourse by exposing the statements that lie within and those that are external to the discursive complex. This process fulfills Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) second, third, fourth, and fifth steps.

Chapter six analyzes the silences, incoherencies, and limits that sustain the discourses presented in chapter five. It looks to scrutinize the hidden discursive power relations the trippers operate within by highlighting how they silence and work around discursive statements that do
not align with their own, further enabling their own hegemonic account of truth. This chapter is guided by postcolonial theory, it identifies how sustained and ongoing settler colonial power injustices privilege Western discursive truths that pertain to the human-nature relationship while silencing and belittling others. Here, I turn back to Waitt’s (2005) checklist to help scrutinize, fracture, and interrupt the Western hegemonic environmental discourses the trippers (re)produce as they take their campers through Algonquin Park.

Chapter seven concludes the thesis with a brief discussion of what summer camp counsellors can do to reconcile the social and political tensions of taking campers through Algonquin Park and their roles as beneficiaries of settler colonialism. It uses the knowledges highlighted and explored in this thesis to provide tangible steps trippers can take to better their practices and create a more socially just, and aware, canoe tripping culture.

To summarize the aforementioned and situate it within the research questions, chapter four addresses Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) first step towards an FDA by using Van den Hoonaard’s (2015) manual data analysis process. It addresses the first research question, “How are environmental discourses perceived and performed by summer camp trippers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park?” Chapter five further addresses the first research question by using Waitt’s (2005) checklist to help identify the second, third, fourth, and fifth steps of Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) checklist by socially and politically situating the discourses and identifying the limits of the discursive complexes. It also addresses the second research question, “How are power, privilege, and knowledge circulated in the environmental discourses?” as the discursive rules of production and limits privilege particular conceptions of power and knowledge while expelling others. Chapter six also addresses the second research question by attending the silences, incoherencies, and limits to the discursive structures. It further exposes how power,
privilege, and knowledge are circulated and normalized in the environmental discourses and truths within which the trippers operate. The thesis concludes with a discussion that answers the third research question, “What can summer camp trippers do to reconcile the social and political tensions inherent in taking campers through Algonquin Park and their role as beneficiaries of settler colonialism?” Addressing the final research question provides trippers with tangible changes they can make to their canoe tripping practices to create a more inclusive and aware canoe trip for all.
Chapter 4: Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the various discourses found on the summer camp canoe trips. It uses Van den Hoonaaard’s (2015) process of manual analysis to address the first step in Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) process of conducting a critical discourse analysis: identifying the regular and systematic statements that comprise each discourse. It answers the following research question: “How are environmental discourses perceived and performed by summer camp trippers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park?” The analysis revealed that there are four prominent environmental discourses the trippers operate within while leading canoe trips. They are:

1. Canoe trips as a tourism experience;
2. Nature as a seemingly people-less place;
3. Canoe trips as a space to explore the frontier; and

The discourses inform the trippers’ actions and are made legible by the ways in which the trippers act, informing how they communicate and assign meanings to landscapes as they pass through them. The presented discourses inform the trippers practice while maintaining and reinforcing a normalized suite of practices in regard to the human-nature relationship.

This chapter does not aim to critique and disturb the discourses found. Rather, it seeks to identify the discourses and how the participants embody them while leading canoe trips. It addresses Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) first step understanding a Foucauldian styled discourse—recognizing discourses as a corpus of regular and systematic statements.
4.2 Canoe Trips as a Tourism Experience

4.2.1 Defining Tourism

The tourism experience discourse circulates through the canoe trips by means of various spoken, written, performed, and visual texts. Tourism is a type of human experience that involves a “departure [from] established routines and practices of everyday life; allowing one’s senses to engage with a set of stimuli that contrasts with the everyday and mundane” (Urry & Larsen, 2011, p. 3). The camp setting in which this research is based can be recognized as the everyday and mundane that Urry and Larson (2011) refer to, as a result of the camp’s tightly followed schedule (wake up, meal times, etc…) and planned activities. In contrast, the canoe trips are presented as an activity external to the everyday and mundane.

4.2.2 “Tripcation”

The camp’s time spent in Algonquin Park is communicated as a vacation by the trip staff. Most notably by Rebecca, who refers to the canoe trips as “tripcations” (Field Notes, July 20, 2018). Coupled with the singing, eating, bonding, and relaxing that comes on a canoe trip, the tripcation sets itself as an exciting tourism experience embraced by many on the summer camp trips. While Rebecca is the only tripper to explicitly label the experience as a tripcation, it is evident that other trippers and visitors to the park embraced it as such.

On the first of the two canoe trips, the group passed a young couple, presumably on vacation; they were laying on a rock near their campsite listening to “Banana Pancakes” by Jack Johnson, drinking beer (Field Notes, July 18, 2018). They were capitalizing on the sunshine and the secluded nature of the park to relax and unwind. Two days later, the same trip passed by a group of six guys sitting in lawn chairs, watching the sunset over Rock Lake, again with beers in
their hands (Field Notes, July 20, 2018). Despite the trips being a summer job for the participants, the trippers, much like the other visitors to the park, embrace their time in the park as an exciting tourism opportunity. While less evident than sun tanning with a beer in hand, the trippers bring various luxury items onto the canoe trips whose purposes are to ease and add excitement to the canoe trips.

The luxury items seen on other trips that result in an enhanced experience, like the beers, lawn chairs, and music, are not outside the summer camps’ tripping realm. The summer camp trips featured hot and fresh coffee, twice daily, and more hammocks than necessary (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). Adam and Jordan started off each day and ended each night with a fresh cup of pressed McDonald’s coffee (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). The trippers brought coffee grinds and a French press with them into the park as a luxury item to enhance their ‘tripcation’. Additionally, multiple trippers (Will, Adam, Alex, Ethan, and the researcher) brought hammocks (Figure 6) onto the trips, allowing for a quiet space to sway in the wind, beside a lake, watching the sunset—the pinnacle of summer relaxation seen on various advertisements around the world (July 31, 2018).

Figure 6. Rebecca Relaxing on a Hammock at Sunset. Source: Brandon Pludwinski
The sunrises and sunsets act as natural spectacles that advance the tourism discourse on the canoe trips, they are visual experiences the participants are restricted from in their everyday and mundane lives. Being in the park affords the participants the chance to marvel at a natural phenomenon, engaging with a new set of stimuli they don’t often get to experience elsewhere. Alex explains how certain aspects of the canoe trip depend on the sunset, “…we all got together, and we ate by a rock, staring out at the sun as it was setting” (Alex, July 31, 2018). It drove several of the staff and campers to wake up early and experience the feeling of “complete serenity” unique to Algonquin Park canoe trips (Field Notes, July 20, 2018; Field Notes, July 31, 2018; Field Notes, August 1, 2018). The sunrises and sunsets provided the trippers with a stimulus experience external to their everyday and mundane, further establishing the tourism discourse on the summer camp canoe trips.

4.2.3 Laws of the Park

The final page of the official Algonquin Park newspaper lists the rules that pertain to alcohol use, vehicles (authorized and unauthorized) in the park, entrance permits, fireworks, fishing, and hunting (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Reviewing, agreeing, and then signing an official document confirming one’s compliance with the rule are mandatory steps to receiving a permit and entry for camping purposes in the park. The trippers undergo this process each time they take a group of campers into the backcountry.

The rules align with the park’s commitment to “provide a setting for peace and natural experiences” for all “visitors”, ensuring the park remains in its “pristine” and “wild” state (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). These rules establish boundaries for the camp to operate within, limiting their actions to those that align with values assigned by the park. Not only do all the trippers abide by the park’s regulations, but Dylan also ensures that his “campers understand
the rules” and behave within them (July 30, 2018). He ensures his campers are aware of the acceptable and unacceptable ways to behave in the park. The rules operationalize as a set of statements that forcefully guide the tripper’s interactions with the landscapes as they lead their campers through the park landscapes.

The rules and regulations of the park shed light onto a set of norms found among Ontario Parks’ enforced, sustained, and normalized conceptualizations of the human-nature relationship. They explain that to “damage, deface, remove, harm, or kill [any] plant, tree, [or] animal” is punishable by a $155 fine (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). These laws are in place “to maintain the Park as a natural setting, [thereby] the removal of natural objects is prohibited” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Similarly, the campsites are “not to exceed nine people” and “more than three pieces of shelter equipment” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). These rules ensure the sites do not “deteriorate, and surrounding vegetation would [not] be destroyed” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). They contribute to the construction of nature as a tourism space in which humans have the duty to maintain the physicality of the setting, “[ensuring] everyone has an enjoyable visit” in a “setting [meant] for peaceful…experiences” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018).

4.2.4 A Place Outside the Busy Hustle and Bustle

The participants conveyed messages that labeled canoe trips in Algonquin Park as exciting tourism experiences whose sole purpose is to relax, rejuvenate, and be freed from constraints of life outside the park.

Rebecca explains that the canoe trips are “four-day breaks from everything going on…from life” that give participants the freedom of “not being [held to] such a schedule” (July 19, 2018). Rebecca’s explanation labeled the canoe trips as an activity to free oneself from
modern social organization. To her, canoe trips provided the participants with the chance to escape civilization and explore a space free of productive labour and progressive culture.

Alex further explained the clear distinction between life in the city and life in the park. The former is everyday life, with all of its routines and structures, and the latter allows us to “escape” the former (July 31, 2018). Will agrees with Alex’s and Rebecca’s thoughts. He said, “While being in nature, [you are] kind of excluding yourself from what is often done in the city…[allowing yourself to get] away from…daily routines” (Field Notes, July 31, 2018). Will presented the park to his campers as a spaced outside productive labour where “we can look at nature and be in a nice retreat” (Field Notes, July 30, 2018).

The trippers constantly labeled the canoe trip as an experience outside the everyday. Most commonly, Will, Adam, Alex, and Dylan labeled and explained the park as a place of “serenity” to their campers (August 1, 2018; Field Notes, July 31, 2018; Field Notes, July 31, 2018). Rebecca, on several occasions, asked the campers to “stop paddling and see where we are”, and, “isn’t this the life, how beautiful is this” (Field Notes, July 17, 2018)? The first time she asked the campers to stop paddling, about three hours into the trip, she encouraged them to think of our trip as an isolated group in the wilderness, passing through empty spaces that no else has ever existed in (Field Notes, July 17, 2018).

Rebecca uses the opportunity of being free from daily life to provide the participants of the trip an experience that will foster personal growth and development, as she sees it, a fundamental notion of the camp canoe trip (Rebecca, July 19, 2018). She carefully designs routes that will allow the campers “just to be more in tune with [themselves]” and less distracted from constraints of the city (Rebecca, July 19, 2018). Rebecca’s goal is to encourage the campers to reflect on their own bodies, “eating when [they’re] hungry, sleeping when [they’re] tired…
becoming more in tune with what they want [from] their survival needs,” rather than the needs of modern life (July 19, 2018). Rebecca uses the park as an escape from societal distractions and scheduled life to allow the campers to become more ‘in-tune’ with themselves. Joelle conceptualized the park similarly. Joelle sees the park as a space that allows the campers “to live in the moment…where everything is much simpler” (Joelle, July 31, 2018). Alex shares Rebecca’s and Joelle’s desire to provide the participants of the trip a new mental state of being, “we need to show these various campers what life is like when you don’t have [excessive] commodities”, allowing the mind and body to enter new states of being (Alex, July 31, 2018).

The trippers contextualized and communicated Algonquin Park as a space free from everyday and mundane distractions of modern society. They ensured their campers got the chance to experience life outside modern civilization, furthering the binary distinction between nature and culture, where they do not and cannot exist in the same space. This is notion is further investigated and troubled in the following chapters.

4.2.5 Placing Tourism on the Trips

A fundamental notion of tourism ensures that the tourist has an enjoyable experience (Urry & Larsen, 2011). While canoe trips may not be for everyone, especially young campers who enter the park and find themselves thrown out of their comfort zones, each of the trippers work tirelessly to provide the campers with the best experiences they can. “At the end of the day,” Adam explained, “we’re showing [the campers] a good time” (August 1, 2018). Will agreed, “my goal is to make everyone have a good time” (Will, August 1, 2018), whether that means taking the “campers to waterfalls, on hikes… [or] thing they don’t get to normally experience” (Will, July 31, 2018). Even when the weather proved to be a challenge, the trip staff could be found under tarps deep frying Oreos, marshmallows, sweet-potato fries, and onion rings
to brighten the camper’s moods (Field Notes, July 31, 2018). The trip staff did all they could to ensure their campers had an enjoyable experience in the park.

The summer camp canoe trips are experiences heavily embedded within the tourism discourse, encouraging the trippers to consider themselves on a tourism experience outside their everyday experiences and engaging in activities and stimuli external to the modern and mundane.

4.3 Nature as a Seemingly People-less Place

4.3.1 Keeping the Park Human Free

Keeping the campsites and spaces the trips pass through seemingly people-less is a critically fundamental aspect of the canoe trips. The staff members adopted the leave no trace (LNT) suite of practices to maintain the spaces free of human presence. The LNT practice was clearly outlined and embraced by several statements that informed the summer camp’s canoe trippers: a rotating PowerPoint slideshow in the park’s office, various sections in the newspaper, and the many seemingly human-free spaces the trippers and campers saw in and around the park.

The LNT practice is comprised of seven principles for users to follow: 1) plan trips ahead of time, packing what is needed and can be carried throughout an excursion, 2) travel and camp on spaces designated for recreation, 3) properly dispose of waste where applicable, 4) leave rocks, leaves, and branches where they lie on the ground, 5) minimize impacts of campfires, 6) respect all forms of wildlife and their natural habitats, and 7) be considerate of others in the recreational areas (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Following each of the seven principles allowed the participants to ensure their trip operated within the discourse of nature as a seemingly people-less place.
4.3.1.1 Planning the Trips

The trippers ensured that the campers were well packed with all the clothing they need for the canoe trip. Each participant packed two sets of clothing, separated into day/wet clothes and night/dry clothes, packing for long, hot, and potentially wet days, and cold nights (Appendix C). They wore what they had and reaped the consequences of forgotten items. Trips into the Algonquin Park backcountry are not afforded the option of purchasing new products to make up for something lost or left behind along the way, thus, removing localized traces of material consumption.

When the trippers were getting ready for the trips, they ensured the materials they packed would contribute towards a successful trip that left no traces of their presence in the park. Take water for an example, the trippers brought along various filtrations systems on the trips. The newer system, called “the Platypus”, sells for $150CAD, is 100% reusable, and leaves no traces of human presence (Adam, August 1, 2018). The filtration system passes water from a dirty bag, filled directly with lake water, into a clean bag, ready for consumption, eliminating the need for single-use water bottles on the canoe trips (Field Notes, July 20, 2018).

Similarly, the trippers packed pots, pans, plates, cutlery, back-up cooking materials, and anything else they could possibly need for a successful canoe trip, all of which is reused from trip to trip. The reusable items they pack eliminate their dependence on consumptive practices and single-use items (like paper plates and plastic forks) that both negatively impact the environment and could also be left behind. Planning and preparing ahead of time allowed the trippers to control the amount of waste the trip produced, strengthening the discourse that normalizes the absence of humanity in the park.
4.3.1.2 Travelling on Certain Surfaces

An integral aspect of the LNT practices that promote nature spaces as people-less places is the emphasis it places on maintaining travel to designated paths. The canoe trips meticulously followed the planned routes, sticking to maintained portage trails, “where all fallen twigs are moved off to the side and the muddy areas have a carefully built [wooden] pathway for visitors to walk on” (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). Maintaining travel to the designated routes protects the land external to those paths from being passed and trampled over, maintaining the illusion that these spaces have never been touched by the modern human.

Canoeing, a fundamental aspect of any canoe trip, is an incredible example of an LNT endorsed method of transportation. Canoeing across a lake leaves no physical sign of an individual’s occupation of the space, nor does it produce any other localized environmental determents. Canoe trips, promoted by various companies, the park’s administration, the summer camp, and trippers, “provide natural [recreational experiences] to visitors while maintaining the ecological integrity of the landscape and aquatic habitats” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018).

The lakes the trips canoe through and paths they portage over are material-discursive productions that strengthen conceptualizations of the spaces in Algonquin Park as people-less. The maintenance of the park’s ecological integrity through travel is pertinent in the park’s rules, as it outlines a $95 fine for camping on and travelling through undesignated spaces (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). This rule asks participants to directly “follow specified routes” and sleep on “designated campsites” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). As a result, the summer camp trips only “take…maintained portage trails” and camp where it’s permitted (Field Notes, July 18, 2018). Thus, maintaining the environmental integrities of the park and leaving no visible traces of human presence on the land.
4.3.2.3 Waste Disposal

There is an expectation that Will and Dylan have towards waste in the park. Will reminded his campers that Algonquin Park is not the place where leaving garbage is acceptable. He said to his campers, “you know you shouldn’t waste and I’m just reminding you that this place isn’t any different” (July 31, 2018). Dylan shared Will’s expectation. He said,

> When you’re looking at the forest, you expect to see trees, you expect to see grass, and maybe even you see campers playing. You expect to see the beauty of nature, but you don’t expect to see the man-made things that are sitting there, noticeably out of place. (Dylan, July 30, 2018)

In the above quote, Dylan adequately summarized his expectations of Algonquin Park and nature. He continued to mention that “it’s easy to notice when things are out of place and when things don’t look like nature” and if it’s seen on the trips, he expects someone to quickly clean it up (Dylan, July 30, 2018). For Dylan, signs of human presence do not belong in nature spaces.

These discrepancies in nature resulted in a statement that countered how the trippers had been discursively operating, both frustrating and bothering them. In one instance, the first trip approached a campsite where an excess of garbage was left in the fire pit, and Rebecca was not pleased (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). Holding onto the illusion that Algonquin Park is a people-less place, Rebecca said, “We don’t want to see that other people were here before. This is why we always make sure to clean up the site after. It’s not nice to see other people were here…” (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). When Dylan said that the site didn’t look like nature and Rebecca said that it’s not nice to see that other people are here, they contribute to, and strengthen, the discourses that hold Algonquin Park as a space outside of humanity.

After one of the meals on the second and larger canoe trip, Adam reminded the campers in charge of the dishes “not to put any food in the water” (Field Notes, July 31, 2018). Will continued, “it’s bad for the environment. Make sure you eat everything, [and the plate is clear],
before you wash [it]” (Field Notes, July 31, 2018). The trippers brought along biodegradable soaps on the trips with them, furthering notions that visitors should not be adding to or altering the lakes in any way (Field Notes, July 31, 2018), keeping the Algonquin Park nature free of any and all traces of human presence (Adam, August 1, 2018).

The yellow garbage bag, as given by the park’s administration upon check-in to the park, is widely used and accepted as a mobile garbage bin that stays with each person that enters the park (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). When leaving a site, the trips undergo an intense cleaning process, ensuring that everything goes “in their proper bags” (Alex, July 31, 2018). The bags were then put into their respective packs and carried for the remainder of the trip (Alex, July 31, 2018). Nothing is left behind at the site or abandoned along the route. Rebecca noted that properly dealing with the trip’s waste and ensuring a clean campsite upon departure is

just making sure that campsite is left exactly how we found it. So that means no garbage on the campsite, it doesn’t matter if it’s even plastic or paper products. We want the campsite to be as beautiful for the next person as it was for us…We try not to put leftover food in the lake, we try not to put it into the [KYBO]…we try to eat what we have, and if not… we take it back with us. (July 19, 2018)

This idea is what the Algonquin Park Newspaper (2018) called the “pack it in, pack it out philosophy”. The newspaper demands that all visitors adopt this way of thinking, one that requires visitors to take everything out of the park that they brought in. The trippers embodied this practice as they used the portable garbage bags, a material statement that reminds the participants to keep their waste with them until the trip’s completion. Further maintaining Algonquin Park as a place that exists external to humanity.
4.3.2.4 Leave What You Find

The fourth notion of the LNT practice asks participants to leave “plants [and] rocks…as you find them” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). It asks participants to leave nature seemingly untouched.

Rebecca ensured the trips that the trips she led maintained the integrity of the natural world, as it lies in its place, throughout the trips she led. During the site clean-up process, she tells the campers that they needed to double check that “every moved log is put back into its original position,” just as it was before they arrived (Field Notes, July 18, 2018).

While the lakes are acceptable places of LNT canoe travel, many of them have lily pads and other forms of natural wildlife. Rebecca told a story of when she was a camper and used to paddle over to the lily pads, and, gently floating on top of them, she would pick them out of the water (July 19, 2018). She said,

I used to pick up the lily pads, like pick them out of the [lake] as we were canoeing. And then my trippers would get mad and explain why we don’t do that, and now that’s something ingrained [in me]… I want to keep everything the way it was before I was there. (Rebecca, July 19, 2018)

What Rebecca’s trippers said to her engrained in her mind, and she has made a note of it for her campers. These processes keep the natural world in their original places.

4.3.2.5 Minimizing Fire Impacts

During the time of the research, Algonquin Park was under a total fire ban, prohibiting all visitors from creating any open fires (Field Notes, July 17, 2018). As a result, the trips used portable gas tanks to cook all the food on each of the trips.

The fire ban represents a concern for the integrity of the natural world, one that is clearly communicated and obeyed within the park. Despite not being able to actually make a fire, Adam
said, “We have one Algonquin Park… [We] need to make sure that fires are drowned, and we don’t start forest fires” (Adam, August 1, 2018). Adam continued to explain that a simple bonfire could become a massive forest fire with potentially devastating effects towards humans, plants, and animals that freely roam the park’s landscapes (Adam, August 1, 2018). He then asked the campers to be cautious of their actions and consequences they carry (Adam, August 1, 2018). Adam’s plea to the campers for fire safety safeguarded the potentially “damaging” fires can play in destroying “our environment,” and leaving clear signs of a human’s presence on the land (Adam, August 1, 2018).

4.3.2.6 Respecting Wildlife

The idea of “live and let live” guided Dylan’s interactions with the landscapes and the species found within as he took his campers through Algonquin Park (July 30, 2018). He asked himself, “with all of the wildlife, with all of the trees, if they’re not bothering us, why should we bother them” (Dylan, July 30, 2018)? There were massive and frequent statements found on the summer camp canoe trips that directly reinforced and strengthened respect for all forms of the natural wildlife within the park.

The Algonquin Park Newspaper (2018) featured a full-page spread, as well as several sections throughout the paper, that forced visitors to consider their actions in the “home” of the “wild” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The newspaper asked visitors to never feed any animals, avoid passing through sensitive habitats, watch wildlife from a safe distance, control any pets brought into the park, and properly store food out of reach for the animals (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The park rangers explained, “It is an offense to intentionally [or] unintentionally attract wildlife” and any actions that do so are punishable by fine or eviction from the park (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Rebecca clearly articulated that we, as
trippers, are too often worried about attracting bears, raccoons, and harmful rodents to our sites that “we kind of forget to appreciate how awesome they are” (July 19, 2018).

The trippers all followed what the park’s superintendent labeled the most “basic principle: have respect and consideration for…the park environment” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The trippers ensured they maintained an appropriate noise level in the park, not to frighten any wildlife around them (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). Additionally, the trips were careful with what they brought to the campsite, bringing nothing that could be “harmful for the animals” (Rebecca, July 19, 2018). Glass bottles are not permitted into the park grounds as they are “easy to break, and [potentially] dangerous…for animals and wildlife that are trying to live there that [might] step on pointy things that weren’t there before” (Dylan, July 30, 2018). The trippers recognize they are in the home of the wild, and they, to the best of their ability, restrict actions and materials that could negatively impact the wildlife around them.

When the trip passed a frog in the water, the campers instantly attempted to hit it with their canoe paddles. Joelle quickly intervened, she told the campers to stop and leave the frog alone. She said, we “are guests in the frog’s home and habitat” (Joelle, July 30, 2018). She demanded the campers respect the wildlife in the park, and let the frog move about its home uninterrupted by a human presence.

Rebecca and Joelle share a common respect for wild species in the park. Rebecca urges the other trippers and campers around her to recognize the species in Algonquin Park as incredible and delicate non-human beings, rather than obstacles to successful canoe trips they are discursively labelled. Ultimately encouraging her peers to respect and appreciate the non-human species around them.
4.3.2.7 Being Considerate of Other Visitors in the Park

The final principle of the LNT asks visitors to “have respect and consideration for fellow visitors” in outdoor recreational spaces (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). As far as the canoe trips were concerned, respecting fellow visitors related not only to the cleanliness of the park and its spaces but also to maintaining the dominating narratives that keep Algonquin Park a people-less space. This is an interesting consideration of the park, particularly in the sense that it asks visitors to respect the people that are not discursively considered to be there.

Silence is sought, celebrated, and held in high regard by the participants. On the first day of paddling through Rock Lake on the first trip, Rebecca asked the campers, “what do we see, smell, hear?” and she told them, “it’s just us” in the park, no one or anything else (Field Notes, July 17, 2018). She then yelled into mountains, only to hear her voice echo through what she conveyed to the campers as an empty landscape (Field Notes, July 17, 2017).

For the most part, the trippers ensured a low level of noise on their trips to be “conscious of other people in the park [because we don’t want to] disrupt anyone else’s experience here. [We want] them to have the same kind of experience [we] do” (Rebecca, July 19, 2018). Similarly, when the campers were being too loud, Adam went over to them and explained “beauty is in the silence and serenity…Algonquin is the place for serenity for everyone, so you need to be quiet and respectful of everyone,” even if we can’t see them (July 31, 2018). This is particularly interesting in light of the statements that the trippers (re)produce that suggest Algonquin Park is a people-less place, discussed in the next section. These statements directly contrast with one another but operate in such a way that maintains a particular park experience.

Should participants be unable to maintain appropriate levels of noise, the Algonquin Park rangers are there to enforce a silence within the park. “You cannot disturb any other person or
interfere with their enjoyment of the park at any time of the day or night” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Participants to the backcountry are responsible for maintaining a silence that enables the auditory conception of the park outside modern industrialized society.

4.3.2 Ensuring the People-less Place

Leaving no trace of human presence on the land has been a part of the summer camp’s culture of canoe trips for generations. When Will was a camper, his trippers gave him a “whole speech about the importance of leaving no trace” during canoe trips (July 31, 2018). Which, for him, “basically began the rule of obviously you can’t leave out or leave any sign that you were there” (Will, July 31, 2018). Adam, who had the same trippers as Will, explained that “there’s always going to be a brief discussion, or just like a sense or pact, we have to leave no trace…” while canoe tripping through Algonquin Park (Adam, August 1, 2018).

Adopting the seven LNT practices encouraged the trippers to interact with the landscapes in such a way that maintained Algonquin Park as a space superficially free of human impacts. Adam summed up his thoughts on his use of the LNT ethic and said,

We are, obviously aware and conscious of the environment that we are in, especially in this day and age when climate change is one of the greatest concerns of all time right now, and respecting the space we live in. There’s this saying that I hope all trip staff live by—leave no trace. You want to leave, not only the campsite but the environment around you the same way as you found it and we do [a few things] to keep with that motto. One is making sure that we don’t leave any litter around, we don’t pollute it, and we use biodegradable soap, which is fine for the lakes that we clean our dishes in. And although we aren’t the most environmentally conscious or aware tripping camp, or just tripping program, we are very aware of our surroundings and what kind of impact we can have on the environment. (August 1, 2018)
4.4 Canoe Trips as a Space to Explore the Frontier

4.4.1 Placing the Frontier

The canoe trippers have labeled Algonquin Park’s backcountry as a space of the wilderness frontier. The constantly refer to it as a space “out in the woods, where you’re alone,” to help the campers conceptualize the landscapes they pass through as entities far removed from modern and industrialized society (Will, July 31, 2018). For the trippers, the frontier represents unchartered territory where modern social organization does not exist, and common everyday experiences are free from modern luxuries and technologies (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999).

4.4.2 A Place Outside Society

The summer camp counsellors have communicated Algonquin Park as a unique space that exists outside modern everyday experiences. Ethan explained,

the untouched nature, the beautiful lakes, the colours, and the surroundings that you see is something that you never, can never see in the city. It includes the stars at night, the clear water by day, and the fish and the everything... there’s the smell, you can smell the pine trees, and the water, and sometimes the mud, but like, it’s just so untampered with. You know you hear the wildlife; you hear quiet for once in your life. Just the feeling of walking on untampered paths through the mud, you know the grit of the canoes on your shoulders, the experience of nature around you that’s so raw and so real...And the tastes, of the food, which you cooked for yourself and [they are some of the best meals you’ve ever had]. There’s just an essence that comes with [the park] and to the realness of it. (July 31, 2018)

Rebecca does the same. She labeled Algonquin Park as a place located physically far outside everyday modern life experiences. She explained that Algonquin Park is a place of the wilderness, or, the place of the animals. She says that to cross over the park borders is to cross into “[the animal’s] place,” in which humans do not reside (Rebecca, July 19, 2018).
Labeling the park as “black bear country” allowed the Park Wardens to strengthen the norms that maintain Algonquin Park as a space outside “human country” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Participants were forced to take precautions, like making “bear hangs” to avoid bears roaming onto their camping sites (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). It is discursively made very clear to the backcountry visitors that the forests are not human-spaces; rather they are spaces operated under the rule of the wild.

Not only does the Algonquin Park newspaper communicate the park as the black bear’s home in the newspaper, but it features countless images of other “permanent occupants” of the park: moose, foxes, beavers, fish, wolves, turtles, and various species of birds (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). All of which furthers thought that the park exists in a space outside modern human society.

Perhaps the strongest statement that labeled the park outside of civilization was the absence of modern industrialized city sounds. The calls of the wild animals suggested that the canoe trips were immersed in a world where the beasts dominate, free of human pressures. Posters of the wolf, perched on a rock above a misty tree line, are shown in the park’s office (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). The call of the loon over the morning mist and the wolf’s howl at nightfall gives visitors the impression that they are immersed in the natural world, far away from the modern city (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). These sounds operate in opposition to that of sirens, cars, trucks, and other people that suggest a human-infested modernized and cultural cityscape (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). The audible sounds in the park further and strengthen the nature/culture binary presented earlier in this thesis that suggest humanity exists separate from nature. This will be further explored and scrutinized in a subsequent section of this thesis.
On each canoe trip, the staff carry a Global Position System (GPS) tracking device, called ‘the spot’ (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). The spot can send out a call to emergency services for assistance at the touch of a button, and it allows the camp’s director to keep an eye on the trip as they traverse through the park, wherever they go (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). Algonquin Park is further assumed to be external to human civilization and development, as modern and everyday technologies, like cellphones, become inadequate in the backcountry. The replacement of the cellphone with the spot signaled to the trippers that they were beyond the borders of civilization and in a space where modern technologies no longer functioned. The trippers would overlook the fact that spot is also a modern technology, further establishing and maintaining the backcountry as a space external to everyday technologies. Using the spot, as opposed to a cell phone, forced a discursive conceptualization of a space beyond modern city limits where common everyday technologies are inadequate. Or, as Ontario Parks explained, visitors cannot rely on common cellphones to keep them safe in the backcountry as cell reception is “none to limited” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The spot became a response to inadequate modern everyday technologies that flourish in urban space but are discursively useless in nature spaces. It acted as a non-verbal text that advanced the thought that participants were immersed in the wilderness frontier, free from modern civilization and human influence while canoe tripping through the park.

In addition to the aforementioned texts, the gift shop featured an array of items, all of which furthered Algonquin Park as a space outside modern society. Visitors could purchase souvenirs with images of bears, beavers, moose, and t-shirts with landscape photos of the sun setting behind an empty and people-less landscape (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). The images on
the souvenirs lacked a human-presence, further amplifying the absence of modern industrialized society in the park.

Remaining outside of the modern city civilization is perhaps one of the most important self-ascribed functions of the park. As the park’s superintendent bluntly explained, Algonquin Park is “an increasingly important refuge from our busy, urban way of life…” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). At the end of the second canoe trip when the trip reached the access point, Ethan said with a sigh of relief, “oh, it’s so nice to be back in civilization”, despite the fact that we were still technically within the park borders (Field Notes, August 2, 2018). It was the first glance of other peoples and modern technologies (cars, permit offices, trucks, other people, etc...) the trip had seen in a few days after entering into the backcountry (Field Notes, August 2, 2018). Ethan’s categorization of being “back in society” played an interesting contrast that helped define the park spaces as out of society (Field Notes, August 2, 2018). To return back to society signifies a departure from society, establishing two distinct places: one of society, and one outside of society (Field Note, August 2, 2018). This defined duality helped explain to the participants that, during the canoe trips, they were outside society, pushing the boundaries of human civilization in a world that has yet to be discovered and explored.

4.4.3 A Space to Explore and Discover

The canoe trippers noted that Algonquin Park is a space to explore, discover, and adventure through the external-to-society wilderness.

Notions of exploring and adventuring were apparent in the ways that the trippers understood their role on the canoe trips. Adam said his purpose in the park is to “take kids on…an adventure” (August 1, 2018). As for Rebecca, she found one of her responsibilities as a tripper was to take the campers to “as many waterfalls and campsites” as possible (July 19,
2018). She finds that her job is to “create new experiences for [the campers],” to allow them to explore as much of the park as possible in the short amount of time they have on the trips (Rebecca, July 19, 2018).

While the canoe trips can only cover so much ground, Rebecca made it her business to share personal stories of the park with her campers, hoping that it would foster a desire for continued exploration. She said,

I have [campers] asking if Algonquin Park is just a lake, which was [also] on this trip. I think after they realize the enormity of it, especially after I try to explain to them that this is the section that we’re in, and it’s [only] a small portion [of the park]…and there’s even more to discover in Algonquin and because of the way that camp canoe trips are set up, we only get a small portion of Algonquin. There’s a crazy amount more they can discover if they’re interested in it and if they want to try and find their own way around. So, I hope they get out of the canoe trip the knowledge of Algonquin Park is just way bigger and way more awesome that even what we’re seeing on the canoe trip [and that they should try and see as much as they can in their lifetime]. (Rebecca, July 19, 2018)

As a result, when Rebecca mapped out the trip’s route, she focused on areas of the park that allowed the campers to explore and discover the most. She took them where they can paddle through the most lakes and hike to “the top of Algonquin Park” (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). Similarly, Adam took his campers to play in a waterfall just off the side of a portage trail, where they could discover the “things they didn’t even know nature could do” (Will, July 31, 2018).

“This is my favourite waterfall,” Adam said as the campers splashed in the water, “it’s like a perfect nature slide” (July 31, 2018). The trippers took the campers places they could explore and discover nature in an untouched and unaltered setting.

4.4.4 A Place to Prove and Challenge Oneself

The participants conceptualized and promoted the Algonquin Park backcountry as a space where the staff and campers can “take really rewarding risks and challenge [themselves]”
Ultimately attempting to become new and improved version of themselves.

Ethan recounted the tripping experience from a point of personal growth. Aside from physically completing the route, “there’s the mental accomplishment of moving through a park, where it’s watching yourself become stronger and [pushing physically] farther and becoming more confident in yourself and your skills” (Ethan, July 31, 2018). Dylan explained that he is a product of his time going through the park as it taught him about strength, perseverance, and hard work. He said,

I think when I was a camper, I learned to work hard because of canoe trips. And I think that’s a huge life skill to be able to push through anything and preserve and to understand the true meaning of hard work, and that’s something the campers will use forever. (Dylan, July 30, 2018)

The staff members played a pivotal role in furthering the idea that nature is a place where individuals can push themselves, and become stronger, more able, and confident individuals. Along portages, the trippers were constantly heard encouraging the campers to “push on” by encouraging them to “say something like I am strong! I am fit! And nature is pretty” (Field Notes, July 31, 2018). When the campers made it to the end of the portage trail, there was an immense feeling of pride the staff instilled in the campers. Rebecca looked at the group and said, “You’re stronger than nature. You’ve defeated this portage” (Field Notes, July 18, 2018).

This thought was common amongst the trippers. Adam explained, “There’s a sort of strength…security, and bravery” that the campers need to embody for a successful canoe trip (August 1, 2018). Will and Adam told the campers that the “better trippers” are the stronger canoeists, paddlers, and portagers; they are the ones that know what needs to get done and aren’t afraid or unable to do it (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). They said the stronger trippers are the people that are able to “push through” any challenges the park throws at them and can still
maintain their route (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). Their thoughts communicate nature as a space where “the stronger and wiser…are the ones who survive” (Adam, August 1, 2018).

While the staff members played a pivotal role in asserting notions of strength onto the campers during the canoe trips, they also recognized that they were still just small entities in a much larger, complicated, and powerful wilderness (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). When the trip’s route was threatened by a storm, the trippers decided to take the day off (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). They stayed in the tents on the site and waited for the storm to pass, rather than trying to push through (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). Spending the day hiding out from the “relentless force” that is nature, was a clear text that no matter how physically strong and able the trip was, it would never be able to fight against the brute and restlessness forces of nature (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The trippers recognize that strength is essential to any canoe trip, but that they will never be able to completely defeat and overcome all forms of nature.

Algonquin Park was communicated as a wilderness space that exists for the participants to explore, discover, and adventure through. The trip staff communicated notions of Algonquin Park as the frontier by labeling the park as raw natural spaces where participants need to be strong, courageous, and smart in order to survive.

4.5 Nature as a Static Space

4.5.1 Nature Will Always Be

The summer camp canoe trips have constructed nature as a static place that remains immune to physical change. The participants understand the Algonquin Park forest as an entity that has always been, and will indefinitely continue to be, exactly as the participants presently
experience it. Not only is the physical land assumed to remain the same, but also the ways in which humans have interacted with the landscapes are discursively similar.

4.5.2 Same Landscape

Notions of familiarity within Algonquin Park stem from the ways in which the trippers talk about the landscapes. Rebecca encouraged thought of Algonquin Park as a constant space when she said,

It’s important to have a place that’s never changing… I think Algonquin, to me, is just having this constant awesome place…I want to be able to come back here for the rest of my life, and I want to be able to take my kids here. (July 19, 2018)

She encouraged thought of Algonquin Park as a space immune to physical change that will remain the same long enough for her to take her kids through the park. Undergoing the same activities years later.

Common discourses of the lands as a static space were perhaps most strengthened by a discussion of the discursive history of Algonquin Park—one that places the beginning of history at the European’s settlement—that labels the space as an ahistorical recreational sanctuary for the modern man (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The Algonquin Park Newspaper (2018) welcomes visitors from around the world to a place of “pristine wilderness” whose functional use has not changed over time.

Dylan echoed the aforementioned, noting that so long as the “[wilderness] forest and trees and everything [is] there” the land will be Algonquin Park (July 30, 2019). The Algonquin Park Newspaper reinforced the idea that the land remains outside of physical change, starting from as early as the Ice Age (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). “The deep sandy soils that characterize the area were deposited by glacial melt water over hundreds of years”, all of which, as advertised by the newspaper, still remains in its original untouched and unaltered form.
(Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). As physical landscapes around the world are constantly changing, the trippers explained that Algonquin Park remains a “sanctuary” outside of the human realm and potential for physical change (Rebecca, July 20, 2018). Both Dylan and the newspaper advocated that Algonquin Park is Algonquin Park so long as it remains in its current and natural state. If the lands of the park ever change, Dylan fears “we’ll [lose] Algonquin Park” (July 30, 2018).

4.5.3 Responsibility in the Static Space

The trippers placed the onus of maintaining Algonquin Park as a static place on themselves. Dylan said, “As a tripper, it’s my responsibility to protect the park and make sure that everybody else is able to enjoy it the same way that I am able to enjoy it” (July 30, 2018). Dylan attained this thought from his trippers when he was a camper, and it remained with him as he guided his campers through the park (July 30, 2018). Ethan agreed and worked towards ensuring that his campers preserve the physicality of landscapes, “a very important [message] that one day [my campers] will hopefully be passing [onto their campers]” (July 31, 2018).

Alex used the “natural” state of the park to teach his campers about their ecological impacts (July 31, 2018). He noted that he wanted the campers to have a deeper understanding of what their own [environmental] footprint can cause. So, by doing that, by teaching them where their water may come from, where their trash may go, how different wildlife can be affected, and probably the reason why we have these conservations areas in the first place… where it’s purely natural and never to be taken down and used for anything… (Alex, July 31, 2018)

Similarly, Adam wanted “[his campers] to understand what kind of gift this place really is and how it should be…preserved for generations” (August 1, 2018). By teaching preservationist values to the campers, Adam did his part in ensuring the lands stayed the same, and that he will always be able to come back to, and experience, the same park (Dylan, July 30, 2018). Ethan
echoed the aforementioned. He said, “we want to be able to [go on canoe trips] for years and years to come. And I think it’s very important to leave the natural-ness of the park for all the future trips” (Ethan, July 31, 2018). As Dylan explained, the beauty is the landscapes, and without properly protecting it, we can easily “lose the [natural world] around us” (July 30, 2018).

The trippers cherished every moment they had in the park and wanted to pass those same feelings and experiences onto their campers. “I want future generations to have the same experiences I did, and so by future generations, I am referring to the campers, especially, because I want them to…enjoy the [same] environment…I [get to]” (Rebecca, July 19, 2018). There is a constant thread being woven by all the trippers that maintains the park as a physically static space that has appears to exist, and has been used, in the same ways they currently are.

4.5.4 Same use

The front page of the newspaper and the visitor’s center gift shop showed the earliest photos of Algonquin Park, depicting small groups of white males engaged in recreational activities. These images show off a cultural history of Algonquin Park where the past, present, and future of the park is recreation. Figure 7—an image on the cover page of the Algonquin Park Newspaper—reflects a popular winter activity in the park, snowshoeing. The caption of the photo in the newspaper is, “Snowshoeing, a favourite activity in Algonquin, in the past and present!” (Algonquin Newspaper, 2018). By referring to the image on the left as the past, and the image on the right as the present, human interaction with the land discursively appears to be the same. Similarly, the gift shop displayed “Old Algonquin Park”, a series of photos for sale that documented the earliest images of the park, all of White recreationists partaking in activities that could be found in the present day (Field Notes, July 20, 2018). The gift shop strengthened the discourse that nature is a static space by presenting the history of Algonquin Park through
images in such a way that is consistent with how the trippers currently use and explain the park and its purposes to their campers.

Figure 7. Image Depicting Visitors Showshoeing Decades Apart. Source: Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018

Will explained the static intergenerational use of the park when he reflected on his experiences canoe tripping as a younger camper, and then as a staff member responsible for fostering those same experiences for the next generation of campers. He called it “repeated exposure”, the practice of passing on the experiences his trippers’ gave to him to the next generation of campers (July 31, 2018). Will has taken his campers on the same hikes his staff took him on and recreated the same experiences that his staff gave to him (July 31, 2018). Adam notes that watching his trippers lead him and his friends is where he learned how to interact with the land and safely bring campers through the park; “I’ve learned [what to do and how to do it], on canoe trips, mainly. I was taught in an era from other trippers, and a lot of things are passed down” (Adam, August 1, 2018). The knowledge of how to use the land is passed down from trippers to campers, creating intergenerational sameness in how the lands are discursively used and conceptualized.

The experiences the trippers gave to the campers were a result of a multi-generational use of the land that is continually passed down and adopted by younger members of the camp community. When Alex explains where he learned how to trip, he notes that “trippers have been
here before, [they] know the lay of the land, what should be expected…” and they have passed that knowledge onto him (Alex, July 31, 2018). The trippers have learned what to do from their trippers. They are a part of an ongoing cycle of knowledge that promotes an intergenerational sameness as it pertains to land uses and tripping through the park.

4.5.5 Still Images

The Algonquin Art Centre displayed pieces of work that further amplified the park as a static space for the trippers. The center, located at kilometer 20 on Highway 60, featured a special art show that exhibited the landmark sites originally featured by Tom Thompson and the Group of Seven. These landmark sites, as explained by the Algonquin Park Newspaper (2018), are the same historic landscapes of Algonquin Park that the Group of Seven captured in their work. The historic work of Tom Thomson featured in the museum and through an outdoor interpretive art walk allows visitors to see and experience the very nature that has inspired some of the most influential “artists from all over the world” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The exhibit titled, “On the Trail of Tom Thomson, 100 Years Later” features paintings and drawings from modern contemporary artists who “paddled and painted the same rivers and lakes” Tom Thomson originally made famous (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The exhibit allows the public to engage with nature and Algonquin Park in a fashion similar to that of a time capsule in which the landscapes, histories, and cultures of the park are perceived to be the same since the beginning of (European) history. This strengthens the notions of a physically static landscape that the summer camp trips pass through each year.

Using the Art Centre as inspiration, Rebecca brought canvases, paints, and brushes onto one of her trips for her campers to document the wilderness as they saw it in the park. Using the park landscapes for inspiration as past artists have, the trippers and campers painted the
landscapes as they saw them. They acknowledged that the empty and pristine landscapes they were painting were the exact same nature spaces that others had done years earlier, strengthening convictions that the landscapes have not altered from their discursively historic pristine and empty state (Field Notes, July 19, 2018).

Beyond their role of taking campers through the physically static Algonquin Park, the trippers circulated a constant narrative of the land by referring to the congruency of past, present, and future uses of the landscapes. Those on the canoe trips were encouraged by various visual and verbal texts, both presented to them and created by them, to think of the landscapes they passed through an entity external to change. The Art Centre, newspaper, and photos in the gift shop contributed to the ongoing thought of an unchanging and physically static Algonquin Park landscape.

**4.6 Moving Forward with the Findings**

To return to mobile methodologies brings forth an interesting discussion of the human-nature relationship in the context of a canoe trip. The mere premise of a canoe trip is to pass through a landscape, providing a foundation in which social relations ensue as a result of physical movement. These discourses presented in this chapter operate at the intersection of people, objects, movements, ideas, senses, and emotions in transport, exposing “complex patterns of social experience” (Sheller & Urry, 2006, p. 208). The mobilities paradigm orientates itself to the “material and institutional infrastructures of movement…economic coercions, and political guarantees that limit or promote” mobility (Tsing, 2002, as cited by Sheller & Urry, 2006, p. 201). These discourses are operationalized by the participants as they pass through the landscapes, using their privileged conceptions of mobility to engage with the normalized practices and uses of Algonquin Park. Mobility is central to the ways in which the participants
pack for the trip, act in the park, and talk about their experiences “pushing through” (Dylan, July 30, 2018), and “discovering” the landscapes (Field Notes, July 30, 2018).

The four environmental discourses that have been explained in this section (canoe trips as a tourism experience; nature as a seemingly people-less place; canoe trips as a space to explore the frontier; and nature as a physically static space) are a product of mobile social experiences that enable particular ways of thinking and performing in the park (Rantala & Varley, 2019).

This chapter has addressed the first research question, “How are environmental discourses perceived and performed by summer camp trippers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park?” and has attended to Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) first-step of recognizing discourses as corpus of statements whose organization is regular and systematic. The following chapter situates the environmental discourses the trippers operate within into broader and recurrent Western environmental discourses. It contextualizes a later deconstruction of how power and privilege have normalized hidden social and cultural injustices to convey particular environmental truths that summer camp trippers (re)produce as they lead campers through Algonquin Park backcountry canoe trips.
Chapter 5: Social Constructions of Truth

5.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) second, third, fourth, and fifth steps to conducting a Foucauldian-style discourse analysis. The second step addresses the discursive origins of thought, highlighting the social institutions and beliefs that have permitted the discourses to develop in the ways they have. The third step seeks the discursive limits; it identifies what statements align with the discourse and what statements do not. By means of identifying the limits of discursive structure, the setting in which new statements can be revealed comes to light. It identifies present-day rules of production, Kendall and Wickham’s (1995) fourth step. The fifth and final step in Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) process identifies the inseparability of materiality and thought. It speaks to how discursive thoughts are materialized, shared, and circulated within a social group.

Chapter four has identified how the trippers perceive and perform various environmental discourses while taking their campers through the park, and chapter five situates the discourses into a broader social and historical context. This chapter identifies the social, cultural, political, economic, and historical underpinnings that the trippers operate within and have maintained on the canoe trips.

The discourses explored in this chapter provide the context that socially legitimizes the meanings and experiences (re)produced by the trippers. I used Waitt’s (2005) checklist (Table 3) to help identify the powers, privileges, and knowledges circulated and normalized through the environmental discourses within which the trippers operate. This chapter contributes to answering the first two research questions, “how are environmental discourses perceived and
performed by summer camp trippers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park?” and “How are power, privilege, and knowledge circulated and normalized in the environmental discourses?”

This section will identify and explain four socially prominent, accepted, normalized, and circulated discourses that guide the trippers as they take campers through Algonquin Park:

- Algonquin Park as the wilderness;
- Canoe trips as a site of consumption;
- Canoe trips as a tool to connect with various ideologies; and
- Particular notions of nationhood

This chapter outlines the social and historical underpinnings that encourage the participants to convey certain Truths of Algonquin Park. It explains the limits to the discursive complexes, what can and cannot be said, and the process by which the discourses are materialized.

5.2 Algonquin Park as the Wilderness

5.2.1 The Non-Human World

The trippers are heavily embedded within a discourse that positions Algonquin Park as the wilderness, a space that is, in essence, non-human (Cronon, 1996). To understand the wilderness discourse and how the trippers embody it, it is important to look towards historical social evolution of the wilderness construct.

5.2.2 The History of the Wilderness

In the past 250 years, the concept of wilderness has held an array of meanings and ideas (Cronon, 1996). The earliest constructions of the wilderness represented an isolated and barren wasteland, creating negative and problematic connotations of spaces that existed outside modern
society (Cronon, 1996). Similarly, the meanings and purposes of the wilderness, as a negative and empty space, found its way into religious conceptualizations where nature was assumed to be a space outside of society and the presence of a god (Cronon, 1996). It was discursively labelled an impure and evil space for its lack of a higher being to protect and watch over the land and its occupants (Cronon, 1996). This notion drastically changed in 1862, when Henry David Thoreau, among others, started fighting for the preservation of the wild. His advocacy paved the way for preservationists, conservationists, and recreationists alike to begin to celebrate and acknowledge positive outcomes that could emerge from these anti-modern spaces (Cronon, 1996).

Their campaigns gained support in the late 1800s. The idea of the wilderness was able to captivate and inspire writers, poets, activists, recreationists, and politicians to begin to act in favour of the wilderness and its benefits to the human race, leading to the establishment of the first protected wilderness area in 1872, Yellowstone National Park (Cronon, 1996). Since then, the wilderness has been conceived as a space whose purpose is to serve the modern human, regardless of the form in which that takes place (Cronon, 1996). Be it as a space to escape modern social institutions and organizations (Cronon, 1996), to recreate themselves in a world external to their own, “undefiled” by the industrial and technological revolutions (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999, p. 18), seek a higher theological presence in a raw and untouched, pristine, and empty natural world, or a space to extract resources to serve the ongoing needs of human development, growth, and progress. Regardless of its use, the meaning of present-day wilderness has evolved into representing “wild spaces” that exist “outside the boundaries” of everyday life (Monani, 2012, p. 102).
5.2.3 Socially Accepted Wilderness

On an institutional level, Ontario Parks acts within the wilderness discourse. The organization encourages visitors to take various precautions as they make their way through the backcountry wild spaces (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). They ensure that participants are made aware of the risks and inaccessibility of modern luxuries and safety nets as they cross over from modern and urban city life into the discursively raw, natural, and untouched.

The park rangers regulate certain actions and behaviours that align with the wilderness discourse in Algonquin Park. Particularly, they regulate the sounds one can hear in the backcountry. The park’s employees enforce an institutional silence that furthers thought of Algonquin Park as external to modern society. This ensures all visitors have a chance to hear the “sounds of the wild,” as they occur in their untouched and uninfluenced wild home (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). When the trippers heard the wolf’s howl at nightfall, it sent chilling messages that said they were away from the comforts of modern society and immersed in a space where the “wolf reigns supreme” (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). The absence of sound helps participants conceptually free themselves from “urban modernity and superficial sociability” in a space discursively designed to be and operate as the opposite (Schwarz, 2013, p. 390).

This silence in the wilderness is embraced and enforced by various actors in and around the park. Including the trippers who make their campers aware of appropriate and inappropriate noise levels in the park, and by blatantly calling the park space “the wilderness” (Will, July 31, 2018). They opt into the notions that would discursively label Algonquin Park the wilderness and use those ideas to help them define and make sense of their canoe tripping experiences.
5.2.4 Adventure Travel

Notions of the wilderness are synonymous with the concepts of ‘discovering’, ‘exploring’, and ‘adventuring’ (Cronon, 1996). The wilderness has become a place in which to “explore, discover, [and] experience freedom and self-reliance” (Kaye, 2010, p. 5). This language has been accepted and embraced by the trippers. Rebecca encourages her campers to “discover” Algonquin Park (July 19, 2018) and Adam sees himself as an “adventure guide” leading his campers through the untouched frontier of civilization (August 1, 2018). This language conveys wilderness spaces as “yet-to-be-discovered places” and encourages the participants of the canoe trips to act as adventurers and discoverers, pushing the boundaries of humanity into the wilderness of Algonquin Park (Cooke, 2018, p. 33).

The statements the trippers (re)produce that pertain to exploring and discovering the wilderness are further situated within the field of adventure tourism. Hall (1992) defined adventure tourism as,

A broad spectrum of outdoor touristic activities often commercialized and involving an interaction with the natural environment away from the participant’s home range and containing elements of risk [whether real or perceived]; in which the outcome is influenced by the participant, setting, and management of the touristic experience. (p. 143, as cited by Kane and Tucker, 2004, p. 220)

Various tourism companies that operate in and around Algonquin Park rely on the language associated with adventure tourism and the wilderness to promote their services. Barlett Lodge, located on Cache Lake in Algonquin Park, welcomes visitors to a “secluded…unsurpassed Canadian Wilderness [where] the peace and quiet of Algonquin await” (Barlett Lodge Brochure, 2018). The Blue Spruce Resort encourages guests to “reconnect with nature in Algonquin’s…wilderness,” the Colonial Bay Cottage Resort lets visitors “explore all…[that] Algonquin Park has to offer” and Killarney Lodge promotes their resort as “surrounded by wilderness” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). These promotional advertisements clearly
inform their clientele that their services are external to modern luxuries and embedded in a world of the discursive wild and untouched.

The above notions reflect what Braun (2002) calls a “reterritorialization” of space (p. 142). This concept refers to the social rebranding and production of a space that is synonymous with the modern needs and desires that come from it (Braun, 2002). The park and its spaces have been ‘reterritorialized’ to fit the needs of the modern tourism industry and the desires of the modern tourist—as they increasingly desire a space untouched by modern and industrial influence. Algonquin Park has transformed into an adventure tourism site in which the tourist has the chance to seemingly discover untouched, unaltered, and pristine wild landscapes (Baker, 2002).

Despite being discursively conceptualized as the vast and open wilderness, Algonquin Park is an enclosed area that is carefully protected, preserved, and maintained to withhold various discursive truths (Baker, 2002). The United States of America’s (1964) Wilderness Act operationalizes the notion of the wilderness through the nature/culture binary. It says the wilderness is “a place where man remains a visitor,” where culture does not exist (Wilderness Act, 1964 as cited by Cronon, 1996). Or as Rebecca similarly explains, a place where “we are [just] visitors,” opting into a particular and well-crafted tourism experience (Field Notes, July 18, 2018). Texts that suggest and impose human settlements on the land and any alterations to its present physicality lie outside the discursive structure and its rules of production. It restricts statements that suggest the wilderness can also be a place of culture. When confronted with statements that contrasted the wilderness discourse, the participants quickly discarded or belittled them to ensure the wilderness discourse operated as an undisturbed and hegemonic Truth.
There were several texts that the trips encountered that suggest the canoe trips were not actually traversing through the untouched and pristine wilderness. The canoe trips encountered several clear signs of modern life and civilization in Algonquin Park. The first was the presence of garbage in the park. When Rebecca encountered a fire pit full of garbage on the site at which she was hoping to stay, she instantly announced that the garbage was a “huge mistake” made by the sites’ previous occupants (Field Notes, July 18, 2018). She continued to note that garbage does “not belong in the wild” (Field Notes, July 18, 2018). Dylan furthered the concept of not belonging in the wild when thinking about other physical signs that suggest a human presence in the wild. On another sighting of garbage, he said, “that’s not what nature’s supposed to look like, and it’s an obvious flaw” (July 30, 2018). While the garbage is seemingly the enemy in this scenario, it is clear that signs of another’s presence on the land, disturbing the discourse of a peopleless place, are at the roots of Rebecca and Dylan’s distaste. Thus, challenging the notions of the untouched, natural, and pristine in the spatiality of the wilderness and helping to establish the limits of the wilderness discourse (Hall, 2001; Haluza-Delay, 2001).

The maps the canoe trippers used manifested as another statement that encourages and challenges notions of the wilderness in Algonquin Park. The map is an objective snapshot that two-dimensionally captures the landscape (Mullins, 2009). Despite it being a clear sign that someone has once travelled through the lands documenting its every inch, the map is still able to convey notions of the wilderness by feeding into the nature/culture binary.

Maps contribute to and legitimize the nature/culture binary for their ability to distinctly classify areas of nature and areas of culture. On maps, spaces of culture and civilization are represented by a network of roads and infrastructure, whereas spaces of nature have a distinct border around them and are tinted green (Jeff’s Map, 2018). The maps represent an objective
way of conceiving the world, and the park map was developed in a particular social context that separates nature spaces from spaces of modern everyday life (Harley, 2009).

Maps twofold sustain colonial discourses as they pertain to the human-nature relationship; they justify colonial displacement and establish a set of practices that are materially and discursively aligned. The maps of Algonquin Park justify the Indigenous dispossession of lands by representing the landscapes as a space meant for recreation rather than civilization by outlining nature spaces, the spaces in which settlement is prohibited (Huggan, 1989). These spaces are then sustained as nature spaces in which humans remain only visitors (Huggan, 1989).

The map recognizes spaces of recreation by highlighting the routes trippers can pass over and by closing off, and restricting by means of a fine, other spaces that lie outside the canoe routes (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The camp provides two different maps to the trippers. The first is the official and heavily circulated “Official Canoe Routes Map of Algonquin Park” (Algonquin Provincial Park, n.d.b) and the second is “Jeff’s Map” (Jeff’s Map, n.d.). The two maps operationalize similar, yet different, truths in how they convey the wilderness discourse.

The official Algonquin Park Map (Figure 8), does not show the vast network of roads currently used for logging, many historical and socio-cultural sites and it restricts entry to specific access points where the wilderness experience is heavily regulated and maintained (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). This plays an interesting contrast to the map shown in Figure 9, as it does recognize social and cultural truths of the park by labelling sites of culture and history in the park landscapes.

Figure 8. A Snapshot of the Official Algonquin Park Map of Rock Lake. Source: Algonquin Provincial Park, n.d.b
Maps acts as an authoritative figure that hold the powers to recognize and outline multiple truths and histories embedded in the landscapes. A map used by the camp (not the official Algonquin Park map, and a map a lot less circulated) shows traditional spaces used by the Algonquin Peoples, including Aboriginal Vision Pits and Pictographs (Figure 9). The map explains, “during puberty the young Algonquins would lie in one of the thirty-one vision pits west of Rock Lake without eating until they had a vision” (Jeff’s Map, 2018). The map also shows the remnants of old train tracks used by the logging industry, power lines, and current spaces where logging, mining, and hunting is permitted (Jeff’s Map, 2018). While these sites are labeled and operate as counter statements to the discursive truths the trippers and Ontario Parks operate within, the trippers failed to acknowledge them as canoed by.

Both maps keep visitors to maintained and regulated distinct canoe routes. The officially endorsed map of the park contributes to the erasure of traditionally and culturally important sites, whereas in Jeff’s Map, the trippers operationalize the silence that contributes to the erasure of the Algonquin Peoples by neglecting to acknowledge their presence. Although Jeff’s Map labels
sites of culture in spaces of nature, the sites labeled by Jeff’s map act as an incoherency that lies outside the discursive structure that suggests Algonquin Park is a culture-less site of wilderness.

5.2.5 A Space Suspended in Time

The wilderness has become a space “suspended in time” for modern city-dwellers to connect with nature (Waitt, 2005, p. 184). The trippers create texts for the campers that suggest the park is external to the modern-day experience, human occupation, and societal evolution (Braun, 2002). The trippers highlighted and praised texts that encouraged a conceptualization of the Algonquin Park as an empty wilderness-scape and shunned texts that suggested otherwise.

The distinctions between the dominant and counter-statements and how they are presented on the canoe trips are fundamental to understanding the limits to the cultural constructions of nature as spaces of wilderness. The participants’ actions and how they communicated what is acceptable in the park make it clear that they are operating within a larger social framework that positions Algonquin Park as a space of wilderness that exists and operates outside modern civilization and everyday experiences.

5.3 Canoe Trips as a Site of Consumption

5.3.1 Consumption

The canoe trips operate within a discourse that perceives nature as a commodity ready to be consumed. Commodification, a widely known and accepted notion of capitalization, is the process by which all things are assigned a value determined by their use and exchange worth (Mrozowski, 1999). The commodification of nature refers to the process by which landscapes, once foreign and abstract spaces, became entities with inscribed values that people desired (Mrozowski, 1999). Wilderness spaces, such as Algonquin Park, became a space with
tremendous material value for and exchange worth, as timber was harvested and extracted from the landscapes (Baker, 2002; Erickson, 2013).

In a pre-capitalist society, human-nature relations were based on subsistence rather than profit accumulation for various needs (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). In the capitalist world, nature existed to fulfill physical and financial human needs (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). However, nature was not only commodified for its economic value. Nature spaces were romanticized and visually consumed as well. To further understand the process of commodification in the human-nature relationship and how the trippers operationalize it, it is helpful to look into capitalism and the origins of consumption.

5.3.2 Material Consumption

The origins of capitalism lie in the use of natural resources to develop products that are marketed and sold for profit (Cronon, 1996). The logging industry within Algonquin Park plays a substantial role in Ontario’s economy, establishing over 11,000 jobs and contributing over $330 million dollars in the 2018 fiscal year (Algonquin Forest Authority, 2019). The natural resources in Algonquin Park are commodified into lumber for furniture, floorboards, construction materials, utility poles, pulp and paper products, and fuelwood (Algonquin Forest Authority, 2019). The landscapes have been transformed into material products that are marketed and sold in the modern and present-day capitalist economy.

Peter Thomson, the first Chief Ranger of Algonquin Park, was responsible for coordinating the timber industry’s presence in the park in such a way that did not disrupt the recreational experiences offered (Baker, 2002). This heavy task extended past Peter Thomson’s time and onto Frank McDougall’s. Frank McDougall, a superintendent of Algonquin Park and an avid forester, has a plaque by the West Gate celebrating his contribution for establishing a
wilderness recreation park that is also open to resource extraction (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). The plaque reads, “While [his] accomplishments are found across the province, it is particularly fitting that Algonquin Park be the location of a permanent memorial to the service in the interest of resources and the people of the province” (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). This plaque further showcases the history of material consumption in the park and the provinces desire to maintain it as a space of wilderness recreation.

While in the park, the canoe trips passed several spaces where they could have purchased souvenirs of their experiences. Canoe trippers can buy t-shirts, key chains, stickers, or pictures of the park and its romanticized landscapes (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). The images on the souvenirs further the wilderness discourse in Algonquin Park while simultaneously contributing to the capitalist economy the park discursively functions within.

Statements that intertwine the capitalist and consumptive economy in the park lie outside the limits of the discursive structures. Despite popular and common knowledge, 65% of the park is currently open to logging by means of a carefully hidden network of over two thousand kilometres of roads (Baker, 2002). There is an intricate web of relations that Algonquin Park is embedded within as it simultaneously represents a space positioned outside modern society and economic systems while housing an exclusive and intricate logging operation fundamental to neighbouring communities (Reynolds, 2010).

While the summer camp canoe trips are not directly involved in Algonquin’s logging industry, almost all Ontarians consume products with productive origins that lie in Algonquin Park (Algonquin Forest Authority, 2019). This speaks to the magnitude of the logging industry within Algonquin Park and its role commodifying the landscapes. However, further localized on the canoe trips, the trippers visually consume, rather than materialistically consume, the
landscapes and the nature in the romanticized park.

5.3.3 Visual Consumption

Visual consumption has become a fundamental notion of the summer camp canoe trip. The sites the trips passed were consumed as a result of the emotional elicitations viewers receive from embellishing in the landscapes (Schroeder, 2004). The landscapes that were passed, viewed, and consumed on the summer camp’s trips became a mental and romanticized souvenir for participants to remember and acknowledge their experiences in the park (Larsen & Urry, 2011).

Notions of romanticism are embedded within the participants’ conceptions of the visually consumed landscapes. The romantic school of thought began in the 18th century as a protest movement in response to the development of modern cities—similar to the popularization of the wilderness (Sage, 2009). For the romantics, nature is understood as a picturesque un-touched object that towers over mankind and prompts an outlook of solitude and relationships with the self, others, and a higher being (Jacobsen, 2004). Will, when stargazing with one of his campers (Field Notes, July 30, 2018), directly experienced the feelings outlined by Jacobsen (2004). While watching the stars in the night sky, he reflected on life’s purpose and whether or not humans were a part of “grand puzzle called life”, or if any other life forms existed beyond our knowledge (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). Will’s interaction with the romanticized settings prompted him to reflect on life’s purposes in relation to his own being, an outcome of consuming a romanticized landscape.

Romanticism praises what has remained seemingly pure and wholesome in the wake of modernization (Cronon, 1996). The romanticized notions of nature, as communicated and embraced on the canoe trips, is strengthened by various texts that encourage park users to
consider themselves immersed in a beautiful and unique world outside of “traditional aspects of the city” (Ethan, July 31, 2018). Ethan elaborated by saying,

The untouched nature, the beautiful lakes, the colours, and the surroundings that you see is something that you never, can never see in the city. It includes the stars at night, the clear water by day, and the fish, the everything...the feeling [is] so raw and real (Ethan, July 31, 2018)

Or as Rebecca noted, “this place is so beautiful there is nowhere else we could see things more beautiful” (Field Notes, July 20, 2018).

On the second canoe trip, the canoes passed over a turtle in the water, beautifully and freely swimming through the lake (Field Notes, July 31, 2018). It sparked a true testament to the heavy emotional weight that romanticized notions of nature spaces can provide to participants. Constructions of the wilderness have allowed nature to become a space perceived as absent from human intervention, and in turn, provide the ideal romanticized setting for humans to visually engage with discursively untouched and pristine landscapes (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). This results in a dynamic type of consumerism in which pleasure, as explained by Ethan (July 31, 2018), is attained from visually attending to and consuming the landscapes (Everett, 2009).

The trippers constantly visually consume the landscapes found in Algonquin Park on the canoe trips and encourage the campers to do the same. When Rebecca asked the campers to “stop paddling,” she encouraged them to visually consume a landscape they had never seen before (Field Notes, July 17, 2018). Adam makes particular note of “the beautiful rocks faces and trees” (August 1, 2018), something that Alex explains “is not seen anywhere but a place like this” (July 31, 2018). Similarly, on the last morning of one of the canoe trips, Will tells the group, “I watched the sunrise alone this morning…it was complete serenity. Just me and nature…” attesting to a visual experience that elicited an intensely emotional and romanticized response (Field Notes, July 31, 2018).
5.3.4 Consuming Romantic Landscapes Through Art

The Algonquin Art Centre encourages visitors to seek out “iconic landmark sites” to “marvel” in the same landscapes in which the best artists once did (Algonquin Art Centre Brochure, 2018). On the first trip, Rebecca took her campers to Penn Falls to paint the untouched river landscape as it visually appeared to the canoe trip (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). She encouraged them to paint what they saw, or as Rebecca explained, what they found “most beautiful” (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). Through this process, campers were, as put by Baker (2002), able to reach aesthetic recreational fulfillment through their wilderness experience. One where they were able to bask in the romanticized aspects of nature for their recreational pursuits. Painting the romanticized landscapes encouraged the trippers and the campers to consume the nature spaces they considered the most beautiful for their own recreational purposes.

Statements that suggest that the landscapes lie external to romanticized conceptions of nature and the environment are unheard of on the canoe trips. The Algonquin Park staff, trippers, art center, and other stakeholders constantly refer to the park spaces as some of the most beautiful places in Ontario, and this notion is affirmed by means of visual consumption.

5.3.5 Consuming Algonquin Park

Algonquin Park has become a space intended for consumption. While economic organizations of Ontario depend on material consumption for economic stability, the summer camp canoe trips depend on visual consumption to fulfill their recreational purposes. As long as the sun rises, the trips pass through “pretty nature”, the sun sets, and the stars shine in the night sky, the canoe trips will be constantly watching and consuming the natural world (Drew, Field Notes, July 31, 2018). While the trips indirectly contribute to the material consumption of the
landscapes, they directly operate within a discourse that visually commoditizes and consumes the Algonquin Park nature.

Statements that suggest nature can house modern urban life and economic organization lie outside of the romantic consumption discourse the trippers operate within (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). The trippers seek to “show [the] beautiful landscapes…Canada has to offer,” and not the modern economic organizations that have found their way into the parks (Adam, August 1, 2018).

The notions of material and visual consumption explained in this section are operationalized by means of particular mobilities and immobilities and the associated norms of LNT. As mobilities in certain spaces are restricted, economic organizations within the park are able to operate in such a way that maintains travel to specific and romanticized wilderness spaces. Keeping the modern industries out of mind, sight, and auditory range for recreationists. Similarly, as the park spaces are conceptualized into spaces to pass through rather than settle, it maintains the illusion that the park is a seemingly empty and romantic space (Grimwood, 2011). No traces of human presence are left behind, thus enabling the landscapes to become romantically and visually consumed.

5.4 Canoe Trips and the (Re)Production of Traditional Gendered Ideologies

5.4.1 Process of Connection

Another discourse that the trippers operate within is one that ascribes canoe trips as a chance to connect with greater socially dominant metanarratives of gender. In her review of the canoe in mainstream literature, Dean (2013) clearly articulates how various poets and writers have recognized the canoe trip’s role in developing and sustaining various identities and gendered conceptions of the self. The trippers operate within a discourse that encourages them to
use their experiences in the park as tools to engage with traditional gender roles and idealized notions of nationhood.

5.4.2 Canoe Trips as a Space to (Re)Affirm Gender Roles

Canoe trips have been portrayed as activities for which success is dependent on the participant’s ability to display certain masculinities. This discourse legitimizes the presence of, and dependence upon, celebrated and idealized gendered performance on canoe trips.

Historically, canoe trips have required taking up particular traditionally masculine performances, and those that were unable to embody those performances were not discursively welcomed in the wilderness (McDermott, 2004). The traditional gendering of canoe trips can be examined through a discussion of the conquering and defeating of the wilderness by means of particular masculine traits that the trippers assume, adopt, and perform while in the park (McDermott, 2004).

The frontier thesis, developed by Frederick Turner, discusses an important aspect of modern America’s development as the conquering and defeat of the wilderness (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). While the frontier thesis has reduced in popularity as other methods of development have been recognized as crucial to modern America’s growth, its impact on the tripper’s perception of nature remains: nature is a place external to industrial society and is a place to be conquered, defeated, and used for personal gain (Benton & Rennie Short, 1999). What existed in the frontier was an unknown mystery, but it was sure to be a dangerous and challenging landscape for the individual to pass through and survival became the ultimate test of manhood (Egan, 2006). As earlier mentioned, the wilderness was a place removed from cultural restraints of the home, school, and church; it became the place where boys were free to prove their raw capabilities by pushing through a raw and unforgiving world (Churchill, 1992, as cited
by McDermott, 2000). The concept of risk is highly apparent on the canoe trips and within the wilderness. Dylan and Adam both mention that taking a group of campers into the park for a canoe trip can be a dangerous activity, and they rely on their displays of traditional and particular masculinities to ensure a safe and successful canoe trip (July 30, 2018; August 1, 2018).

In Frohlick’s (2005) critical study of mountain film festivals, she found that attributes such as strength, wit, and athleticism were celebrated, encouraged, and sought after by outdoor adventurers. This sentiment was clearly localized onto the summer camp canoe trips by the trippers. Adam, Dylan, and Will tell their campers before the trip that they are expecting them to be the best trippers possible. They go on to say that the best trippers are the “strongest and quickest” paddlers and portagers, further aligning with particular masculinities (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). The trippers encourage the campers to adopt and embody particular masculinities that are synonymous with wilderness recreation as outlined by Frohlick (2005). When the campers struggled to complete a portage, the trippers encouraged them by saying they were “strong” and “fit” (Field Notes, July 31, 2018) and could easily “rise above nature to beat” and “defeat” any portage (Field Notes, July 18, 2018). These statements refer to the masculinized discourse of overcoming nature (Newbery, 2003).

Masculinity is an act that is constantly affirmed through performance (Hantover, 1978). The male trippers constantly perform certain masculinities on the canoe trips, particularly displays of strength, dominance, and a willing desire to roll around and “play in the dirt” (Will, July 31, 2018). The male trippers have an ongoing competition to see who can complete a three-kilometer portage the quickest, once and for all revealing the strongest and most masculine tripper of the group (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). This competition aligns with the trippers
desire to perform particular masculinities that discursively showcase the most masculine (Fleming, Barrington, Mann, Lerebours, Donastorg & Brito, 2017).

This set an interesting contrast between the male and female trippers. While the female trippers displayed particular traditionally masculine traits, they also took up traditionally feminine traits while leading the trips—traits that excluded their participation in the portaging competitions (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). These traditionally feminine traits included “showing compassion” to the natural world (Rebecca, July 19, 2018). The female trippers challenged the historical thoughts that read embodied feminine traits as weaker and less capable than traditionally masculine traits (Newbery, 2013). This simultaneously asserted and normalized the presence of particular traditional feminine character traits on summer camp canoe trips (Newbery, 2013).

A strong and dominant male presence is deeply rooted in the history of canoe tripping (McDermott, 2004). Will explained, “leading a trip tends to be a more masculine thing” (July 31, 2018). Adam echoed his thought and elaborated,

> when kids are going into the park for the first time…[the trippers] need to show some sort of security and bravery and they need to make the kids feel that they’re safe and they know what they’re doing… [and that is] definitely shown more as a [traditionally] masculine trait. (August 1, 2018)

Will continued to note he believes Rebecca is an incredible tripper that is “able to overcome nature” despite not being as physically strong as the other trippers (July 31, 2018). Rebecca casts herself as “strong and able” while expelling notions of weakness that are discursively synonymous with traditional acts of femininity on wilderness canoe trips (Newbery, 2003, p. 213). The presumed weakness of traditionally feminine characteristics on canoe trips can be traced back to the historical conceptions of nature and the wilderness, where “gender [discursively] appears to be a barrier to success” (Newbery, 2003, p. 208).
5.4.3 Gendered Tasks

The distinguishing of physical abilities is another trait that guides traditional masculine performances on canoe trips. On the trips, there are unwritten and unsaid rules that guide what the trippers do and how they do them. These actions can be understood through the theory of expectation. The theory suggests that each individual in each social setting has expectations of themselves and of the others regarding how they should act and perform (Jordan, 1991). These expectations are based on characteristics such as sex, age, race, gender, and physical size (Jordan, 1991).

There are certain practices of canoe tripping that are normalized and assumed by those who take up traditionally masculine performances. McDermott (2004) explains that while on a mixed-gendered canoe trip, activities such as carrying heavier packs and sterning the canoe were traditionally left for the more masculinized subject on an account of them being physically stronger and more able to carry heavier equipment; whereas tasks such as cooking and carrying paddles and life jackets were traditionally left for those that embodied traditionally feminine traits, as they were discursively assumed less capable than their masculinized counterparts (Newbery, 2003).

Additionally, there was a discursive expectation that dictated men should be sitting in the back of the canoe sterning while women sat in the front. While with Rebecca, I, a male tripper, opted to sit in the front of the canoe on a paddle into the middle of the lake to get water. Rebecca asked me, before I could reach the bow, “shouldn’t you be sterning?” (Field Notes, July 19, 2018). Her question was referring to the fact that I am a male and a more senior staff member. Despite Rebecca’s sterning skills are higher than average, and better than my own, there was still a social standard that suggested I should have been sterning instead of Rebecca. This example clearly showcases the gendered division of labour found on canoe trips, dictating who should
perform which tasks based on gender discursively assumed abilities rather than skill (McDermott, 2004).

Carrying a canoe and a 50+ pound pack on one’s shoulders for kilometers at a time is a physically demanding task, and often causes conflict among many women who are often naturally smaller than men (Newbery, 2003). This results in a localized reading of the female body that suggests it is weaker than the male body, privileging the male body and its performances on canoe trips (Newbery, 2003). On portages, it is typical that each person would take one of the packs or a canoe; however, the male trippers often opted to carry more than their fair share, taking “two packs and a canoe” (Adam, August 1, 2018). The assertion of strength and dominance displayed by the trippers is a part of an obsessive need to affirm and display the masculine body in the wilderness (Jordan, 1991; Newbery, 2003). When the female trippers were able to successfully complete the portage, an event I’ve witnessed on every trip, they are projected and read as subjects that take up masculine characteristics for their “[displays of strength], a trait that has typically been shown in men” (Adam, August 1, 2018). Rebecca makes a point to express her distaste for the traditional gendered division of labour on canoe trips. She recalls her “frustrating” past as a tripper, noting that she would often get assigned and performed “more menial tasks while [male trippers] were given more responsibilities, which without a doubt, [she could have] handled” (Rebecca, July 19, 2018). Rebecca’s frustrations are embedded within a discursive norm where “men know the wilderness…[and] women provide the comfortable, snug, and cozy atmosphere indoors” (Daugstad & Villa, 2001, as cited by Brandth & Haugen, 2005).

The gendered division of labour helps ensure that practices on the canoe trips are reflective of the discourses that the trippers operate within. Discursive notions of nature suggest
that a participant needs to embody and act upon traits traditionally associated with certain masculinities in order to ensure a successful trip. In this discourse and understanding of nature, those who can portage a canoe without showing signs of being “soft” and taking a break are the privileged whose success in the wilderness is never questioned (Newbery, 2003, p. 207).

The gendered nature of canoe trips has created a social lens that participants use to contextualize and legitimize various performances in the park. Whether they are encouraging domination over nature, or exemplary displays of strength and power for themselves and their peers, the participants are embedded within a discursive structure that favours, celebrates, and depends on various notions of traditional masculinities to survive the wilderness frontier. Statements that celebrate and embrace performances of strength and power lie within the discursive complex, whereas statements of pacifism and weakness are external and excluded from the discursive realm and are tabooed from the trips.

However, Rebecca is among the individuals that contest and disturb this narrative, acting outside the limits of the discursive complex. Her actions clearly display that nature, the wilderness, and survival on canoe trips are not solely contingent on performing traditional masculinities. In Rebecca’s journal, she wrote about the barriers she faced in becoming a tripper. She identified “brute strength” as the biggest obstacle (Journal Reflection, August 1, 2018). She recalls a time giving up her dreams of becoming a tripper because her “strength wasn’t on par with the others…and that wasn’t really acceptable” (Journal Reflection, August 1, 2018). Rebecca came to the realization that “not being the best at [brute] strength has made [her] a better, more creative, [and] different type of tripper” (Journal Reflection, August 1, 2018). The trippers need to acknowledge other strengths, as Rebecca identified, empowering all to see themselves as able and capable trippers.
Notions of performed gender traits on canoe trips can be traced back to early conceptions of outdoor recreation, where being in the wilderness required strength, grit, and determination to brave the undiscovered frontier (Cronon, 1996). This historic conceptualization of the wilderness that the summer camp canoe trips operate within has maintained as necessary and valued traits to be embodied by canoe trip participants.

5.5 Particular Notions of Nationhood

5.5.1 “The Canoe is Canada”

For many Canadians, paddling a canoe connects them to something bigger. Raffan explains, “the canoe unites Canada from coast to coast and grids us with the strength of a common heritage… The canoe guides us through direct and accessible experiences in our home landscape. The canoe is Canada” (cited by Erickson, 2013).

Paddling the canoe through a wilderness landscape has, discursively, become a quintessentially Canadian activity (Dean, 2013; Erickson, 2013). Canadian heroes, explorers, celebrities, and Prime Ministers are all tied together by the common thread of paddling a canoe, contributing to the discourse that to paddle a canoe through the wilderness is to connect with the nation on a deeper level. Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada (1968 – 1979 & 1980 - 1984), embraced this notion and received the Bill Mason Award for his “outstanding contributions to canoeing heritage” in Canada (CBC, 2004). The trippers similarly operate within a discourse that positions canoe tripping through the wilderness as fundamental to “Canadian nationalism and identity” (Hamilton, 2017). The canoe journey has become a “defining feature” in the building of the nation for its ability to connect paddlers, coast to coast, with feelings of “nativeness” (Dean, 2013, p. 25), with explorers that founded the modern nation, and with a
pristine wilderness that acts as a “symbol of what it means to be Canadian” (Dylan, August 1, 2018).

5.5.2 Entering the National Imaginary

Objects and experiences have the capabilities to operate as discursive statements that normalize particular symbolic and cultural values while simultaneously silencing others (Dean, 2013). As Dylan explained,

> When I think of Canada and I think of all the things I’m proud of in Canada and why I’m so happy to be Canadian, one of the first things I think about is Algonquin Park, I see it as such a huge part of our culture, and I see it as a symbol of what it means to be Canadian. (August 1, 2018)

The wilderness is embedded in Canadian culture, so much so that during the G8 summit held in Toronto in 2012, an indoor lake was built at the cost of over two million dollars to showcase the Canadian wilderness to world leaders (Erickson, 2013). The processes that Dylan described and enacted during the G8 are what Kaufmann and Zimmer (1998) call the “nationalization of nature” (p. 483). It provides a detailed account by which images and conceptions of a nationally homogenized wilderness enter the national imaginary and embraced as such (Kaufmann & Zimmer, 1998). Alternatively, as O’Brien and White (2018) explain, this process occurs “to make us at home in our own country” (p. 24). It provides us with a national nature-based identity that can be showcased to ourselves and to the rest of the world (O’Brien & White, 2018). This concept is echoed by Will when he noted that people come from all over the world to see Algonquin Park, referencing the sign that stands just off of Highway 401 near Toronto’s Pearson International Airport telling visitors that Algonquin Park is 238km away (August 1, 2018). Or, less explicitly, he is referencing the countless “cruisecanada.com” recreational vehicles (RV) seen passing through the park, all with pictures of majestic landscapes on the side and the name “Canada” plastered all over it (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). The RV company’s website is
covered with images of pristine wilderness and wording that suggests that “Canada” can be found “out there” (Cruise Canada, n.d.). Not only does this notion carry the sentiments of a nation built from nature, but it also alludes to the nature/culture duality that positions nature external to modern and everyday city life. This further recognizes that the Canadian wilderness experience cannot be found in the everyday and mundane but must be enacted by means of mobility by physically travelling from one space into another.

The materiality of exploration could be seen in the trippers clothing. Drew wore a navy-blue Roots Company hat on the canoe trip that read, “Canada: Explore More” (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). As for Drew and her hat, Canada is articulated as a space to explore and discover. This materiality is further seen in the gift shops, as visitors can purchase key chains and stickers, among other items, that contribute to popular conceptions of nature, adventure, and the wilderness as fundamentally Canadian entities (Field Notes, July 30, 2018).

The aforementioned discourse that guides the trippers through the park is fundamentally connected to metanarratives of Canadian nationhood. On one of the final paddles before reaching a final access point, the trip passed a site occupied by an unknown group that proudly flew a massive Canadian flag by the water (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). This statement emotionally connected the participants to a larger sense of “Canadian Nationalism” and pride on the trip (Field Notes, August 1, 2018).

This discourse is heavily operationalized in Algonquin Park. The Group of Seven’s work nationalized the Algonquin Park landscapes by producing artwork that is fundamentally Canadian (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Their work instilled a sense of Canadian nationalism into the landscapes and communicated it across the nation (Jessup, 2002). This concept is further troubled in the following chapter.
The limits to this discourse pertain to notions of nationalism and the idea of “owning” land. The discursive origins of though lie in the statements that the suggest the landscapes belong to Canada, it allows the trippers to connect themselves to the nation while expelling the statements that suggest that landscapes belong to another group of people(s). Statements that suggests the landscapes belong to another group of people(s) lie external to the structure.

Dean (2012) has argued that “Canada is a canoe route” (p. 40). This statement not only entered the national imaginary, but it also depends on mobile and discursive structures that silence and overlook other truths, and ways of knowing and being. The following chapter further investigates and scrutinizes this notion to uncover the unjust and oppressive settler colonial power injustices that have enabled the common thought of canoe tripping as a Canadian activity.

5.6 Conclusion

The trippers operate within several discourses that align and build off one and other to provide particular accounts of truth on the canoe trips. These truths are highly embedded in broader contexts that privilege certain actors and conceptualizations of nature and its uses over others. The traits the trippers take up while guiding their campers through the park are deeply rooted in Western origins of thought that limit what can and cannot be said as it pertains to canoe tripping through the wilderness frontier. These four discourses the trippers heavily operate within (Algonquin Park as the wilderness, canoe trips as a site of consumption, canoe trips as a tool to connect with various ideologies, and particular notions of nationhood) help the tripper navigate their way through the human-nature relationship as it pertains to making sense of the Algonquin Park canoe trip.

Using the help of Waitt’s (2005) checklist, this chapter has explored Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) second, third, fourth, and fifth steps of engage with a Foucauldian styled
discourse analysis. It has situated the discourses the trippers act within into broader social and historical contexts (step two), identified the discursive limits (step three), the process in which new statements are created (step four), and the process by which the discourses are materialized and practiced (step five). It has contributed to answering the first two research questions, “how are environmental discourse perceived and performed by summer camp trippers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park?” and “How are power, privilege, and knowledge circulated and normalized in the environmental discourses?” This chapter has shown that the discourses the trippers operate within are heavily regulated by particular social contexts that inform their practice.

The following chapter, chapter six, scrutinizes the social contexts that have normalized and circulated in environmental discourses in which the trippers operate. It uses a postcolonial lens to illuminate how power, privilege, and knowledge have been normalized and circulated on the summer camp canoe trips.
Chapter 6: Troubling Discourses

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapters have outlined four environmental discourses that guide the trippers through Algonquin Park (chapter four) and subsequently situated their statements into broader and recurrent social discourses (chapter five). This chapter deconstructs the environmental discourses to illuminate the silenced, normalized, and unjust power relations that have operationalized on summer camp canoe trips. This chapter uses Waitt’s (2005) checklist to help unpack and shed light onto how particular silences and incoherencies enable the environmental discourses to operate as distinct, legitimate, hegemonic Truths that recreate and reinforce the oppressive legacies of settler colonialism.

This chapter will show that the environmental discourses that guide the trippers are not universal; instead, they can be fractured and broken down to expose other regimes of truth that speak to the human-nature relationship. It uses a postcolonial theoretical orientation to navigate the silences and incoherencies that enable the environmental discursive structures, allowing me to consider how colonial power injustices have normalized within settler colonial conceptions of environmental truth and knowledge (Grimwood, Yudina, Muldoon & Qui, 2011; Tuck, McKenzie & McCoy, 2014). Illuminating various unseen, unspoken, and unannounced statements will show that the environmental discourses in which the trippers operate are social constructs that depend on settler colonialism to sustain themselves as truthful accounts of the human-nature relationship (Braun, 2002).

This chapter contributes to answering the second research question, “How are power, privilege, and knowledge circulated and normalized in the environmental discourses?” It reveals
how the discourses privilege certain truths while simultaneously silencing and expelling incoherencies of others that exist external to the discursive sayable the trippers operate within. This discussion focuses on the human-nature relationship as it pertains to living off and alongside the landscapes, a peopleless wilderness, resource extraction, taking up particular traditional masculinities, nationalism, and a religious identity.

6.2 Living Off and Alongside the Landscapes

The settler discourses that the trippers operate within contribute to the silencing of hunting and the ongoing re-imagimation of what it means to live off the land. For the trippers, to live off the land is to live in harmony “with all of the wildlife, all of the trees…and everything else that lives [there]” (Dylan, July 30, 2018). The discourse limits the notions of living off the land to living with and alongside the plant and animal species that can be found in the park. In doing so, it silences the statements that pertain to methods of subsistence that directly and sustainably engage with the natural environment and rewrites deeply spiritual and complex practices as barbaric and savage-like.

As the park borders developed, the settler government instilled that it was illegal to “disturb/kill/remove/harm/harass” the animals, plants, or trees within Algonquin Park (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). This law maintains Algonquin Park as a space where the human-nature relationship is based upon mutual respect and cohabitation, despite the fact that respect and cohabitation are fundamental underpinnings of Indigenous hunting and gathering practices (Manore & Miner, 2011). “For many,” Manore and Miner (2011) wrote, “hunting is a form of religion and a source of spiritual enrichment and [ethical] guidance” (p.256). The silencing of traditional subsistence practices and its foundational principles suggests that hunting and gathering practices operate outside the discursive limits presented by Western hegemonic
notions of environmental truth. The discourse the trippers operate within enable them to ignore the methodological, morally rooted, and traditional practice that physically, socially, and culturally sustained the Algonquin Peoples (Lawrence, 2012). It shows that there are other ways of thinking and relating to subsistence that involve direct interactions with specific and localized landscapes for human need. This notion punctures the all-encompassing nature of the discursive truth that suggests the landscapes are not places to practice traditional methods of subsistence.

On the trips, the trippers were faced with incoherencies to the discourse that suggests subsistence practices should happen outside the park borders. When reflecting on traditional practices of hunting in Algonquin Park, Will motioned that it was a “shady” practice that occurred in a “[horribly] managed” park (August 1, 2018). The presence of traditional hunting on the landscapes operates as an incoherency to the ways in which the trippers conceptualize what is, and what is not, acceptable uses and practices on the landscapes. The trippers, as Will showed, opt into the discursive thought that deem traditional subsistence practices “barbaric” and “savage” (Manore & Miner, 2011, p. 31). This rhetoric manifests through the notions of “playing Indian,” previously explained in this thesis (Koffman, 2018, p. 413). Notions of “savagery” and barbarianism are attached to the “primitive” chase and are excluded from the “moral development [required] for citizenship” (Koffman, 2018, p. 420).

When the trippers label traditional subsistence practices as savage-like, they contribute to the discursive school of thought that further belittles and oppresses Indigenous cultures, ways of being, and knowing. It privileges European methods of subsistence as seemingly more developed and moral than that of the traditionally Indigenous. Similarly, the formal restriction placed on traditional methods of subsistence contributes to dispossessing the Algonquin Peoples of their autonomy and rights over their traditional homelands. There are strict regulations and guidelines
that Algonquin hunters and trappers must adhere to in order to practice traditional methods of subsistence on the lands, all of which are under the strict supervision of the settler government (Algonquin Provincial Park, n.d.c). The allowance of traditional methods of hunting and trapping on the landscapes suggests that there are, in fact, other ways of thinking and being that pertain to subsistence in Algonquin Provincial Park. It shows that other discursive truths exist external to that of the settler colonials, challenging and contesting the hegemonic and all-encompassing nature of subsistence presented by the Western hegemonic environmental discourses.

European settlers viewed modern humanity as an entity veering away from barbarianism and savagery, an exclusive process that could only be taken up by “white races” (Bederman, 1995 as cited by Erickson, 2013, p. 105). Aligning with the racist undertones of this statement, settlers did not consider the Algonquin Nations’ nomadic cultures and ways of life to be legitimate (Lawrence, 2012), nor did they see them on the path toward modernity, in part due to their traditional methods of subsistence (Braun, 2002).

The trippers asserted that plants and animals “belong” in the wild and untouched landscapes, and that their existence should not be threatened by human-visitors (Field Notes, July 18, 2018). For the trippers, notions of subsistence pertain to being well fed. For the Algonquin Peoples, their nomadic subsistence practices that their cultures are based upon are “not only necessary providers of food, but the primary means which an Algonquin identity can be lived on the land” (Lawrence, 2012, p. 147). The self-established powers the settler governments operate within have restricted traditional subsistence practices on the landscapes, simultaneously restricting the Algonquin Peoples ability to fulfill their identities and cultural practices. It clearly shows how power has been used by settler colonial societies to perpetuate an ongoing oppression of the Algonquin Peoples.
While the trippers encourage a particular harmonious narrative of living alongside wildlife, the meals the trippers pack for the campers are considered “meat-meals” (Field Notes, July 31, 2018). The majority of the meals the trippers prepared for the campers included some sort of animal-based protein. Salami was mixed into scrambled eggs in the morning, lathered in barbecue sauce and stuffed in a pita for lunch, and the trip feasted on hamburgers, chicken-stir fries, or pasta with either hamburgers or salami mixed in for dinner (Field Notes, July 20, 2018). While eating meat is a normal aspect of the canoe trips, killing an animal within the Algonquin Park borders for subsistence purposes is discursively unethical and incredibly illegal (Pacini-Ketchabaw & Nxumalo, 2015).

The canoe trippers fed the campers meat in the park while promoting a harmonious relationship between humans and nature. The act of serving meat on the canoe trips further strengthens the nature/culture dichotomy as it classifies meat as a product of the city rather than a product of an animal species similar to those found in the park. The trippers silence and normalize the slaughterhouses and factories that the trip’s food had come from but label the moral and spiritual practices of traditional methods of subsistence as barbaric and savage-like.

To sustain the discourse of living alongside nature, the trippers never question the mobility considerations of their food. They overlook where their food comes from as well as the processes by which they obtain it. The negative environmental impacts by which their food is grown, packaged, and transported are silenced, allowing the trippers to conceptualize their experiences in Algonquin Park as harmoniously living alongside nature. This process effectively operates in the nature/culture binary. It sees that impacts of producing, packaging, and transporting food products are localized to the spaces of urban culture, where actions of pollution and traces of human influence are seemingly acceptable in urban/cultural settings. This process
discursively maintains that the trippers are not impacting nature spaces in any way, as their consumptive practices and impacts are discursively localized outside of nature spaces, despite the fact that pollution and carbon emissions are universally located (Cronon, 1996). Mobility considerations urge us to think about the carbon footprints associated with the products consumed on the canoe trips and their discursively silenced role in diminishing the nature/culture dichotomy.

Rebecca, however, does question the normalized silence of eating meat on the canoe trips. She urges the other trippers to think through “environmental and ethical standards” embedded within the meat culture on canoe trips, arguing that they are “super inhumane practices” that “[send] different messages [about nature] than [she’d] like on canoe trips” (Rebecca, July 19, 2018). When this incoherency was raised, Adam was quick to rationalize the act of eating meat by citing the discursive traditional masculinized norms that suggest, “meat is the all-powerful, male, food, the essential food group” (August 1, 2018). Adam relies upon the discursive norms that privilege particular traditional masculine character traits that have normalized and been embraced by canoe trippers in Algonquin Park to rationalize the incoherency of appreciating and preserving wildlife while eating meat on canoe trips.

Additionally, silencing the Algonquin People’s history of subsistence on the land establishes that there are other socially constructed environmental discourses that guide another social group’s perception of the human-nature relationship. The Algonquin Peoples traditional methods of subsistence are discursive truths that operate external to the human-nature relationship that the trippers operate within.

Through the use of socially sustained and normalized unjust power relations, the trippers are able to privilege their own conceptions of truth and knowledge, further silencing the
structures that operate external to their own. The Algonquin Peoples traditional methods of subsistence show that there are other truths that guide human-nature relationships that do not rely on privileged Western thoughts and knowledges. In other words, it shows a way of interacting with the land that is not privileged by Western thought. Illuminating the silences and incoherencies contribute to breaking down the totalizing nature of truth within which the trippers operate as they challenge the hegemonic discursive nature of subsistence by showcasing methods of being and relating to the land that operate outside privileged Western conceptualizations.

6.3 Peopleless Wilderness

The Western environmental discourses the trippers operate within suggest that Algonquin Park is the home of the wildlife, where humans are mere “visitors” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Scrutinizing this notion brings forth an interesting discussion on the incoherencies, limits, and silences of the discursive structures that suggest and maintain nature as a peopleless place.

A highly visible incoherency in this discourse is the presence of the Algonquin Peoples culture, in and around the park. The Aboriginal Vision Pits and Pictographs labelled on the park’s map (Adam, August 1, 2018), the totem pole (Field Notes, August 1, 2018), and updates on the Algonquin Peoples land claim negotiations in the Algonquin Park Newspaper (2018) act as incoherencies to the discourses that suggests Algonquin Park is an uninhabitable, peopleless space.

The maps some of the trippers use acknowledge the Aboriginal Vision Pits and Aboriginal Pictographs (Figure 9). Both of the canoe trips paddled past them, and the trippers were aware of their presence as they did but failed to recognize them. Upon reflecting on the cultural sites, Dylan said, “I’ve passed by that Aboriginal Vision Pit on Rock Lake probably a dozen times, and it’s written right there on the map…maybe two or three times I’ve pointed it
out to my campers, but I don’t know anything about it [so I don’t often do that]” (August 1, 2018). Although Dylan has pointed out this incoherency within the discourse a few times on his canoe trips, his knowledge of it is limited, and often paddles past it without recognizing or introducing his campers to the sites, further silencing this incoherency as he leads his campers through the park. Similarly, the totem pole at the East Gate of Algonquin Park is an incoherency that suggests the Algonquin Peoples presence on the land before the space was established a peopleless park by settler colonial figures. The totem pole signifies the cultural heritage of the Algonquin Peoples and is a symbolic representation of their presence on the land (Algonquins of Ontario, n.d.d). The totem pole is similarly silenced on the canoe trips. Collectively, these incoherencies showcase the limits to the discursive complexes by highlighting the statements that outside the discursive sayable. They collectively close off the discursive thought to maintain nature as a peopleless place. These acts overwrite and erase the historical, cultural, and social practices that are localized to the landscapes. Further contributing to the process of erasure of the Algonquin Peoples and their practices on their homelands.

The eighth page (of twenty-eight) of the Algonquin Park Newspaper (Figure 10) is the only page in the Algonquin Park Newspaper (2018) that recognizes the lands of Algonquin Park as rightfully belonging to the Algonquin Peoples. The vague and broad description explains, “Algonquin Provincial Park lies within unceded Algonquin traditional territory which is the subject of negotiations aimed at reaching Ontario’s first modern treaty” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). This section continues to talk about how these negotiations are “making history and taking action on reconciliation” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). In keeping the discussion on reconciliation vague and short, the authors of the Algonquin Park Newspaper were able to emphasize other histories in the park that start at the time of European settlement. The
year 2018 marked the 125\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Algonquin Park, in which “a rich history and broad natural diversity have occupied an increasingly important place in the hearts and minds of Ontario citizens and of visitors from around the world” (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The Algonquin Park Newspaper (2018) says, multiple times, that the history of Algonquin Park begins in 1893 with the logging operations. This reduces the history of Algonquin Park to settler experience and labels it as a space that has traditionally existed outside of history and human influence. In addition, it alludes to the exclusive processes by which Indigenous knowledges and truths that operate external to Western knowledges and truths are stories of folklore rather than fact (further touched upon in a later section of this chapter).

Silenced from the newspaper section that speaks to the “Algonquin History” are the legacies of colonialism and settler colonialism that negatively impact the Algonquin Peoples (Algonquin Newspaper, 2018). By assuming the authoritative voice as the agents responsible for speaking to particular histories in Algonquin Park, the settler colonial institutions are able to silence particular histories and truths that would trouble their wholesome nature. Similarly, the
choice to omit this discursive truth from the newspaper silences the histories and notions that the landscapes are, in fact, habitable spaces. It would shatter the nature/culture dichotomy the trippers, and Ontario Parks, operate within and privilege. The histories of the Algonquin Peoples and the physical presence on the land as its occupants lie outside the discursive structure that enable conceptualizations of the landscapes as a peopleless wilderness- scape.

To make sense of the aforementioned incoherencies in the discursive structure that pertains to a peopleless wilderness, the trippers rely on colonial constructions of the Indigenous as the “Other” (Braun, 2002, p. 91). The trippers simplify Indigenous identities to representations of the “Other of modernity” (Braun, 2002, p. 91), signifying they operate within a culture external to notions of “reason and rationality” (Braun, 2002, p. 90). The trippers work around the aforementioned highly visible incoherencies on the canoe trips by trivializing the Algonquin Peoples’ culture. They label the Algonquin Peoples’ culture as “the simple life,” and therefore external to modern, complex, humanity (Alex, July 31, 2018). This maintains, normalizes, and circulates colonial and settler colonial constructions of the Algonquin Peoples as less than the Euro-Settlers, and Algonquin Park as a peopleless space.

This construction stems from a colonial domination that suggests the modernized European settler culture is different from, and better than, Indigenous and traditional cultures. It assumes Indigenous cultures are a part of untouched, pure, and pristine nature-scapes for their lack of European refinements (Braun, 2002). Engulfing the Algonquin cultures into the same category as nature sustains Western hegemonic and privileged discourses that preserve the nature/culture binary in which civilization cannot exist in nature (Braun, 2002). This process erases the Algonquin Peoples’ culture and assumes signs of their presence into “natural” features of the park (Braun, 2002, p. 244). The Aboriginal Pictographs and Vision Pits the trippers pass.
by are merely ascribed into “Algonquin [Park’s natural] history,” no different than any other tree, bush, or rock that they pass by (Rebecca, July 20, 2018). This sustain settler colonial constructions of the Indigenous Other that operates in a primitive and barbaric culture that is less than that of the Europeans (Manore & Miner, 2011).

The newspaper continues to explain the history of logging within the park, much more than it does of the Algonquin Peoples history. As a result, the significance of the Algonquin Peoples’ and the processes of colonialism and settler colonialism that continually oppress them are heavily minimalized in comparison to that of the logging operations that have “built” the province and the communities surrounding the park (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). While the act of logging is an incoherency to the discourses of a peopleless wilderness and a space that exists outside of modern society, the logging industry is heavily silenced and presumed to be non-existent in the park (further scrutinized in the next section of this chapter).

These incoherencies outline the limits of the discursive structure. They show the statements that exist outside the structures and how various actors explain and work around them in such a way to further align them with their own self-privileging discourses. Recognizing the histories of the Algonquin Peoples on their traditional landscapes opts into a discourse that suggests the Algonquin Park landscapes are actually habitable spaces in which cultures have existed. The presence of the vision pits, totem pole, and treaty negotiation updates puncture the totalizing nature of the peopleless wilderness discourse circulated and normalized by Western hegemonic truths that suggest the park operates external to dynamic and complicated cultures and civilizations.
6.4 Resource Extraction

Baker (2002) argued that Algonquin Park is a multi-dimensional space encoded with social, political, cultural, and economic histories that reproduce social class relations and purposes within its boundaries. In other words, Algonquin Park is a cultural space encoded with power relations that reflect the socio-political, cultural, and economic conditions of modern society.

Progress, “represented by clear-cuts and smokestacks,” guides settler colonial societies (Braun, 2002, p. 213). The discourse Ontario Parks and the modern Ontario economy operate within conceptualize the Algonquin Park landscapes as resource pool ready for capitalist exploitation, thus, promoting progress (Braun, 2002). With the landscapes in the hands of the settlers and the Algonquin Peoples removed, the forests were discursively transformed into spaces embedded in the “late-capitalist epoch of consumption” (Baker, 2002, p. 202).

The capitalist exploitation of the landscapes favoured particular voices and actors who decided how the landscapes were going to be used and to what extent. Settler communities have privileged those who hold Western knowledges by labelling them as “specialists” who could be the voice of reason and representation for the spaces (Braun, 2002, p. 37). Voices that did not hold Western credentials and knowledges were discursively deemed illegitimate and uneducated voices and actors (Braun, 2002). This process circulated Western sciences as agents of truth while lessening Indigenous ways of knowing, labelling them as “folklore” instead of “fact” (Baldwin, Cameron & Kobayashi, 2011, p. 39). It belittles the Indigenous ways of knowing while further privileging Western sciences and knowledges as the supremely dominant. Under the guidance of the Western specialist who knew how to “upkeep the land” (Will, August 1,
2018), the land’s resources were extracted while the space was discursively maintained as an “unmarked, abstract [entity,] empty of any social and cultural contexts” (Braun, 2002, p. 42).

The process of logging is an actively silenced industry in Algonquin Park that contributes to modern progress under the directional voice of the Western specialist. The logging industry operates within a network of more than two thousand kilometers of closed roads (Figure 11), all of which are restricted to recreationists (Baker, 2002). A $65 fine will be given to unauthorized users of the closed roads (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). The newspaper explains,

Roads not shown on the Canoe Routes of Algonquin Provincial Park map-brochure are closed to unauthorized vehicles and bicycles. Road closures are indicated by gates and/or solid red circles on either side of the roadway. A park permit is not authorization to travel on a closed road. (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018)

![Figure 11. Map of the logging operations in Algonquin Park 2019-2020. Source: Algonquin Forest Authority, 2019.](image)

Algonquin Park’s rules silence the purposes of the roads, the role they play in enabling the logging industry, and other discursive truths that pertain to resource extraction in the human-
nature relationship. The silenced notions of the logging industry enable settler conceptualizations of the park as a seemingly “untouched” (Will, August 1, 2018) and “incredible” (Will, July 31, 2018) wilderness that exists external to processes of industrialization that have dominated urban cultural spaces and left nature as an ahistorical, pristine, and untouched space.

The logging systems in Algonquin Park emerged as a part of the “late modern economy where cultural production takes its place alongside [other] industries” (Baker, 2002, p. 201). To the trippers, Algonquin Park is a space of untouched and pristine wilderness embedded in the romanticized tourism industry. To the careful and detailed logger, however, Algonquin Park is a site of discreet resource extraction and material utilization (Baker, 2002). While the two industries (romanticized tourism and industrialization) house inherent contradictions to one another, their statements and silences dynamically manifest in such a way to carry certain conceptions of the human-nature relationship as truthful. They are both by-products of settler colonial claims to land which depend on the landscapes being discursively labelled as uninhabited and uncultivated. Western specialists enable the logging industry in the park while simultaneously silencing it to preserve the nature/culture binary that the tourism industry heavily operates within.

To shed light onto the logging industry punctures the hegemonic discourse that suggests nature exists outside modern industry and organization. It shows that logging operates within the park, slashing the notions of nature as a pristine and empty landscape as it highlights the coexistence of culture and nature in the same space and the same time. It also allows for a discussion on the uses and representations of nature and whose voice is the legitimate one. Settler colonial societies have assumed the authoritative voice of the forest lands, establishing its proper and improper uses (Cronon, 1996). Through this process, the settlers were able to justify
and normalize their uses of the park and forest lands, privileging the conceptions that fit their own societal purposes and ways of being while expelling and restrict notions that exist outside and challenge their own.

The logging industry normalizes the incoherency of their practice by appealing to the “public interest” of the land (Braun, 2002, p. 278), noting its “necessity” to the communities surrounding Algonquin Park and the province’s economy (Algonquin Forest Authority, 2018). In serving the needs of the greater public interest, the industry inherently “silences [the] minority,” or those that do not feed into the greater public and their interests (Braun, 2002, p. 278). There is an encapsulating assumption that the “public interest” speaks to the will of the entire population rather than to the will of the exclusive group in which it actually serves (Braun, 2002, p. 278). In the context of Algonquin Park, the exclusive group in which the public interest serves is the settler communities who ongoingly benefit from the landscapes as both spaces of recreation and also as sites of resource extraction and development. Responding to the will of the greater public interest silences other ways of thinking about the land, resource extraction, and the human-nature relationship that do not align with the majority.

The benefits of logging are embedded in the capitalist epoch which have served settler communities more than others. This further perpetuates settler colonial strengths and knowledges that privilege and empower Western settler actors as more truthful and legitimate voices of the forests. This act simultaneously oppresses the Algonquin Peoples as it removes their traditional voices and knowledges from discussions of best practices on the lands and self-justifies the physical alterations the landscapes whose uses are fundamental to the Algonquin Peoples identities (Lawrence, 2012).
During one of the portages, the trip “hiked” over an active road used by the logging industry (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). The trippers neither expelled nor embraced the road, they remained silent and again subsumed it into the natural state of the park. This is due to the ongoing silencing of logging within the park that “[makes it seem that logging has stopped” (Adam, August 1, 2018). After reflecting on the human-nature relationship in regard to resource extraction with Adam, he noticed “a huge truck with logs and logs and logs on it driving through highway 60” (August 1, 2018). He continued to say that he “hasn’t brought up [the logging industry in the park]” yet to his campers, but “[he’s now] more aware” of the multiple purposes and uses of the park and intends on bringing it up one day (Adam, August 1, 2018).

The Algonquin Park Newspaper (2018) encourages visitors to “step back in time” as they learn about “Algonquin’s logging history” at the park’s logging museum. The newspaper explains logging as a temporal occurrence of the past that has “affected the park,” making it appear as an activity that no longer exists, operates, and affects the park (Algonquin Park Newspaper, 2018). Illuminating this silence shows another discursive truth that is hidden from users to maintain the park spaces as seemingly empty and pristine spaces outside of human presence and development.

Illuminating resource extraction in the context of Algonquin Park shows that the landscapes are not actually the objectively pristine and empty wilderness sanctuaries they are discursively labelled, but rather they are spaces in which many truths are carried. Recognizing the silences and incoherencies lodged within the resource industry in Algonquin Park exposes the holes within the hegemonic truths Western discourses circulate about the separation between nature and city spaces. It shows how Algonquin Park is a site heavily intertwined with modern
capitalist industrialization ventures that continually oppresses the Algonquin Peoples while enabling settler European progress.

### 6.5 Taking Up Particular Traditional Masculinities

Western discourses assert nature as a space where humans can test and affirm various traditional gender performances within themselves and others. This discourse operates alongside others that enforce the nature/culture binary, and the wilderness as an empty space that exists outside modern influence and technologies.

Western environmental discourses suggest that nature spaces operate as the frontier: an unforgiving space where actors can assert, prove, and affirm various gender roles and ideologies (Newbery, 2003). The frontier thesis, developed by Turner (1894 as cited by Benton & Rennie Short, 1999), depends on six different factors. The third of the six, suggests individuals in the wilderness are in constant “combat with the villain—against the wilderness, Indians, and wild beasts” (Cronon, 1996, p. 143). In other words, the frontier is the “wilderness free for all” (Rebecca, July 19, 2018) that “masters the colonist” against the wild, the animals, and the Indigenous (Cronon, 1996, p. 143). These conceptions of the human-nature relationship favour the presence of a strong, dominant, masculinized, White “hero” who can tame a landscape before they can be considered suitable for anyone else (Cronon, 1996, p. 143). The traditionally masculine and able colonist is a privileged and preferred actor responsible for taming the wild landscapes and people they pass as they journey through the frontier space that civilized “man” has never been before (Cronon, 1996, p. 147). Whereas actors that do not take up those particular traits operationalize as an incoherency to the dominant discursive narrative.

“Man and nature [have historically gone] hand-in-hand,” Adam said (August 1, 2018). “The trip staff,” he continues, “have historically been male, and people would think of [them] as
strong, brute, crazy, wise, [and] mature, to a certain extent obviously…” (Adam, August 1, 2018). Adam explained that trippers, typically male, were synonymous with certain traits that would enable them to socially assert their dominance over the untamed wilderness. Further, he notes how in previous years there had been “more female than male [trippers],” but they still encouraged each other to “be [and act like] a man” (August 1, 2018).

As Will explained, “the female trippers tend to have more masculine ways about them. You don’t really see these stereotypical females running around trips and lifting all these things and rolling through the mud…” (July 31, 2018). Similarly, Will explains that Rebecca, when talking about long-gruelling portages, “may not necessarily be strong enough, but she is still able to overcome nature” (July 31, 2018). Although Rebecca does not take up the traditional masculinities the male trippers do, her presence in the park as a tripper is an incoherency that is rationalized by asserting traditionally masculine attributes to her performances. This process not only shows the limits to the gendered discursive structures in nature and who operates external to them, but it also privileges, strengthens, and normalizes heroic performances of domination in nature spaces.

While Rebecca shows trippers that do not ‘fit’ the traditional masculine discourse are still capable and can successfully lead a group of campers through the park (puncturing the hegemonic discourse that would suggest otherwise), the other trippers ascribe particular traditional masculinized traits to her and her performances to rationalize her presence as a feminine and female canoe tripper.

Technology, on the other hand, is a heavily silenced notion within the human-nature relationship as it pertains to performances of strength and heroism in colonial conceptions of
nature spaces. The canoe is a particularly interesting technology whose use is embedded within various colonial discourses.

The summer camp uses Swift Canoes (Field Notes, August 1, 2018), a popular and openly embraced brand of canoes designed to be lightweight and easy to control (Swift, n.d.). The canoe was conceptually developed thousands of years prior to European settlement in North America and remains a technology foundational to Indigenous ways of life (Gidmark, 1988). Once the canoe was introduced to settler colonialists, they sought to improve it (Erickson, 2013). They insisted they had the knowledges and means to produce a better than the sustainably and culturally built canoe that Algonquin Peoples made (Erickson, 2013; Gidmark, 1988). This concept furthers the discursive thought of the settler communities as more advanced knowledge holders who solely know how to improve the lives of the Other, and further belittles Indigenous knowledges as inadequate compared to that of the settler Europeans (Erickson, 2013). As a result, the settler communities assumed the canoe, and it entered neoliberal markets as a widespread appropriated settler technology (Erickson, 2013).

Conceptualizing the canoe as a settler entity not only discredits and silences the Indigenous Peoples as the originators of the canoe, but the production, manufacturing, and distribution of the “new and improved” canoe is embedded in, and benefits, European capitalist ventures that are sustained and strengthened by each purchase (Swift, n.d.).

In Veblen’s (1979 as cited by Erickson, 2013) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, the intersection between leisure and consumption is explained. Veblen articulates how leisure pursuits are inherently intertwined with modern capitalist ventures (Erickson, 2013). By purchasing canoes from Swift, the camp not only feeds into the capitalist markets, but they also further engrain themselves into a discourse that silences and overlooks the history of the canoe
and the oppressive roots in which it came into the hands of settler colonialists. They encourage a conceptualization of the canoe as a settler technology whose use and purpose reflects the needs of modern recreation rather than as a vehicle that sustained cultures and livelihoods.

In Western discursive thought, the multiple histories of the canoe are silence. Rendering it an entity with one purpose: recreation. Highlighting the silences imbedded with discursive thought of the canoes shows that there are other purposes, histories, and conceptualizations of it that lie outside Western hegemonic discursive conceptualizations. The statements that breach the discursive limits highlight other truths that pertain to the purposes of the canoe, and the human-nature relationship.

Performances of masculinity that trippers require to trek through the frontier are silently put to ease by a series of technologies. The GPS the tripper’s carry provides the opportunity to call for help at any time (Field Notes, July 30, 2018). The trippers are not “pushing through” the elements as they use the carefully stowed and expensive water filtration systems or perform enduring displays of strength by carrying carry up-to-date packs that are both comfortable and efficient (Will, July 31, 2018). These technologies were designed to ease and comfort participants as they make their way through nature spaces, challenging the hegemonic discursive notions of strength and grit required in the frontier. Technologies on canoe trips render the traditional masculinized narratives of the wilderness non-essential.

These technological incoherencies expose a collection of statements that challenge and press against normalized assertions of masculinity in Algonquin Park. They further trouble and break down the hegemonic truths that inform particular traditional masculinities of strength and heroism in nature spaces while encouraging a reconceptualization of traditionally taken up masculinities in Western accounts of the human-nature relationship. Collectively, the
incoherencies press against and fracture the hegemonic discourse that normalizes and circulates expressions of particular traditional masculinities in nature spaces. They show the limits to the discourse by operating outside of them. They suggest that particular traditional masculinities are not essential parts of summer camp canoe trips and that trippers who operate outside them can still give their campers and incredible, safe, and engaging experience in the Algonquin Park backcountry.

6.6 Nationalism

National identity is a vast and heavy topic. This section takes a postcolonial lens to the intersection of nature spaces and nationalism to expose the unjust power relations that have enabled and sustained the wilderness as “jewels in the crown of Canada” (Hamilton, 2017, p. 8).

In the years after World War II, the Canadian nation lacked a unity that it could use to define and represent itself both nationally and internationally (Braun, 2002). The Group of Seven, a small group of painters from Toronto, is accredited with developing and circulating a style of landscape impressionism that showcases the “rugged character of the [Canadian] lands” (Thorpe, 2011, p. 22). Their work materializes various Western discourses as they pertain to nationhood.

The Group of Seven was considered to be the arbiters of picturesque scenery and the ultimate voice on how to represent a unified country through art (Jessup, 2002). Getting free trips across the nation from the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways, the artists were able to capture the untouched wilderness found across the nation (Jessup, 2002). Settler communities privileged the Group of Seven’s work as an objective documentation of the Canadian landscape and used them to nationalize a common spectacle of art to construct the landscapes into something fundamentally Canadian.
Through their artwork, they contributed to the silencing and erasure of Indigenous Peoples by documenting the uniquely and commonly shared empty Canadian wilderness (Jessup, 2002). Attending to the silences within the art showcases another discursive truth of the human-nature relationship. One that not only shows the land and the previous occupants but also troubles the national narratives that suggest the landscapes are fundamentally Canadian.

“For some”, Erickson (2013) wrote, canoe tripping “exists at the heart of the Canadian experience, one of the key elements of Canada’s identity” (p. 1). When the canoe trip passed by a campsite with a Canadian flag stuck in the ground, it was a symbolic representation that reminded participants that canoeing in Algonquin Park connects them to “something bigger” (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). However, the foundation on which Canadian nationalism is built upon and constantly reaffirmed depends on an ongoing cycle of “colonial action against Indigenous peoples, who claims to land, and self-determination undermine the legitimacy of Canadian authority and hegemony” (Barker, 2009. p. 325). The processes by which trippers are able to connect with greater notions of nationalism and pride operate on colonial injustices that have marginalized Indigenous peoples across the nation.

Racist and oppressive colonial histories are silenced and normalized through the nationalization of nature spaces in Canada (Baldwin, Cameron & Kobayashi, 2011). Dylan explains, “[The histories of colonialism in nature spaces] are not [things] that we need to directly focus on…as our problem. It’s not something that I want…to be constantly pressing on me while I’m [in Algonquin Park]” (August 1, 2018). Recognizing notions colonialism embedded in the landscapes rests uneasily with Dylan as it creates dissonance with how he conceptualizes Algonquin Park and his privileged placed within it. Dylan’s attempt to overlook the histories of the landscapes denotes other truths to the nationalism discourse exist. It shows that the
Algonquin Park landscapes are tethered to other ways of thinking that contrast with the wholesome notions of nationhood Dylan wishes to exclusively engage with as he canoes through the park. Thus, highlighting the types of statements that lie within the environmental nationalism discourse are those that do not challenge its authoritative nature.

Recognizing the landscapes as something other than belonging to settler Canadians heavily fractures the narratives that situate the landscapes in the Canadian imaginary. Rebecca explained that recognizing the incoherencies within the national narrative could spark the process of “reconciliation” (August 1, 2018), severely fracturing the hegemonic national discourse of the great Canadian landscapes (Baldwin, Cameron & Koyayashi, 2011).

Highlighting statements that operate within the limits of this discourse showcase the statements that operate outside of it. The discourse permits statements that allude to a Canadian wilderness while expelling and silencing those that suggest the landscapes ‘belong’ or ‘belonged’ to another group of people (Lawrence, 2012). It enables other ways of thinking and relating to nature and the environment that highlight colonial and settler colonial dispossessions, penetrations, and appropriations. Further, it showcases discourses that operate outside a national imaginary that paint seemingly wholesome and pure pictures of the intersection between the human-nature relationship and nationalism.

6.7 A Religious Identity

The trippers share a religious commonality. Put simply by Rebecca, “we’re all Jewish” (July 19, 2018). The Jewish orientation towards nature and the environment maintains that “destroying fruits” and engaging in “immoral behaviour that would pollute nature” is prohibited (My Jewish Learning, n.d.).
Both of the trips this research occurred on passed several other Jewish oriented summer camp canoe trips. All of the trips displayed a similar socio-economic status; the summer camp trippers used similar packs and wore similar brands (Field Notes, July 17, 2018). Thus, contributing to the development of their cultural capital and habitus (spoken about in chapter two). As a result of their privilege as white, Jewish, settler colonial subjects, their presence in the park remained unquestioned as they are presumed normal and welcomed actors in the space.

The actors that can be seen in the park visually align with notions of the “White culture” that Erickson, Johnson, and Kivel (2009, p. 540) spoke to. The trippers were left unquestioned in the park and other users did not look twice. The trippers did not display any signs that would place them in social minority and their presence in the park was left unquestioned.

Welcoming a diverse range of actors into the nature spaces would present itself as an incoherency to White culture operationalized in nature spaces. It would fracture the hegemonic discursive norms that suggest nature spaces are for White affluent subjects. It would pave the way to a new conceptualization of the human-nature relationship that does not privilege settler colonial subjects and can welcome users that do not identify as such.

6.8 Fractured Structures

This chapter has presented the silences and incoherencies inherent to the settler colonial discursive structures the trippers operate within. Bhabha (1994, as cited by Erickson, 2013) argued that the human world has been fragmented into certain groups and that each group has its own set of values, beliefs, and truths. Through this previous discussion, and highlighting other values, beliefs, and truths, we can begin to break down the “Western superiority” that exists external to settler constructions of the human-nature relationship (Johnson & Parry, 2015, p. 303). It has revealed the fractures that exist in the discursive norms that navigate the trippers
through the human-nature relationship as they pertain to living off and alongside the landscapes, a peopleless wilderness, resource extraction, taking up traditional and particular masculinities, nationalism, and religious identities.

The environmental discourses the trippers operate within are intertwined, and they collectively operate, and depend on notions of mobility to sustain themselves as discursively objective accounts of environmental truth. They reinforce and privilege each other while expelling statements that would challenge their all-encompassing nature. The discourses do not operate in silos. They dynamically operate while collectively silencing statements that challenge their all-encompassing nature. This dynamic discursive nature is particularly seen through the works of the Group of Seven whose images simultaneously showcase Canada as a rugged wilderness that exists in an ahistorical and empty space outside of modern social organization that could only be crossed by the brave and heroic actor ready to fight against the raw and natural elements (Jessup, 2002).

This chapter has suggested that the discourses the trippers operate within can be challenged, fractured, and broken down. It shows that the discourses that guide the trippers are not as encompassing and universal as they discursively appear.

This chapter has contributed to answering the second research question, “How are power, privilege, and knowledge circulated and normalized in the environmental discourses?” It shows how the discursive truths the trippers operate within further perpetuate settler colonial power injustices. Furthermore, this chapter has contextualized the recommendations that are given to trippers in the next section that will help them reconcile the social and political tensions inherent to taking campers on canoe trips Algonquin Park.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Moving Forward

This thesis has illuminated the unseen, unspoken, and unannounced practices of summer camp canoe trips. It has shown the social, political, power, and knowledge injustices trippers (re)produce as they lead their campers through Algonquin Provincial Park canoe trips. From watching the trippers and being one myself, it’s clear that the trippers are incredibly passionate individuals who care deeply about the campers and the canoe trip experience. In light of this research, changes to the traditional tripping program need to happen.

The first half of this chapter outlines recommendations that can be made to various trippers and organizations to positively address what has been illuminated by this research. These recommendations answer the third research question, “what can summer camp trippers do to reconcile the social and political tensions between taking campers through Algonquin Park and their role as beneficiaries of settler colonialism?"

Having spent the past 15 summers at the camp in which this research was developed as a camper, staff, and supervisor justifies my ability to suggest feasible changes to the canoe tripping program and positions me as enough of an authority figure in the camp to implement and embody these changes. These suggestions align with the purposes of summer camp canoe trips and are practical enough that will allow the trippers to forge a path towards a new camp and canoe tripping culture. The proposed alterations to the trips will ensure the campers’ exposure to a culture cognizant of the truths, knowledges, histories, and cultures embedded in the Algonquin Park landscape while still providing their campers with the best canoe trips possible. While the suggestions outlined in this chapter are rooted in one summer camp’s canoe tripping program,
other trippers and tripping organizations can easily adopt them and bring a social justice orientation to their practice.

7.2 Embracing Change

7.2.1 Using Reflexivity

Drawing from Gibson (1979), Ingold (2000) explains that learning occurs by attending to the actions in one’s surroundings. In terms of this research, Ingold (2000) tells us that the campers and trippers are always learning from one another, constantly interpreting and adopting the actions of the other as they are performed. Outdoor recreation participants need to cognize their actions to ensure they do not provide unwanted and “intuitive… conceptions of human-environmental relations” that can be interpreted and adopted by others (Mullins, 2011, p. 381-382).

In Warren’s (2002) plea for more socially aware outdoor recreational leaders, she suggests that staff members are ill equipped to discuss issues of social justice in outdoor recreation. When campers go on canoe trips led by naïve staff, they are socialized into a naïve world (Warren, 2002). As I have, the trippers in this research have neglected a critical examination of this ongoing cycle of knowledge where powerful discourses, infused with unjust racial, political, and gendered power imbalances, are normalized and accepted. This ongoing cycle has reproduced trippers that, both consciously and unconsciously, sustain unjust discursive truths while further enabling the marginalization of Indigenous Peoples.

Freire (2000) explains that “authentic liberation—the process of humanization…is praxis: the action and reflection upon [one’s] world to transform it” (as cited by Mullins, 2013, p. 572). Praxis is the interpretive process, guided by one’s own values and intentions, where participants have the chance to reflect on their practices and alter them how they see fit (Mullins, 2013).
Engaging in praxis could foster a canoe trip centered on social collective and relational well-being, particularly if guided by complexities presented in this research, and allow participants to control the legacies they pass onto the campers (Prilleltensky, 2001). They can further choose the discourses they wish to circulate, strengthen, and normalize as they take their campers through the park. The education of attention tells us that when the trippers embody these changes, the campers will be exposed to them and ultimately adopt them as their own actions. Effectively creating a culture shift in the ways in which settler colonial trippers conceptualize their place in the human-nature relationship. This will start the process by which new discursive truths are introduced to canoe tripping practice and campers are given a more aware and well-rounded nature-based recreation experience.

I call for a change in the ways summer camp canoe trippers conceptualize their presence in nature spaces, how they teach their campers about nature, and the languages they use on the canoe trips. Attending to the changes and ideas I’ve laid out below will put a stop to the ongoing cycles that marginalize and oppress some members of society while easing and enabling the experiences of others.

### 7.2.2 Purposeful Curriculum Development

Warren (2002) outlines two recommendations to aid outdoor recreation leaders in their journeys of self-awareness to provide a better service to their participants: research and an intensive staff-training program. Trippers have not ignorantly discounted social injustices on the trips; rather, as seen by the trippers in this research, they are “often at a loss as to how to address social justice issues” and therefore omit those discussions from their excursions (Warren, 2002). Warren’s (2002) notion of research asks leaders to seek various “inequities” in outdoor recreation to begin to understand how common and lay activities perpetuate them (p. 232).
Through research, trippers will be exposed to new ways of thinking and social phenomena that will give them the knowledge to engage in potentially difficult and important conversations with their campers. In addition, research of other knowledges and cultures will aid in breaking down the hegemonic postcolonial reality in which the trippers currently operate. Using this newfound knowledge, trippers will be able to develop a curriculum that is aware of other truths and ways of relating to the land, similar to what has been uncovered by this thesis. By learning from multiple discursive truths, including those associated with other cultures, trippers can begin to respectfully acknowledge other ways of thinking that pertain to the human-nature relationship that exist outside their own discursive structure.

The latter recommendation made by Warren (2002) refers to an intensive staff-training program where trippers collaboratively rethink their practices. It would provide the trippers the chance to think through a meaningful curriculum to deliver to their campers, ultimately standardizing the environmental discursive truths that the trippers are socializing their campers into. While the trippers already have their own staff-training program before the summer begins, I recommend they take the time to collaboratively develop and instill a socially just and aware curriculum into their practice.

The Ontario Camping Association (1984) outlines three of the most basic outcomes of canoe tripping. The first is the development of the land ethic: a stewardship value that suggests humans have an ethical behaviour to act towards the wellbeing of all species on the land (Leopold, 1970; Ontario Camping Association, 1984). The second is the encouragement of leadership development skills, bringing campers into the wilderness to inspire them to strengthen their leadership skills (Louv, 2005; Ontario Camping Association, 1984). The final outcome is to teach the campers valuable land and survival skills (Ontario Camping Association, 1984). In the
wake of this research, I would like to propose a fourth. The fourth outcome of a canoe trip should be a recognition and acknowledgment of the socio-cultural and political histories from which the summer camp canoe trip is privileged from. This fourth outcome can be presented to members of the Ontario Camp Association at their annual conference.

While this would encourage the trippers to change their actions, it also speaks to the necessity of a cultural shift in traditional ways of thinking and being as it pertains to Algonquin Park. Collectively, the users and stakeholders of Algonquin Park share a responsibility to develop a way of thinking about and communicating Algonquin Park that aligns with socially aware and just constructions of the human-nature relationship. Trippers would be able to maintain and instill this proposed fourth outcome by means of a dynamic and well-developed curriculum that addresses and operates within multiple truths, cultures, and histories embedded within Algonquin Park.

7.2.3 Particular Language(s)

Language is a powerful instrument used to convey certain knowledges and truths (Fairclough, 2013). It can both sustain and undermine power relationships and truths that have discursively normalized (Fairclough, 2013). The languages and words the trippers use are intertwined with the discursive institutions that help to maintain unequal social and power relations (Alim, 2005). By developing a critical language awareness (CLA), trippers would be able to challenge these unequal institutions and bring forth positive changes (Alim, 2005; Wodak, 1995).

Critical language awareness allows subjects to understand the world in which words are embedded by paying particular attention to the unspoken (Alim, 2005). It is the practice of speaking about what is discursively hidden. It would see that the trippers get comfortable talking
about, and recognizing, the statements that operate out the discursive complexes that guide them through the park, rather just solely conveying particular truths privileged by specific discursive structures (Clark, Fariclough, Ivanič & Martin-Jones, 1990). This process would require the trippers to research and familiarize themselves with an array of discursive truths, many of which contrast to their own, and become comfortable and honest enough with them to engage their campers in conversations about other truths and ways of thinking. I anticipate this process will take a long time for the trippers to successfully navigate. It may begin during the staff training weeks prior to any canoe trip with campers and continue through every trip the trippers take as they continually strengthen and (re)produce the discourses foundational to a new summer camp canoe trip.

Making the shift towards critical language awareness would veer the trippers away from making particular claims of truth, such as, “look how beautiful the wilderness is. I bet no one has ever been to the top of that mountain over there” (Field Notes, July 31, 2018). Alternatively, such a shift would help the trippers adopt a critical pedagogy that confronts the “harsh ways of the world we live in” (Alim, 2005, p. 29). This process will not be easy. It asks trippers to begin to fracture the hegemonic truths in which they have come to understand nature and foundations on which they have built their identities. The CLA aligns well with Braun’s (2002) notion of breaking down the postcolonial condition, as it requires the very actors that operate within and strengthen particular discursive truths to alter their practices and contribute towards its fracturing.

7.2.3.1 Acknowledging the Land

As a part of the CLA, I propose the trippers vocally embrace a Land Acknowledgment. The Land Acknowledgement is a short statement that achieves multiple feats. It formally
recognizes the traditional occupants of a particular land, it raises awareness of suppressed or forgotten histories, and it rejects commonly celebrated Eurocentric doctrines of discovery (Keefe, 2019). This directly aligns with the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation’s (2015) 47th call to action. It reads:

We call upon the federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to repudiate concepts used to justify European sovereignty over Indigenous peoples and lands, such as the Doctrine of Discovery and terra nullius, and to reform those laws, government policies, and litigation strategies that continue to rely on such concepts. (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015)

Operationalizing this call to action on the summer camp canoe trips will formally acknowledge the traditional rights and occupations of the Algonquin People on the land while complicating the narratives that position the settler-European as the land’s true discoverer and owner. Bringing the Land Acknowledgment onto the canoe trips is a step the trippers can take that adopts a CLA and verbally places the Algonquin Peoples, by name, on their traditional lands.

Further, I recommend the trippers also acknowledge the material items, like the canoe, that have been appropriated from Indigenous cultures and assumed by settler colonialists. Similar to the Land Acknowledgement, this process will encourage the trip’s participants to begin thinking about meanings and cultures that have been subsumed into the outdoor recreational summer camp canoe trip. This is an easy step for trippers to take before starting their canoe trips that will prompt critical thought of the hidden histories, legacies, and uses of Algonquin Park.

Language is a powerful tool. Used incorrectly, it can reinforce unjust power relations that have discursively been normalized, but used correctly, it can challenge and change unjust truths that have sustained and normalized across a culture. I strongly urge the trippers to critically consider the language they use on the trips and ultimately teach their campers about the world as it is, rather than how it is discursively constructed.
7.2.4 Embracing Other Discursive Statements

Statements that lie outside the environmental discursive truths the trippers operate within are easily identifiable throughout the park. Recognizing and embracing these statements will introduce the campers to other schools of thought that have previously been silenced and overlooked.

Formally acknowledging other discursive statements is a pedagogical tool that “challenges racism, sexism, [and] classism while working toward social justice” (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). The trippers can rely upon other discursive statements to showcase how truths exist external to their own realm of knowledge, such as the totem pole at the east gate, or the Algonquin Pictographs and Visions Pits on Rock Lake. This would evoke a process of cognitive dissonance, the unpleasant state of mind that occurs when people experience phenomena that contrast their own systems of belief, prompting an attitude and behavioural change (McCartan, & Elliott, 2018).

On the trips, the trippers have overlooked the narratives that counter their discursive norms, allowing them to further distinguish their truths as the Truth. Recognizing counter narratives as the trips as they pass them will begin to shatter the discursive walls within which the trippers operate, creating space for other truths to manifest. If more trippers adopt Rebecca’s will to call out statements that contrast the discursive truths (recognizing the duality of eating meat and appreciating wildlife and the breaking down of traditional notions of masculinity on canoe trips), canoe trips will become a more inclusive and welcoming space for all.

As I have argued in this thesis, the postcolonial discourse is not all encompassing. It is fractured and filled with holes that house counter narratives to prevailing discursive truths. Recognizing and embracing the narratives that counter the particular truths the trippers operate within will further fracture, deepen, and split the discursive and unjust truths the trippers are
currently embedded within. Should the trippers successfully fracture the hegemonic narratives on their canoe trips, female campers who want to become trippers will not be faced with the same obstacles Rebecca was, the trippers will be more cognizant of the Algonquin Peoples, their presence within the park, and the settler colonial environmental discursive legacies that continuously oppresses and belittle the Indigenous Peoples and the cultures. This would put an end to the ongoing cycles that reproduce and sustain colonial injustices, ultimately bringing forth a social justice orientation to summer camp canoe trips.

7.2.5 Embracing Change

History should be used not to make ourselves comfortable, but rather to disturb the taken-for-granted
- Kendall and Wickham, 1999, p. 4

Outdoor recreation leaders have a responsibility to attend to the multitude of histories, values, and attitudes embedded within the landscapes; otherwise, they risk (re)producing unjust settler colonial legacies (Stewart, 2008). When the trippers are able to identify and confidently speak to the varying historical accounts of the lands they can enact “a [responsive] pedagogy to [enact change and] prevent future injustices” (Stewart, 2008, p. 94).

We, as trippers, have a responsibility to our campers. We are morally obligated to return them from canoe trips more knowledgeable and aware members of society. We have the responsibility to inform them of the opportunities they are given and their innate consequences. If we continue to silence and overlook the structures that marginalize and oppress certain members of society, the structures will continue to thrive on naivety and ignorance. Only by changing the status quo and questioning the normalized will be able to take our campers the long overdue socially just canoe trip, and return them as more aware, intelligent, and cognizant members of society.
7.3 Revisiting the Summer Camp Canoe Trip

This thesis has presented summer camp canoe trips in a light that many trippers have yet to acknowledge. While canoe trips provide an array of social, cognitive, and developmental benefits for campers, they also risk (re)producing negative legacies and discursive truths founded by colonial thought and rule that inadvertently normalize unjust social relations between races, classes, and socio-cultural groups. These discursively innocent summer camp canoe trips provide campers across Ontario with a strong foundation on which they learn to navigate and make sense of the world around them, but often overlook the settler colonial processes and injustices foundational to these excursions. This thesis has lifted the veil of ignorance under which my fellow trippers and I have operated, exposing a park infused with unequal and unjust social, cultural, and economic power relations.

The purpose of this postcolonial mobile qualitative research is to analyze the environmental discourses summer camp canoe trippers operate within while leading campers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park. Using a postcolonial framework, this research aims to deconstruct how environmental discourses are commonly, both consciously and unconsciously, enacted by residential summer camp trippers and embedded within broader and recurrent discourses that have normalized in a religious residential summer camp’s canoe tripping program in Haliburton, Ontario. The research questions are as follows:

1. How are environmental discourses perceived and performed by summer camp trippers on canoe trips through Algonquin Park?
2. How are power, privilege, and knowledge circulated and normalized in the environmental discourses?
3. What can summer camp trippers do to reconcile the social and political tensions between taking campers through Algonquin Park and their role as beneficiaries of settler colonialism?

7.4 Key Contributions

This research contributes to multiple of bodies of knowledge: personally, institutionally, and academically. In the wake of Canada’s controversial 150th anniversary celebrations, Gord Downie was able to summarize the mindset that motivates this research and its contributions. He said, “Let’s not celebrate the past 150 years, let’s just start celebrating the next 150 years” (Downie, 2016).

7.4.1 Personal Contributions

Developing this thesis has been an incredible journey, one that I am sure will make me a better tripper. Soja (1989) wrote, “spaces can be made to hide consequences from us…relations of power and discipline are inscribed into the apparently innocent spatiality of social life” (as cited by Baker, 2002, p. 199). Legacies of colonialism, capitalism, and modernity have become so engrained in how I discursively conceptualized the landscapes, and this research has rendered those legacies visible.

This research has sparked reflexivity. Reflexivity is a tool with which one can “critically situate [one’s] own knowledge, values, and power within dominant social orders and encourage [them] to navigate ramifications of this situated context” (Rose & Paisley, 2012, p. 147). Engaging in a critically reflexive practice has given me the opportunity to situate my privileges as a white, middle-class, and able male subject in a postcolonial world. Bringing this reflective practice to my summer camp sphere has enabled me to witness and understand how my
privileges are silently normalized and maintained through privileged notions as a discursive Truth that operate on the backs of others. Further, this thesis has made me increasingly aware of the social dynamics that have shaped the practices and worldviews I have passed onto my campers as canoe through Algonquin Park.

This project has helped me critically analyze the environmental discourses I have unconsciously used to build my own identity. It has not been an easy process. I cannot deny the twofold truth that I am the person I am today because of my experiences on summer camp canoe trips, and that these trips are infused with the very social structures, oppressions, and injustices that I strive to resist. While the aforementioned self-conceptualization is deeply rooted in contradictions, it represents a newfound knowledge I have attained during this thesis. It is this newfound knowledge that I am looking forward to navigating, embodying, and passing onto my campers on my next, and every other, trip into the Algonquin Park backcountry.

7.4.2 Institutional Level

While carrying through with this project, the hundreds of campers I have had over my eight summers as a camp counsellor and tripper have remained at the forefront of my mind. I have held the immense responsibility and privilege of teaching these campers about nature, about cultures, and about the lens through which they can simultaneously see both. This research will contribute to a culture shift in which summer camp trippers are able to take a reflexive approach to their practices, thereby altering the experiences and legacies they provide to campers.

The Canadian Camping Association (n.d.) has recognized the importance of teaching campers the multiple histories, humanities, and sciences embedded in the spaces in which summer camps operate. Exposing campers to the power dynamics embedded in the world of
canoe trips will provide them with the tools they need to become the cognizant innovators and role models (Canadian Camping Association, n.d.).

This research can be applied to camps and youth outdoor adventure recreational programs across the nation. There are organizations that operate similar to my summer camp’s canoe tripping program, taking youth groups through similar ‘empty’ and ‘pristine’ landscapes across the nation socialize their participants into nationally dominant and recurrent unjust and naïve discursive truths. These other organizations, similarly, can adopt the recommendations made by this thesis and bring forth a social justice orientation to their practice.

The 66th call to action put forward by the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation (2015) looks to the federal government to “establish multi-year funding for community-based youth organizations to deliver programs on reconciliation, and establish a national network to share information and best practices.” Summer camps in Ontario operate as members of two separate networks (the provincial Ontario Camping Association and the national Canadian Camping Association), both of which already embrace the sharing of information and best practices. Summer camping organizations can easily adopt the 66th call to action, contributing to a national, cultural, and institutional change towards a standard of reconciliation in youth outdoor recreation programming by using their established networks. This thesis can help facilitate some of those conversations.

Change is possible. After reflecting on the inherent powers that we, beneficiaries of settler colonialism, held as we canoed through the park, the history of the Algonquin Peoples and their exile from the land by settler governments, and the reconceptualization of the lands as recreational parks, one tripper revealed, “those ideas have always been separate in my mind [but now I see they] are actually very intertwined…” (Dylan, August 1, 2018). He continued to say,
“I now feel like I am armed with more knowledge, [and] the tools to potentially start having those [types of] conversations in the future…” (Dylan, August 1, 2018). Similarly, Adam and Will had a conversation about the trip and their experiences as participants in this research. They agreed that since the interviews and reflective processes, they had “been more conscious of [their] impacts [and] place on the land” (Field Notes, August 1, 2018). A culture change is possible; in fact, it has already begun.

The trippers have opened their eyes to change. Moving forward, I urge the trippers pressure institutions such Parks Ontario, the Ontario Government, the amenities in the park they interact with, other trippers and other camp canoe trips they pass to open their eyes as well. I believe the trippers hold a social responsibility to challenge the unjust institutions that rely on particular and unjust discourses that allow the settler colonial actors to make sense of a human-nature relationship in the ways in which they traditionally have. The trippers have a responsibility to use the knowledge uncovered by this thesis to encourage a culture shift that embraces, recognizes, and reconciles the multiple histories and ways of relating to the landscapes inherent to Algonquin Park.

7.4.3 Towards Academia

This thesis has contributed to the growing body of literature on mobile postcolonial deconstructions of nature in the context of summer camp canoe trips. Valuable insight has been gained by investigating the discourses embodied by summer camp trippers and the discursive truths they pass on to the campers as they pass through the park. The thesis contributes to filling the knowledge gap positioned between summer camps, mobilities, social constructions of nature, and the socio-political legacies of Algonquin Park and the Algonquin Peoples (re)produced by summer camp canoe trippers.
The thesis also contributes to diminishing hegemonic discourses that privilege Western discursive truths of the human-nature relationship. It adds to ongoing discussions of environmental discourses and effects of truths that are circulated, normalized, overlooked, and silenced by means of unjust power relations. This work has presented the discursive norms that trippers operate within, showcasing inherent racial, gender, and class power imbalances that exist, and has accordingly signaled a need for change.

7.5 Limitations

The most dominant limitation of this study was its inherent privilege. The participants were selected from a pool of privilege, originated from a privileged setting, and were engaging in a privileged activity. The researcher is no exception. This research lacks a diversity of participants that would shed light onto differentiating discourses and conceptualizations of the park. However, this limitation was also an opportunity for the research to deeply immerse itself in a localized summer camp canoe tripping culture.

Other limitations to this research, already discussed, were the product of its mobile methodological framework. Not only was the researcher faced with several tasks on the canoe trip, but the mobility conceptual framework also urges the research to occur alongside and during a physical journey. While the data was collaboratively collected in situ with the participants, the analysis process occurred in a static space. Moving forward, it would be interesting to see how researchers could tie data analysis processes to notions and aspects of mobilities.

7.6 Future Research

Future research should investigate how the proposed changes set by this research impact how the staff and campers conceptualize nature, culture, and the environment in Algonquin Park.
as they canoe trip. While this could present itself as a longitudinal study, there is merit to collecting data that could speak to a culture shift that in the field of recreation. It would respond to the call for a critical social justice orientation in outdoor recreation for which various scholars (Mullins, 2011; Rose & Paisley, 2012; Warren, 2002) have made.

Along similar lines, it would be interesting to see how enacting a social justice paradigm on summer camp canoe trips would alter what is performed on summer camp canoe trips. This mobile research could uncover practical ways in which trippers make sense of discursive statements that exist external to hegemonic conceptions of the human-nature relationship. It could provide an incredibly interesting account of how trippers make sense of statements that challenge the truths they have discursively operated within.

It is my hope that summer camp trippers enact the changes recommended by this research and provide their campers with the long-overdue socially just canoe trip.
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Appendix A: Interview Guide

Environmental Ethics
1. What is a canoe tripper?
   a. *What does it mean to be a canoe tripper to you?*
   b. *What are the roles and responsibilities of canoe tripper?*
   c. *How did you learn these roles?*
   d. *Are there any roles/responsibilities of canoe trippers that you learned on your own?*
      i. *How did you come to learn those*
2. What does it mean for you to go through the park?
   a. *What is important to you about Algonquin Park?*
      i. *How do you interact with those parts of the park?*
      ii. *What would it mean for you if those parts of the park no longer existed?*
      1. *Why?*
3. What do environmental ethics mean to you?
   a. *How did you come to realize this?*
   b. *What does it mean to practice environmental ethics to you?*
4. What are your environmental values?
   a. How do your environmental values help you understand your role on a canoe trip?

Environmental Action
1. What motivates you to act in the ways you do when you are on canoe trips?
   a. *What influence do the campers play into that?*
2. How have your environmental practices reaffirmed your position of environmental ethics?
3. How does thinking about your role in the environment help you decided how to act in the park?
4. Can you tell me about a time when you acted in accordance and against your environmental ethic?
   a. *How do those times resonate with you?*
   b. *How do you think about your role as a canoe trip leader when you reflect on these past actions?*
   c. *What does that mean for the campers you are taking on a trip?*

Environmental Education
1. What are some of the stories you tell your campers about nature? About Algonquin Park?
   a. *How did you develop these stories?*
2. How have some of your campers understood nature before and after the canoe trip?
   a. *What influence do you think you had on that?*
3. Have you conducted any specific nature-based programs for your campers?
   a. *Y: Can you tell me about those?*
      i. *How did the campers react?*
   b. *Y & N: Where do you see this falling into your role as a canoe trip leader? Is it your responsibility to run these programs?*
4. What do you hope your campers will walk away with after the trip?
The shady past of Parks Canada: Forced out, Indigenous people are forging a comeback

Among Indigenous leaders, there is more talk of a day when their people will return to the parks — not to amuse tourists, but to live and work.

Banff National Park is celebrated as a Canadian treasure, "home to imposing 3,000-metre peaks, alpine meadows rich with colourful wildflowers, brilliant blue glacier-fed lakes," as Parks Canada describes it.

What you will not find within Canada's oldest national park — leaving aside the questionably named Stoney Squaw Mountain — is much trace of the Indigenous people whose ancestors resided and hunted there.

When the park was created in 1887, authorities viewed the Stoney as “stragglers,” best confined to the neighbouring reserves. Park superintendent George Stewart wrote in his first annual report that Indians had to be excluded from the park. “Their destruction of the game and depredations among the ornamental trees make their too frequent visits to the Park a matter of great concern,” he wrote, as quoted by aboriginal historians Theodore Binema and Melanie Niiem in a 2006 article.

When the Stoney were invited back in, it was for the annual Banff Indian Days, an event that ran into the 1970s. Tourists were entertained by dancing, drumming, “war whoops” and archery performed by “Chief and Braves and squaws in full regalia,” as a 1909 advertisement put it.

This year, national parks are in the spotlight after the federal government offered free admission as a 150th birthday gift to Canadians. More than 14.2 million people have taken advantage of the offer, an increase in attendance of 10 per cent in the first seven months of the year over last year, with some parks and historic sites seeing attendance more than double from last year as people take up Parks Canada’s invitation to “find adventure, fun for the whole family.”

**SEE ALSO**

- Movie with aboriginal gang character denied permission to shoot by Parks Canada
- Conservationists concerned about free entry to Canada’s national parks in 2017

The race to preserve a B.C. First Nation’s history and the village where there is only one couple left...
But beneath the feel-good evocation of family camping trips and pristine wilderness, another discussion is taking place about the very nature of Canadian parks and the responsibility of authorities to reconcile with a tarnished past. Among Indigenous leaders, there is more talk of a day when their people will return to the parks — not to amuse tourists, but to live and work.

The Stoney were not alone in being banished from lands they once lived on to clear the way for Canadian parkland. In 1938, members of the Keeseekoose Ojibwa band were expelled from a fishing station within the newly created Riding Mountain National Park in Manitoba. As they left for a reserve outside the park with their belongings on wagons, they saw smoke rising from their houses and barns, set alight by park wardens wanting to ensure the Ojibwa did not return.

Provincial governments had a similar attitude, with Ontario banning all hunting in Algonquin Park, and Quebec doing likewise in the Parc des Laurentides in the late 19th century. Around the same time, First Nations were also removed for the creation of Vancouver’s Stanley Park.

In an article published by Walrus in June, Indigenous writer and businessman Robert Jago denounced “a parks system that has robbed and impoverished Indigenous peoples.” He argued that Canadians need to change their concept of wilderness and accept that, 50 years from now, “Algonquin people may again be living in Algonquin Park, and that Stanley Park and the turquoise waters of Moraine Lake in Banff National Park may be dotted with First Nations homes and businesses.”
It's a striking image, but he is not alone in his view. Steven Nishaw, former chief of Lutsel K'e Dene First Nations in the Northwest Territories, is involved in ongoing negotiations to create Thaidene Nene national park at the eastern end of Great Slave Lake. In an interview, Nishaw praised the progress in government attitudes toward Indigenous people. Leaving behind a period of what he called disrespect up to the 1970s, he said the recognition of the role Indigenous people can play in the management of protected areas is now "quite good." But there is more to be done.

"There's no reason why we can't take all the national parks and provincial parks that exist across the country and reintroduce Indigenous people into those lands, with their rights recognized, and give them responsibility in the management and operation of those protected areas," Nishaw said.

"That will create employment opportunities, a new story those places can tell. It will be a safe space that Canada can use to demonstrate what they mean by reconciliation."


and, over the past decades, has evolved its approach and now honours Indigenous rights and traditions and includes Indigenous peoples in decision-making."

In fact, nearly 90 per cent of Canada's national parks are managed in accordance with treaties or agreements with Indigenous peoples. Areas designated to become national parks, such as Thaidene Nene in the Northwest Territories, are first set aside as national park reserves pending negotiations with Indigenous peoples who have a claim to the land.

In one such reserve, the Gulf Islands in British Columbia, Parks Canada staff are working alongside the Coast Salish peoples to reintroduce the traditional practice of building rock walls at the low tide mark to trap sand and create “clam gardens.”

Members from Tsartlip, Tsawout, Pauquachin and Teycums communities work together to dig the beach and rebuild the clam garden wall at Russell Island in the Gulf Islands National Park Reserve. (Photo: Robert Kurl courtesy of Parks Canada)

Nathan Cardinal, manager of resource conservation at Gulf Islands National Park Reserve, said he discourages the view of parks as pristine or untouched. “All these landscapes were actively managed by First Nations for millennia,” he said. One of his goals is to “change some of the common perception of Indigenous people as people who were hunter-gatherers to people who were effectively resource managers, just as I’m doing today,” he said.

It is not always an easy sell. When Parks Canada adopted the Indigenous practice of a controlled burn last year on a small uninhabited island within the park reserve, aimed at regenerating species of medicinal plants, some nearby residents complained about the smoke and the impact on their view.

The historian Binemna, a professor at the University of Northern British Columbia, said people initially took exception in 2000 when a B.C. park was closed for an exclusive Indigenous deer hunt, complaining of favouritism. “Canadians should not react in a kneejerk fashion, assuming that governments are simply handing over national parks to Indigenous people to pillage them. That’s just not the case,” he said. Binemna said that Canadians who bristle at the idea of a human presence in parkland should rethink their concept of wilderness. “Every visitor to a national park in Canada, whether it’s Fundy or Banff or Jasper, when they strike off into the bush on a trail, they are experiencing an environment that is utterly changed from what it was before the national park was created, and utterly different from any environment that existed there in the past,” he said.
“They should know that when national parks were created, certainly any national park created before the 1970s, the approach taken was to remove the hand of humanity in the management of those parks to a degree that was artificial.”

For example, some of what is now forest in Banff National Park was previously grassland, the result of fires Indigenous people set to influence the distribution and abundance of sought-after plants and animals. And far from seeking to preserve an unspoil ed landscape, the park’s architects were more than happy to have towns within the boundaries catering to tourists.

Elie Enns, a research fellow at the University of Victoria and member of the Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations, said his people’s experience with the Pacific Rim National Park Reserve reveals a vision of the future — and a “tremendous” improvement over the past.

When the reserve was established in 1970, rangers harassed elders collecting medicinal plants and sea life, Enns said. “They would have to throw them on the ground and leave them,” he said. “It was very disrespectful.”

In 2004, Parliament passed legislation to return land from the Pacific Rim and Riding Mountain parks to dispossessed Indigenous peoples. The 86 hectares carved out of the Pacific Rim reserve for the Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations has become a residential community powered by geothermal energy.
The moon rises over a creek in Manitoba's Riding Mountain National Park. (Heaslip/Postmedia)

“I think the lesson to Canadians out of that is, the idea of fencing off nature and ‘protecting’ it is a dysfunctional way of understanding ourselves and our relationship to our natural environment,” he said. “In that way, national parks and provincial parks are just as dysfunctional as industrial parks, because it triggers a world view of disconnection.”

He has worked in B.C. to establish tribal parks where there is an emphasis on sustainable economic development, such as eco-tourism, small hydro dams and forest products. That, he said, should be the model for Canada’s future national parks.

Yet, amid the fanfare around Canada’s 150th anniversary, Parks Canada did not draw attention to the historic exclusions of Indigenous people from parks. And the government agency has never formally apologized.
John Sandlos, a professor of history at Memorial University, said that was a missed opportunity to shine a light on a past that Canada shares with other countries that have cleared out humans to create parks and wildlife preserves. He draws a distinction between Canada’s newer northern parks, where there is greater Indigenous involvement in the management, and southern parks, where there is still a sense that Indigenous people are excluded.

“These places have been wound up in a sense of Canadian nationalism and identity. They are trotted out as symbols of Canada,” Sandlos said. “Some of them talk about being jewels in the crown of Canada, and yet they have this history that tells about another side of Canada — a history of colonialism and dispossession.”
Appendix C: Canoe Trip Packing List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U-Pack</th>
<th>departure</th>
<th>arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Large pot</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Small pot</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 knives</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 plates</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 forks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securely stored Saw</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat phone</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FA kit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Propane tanks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Burner base/head</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 full bundles Rope</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunscreen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugspray</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 Lighters/matches</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Toilet paper</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water purification+cups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Garbage bags</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 extra ziplocs/garbage bags</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Duct tape</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sharpie</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bottle Camp suds</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Steel wool</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pr Fire gloves</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spondonical</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cutting Board</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampons (girls)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Spoon</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Spatula</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tongs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA Kit</th>
<th>departure</th>
<th>arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band aids</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advil/Tylenol</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold+sinus</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tensor bandages</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Triangul ars</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweezers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epipen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tums</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regmeds (LABLELED)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benadril (cream and/or pill)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-itch cream</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polysporin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloevera</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meds Tracking Sheet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clothi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Day/Wet Clothing**
- Running shoes or hiking boots
- Socks
- Bathing suit/shorts
- T-shirt
- Rain jacket
- Hat

**Night/Dry Clothing**
- Slide on shoes
- Socks
- Sweat pants
- Underwear
- T-shirt
- Sweat shirt
- Toque (optional)
Glossary of Terms

**Canoe Trip**: Also referred to as canoe camping, canoe trips are a popular outdoor recreational activity. It combines canoeing across various bodies of water and camping over a multi-day time frame.

**KYBO**: The camp-wide popular name of the backcountry camping ground’s toilet. It is a little wooden box with a hole on the top, often found about 100 feet away from the campsite. The staff and campers joke that while using the toilet, one must “Keep Your Butt Off”, hence the name.

**Portage**: The practice of carrying a water vessel and all accompanying possessions between two bodies of water, or around an obstacle.

**Sterning**: The act of sitting at the back of a canoe and steering it.

**Tripper**: An experienced canoer who leads participants on canoe trips. Trippers ensure their participants’ safety while instructing them to pitch tents, to cook over an open campfire, to perform various wilderness skills, and to appreciate the beauty of the outdoors. In the context of summer camps, the trippers also act as the camp counsellors.