



## One movement, three clusters: the national parks movement in England and Wales, 1929-1949

Kristian Martinus Mennen

**To cite this article:** Kristian Martinus Mennen (2023) One movement, three clusters: the national parks movement in England and Wales, 1929-1949, Contemporary British History, 37:2, 266-300, DOI: [10.1080/13619462.2023.2196409](https://doi.org/10.1080/13619462.2023.2196409)

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/13619462.2023.2196409>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 20 Apr 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1466



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# One movement, three clusters: the national parks movement in England and Wales, 1929-1949

Kristian Martinus Mennen

Department of History and Art History, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

## ABSTRACT

The history of the national parks movement in England and Wales culminated in the passing of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act in 1949. Many constituent bodies were, however, dissatisfied with the administrative arrangements in the new National Parks. To explain this inconsistency, this article seeks to understand the national parks movement as a heterogenous network of loosely affiliated civil society organisations. The movement consisted of three separate clusters, each with its own approach to, definitions and expectations of national parks. These clusters emphasised the aspects of planning and rural preservation, scientific interests and nature preservation, and open-air recreation, respectively. They first joined forces in 1929, when the government appointed the first National Park Committee. Different core organisations led the movement at different stages, forming different coalitions and committees, re-defining the character of the national parks movement and its public and political profile in the process. The scientific and nature preservation cluster was the most successful after abandoning the other two clusters after 1945. This article offers a new interpretation of the history of the national parks movement in England and Wales as a highly contentious and internally divergent social movement.

## KEYWORDS

England and Wales; National parks; Nature conservation; Open-air recreation; Planning

## Introduction: the national parks movement in the United Kingdom

The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, which received Royal Assent on 16 December 1949, is commonly regarded as a major milestone in the history of nature and landscape preservation in the United Kingdom. With its new arrangements to designate National Parks in England and Wales, the Act is seen in retrospect as the culmination of the decades-long efforts of the national parks movement.<sup>1</sup> As such, it could be expected that at least a small majority of the supporters of this movement were satisfied with this legislation.

This presumption stands in stark contrast to the scenes that took place on 26 May 1952, when Harold Macmillan, Minister of Housing and Local Government, received a deputation from the Standing Committee on National Parks, one of the central co-

---

**CONTACT** Kristian Martinus Mennen ✉ [k.m.mennen@gmail.com](mailto:k.m.mennen@gmail.com) 📍 Department of History and Art History, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

ordinating bodies of the national parks movement. In her internal brief to the Minister, Deputy Secretary Evelyn Sharp had warned him that it would be 'a terrible meeting'. The Standing Committee representatives complained that the constitution of a Joint Planning Board for the Snowdonia National Park had been delayed, and that the Minister had consulted local authorities before appointing national representatives in the Dartmoor National Park Planning Committee.<sup>2</sup> In insisting on these 'points of procedure', the deputation referred to various oral assurances wrung from the Minister's Labour predecessor Lewis Silkin.<sup>3</sup> Macmillan invited the Standing Committee representatives to inform him about actual grievances or failures of local authorities in the newly established National Parks, but they seemed only marginally interested in progress in terms of nature and landscape preservation.

This incident reveals profound differences in opinion on what National Parks were about and what they were supposed to accomplish. The Standing Committee on National Parks stressed the importance of proper administrative arrangements and was decidedly unhappy about the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act. Other organisations within the national parks movement, for example the groups interested in nature conservation, did not voice any such complaints about the legislative arrangements in the early 1950s. Successive responsible ministers were unwilling to concede to demands to amend the Act without evidence proving that local authorities were unable to perform all of their necessary functions in the Park areas within the existing legislative framework.<sup>4</sup>

Contemporary observers already indicated the potential internal discord within the national parks movement, for example Herbert Griffin in 1946. In his synopsis of the history of the movement, he distinguished between 'three main streams of effort, namely for landscape preservation, for public access, and for the protection of wild life'.<sup>5</sup> Is the history of the national parks movement in the United Kingdom a long story of internal conflicts and disagreements between these 'main streams of effort', then, or is it a classical example of a single-issue movement, which unites several constituent bodies for one common cause? Both perspectives are represented in the historiography of the development towards the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949. John Sheail, John Blunden and Nigel Curry confirmed that there had not always been 'unity of purpose' among the proponents of national parks. John Sheail even called this the 'great divide' between the defenders of natural beauty and those of nature conservation.<sup>6</sup> When focussing on the details of the legislative process between 1945 and 1949, the defects in the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act or the problems with its practical implementation, however, John Sheail and other scholars accept 'the National Parks movement' as such as a more or less coherent group of actors for the sake of argument.<sup>7</sup> Both approaches are historically correct and useful for their respective research questions. For the historian seeking to characterise the national parks movement in England and Wales since it was first formed in 1929, however, this complicates the endeavour. Was the history of the movement dominated by unity or by discord, and what does that tell us about its goal, about the political strategies followed, and about the path towards the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act?

This article points at one possible solution, inspired by the approach of 'inter-organisational networks'. Between 1929 and 1949, the national parks movement was not an inherently consistent 'social movement'. Rather, it consisted of multiple constituent bodies with very different approaches, perceptions, and expectations of what national

parcs should achieve. The movement should therefore be understood as an heterogeneous field of loosely affiliated civil society organisations, that had to rely on one or more ‘core organisations’, central to the network, to take the lead in defining the national parks movement and its actions.<sup>8</sup> These ‘core organisations’, for example the Council for the Preservation of Rural England (CPRE) or the Standing Committee on National Parks, could speak on behalf of the movement at large when dealing with outside actors and stakeholders in politics and society. The following analysis is not based on a statistical or quantitative network analysis in a strict social science sense: it does not measure parameters such as network patterns, centrality, or density, although such a research approach would be highly recommended for this topic.<sup>9</sup> Still, this article distinguishes between three different ‘clusters’ of organisations in the national parks movement. Each cluster had its own ‘broker’ or ‘linking pin organisation’ that established links both within the clusters and with the wider national parks movement.<sup>10</sup> These clusters were more than mere subcurrents in an otherwise coherent, unitary movement: their existence and mutual competition were co-determining factors in the history of the national parks movement.

Table 1 below gives a first preliminary overview of the three clusters concerned. The clusters and their main constitutive organisations will be introduced in more detail when they first occur in the history of the national parks movement.

The clusters did not necessarily use different definitions of ‘national parks’, but their perceptions and expectations of how such parks could contribute to the realisation of their own goals and ideals were notably different. The clusters joined the national parks movement at different moments and set different priorities. Different core organisations competed to co-ordinate and speak on behalf of the movement. The delicate balance between the different objectives of rural preservation, open-air recreation, and nature conservation changed over time and affected their definition of national parks and their political strategies for achieving the common goal: the establishment of national parks in England and Wales.

Considering the composition of the national parks movement, the diverging definitions of national parks put forward by its constituent bodies, and their sometimes mutually exclusive approaches, perceptions, and expectations, it is difficult to imagine a legislative and administrative set-up for national parks that could satisfy them all. The

**Table 1.** The three clusters of the national parks movement, 1929–1949.

| Clusters in the national parks movement  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Cluster objectives   | Core organisations  | Other significant organisations  |
| Town planning<br>Preservation of the countryside                                   | Council for the Preservation of Rural England (CPRE)                                    | National Trust<br>Town Planning Institute<br>Council for the Preservation of Rural Wales (CPRW)  |
| Open-air recreation<br>Public access to the countryside                            | Ramblers’ Association   | Youth Hostels Association (England and Wales)<br>Fell and Rock Climbing Club   |
| Scientific research<br>Nature conservation<br>Preservation of wild fauna and flora | Society for the Promotion of Nature Reserves (SPNR)<br>British Ecological Society (BES) | Society for the Preservation of the Fauna of the Empire (SPFE)<br>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)<br>Zoological Society of London |

National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 indeed failed to deliver on all of its promises and meet the expectations of the national parks movement. Existing studies have paid due attention to the details of the legislative process between 1945 and 1949 and the difficult political and economic situation in the United Kingdom at that time to explain this failure. They have also pointed towards the heterogeneous nature of the movement and the fact that the different clusters within the movement did not loyally cooperate to achieve the same goal. The scientific societies around the BES abandoned the national parks movement after the Second World War and adopted their own political strategy, with considerable success.<sup>11</sup> In addition to these existing studies, this article applies the perspective of internal contention and competition between the three clusters to the longer history of the national parks movement from 1929. Internal friction and mutual disagreements formed a determining factor in the history of the national parks movement in England and Wales.

It must be noted at this point that this article deals with the history of the national parks movement in England and Wales only. The story of national parks is closely related to the movement in Scotland in the 1930s and 1940s: most scientific societies did not distinguish between their English and Scottish branches and the movements for national parks in both countries were closely entangled. In the end, however, the actors, interests (political and otherwise), approaches and definitions diverged too far, which is why the political history of the national parks movement in Scotland is largely a separate story. The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 only applied to England and Wales, with the exception of the clauses on nature reserves and the Nature Conservancy, which had a wider geographical range. National parks were not created in Scotland until 2002. The Scottish movement is only referred to in passing in this article.<sup>12</sup>

The article is organised chronologically and follows the history of the national parks movement, starting with its origins around 1929. The first two sections examine the political circumstances in 1929, the appointment of the Addison Committee, and the almost accidental core position of the CPRE. The third section moves beyond the first National Parks Report in 1931 and describes how the open-air associations took over the leading role in the national parks movement. They instigated the creation of the Standing Committee on National Parks in 1935 against the initial opposition of the CPRE. The aspects of open-air recreation and access to the countryside were crucial for the successful agenda-setting of national parks as a political issue at this stage. The fourth section focuses on the Second World War and particularly on the re-emergence of the scientific societies as a distinctive cluster with its own political strategy. The fifth and final section looks at the legislative process after the war. The Labour government and the national parks movement did not agree on the merits of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Bill. The final section of this article formulates a number of conclusions about the character of the national parks movement in England and Wales.

### **National parks in Great Britain: a side issue for rural planning and preservation**

The idea of 'national parks' emerged in public debates in the United Kingdom in the late 1920s. The concept originated from the United States, where large areas of allegedly 'wild', 'virgin' country were set aside 'for the benefit and enjoyment of the

people' since the 1870s. Yellowstone National Park served as a blueprint for the creation of National Parks in the Dominions of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand in the following decades. The concept's first application to existing game reserves in the colonised territories of Africa encouraged the formulation of a different kind of definition: 'national parks' serving the needs of natural science and the preservation of the wild flora and fauna. In densely populated countries in Europe, the concept was widely regarded as not relevant. The first National Parks in remote areas of Sweden (1909) and Switzerland (1914) carried the name, but were unlike the American model in purpose, landscape type, and park management.<sup>13</sup> The applicability of the concept of 'national parks' to the British context was questioned from the very start of the debate in the 1920s. The most prominent proponent of national parks in England and Wales was Charles Bathurst, Baron Bledisloe and Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture. Lord Bledisloe visited the National Parks in the United States and Canada in 1924 and was impressed by the combination of functions in these national parks: they were both sanctuaries for wild flora and fauna and holiday resorts for the population. He argued for the creation of national parks in Great Britain at a lecture for the Royal Society of Arts in 1925. Lacking a proper definition, he suggested in general terms that the parks should preserve extensive and relatively wild areas in their present state. Bledisloe suggested the Forest of Dean as the first national park in the British Isles.<sup>14</sup> He tried to gain political support for his plan, but neither the Office of Works, which was responsible for the protection of ancient buildings at the time, nor the Forestry Commission saw a reason for further action.<sup>15</sup>

Without a social movement supporting Bledisloe's idea, these talks remained highly non-committal. A 'national parks movement' started to evolve once the Council for the Preservation of Rural England (CPRE) took up the concept. The CPRE was formed in 1926 as an umbrella body for 22 civil society organisations, local and national interest groups. Among its constituent bodies were the Town Planning Institute, Royal Institute of British Architects, Land Agents' Society, County Councils' Association, National Trust, Automobile Association, and Cyclists' Touring Club. They shared the same concerns about the perceived loss of rural beauty as a result of the 'encroachment' of suburbanisation into the countryside, 'disorderly' ribbon development along roads, unsightly sheds and petrol stations in the landscape. Traditional agricultural land use was, according to the predominant view in the CPRE at this time, an indispensable part of what lent 'rural beauty' to the countryside. Farming, which was in crisis itself in the inter-war period, should be protected against urban and industrial development and could not constitute a problem to landscape or countryside, it was believed. Urban planners set the tone within the CPRE: the architect Guy Dawber was its first President. Patrick Abercrombie, Professor of Civic Design in Liverpool, served as Honorary Secretary and, after 1938, as President of the Council. Historiographical debates have concluded that the CPRE did not favour an anti-modern, nostalgic idea of countryside preservation, along the lines of the National Trust. The planners did not consider the forces of modernity as problematic in and of themselves; they contended that neither modernisation, industrialisation, nor the rise of motorised transport should be prevented, but rather managed and planned in a proper and orderly way. The preservation of the English countryside was, in their view, a matter of professional spatial planning.<sup>16</sup> The CPRE became the core organisation of the planning

and rural preservation cluster. Its actions in 1929 would be the founding acts of the national parks movement in England and Wales.

The CPRE initially expressed its interest in the national parks issue only in passing references to Lord Bledisloe's proposal or in geographer Vaughan Cornish's suggestion of a national park in the mountains of Snowdonia at the Council's annual general meeting of 1 March 1929.<sup>17</sup> The topic was put on the political agenda during the election campaign for the May 1929 general election. The leaders of the three major political parties pledged to 'advocate the preservation of our countryside' as an interest above political divisions.<sup>18</sup> Lord Bledisloe responded to these political opportunities by writing a letter to the *Times*. He suggested the Forest of Dean again as 'eminently suited' as a national park in England.<sup>19</sup>

When Herbert Griffin, Honorary Secretary of the CPRE, noticed Lord Bledisloe's letter in the *Times*, the Council was already involved in preparing a public memorandum. The memorandum intended to bring a wide range of issues to the attention of the broader public and of the new government: road construction, the location and design of electricity lines, ribbon development along roads, landscape disfigurement, the planning of new airfields, and the preservation of rural amenities.<sup>20</sup> National parks were not mentioned in the first versions of the text, but were in the final memorandum, which was released on 2 August 1929. Why did the CPRE decide to associate this new concept to its core business of spatial planning and preservation of the countryside? Archival documents show that financial considerations played a crucial role. The Council planned a lot of investments in its public campaigning for its memorandum and needed to show results in terms of output, public attention, political support, and financial benefits in the form of donations or subsidies. Lord Bledisloe was a member of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Trust charity. Herbert Griffin stated that it was important 'to sweeten him' with a view to future applications for a Carnegie grant. Therefore, it would be wise to insert 'some recommendations with regard to National Parks, in which he is interested', into the memorandum.<sup>21</sup>

David Lindsay, Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, at that time acting President of the CPRE, drafted a paragraph about national parks.<sup>22</sup> The CPRE memorandum was submitted to the Prime Minister on 2 August 1929 and brought to the attention of the press. Lord Crawford's following lines on the creation of national parks were included in this memorandum:

The proposal to establish National Parks is attracting much public attention, and the C.P.R. E. will be prepared to make recommendations, if so desired. At the present moment the C.P.R. E. confines itself to observing that the objectives are very varied and in some ways contradictory – recreation and repose, rambling, camping out, afforestation, nature study and the preservation of flora and fauna, being the principal aims.<sup>23</sup>

The demand for national parks was only one topic, and it was certainly not the most important one in the CPRE memorandum. It could be argued that this was purely coincidental: the CPRE had not paid much attention to the topic of national parks before, and apparently started to do so as a matter of financial expediency with a view to seeking funding from the Carnegie Trust. To the Council, national parks were a side issue to larger concerns about rural planning and the preservation of the countryside. Still, its 1929 action was of vital importance for the development of the national parks movement. The memorandum provided the first working definition for national parks in the United Kingdom and brought the topic to the attention of a larger audience and political leaders.

The CPRE became the natural core organisation for the developing national parks movement in the following years.

### **The Addison Committee 1929–1931**

The new Labour government was compelled to take some action on the national parks issue during its first months in office. James Ramsay MacDonald, the new Prime Minister, had expressed his support in principle for a national park in the Cairngorms in an interview published in January 1929, which made him the first addressee for pressure from the civil society.<sup>24</sup> George Lansbury, the new First Commissioner of Works, had to answer questions in the House of Commons on 24 July about this ‘project’ in the Scottish Highlands.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, the CPRE had directed its memorandum with its reference to national parks to the government on 2 August. When Lord Bledisloe approached MacDonald and Lansbury, the appointment of an inter-departmental National Park Committee was therefore quickly decided upon.<sup>26</sup> The formal appointment of the Committee, chaired by the former Minister of Health Christopher Addison, took place on 26 September 1929. Its terms of reference were ‘to consider and report if it is desirable and feasible to establish one or more National Parks in Great Britain with a view to the preservation of the natural characteristics, including flora and fauna, and to the improvement of recreational facilities for the people’.<sup>27</sup>

At that time, the concept of national parks had a familiar ring to it and a certain popular appeal in England and Wales, but it did not have a generally accepted definition. Even prior to its first meeting on 10 October, the National Park Committee identified this definition problem as its most pressing issue. National parks such as the ones existing in the United States or in Canada, were large, wild, and allegedly uninhabited, ‘virgin’ territories, and were not thought possible in the small and densely populated British Isles. But even in the more remote parts of Scotland or Wales, the three major objectives of national parks: flora and fauna, exceptional areas, and public recreation would be mutually incompatible: ‘if you organise camp sites you cannot have a bird sanctuary within reasonable distance’.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, Addison (correctly) anticipated that many local societies would contact his Committee to advocate the merits of their own respective regions as potential national parks. He feared his Committee would be ‘overwhelmed’ by the abundance of evidence based on such local considerations.<sup>29</sup>

Under these circumstances, Addison found himself ‘in a first-class mess’, as Lord Crawford later expressed.<sup>30</sup> Once he learned about the existence of the CPRE, however, he approached Lord Crawford and asked him to assist in arranging and combining the evidence.<sup>31</sup> In the meantime, a session dedicated to the topic of national parks had taken place at the CPRE Conference for the Preservation of the Countryside in Manchester. The Conference instructed Kenneth Spence to prepare and collate evidence, with special consideration to the Lake District.<sup>32</sup> On 24 October 1929, the CPRE agreed to assist the National Park Committee by providing a ‘Who’s Who’ for the various interests, and to coordinate evidence from these interested persons and organisations, so as to avoid overlaps or conflicting evidence. Lists of relevant societies were compiled for each of the three major aspects of national parks.<sup>33</sup>

The CPRE suggested that Addison first consult Professor Abercrombie and Vaughan Cornish. Abercrombie approached national parks as a feature of national planning, in



relation to the existing town planning legislation and the distribution of population, whereas Cornish presented a first selection of national parks, based on the different types of scenery.<sup>34</sup> For the selection of the 34 organisations and individuals who were eventually requested to submit written or oral evidence, it is important to note the considerable input provided by the CPRE.<sup>35</sup> In a perfect example of governance, the Council made an initial selection of the organisations involved, which would form the national parks movement in the next couple of years.

On behalf of the planning and rural preservation cluster of the future national parks movement, Sir Raymond Unwin, the CPRE, the Council for the Preservation of Rural Wales (CPRW), and the associations of local authorities submitted their evidence to the National Park Committee. They concurred with the view of the Town Planning Institute that national parks were merely 'an extended application of the principle of Regional Planning'.<sup>36</sup> This prioritisation of rural preservation by means of proper spatial planning over other objectives became a dominant feature in the national parks movement. On behalf of the open-air recreation interests, a number of rambling club federations, the Pedestrians' Association, the Fell and Rock Climbing Club, and the Commons, Open Spaces and Footpaths Preservation Society presented their evidence. For them, the questions of public recreation, reasonable regulations regarding rights of access, and creating a network of footpaths were the most prominent aspects of national parks.<sup>37</sup>

The second cluster of the national parks movement had its roots in the nature conservation movement. The Society for the Promotion of Nature Reserves (SPNR) served as the first linking pin organisation in this cluster of natural history and nature preservation societies. In its endeavour to protect a total of 273 natural areas across Great Britain, listed by its founder Charles Rothschild in 1915, the SPNR depended strongly upon its co-operation with the National Trust and lobby work with other organisations.<sup>38</sup> Another prominent actor in this field, the British Ecological Society (BES), expanded its scientific research on nature in the British Isles, focussing on aspects of the British landscape, vegetation, and freshwater ecology. The emerging discipline of ecology provided a scientific framework to understand nature conservation as the preservation of natural habitats.<sup>39</sup> It should be noted that this cluster still described its objectives for national parks and nature reserves as 'preservation' or 'protection of nature'. The concept 'nature conservation' was not in common use at this stage, because 'conservation', derived from the United States, was thought to relate to the wise use and sustainable long-term exploitation of natural resources only.<sup>40</sup> This aspect would become a point of debate with regards to the continuation of economic activities such as farming, quarrying and forestry in the national park areas in England and Wales. British ecologists played a central role in the popularisation of the term 'nature conservation' at the international level after 1945, when they claimed that ecological expertise was indispensable to develop solutions for the exploitation of natural resources.<sup>41</sup>

A nascent scientific and nature preservation cluster of organisations already existed prior to 1929, but this group had not yet taken up the cause for national parks. The CPRE established the first contacts between the Addison Committee and these 'Natural History people'.<sup>42</sup> On behalf of the cluster, the British Correlating Committee for the Protection of Nature presented its evidence to the National Park Committee on 4 December 1929. The British Correlating Committee included the most important scientific societies involved: the BES, the Geological Society of London, the British Ornithologists' Union, the

Entomological Society of London, the Linnean Society, the Society for the Preservation of the Fauna of the Empire (SPFE), the SPNR, and the Zoological Society of London. Peter Chalmers Mitchell, the chairman of the British Correlating Committee, thought it was impossible to reconcile the objectives of public recreation and preservation of fauna and flora in national park areas. For the latter, he advised establishing a system of nature reserves or sanctuaries, independent of the national parks proper.<sup>43</sup> The Report of the National Park Committee agreed that 'it might be appropriate to provide a small enclosure within the Forest [of Dean] for a Nature Sanctuary, with adequate measures of protection'.<sup>44</sup>

The work of the Addison Committee was initiated by Lord Bledisloe and Prime Minister MacDonald, before a proper working definition for 'national parks' in Great Britain was established. Since the CPRE could claim to have expertise about national parks based on the paragraph on the topic in its Memorandum to the government, the Council took the initiative and supplied the Addison Committee with information about the civil society organisations that it should approach. For the future development of the national parks movement, this had two significant consequences. First, the CPRE exerted a great deal of influence on the future understanding of national parks in England and Wales. The definition of the National Park Committee mentioned the following objectives for a National Park scheme:

- (I) To safeguard areas of exceptional national interest against (a) disorderly development, and (b) spoliation. (II) To improve the means of access for pedestrians to areas of natural beauty.
- (III) To promote measures for the protection of flora and fauna.<sup>45</sup>

Secondly, the societies and organisations contacted by the Addison Committee formed the nucleus of the national parks movement. They had contacted each other, formulated their own visions for national parks, and co-ordinated their evidence to the Committee. The very existence of the Addison Committee triggered the emergence of the national parks movement. The organisations and societies constituting the movement expressed their support for the Report of the National Park Committee when it was issued on 23 April 1931, and for government action to set up a system of national parks. However, the erupting economic crisis, budget cuts, and MacDonald's resignation as Prime Minister in August made any political or public action pointless. National parks ceased to be a political issue over the next few years. Successive governments proved unwilling to consider legislative action along the lines of the Addison Report. It was up to the societies and organisations in the national parks movement to re-establish their mutual contacts, re-define their common purpose, and plan their courses of action to put national parks back on the political agenda.

### **The national parks movement on a new footing: the open-air recreation cluster**

After 1931, the constituent organisations of the national parks movement did not maintain a consistent campaign for national parks. The CPRE and the other societies in the planning and rural preservation cluster were initially more interested in the new Town and Country Planning Act of 1932. The CPRE invested a lot of effort in preparing and evaluating this legislation, which allotted spatial planning powers in rural areas to local

authorities.<sup>46</sup> At a regional level, such as in the Lake District, the Council actively pushed for local authorities and central government bodies, such as the Forestry Commission, to take the necessary steps to preserve the characteristic landscape.<sup>47</sup> A co-ordinated campaign for national parks seemed less feasible for a long time.

However, there were a few political initiatives. The Conservative MP Sir John Withers formed the 'Parliamentary Amenities Group' in February 1933. This group intended to co-operate closely with the National Trust and the CPRE.<sup>48</sup> Its first action was to send a deputation to the Minister of Health and the Secretary of State for Scotland on 14 March 1933 to urge the government to set up advisory committees for the creation of national parks, following the recommendations of the National Park Committee.<sup>49</sup> The deputation, which was followed by questions in the House of Commons in February 1934, received a disappointing response from the Minister: he could 'not at the present time hold out any prospect of putting either of their recommendations into operation', for example via Exchequer grants. Even if it was financially possible, it was probably unnecessary with a view to the 'steady progress' of planning schemes under the Town and Country Planning Act. If local authorities did not consistently exercise their new powers to preserve the countryside and prevent disfigurement, then the responsibility fell to voluntary societies, such as the CPRE, to provide expert advice to local authorities and enlighten local public opinion.<sup>50</sup>

One reason for the national park movement's poor political leverage between 1932 and 1936 was its lack of co-ordination with its parliamentary wing. The timing of resolutions adopted by CPRE Conferences for the Preservation of the Countryside or by the Federations of Rambling Clubs did not coincide with questions in Parliament. In some cases, MPs and civil society organisations were not even aware that the other side was contemplating action directed at the Minister. Another reason, however, was the strong emphasis on planning. Since this was central to the national parks issue in the view of the planning and rural preservation cluster, it was relatively easy for the Ministry of Health to dismiss local problems as unfortunate incidents, with no indication that the planning system was not working as intended, and to defer the principal decision on national parks. For this to change, a balance shift within the national parks movement was required.

This change occurred as a result of actions of the third cluster, which consisted of bodies and associations concerned with open-air recreation and public access to land. Their primary concerns and demands, with the exception of the protection of common land, had been a side issue in the Report of the National Park Committee; the open-air associations' involvement in the national parks movement had been similarly minimal. Rambling, camping, cycling and various other forms of organised leisure became extremely popular in inter-war Britain. Voluntary societies associated with open-air pursuits, ranging from the Holiday Fellowship and the Clarion Cycling Club to the Co-operative Holidays Association, the Workers' Travel Association and the Youth Hostels Association boasted a huge membership base among younger working-class people in the industrial cities in the North of England.<sup>51</sup> Rambling inevitably came into conflict with the landed interests: landowners in the Peak District, Yorkshire and Scotland closed off their land to ramblers to prevent damage to their 'sporting interests': i.e. deer hunting and grouse shooting. The conflict between property rights and trespassing had a long history in the nineteenth century and was related to social issues such as land reform and large-scale clearances.<sup>52</sup>

The issue of access to the countryside became a politically contentious matter in the inter-war period. The leadership of the ramblers' organisations, the Labour party and the trade unions overlapped, especially in the north of England, whereas landowners' fears that a right of trespass was a first step towards Labour's old ideal of land nationalisation were usually articulated by Conservative MPs and peers.<sup>53</sup> The Communist-leaning British Workers' Sports Federation tried to instrumentalise the public campaign for access and organised the Kinder Scout mass trespass in the Peak District on 24 April 1932. This was condemned by the London-based National Council of Ramblers' Federations as a political action designed to fuel the class struggle. The Ramblers' Association, constituted in 1935 as a unitary national association, speaking on behalf of the rambling movement throughout the United Kingdom, took steps to bring the open-air associations back into the political mainstream, although access to the countryside remained an extremely politicised issue.<sup>54</sup>

The Ramblers' Association became the core organisation for the open-air recreation and access cluster in the national parks movement. For this cluster, the most important function of national parks was a means for members of the working classes to escape from unhealthy living environments in industrial cities. The emergence of the open-air recreation and access cluster caused a political shift within the national parks movement. The movement's original right-wing political affinity based on the preservation of the countryside, and the close association of the National Trust with large estate holders and aristocratic circles, were at odds with the 'access to the countryside' rallying call. The ramblers' federations of Manchester and Sheffield claimed that the National Trust and the CPRE were 'not militant enough', too friendly with the landowners, and 'too gentlemanly'.<sup>55</sup>

With access to land being an unresolved social issue, national parks gained a new urgency. The open-air recreation societies explicitly referred to 'the importance of National Parks to the health and education of the youth of the present and future generations'.<sup>56</sup> At a conference of 40 associations in Central Hall in Westminster on 30 November and 1 December 1935, the delegates decided to appoint a new Standing Committee on National Parks.<sup>57</sup> The CPRE was strongly opposed to the establishment of this new committee as an independent organisation. According to Honorary Secretary Griffin, the CPRE already provided the necessary 'machinery for collective action'. The CPRE had kept the matter on the political agenda, and it was generally recognised as 'the body dealing with the matter'. A new Standing Committee could therefore only be a 'dis-service' to the 'united front' for national parks.<sup>58</sup> Despite these doubts, Griffin accepted the appointment of the Standing Committee, chaired by Norman Birkett, which took over the core position in the national parks network. However, he managed to guarantee a strong CPRE influence over the new body and had it integrated in the organisational structures of the CPRE and CPRW. John Lloyd (for the CPRW) and Griffin himself became the Joint Honorary Secretaries of the Standing Committee.<sup>59</sup>

The conference in Central Hall took an explicitly political stance. The Standing Committee on National Parks received the task to "ginger up" the Government into setting up a central authority for national parks' without further delay, and that they should therefore send a deputation to Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin.<sup>60</sup> Sir John Withers promised to re-constitute the Parliamentary Amenities Group after the November 1935 general election, but advised against premature action by the open-air enthusiasts until

the national parks movement had more information about the government's intentions and had ensured 'a good backing' for its cause in the House of Commons first.<sup>61</sup>

The predominance of the recreation, health and fitness arguments in the ensuing parliamentary debates reflect the strong position of the open-air recreation and access to the countryside cluster at this stage. The Liberal MP Geoffrey Mander moved a resolution in the House of Commons and prepared the debate on 9 December 1936 about the Addison Report in close co-operation with the national parks movement.<sup>62</sup> Mander urged the government to 'take whatever steps may seem most appropriate in the light of the recommendations of the National Park Committee, 1931, to stimulate and develop action for the preservation of the countryside and its amenities'.<sup>63</sup> Besides the preservation of the wild flora and fauna and of the natural characteristics of the land, recreational facilities in the interests of millions of people living in the cities formed one of the main purposes of national parks.<sup>64</sup> Mander explicitly mentioned the government's planned 'crusade in the matter of public health': the state massively expanded its involvement in the sports sector in the 1930s.<sup>65</sup> In the years 1937 and 1938, the so-called National Fitness Campaign was a state-sponsored public campaign intended to promote the voluntary improvement of physical fitness and restore degenerated national health.<sup>66</sup> The creation of national parks was obviously connected to this commitment to fitness and exercise.

In the Commons debate on 9 December 1936, both Labour and Conservative MPs expressed their disappointment about the government's inaction, although they disagreed about the balance between a statutory right of access to the countryside and preservation of rural beauties by benevolent landowners.<sup>67</sup> Through Mander's mediation, R.S. Hudson, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health, agreed to receive a deputation of the Standing Committee on National Parks on 15 March 1937.<sup>68</sup> The discussion with the Parliamentary Secretary proceeded quite disappointingly for the representatives of the national parks movement. Hudson offered to look into individual issues around the lack of planning co-ordination, for example in the Lake District, but he refused to consider a major overhaul of the existing town planning system or call for a 'different or additional machinery', as planning by local authorities was sufficiently effective in the majority of areas. In the meantime, 'much could be done by voluntary associations if they got together and endeavoured to educate public opinion and public taste'.<sup>69</sup> In the Ministry of Health, it was acknowledged internally that some kind of 'gesture' would be necessary at some point 'given to the large body of opinion in favour of definite action for the preservation of the countryside'.<sup>70</sup> When Chancellor of the Exchequer Neville Chamberlain received a deputation of the Parliamentary Amenities Group on 14 April 1937, he indicated that the National Trust or the CPRE might apply for Exchequer grants for the acquisition of selected areas.<sup>71</sup> A major overhaul of existing planning arrangements in the national park areas was, however, rejected.

Faced with the continued lack of committed interest by the government, the Standing Committee on National Parks launched a consistent campaign. Its affiliated organisations were requested to send resolutions to the Ministry of Health, urging the government to pursue action with regards to national parks and showing them 'the weight of public opinion behind the movement'.<sup>72</sup> Answering a question in the House of Commons, Minister of Health Sir Kingsley Wood confirmed on 4 November 1937 that at that point, 41 organisations had submitted such resolutions.<sup>73</sup> The following actions of the Standing

Committee were supported by a £600 gift from the Carnegie Trust.<sup>74</sup> A private deputation to the Minister of Health, a publicity campaign, 'infiltration' via private discussions with government members, briefings of interested MPs and a debate in the House of Lords should prepare the government and the political atmosphere for the final action in the campaign: a deputation to the Prime Minister, after which he would agree to introduce a Government Bill for National Parks.<sup>75</sup> Other ideas included press conferences, questions by MPs, radio talks, and even a film, for which the title *Battle for Beauty* was selected. The actions should be taken in a strict pre-arranged sequence, to make sure that the initiative would not go 'into the waste-paper-basket or pigeon-hole and be forgotten'.<sup>76</sup> No fewer than 40,000 copies were printed of John Dower's pamphlet *The Case for National Parks in Great Britain* in 1938. In this pamphlet, Dower defined a National Park as

an extensive district of beautiful wilder landscape, strictly preserved in its natural aspect and kept or made widely accessible for public enjoyment and open-air recreation, including particularly cross-country walking, while continued in its traditional farming use.<sup>77</sup>

The national parks movement did not hesitate to pull the political card, using national parks as an explicit 'vote catching move'.<sup>78</sup> When Griffin discussed with the Conservative MP Sir Alfred Bossom how best to get members of the House of Commons involved, he insisted that 'in the north at any rate' the National Parks question would 'bring candidates thousands of votes at the next election whatever party they belong to'.<sup>79</sup>

As the national parks movement intensified its public activity in 1937, invigorated by the open-air recreation and access to the countryside cluster, it proved difficult to reconcile the various interest groups within the movement. The Scottish movement stepped out of line because of John Dower's public memorandum *The Case for National Parks in Great Britain*. The Association for the Preservation of Rural Scotland insisted on checking and verifying the text sections referring to Scotland and was profoundly unhappy about the suggested selection of Scottish National Park areas.<sup>80</sup>

A different and more significant type of opposition was offered by the second cluster of the national parks movement: the natural history and scientific societies. G.F. Herbert Smith, Honorary Secretary of the SPNR, raised the concern that nature reserves and 'the flora and fauna aspect of National Parks' had all but vanished from Dower's definition and from the national parks campaign.<sup>81</sup> Herbert Smith and Lord Richard Onslow, President of the SPNR, therefore convened a conference of the scientific and nature preservation cluster on 23 November 1937, to consider the question of national parks in relation to the preservation of fauna and flora.<sup>82</sup> Lord Crawford tried to solve the apparent misunderstanding and prevent independent action by the scientific societies. He assured them 'that the intention of the C.P.R.E. as a whole is to give loyal and continuous support to those of their Constituent and Affiliated organisations interested in the protection of flora and fauna'.<sup>83</sup> In their resolutions at the conference, the delegates of scientific societies distinguished 'national parks' from the smaller 'nature reserves'. Some of these nature reserves, created for the purpose of 'the preservation of the indigenous fauna and flora in their natural state', would be located in National Park areas, but most would not. The general public's access to nature reserves should be restricted. The scientific societies called for the constitution of a separate standing committee to guard the interests of nature preservation.<sup>84</sup> Their cluster did not separate from the national parks movement in 1937, but the resolutions presented a fundamental issue for the movement: it was no

longer possible to keep all clusters on board without addressing the incompatible objectives of nature preservation and recreation for the public, or without inserting provisions for nature reserves in its future approach to national parks.

The meticulously prepared public campaign for national parks was first interrupted in March 1938: since 'the German problem' absorbed the attention of Parliament and of the public at large, it would be preferable to postpone the action for a few weeks.<sup>85</sup> The international situation did, however, not improve over the next months and years. Since the rearmament programme had the highest political priority, the government would oppose any Private Members' Bill affecting state expenditure.<sup>86</sup> Under these circumstances, the CPRE and the Parliamentary Amenities Group decided to postpone the consideration of a draft National Parks Bill. The outbreak of the Second World War prevented the introduction of this Bill in Parliament.<sup>87</sup> Only the open-air recreation cluster continued its agitation for a new Access to Mountains Bill. This Bill received Royal Assent in 1939, but its stipulations had been 'watered down' in Committee to such an extent that the Ramblers' Association rallied against the Act.<sup>88</sup> At the time, no constituent cluster of the national parks movement could foresee that the Second World War proved a 'window of opportunity' for their cause in England and Wales.<sup>89</sup>

### The national parks movement during the Second World War

The enhanced popular appeal and renewed vigour of the national parks movement in England and Wales while there was a war going on seem rather counter-intuitive. Many prominent members of the national park lobby were involved in positions related to the war effort, and many natural areas were destroyed as a result of intensified agricultural use and the construction of military facilities during the war.<sup>90</sup> The successes of the national parks movement during and immediately after the war becomes understandable in the light of two interrelated socio-cultural aspects.

The first of these is the sense of a moral obligation towards the soldiers sent abroad. After fighting over five or six years to defend and preserve their country, they should not return and find its countryside utterly destroyed, scattered with ugly buildings, or inaccessible. The traditional English countryside acquired a new value during the war as 'a place worth fighting for' and even a 'land fit for heroes'.<sup>91</sup> Wartime propaganda recognised the 'clear picture of a better world which lies ahead', a better Britain after the war, as a 'vital incentive to the war effort'.<sup>92</sup> The debates in the House of Lords reveal a sense of inter-generational obligation. The preservation of the beauties of England and, consequently, the question of national parks, was an urgent issue, to be solved 'in time, before our sons come back from the war'.<sup>93</sup>

The second aspect was the immense prestige of planning during and directly after the war. The plan economy of the Soviet Union and the thoroughly planned British war effort had emerged from the war victoriously in 1945. Social, economic, and spatial planning contained the promise to build a new and better Britain.<sup>94</sup> War-time destruction in itself provided new opportunities for town planners. 'Hitler with his bombing' had finally created the 'wonderful chance to get rid of slums and overcrowding'.<sup>95</sup> Patrick Abercrombie, the highly influential urban planner who was also a leading member of the planning cluster of the national parks movement, was involved in the far-reaching plans for reconstructing bombed cities, for example for Plymouth in 1943.<sup>96</sup> The creation

of 'some central planning authority' and reconstruction on the basis of 'a scientifically prepared plan'<sup>97</sup> should guarantee that the cities were rebuilt as modern garden cities, according to a new, modernist layout and the requirements of modern traffic, with due consideration for recreation, public health, fresh air and green spaces for the urban population. National parks formed part of this vision for the post-war world.

The national parks movement's main contact with the government were the consecutive planning ministers: from Lord John Reith, Minister of Works and Buildings, and his successor, Lord Wyndham Portal, via Sir William Jowitt, Paymaster General and chairman of a committee on Post-war Reconstruction, to William Morrison, who became the first Minister of Town and Country Planning in March 1943.<sup>98</sup> This was perfectly in line with the pre-war strategy of the national parks movement. The planning and rural preservation cluster considered land use planning and development control as the most important aspects of the national parks issue. Even during the war, this seemed the best possible strategy with a view to the predominant discourse about planning and reconstruction and the new responsibilities of the planning ministers. Lord Reith appointed the Committee on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas in October 1941, chaired by Lord Justice Leslie Scott, with the terms of reference to consider the preservation of rural amenities, among others. The Scott Committee invited the Standing Committee on National Parks to submit evidence and concluded that the establishment of National Parks was 'long overdue'.<sup>99</sup> The main purpose of these Parks would be public recreation, although the facility of access to the countryside should not impede traditional agricultural land use in National Park areas.<sup>100</sup>

Lord Portal, Minister of Works and Planning, appointed John Dower in July 1942 as a temporary civil servant with the instructions to prepare a report on National Parks in England and Wales. Based on Dower's personal survey of areas, the report should provide a list of potential future National Parks and a first outline of the post-war management and administration of these areas. The final Report *National Parks in England and Wales* selected nine areas as possible National Parks.<sup>101</sup> In order to cover all necessary information about these areas, Dower used his existing network of contacts in the pre-war national parks movement and information received from local natural history societies.<sup>102</sup>

Parallel to these initiatives under supervision of the Ministry, the scientific and nature preservation cluster provided a significant additional impetus for the national parks cause.<sup>103</sup> The SPNR and the BES followed diverging approaches and strategies during the Second World War. Lord Onslow and Herbert Smith, President and Honorary Secretary of the SPNR, convoked 30 scientific societies interested in the preservation of flora and fauna in a first meeting in June 1941. The purpose of this so-called Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-war Reconstruction was to encourage and advise the government on the reservation of 'suitable sanctuaries for the preservation of the fauna and flora of Great Britain': nature reserves as part of a general system of national planning.<sup>104</sup>

The Paymaster General, Sir William Jowitt, received a deputation from this new body on 4 May 1942. He requested that the Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-war Reconstruction set up its own committee to prepare practical suggestions for the post-war arrangements of nature preservation. The Conference agreed and appointed a Nature Reserves Investigation Committee (NRIC) with the terms of reference 'to examine proposals for the establishment of nature reserves as part of any general scheme of national planning'.<sup>105</sup> The NRIC produced several memoranda in the next few years, addressing the



need for national parks, nature reserves and conservation areas from the perspective of nature preservation, with criteria and lists of suitable areas for each of these categories. The survey and selection work of the NRIC, supported by a large number of local and regional naturalist societies, formed an important contribution to the future post-war work of the various national park and nature conservation committees.<sup>106</sup>

The BES emerged as the other main actor within the scientific and nature preservation cluster during the war. The BES was involved in efforts to create a Biology War Committee at the start of the war and promoted the potential contribution of ecologists to the war effort in a number of ways, such as applied research on agricultural methods and experimenting with rodent control.<sup>107</sup> Members of the Society contributed significantly to the war-time work of the Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-war Reconstruction and the NRIC.<sup>108</sup> In May 1942, however, the Council of the BES noted the Society was itself in the best position to collect and analyse scientific data and to compile a correct list of nature reserves. A new Committee on Nature Reserves was appointed, chaired by the prominent botanist and ecologist Arthur Tansley. This Committee's terms of reference were later extended to consider and report on the whole question of the conservation of nature in Britain with special reference to plant and animal species and communities, and to draw up a list of areas that should, on ecological grounds, be kept as National Nature Reserves.<sup>109</sup> The Council of the Society approved the Committee Report 'Nature Conservation and Nature Reserves', largely drafted by Tansley himself, in October 1943. The list of proposed reserves was forwarded to the NRIC, but the BES also had the report published in its *Journal of Ecology*. In addition, Tansley published his own book *Our Heritage of Wild Nature* in 1945.<sup>110</sup>

The NRIC memoranda, the BES report, and Tansley's book all differed slightly in their terminology and, more significantly, in their political strategies, but they strongly concurred with regards to their conclusions about the proper system of nature conservation in England and Wales. They distinguished between national parks for the purposes of recreation, public enjoyment, and the preservation of rural beauty, on the one hand, and 'national nature reserves' for nature conservation and scientific research, on the other. The national nature reserves were intended to 'ensure the survival of all the main natural and seminatural communities of plants and animals for the purpose of serious study'.<sup>111</sup> The reserves, some of which could be located within national parks, should be carefully managed by a special National Reserves Authority according to ecological expertise, to the possible exclusion of other objectives and interests, such as public recreation.<sup>112</sup> This strict distinction between national park and nature reserve areas by these war-time committees was at the basis of the 'great divide' in the British nature conservation system established after 1949.<sup>113</sup>

In strategic terms, the BES report deviated significantly from the main political strategy of the national parks movement and its scientific and nature preservation cluster. The NRIC placed its proposals for a system of national nature reserves in the existing framework of national parks. Its envisaged National Reserves Authority would be an advisory body to the National Parks Authority, and the different planning ministers remained the primary addressees for the NRIC memoranda. The BES, however, put scientific interests at the forefront of its plans as the main legitimisation for nature conservation, while nature conservation was presented as a prerequisite for ecological research. In the BES's view, the statutory National Wild

Life Service should designate the nature reserves on a strictly scientific basis, and independently manage these areas as 'outdoor laboratories' for longitudinal ecological research and scientific experiments. Biologists and ecologists would be ultimately responsible for the system of nature conservation in the United Kingdom, with the possibility to provide scientific advice about wild life protection, the proper location and ecologically sound management of both national parks and national nature reserves.<sup>114</sup> With these proposals, the BES went beyond the original political scope of the national parks movement and made its own concern, nature reserves, an issue for post-war scientific policy.

The core organisations of the national parks movement, the CPRE and the Standing Committee on National Parks, viewed this independent action with concern. Sir Lawrence Chubb attended the first meeting of the Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-war Reconstruction on behalf of the CPRE and 'strongly urged that no statement should be submitted to Lord Reith's department unless it carried the support of the C.P.R.E. and of the Standing Committee on National Parks', since the 'Standing Committee was in existence and was a fully representative body'.<sup>115</sup> This, however, was exactly what the scientific societies would do. While still operating within the national park movement, the scientific societies put forward their own special objectives and explicitly dissociated themselves from 'the other—the recreational and aesthetic—aspect' of national parks.<sup>116</sup>

This internal disagreement was particularly inconvenient in direct contact with planning ministers and leading civil servants. For example, when Lord Reith received a deputation of the Standing Committee on National Parks and the Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-war Reconstruction on 6 January 1942, Patrick Abercrombie loyally mentioned the three main uses for National Parks: the preservation of agriculture, recreation for the public, and the preservation of wild life. In the very same meeting, however, Herbert Smith presented National Parks and Nature Reserves as two very different kinds of areas. The purposes of amenity and recreation were incompatible to those of nature preservation and natural history, although 'a satisfactory compromise' would be possible in 'actual practice'.<sup>117</sup> Even George Pepler, Chief Technical Adviser in the Ministry of Works and Buildings, complained that the Standing Committee on National Parks claimed to speak on behalf of all its constituent bodies, but that did not stop these bodies from submitting their own memoranda and requests for deputations, rather than working through the Standing Committee.<sup>118</sup>

Even without considering the very real risk of sending contradictory messages, the disagreement about the management of future national parks and nature reserves was profound between the scientific and nature preservation cluster, on the one hand, and the Standing Committee, the Ministry of Works and Buildings, and John Dower, on the other. When the Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-war Reconstruction acknowledged the responsibility of local County Councils for spatial planning in national park areas, the Standing Committee on National Parks and the CPRE accused the preservationists of departing from the recommendations of the Addison Report and therefore from the common goals of the national parks movement.<sup>119</sup> Dower was, moreover, very sceptical about the prospects of the NRIC and BES proposals for an independent National Reserves Authority that had extensive powers to designate and manage nature reserves, and to purchase and close these areas for the exclusive purpose of scientific research. According to Dower, the NRIC Report 'bids very high on an unseen hand'.<sup>120</sup>

Independently of the plans' actual merits, it was unclear which financial provisions Treasury and Cabinet would agree to after the war.

The Dower Report in May 1945, at the end of the Second World War, provided a last opportunity to reconcile the different clusters in the national parks movement. Its publication was delayed by extended discussions with the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries and disagreements about the Report's status. It would be Dower's personal document to the Minister and would not commit the government in any way for its post-war policy.<sup>121</sup> Dower defined a national park in the context of Great Britain as

an extensive area of beautiful and relatively wild country in which, for the nation's benefit and by appropriate national decision and action, (a) the characteristic landscape beauty is strictly preserved, (b) access and facilities for public open-air enjoyment are amply provided, (c) wild life and buildings and places of architectural and historical interest are suitably protected, while (d) established farming use is effectively maintained.<sup>122</sup>

This definition reflects the open-air recreation interests and the ideas of the planning and rural preservation cluster: for example the idea that 'established farming use' should be maintained in national park areas. Dower did not foresee the possibility that modern developments in the agricultural sector could endanger the 'characteristic landscape beauty' in future decades. The aspects of scientific interests and wild life conservation were alluded to only marginally in the Report, in a separate section about Nature Reserves. Dower considered wild life conservation as a part of his proposed National Parks policy, and the planned National Parks authority as responsible for managing the Nature Reserves, albeit after considering expert guidance.<sup>123</sup> The core organisations of the scientific and nature preservation cluster had prepared an alternative scheme during the war, which proposed the creation and management of nature reserves on a strictly scientific basis. This cluster continued to adhere to the common goal of national parks during the war, but after 1945, they would opt out of the movement and pursue their own strategies.

### **National parks and nature reserves: the path to the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949**

Even before the cessation of hostilities, the government felt compelled to prepare its future policies with regards to national parks. Geoffrey Mander MP, who was affiliated to the national parks movement, increased this pressure by regular questions about the government plans and was not satisfied by answers that the Dower Report would be published 'shortly'.<sup>124</sup> The Ministry of Town and Country Planning prepared the appointment of a new National Parks Committee, while discussing its constitution and terms of reference with Dower. The Committee, chaired by Sir Arthur Hobhouse, was appointed in July 1945.<sup>125</sup> Among its members were prominent representatives of the national parks movement. E.N. Buxton, Lord Chorley, Julian Huxley, Clough Williams-Ellis, and John Dower had already been members of the Standing Committee on National Parks.<sup>126</sup> Their terms of reference were virtually the same as those of the Addison Committee: to 'consider and report' on the proposals made in the Dower Report as to the selected areas for National Parks and additional measures necessary to secure the objects of National Parks.<sup>127</sup> Representatives of the national parks movement criticised the idea that the

Hobhouse Committee should rehearse the work already done by Dower during the war. Norman Birkett thought this was 'simply procrastination run mad'.<sup>128</sup>

In contrast to the previous committees and reports, however, it was decided to ask Hobhouse to immediately set up a separate subcommittee 'to advise on all "flora and fauna" aspects of National Parks, and, in particular, on proposals for National Nature Reserves'.<sup>129</sup> Chaired by the biologist Julian Huxley, members included a number of prominent ecologists and naturalists: Arthur Tansley, Cyril Diver, Charles Elton, E.N. Buxton, and Max Nicholson. The strong representation of BES members in this Wild Life Conservation Special Committee guaranteed that the reports produced by the scientific and nature preservation cluster during the war would be taken into account for the nature conservation aspect of the future National Parks and National Nature Reserves system.<sup>130</sup> The SPNR and the NRIC were pointedly ignored in the preparation and constitution of this new Committee, since the civil servants at the Ministry of Town and Country Planning and the members of the Huxley Committee had a rather low opinion about the scientific quality of the survey reports prepared by the NRIC sub-committees during the war. Herbert Smith's request that an NRIC representative be appointed to the Wild Life Conservation Special Committee was rejected accordingly.<sup>131</sup>

The landslide general election in July 1945 radically re-set the political context in which the national parks movement operated. The new Attlee government took office with the promise to rebuild a 'better Britain' after the war.<sup>132</sup> The historiographical debate about the merits of its post-war legislation has mostly focussed on the large range of social security measures, the establishment of the modern welfare state, or the successes of its housing programmes or the new National Health Service. Concerning spatial planning policies, the New Towns Act (1946), Town and Country Planning Act (1947), and National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act (1949) were the most significant new Acts under the Minister of Town and Country Planning.<sup>133</sup> These post-war developments were not an exclusively Labour affair. The experiences of the world economic crisis of the 1930s, widely regarded as the demise of *laissez-faire* liberalism, and the success of the state-controlled war economy, set the stage for a new political culture in favour of more state intervention and government control over economic enterprise. The Conservative party shared and supported this common discourse with regards to planning and social policies. Most post-war innovations were in fact long overdue, prepared by Conservative governments before 1945 and passed with Conservative support in Parliament.<sup>134</sup>

Relevant for the national parks movement, the new Labour government provided the best possible political conditions for national parks legislation. Labour MPs were traditionally strongly in favour of the long-term goal of land nationalisation and sensitive to the question of access to the countryside.<sup>135</sup> Herbert Morrison, the new Lord President of the Council, Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lewis Silkin, Minister of Town and Country Planning, had personal backgrounds in the ramblers' movement.<sup>136</sup> Silkin received a deputation from the Ramblers' Association on 12 December 1945. He expressed his sympathy for the organisation and their goals. His statement that he shared their strongly negative opinion about the Access to Mountains Act caused a stir among the landed interest groups.<sup>137</sup> A Footpaths and Access Special Committee was appointed in July 1946 as a sub-committee to the Hobhouse Committee, in which the open-air recreation cluster of the national parks movement was strongly represented.<sup>138</sup> The open-

air associations continued to exert direct pressure on Silkin and on Labour MPs, explicitly stating that if Labour wished to win the next election, the government should address the concerns of its voters in the North of England and amend the Access to Mountains legislation.<sup>139</sup>

The technical questions about which authority should designate and manage Nature Reserves, and how these areas should relate to the proposed National Parks Authority had been a point of disagreement between the scientific and nature preservation cluster and the other constituent parts of the national parks movement during the Second World War. The first meetings of the Wild Life Conservation Special Committee considered these problems, especially in light of the NRIC and BES recommendations of an independent Wild Life Conservation Authority to manage Nature Reserves according to scientific criteria. It seemed still necessary at the first stage to continue thinking Nature Reserves in the context of National Parks, land use planning and rural preservation. Huxley also pointed out that the purpose of wild life conservation was probably most effectively achieved 'if it is linked with the popular movement for National Parks'.<sup>140</sup> The Committee initially operated under the assumption that its objectives depended on the cause of National Parks.

Two natural scientists in influential positions had a decisive influence on the change of opinion of the Huxley Committee. The entomologist John Fryer was Secretary of the Agricultural Research Council, whereas the ornithologist Max Nicholson, a member of the Huxley Committee, was employed at the Office of the Lord President of the Council. The Lord President Herbert Morrison, a senior member of Cabinet, was responsible for scientific policy at that time. Fryer drafted a first proposal on 'Nature conservation and research on the British terrestrial flora and fauna' in September 1945, on behalf of the Scientific Advisory Committee, another scientific body under the Lord President.<sup>141</sup> The Huxley Committee rejected this first official proposal for a separate Biological Service in November, citing 'some procedural difficulty': Huxley had to report to the Minister of Town and Country Planning and co-ordinate his recommendations with the Hobhouse Committee.<sup>142</sup> The BES, Linnean Society, NRIC, and SPNR exerted additional pressure with their evidence to the Committee in January and February 1946. They recommended the creation of a Wild Life Conservation Council with full responsibility for the management of Nature Reserves, detached from the National Parks system.<sup>143</sup> Under the influence of further deliberations and meetings with the Scientific Advisory Committee, a change of position can be discerned in the documents of the Wild Life Conservation Special Committee over the next weeks and months.<sup>144</sup> The Report of the latter Committee in 1947 endorsed the proposal for a new Biological Service.<sup>145</sup>

The recommendation of the Huxley Committee still needed significant outside and political support, though. The National Parks Committee, with John Dower as the most outspoken representative of the national parks movement, was highly critical of the defection of the scientific and nature preservation cluster.<sup>146</sup> For the adoption of the proposals for National Nature Reserves and a Biological Service at the political level, however, the overlapping memberships of leading ecologists in influential positions proved exceedingly effective. Once an agreement with the Huxley Committee had been reached, John Fryer drafted a report on 'The need for a National Biological Policy' on behalf of the Scientific Advisory Committee, in which he explicitly framed nature preservation as a scientific issue. In a next step, Nicholson

assessed Fryer's report positively and submitted it to Herbert Morrison, the Lord President of the Council, in July 1946.<sup>147</sup> When the Huxley Report, unsurprisingly, also recommended the creation of a Biological Research Council and Nature Conservation Board, Morrison presented these suggestions in a Cabinet Committee in April 1948 as unanimous scientific opinion.<sup>148</sup> Ensuing inter-departmental debates sought to clarify the new research council's exact status and position. One option was, for example, to establish it as a subsidiary body to the Agricultural Research Council.<sup>149</sup>

The creation of the new Nature Conservancy was a resounding success for the second cluster of the national parks movement: the scientific and nature preservation societies. By a separate Royal Charter on 4 March 1949, the new state agency received immense powers to provide scientific advice on the conservation and control of the national flora and fauna of Great Britain; to establish, maintain and manage nature reserves in Great Britain, including the maintenance of physical features of scientific interest; and to organise and develop research and scientific services related thereto.<sup>150</sup> The national nature reserves were covered in a separate section of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, which also applied to Scotland. Because these nature reserves would cover only 70,000 acres and financial expenses were limited to £500,000 per year, Parliament did not pay a lot of political attention to these aspects of the Act.<sup>151</sup> Tansley became the first chairman of the Nature Conservancy. Cyril Diver was its first director-general until Nicholson succeeded him in that position in 1952. The agency employed a large number of ecologists to conduct field research and manage National Nature Reserves throughout the United Kingdom.

Within the scientific and nature preservation cluster, the SPNR and the local natural history societies were excluded from the new arrangements after 1949. The appreciative mention of the NRIC in the Report of the Huxley Committee was the most tangible result of their efforts.<sup>152</sup> Nicholson and the SPNR co-operated in 1957 to establish the new Council for Nature as an umbrella organisation for the voluntary associations and natural history societies.<sup>153</sup> The Council for Nature was eventually merged into the current Wildlife and Countryside Link.

In order to resume this narrative for the other clusters of the national parks movement: the Report of the Hobhouse Committee was published in July 1947. Its recommendations proved very controversial with regards to the interests and objectives of the second cluster: open-air recreation and access to the countryside.<sup>154</sup> For them and for many Labour MPs from the North, this was the most important aspect of the anticipated National Parks and Access to the Countryside Bill. When Silkin introduced the Bill in Parliament, he called it a 'people's charter' because it effectively guaranteed rights of access to uncultivated land and was an effective way to promote happiness for working-class families.<sup>155</sup> Landowners and farmers opposed a statutory access to the countryside for the opposite reason. Conservative MPs and peers vividly painted the dangers of thousands of city-dwellers 'sprawling all over the place' in newly designated National Park areas.<sup>156</sup> Unfamiliar with the ways of the land, they would 'leave gates open, take uncontrolled dogs with them, break walls and hedges, or tread down grass and arable crops'.<sup>157</sup> Many provisions of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act proved difficult to implement after 1949. Local authorities had, for example, only five years to codify existing rights of way and to negotiate access agreements with landowners, but

they did not have many options in daily practice and even less financial means to realise the ramblers' dreams of unfettered access.<sup>158</sup>

Hobhouse's expectation, expressed on 2 April 1946, that a National Park policy should expect an 'easy passage', which was merely complicated by 'the contentious problem of Access for the country as a whole', was refuted by subsequent events.<sup>159</sup> The technical administrative and management arrangements of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Bill proved much more difficult than the access question. In the preparatory stage, before the National Parks Bill was introduced, the Ministry of Town and Country Planning had to reach a compromise between the expectations of the national parks movement and the limitations set by other government departments. The Hobhouse Committee had adopted the ideas of the planning and rural preservation cluster, the first cluster around the CPRE and the Standing Committee on National Parks, regarding an independent National Parks Commission. This Commission was intended to designate the National Parks and have large financial means. Since National Parks were a work of 'national importance', the Commission should have direct planning powers in the National Park areas for the provision of new parkways, direction signs or camping spots, with the right to overrule local councils.<sup>160</sup>

This was a viable solution from the perspective of an active National Park planning in the interests of outdoor recreation and preservation of local amenities and beauty spots. Many local planning authorities in National Park areas did not have the necessary technical expertise or financial means to cover expenses for recreational facilities for visitors from other parts of the country, or for compensation to landowners in the case of compulsory acquisition or the denial of development rights. Grants from the national government could not solve this dilemma: on the one hand, the Treasury was opposed to grants from the national government for tasks that were explicitly reserved for local authority powers. On the other, if the national government provided grants for provisions in National Parks, should not the government or the National Parks Authority have a direct say in the management of the Parks? A system of central control and management of National Parks, which the Hobhouse Committee and the planning cluster of the national parks movement advocated, would contradict the new Town and Country Planning Act of 1947, which had allotted responsibilities for spatial planning, building and development to local authorities.<sup>161</sup> The Standing Committee on National Parks submitted a new memorandum to the Ministry in September 1947, which reiterated the suggestion to create a powerful National Parks Commission, with the authority to act independently of the Minister and overrule local planning authorities in national park areas. According to internal notes in the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, these proposals were 'preposterous' and expressed a 'complete lack of sense of proportion' regarding the working of local government.<sup>162</sup>

It should be noted at this point that the Ministry of Town and Country Planning was a relatively new department, which had yet had to gain its position in the government machinery. Silkin was not a member of Cabinet and therefore had insufficient political leverage.<sup>163</sup> After inter-departmental consultations and a decision at Cabinet level in 1948, he therefore had to backtrack, revise his National Parks and Access to the Countryside Bill, and bring it more into line with the Town and Country Planning Act. The planning machinery in the National Park areas would be left to the local authorities.<sup>164</sup> As Parliamentary Secretary Evelyn Mansfield King put it later in the House

of Commons, it would not be 'good administration to allow the powers which as recently as July last were conferred upon local planning authorities to be taken away from them on April Fools' Day of the following year'.<sup>165</sup> Where National Parks exceeded local council boundaries and local ratepayers' and business interests, local authorities got the option, but not the obligation, to institute joint planning boards, employ a trained planner, or seek expert advice for matters of common interest for the national parks.<sup>166</sup>

Silkin informed the national parks movement of this change of position himself. He explained to a deputation of the Standing Committee on National Parks on 3 December 1947 that the National Parks Commission would have a purely advisory role in planning, and that National Park areas would be adequately safeguarded under the Town and Country Planning Act.<sup>167</sup> The Standing Committee was 'much perturbed' at Silkin's 'apparent unwillingness to accept the recommendations of the Hobhouse Committee'.<sup>168</sup> The national parks movement responded with increased activity in 1948 and 1949, with more letters to the Minister and to the editor of the *Times*. All of these concentrated on the issue of national parks as a necessarily national concern that should not be left to the whims of local authorities.<sup>169</sup>

The years of 1948 and 1949 saw a co-ordinated resistance of the national parks movement *against* the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act. Compared to the large-scale campaign to put national parks on the political agenda before the Second World War, its agitation against details of the eventual legislation seem a peculiar way to celebrate the success of its long-standing lobby work. Henry Symonds even suggested that for the long-term benefit of National Parks, it was probably best that the Minister withdraw the Bill in its present form altogether.<sup>170</sup> The Standing Committee on National Parks distributed memoranda and aide-memoires to MPs and peers, and tried to co-ordinate debates and amendments in Parliament.<sup>171</sup> One problem was that in both Houses of Parliament, the national parks movement found most support for its criticism among Conservative members, whereas Labour MPs were supposed to follow the government whip and not vote against provisions of the government Bill.<sup>172</sup> The Act received Royal Assent on 16 December 1949.

## Conclusion

A large portion of the historiography on national parks in England and Wales in the first decades after 1949 is dedicated to the question what went wrong. The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act was presented as a people's charter, but it severely disappointed the high expectations of the actors and constituent bodies of the national parks movement. Most critical studies of the National Parks system in England and Wales concentrate their attention either on the legislative process in the years 1945–1949, or on implementation measures in the early 1950s.<sup>173</sup> Another significant angle of the historiography is the political one: the National Parks Act was passed under a Labour government, but Conservative Ministers were responsible for implementing the legislation. Although it should be noted that these successive Ministers did loyally create National Parks in England and Wales from 1951, their commitment to the cause of national parks and their willingness to heed the comments and appeals from the national parks movement was obviously different. These studies on the history of National Parks focus on the merits of the legislation itself, financial constraints and possible flaws and conflicts in the



political process and the legislation. Beyond this interpretation of the history of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, however, the above article directs the attention to another side of this story: the history of the national parks movement as a social movement from below.

In order to understand the disappointment with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, it is important to note that the national parks movement actually consisted of multiple constituent bodies with very different approaches, perceptions, and expectations of what national parks should achieve. When Macmillan received a deputation from the Standing Committee on National Parks in 1952, an irreconcilable tension arose between these expectations and what the Act actually stated. The planning and rural preservation cluster had held from 1929 that for a national park to be truly 'national', a central National Parks Authority should hold planning powers in the designated area. Since this power could not be taken from local authorities under the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947, the national parks movement had to make do with Silkin's oral assurances that he would intervene when necessary, force local authorities to co-operate and set up joint planning boards, codify rights of way and create long-distance footpaths, and to prevent the disfigurement of national park areas by industrial development. The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, however, did not contain binding clauses to that effect and left it to the Minister's discretion to intervene or not. The Minister saw no reason in 1952 to do so, as long as the Standing Committee on National Parks could not point out actual problems or failures of local authorities in the National Parks, in terms of nature and landscape preservation. Macmillan and his successors as Minister of Housing and Local Government were genuinely surprised that the Standing Committee immediately pressed for amendments to the National Parks Act, while refusing to wait and see how developments within the parks would materialise.<sup>174</sup>

Developments within the national parks movement from 1929 suggest that there was more at stake here than a politically motivated difference of interpretation between Labour and Conservative Ministers. The very concept 'national parks movement' presupposes a unity of purpose. A theoretical description of this multi-faceted movement could probably apply the definition of a 'single-issue movement'. The different clusters and interests co-operated for a single purpose: the creation of national parks, according to the relatively consistent definitions of the CPRE memorandum in 1929 or the Hobhouse Report of 1947. The CPRE and the Standing Committee on National Parks functioned as 'core organisations' of a heterogeneous field consisting of three clusters, and could look back in 1949 on twenty years of unbroken activism for national parks. The rural preservation societies, open-air associations, and scientific societies were fellow travellers for, at least, a part of their journey.

Discord, however, was never far away and distorts the image of the national parks movement as a coherent single-issue movement. This started in 1938 with the disagreement with the Scottish national parks movement, but in England and Wales, too, the single movement was divided in three different clusters. The various constituent bodies co-operated and joined forces in committees and campaigns for national parks, but they did so from different backgrounds, with diverging meanings, beliefs, and expectations of what national parks should achieve. They also used markedly different strategies, found diverging windows of opportunity to address their issues to the political level and at times even actively contradicted each other's ideas and approaches. Looking at the diverging

interests and objectives, national parks seemed to have been less the concern of a single-issue movement than a matter of *multiple adjacent issues*.

The open-air associations and the scientific and nature conservation clusters were not always willing to follow the lead of the planning and rural preservation cluster and subscribe to its objectives, proposed administrative arrangements, and strategies for national parks. The scientific societies and nature preservation organisations focussed on their core interest of nature reserves and the goals of nature preservation and scientific study. The scientific cluster largely abandoned the common cause for national parks after 1945, pursued its own special strategy, but did so to great success via the Lord President of the Council and the Wild Life Conservation Special Committee. The creation of the Nature Conservancy in 1949 with all its extensive functions, powers and financial provisions, was a landmark success for this cluster.<sup>175</sup> It is quite ironic that the ecologists achieved this success after having thought until 1946 that they should stick to the popular cause of national parks to attain their goals of nature conservation and scientific research. For the open-air associations, the statutory right of access to the countryside and provisions for long-distance footpaths in the 1949 Act merely opened a new era of lobbying and negotiations with local authorities and landowners.<sup>176</sup>

How, then, does this story help to explain the national parks movement's disappointment of the 1949 Act and its subsequent implementation? One reason was the defection of the scientific and nature conservation cluster in 1946, when the Huxley Committee decided to propose a separate Wild Life Conservation Council and a separate system of nature reserves. From that moment onwards, the different clusters in the movement worked towards different ends. Secondly, but related to that, it seems that the core organisations were no longer in complete control of the national parks issue. The Standing Committee on National Parks had monopolised the question of national parks in England and Wales between 1936 and 1939. Its definition and interpretation of national parks and its leading voice on behalf of this cause were broadly recognised despite reservations at the political level and disagreements within the movement about its priorities. That predominance, however, lapsed after 1945. Once the Hobhouse Report became an object of discussion within the Ministry of Town and Country Planning and between government departments in 1947, the national parks movement became a passive observer of the legislative process. The movement protested against details of the proposed legislation and mobilised its support in Parliament, but it had lost the initiative. The Standing Committee had become one of many lobby groups: it no longer owned the national parks issue or the authority to define 'national parks' as such.

To what extent is this just an inevitable result of the political process, when a cause is taken over from its civil society origins and converted into legislation? For the history of national parks in England and Wales after 1945, the effective breaking up of the movement and the timing of events should be considered. The popular appeal of the call for access to the countryside, the strong influence of the scientific and nature conservation cluster in central government offices, most notably the Lord President's Office, and the common denomination 'national parks' formed a formidable force for national parks. The Labour government, with its many Labour MPs and Ministers with backgrounds in the North of England or the ramblers' movement, was particularly susceptible to this pressure before the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 set the stage for a new system of land use planning based on local authorities. In this decisive time frame, however, the national

parks movement in England and Wales frayed. When the Standing Committee on National Parks sent a deputation to Macmillan in 1952, it could no longer speak as a co-ordinating body of an influential social movement, on behalf of a large range of constituent bodies and interests. The grand cause of 'national parks' was now cemented in legislation, and the Standing Committee had become merely one more lobby group among many.

## Notes

1. E.g. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*; Evans, *A History*, 60–78; Parker and Ravenscroft, 'Benevolence'; Sheail, 'The Management'.
2. NA, HLG 92/19: E.A. Sharp, 'Meeting with Standing Committee on National Parks', 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 1952. NA, HLG 71/2368: 'Fuller note'.
3. NA, HLG 92/19: Sharp, 'Meeting with Standing Committee'. NA, HLG 71/2368: 'Fuller note', 1.
4. See the documents in NA, HLG 71/2368, HLG 71/2369, HLG 92/175 and HLG 140/2.
5. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/40: Letter, H.G. Griffin to John Bowers, 17th October 1946, 2.
6. Sheail, 'The Great Divide', 2; Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 1–92.
7. Cherry, *Environmental Planning*, 27–106; MacEwen and MacEwen, *National Parks*, 3–22; Sheail, 'Nature Reserves'; Sheail, 'The Great Divide'.
8. Diani, "'Leaders" or Brokers?'; Ebers, 'Interorganizational Relationships'.
9. Chiesi, 'Network Analysis'; Scott and Stokman, 'Social Networks'; Steketee, Miyaoka, and Spiegelman, 'Social Network Analysis'.
10. For the concepts of 'brokerage' and 'linking pin organisations': Aldrich and Wetten, 'Organization-Sets'; Diani, "'Leaders" or Brokers?'.
11. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 1–92; Cherry, *Environmental Planning*, 49–106; Sheail, 'The Great Divide'; Wilkinson, *Fight for It Now*, 183–253.
12. For the history of the Scottish movement, see Lambert, *Contested Mountains*, 145–233.
13. See De Bont, 'A World Laboratory'; Carruthers, 'Nationhood and National Parks'; Gissibl, Hohler, and Kupper, eds., *Civilising Nature*; Kupper, *Creating Wilderness*; Piccioni, *The Beloved Face*, 201–217.
14. 'Dean Forest as a National Park'; Sheail, 'The Concept', 42.
15. Mair and Delafons, 'The Policy Origins', 294–95.
16. Burchardt, *Paradise Lost*, 90–102, 134; Jeans, 'Planning'; Matless, *Landscape and Englishness*, 45–93; Murdoch and Lowe, 'The Preservationist Paradox'; Murray, 'The Council'.
17. Abercrombie, 'The Preservation', 15, 56; Griffin, 'National Parks'.
18. Cited in: Griffiths, *Labour and the Countryside*, 81–82.
19. Bledisloe, 'A National Park?'.
20. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/104/A: Memorandum, Crawford & Balcarres, E. Guy Dawber & Patrick Abercrombie, to the Prime Minister.
21. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/104/A: Letters, Griffin to G.L. Pepler, Professor S.D. Adshead, and Abercrombie, 1st July 1929.
22. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/104/A: Notes, Special Sub-Committee for drafting the Memorandum to the Government, July 9th, 1929, 2; Letter, Lord Crawford to Griffin, 10<sup>th</sup> July 1929.
23. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/104/A: Memorandum to the Prime Minister, 4.
24. Lambert, *Contested Mountains*, 181–83.
25. James Macpherson in House of Commons, 24 July 1929, 1329–30.
26. NA, WORK 16/853: Minute Lionel Earle, 30th July, 1929; Copy letter, H.G. Vincent to R.H. Franklin, 2nd August, 1929.
27. NA, HLG 52/718: List of members & Terms of reference, 24<sup>th</sup> September 1929. Mair and Delafons, 'The Policy Origins', 295–97.

28. NA, WORK 16/853: Notes of interview with Secretary to Commons and Footpaths Preservation Society, 23rd September, 1929. Sheail, 'The Concept', 42–43. NA, HLG 52/718: Barnes, 'Considerations arising out of Terms of Reference', 24.9.29. NA, HLG 52/717: Minutes of the First and Second Meetings, 10th October and 4th November, 1929.
29. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/1: Copy letters, Lord Crawford to Dr. Hill and Vaughan Cornish, 21<sup>st</sup> October 1929. For examples of evidence submitted to the National Park Committee advocating National Parks in specific areas: see NA, WORK 16/853, WORK 16/855, HLG 52/718, HLG 52/719 and HLG 52/720.
30. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/1: Letter, Lord Crawford to Griffin, 23<sup>rd</sup> October 1929.
31. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/1: Copy letters, Lord Crawford to Hill and Cornish, 21<sup>st</sup> October 1929.
32. 'Preservation of Lakeland'.
33. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/1: Notes Informal Meeting, October 24<sup>th</sup>, 1929; Letter, Lord Crawford to Griffin, 23<sup>rd</sup> October 1929.
34. NA, HLG 52/717: Minutes of the fifth Meeting, 3rd December, 1929. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/1: Summary of Evidence by Patrick Abercrombie, 27<sup>th</sup> November, 1929; Types of Scenery suitable for the National Parks of England & Wales. Being Evidence given by Vaughan Cornish, Dec, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1929.
35. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/1: Griffin, 'Draft to Dr. Addison', 25/10/1929, 1–2. NA, HLG 52/718: Copy letter, Crawford and Balcarres to Addison, 30th October, 1929; 'Societies and institutions interested in the three aspects'.
36. NA, WORK 16/855: Abstract of Evidence of the Council of the Town Planning Institute, 3. 'Report of the National Park Committee', 46–50.
37. NA, WORK 16/855: "Summary of evidence of Pedestrians' Association"; Minutes of the Ninth and Fifteenth Meetings, 12<sup>th</sup> January and 4<sup>th</sup> March, 1930.
38. Sands, *Wildlife in Trust*, 1–18.
39. Sheail, *Seventy-Five Years*, 22–23, 29–36, 64–81, 105–117; Worster, *Nature's Economy*, 291–315.
40. Robin, 'Conservation and Preservation'; Worster, *Nature's Economy*, 261–271.
41. Bocking, *Ecologists and Environmental Politics*.
42. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/1: Copy letter, Lord Crawford to Griffin, 20<sup>th</sup> November 1929; Notes Informal Meeting, October 24<sup>th</sup>, 1929, 2.
43. NA, HLG 52/717: Minutes of the Sixth Meeting, 4th December, 1929. NA, HLG 52/718: British Correlating Committee for the Protection of Nature, 'Memorandum on the Preservation of Fauna and Flora', November 1929.
44. 'Report of the National Park Committee', 23.
45. *Ibid.*, 12.
46. Sheail, *Rural Conservation*, 70–89; Ward, 'The Town and Country Planning Act'.
47. Sandbach, 'The Early Campaign', 499; Wilkinson, *Fight for It Now*, 42–55. See the documents in NA, F 18/289, F 19/21 and F 19/22.
48. 'Political Notes'.
49. NA, HLG 52/714: Deputation of Amenities Group to the Minister of Health and Secretary of State for Scotland, 14 March 1933.
50. Sir Edward Hilton Young in House of Commons, 22 February 1934, 521. 'Town and Country Planning'..
51. Jones, *Sports*; Taylor, *A Claim*, 226–54; Walker, 'The Popularisation'.
52. Burchardt, *Paradise Lost*, 35–45, 77–88; Hill, *Freedom to Roam*, 11–50; Lambert, *Contested Mountains*, 34–67; Taylor, *A Claim*, 120–31.
53. Griffiths, *Labour and the Countryside*, 86–97; Hill, *Sport, Leisure and Culture*, 84; Tichelar, 'The Labour Party'.
54. Hey, 'Kinder Scout'; Hill, *Freedom to Roam*, 52–74; Stephenson, *Forbidden Land*, 153–54; Taylor, *A Claim*, 250–51, 258–61.
55. 'Ramblers and next Election'; "'Access to Mountains'". Cf. Weideger, *Gilding the Acorn*.
56. 'Is the National Parks Movement Dead?', 1.
57. 'National Parks'; 'National Parks in Britain'.

58. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/3: Letters, Griffin to E. Bright Ashford, 31st December 1935, 1, and to Abercrombie, 18<sup>th</sup> December 1935 and January 10<sup>th</sup>, 1936.
59. Sandbach, 'The Early Campaign', 511.
60. 'National Parks'.
61. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/3: Letter, John J. Withers to Sir Lawrence Chubb, 11th January, 1936. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE A/3: Minutes Executive Committee Meeting, January 29th, 1936, 7.
62. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/10: Letters, Griffin to Norman Birkett, 2<sup>nd</sup> December 1936, and to G.F. Herbert Smith, 5th December 1936.
63. House of Commons, 9 December 1936, 2132.
64. Geoffrey Mander in House of Commons, 9 December 1936, 2073–74.
65. House of Commons, 9 December 1936, 2080. Cf. Jones, *Sports*, 129–35.
66. Lemcke, "'Proving the Superiority of Democracy'"; Zweiniger-Bargielowska, 'Building a British Superman'.
67. House of Commons, 9 December 1936, 2073–2132.
68. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/10: Letter, Griffin to John Dower, 5th January 1937.
69. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/11: Copy letter, R.S. Hudson to J.D.K. Lloyd, 27th May 1937, 3. NA, HLG 52/716: Note 'National Parks' (1).
70. NA, HLG 52/716: Note 'National Parks' (2), 2. Cf. Sheail, 'The Concept', 46.
71. NA, HLG 52/716: T.L. Rowan, Deputation from Amenities Group of the House of Commons to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, 14<sup>th</sup> April, 1937.
72. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/11: Letter of the Standing Committee to Affiliated Bodies, Constituent Bodies and Scientific Societies, and County Branches, C.P.R.E., June 1937.
73. Sir Kingsley Wood in House of Commons, 4 November 1937, 1123.
74. Council for the Preservation of Rural England, *Report November 1937*, 25.
75. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/11: John Dower, Note of discussion with Viscount Samuel, 25th October, 1937. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/12: John Dower, Note on Publicity etc., 28th March 1938.
76. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/12: Dower, Note on Publicity etc., 28th March 1938, 2. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE A/4: Meetings Film Synopsis Committee, June 1<sup>st</sup> and July 5<sup>th</sup>, 1938.
77. The Standing Committee on National Parks, 'The Case for National Parks', 4.
78. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE A/4: Minutes Public Relations Committee, October 19<sup>th</sup>, 1938, 1.
79. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/53/2: Letter, Griffin to Alfred C. Bossom, 28<sup>th</sup> July 1938.
80. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/12: Letters, Griffin to Edward McGegan, 18th January 1938; Edward McGegan to Griffin, 25th January, 1938; McGegan to Dower, 21st. March, 1938. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/14: Letter, McGegan to the Standing Committee on National Parks, 27<sup>th</sup> July, 1938.
81. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/12: Letter, Herbert Smith to Griffin, 5 November 1937.
82. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/12: National Parks and Nature Reserves. Conference, 23 November 1937, 1.
83. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/12: Letter, Griffin to Prof. Julian Huxley, 22nd November 1937; Copy letter, Lord Crawford to H. Smith, 10<sup>th</sup> November 1937.
84. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/12: National Parks and Nature Reserves. Conference, 23 November 1937.
85. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/12: Letter, Lloyd to Dower, 16th March 1938.
86. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/53/2: Letter, Bossom to Griffin, 22<sup>nd</sup> July 1938.
87. Sheail, 'John Dower', 3.
88. Cherry, *Environmental Planning*, 16–25; Sheail, 'The Access to Mountains Act'; Stephenson, *Forbidden Land*, 165–83.
89. Bocking, 'Nature on the Home Front', 280.
90. Foot, 'The Impact'; Willis, "'An Arena'".
91. Evans, *A History*, 63; 'Countryside Fit for Heroes'.

92. Ministry of Works and Planning, 'Report of the Committee on Land Utilisation', vi.
93. Earl De la Warr in House of Lords, 19 November 1942, 151.
94. Cullingworth, *Environmental Planning*; Hollow, 'Utopian Urges'; Stevenson, 'Planner's Moon?'
95. Earl of Cork and Orrery in House of Lords, 26 February 1941, 502. Cf. Clapson and Larkham, *The Blitz*; Flinn, *Rebuilding Britain's Blitzed Cities*.
96. Dix, 'Patrick Abercrombie', 114–21.
97. Ministry of Works and Planning, 'Expert Committee on Compensation and Betterment', 11–12, 17. Cf. Lord Reith in House of Lords, 26 February 1941, 507–14.
98. NA, HLG 92/51: Pepler, 'The Standing Committee on National Parks', 20th August, 1943; 'Note on the deputation from the Standing Committee on National Parks received by the Minister on 14th September, 1943'.
99. Ministry of Works and Planning, 'Report of the Committee on Land Utilisation', 59.
100. Sheail, 'Scott Revisited'; Tichelar, 'The Scott Report'.
101. Dower, 'National Parks', 8–10; Wilkinson, *Fight for It Now*, 99–112.
102. See the documentation in NA, HLG 92/46 and HLG 92/47.
103. Bocking, 'Nature on the Home Front'; Sheail, 'War'.
104. Sands, *Wildlife in Trust*, 20.
105. Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-War Reconstruction, 'Nature Conservation', 2. NA, HLG 92/18: Delegation from the Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-War Reconstruction, 4th May, 1942, 3.
106. Sands, *Wildlife in Trust*, 22–25; Sheail, 'War', 272–76.
107. Bocking, *Ecologists*, 22–31; Sheail, *Seventy-Five Years*, 123–28; Sheail, 'Wartime Rodent-Control'.
108. Sheail, 'War', 272–73; Sheail, *Seventy-Five Years*, 134–35.
109. Archive BES, BES/MB/5: L.A. Harvey, Minutes, meeting of the Council, May 26<sup>th</sup>, 1942; H. Godwin, Minutes Council Meeting, 5 Jan. 1943, 2. Sheail, *Seventy-Five Years*, 135–36.
110. 'Nature Conservation'. Archive BES, BES/MB/5: Minutes, meeting of the Council of the Society, October 26th 1943. Tansley, *Our Heritage*.
111. 'Nature Conservation', 78; Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-War Reconstruction, 'Nature Conservation', 8.
112. 'Nature Conservation', 57–70; Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-War Reconstruction, 'Nature Conservation', 8–20; Tansley, *Our Heritage*, 41–45.
113. Sheail, 'The Great Divide'.
114. 'Nature Conservation', 79–81; Bocking, 'Conserving Nature', 98–101; Sheail, *Seventy-Five Years*, 139–41.
115. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE A/5: Minutes of the War Emergency Committee meeting, 24th July, 1941, 2.
116. HLG 71/537: Letter, Herbert Smith to Lord Reith, 17 November 1941, 1.
117. NA, HLG 92/51: Standing Committee on National Parks. Deputation received by Lord Reith on 6th January, 1942, 4.
118. NA, HLG 71/1695: Minute, Pepler to Vincent 8/xi/41. NA, HLG 92/51: Pepler, 'The Standing Committee', 20th August, 1943, 1.
119. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE A/5: Minutes Executive Committee meeting, September 17th, 1941, 3. NA, HLG 92/18: Nature Reserves Committee, Meeting January 19th (1943); Letter, Dower to Vincent, 12.4.43.
120. NA, HLG 92/18: John Dower, 'Nature Conservation in Great Britain (proof)', 10th February, 1943; Letter, Dower to Vincent. 12.4.43.
121. Wilkinson, *Fight for It Now*, 127–169.
122. Dower, 'National Parks', 6.
123. *Ibid.*, 21–22, 39–43.
124. Geoffrey Mander in House of Commons, 18 October 1944, 2381–82; 18 January 1945, 359; 20 March 1945, 774–82; 29 March 1945, 1511, and 12 April 1945, 1963–64.

125. NA, HLG 93/1: Copy letter, Dower to Neal, 'Preparatory National Parks Commission: Suggestions for Membership', 19th April, 1945; Minute, Geoffrey Whiskard to Parliamentary Secretary & Minister, 'National Parks', 8th June, 1945.
126. 'Experts to Formulate Plans'.
127. Ministry of Town and Country Planning, 'Report of the National Parks Committee', 1.
128. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/40: Letter, Birkett to Griffin, July 15th. 1945.
129. NA, HLG 93/1: Copy Minute, John Dower, 'National Parks Committee', to Hill and Whiskard, 21.5.45, 2.
130. Bocking, 'Conserving Nature', 106–107; Sheail, *Seventy-Five Years*, 138–41.
131. Sands, *Wildlife in Trust*, 24–26. Cf. NA, HLG 92/18: Letter, Herbert Smith to Morrison, 23 July 1945. NA, HLG 93/1: Minute, J.B. Bowers to Hill and Neal, 'National Parks Committee', 8th June, 1945.
132. Hennessy, *Never Again*, 122.
133. Francis, *Ideas and Policies*, 14–64; Hennessy, *Never Again*, 119–215; Kynaston, *Austerity Britain*; Sked and Cook, *Post-War Britain*, 19–53.
134. Kynaston, *Austerity Britain*, 20–40; Stevenson, 'Planner's Moon?'.
135. Griffiths, *Labour and the Countryside*; Tichelar, 'The Labour Party'.
136. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 35, 47.
137. NA, HLG 71/1696: K.M. Tomlinson, "Note of a meeting on 12th December, 1945, when the Minister received a deputation from the Ramblers' Association".
138. Ministry of Town and Country Planning, 'Report of the National Parks Committee', 3.
139. NA, HLG 71/1698: Letter, Alfred Milner to the Prime Minister, 25.11.46.
140. NA, HLG 93/48: 'The Organisation which May be Needed for the Eventual Control of Wild Life Conservation', 1; Minutes of the 1st meeting, 6th September, 1945, 1–2.
141. Sheail, 'From Aspiration to Implementation', 40–43; Sheail, 'War', 279; Sheail, *Seventy-Five Years*, 141–42.
142. NA, HLG 93/48: 'Draft Letter in reply to Mr. Flett's letter to Mr. Bowers', 27th November, 1945, 1.
143. See the evidence submitted by these groups to the National Parks Committee in NA, HLG 93/49.
144. NA, HLG 93/48: Minutes of the 10th and 12th Meetings, 18th February and 8th March, 1946; 'Memorandum on the constitution and functions of a Biological Service', 17th April, 1946. NA, HLG 93/36: 'Note on Meeting with the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Cabinet (1st March, 1946)'.
145. Ministry of Town and Country Planning, 'Conservation of Nature', 50–62.
146. NA, HLG 93/4: Record, joint meeting between the National Parks Committee and the Wild Life Conservation Special Committee (20 February 1946). NA, HLG 93/48: John Dower, 'Report of the Wild Life Committee. Comments', 16th October, 1946.
147. NA, HLG 71/537: H.H. Dale, 'The need for a national biological policy', 31<sup>st</sup> July, 1946. NA, T 223/258: Max Nicholson, 'Conservation of Nature in Great Britain'. Sheail, 'Nature Reserves', 30–31.
148. Sheail, *Seventy-Five Years*, 142–44; Sheail, 'Nature Reserves', 31–32.
149. See the discussion as documented in NA, T 223/258.
150. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 191–92.
151. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 50–53, 72–73; Sheail, 'Nature Reserves', 31–32.
152. Ministry of Town and Country Planning, 'Conservation of Nature', 6–7.
153. Sands, *Wildlife in Trust*, 32–44.
154. Ministry of Town and Country Planning, 'Report of the National Parks Committee', 64–67.
155. House of Commons, 31 March 1949, 1485. Cf. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 63–64.
156. Ian Fraser in House of Commons, 31 March 1949, 1518.
157. Dower, 'National Parks', 31. Cf. Hoyle, 'Opposition', 303–309; Stephenson, *Forbidden Land*, 206–14.
158. Parker and Ravenscroft, 'Benevolence', 300–309.
159. NA, HLG 93/4: Minutes of the Meetings (9th Series), 2nd and 3rd April, 1946, 4.

160. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 49–68. Ministry of Town and Country Planning, 'Report of the National Parks Committee', 15–19.
161. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 66–79; Cherry, *Environmental Planning*, 85–88, 102–104. Cf. NA, HLG 93/5: Lord Chorley, Memorandum 'Constitution of National Parks Planning Administration', 9:8:46. NA, T 227/43: Fraser, 'National Parks etc. Note for the Chancellor's Talk with Mr. Silkin 11/6/48'.
162. NA, HLG 92/65: Standing Committee on National Parks, Comments submitted to the Minister of Town and Country Planning, September 6th 1947; Minute, T.H. Sheepshanks to Minister, 29th November, 1947.
163. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 79; Sharp, *The Ministry*, 15–25.
164. Cherry, *Environmental Planning*, 81–104. See the documents in NA, CAB 124/444.
165. House of Commons, 1 April 1949, 1655.
166. Lewis Silkin in House of Commons, 31 March 1949, 1468–74, 1481–93.
167. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/40: Note of meeting between the Minister of Town and Country Planning and a deputation from the CPRE on 3.12.47. Cf. Cherry, *Environmental Planning*, 92–93.
168. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/41: Letter, Griffin to Silkin, 15th March 1948.
169. Abercrombie, Crawford, and Birkett, 'National Parks'; Symonds, 'National Parks'. MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/102/41: Copy letter, Birkett to Silkin, 19th February 1948.
170. Symonds, 'National Parks'.
171. Conway, 'National Parks'. MERL, Archive CPRE, C/1/102/40: Letter, Griffin to the Lord Merthyr, 23rd January 1948; MERL, Archive CPRE, C/1/53/75: Circular letter, Griffin, 29<sup>th</sup> September, 1949; Letters, M.V. Osmond to Earl De La Warr, 22nd September 1949, to Viscount Samuel, 13th October, 1949, to the Lord Llewellyn, 25th October, 1949, and to Lord Reith, 28th October, 1949.
172. MERL, Archive CPRE, C/1/53/75: Letter, Griffin to Lord Aberdare, 20th August 1949; Letter, Lord Chorley to Griffin, 1st October, 1949.
173. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 49–92; Cherry, *Environmental Planning*; MacEwen and MacEwen, *National Parks*; Parker and Ravenscroft, 'Benevolence'; Sheail, 'The Management'.
174. See the documents in MERL, Archive CPRE, CPRE C/1/53/76 and in NA, HLG 71/2369, HLG 71/2369, HLG 92/175 and HLG 140/2.
175. Bocking, 'Conserving Nature', 90.
176. Blunden and Curry, *A People's Charter?*, 129–157, 246–260; Hoyle, 'Securing access', 193–205, Parker and Ravenscroft, 'Benevolence', 302–305.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my thanks to the reading room staff of the Museum of English Rural Life in Reading, and of the National Archives in London Kew, for their excellent support and assistance during my visit; the last time in the National Archives in the difficult conditions of a global health emergency situation. I am also grateful to the British Ecological Society for their kind permission to study their archival records at their office, and to Lidewij Nissen, Catherine Forrest and three anonymous reviewers for their very helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Funding

This article is part of a project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 832350.



## Archival sources

British Ecological Society, privately held, London (BES):

BES/MB/5 and BES/MB/6.

Museum of English Rural Life, Reading (MERL):

Archive Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE): SR CPRE A/2, A/3, A/4, A/5, A/7, A/8, C/1/53/2, C/1/53/49, C/1/53/74, C/1/53/75, C/1/53/76, C/1/72/1, C/1/72/6, C/1/102/1, C/1/102/2, C/1/102/3, C/1/102/10, C/1/102/11, C/1/102/12, C/1/102/13, C/1/102/14, C/1/102/40, C/1/102/41, C/1/102/51, and C/1/104/A.

The National Archives, Kew (NA):

Cabinet Office (CAB): CAB 117/123 and 124/444.

Ministry of Housing and Local Government (HLG): HLG 52/714, 52/716, 52/717, 52/718, 52/719, 52/720, 52/723, 68/56, 71/537, 71/1044, 71/1197, 71/1695, 71/1696, 71/1698, 71/1699, 71/2368, 71/2369, 80/21, 80/70, 82/10, 92/18, 92/19, 92/46, 92/47, 92/49, 92/51, 92/65, 92/175, 93/1, 93/3, 93/4, 93/5, 93/36, 93/48, 93/49, and 140/2.

Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food Departments (MAF): MAF 48/665 and 48/668.

HM Treasury (T): T 161/1183, 223/258, 227/42, 227/43, and 227/126.

Works departments (WORK): WORK 16/853 and 16/855.

## Bibliography

Abercrombie, P. "The Preservation of Rural England." *The Town Planning Review* 12, no. 1 (1926): 5–56. doi:[10.3828/tpr.12.1.3152r3n37v718061](https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.12.1.3152r3n37v718061).

Abercrombie, P., David Lindsay Earl of Crawford, and N. Birkett. "National Parks: Hobhouse Report Proposals." *Times*, March 3, 1948: 5.

"Access to Mountains." *Manchester Guardian*, July 10, 1935: 10.

Aldrich, H., and D. A. Wetten. "Organization-Sets, Action-Sets, and Networks: Making the Most of Simplicity." In *Handbook of Organizational Design: Vol. I*, edited by P. C. Nystrom and W. H. Starbuck, 385–408. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Bledisloe, C. B. V. "A National Park for England? The Forest of Dean." *Times* June 10, 1929: 12.

Blunden, J., and N. Curry. *A People's Charter? Forty Years of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949*. London: HMSO, 1990.

Bocking, S. "Conserving Nature and Building a Science: British Ecologists and the Origins of the Nature Conservancy." In *Science and Nature: Essays in the History of the Environmental Sciences*, edited by M. Shortland, 89–114. Oxford: British Society for the History of Science, 1993.

Bocking, S. *Ecologists and Environmental Politics: A History of Contemporary Ecology*. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 1997.

Bocking, S. "Nature on the Home Front: British Ecologists' Advocacy for Science and Conservation." *Environment and History* 18, no. 2 (2012): 261–281. doi:[10.3197/096734012X13303670112894](https://doi.org/10.3197/096734012X13303670112894).

Bont, R. De "A World Laboratory: Framing the Albert National Park." *Environmental History* 22, no. 3 (2014): 404–432. doi:[10.1093/envhis/emx020](https://doi.org/10.1093/envhis/emx020).

Burchardt, J. *Paradise Lost: Rural Idyll and Social Change in England Since 1800*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2002.

Carruthers, J. "Nationhood and National Parks: Comparative Examples from the Post-Imperial Experience." In *Ecology and Empire*, edited by T. Griffiths and L. Robin, 125–138. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997.

Cherry, G. E. *Environmental Planning 1939-1969: Volume II. National Parks and Recreation in the Countryside*. London: HMSO, 1975.

Chiesi, A. M. "Network Analysis." *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* 2nd Vol. 16 518–523. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2015. [10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.73055-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.73055-8).

Clapson, M., and P. J. Larkham, eds. *The Blitz and Its Legacy: Wartime Destruction to Post-War Reconstruction*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

- Conference on Nature Preservation in Post-War Reconstruction, Nature Conservation in Great Britain: Memorandum No. 3. London, 1943.
- Conway, G. "National Parks: Briefing M.P.s for Action." *Liverpool Echo* May 12, 1948: 2.
- Council for the Preservation of Rural England. *Monthly and Conference Report*. London, November 1937.
- "Countryside Fit for Heroes." *Staffordshire Evening Sentinel*, April 26, 1943.
- Cullingworth, J. B. *Environmental Planning 1939-1969: Volume I. Reconstruction and Land Use Planning 1939-1947*. London: HMSO, 1975.
- "Dean Forest as a National Park. Lord Bledisloe's Interesting Proposal." *Dean Forest Guardian*, November 27, 1925.
- Diani, M. "'Leaders' or Brokers? Positions and Influence in Social Movement Networks." In *Social Movements and Networks*, edited by M. Diani and D. McAdam, 105–122. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Dix, G. "Patrick Abercrombie 1879-1957." In *Pioneers in British Planning*, edited by G. E. Cherry, 103–130. London: The Architectural Press, 1981.
- Dower, J. *National Parks in England and Wales*. London: HMSO, 1945.
- Ebers, M. "Interorganizational Relationships and Networks." *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* 2nd Vol. 12 621–625. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 2015. [10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.73125-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.73125-4).
- Evans, D. *A History of Nature Conservation in Britain*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 1997.
- "Experts to Formulate Plan for National Parks." *Morning Advertiser*, August 21, 1945.
- Flinn, C. *Rebuilding Britain's Blitzed Cities: Hopeful Dreams, Stark Realities*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.
- Foot, W. "The Impact of the Military on the Agricultural Landscape of England and Wales in the Second World War." In *The Front Line of Freedom*, edited by B. Short, C. Watkins, and J. Martin, 132–142. Exeter: British Agricultural History Society, 2006.
- Francis, M. *Ideas and Policies Under Labour, 1945-1951: Building a New Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Gissibl, B., S. Hohler, and P. Kupper, eds. *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2012.
- Griffin, H. G. "National Parks: In England and Snowdonia." *Times* June 12, 1929: 12.
- Griffiths, C. V. J. *Labour and the Countryside: The Politics of Rural Britain 1918-1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Hennessy, P. *Never Again: Britain 1945-51*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1992.
- Hey, D. "Kinder Scout and the Legend of the Mass Trespass." *The Agricultural History Review* 59, no. 2 (2011): 199–216.
- Hill, H. *Freedom to Roam: The Struggle for Access to Britain's Moors and Mountains*. Ashbourne: Moorland Publishing, 1980.
- Hill, J. *Sport, Leisure and Culture in Twentieth-Century Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.
- Hollow, M. "Utopian Urges: Visions for Reconstruction in Britain, 1940-1950." *Planning Perspectives* 27, no. 4 (2012): 569–585. doi:[10.1080/02665433.2012.705126](https://doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2012.705126).
- Hoyle, R. W. "Securing Access to England's Uplands: Or How the 1945 Revolution Petered Out." In *Contexts of Property in Europe*, edited by R. Gongost and R. Santos, 187–209. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.
- Hoyle, R. W. "Opposition to the Creation of National Parks: The Case of the Yorkshire Dales." *The Agricultural History Review* 67, no. 2 (2019): 283–314.
- "Is the National Parks Movement Dead?" *The Open Road and the Tramper and Cyclist* 4, no. 8 (1937): 1–2.
- Jeanes, D. N. "Planning and the Myth of the English Countryside, in the Interwar Period." *Rural History* 1, no. 2 (1990): 249–264. doi:[10.1017/S0956793300003332](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956793300003332).
- Jones, S. G. *Sport, Politics and the Working Class: Organised Labour and Sport in Inter-War Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Kupper, P. *Creating Wilderness: A Transnational History of the Swiss National Park*. New York: Berghahn, 2014.

- Kynaston, D. *Austerity Britain, 1945-51*. London: Bloomsbury, 2007.
- Lambert, R. A. *Contested Mountains: Nature, Development and Environment in the Cairngorms Region of Scotland, 1880-1980*. Cambridge: White Horse Press, 2001.
- Lemcke, A. M. "'Proving the Superiority of Democracy': Die 'National Fitness Campaign' der Britischen Regierung (1937-1939) im transnationalen Zusammenhang." *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 57, no. 4 (2009): 543–570. doi:10.1524/vfzg.2009.0054.
- MacEwen, A., and M. MacEwen. *National Parks: Conservation or Cosmetics?*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982.
- Mair, J., and J. Delafons. "The Policy Origins of Britain's National Parks: The Addison Committee 1929-31." *Planning Perspectives* 16, no. 3 (2001): 293–309. doi:10.1080/02665430152469601.
- Matless, D. *Landscape and Englishness*, 2016. Reprint ed. London: Reaktion Books, 1998.
- Ministry of Town and Country Planning. "Conservation of Nature in England and Wales. Report of the Wild Life Conservation Special Committee (England and Wales)." London: HMSO, 1947.
- Ministry of Town and Country Planning. "Report of the National Parks Committee (England and Wales)." London: HMSO, 1947.
- Ministry of Works and Planning. "Expert Committee on Compensation and Betterment. Final Report." London: HMSO, 1942.
- Ministry of Works and Planning. "Report of the Committee on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas." London: HMSO, 1942.
- Murdoch, J., and P. Lowe. "The Preservationist Paradox: Modernism, Environmentalism and the Politics of Spatial Division." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28, no. 3 (2003): 318–332. doi:10.1111/1475-5661.00095.
- Murray, P. J. "The Council for the Preservation of Rural England, Suburbia and the Politics of Preservation." *Prose Studies* 32, no. 1 (2010): 25–37. doi:10.1080/01440351003747659.
- "National Parks in Britain." *Times*, December 2, 1935: 8.
- "National Parks: Need for a Central Authority." *Manchester Guardian*. December 2, 1935: 10.
- "Nature Conservation and Nature Reserves: Report of the Committee Appointed by Council on 26 May 1942." *The Journal of Ecology*, 32, no. 1 (1944): 45–82. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2256486>.
- Parker, G., and N. Ravenscroft. "Benevolence, Nationalism and Hegemony: Fifty Years of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949." *Leisure Studies* 18, no. 4 (1999): 297–313. doi:10.1080/026143699374871.
- Piccioni, L. *The Beloved Face of the Country: The First Movement for Nature Protection in Italy, 1880-1934*. Winwick: The White Horse Press, 2020.
- "Political Notes." *Times*, February 16, 1933: 7.
- "Preservation of Lakeland: Framing a Policy." *Times*, October 14, 1929: 11.
- "Ramblers and Next Election." *Daily Dispatch*, June 1, 1935.
- "Report of the National Park Committee." London: HMSO, 1931.
- Robin, L. "Conservation and Preservation." In *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*, edited by A. Iriye and P.-Y. Saunier, 191–194. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Sandbach, F. R. "The Early Campaign for a National Park in the Lake District." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 3, no. 4 (1978): 498–514. doi:10.2307/622126.
- Sands, T. *Wildlife in Trust. A Hundred Years of Nature Conservation*. London: Elliott and Thompson, 2012.
- Scott, J., and F. N. Stokman. "Social Networks." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed., Vol. 15, 473–477. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2015. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.32101-8.
- Sharp, E. *The Ministry of Housing and Local Government*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1969.
- Sheail, J. "The Concept of National Parks in Great Britain 1900-1950." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 66 (1975): 41–56. doi:10.2307/621620.
- Sheail, J. *Rural Conservation in Inter-War Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Sheail, J. "Nature Reserves, National Parks, and Post-War Reconstruction, in Britain." *Environmental Conservation* 11, no. 1 (1984): 29–34. doi:10.1017/S0376892900013461.
- Sheail, J. *Seventy-Five Years in Ecology: The British Ecological Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific, 1987.

- Sheail, J. "The Great Divide: An Historical Perspective." *Landscape Research* 13, no. 1 (1988): 2–5. doi:[10.1080/01426398808706242](https://doi.org/10.1080/01426398808706242).
- Sheail, J. "The Management of Wildlife and Amenity — a Post-War Perspective." *Contemporary Record* 7, no. 1 (1993): 44–65. doi:[10.1080/13619469308581236](https://doi.org/10.1080/13619469308581236).
- Sheail, J. "John Dower, National Parks, and Town and Country Planning in Britain." *Planning Perspectives* 10, no. 1 (1995): 1–16. doi:[10.1080/02665439508725810](https://doi.org/10.1080/02665439508725810).
- Sheail, J. "War and the Development of Nature Conservation in Britain." *Journal of Environmental Management* 44, no. 3 (1995): 267–283. doi:[10.1006/jema.1995.0045](https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.1995.0045).
- Sheail, J. "From Aspiration to Implementation — the Establishment of the First National Nature Reserves in Britain." *Landscape Research* 21, no. 1 (1996): 37–54. doi:[10.1080/01426399608706474](https://doi.org/10.1080/01426399608706474).
- Sheail, J. "Scott Revisited: Post-War Agriculture, Planning and the British Countryside." *Journal of Rural Studies* 13, no. 4 (1997): 387–398. doi:[10.1016/S0743-0167\(97\)00028-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0743-0167(97)00028-4).
- Sheail, J. "Wartime Rodent-Control in England and Wales." In *The Front Line of Freedom*, edited by B. Short, C. Watkins, and J. Martin, 55–66. Exeter: British Agricultural History Society, 2006.
- Sheail, J. "The Access to Mountains Act 1939: An Essay in Compromise." *Rural History* 21, no. 1 (2010): 59–74. doi:[10.1017/S095679330999015X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S095679330999015X).
- Simmons, I. G. *An Environmental History of Great Britain: From 10,000 Years Ago to the Present*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001.
- Sked, A., and C. Cook. *Post-War Britain: A Political History*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979.
- The Standing Committee on National Parks. *The Case for National Parks in Great Britain*. London: Standing Committee for National Parks, 1938.
- Steketee, M., A. Miyaoka, and M. Spiegelman. "Social Network Analysis." *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* 2nd Vol. 22 461–467. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2015. doi:[10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10563-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10563-X).
- Stephenson, T. *Forbidden Land: The Struggle for Access to Mountain and Moorland*, edited by A. Holt. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Stevenson, J. "Planner's Moon? The Second World War and the Planning Movement." In *War and Social Change*, edited by H. L. Smith, 58–77. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986.
- Symonds, H. H. "National Parks." *Times* May 17, 1949: 5.
- Tansley, A. G. *Our Heritage of Wild Nature: A Plea for Organized Nature Conservation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945.
- Taylor, H. *A Claim on the Countryside: A History of the British Outdoor Movement*. Edinburgh: Keele University Press, 1997.
- Tichelar, M. "The Labour Party and Land Reform in the Inter-War Period." *Rural History* 13, no. 1 (2002): 85–101. doi:[10.1017/S0956793302000250](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956793302000250).
- Tichelar, M. "The Scott Report and the Labour Party: The Protection of the Countryside During the Second World War." *Rural History* 15, no. 2 (2004): 167–187. doi:[10.1017/S0956793304001220](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956793304001220).
- "Town and Country Planning." *Times*, March 15, 1933: 8.
- Walker, H. "The Popularization of the Outdoor Movement, 1900-1940." *The British Journal of Sports History* 2, no. 2 (1985): 140–153. doi:[10.1080/02649378508713571](https://doi.org/10.1080/02649378508713571).
- Ward, S. "The Town and Country Planning Act, 1932." *The Planner* 60, no. 5 (1974): 685–689.
- Weideger, P. *Gilding the Acorn: Behind the Facade of the National Trust*. London: Simon & Schuster, 1994.
- Wilkinson, D. *Fight for It Now: John Dower and the Struggle for National Parks in Britain*. Oxford: Signal Books, 2019.
- Willis, G. "'An Arena of Glorious Work': The Protection of the Rural Landscape Against the Demands of Britain's Second World War Effort." *Rural History* 29, no. 2 (2018): 259–280. doi:[10.1017/S0956793318000134](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956793318000134).
- Worster, D. *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Zweiniger-Bargielowska, I. "Building a British Superman: Physical Culture in Interwar Britain." *Journal of Contemporary History* 41, no. 4 (2006): 595–610. doi:[10.1177/0022009406067743](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009406067743).