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Abstract

This thesis studied the different values people hold towards nature and their relationships with national parks, with the goal of understanding why some people support national parks and why some are against them. It explored a variety of cultures and models as a background for the thesis. It looked at how the different values held by people affected their outlook on national parks, and how influential their culture was on their view of nature. Parks across the world have struggled to resolve the issues that people have with them. These include loss of access to land, economic disadvantages, and cultural issues. This thesis looked at how these problems related to the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument in Maine and different values through a literature review, interviews, and a review of letters to the editor from Maine newspapers. The research demonstrates that there are some problems with fortress conservation and with co-management. It also demonstrates the importance of culture in people’s outlook on issues with nature. There was some common ground between opponents and proponents, but key differences also existed. It was important to do this research as the issue of Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument continues to become more prominent in Maine.
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Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

Maine, or as the license plates say, “Vacationland,” is a state full of woods, water and wilderness that gives those who visit a sense of calm and purity, encouraging future visits to the state and the preservation of its natural resources. On the other hand, the locals in many parts of the state think of this land as their own; they have generations-long connections to the land and want to continue to have this. Many who visit the state think of it as a vacationland where they can explore this wilderness. These different attitudes play a key role in the ongoing debates about the creation of a new National Park in Maine. In northern Maine, an intense debate still rages over the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument (KWWNM) between those who want a national park and those who do not. A national park was proposed for the land in 1994 and since then it has been the focus of frequent debates. In 2016 President Obama made the area Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument, with 75,000 acres declared part of the monument and 75,000 as a part of a natural recreation area. The creation of the national monument has only added to the problem because a decision has been made, while many locals feel they were left to figure out what this means. They feel bypassed by the executive order to make a national monument, as national monuments are seen as a potential step towards creating a national park. This has contributed to the frustration of locals and the importance of research on parks. Perhaps the biggest issue is the conflicted identity of the Maine woods, as some have called it a national treasure and vacationland, while some feel as though it is their own backyard, their permanent residence, and the area where their forefathers lived and worked the land. They have long relied on access to the land and livelihoods based on extracting resources from the woods.
Many in the northern part of the state feel at odds with the proponents of the National Park because they feel their rights are being infringed upon by the national monument. Many of the proponents are people from different parts of the state or outside of the state. Opponents also take issue with this park as they feel like some of the proponents are just looking for a vacation home and do not care about the locals. This sets up an incredibly divisive, important, complex and unique issue. This is an important issue because of the potential for political ramifications as well as economic, cultural, and environmental impacts.

The issue is complex, in part, because of Maine’s traditional system of access to land. In Maine the people previously had a tradition of "open lands" with access being granted to privately owned land. The different values of different people add to the complexity of the debates over sustainable use and jobs. The unique culture of Maine makes any federal project, like a national park, hard because of the local’s sense of place and history. In northern Maine this has influenced people to want no interference from the government, because they do not want to lose this tradition. The industries that occupied the region around Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument in the past provided jobs as well as access to the land. This form of access and these types of jobs would be incompatible with a national park. This has many people in northern Maine worried because of the implications the monument has on their relationship to the land. Also adding to the complexity, people are beginning to question the popular model of exclusion based conservation. The United States has a history of exclusion-based national parks that started the foundation for modern day national parks, but there are spectrums of conservation options. There are more restrictive conservation models that create a
"fortress-like" park, which prevents most forms of human use. These are often called fortress conservation because people are removed from land, allowed minimal access to the land and decision making (Brockington 2002, Igoe 2004).

There are also more cooperative models like co-management, or having different zones for activities. There is a spectrum of control with government having all the power at one end, and locals having it all at the other. In Maine the issue stems from conflicts over how much of a say locals will get, how much access they can have, and what the economic benefits of a park will be. New models and ideas designed to be more inclusive in both access and decision making are being tried throughout the world. They are being tried in the United States, in places like Yellowstone, with mixed success and hopeful potential. Can working with the locals to allow them more decision making in the process help the situation? Will they get more access? Collaborating with locals has become more common in conservation efforts and this has led to a rise in studies about cooperative types of management. These studies suggest that cooperative management can help with adaptiveness and getting the locals involved. In Maine the locals have used the natural resources for centuries and hold a connection with the land. They could benefit conservationists with their experiences, and by working together, perhaps more resources could be conserved and local adaptive capacity could be improved.

Preservation of nature has been a dominant concern in the United States since the 1800s. It has grown into a major movement to try to preserve many of the nation’s landscapes, to keep nature pristine and minimize human interference. This is often seen as a tradeoff to people working the land to produce goods, jobs, and other benefits. In order to preserve the land it is often thought that you must not allow humans to have
access to the land. But preservation has always been contentious. While some have argued for preservation, others have argued that we should "wisely" use our resources to ensure conservation over the long term. This tradeoff causes problems because preservationists and those who use the land want different things. Many view conservation as more important, whereas others believe preservation and conservation present high costs. This conflict is a reflection of differences among people and groups in society. Many programs encourage conserving biodiversity to protect species and help ecosystems. In today’s society more and more resources are being used and this continues to encourage conservation of the limited resources, because the more society expands, the more resources are being used.

This thesis will analyze the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects of various national parks throughout the world, that vary in their level of restrictiveness and community involvement, specifically focusing on the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument and the proposals to make it a national park. It will look at the potential for a national park in northern Maine to meet the needs of locals and conservationists. Is a national park an effective use of the land for the local people? Is it effective to ensure biological and ecological conservation? What are the values that that underlie both opposition to and support for the national park? How do people value the environment in general? How can management plans be designed to balance the value of ecological conservation with the value of diverse forms of human use? These questions are important to ask when discussing a conservation project like the KWWNM. This paper aims to answer these questions to help contribute to the understanding of why National Parks are a contentious issue in general, and more specifically in Maine.
Exclusionary national park models do not work well in many places due to the effects they have on the local people, and sometimes, due to environmental failures. Instead of these models, are there models that can balance conservation and the needs of locals in northern Maine?

There are issues of external pressure because of the groups like the timber industry and people that go hunting extract resources from land in Maine, may now put more pressure on other land. Conservation programs like this can have unintended consequences and can also alienate the locals from conservation efforts. For proponents, parks are strong economically because they create the potential for jobs through something like a tourism industry. Maine is a state in which tourism is one of the biggest industries, although a large part of that is in the southern and coastal parts of the state. Creating a park could potentially bring in more tourists to the state, or at least bring some of tourists to the northern part, spreading the wealth and making up for the loss of local industry. National Parks are often created with the idea that they will provide jobs and an economic boost to the area. This is done through what is called the ecotourism industry. It is the idea of bringing in tourism through attracting people to the natural beauty of an area. It also aims to promote conservation, often at the expense of locals who are kept out. The jobs and money are brought in through tourists coming into see the park. They often end up getting more access than the locals who originally held the land. The idea that this may happen in northern Maine is frightening to the locals. This is bad because they may not help the effort with their local knowledge, and may continue to use resources in a way that is not sustainable.
To address my research questions with my interviews, I asked questions that were designed to see how people valued nature and why they were or were not in favor of the park proposal. These were open-ended to allow people to explore all avenues. I asked why people did or did not want a national park, what was important to them about the land, in order to determine how they felt about nature and parks in general. The literature review was designed to help answer why people have problems with parks and what different values of nature people have. I also analyzed letters to the editors to find people’s values of nature. Using Kellert’s model I looked through letters to the editor determining each time someone stated something that would fall into a value, and how many times they stated it.

A literature review of different national parks demonstrates the strengths and weaknesses, of different park models as well as the challenges they face. The United States national parks were based from the unique history and relationship people had with nature and wilderness. This preservationist orientation shaped national parks in the U.S. to separate people from wilderness. This often causes debates about the use of the land in the areas of a national park. It has caused issues throughout the history of national parks and continues to do so today. The national monument has started an intense debate that deals with the culture, economic, and environmental interests of locals, people in Maine and throughout the nation. National parks in the U.S. were incredibly influential. There have been many parks across the world in other countries that followed the model of the U.S. They used fortress conservation. This model has been widely accepted, but now anthropologists and other scholars are beginning to question the wisdom of this method. This is because of the potential social and environmental ramifications that are involved.
with fortress conservation. On the opposite side of the spectrum is community based conservation. Somewhere in the middle are co-management models that allow people more access in the decision-making process, and sometimes access to the land being conserved. Looking at these models and some of the values people hold in Maine can provide valuable information on topics in conservation anthropology, helping further the discussion of how people value nature and conservation projects like national parks.

Several key concepts emerged from this research. One important one is that there is more to how people value nature and parks then the traditional values; culture also plays a large role. The park in Maine is debated and that has to do with history of people in Maine and the land. The culture of Maine plays a big role in the debate about national parks and the use of land. The literature review demonstrated the complexity of the issue as fortress conservation has had problems as well as co-management; in part because of the problems locals have with them. The literature review also showed how these different models could work and demonstrated the potential of the different models. The interviews and letters to the editors provided valuable insight into how and why people felt about the national monument, nature, and their cultural relationships. In the discussion of national parks and conservation it is not only important to look at the different values people hold of nature, but the wide range of cultural values people hold as well, these all can lead to different conclusions about conservation for people, as cultural and historical backgrounds can play as large a role as people’s value of nature in how they feel about a conservation project like KWWNM, as the culture of northern Maine does not work well with a conservation project like KWWNM.
Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The Philosophical Roots of US National Parks

National Parks in the United States started at first with Yellowstone National Park, the first instance of large scale wilderness protection in 1872 (Nash, 1970). National Parks were originally proposed by George Catlin an American artist who often traveled west to paint landscapes early in the 1800s, then later by John Muir a conservationist and author (Nash, 1970). This was the beginning of a shift in the perception of nature. Parks were originally formal gardens that were neat and trimmed, because people wanted to control nature and the parks reflected this (Nash 1970). John Muir went further on what Catlin was trying to do and founded the Sierra Club, an organization designed to protect natural resources. They specifically focused on sites that appealed to people, and at the time was a lobbying group for national parks (Nash 1970). Muir, like many others, had spent considerable time in the American West and began to have a more romantic view of nature, this along with the increased urbanization of America lead to a strong conservation ethic. People began to champion the cause because of this romantic view which also was related to the upper class because they were the ones who could take leisure trips out of the urban areas, to what they saw as clean, healthy, and wholesome areas to visit (Cronon 1995). This division is significant today as it is still relevant to the issues faced when creating a park. Rich and wealthy people who saw the wilderness in this romantic notion, did so because of their spare time and the idea of escaping the urban sprawl (Cronon 1995, Nash 1970). They were the early champions of the conservation movement (Cronon 1995, Nash 1970). There was this idea of subliminal power of nature, and that it was a place to get closer to god, or for more
agnostic people a chance to have a transcendental experience. The romantic notion leads to a stronger desire for people to have preservation of wilderness through parks. Importantly with this notion people did not feel they were a part of nature, but that they were a separate entity (Cronon 1995). Wilderness has falsely been thought of as untouched by man, as this idea was a human creation (Cronon 1995). This innocent, unplundered paradise image has driven American conservation ethics (Cronon 1995). This drove the sublime aspect of nature conservation, but also another of frontier conservation.

Along with the sublime there was also the notion of the frontier being lost. People like Theodore Roosevelt who felt wilderness was part of the American identity promoted this. The fear of losing this wilderness and the chance to become hardier lead to the preservation of it. The frontier of America was ingrained in American identity, and helped to push a conservation ethic because with the loss of wilderness frontier, so too would the American past and identity be lost (Cronon 1995). Exclusionary models reflect the western ideas of separation of nature and humans. Importantly Roosevelt and Muir did not want to lose this wilderness from the expanse of the frontier. These were driving forces in the creation of national parks and can be seen in the philosophy of parks today.

A national park in the United States is created through congressional approval. National parks do not allow hunting, mining, or other consumptive activities, and park rangers are able to enforce these and other limitations (NPS n.d.). National parks also aim to protect cultural resources, but most importantly aim to conserve natural resources. National parks have a purpose to conserve while allowing people to enjoy and learn from them (Bieschke 2016 and NPS n.d.). Conservation efforts aim to protect biodiversity,
amongst the expansive society of today (Igoe 2004, Rosenzweig 2003). Our society uses large amounts of resources and it is important for conservationists to stop the loss of biodiversity (Igoe 2004, Rosenzweig 2003). Conservation efforts must take precedent for the National Park service (Bieschke 2016, NPS n.d.). One example of their protection programs are when they do things like fight invasive species through education, and not allowing or discouraging different items from the parks (NPS n.d.). This works towards the aim of restoring native species populations (NPS n.d.). They have had success with some of these programs (NPS n.d.). When an area is made into a park it brings with it limitations of hunting and extraction activities, but it provides ways for people to see nature and wilderness on things like trails, tours, and other activities (NPS n.d.). These maybe limited if they conflict with the conservation goals of the park.

There are 59 parks in the United States today. The U.S. national park model has been very successful with education and conservation, as well as being influential on other countries conservation programs. Many national parks in other countries are similar because of the vast influence of U.S. national parks, and the philosophy behind this wilderness conservation. The idea that people are separate from wilderness influenced the conservation ethics in places like the tropical rainforests (Cronon 1995). This influence has been strong throughout the world in places like the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, the list goes on (Nash 1970). Western conservation science and models have been spread throughout the world, and a large part of this is from the United States model, which influenced Europe, and Europeans influenced places in Africa (Nash 1970 and Allin 1990). German naturalists have had influence in Africa in places like Tanzania and Kenya (Igoe 2004 and Allin 1990). Canada followed the U.S. and has a park system that
is similar, although some key differences like the use of a zoning system for different levels of access and use (Allin 1990 and Nash 1970). A similarity is that they do encourage enjoyment of the park and preservation, and with little exception extraction is not allowed (Allin 1990). And each of them face different issues that do overlap with the needs of locals in Maine. This spread happened because of the perceived strengths of national parks to bring in money through tourism while protecting the environment.

US national parks have had conservation successes, but also problems accomplishing their goals of conservation. Protected wilderness areas like national parks can help protect species, and allow them to grow (Rosenzweig 2003). There are quite a few success stories of national parks protecting different species, helping to conserve some endangered and even non-endangered species (Rosenzweig 2003 and Allin 1990). Unfortunately though due to limitations of resources and boundaries, things like grizzly bears, wading birds, douglas firs have still declined or not fully been protected (Allin 1990). This is in part because animals move, or the boundaries do not cover enough space for a species of tree to fully be protected (Allin 1990 and Rosenzweig 2003). Important to note is that public support is key to helping the success of national parks. In one example, efforts to protect douglas fir trees were hampered by the influence of industry to limit park boundaries (Allin 1990). In general protected areas minimizing human interactions have had mixed success (Sharachchandra et al. 2010). In some areas deforestation has declined, while in some forest loss has continued (Sharachchandra et al. 2010). The US model has helped to protect some specific species, and stopped hunting and other potentially disruptive human-wildlife interactions. Unfortunately there are also consequences, which have resulted from the United States national park system (Allin 1990).
Locals from different places request different forms of use. One issue in Maine is snowmobiling, which the National Park Service is also dealing with in Yellowstone. Drawing from a study done by Brian Bieschke (2016) I will explain some of the problems Yellowstone has had and the National Park Service’s response to them. Some of the drawbacks from over snow vehicles (including snowmobiles) in Yellowstone have been air and noise pollution, wildlife harassment and conflict between users. It is important to note on this subject that when the National Park Service was created it had two purposes to conserve scenery, wildlife, natural and historic objects while providing enjoyment. Conservation is the main goal of a national park; therefore conservation takes precedence if there is conflict between enjoyment and conservation. Trying to balance these needs has been difficult, and the attempts in Yellowstone have had varying levels of success. Currently a new policy in which all snowmobile trips must guided is being phased in with three periods. The first phase occurred in 2013-2014 and that was transitional with old rules remaining the same. The second phase occurred the next two years and was the implementation of a transportation events limitation, which only allowed up to 50 snowmobile events and 110 over snow vehicles events. Transportation events are the amount of trips per day. There are limits to these events. For example, the commercial snow tour operators must average no more than seven snowmobiles per trip a day, however flexibility is achieved by allowing more snowmobiles if certain standards are met. As Bieschke explains the third and final phase “The thrust point of this phase is that all over snow vehicles legally operating in the park, regardless of whether or not they were in operation prior to the issuance of the 2013 final rule, must meet the enhanced
sound and air emission standards” (2016: 562). This third and final phase is geared at meeting the final goal of making the park cleaner, and along with the second phase it aims to allow the most visitors and flexibility. This new plan has several advantages, however there is potential for environmental groups to challenge this policy legally like prior policies of 2001 where snowmobiles were allowed on trails, but phased out by 2004. Or the 2003 rule which allowed 950 snowmobiles a day. With the second phase flexibility was achieved. However it is not yet known if the other two goals of allowing the most visitors and keeping the park clean are achieved. While the plan is still young, it has seen some more support from people, in part because new personnel making this plan worked and developed relationships with local stakeholders (Yochim 2014). Even with this support, it must be done in a way in which all groups are happy or at least legally unable to challenge it because it is possible for a policy to be undermined otherwise.

National parks can be successful if they are done in a way that accounts for these possibilities, rethinking the KWWNM using other national park models is necessary if it is to be successful. This issue demonstrated part of the larger problem faced in Maine as well, the recreationists wanting access for recreation in nature, and conservationists want to minimize their access. It setups a complex legal debate that is based in two sides with people who have different backgrounds and nature values. Both sides want to be able to use nature recreation the main issue is snowmobiles being potentially destructive. If a national park model that is based in excluding people is used, the anthropological research on the subject can provide useful information.

Problems with exclusion:

Exclusion leads to many different problems socially, economically, culturally, and
potentially even environmentally. This has led to a rethinking about national parks in the United States and abroad. Debates over how resources should be used are frequent. Cultural preservation frequently conflicts with environmental conservation, often causing issues with the parks. This section will look at these problems and issues in general, and then use specific examples to demonstrate them.

Currently national parks are hard to create and maintain. Limited land for a multitude of things such as timber and logging, hunting, fishing and other resource gathering activity puts a strain on many current parks and makes people question the need for new parks (Taggart and Egan 2011, Bouvier 2010, and Igoe 2004). With these problems the exclusionary conservation does not work well (Igoe 2004). People are beginning to shift away from government control of land, and in Maine the federal government has historically had limited government control of land (Buscher 2008, Acheson 2006). These struggles show that fortress based conservation struggles with the mentality of many people today.

Fortress conservation is when the federal government or a private organization, allows minimal interactions with people and the environment in an area to conserve the natural resources (Igoe 2004). By doing this they, in effect, create a fortress. It is based in forceful exclusion, and not allowing traditional access (Brockington 2002). Fortress based conservation is designed from colonial powers, and often used to benefit them even to this day. It often fails to account for local needs, and changes in the groups being affected by it (West, Igoe, and Brockington 2008). Often people are excluded by force and regulations, displacing many people and limiting their access to their former land. (Brockington 2002, Dear and Myers 2007). If caught hunting, people are considered
poachers often in land that they have previously hunted and used in the past. Kenya had shoot on site laws for poachers, and through the influence of western groups many people in African countries lost access to traditional lands and now have only the option for illegal use (Hill 1995). For people who are herders, loggers, foragers, their livelihoods severely limited if they are not lost. The idea of people poaching and losing their traditional livelihoods and activities is common in all areas with fortress conservation. Even in areas where some activities like hiking, touring, licensed hunting is allowed many locals lost their traditional means of living, and are considered poachers or separate from their own homeland (Hill 1995). Ecotourism through national parks can generate economic benefits, but also it can generate conflict and cause negative economic change for local people (West, Igoe, Brockington 2008: 262). Many parks displace people, and cause a dependence upon ecological tourism (West, Igoe, Brockington 2008). In some places there are discrepancies between who benefits from the park and who does not (West, Igoe, Brockington 2008: 262). National parks based in excluding people can cause many social and economic issues. This is not all that surprising since they are based in keeping local resource dependent people and nature as separate as possible, often the costs to do this are high directly and indirectly with the social disruption it causes. Often it does allow some tourist interaction, at the expense of local resource users. What may be surprising is the weakness of conservation for these systems.

Exclusion based parks similar to the US do have weaknesses when it comes to their ability to protect all of the animals. One problem is that they do not have the ability to protect every animal in their borders, smaller parks often miss many species, as species often move in and out of the geographical boundaries of parks (Rosenzweig 2003). One
study showed that in apple orchards and other human habitats 24 out of 30 local species were able to live in these human habitats, the other 6 were in a nature reserve (Rosenzweig 2003: 70). This shows that reserves do have the ability to preserve more species, however many can also coexist with people given the right conditions. Certain species cannot be protected without the government or some higher power assisting them directly, and national parks can be great for that (Rosenzweig 2003: 168). But they can also miss protecting some species. Also by excluding people from resource gathering in one spot more pressure is put on another spot causing increased resource exploitation there (Sharachchandra 2010). National Parks and exclusion-based fortress conservation do have some strengths, but they have many weaknesses as well, the New Jersey Pine Barrens and Alaskan Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve offer quick examples of this.

In New Jersey the Pine Barrens are a region near the shore, which has seen change due to the popularity of the New Jersey shore. The shore has brought a lot of growth to the region and conservation efforts of the Pine Barrens have been put in place to help preserve them from this increase in people. Drawing from Mary Hufford’s book on the Pines Barrens I will explain the background, and implications of conservation and change in the Pine Barrens (1986). The growth and change are not necessarily unwelcome by the residents, but they are not happy with what they perceive as poor planning, and loss of quality of life. This problem is common in both Maine with the proposal, and with fortress/exclusion based conservation. The people who live in the Pine Barrens have a rich history, which includes their own set of local ecological knowledge. The area is a natural reserve restricting some of the locals’ traditional uses. The locals
have their own names for things, which often are quite different from the scientists causing friction. This stems from a lack of adaptation, scientist use their own terms, and so do the locals. This knowledge is not being facilitated well because planners are struggling to blend "knowledge of the land and its resources with scientific 'knowledge about' them in protective planning" (Hufford 1986: 34). The locals are willing to give chances to the government and have change, but they would like it to be done in the best possible way. The locals may not be able to perform some of their traditional activities, which could be problematic. They have a deep understanding and appreciation of their surroundings. It is part of their cultural identity so it is important that they are able to have access to the land, as well as the decision making, and even educational processes involved. According to Hufford, the locals need to be worked with and cultural conservation needs to have more of an emphasis. Information facilitation and involvement are keys to success.

Alaska also offers a brief look at how people have been excluded from their land. Native Americans were not excluded as harshly as in other places in America as Dear and Myers explain “Displacement of native people did not occur in Alaska to the extent that it did in the contiguous United States, nor did native people in Alaska sign treaties relinquishing their rights to the land” (2007: 822). This shows in Alaska Native Americans were displaced, although it was not as bad as in the continental US, this still caused problems. Subsistence use has been affected; the rural areas around the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve do have the ability in some ways to practice former subsistence practices. However with National Park Service conservation is key, and they often limit other activities to protect wilderness (Dear and Myers 2007). So while not a
perfect example of fortress conservation Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve does represent an area in which people have been excluded and the problems with that. These problems are displacement and disruption of resource gathering, which brings into the question the success of the wildlife mandates and the recreational uses.

Drawing from James Igoe’s work (2004), Tanzania offers a good in depth case study of the problems related to exclusion-based conservation. The Maasai of Tanzania have been excluded by various national parks such as Tarangire. This exclusion has caused a variety of problems for the Maasai, a group that had a traditional grazing model that used much of the land occupied from the park. The Maasai had a traditional system that encouraged larger herds of smaller cattle, which moved around with changing seasons and rain, large trade networks and traditional ecological knowledge. With the national park they have lost access to dry season grazing areas, which puts more pressure on the wet season grazing areas. This not only causes problems for the Maasai, but also causes damage to the ecology of the area. Socially the national park has caused problems because the traditional grazing model helped to provide social networks. This helped distribute wealth, limit damage in cases of drought and provide social connections. An emphasis placed on farming has further limited the space for grazing, shifted people away from these social networks and traditional knowledge forms. The Maasai also used traditional burning techniques to help grow more nutritious grass, helping not only livestock but other animals. This burning also helped to limit the Tsetse fly. Many of the problems deal not only with the type of conservation but also the basis for the conservation.

The national park system in Tanzania is based heavily in western science and that
has caused it to be at odds with the traditional grazing system. It has had some success in protecting animals, however it also failed in some respects to do this. The national park system is based on rigid boundaries, which ignore the fact that many of the animals it aims to protect migrate in and out of the park limiting the power of protection. Many of these animals adapted with the grazing animals of the Maasai, thus the traditional grazing system can work with these animals. These parks are also good at attracting tourists, however they still have major wealth discrepancies with the local people as money does not get properly spent on locals. Overall a fortress-like model for conservation can be good for conservation, however it disregards most if not all human needs and often is not perfect for conservation (Rosenzweig 2003). Tanzania provides an example of the social and economic challenges that can be faced from this type of conservation.

**Inclusive models:**

New forms of conservation that allow people more access or inclusion in the decision making process are becoming more popular. Co-management is collaboration between user groups, government agencies, research institutions, and other stakeholders to participate in a decision process about regulation, and continuing with the management of the park (Zachrisson 2009). Co-management has great potential as Indrawan explains “An effective co-management system is generally recognized as being capable of generating rules while ensuring that bargaining powers and rights in decision making are shared among members, especially in relation to local communities” (Indrawan et. al 2014: 1184). This makes co-management a desirable option to people in local communities because if done well it can give them more of a voice. It is important with a co-management system that the process is continual, it is not a fixed state but continual
interaction to make arrangements (Carlsson and Berkes 2005). Many conservation projects including some more inclusive models have struggled with getting people involved, but when the community is involved conservation is strengthened (Indrawan et al. 2014). In conservation success is judged by ecological achievements, but often social and cultural successes are needed for these to happen (Indrawan et al. 2014). By using a co-management process, trust can be built and power disparities overcome (Indrawan et al. 2014). Co-management offers a strong ability to allow local communities more say in the issues and strengthen the potential ecological protection achieved, but it is not without its faults. It can blur who is accountable, requires a general interest from the public, and could weaken the ability to achieve conservation goals (Zachrisson 2009). Often the idea of co-management is used with the idea that communities and the states do not have many faces (Carlsson and Berkes 2005). Co-management has potential and Fulufjallet National Park in Sweden demonstrates a good example of co-management.

Fulufjallet in Sweden is an example of the potential for co-management economically. Since being designated a national park, the area has seen a boost in the visitation and spending (Fredman and Yuan 2011). Since many of the surrounding areas have a tourist base this has created economic benefits (Fredman and Yuan 2011). National parks aim to keep the wilderness area clean, and with increased tourism and participation, more resources might be available to do this (Raadik et. al 2010). Many people who come enjoy the environmental preservation aspects of Fulufjallet (Raadik et. al 2010). Fulufjallet and the surrounding areas have had massive increases in visitation, but this does not come without potential problems.

With the increase in visitors there is more to monitor. While there are trails and
visitation areas park managers cannot always enforce that people stay on these (Raadik et. al 2010). The natural aspects of the park offer appeal to the tourists but as the industry expands more, some recreational experience preferences may be lost including ecological protections (Raadik et. al 2010). So the economic benefits must be carefully balanced with other needs of the park. The park was considered a success after a long debate about the park and increase in participation, but it seems that consensus and working together has occurred in the designation process, but not the actual management (Zachrisson 2009). Fulufjallet in some ways fell into the trap of not continuing to include locals, although they are supposed to have some say in the management and there are some organizations being formed to help this (Zachrisson 2009). Fulufjallet offers a good look at co-management, and other countries like Nepal have had more general forms of allowing access.

Nepal’s parks like Sagarmatha National Park and Buffer Zone offer a good example of the advantages and disadvantages of an inclusive national park model. In 1979 the king of Nepal initiated a more open-access, people-orientated approach that allowed for some subsistence extractions (Kharel 1997). The villages in the area of Langtang economically maintain traditional agricultural techniques as a means to help sustain themselves (Kharel 1997). This access has potentially caused problems. Cheese farms and factories have developed and use lots of wood, and yaks cause problems (Kharel 1997). There was once a delicate balance between competing interests that has been lost (Kharel 1997). These issues have potential solutions (pig and crop management, buffer zones and other better land zoning), but currently the open access model has caused problems, among some successes (Kharel 1997).
There have been successes however with managing ecological needs at the same time as allowing people access. Humans and tigers have been able to coexist in the park (Carter et. al). This is because prey for tigers has successfully been preserved and with more prey, there is more potential for co-occurrence (Carter et. al). Research has shown that animals in Nepal have had encouraging results from the conservation efforts, although some types have struggled (Heinen and Yonzon 1994). Despite these successes, there is some fear that over access is causing problems (Jefferies 1982). A success of the park is increased tourism, but with that comes increased resource use. Before the locals only used as much timber as they needed for cooking and everyday life, but with more people coming more wood is needed (Jefferies 1982). Originally wood was used on a small scale, but now it is used for large scale tourism operations and a factory (Jefferies 1982). Despite being more inclusive, some of the people of Nepal feel as though they are not able to get what is needed from the land. Some people feel their needs are not met by the land in the park and local agriculture interest comes into conflict with park administration (Kharel 1997). People need to work together with the government entities to have success, which has not always happened (Jefferies 1982). This has caused problems for Nepal and other open access systems as they have not always done this and the potential for these conservation methods has not always been met. So more inclusive models can be successful but they need to thoroughly include people throughout the process, and be fluent in their ability to problem solve while working with different groups and factors.

Models can range from fully government-run to fully community-lead conservation. They can be more or less restrictive, and have more or less community
engagement (See Figure 1). All of these differences can have different effects on ecological conservation and human inclusion. In order to be successful the models must balance inclusion of locals and ecological conservation. In order to do this, a few different conditions need to be met. When looking at the models to find what strategies can balance these priorities, they need to be analyzed on a spectrum of adaptiveness, and community involvement. A government managed protected area tends to ignore the needs of locals, it can have input from locals but ultimately the government is the one making the decisions. Co-management tends to include both parties, but often government is in the lead and the communities work with them. An important note is that with co-managed areas consensus must be achieved, the information from the top needs to be facilitated down (Jefferies 1982). If this does not happen there will be limited adaptation and like in the Nepal case the area will be mismanaged. Facilitation of information is possibly the most important part of co-management. In order for it to work coordination is key. This coordination is necessary for co-management and can help to bring change for locals or the environment. The least “restrictive” would be community controlled, which is when decision making is given to the community. They still often work with the government for a variety of reasons, and adaptiveness, and communication are keys. Figure 1 demonstrates the different levels of government or community management across a spectrum with the different interactions at each level.

While collaboration and adaptiveness are not the same they do tend to work together. It is almost impossible for a co-managed system to work without adaptiveness to different needs. If not adaptive a system will not work, collaboration tends to promote adaptiveness, and without collaboration those who are not stakeholders in the decision
will undercut most adaptiveness. High adaptiveness stems from well-facilitated information, and willingness to adapt. Low adaptiveness stems from ignorance, poor facilitation, and resistance to change. High collaboration encourages high adaptiveness and vice versa, though it is not a guarantee. Low collaboration encourages low adaptiveness. Figure 2 demonstrates the spectrums of adaptiveness and collaborations together. Notice that adaptiveness and collaboration are not mixed together because it is possible to have one without the other.

**Figure 1 Different Forms of Protected Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government-managed protected areas</th>
<th>Co-managed protected areas</th>
<th>Community conserved areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full authority and responsibility held by the protected area agency</td>
<td>Authority and responsibility shared between the protected area agency and the concerned communities</td>
<td>Full authority and responsibility held by the concerned communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore and repress, Inform and/or consult</td>
<td>Seek consensus, also through top-down decision-making and benefit-sharing agreements</td>
<td>Formally share authority and responsibility (e.g. via seats in a comanagement board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate (involve in decision-making) and develop specific agreements</td>
<td>Devolve, restitute, recognise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Research by John Parr demonstrates the spectrum of full government control and community control. It shows that when governments have full control the communities’ are mostly ignored both in voice and needs. In the middle there is more of a negotiation, and consensus though often government still maintains control. At the far right of the spectrum communities have full control of management in decision-making, and responsibility.
Figure 2 Collaboration and Adaptation

Figure 2: From CIFOR demonstrates the key importance of adaption with collaboration. In order to maximize human needs and ecological benefits a system needs to be adaptive, it needs have some enforcement, the community must be involved in decision making, and information must accurately and effectively be facilitated to the locals. Facilitation and working together are perhaps the most important as they give stakeholders more incentive to work towards conservation, increasing conservation strength. The graphs demonstrate what is needed for each type of different government level of access, and for adaptiveness. The Nepal case demonstrated how decentralization could lead to miscommunication, and a lack of enforcement, which lead to its own problems (Kharel 1997 and Jefferies 1982). A heavily government run conservation program that does not allow people access to the land or decision making will also suffer as Tanzania showed (Igoe 2004). By having a model similar to co-management in which enforcement mechanisms are appropriately used, and information is facilitated adaption.
is enabled and cooperation is fully achieved, will prove most successful at meeting locals’ needs and conservation.

Chapter 3: CASE STUDY BACKGROUND

The proposal for a national park in the northern woods of Maine was originally proposed in 1994, and since then it has been proposed again several times. The most recent change was when President Obama made it a national monument in 2016. It has been met with heavy contention throughout its history. The original park was proposed for 3.2 million acres, but the most recent proposal includes 75,000 acres of a national park and 75,000 of a national recreation area. This proposal was put forth by Lucas St. Clair, son of Roxanne Quimby, founder of Burt's Bees products who purchased land in the 2000s, and by 2005 owned 50,000 acres (Harrison 2006, and Welcomer and Haggerty 2007). Roxanne Quimby was able to buy massive amounts of land through her fortune from Burt’s Bees and originally proposed donating the land to the federal government for designation as a national park (Harrison 2006). She joined "RESTORE: The North Woods" the original proponents of making that area a national park in the 1990s. The original proposal was designed to extend protection from Baxter State Park, and aimed to prevent logging and other potentially destructive habits (Harrison 2006). Currently many of the mills and timber industry are shutting down and moving out, people however still use the land for hunting, fishing, and recreation. The landscape is unique in that it is near Mount Katahdin and has some surrounding mountains; as well it is a part of the northern forest of Maine. Some species could benefit from protection like black bears, lynx, and eagles (Sierra club, n.d.). Figure 3 shows the original proposal. It is incredibly large, and would take away access from about a 1/7 of the state of Maine. This would hinder access
to all of this land for locals, but also access to Baxter State Park, thus it would absorb the park. Figure 4 shows the more recent proposal, which while much smaller, would still create a big impact on the locals and Baxter state park. The original proposal had an issue of someone or some people from away with money trying to create the park against the wishes of locals reliant upon the timber and mill industry, and this issue still continues to be faced today (Harrison 2006, Welcomer and Haggerty 2007). There have been countless meetings with locals attended by Lucas St. Clair, Roxanne Quimby, the National Park directors and other proponents who have tried to convince locals that the park will be good for them. According to Blake Harrison, the debates about the park generally are about “(1) the relationship between economic development and environmental protection; (2) the relative social and political power of outsiders and insiders; and (3) the nature and degree of public recreational access to private forestland” (2006: 405). These are still relevant to the debate today, and show that the issues have yet to be fully solved. These issues need to be addressed, and the area is still facing these issues even with the less burdensome national monument. Today, many Maine residents remain concerned about how much access people can have, what type of activities will be allowed in the park, and the economic benefits. These issues have been a part of the debate of many national parks throughout their history.
Figure 3 Proposed Maine Wood National Park and Preserve

Figure 3 from Maine Woods shows the original 3.2 million acre park proposal. It surrounds Baxter state park occupying area in 3 counties in Maine and large swathes of land.
Figure 4 Proposed National Monument

Figure 4 from The Wilderness Society demonstrates the more recent proposal. This is much smaller proposal occupying much less land, and also has a reserve area. Notice the broken up nature of the monument.

Currently the land in northern Maine, as shown in figure 4, is designated a national monument. There is not a significant difference between National Monuments and National Parks, in the way that the land can be protected, or is managed (NPS n.d.
and Sierra Club, n.d.). However a key difference is that the president can designate a national monument. National parks explicitly forbid hunting and consumptive activities, whereas national monuments do not have to do that (NPS n.d.). However they can and in the national monument hunting is not allowed currently. National monuments are typically for more specific interests while national parks have a wide variety, though not always the case (NPS n.d.). National monuments are also seen as a step towards land becoming a national park, which has increased the importance of this project due to the perceived imminence of a national park (Sierra club n.d.).

Before the proposal for a national park in northern Maine the region was a heavily forested, and used for the timber industry (Harrison 2006). But this began to change with a variety of factors that caused increase land sales and instability in the region (Harrison 2006). Maine is a unique state because of the large amount of private land ownership, at around 90% (Acheson, 2006). The state owns about 8.7 percent and the federal government around 1.5% (Acheson, 2006). Large amounts of land at 90% are covered in forest, which is the largest amount in the nation (Acheson, 2006). This makeup has led to Maine having a very unique system of access to private property as if it is communal (Acheson, 2006). As Welcomer and Haggerty explain, Maine has a unique tradition and access system “its historical commitment to mills and timber resource extraction, and its tradition of public citizen access to private industrial land.” (Welcomer and Haggerty 2007: 384). This has been through the timber industry, which is fading away, now many new people are coming into the state with different backgrounds and thoughts about public access. Often they keep the land as private through posting signs allowing less access than the timber companies.
In the past the timber industry provided economic benefits, but even without these economic contributions, the industry and the access it provided remains a key part of the cultural identity in Northern Maine. The original proposal would have lead to change in the industry through cutting off vast amounts of land; while the current proposal is smaller this sentiment remains (Welcomer and Haggerty 2007). As it is important for jobs and industry, there is kickback about the national monument and other forms of change (Welcomer and Haggerty 2007). Also important was that someone who was so wealthy could buy the land and the locals could be alienated by this show of power and the perceived job opportunities. This was a part of the change in culture with new people coming in and cutting off access to the land. Implied access (where private land is not posted) is assumed to be accessible, but big tracts of land being cut off, like a national park or monument, goes against this tradition (Acheson, 2006), whether it be private ownership or a national park. Doubts exist as to whether there would be economic benefits from the park, including the creation of new jobs (Welcomer and Haggerty 2007). This causes resistance to the federal intervention of a national park and national monument because of this history of access, and the fear of losing timber and mill jobs.

Chapter 4: RESEARCH QUESTIONS

What are the environmental values that underlie both opposition to and support for the national park or the national monument if not the park? How can management plans be designed to balance the value of ecological conservation with the value of diverse forms of human use? It is important to look at how national parks can balance these because in order for national parks to be effective, people need to support them.
They are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but it cannot be assumed that they can be balanced. If people feel good about conservation, it will be more effective due to the positive relations (Kellert, 1996 and Igoe, 2004). People can also benefit from conservation whether it is economically or through an ascribed value, but in order to achieve this they must see that they are benefitting from it and work with the conservation program (Kellert 1996 and Igoe 2004). By answering this question we can find out a way to help encourage people to work towards this more harmonious relationship between conservation and human uses. It also is important to know if they can balance these needs before trying to establish a new park model.

How do people value the environment? We need to answer how to balance both the needs of people and the environment, and in order to do that we need to know what people value. Stephen Kellert identified nine key values people have in nature, and these can be used to identify how people in Maine feel about nature (Kellert, 1996). These values are different relationships people have to nature and can be characterized by things like fear, need to use, ethics, bonds, etc. (Kellert, 1996). Figure 5 shows the values below. Scholars like Kellert classify these values by using different responses to questions from their own or other studies and analyzing the responses to see what they most line up with in terms of fear, anger, wanting to dominate, wanting free use, and other values (Kellert, 1996). By answering that, you can figure out under what conditions people are motivated to conserve nature or not. Bringing out these values with conservation methods will create more effective conservation; people will put more of an effort into conservation if they perceive that they are getting something of value out of their interactions (Kellert, 1996). People often have a particular evaluation of nature, these may not be the same
values but the question then becomes if and how these can be balanced. To answer this you first must answer the research question of how people ascribe these values.

**Figure 5 Kellert’s Nine Values of Nature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Exploitation of nature to fulfill some human need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalistic</td>
<td>Human satisfaction through direct experience with nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecologic-Scientific</td>
<td>Relationships of interdependence structures that support life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Emotional responses to the beauty of nature, landscapes, and animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>Use of nature as the bases for communication and thought. Also, used to communicate culturally important topics through myth, fairytale etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominionistic</td>
<td>Urge to suppress nature based on survival needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>Bonding and intimacy with animals (typically) resulting in them being part of the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralistic</td>
<td>Based upon the unifying diversity of life, focus is on the ethical treatment of nature in all forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negativistic</td>
<td>Evocation of negative feelings based upon fears and bad experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Kellert, *The Value of Life*)

**Figure 5** Kellert discussed nine different values to hold for nature. These values have a wide range of morals, ethics and reasons for holding a belief about nature.

What social, economic, and other values do people in the area hold? Why do people care about the land? Before you can have a successful conservation project, it has to be known what the goals of it are, and what other people want from an area. What people want is important because by giving them what they want with a conservation project, there will be more support for the park and it can accomplish greater things for conservation and human needs (Igoe, 2004). By answering these questions it gives more insight into how to get people to support the park and how to get a more utilitarian solution.

Is there a solution that might work in Maine using these values, other than the US national park model? Exclusionary national park models do not work well in many places due to the effect they have on the local people, and sometimes their environmental
failures. Models like co-management and other inclusive models are also often perceived as ineffective for meeting conservation needs. Is it possible for one of these models to work in Maine? Would they address the concerns of locals? For a park to be successful the needs of locals must be met. The values might lead to a more moderate solution, that can match another national park and by finding this it would be more effective or a different solution entirely, but in order to find this, the values must be known.

Chapter 5: METHODS SECTION

This thesis includes an analysis of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects of various national parks throughout the world, varying in their level of restrictiveness and community involvement, specifically focusing on the Katahdin Woods and Waters national monument and the proposals to make it a national park. By looking at the values of the people around the national monument, and how these relate to other models around the world, we can see if other models could provide insight into how to meet local needs.

The research began with a general literature review, focused on conservation and national park systems. I worked with various faculty, using sources from their classes to find starting points. Using what I gathered from these sources I then used this as a basis for my library research using search engines like J-Stor and Ursus through Fogler library. I did not look for a particular journal or publication, but I did search for some articles that were cited in other articles I read. I also searched for some authors who have been influential in the study of conservation. I also looked for keywords like national park, conservation issues, Maine national parks, etc. I found books specifically about various national parks that briefly went over how they work to find more specific targets. The
national park case studies utilized in the literature review were selected based on a search of various national park models. A variety of parks were featured, from four different countries - the U.S., Sweden, Nepal, and Tanzania were in part selected from a list describing several different models in James Igoe’s book on conservation anthropology.

The second phase of the research included searching through and reviewing various news and peer-reviewed articles to better understand the history and background of the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument. From this literature review information was gathered that allowed for an interview protocol to be designed, based on various concerns that people have about the creation and management of national parks. The interviews along with information about other national parks can provide information about the potential success of the proposed national park, and other models.

I looked through many different newspaper articles to gather a background on the national park and how people felt about it. This gave me a background about what was happening with the national park and national monument with respect to what conservationists wanted, and what the dissenters wanted. It gave me an idea of what to look for when I did my interviews, and it also gave me an idea for what to look for with different national parks. This background gave me a good base for the history of the national park proposal in Maine. Some ideas of why people want the park, and why some people do not. It showed me some of the potential values that people may want from their environment. When looking for different news articles I searched using terms like Maine National Park proposal, Maine national monument, Maine North Woods National park, etc. through various sources like Washington Post, New York Times, Bangor Daily News, Portland Press Herald, etc. After having a broader search with sources that were
local and non-local, I began to focus on the more local sources like Bangor Daily News. This was because they had a more localized viewpoint. They included interviews from local people who were important for the thesis because they are the ones closest to the national monument and most affected by it, they could potentially be interviewed further by myself to gain more insight into their outlook. It made it easier to find people who were from and still lived in Maine, as opposed to people who were from other states weighing in. This allowed me to focus on people most affected by the National Park. The interviews were analyzed to see what values people ascribe to nature related to Kellert’s values and their conservation interests. I looked for what values were expressed and the frequency at which they were expressed.

After completing an IRB application and getting approval, I conducted a series of interviews. The interviews aimed to find out how happy people were with the national monument. It aimed to find out why they wanted or did not want a national park. It aimed to find out the different values they were looking to find in a national park and if they had another idea for the land beside national parks. I identified my sample by using purposive sampling looking at people who have spoken out in favor of or against the proposal for Katahdin Woods and Waters National Park and using some snowball sampling in relation to those who responded to find other willing participants. Looking for people who had expressed a pro national park or anti national park response to find out why they held the views they did. I recruited them through emailing/calling them with a premade script asking if they are willing to participate.

The interviews were semi-structured interviews that were supposed to last from 30 to 45 minutes at most. The target number of interviews was eight proponents of the
national park, and eight opponents. These would be chosen based on people speaking to news sources and from asking participants. They were contacted by email or phone, found either through their own website or an organization website that they were a part of. Due to time constraints and difficulties recruiting participants the goal of 16 interviews was not met. Four interviews with proponents were conducted by phone and recorded, then later transcribed and analyzed by looking at how these people ascribed value to nature, and what models seemed to best fit their answers.

The interview questions were designed to help answer the research questions by asking questions like what did the participants think about the park? How did they think the land should be used? I also asked about several specific concerns in conservation that I identified through the literature review, to be rated on a scale of one to five. These were things like resource gathering, environmental protection, non-wilderness and wilderness activities, etc. By doing this I hoped to more scientifically identify what values were most important for this land for different groups. These interviews were designed to expand upon what the newspaper articles did in a couple ways. First, the interviews were designed to be more scientific by including other outside research on national parks in forming the questions. These were analyzed by reading through and seeing if a sentence was in favor or against the park fell into one of Kellert’s values. If the statements about the park did not fall into a particular category they were put into a tenth category called non-nature based. These were generally things like not wanting outsiders, or not wanting federal control of land. This expanded upon the research by generating more information to analyze for what people might want with the land, and why they might want or not want the national park.
I analyzed the interviews by going through and seeing if people had different ideas for the land use. I looked at their responses to see why they were in favor of a national park or not. I also looked to see if these responses coincided with a different model for conservation as well as asking them if they considered other models. This helped me to see how much access they wanted to allow. I also read through and looked at how often different values were reflected. This was informal, but I kept general track of what values were being mentioned, and how often they were being demonstrated and repeated. This was not directly tallied, however this did allow me to see the overarching themes of each person’s responses and get an idea of their value system. It was analyzed to see if they had an overwhelming reason for their opinion on the national park or multiple strongly held reasons, and what the differences between these reasons were. I read through to see how the responses could fit into Kellert’s model, and also to see how they related to other park models.

The interviews were analyzed to look for specific values that people have with respect to the land. It was designed to gather what people are looking for in the land that makes up the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument. I looked for differences and similarities between proponents and opponents and perspectives. I tried to see if the differences could be reconciled, whether through the current model or another conservation strategy. The likert scale from my survey was used to determine how important some things were in an easy quantified way by getting them to value different activities that could take place in the area. More open-ended questions served the purpose of gathering what some different values were, and understanding their meaning in individual and local perspectives. As well seeing if people had thought of using the land
for something other than a national park. For people who were proponents of the national park model, this could be something like a wilderness preserve. For people against the national park it could be something like making the land be a national forest, land for the timber industry, or just allow it to stay the same. National forests aim for preservation, while allowing much more access and activities like woodcutting, cattle grazing, and recreation (NPS n.d.). This was supposed to see if people were looking for conservation, jobs, or any other specific thing. It was also analyzed to look for if another conservation model might meet their needs and to see how strongly they hold these values. If people were very concerned with one value they hold and unconcerned with other values these could be balanced. Another question was if people thought that the conservation could be balanced with local interests. This is important to look at because, for any conservation model to succeed, it needs to be met with support (Kellert 1996 and Igoe 2004).

These interviews can help to feed into the discussion about balancing inclusion and conservation, by showing what different values people hold in relation to nature in Maine. This contributes to the discussion by showing how these values might line up with a national park or other conservation models. It also shows that values about nature and conservation maybe affected by values seemingly unrelated. Some may want conservation, but they do not always want the federal government getting involved. It also shows that some of Kellert’s values like utilitarian can be quite broad and held by people on opposite sides of an issue. With Kellert’s model they show that people can share values yet look at something almost entirely differently, understanding this is key to the discussion and can help contribute to seeing how the values of conservationists and locals who want more access can be met. Working together by seeing these different
values will help. These interviews show what values are held in common and what are not.

In addition to conducting interviews I read through letters to the editor about the park. I selected the letters to the editor based on whether or not the person was living in Maine. I also looked at what they were addressing. I found a couple letters that talked about the park, but were talking about a lot of other issues as well. I tried to focus on those that related to the use of the land in northern Maine, specifically the proposal to make the land a national park. If it was about the designation of the monument I also considered those, if they talked about the park proposal as well. When reading through the letters, if a sentence had words describing a particular value it was counted and added to a frequency spreadsheet. The number of people who expressed each value were added up, and the overall number of mentions (measured per sentence) were added up. These demonstrated the values people held and how they related to their views. When the interviews were added to the letters they add important context to the contrasting perspectives.

To arrive at the conclusion and discussion sections of this paper, data and information from the interviews were combined with the literature review to begin to gather some insight into models that might be preferable among stakeholders in Maine. It aimed to see if there was a model that might best balance the needs and interests of locals and conservationists. If there is not, could different models be mixed together to create something that would effectively meet both groups’ needs?

Chapter 6: RESULTS

Newspaper background
The letters to the editors were used to supplement the small number of interviews. They were taken from Maine newspapers, and were read through to see how many values people had, what values they held, and how often they were expressed. A table was created from this analysis to show the results of these letters to the editors. The results demonstrate that there were shared values, but key differences as well.

Proponents:

Table 1: Expressions of Kellert’s values among proponents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th># Of people who expressed it</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalistic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecologist-Scientific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominionistic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negativistic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-nature based belief</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 demonstrates the amount of proponents who expressed different traits and how many each one expressed them. Times expressed are how many sentences in each letter someone said something that would fall into that category added up.

Proponents demonstrated values that lined up with several of Kellert’s values. None expressed non-nature based beliefs. One point of interest was that often each sentence or paragraph expressed traits that could fall into one or more value. An example of this is in one letter someone expressed “If my experience serves as an illustration of the power of public lands to attract people (and their dollars) to a magnificent state in
need of both”. The author of this letter was discussing how they were drawn into the state of Maine after experiencing the immense beauty (aesthetic) for recreational purposes (naturalistic). They were explaining how the park could protect the natural resources (moralistic) and provide money for the state and its people (utilitarian). Many of the letters demonstrated that the values could be shared. People can feel that wilderness is important for recreation not necessarily for themselves but for the jobs and economic benefits that recreation could provide. Utilitarian, naturalistic, aesthetic, and moralistic views were all expressed.

The utilitarian belief expressed in the letters was mostly non-extractive. For utilitarian expressions I looked for examples of people talking about using nature for their own gain. This could be through resources gathering like hunting, or it could be something like jobs provided through ecotourism or another non-extraction based industries. For proponents this was the idea that a park could bring jobs and people to the area to see the Maine wilderness through non-extraction. With the utilitarian value, a mix of values was still expressed as this quote shows “The creation of a national park and national recreation area on the donated lands will entice all Americans to come share in the beauty and serenity of northern Maine, while providing a much needed and welcome stimulus to economy of the area”. This quote focused on getting people to the area to see the beauty of nature, and recreation was mentioned as well. Most importantly this quote was about the economic benefit of nature to draw people to use/see it (utilitarian), while it also expressed admiration for the beauty. It is important to note that they did not talk about extraction, they expressed that it is important to preserve the wilderness feel and the majestic beauty by not extracting. So the utilitarian outlook here is different from that
of opponents. It is more based in people coming into the area to see the wilderness, so the other values seem to outweigh utilitarian because it can be a byproduct. This utilitarian value is still mentioned a lot and significant. A pure economic quote was “establishment of the park would also create- directly and indirectly- 450 to 1,000 jobs according to studies reviewed by Maine’s top economists”. This person discusses the jobs that the park could bring, a utilitarian outlook because the park would use nature to provide these jobs. Nature could help Maine economically without extraction. It is important to note the person discussed how it would create abilities for recreation for both people coming in and already in the state. So the outlook was utilitarian in that nature would provide jobs, but naturalistic in that it provides recreation for those in the region and those coming in.

All the proponents demonstrated a naturalistic value as well. Naturalistic values were demonstrated when someone was discussing being close to nature, and being able to use it for things like recreation. While the quotes above talked about recreation more for a utilitarian benefit of income, personal benefit of the nature for recreation was also common. One quote that expressed how people had a naturalistic value was “one of the reasons my wife and I chose to move to Maine was to be closer to its incomparable forests, rivers, and coastline”. They wanted to have direct experience and link with nature thus showing the naturalistic value. They wanted to get closer to nature to have more experiences with it. Many people want to have recreation available or just get closer to nature. Similar statements to the one above were expressed throughout proponents’ letters to the editors. This quote and many of the naturalistic values were close to the aesthetic value of nature. The difference being, quotes like this were talking about recreation and being close to nature, where as when people have aesthetic values they
talk about the beauty of nature.

Aesthetic views were not as common as utilitarian or naturalistic, but they still occurred with some frequency. Aesthetic values were demonstrated when someone talked about how beautiful and awesome nature was, in a pleasurable manner. One quote demonstrating this value was “Our new home is a treasure and absolutely deserves national recognition”. This person was talking about how they moved close to the national monument and that they thought of the land as incredibly beautiful. They talked about appreciating it for themselves, demonstrating the value they hold. Sometimes they talked about the economic benefits, while at the same time bringing up the observation of the beauty of nature. All but one letter to the editor talked about how pretty and beautiful the wilderness of Maine was. Proponents did seem to value this beauty of the area for themselves, but frequently they did bring up how it could bring people to the region. A surprise was the lack of letters to the editors talking about moralistic values.

Moralistic values were not expressed as often as the other values in the proponents’ letters to the editors. Moralistic values were when people talked about respecting or protecting nature. One likely reason for this is that these letters were trying to convince people of why the national park should be made, which caused them to focus on other traits. Moralistic does coincide more with the idea of conserving nature through something like a national park, but not necessarily with the idea that opponents focus on extracting resources from the land. So the proponents may have been appealing to opponents' more utilitarian values. This is important because of key differences among this valuation system. This is shown by the context of most quotes being about the utilitarian benefits of protecting it so other people can see it or use it. For example “Not
only would it protect the rich biodiversity of the upper Penobscot watershed, but it would create between 450 and 1,000 new jobs in the Katahdin area”. This quote demonstrates that while they do have the moral view of protecting nature, they also talked about it in a persuasive sense of convincing people that it could improve the economy of the area. This is important because it shows that proponents care about the land being protected and creating jobs. The letters were also meant to be persuasive and that is why moralistic came up less often because of the perception that appealing to opponents’ value of utilitarian use of nature is a way to convince them. This is significant because of the difference in utilitarian values that will be elaborated on later, and while opponents do share a moralistic belief, it may rank lower to them.

Opponents:

Table 2: Expressions of Kellert’s values among opponents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th># Of people who expressed it</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecologicist-Scientific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominionistic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negativistic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-nature based belief</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 demonstrates the number of opponents who expressed different traits and how many times each individual expressed these ideas. Times expressed is how many times in each letter someone said
something that would fall into that category added up. Non-nature based beliefs are things that affected their outlook on the national park but had nothing or little to do nature, or when cultural values overshadowed value of nature.

For opponents, utilitarian and non-nature based beliefs were the most common values expressed. Some moralistic and naturalistic values were also expressed, but most important were the utilitarian and non-nature based beliefs. Opponents expressed utilitarian beliefs frequently and as the following quote demonstrates they were based in extraction “a national park spells the end of all hunting, trapping, fishing, or even gathering any firewood”. This is an obvious utilitarian value of wanting to extract resources from nature. While utilitarian values were expressed in both proponents and opponents letters there is a key difference. The opponents’ letters are utilitarian in that they want to directly extract resources from nature. This seeming similarity is actually an incredibly significant difference, which plays an important part in the debate about a national park, since they do not allow hunting, and extractive industries (NPS n.d.). Another common ground may have been a shared moralistic value, but ultimately it seemed less important for the opponents. The idea that conservation could be achieved while extracting resources was a key difference between the two sides.

Non-nature based beliefs were very important because they revealed that some issues with nature are influenced by non-nature values. Non-nature based beliefs can feed into or override a value of nature. One of the influences was people being opposed to the involvement of the federal government as the following quote demonstrates “would anyone who makes a living in the woods dare hand it over to the federal government to manage?”. While this might seem utilitarian it is more important that the government does not have control. It is the idea that the government will not handle the land in the best interest of the locals. It is a mixture of distrust due to the idea that the government
will not work with them, and the past system of public access to private land. Several of these letters are full of this sentiment. Another key value was anti-outsider as expressed by one opponent “My family helped settle Otter Creek. My great-great grandfather Julius John Smith fished for a living in Otter Creek Harbor and fought against slavery in the Civil War”. This is significant because throughout the letter this person discussed the negative effects of a national park. Their qualm was not with preserving nature, but the idea that it would bring outsiders and they would lose their town. It might seem to be utilitarian with the fishing aspect, but the whole letter was laden with comments about the problems that outsiders could bring. There were utilitarian aspects, but the anti-outsiders narrative prevailed throughout the letter. Many of the opponents have views that are not related to nature that can influence their opinion on something related to nature. The opponents expressed moralistic beliefs, that would coincide with the national park however, other beliefs outweighed this. As the park would bring too many outsiders and have a poor effect on the locals. These beliefs influenced the opponents’ outlook on conservation and thus nature indirectly. These are part of the culture of the region and part of the third non-nature based trait of sense of place and cultural identity.

Another value that was non-nature based, and is very important, is the sense of place and culture around the land. The anti-government and outsider values were influenced by this culture and reflections of it. For the people in northern Maine the history of the region is an important part of why they want access. It does not necessarily have to deal with recreation in the wilderness, using for resources, or anything like that. It has to do with the unique sense of place that people have, and the culture of the region. One quote that demonstrates this is when discussing the proposal for a national park and
the economic benefits it could bring someone said “but not an increase in timber harvesting jobs”. This a very significant quote because while it may seem to be utilitarian, the person is not disputing that jobs are created, but complaining about the potential loss of traditional jobs. The economic and nature portion of this are not important, but what is important is the loss of what was a large part of the cultural identity to the region. The letter about Otter Creek was filled with information about how the author’s family settled the area and it was a part of his personal history. The authors looked at a national park as going against this history. This outlook of nature to be harvested in part is heavily influenced by this non-nature value, and this also influences the anti-park outlook. The significance is that the people could lose their traditional means of living.

**Interviews results proponents:**

The results for the interviewed proponents of the National Park showed that the moralistic value of nature was the most common and important for them. They were focused on protecting animals and the environment for a variety of reasons. One proponent who wished to remain anonymous did have a strong utilitarian viewpoint that seemed to outweigh other potential reasons. He saw the park as a chance to bring back jobs to the area. They also had aesthetic, and naturalistic values, but they were not as prominent as other values. Moralistic was a very important part of the proponents viewpoints, all four interviewed at least mentioned a value of protecting the environment. Utilitarian is significant because it is a value heavily shared with the opponents, yet there is also a vast range of what it could mean for them.

All four proponents I interviewed had moralistic values, but for three of them
moralistic seemed to be the most important value. While a fourth person interviewed did express an importance of conserving nature, utilitarian values overshadowed moralistic. They were concerned for animals and the environment, but also the economic boost a park could bring. One quote that is telling when explaining why they were in favor of the national park is, “the ecosystem up there is very fragile. And there is a huge sense of urgency with protecting as much of that ecosystem as possible”. Statements similar to this came up throughout the interview. Moralistic values were expressed throughout all the interviews. One person when asked what he thought when it was designated a national monument responded, “Well of course we were for any kind of protection up there is good protection. We were definitely pleased”. The idea of any protection for the environment was important for them. Things like pollution, logging, and other potentially destructive industries and hazards are things that they want to prevent. All four proponents interviewed expressed some form of moralistic view. Several specifically talked about protecting animals and other things. This moralistic view was important because, for three of them, it was the primary idea of the park and they were against extraction of resources in order to protect nature.

Two of them did put importance in economic benefits like business growth. An interesting response that was brought up by my anonymous interviewee was that there would be more access now as opposed to when the land was bought by Roxanne Quimby. He expressed utilitarian viewpoints throughout his interview, quotes like this demonstrate his value of nature when asked why he supported the national park “Personally like I said it can only help the area because it diversifies our economic base” and later “So as I said a national park would be just one way diversifying our economic ability to make a living
up here. Bringing any other business I’m all for it you know I support all economic developments, but uh I’m I’d pragmatically realistic about how things are going to occur”. This economic development is key to his support for the park. The idea is that the mills have closed, and a lot of the industry has gone away and will not come back was key for his support of the national park. It is important to note when asked about how he would like to see the land used he talked about using it for economic things, but balancing them with protection for the environment. He was more for extractive industry than the other proponents, but he thought that they could be balanced. Recreation and using the area for purposes like that also came up frequently.

All the proponents expressed naturalistic values though it tended to not be as important as other traits. Proponents rated the ability to have wilderness-related recreation highly, these were things like bird watching and hiking. Some were higher than others but all had a naturalistic value of nature. One person said “I think the national parks preserve it and provide access for the people which I think is a really important part of it”. The idea of being able to access the land is something that both sides can agree on, however level of access is different as well as the reason for access. He also still demonstrates a moralistic value of protecting nature. When asked what appeals to him about having a national park he responded in part “community engagement people get to experience the outdoors that’s a big part of it”. The idea of recreation is important, also important to note is the mention of community engagement. This park for proponents can help the community and people, which is important when understanding the differing values. It is not all about nature or people. One quote that is also indicative of the naturalistic values “We understand it being a national park there will be many great
opportunities for the human species to enjoy the area, such as boating, camping, fishing”. People will get to enjoy nature, and that is important, but this also feeds into moralistic, and even aesthetic because it will help increase people’s appreciate nature like others said. One person even expressed that it was most important to see the land get protected and it would help by exposing people to the ability to have recreation in nature.

All four interviewed expressed aesthetic values. These were not as important as some of the other values but they all mentioned it. One person said this when asked about what level of access she would like to see in the area “it’s great if people go there because that’s just going to enhance their appreciation of nature and wildlife”. This could fall under moralistic because they were talking about gathering support for the national park to help conservation, however this and some other quotes by her shared the traits with the aesthetic value of nature. They saw the beauty and visitors could also be exposed to this. One person who wished to be anonymous talked about hiking the mountains in the region and how he could see them in town. It was a bit naturalistic because he talked about using the land for recreation, but he was also focusing on the beauty. He valued the ability to see this beauty of nature as well as using it for recreation.

Chapter 7: DISCUSSION

One surprising result was the low amount of moralistic expressions in the letters to the editors. They appeared quite frequently in the interviews with proponents, and were still important in some of the letters, but not nearly as much as in the interviews. This discrepancy might be because of the persuasive nature of the letters to the editors. The interviews were done in a more personal manner so that people could explain why they wanted the national park and to determine what values they held toward nature that
shape their opinion. The letters were designed to explain a stance, and why others should hold that stance. They tried to appeal to the opponents’ values more, while showing their own and why those are important. By adding the interviews it helps to clarify the importance of the different values for proponents, and demonstrate some of the key differences between the two sides values and culture. It is important that the proponents understand the importance of locals and this is a good sign for something like co-management because it does demonstrate a willingness to work with locals, however it also demonstrates a misconception. The supposed shared value is actually quite different because of different cultural relationships to the land.

To many of the locals, the perception of this huge cultural change is just as important as the conservation ethics involved. One letter discussed how both conservation and industry could benefit and this mentality was a mix of moralistic and utilitarian viewpoints. It noted the importance of the locals and their history with the land. This letter questioned some of the ideas behind the park of outsiders, and fear of federally run land. Not because of being xenophobic per say, but because the fear of change that these outsiders bring. In the newspaper letter to the editors that I looked at, I noticed a lot of people questioned the motives of Roxanne Quimby, the potential success of a national park, and the potential flaws in a national park. In a place like the United States, not wanting a national park, the “pinnacle” of conservation in the US, is seen as not wanting to conserve. The people against the park are hesitant to allow outsiders to come in. They bring change, often going against the locals’ traditions, and locals sometimes question the motives of conservationists because they feel they just want the land for themselves. It is because outsiders might infringe upon the historical access to the land. People care about
the land because of what it means to them culturally. They might change the dynamic of the region in a manner the opponents find unfavorable. This mentality is an important reason for why people care so much about the park, and important for when looking at the potential for compromise. It is important to work with the people to let them know that they will still have at least some access and control; otherwise they will not support the park.

In relation to Kellert’s framework, it is important to note that ‘utilitarian’ can have a vast meaning. When looking at how people ascribe values to nature it is important that this meaning is clear. Using Kellert’s utilitarian value can lead to a problem of thinking that there is a common trait, when there is not. Two common forms of utilitarian views emerged from the letters and interviews: extractive and non-extractive. This was part of why some supported the park and some did not. This is important for the research because conservationists have to understand that the jobs aspect is not as important as the cultural aspect behind the jobs. Additionally, they have to learn to work with the locals at preserving this culture and helping to create interest in the conservation project. A national park may not be able to address the cultural needs of the people. Working with the locals to meet the utilitarian value is not as simple as saying that jobs will be created, there also has to be a cultural aspect to be met. They must be fulfilling jobs, while fulfilling the cultural relationships that people have to nature.

Some of the research questions for this paper were aiming to evaluate people’s values and how they are related to the national monument. A large portion of how locals ascribe these values comes from outside of nature and a key concept was that people’s value of nature can be overshadowed by non-nature based beliefs, or directly influenced
by them. A lot of the opponents ascribed a utilitarian value because of the past relationships they and their families had with nature in the area. They saw it as a place for recreation on their terms, and as a place where they once used the land to extract resources for money. One particular example of this is logging. One letter was specifically complaining about the lack of support from logging companies. This key piece of sense of place for the people of Maine shows that a national park will be undermined by the inability to allow this type of industry. This unique history is at odds in many ways with the national park model. This is important for the research question of why are people in favor or not of the national park, and how do they ascribe values to the environment. One of the ways people do this is through a cultural connection to the land that might not fall into one of Kellert’s values.

Importantly, the anti-government mentality that was common amongst opponents makes creating a national park difficult. If a park is created using a fortress model it will completely alienate the locals, but working with the locals will have its challenges. These will stem from the unique history of the place, as mentioned above, and from mistrust of the government. Models that allow the people to have more access to decision making and to the land could help with this. They could help to meet some of the non-nature based beliefs of opponents. It must be remembered that adaptation is key, as shown earlier. Mistrust could cause these to be less effective. In order to work the government would have to make sure it earns the locals’ trust and work to make sure they are adapting to both their needs and the environment’s needs. One thing that conservationists and the park service could do is to work with the locals to find more about how they view the environment like in the Pine Barrens example. Working with the locals to get a sense
of their knowledge and how they express it could be very helpful. This would be challenging as the results show there is distrust, and some already feel alienated.

Importantly, the results do indicate that there are shared traits between the two groups, which is encouraging for balancing human needs with conservation. Those who are in favor of the park share traits with those against that indicate favorability of conserving the park. The moralistic view was very important for proponents interviewed for why they wanted a park and it drives conservation ethics for both sides. Both share the idea that nature is important from a moralistic, naturalistic, and aesthetic sense, but other factors are more important for the opponents. The key is that opponents do value nature moralistically, they just have a different value set that led to different conclusions about how to conserve nature where extractive industry is allowed. These shared traits are important for the discussion of balancing human needs and environmental needs. It shows that people do care about the environment. This is encouraging for the sake of balance because proponents and opponents do share a value of nature. People care about this land for a variety of reasons, and this does show that there is common ground between opponents and proponents. Despite this, some of the results are discouraging for using the current national park model of the United States. This is because there are key differences in the traits that they share, as well they have different prioritizations for each trait.

An important part for the anthropological outlook on conservation issue is people. Things other than their view of nature can influence how they value something and approach things. People can value conservation but not value a conservation model for a variety of reasons. In Maine a lot of these disagreements stemmed from the belief that the
national park proposal was not the best way to conserve. As seen in other cases, this is often a disagreement about how to use the land, for reasons like not wanting the federal government to have role, instead have the state be in charge; not wanting it preserved for outside use, the idea that it is the locals’ area so they get the primary access; or just questioning the motives of conservationists. This questioning is not how much do they care about the land, but how much do they know about it, and how much good the park can do for the locals. It is important to understand that people are not inherently against the park or conservation, but that they hold some different values, including an anti-government and outsider value. This can help conservationists to better understand how to work with locals to meet their needs, and to increase effective communication and adaptation.

With relation to the literature review, the letters to editors and interviews show that cooperation is key. Traditional conservation models such as fortress conservation will not work with the locals. Which would be problematic because adaptiveness through communication would not happen. Not working with locals can hamper adaptiveness, and can alienate the potential stakeholders in the park. It will cause problems where locals may put more pressure on other areas to gather resources, or they may attempt to gather resources in secret in the park, and it may limit the effectiveness of conservation because the conservationists do not use local knowledge. Fortress conservation will not work with locals because of the culture in Maine, and opponents’ heavy desire to extract resources. Their utilitarian value goes against this conservation model, and other problems could happen like loss of local enjoyment and loss of the sense of place for
locals. Simply put, fortress conservation is incompatible with the people of northern Maine.

Co-management and other models that allow the locals to be more involved could solve some of the problems. By allowing the people to have influence in the park it would help them to preserve cultural history. Using a model like co-management, allowing local people to have a say, may help them deal with some of their issues. There will still be a difference of values, and possibly conflict over land use, but it would help to facilitate solutions to these by allowing locals to have more of a say. Adaptation could be achieved if they work together. Outsiders still may come in and there may be a cultural change, but this allows locals to potentially hold on to the history more. Adaptation will be helped by working with the locals because the locals know a lot about the land and could work with scientists and the government to adapt to what is needed. The conservationists and government can adapt to the needs of the locals by working with them and building trust. The community’s non-nature based values would be helped with a model like co-management because they would get a say and potentially retain cultural history of land access. Information could be facilitated more smoothly if locals are involved due to the direct link. Allowing locals to have a say will be very important and balancing the old system of access is also important. A system like co-management is the most likely to balance the needs of a successful conservation program and the needs of locals.

Chapter 8: CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates the incredible complexity of undertaking a conservation project like a national park. There are many different models that can be applied to some
form of a national park and they have different strengths and weaknesses. There are
issues with the philosophy of US national parks, especially in Maine where the culture
has led people to question the park proposal. This separation idea is not a healthy one,
because people in Maine have used their environment for years, and sometimes the
environment evolves with people using it. Often, people interact with nature for
recreation or gathering resources, impacting nature. National parks often exclude people
and prevent this extraction of resources. This is important not only because nature has
provided livelihoods for people in Maine through the extraction of resources, but also
because it has provided them with a cultural identity. As seen in places like Tanzania and
other places in the United States this blocking off from those past resources can be very
problematic.

Fortress conservation leads to the blocking off of these traditional resources. This
will cause many problems in Maine because of how the people previously gathered
resources, and what that has done to them culturally. In Maine people have had access to
private lands as if they were part of the commons. Fortress conservation would be the
exact opposite of that. Another form of management could be something like co-
management where locals have more access to the land and to decision-making. This
could work well for Maine, but as the literature review showed this has to be done well.
There needs to be communication between the managers of the land and the local
stakeholders. Not only for adaptive purposes but also to meet the needs of the locals who
can help with the project. There needs to be some form of enforcement; if it is too
decentralized and no one can enforce the conservation efforts, people may overexploit
resources and cause problems. Working with the locals could help this by making them
have more of a stake; they would care more about conservation and work to protect it. Additionally, they could help to provide knowledge to the managers of the area. If their cultural values are upheld the opponents will likely be more in favor of a conservation model, and something like co-management has the ability to potentially answer their questions about the national park.

It is important to realize that opponents of the national park are not opposed to conservation. It is an issue of different values related to nature, but not always directly about nature. The importance of extracting resources through traditional industries and activities are what rank highest for the opponents. For them it is matter of maintaining a way of life that a national park would not help preserve. National parks promote the idea that humans and wilderness are separate and this goes against both the historic industries of Maine and the public access to private lands. The locals want to be able to have access to their land like before, and they also do not want to be cast aside and forgotten. They have a large amount of experience with the land and could help to conserve it. Working with them would benefit conservation and their own needs. By allowing them to have some access for the old extraction based ways their utilitarian value could be appeased, working with the managers of the park or monument could benefit both. They could further protect these resources for themselves, while helping the managers of the land to adapt to the best possible conservation. The locals could keep their cultural connection to the land, while conservation could be achieved. It is a situation in which people’s aesthetic, moralistic, naturalistic, utilitarian, and non-nature based values could be met and appeased.
The biggest issues with undertaking a conservation project like this are being able to please everyone. One key issue is that nature values are not always the most important in an issue like a national park. Culture can play a very significant role. Maine’s unique history led to a very unique outlook on natural resources. Extracting resources from nature is quite common, but what is unique is how this was a part of the identity of people in Maine. A park could preserve the scenic beauty and the ability to see it, through activities like hiking and other things, but it would not be the same as before. Locals have historically had an almost unlimited access to privately owned land that was different from how it would be under a national park. They view this history as very important to their cultural identity. The idea that outsiders and the government could come in and take that away is unpleasant to them. They would like to keep their historic access to the area, and also be able to utilize the historic industries. A national park would not preserve this. While many forms of conservation would not be able to fully do this, working with the locals could help to prevent the alienation they would feel by losing the past if they were able to keep some of the same systems of access and extraction. National parks in the United States have historically faced challenges when they are first proposed, and this is no different in Maine, where the issue stems from Maine’s unique heritage and the cultural values that people hold. The solution is not a simple one, but working with the locals to ease their concerns of cultural change and use of nature while conserving it could prove to be the most helpful in establishing a conservation model.

In relation to how people value nature the research shows that people in this debate hold some values in common that are encouraging for national parks, but more so for something like co-management. The differences between the two sides may seem
vast, but in actuality they are able to be reconciled. A conservation project like a national park will not work immediately, the locals must continuously be coordinated with to adapt to their needs. They ascribe some values that are the same but they mean different things. What makes a national park appeal to some is its benefits to conservation and to people with economic impacts, but for those against the park the economic impacts are the biggest problems. Often these impacts are designed with the mindset that any growth is good growth, ignoring the strong tradition that locals have with the land. Working with the locals can accomplish meeting their needs while hopefully increasing adaptation and communication to help with the conservation efforts. Even though the opponents want to have more extractive industries, working with them could help to counteract this. Working with them and allowing some extraction would make the opponents much more willing to help because they are distrustful of the government and some conservationists. Effectively communicating with the locals could lead to more support and adaptation from the NPS for the environment and locals.

People care about this land because they see it as something beautiful. Some also see it as home. Proponents see the land as beautiful, a treasure, and a place to visit, explore and see new sights. This contradicts those who have lived in the area, often for generations, who view the land as a place to work, to make a living. These culture differences cause the problems with the acceptance of the park. Respecting these cultural differences by understanding them and working with them in mind will be one of the most important things for any conservation program. A national park model the way the United States currently uses them will not necessarily be able to meet these. The particulars of this model would require more research, but conservationists need to work
with the locals in decision making due to their distrust, respect their cultural access so they feel they are not ignored and they can help with adaptation, while making sure that the land is conserved and not overused.
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Background: National parks are a conservation system that have been met with resistance all over the world, including the United States where they have been critiqued for their exclusiveness, regardless of their economic and environmental benefits (Igoe 2004). Additionally, national parks have been an important part of American history and the preservation of wilderness (Nash 1970). Because of this, it is important to understand why there is so much resistance and how these conservation methods can be improved to coincide with the values of local communities.

In order to understand this issue, questions have to be answered. What do opponents and proponents of the park want from the land? Do they want everyone to have access to it, or just certain people? Who would these people be? Why do they want access to the land?

The purpose of this research is to try to answer some of these questions, particularly as they relate to ongoing debates about land use and management in the new Maine North Woods National Monument.

This study is designed to gather information about people’s opinions on land use through interviews with individuals who have publicly expressed interest in the proposed national park. Interview questions will explore the differences of people’s opinions and value orientations toward nature. Research results will provide data for my honors thesis.

Methods: Semi-structured interviews, lasting approximately 30-45 minutes will be conducted with 16 Mainers, 8 publicly in favor of the park and 8 publicly opposed to the park. Interviews will be conducted in person at a location of the participant’s choosing, or by phone if necessary. The interviews will be scheduled via email or phone (see participant recruitment) at a time convenient for those being interviewed. The interviews will be recorded. The consent form will be emailed ahead of time and either signed in person (in person interview) or signed and returned via email. Interview questions can be found in Appendix 1 and interview consent forms can be found in Appendix 2. Recruitment texts for the interviews can be found in Appendix 3.

Personnel: Kyle Lonabaugh will be the principal investigator in this study. Kyle is a fourth year anthropology major conducting his research as part of his honors thesis. His primary interests are the environment and how people interact with it. He has never worked with human subjects before. Kyle completed his CITI human subjects training 10/6/16. Kyle will be supervised by faculty member Cindy Isenhour. Dr. Isenhour is an Assistant Professor of Anthropology and a cooperating Assistant Professor with the Climate Change Institute. She completed her PhD in Anthropology at the University of Kentucky in 2010. Utilizing a mixed-method approach to ethnographic research and environmental policy analysis, Dr. Isenhour has conducted field-based research with human subjects on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, throughout Sweden and
most recently in Beijing, China. Her research has been supported by the US Fulbright Program, the Wenner Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, the American Scandinavian Foundation and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. CITI human subjects training completed 9/17/14.

Participant Recruitment: The target participants for this study are those who have publicly expressed interest in the outcome of proposals to create a new national park. We will recruit 8 proponents and 8 opponents of the new park for participation in interviews. These people will be identified based on analysis of public commentary from newspapers and in public meetings. We will recruit participants by phone and email, identified in publicly available listings. We will quota sample to balance for gender and for participants from both southern Maine and northern Maine. Participants must be at least 18 years of age to participate. We aim to recruit eight opponents and eight proponents, to ensure data saturation (Schensul and Compte 2000).

Informed Consent: The consent form will be presented to research participants in person unless the interview is conducted over the phone, in which case the consent form will be emailed to the participant prior to the interview. Participants will sign one copy of the form and will be presented with a second copy to keep for their records. In the case of a phone interview participants will be asked if they would like for their responses to be kept confidential. This preference will be recorded on the PI’s copy of the consent form. Phone participants will then be asked if they agree to participate. Verbal consent will be recorded on the PI’s copy of the form, without the requirement of the participant’s signature (see Appendix 3 Survey Consent Form).

Confidentiality: Because we will be working with individuals who have already spoken publicly about this issue, we will give participants the option to be identified or to have their identities remain confidential. Participants who wish to have their identities remain confidential will be assigned a pseudonym and have all other identifying information removed from their data. A paper key will be created for participants with pseudonyms and kept in a locked file in Dr. Isenhour’s office. The key will be destroyed after the completion of the study, in May 2017. All interviews will be recorded and transcribed by Mr. Lonabaugh. Voice files will be destroyed after transcription, by approximately February 1st, 2017. Transcript data will only be accessible by Dr. Isenhour and the principal investigator. The data will be stored on Mr. Lonabaugh’s password protected computer indefinitely.

Risks to participants: We do not anticipate that participation in this research project will result in any psychological, social or physical risk. While people will be asked questions that about a heated issue they will be people who have already been identified as willing to talk about the issue. They will also be informed that they do not have to respond to questions they do not wish to. All Participants will be given complete contact information for the faculty sponsor and Gayle Jones of the University of Maine’s Human Subjects
Review board should they have questions regarding the study or their rights as research participants.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to participants who choose to participate in this study. The research benefits of the study are contributing to the research on conservation and national parks, and debate on national parks in Maine and the United States.

Compensation: Participation is voluntary and will not be compensated.

IRB Application – Kyle Lonabaugh Appendix 1: Interview Questions
1. What was your position on proposals to designate the Maine North Woods a national park?
   A. Why?
   B. How would you like to see the land used?
   C. What level of access did you think was most appropriate? Would you like things like recreational access, motorized recreation, resource gathering, resource extraction, etc?
   D. Is there another alternative conservation model that you would prefer?
   E. Could rate the following based upon their importance on a scale of 1 to 5. 5 being most important 1 being least important. Environmental protection, the ability to observe “wilderness”, the ability to use land for resource gathering (wood gathering, hunting, plant gathering), the ability to use land for recreation non wilderness related (snowmobiling, jogging), the ability to use land for recreation wilderness related (Hiking, hunting, bird watching, etc), business growth around an ecotourist industry, jobs.
   F. Do you think there is a way to balance conservation with local interests? How?
   G. Were you pleased that the area was designated a National Monument, rather than a National Park?

IRB Application_Kyle Lonabaugh Appendix 2: Consent Form

Summary of Research: You have been invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Kyle Lonabaugh, an undergraduate student, and Dr. Cindy Isenhour, a faculty member, in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Maine. You must be 18 years or older to participate. The purpose of this research is to explore diverse perspectives on the new Maine North Woods National Monument. It aims to explore tradeoffs between conservation and local use. You have been invited to participate because of your expressed interest on the outcome of the national park debate.

What will you be asked to do? The following interview will take approximately 30-45 minutes of your time. During the interview you will be asked to answer several questions regarding your opinion on land use in Maine, the new national monument and the proposal for a national park. For example, I will ask you to talk about your position on proposals to designate the Maine North Woods a national park. I’ll also ask you if you were pleased that the area was designated a National Monument, rather than a National Park. With your consent, your interview will be recorded for transcription.

Confidentiality The information you provide will be associated with you unless you
would prefer that your identity remain confidential. If you elect to remain confidential you will be assigned a pseudonym and any identifying information will be removed from your responses. A pseudonym key will be created on paper and kept in a locked filing cabinet in Dr. Isenhour’s office. This key will be destroyed after the completion of the study, in May 2017. Your responses will be recorded then transcribed by Mr. Lonabaugh. The voice file will be deleted after transcription, by February 1st, 2017. The transcript will be kept indefinitely on Mr. Lonabaugh’s password protected computer.

Voluntary Your participation in this interview is voluntary. You may choose to withdraw at any time. You may also choose to not answer a question if you do not wish to.

Risks Identifiable risks associated with participating in this study are minimal, just time and inconvenience. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to.

Benefits There are no direct benefits to you for your participation in this study. The research benefits of the study are contributing to the research on conservation and national parks, and debate on national parks in Maine and the United States.

Questions If you have any questions about this study, please contact Kyle Lonabaugh via phone at 609-970-7877 or via email at kyle.lonabaugh@maine.edu. You may also contact faculty sponsor Dr. Cindy Isenhour via phone at 207-581-1895 or via email at cynthia.isenhour@maine.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact Gayle Jones, Assistant to the University of Maine’s Protection of Human Subjects Review Board, at 207-581-1498 (or email gayle.jones@umit.maine.edu).

Statement of Consent: By proceeding, I indicate that I have read the above information, and have received answers to any questions I asked. I understand that my participation is voluntary and certify that I am at least 18 years of age. I consent to take part in the study and agree to have the interview recorded.

☐ Check here if you consent and wish to be named in this study

☐ Check here if you consent and wish to remain confidential

Signature_____________________________________
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Appendix 3: Recruitment text

Email Recruitment Text

Hello,

My name is Kyle Lonabaugh, I am a senior at the University of Maine doing my Honors Thesis on the new national monument in northern Maine. You are receiving this email because we would like to invite you to participate in a research study I am doing under the supervision of Dr. Cindy Isenhour from the Department of Anthropology at the University of Maine. The purpose of this research is to explore diverse perspectives on the Maine North Woods National Monument. You have been invited to participate in this
project because you have been identified as a figure who cares about the way that land is used and I got your information from ______. Your participation in an interview should only take about 30 – 45 minutes of your time and your responses will aid us greatly in the continuation of our research. The questions are open-ended and you are free to not answer any questions you do not want to. The interviews will be recorded and held in person at a location of your choosing, or by phone if needed. If you are interested in the interview please contact Kyle Lonabaugh through email at kyle.lonabaugh@maine.edu, or by phone at 609-970-7877.

**Telephone Recruitment Script**

Hello,

My name is Kyle Lonabaugh, I am a senior at the University of Maine doing my Honors Thesis on the new national monument in northern Maine. You are being contacted for a study being conducted by Kyle Lonabaugh and Dr. Cindy Isenhour from the Department of Anthropology at the University of Maine. You have been invited to participate in this project because you have been identified as a figure who cares about the way that land is used and I got your information from ______. The purpose of this research project is to gain more information about the national monument and proposed national park. The Interview should only take about 30 – 45 minutes of your time and a researcher will travel to your location. If you are interested in participating please let me know. The questions are open-ended and you are free to not answer any questions you do not want to. The interviews will be recorded and held in person at a location of your choosing or by phone if needed. If you are interested in the interview please contact Kyle Lonabaugh through email at kyle.lonabaugh@maine.edu, or by phone at 609-970-7877.
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Author’s Biography
Kyle Lonabaugh was born on April 2, 1995 in Woodbury, New Jersey where he was raised. He graduated from Woodbury High School in 2013. In college he majored in anthropology with minors in earth science and legal studies. He is a member of Tau Kappa Epsilon and has served as several officer roles in the past. He has received the University of Maine Grant, University of Maine Black Bear Award, and the New Jersey Alumni Scholarship.

Upon graduation, Kyle is planning on taking a year off and then going to law school or a graduate school for environmental anthropology. He plans to work with the environment either through environmental law, or environmental anthropology.