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Abstract

Beyond Eden: Cultivating Spectacle in the Montreal Botanical Garden

Ann Armstrong

The Montreal Botanical Garden, a 180-acre complex comprised of over thirty outdoor and ten indoor landscapes located in the city’s east-end, is the product of a Depression-era government funded Public Works project. Its founding director, preeminent botanist Frère Marie-Victorin, drew from and expanded upon four hundred years of western botanical studies and garden planning to realize the Garden. In this thesis, the factors which inspired him, particularly his perceived need of such an institution to fulfill the purposes of popular botanical education for the masses through attracting and instructing local and foreign visitors, and the provision of a place where people could commune with nature, are explored. In recent years, the function of the Garden as a tourist mecca has surpassed Marie-Victorin’s original aims. The construction involved in creating “natural” and “cultural” spectacles is investigated in order to comprehend the extent to which this widely acclaimed and advertised sight/site reflects its ideological and physical locus within the city’s urban fabric and history.
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Introduction

Botanical gardens have contributed greatly to the cultural development, economic progress and commercial growth of many western countries. The Montreal Botanical Garden, founded in 1931 by Quebec botanist Frère Marie-Victorin (1885-1944), provides fertile ground for a discussion surrounding the politics underlying the creation of a Depression-era civic garden which combines scientific, cultural and educational programmes.

This study takes a circuitous route, leading the reader down, rather than up, the garden path. In order to place the Montreal Botanical Garden within an ideological and historical context, chapter one outlines the history and function of the first western botanic gardens founded during the Renaissance period which attempted to recreate the Garden of Eden. The subsequent exploitation of foreign lands and peoples for the economic gain of European colonial powers which resulted from voyages to the “New World” is traced. The shift in garden design in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries resulted from a greater emphasis placed on state-sanctioned public education and nature controlled for human pleasure. One of the first attempts to establish a botanic garden in Montreal, proposed by David Pierce Penhallow (1854-1910) followed this trend. A professor of botany at McGill University, Penhallow’s appeal was steeped in imperialist rhetoric to gain the sympathy of the city’s wealthy anglophone community. While the garden did not come to fruition, his work was important for planting the idea in civic memory.

It took the vision, reputation and determination of Marie-Victorin, combined with a desperate economic climate, to realize the garden. His diplomacy and political savvy were important attributes in seeing the garden through the tumultuous years of the Great Depression. His most often acknowledged collaborators were architect Lucien Kérouack, to
whose plans the administration pavilion was built, and curator Henry Teuscher, responsible for the master plan of the garden, yet the project could not have been completed without the support of Public Works projects and the more than two thousand nameless workers who laboured on the garden between the years 1931-1939.

Both Penhallow and Marie-Victorin recognized the value of creating a botanic garden in Montreal to attract local visitors and those from abroad. This touristic function was used to appeal to a public who knew little and cared less about the botanical sciences. In chapter two the role that the municipal, provincial and federal governments continue to play in creating and supporting what is marketed as a “natural” spectacle is revealed. A garden, it is argued, is not nature but rather nature idealized, with plants living in artificial spaces, at times constructed to resemble their native habitats, labelled and displayed for the edification and pleasure of the public. Divorced from their geographical and cultural contexts, the plants are often placed in fantastic horticultural displays which do little to inform the visitors of natural processes.

In charting the history of landscape movements, W.J.T. Mitchell questions whether landscape is integrally connected with imperialism, noting that most movements commenced during the imperial regimes of China, Japan, Rome, France and Britain. In the former, landscape reached its pinnacle at the height of Chinese imperialism and began its descent as China itself became the focus of English fascination and appropriation when England became an imperial power.¹ At the Montreal Botanical Garden, not only nature is constructed for tourist spectacle, but cultures are represented and defined through landscape practices, particularly notable in recent years with the addition of three small Japanese gardens and community centre in 1988, and the Dream Lake Friendship Garden, a joint venture between
Montreal and Shanghai, completed in time for the city’s 350th anniversary in 1991. These gardens have strong diplomatic ties with the countries integral to their founding and funding, and within their respective local Asian communities. The reasons underlying the creation of these gardens are investigated in this thesis, written at a time when many landscape architects are rejecting set historical styles and conventions, preferring to respond to local context using native plant specimens and creatively evoking myth and metaphor in their design solutions.

The methodological approach adopted in this text consists primarily of a historicism informed by Marxist and social art historical practices as defined by Janet Wolff, particularly by looking into “the political economy of cultural production.” Recognizing that criticism of some contemporary art history mourns the displacement of the art object in favour of an investigation of the socio-historical conditions surrounding its creation, formal analysis is used in the discussion of the administration building. Descriptions of the physical changes in garden planning are provided to illustrate how shifting ideologies held toward the natural world have been manifested historically in the design of botanical gardens.

Chapter two departs from the historicity of the first and borrows heavily from the disciplines of anthropology and social geography. However, as a path threading through the garden, leading the spectator from prospect to prospect, the chapters are linked by recurring themes, predominantly that of colonialism. In the first chapter, imperialism as it has generally been documented through empire building and colonial conquests and its relationship to botanical garden cultivation is outlined. Three successive periods of power are revealed: with the foundation of botanic gardens in the 16th century, power was wielded over nature; in the imperial gardens of the 17th and 18th centuries, power was held over
indigenous populations forced to cultivate crops for the colonizers; and in the 19th and 20th centuries, power is more subtly worked over those members of the population who visit gardens and similar institutions with a pedagogic mission, the state providing what Tony Bennett deems an "exhibitionary complex." In the second chapter, tourism is understood as a new form of colonialism, whereby the visitor leaves home to come into contact with some "other" whether that mean space, foreignness, history or nature, thus fulfilling the modern impulse to conquer, categorize and consume and often display "it" in a museum or similar institution.3

In this thesis, I have used the term "other" in the sense employed by Ivan Karp: a "generalized artifact of the colonial and imperial encounter."4 As a WASP who grew up in Victoria, British Columbia, a city which prides itself on its ties to the British "Empire" the cultural others with whom I was schooled were primarily of Chinese, Japanese and Native descent. The history formally taught excluded their histories and ignored or glossed over the inhumane treatment they have received at the hands of the Canadian government. I have tried to be sensitive to their histories but cannot pretend to identify or empathize except at the remove which my otherness demands.
Chapter One

Redesigning Paradise

It is written in Genesis that god's first earthly creation was a garden where the climate was always temperate and trees bore flowers and fruit simultaneously. During the Renaissance explorers sailed throughout the southern hemisphere seeking the Garden of Eden which many thought had survived the great flood. On Columbus's third voyage he believed he had located it in South America where the vegetation and climate fit the description of Eden's perpetual spring. Yet in these newly charted territories were found plants, such as corn, potatoes, yucca, tomatoes, tobacco and vanilla, not among those listed in the Bible; nor were the llama, iguana, toucan or anaconda recorded as Noah's passengers. The native peoples did not resemble descendants of the ten lost tribes of Israel thought to be of Moorish or African heritage.5

Explorations in search of the garden continued for more than a century until it was decided that if the garden had not yet been found, it had been destroyed in the flood. Botanic gardens were then created in an attempt to replicate Eden, despite

[the discovery of America [which] posed a challenge to the authority of the Bible. But the ease with which the invading European men, animals and plants advanced, and the rapidity of the collapse of the indigenous civilizations in the face first of firearms, and then of European diseases, meant the native were soon reduced to the role of extras upon the scene of European expansion.6

The ease with which other countries were conquered supported the claim made in sixteenth century Italy: Europe was destined to rule Africa, America and Asia.

The early botanic gardens of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were based on the monastic gardens of the Middle Ages cultivated for instructive and medicinal purposes.
These gardens, protected by high walls, shielded out the surrounding wilderness, created an "early intellectual antithetical relationship between people and nature." Renaissance princes planted botanical collections within their large pleasure gardens to provide not only places for entertainment, meditation and settings for sculpture, but for botanical and medical research. Most investigation was undertaken at universities where botanical gardens served as centres for scientific experimentation, teaching and study. In the latter gardens, aesthetic considerations were often sacrificed to cultivation requirements. Statues, grottoes and fountains were replaced by newly discovered rare species, such as irises or tulips, gathered from expeditions abroad. Medicinal plants were cultivated in geometric beds which facilitated their organization and corresponded with the arcane beliefs associated with astrology then important to the natural sciences. These "order" beds implied an ordering of untamed nature.

The earliest botanic gardens in Europe were established in Pisa (1543) and Padua (1545), followed by gardens in Florence (1550), Leipzig (1580), Oxford (1621), Paris (1635), Edinburgh (1670) and Amsterdam (1682). The dominant theme found in the guidebooks to these gardens is the collecting of plants from around the globe in order to provide a visual encyclopedia of creation -- thereby recreating the botanical totality of Eden. A natural history museum was often constructed adjacent to the garden bringing the animal, mineral and plant kingdoms together to produce a microcosm of the world outside its high walls. John Prest has called the botanic garden "the most perfect example of the attempt to collect the whole world in a chamber,..." enabling post-expulsion man to recover knowledge and exert power over nature. It was believed that God had revealed a part of himself in each thing he had created; in a collection of all he had created, he would therefore be completely
revealed. The pursuit of knowledge, no longer forbidden as it had been in Eden, was now the primary function of the botanic garden.

The "great voyages of inquiry or exploration"\textsuperscript{13} and the resulting fascination with early botanical gardens were addressed by Michel Foucault:

It is often said that the establishment of botanical gardens and zoological collections expressed a new curiosity about exotic plants and animals. In fact, these had already claimed men's interest for a long while. What had changed was the space in which it was possible to see and describe them. To the Renaissance, the strangeness of animals was a spectacle ... The nature history room and the garden, as created in the Classical period, replaced the circular procession of the 'show' with the arrangement of things in a 'table'.\textsuperscript{14}

European explorations had revealed that nature's riches are concentrated in the tropical and subtropical latitudes, precisely where Europe is not.\textsuperscript{15} Economics became one of the great motivations for founding botanic gardens: explorers went "searching the Indies for their Balm and Spice" in order to "Rifle the treasures of old Paradise."\textsuperscript{16} The botanically rich were robbed for the benefit of the genetically poor. Many botanic gardens were created as nursery or propagation centres for the receipt of germplasm of commercial crops; others for the scientific study of tropical botany.

Tropical gardens played a considerable role as a tool of colonial expansion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and to a large degree the history of colonialism is enmeshed in the history of the struggle to capture and monopolize botanical treasures.\textsuperscript{17} Agricultural patterns were radically altered through the exchange of information and the transfer of germplasm between different regions of the world. In the seventeenth century, the Dutch moved coffee from the Indian Ocean crescent to Surinam and Latin America; cocoa was moved from Central America to West Africa; in the nineteenth century tea was
transported from China to South Asia and East Africa; rubber from the Amazon and cinchona from the Andes were moved to South and Southeast Asia; sisal was moved from Central America to East Africa, oil palm from West Africa was planted in Southeast Asia, and Asian bananas were moved to the Caribbean.\textsuperscript{18} Crops were introduced onto plantations maintained by officially or unofficially enslaved natives. Workers not only suffered considerable dislocation but were made to learn new cultivation techniques.\textsuperscript{19}

Europeans dominated plant explorations from the 1500s until the 1800s. Intense economic rivalry arose between British and Dutch imperialists who cultivated gardens in India, southeast Asia and the Caribbean. Stamford Raffles of the British East India Company established a garden in Singapore in 1822 in an attempt to break the Dutch monopoly over the spice trade. The garden was abandoned in 1846.\textsuperscript{20}

The botanical transfers had an incalculable impact on the global agricultural economy and wielded enormous power in either making or breaking a culture's survival. Asia's economy flourished from the botanical transfers; Africa's was crippled. West Africa lost palm oil which today occupies fifteen percent of a multi-billion dollar vegetable oils trade.\textsuperscript{21} In South America, Brazil, which had been the only rubber producing country, now controlled less than five percent of the world's market with greater production in Africa and Asia. The ultimate winners, however, were the colonial powers. No matter where the plants were cultivated, profits were routed to Paris, London and other northern capitals.\textsuperscript{22} The economic supremacy over the south remains to the present day with many poorer countries continuing to rely on crops introduced by colonialists.

The layout of botanic gardens was affected by developments in aesthetic theory and scientific principles from the mid to late eighteenth century, leading to a departure from the
strict geometry of the earliest gardens. Botanists on plant hunting explorations developed the view wherein the world was seen as a system of organic interaction, which replaced the strict adherence to newly discovered taxonomies which characterized early 18th century gardens. The recreation of the ecological habitats in which the plants had been found was mingled with scientific groupings in late 18th century botanic gardens.

At Padua, during the 1540s, the circular plan of the garden was divided into four quarters representing the four continents of the earth. Within each quarter the flora appropriate to its continent was planted, yet no conceptual relationship existed between the internal arrangements of the plants and the characteristics of plants from a particular region.23 (Ills 1:2) Sixteenth century gardeners favoured an ordered garden, laid out at one time, regularly shaped and planted. It was believed that since the Garden of Eden had been created in one day, botanic gardens should be ideally planted in a single operation. In the late sixteenth century, Padua was still being planted from centre to circumference in accordance with its original blueprint. The emphasis on regularity resulted from the belief that in the pre-lapsarian world, nature itself was regular, the earth level with trees planted in rows.24

The botanic garden at the University of Leiden was established in 1590 (Ill. 3). Under the direction of Herman Boerhaave (1668-1738) from 1709 until his death, Leiden became the centre for medical education. He devised a system of classification consisting of 34 classes subdivided into 104 sections characterized by factors such as the geometric form of the parts of the flower. The symmetrical, rectangular layout of the garden underlined the order of his abstract system (Ill. 4).25

Karl von Linné, commonly known as Linnaeus (1707-1778), a Swedish botanist
trained at Leiden, developed his own scheme in 1735, adopting a binomial nomenclature for each species. In his ten editions of *Systema Naturae* published between 1735 and 1758, he attempted to classify all living things in one table.\(^{26}\) He believed natural beings are constituted by only four variables: "the form of the elements, the quantity of those elements, the manner in which they are distributed in space in relation to each other, and the relative magnitude of each element."\(^{27}\) He divided plants according to the geometry of their reproductive organs. The layout of gardens according to his system of classification also resulted in an abstract system, or "grid of knowledge."\(^{28}\) Plants were arranged in geometric parterres dominated by axial symmetry: "The construction of squares ... as the method of systematizing botanical and zoological garden," writes Foucault of the eighteenth century, "was one of the main preoccupations of scientific technology ... The square is simultaneously an exercise of power and a method of knowing. It is a way of organizing multiplicity, of providing oneself with a tool for investigating and mastering it; it is a way of imposing an 'order on it.'\(^{29}\)

Between 1737 and 1810, Linnaeus's system for grouping plants became the most widely used in botanical studies. However, examination of plants in botanic gardens and in their native habitats revealed the limitations of his descriptive scheme. The gardeners most admired in the early seventeenth century were home-based collectors, yet by mid-century they were replaced by travelling botanists who left to seek out plants growing unaided in their natural habitats.\(^{30}\) Progress in plant geography developed only when these botanists saw freshly explored lands themselves and the plants in situ, leading to a new understanding wherein the natural world became known as a system of organic interaction. A more empirical approach, it dictated that plants be studied in the wild, or in reconstructed
ecosystems within botanic gardens. Gardeners decided nature likes variety and designed different parterres, including specialized gardens and created artificial wildernesses within the garden’s precincts. In the designs of Renaissance gardens, straight lines and avenues of trees had been considered demonstrations of intelligence: through the imposition of regularity and order over nature, anything out of place would be immediately be brought to order. Threaded by sinuous paths, nature regained its innocence in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

In 1774, Antoine Laurent de Jussieu developed a more ‘natural’ system to comprehensively present plants related to one another as well as to their environment. His method, published in Genera Plantarium, 1789, marked the beginning of nomenclature based on plant families.

During the late eighteenth century, the Linnaean system was gradually replaced by Jussieu’s method for organizing botanic gardens. Ecological thought surrounding humanity’s place in nature evolved; what had been thought constant in the fixity of species gave way to a recognition of the adaptability of natural phenomena. Early botanic gardens, while facilitating the scientific study of plants, had not necessarily contributed to landscape aesthetics, leading Jakob Burckhardt to note that, “the classifying and collecting urges which inspired the design of early botanic gardens were a retarding influence in garden design.”

In the early 19th century, several botanic gardens were established at American universities including Harvard, Yale, Princeton, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. The popularity of American university gardens was enhanced by their accessibility and value to all citizens regardless of their place in society. Their founding was stimulated by the obvious educational benefits, as well as the economic advantages to be gained through the
naturalization and cultivation of useful plants. These gardens combined new ecological views of the world with modern developments in landscape design.\textsuperscript{34}

In the 1820s, the modern style meant irregular or naturalistic, with deliberately asymmetrical plantings influenced by the work of English landscape gardener Humphrey Repton (1752-1818), continued into the mid-nineteenth century by J.C. Loudon (1783-1843) in Britain and A.J. Downing (1815-1852) in the United States.\textsuperscript{35} Loudon, in his plans for England’s Birmingham botanic garden, 1831, and Derby Arboretum, 1839, accommodated scientific and ornamental programmes by juxtaposing picturesque and geometric designs. He employed Jussieu’s system and developed the gardensque style which emphasized the natural form and habitat of each plant. The interconnection between the scientific arrangement of plants and the design of the garden led him to combine several different garden styles such as the labyrinth, French and Dutch flower gardens, a style which became known as Loudonesque. He sought to improve science, exhibit useful plants and acclimatize foreign plants in gardens designed for the enjoyment and education of the public. In recognizing the impact of society on gardens, he believed that gardening is affected by government, religion and states of society. As an art of design, he concluded, it must be considered in relation to the climate and situation of the country and the habits and manners of its inhabitants.\textsuperscript{36}

One of the most popular attractions in botanic gardens was the greenhouse. Verdant throughout the seasons, filled with exotic flora and tropical trees, in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century it was a symbol of the Garden of Eden, providing a prototypical social utopia. Loudon’s invention of a wrought iron glazing bar specifically for horticultural structures in 1823 launched the first phase in the development of the greenhouse. He designed greenhouses with curvilinear
outer skins which culminated in Joseph Paxton’s Great Conservatory at Chatsworth, 1836. These early conservatories were the preserves of the aristocracy and upper middle classes. A greenhouse built by the Royal Botanical Garden under Queen Victoria’s patronage in Regent’s Park between 1842-1846, gave the impression of a “genteel botanical seminar” and were “little empires, patrolled by white Europeans without the usual inconveniences of raging fevers and hostile indigens.”

The second phase commenced in the 1840s, following the 1845 repeal of the glass tax in Britain which substantially lowered construction costs. Prefabricated units were used to produce large public greenhouses, the plans of which were distinguished by the connection of various rooms of varying heights. The winter garden, designed to provide amusement for all members of society; was a place where the “meditative, private garden of the past was transformed into the botanical display as mass entertainment and mass education.”

It ushered in the modern era after which nature could only be enjoyed in an artificial form, as a ‘product’ and as such, was no longer natural:

In the secret world of the hothouse nature is on display, like an uncovered picture, as the illusion of a wide world, and simultaneously as a tangible earthly paradise brought nearer to hand. In the setting out of the display there is, however, a completely irrevocable separation from the object on which the gaze falls; nature is no longer available in its pure and guileless form but has a market value. She opens a window onto the tropics for an entrance fee. The more crowded the city, the greater was the desire for the delight of looking at nature this way.

The botanic garden, with its emphasis on knowing the plants through classification, order, and display, thus visually asserting power over nature, is an example of what Tony Bennett has called the “exhibitionary complex.” Institutions of exhibition, such as art, history and natural science museums, heretofore existing for the enjoyment of a very wealthy
few, opened to benefit a broader public in the nineteenth century, forming a complex of
disciplinary and power relations to subtly convey the message of state power over society.
Museums became an instrument for the moral and cultural regulation of the working class
providing a permanent setting for the display of power and knowledge. Through
commanding and arranging objects for display, people were given the power to know, rather
than be known, and became the subjects rather than the objects of knowledge.40 Paxton’s
Crystal Palace, the form of which was derived from the greenhouse and wintergarden,
constructed for London’s Great Exhibition in 1851 set an architectural precedent by
arranging new, “relations between the public and exhibits so that, while everyone could see,
there were also vantage points from which everyone could be seen, thus combining functions
of spectacle and surveillance.”41 The state increasingly became involved in the provision of
spectacles considered educative and civilizing. The mingling of the social classes in these
institutions was expected to lead to the improved behaviour of the working class, thereby
forming a new, improved public.

The belief that the perfect environment would mould the perfect citizen was, to a
large degree, the impetus behind the founding of a number of public parks and botanic
gardens in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In rapidly expanding industrial
cities, nature was seen as an antidote to the ills of city living that would combat alienation
and restore a sense of community to its inhabitants. Parks, “the lungs of the city,” and trees
provided refuge and absorbed gases, receiving or preventing heat reflected from brick
houses. Social reformers blamed London’s 1832 cholera epidemic on the congestion and
squalid living conditions which resulted from the Industrial Revolution. The circulation of
fresh air in parks, they believed, would purify the disease-ridden atmosphere which was
absolutely essential for the health and vitality of urban dwellers. Although, as Kohlmaier and von Sartory state, the “introduction of greenery always had a moral and ethical background in the plight of the working class”42 the illusion of nature could not stem growing social tensions in overcrowded cities.

The technological and economic developments of the Industrial Revolution altered the living conditions of all classes of society as rural dwellers flocked to cities, thus severing the traditional physical relationship with the land on which they had lived and from which they had earned their livelihood. The accommodation of this growth transformed old neighbourhoods into slums lacking adequate lighting, ventilation, and sanitary provisions. The greenhouse, made possible through industrial innovation, was the site of temporary refuge and a symbolic reunion with nature. A contemporary of Paxton’s, W. Bridges Adam, wrote:

Why should the inhabitants of the metropolis not be enabled to command between the months of October and April of every year, the facilities a winter garden would afford for healthful enjoyment; and especially that large and invalid class of our population who the first breath of a north-easterly wind now consigns to the imprisonment of their own dwellings.43

Penhallow’s Proposals

Montreal was not unscathed by the social ills which plagued other industrial cities. Working class neighbourhoods grew too quickly, resulting in overcrowding, insufficient water supplies, poor sanitation and housing. Fires raged and a fierce cholera epidemic swept through Quebec in 1859. McGill University professor D.P. Penhallow (1854-1910) was one of the first propagandists for a botanic garden in Montreal. He outlined his proposals in a series of editorials published in the Daily Herald in March 1885, which later appeared as the
10th annual report of the Montreal Horticultural Society and Fruit Growers’ Association of the Province of Quebec, entitled On the Establishment of a Botanic Garden and Arboretum in Montreal.\textsuperscript{44}

Penhallow petitioned the city for seventy-five acres of Mount Royal in order to create a garden and arboretum, the latter to showcase trees not only from across Canada, but from all parts of the world. Because Canada’s economic future was linked to the forestry industry, forty acres would be devoted to the arboretum; five acres would be home to aquatic and marsh plants and the remaining thirty acres would be formally planted. The greenhouses would enhance the attractiveness of the park and include palms, orchids, tropical ferns and exotics, “essential to the purpose of instruction.” Measuring 216 feet in length and 90 feet in depth, the greenhouse was designed to allow for “future extension of the buildings without disturbing the harmony of the first construction.”\textsuperscript{45} Planned additions included lecture rooms, a library with an office and an economic museum.

In order to reach and serve all citizens, no entrance fee would be charged. He proposed an educational mandate based on that at Kew, established near London in the late seventeenth century, which offered information for recreational gardeners, as well as classes two evenings each week in elementary chemistry, physics and meteorology.\textsuperscript{46}

In addition to popularizing botanical science, he expected the garden to provide recreation and instruction to the labouring classes, thus elevating public sentiment. His proposals reveal the Victorian era’s faith in the curative effects of nature on physical and moral health, and are steeped in a colonialist rhetoric which would have appealed to the city’s philanthropic Scottish Presbyterian anglo-elite. As no other city in the Dominion was home to such a wide-range of important educational institutions, nor so well placed in the
centre of the country, he argued that the creation of a botanic garden in Montreal was of absolute necessity and long overdue.\textsuperscript{47}

To justify the costs incurred in creating the garden, (anticipated initial expenditures were between $50,000 to $80,000 with annual maintenance costs of between eight to ten thousand dollars) Penhallow used the examples set by other nations. He reported that there were 187 botanic gardens which he broke down numerically by country. He argued that the most civilized nations possessed such gardens. Canada, in its lack, was "forced into a list with those nations of least enterprise and in the lower scale of civilization. She even stands lower than Japan, ... a country which is generally considered to have been half civilized until within a very few years, but which, notwithstanding, maintained a botanic garden for a number of years before the present European contact."\textsuperscript{48}

Penhallow emphasized the function of European gardens, whether state or university affiliated, as providing not only popular education but ornamental or pleasure grounds. A garden in Montreal would benefit scientists by encouraging original research, classifying plants from all parts of the world and promoting seed exchanges with similar institutions. It would prove economically advantageous through the cure of plants diseases. No hint of commercial enterprise was to be associated with the garden.

The primary benefit for the citizens of Montreal was to be the elevation of moral and social standards. Penhallow argued that in order for a culture and civilization to advance, a place must be provided for the contemplation of natural objects. He established a link between the degree of civilization a people possessed and the number of gardens they cultivated, asserting that "Canada can hardly afford to do less than those nations over whom she claims superiority, while her interests actually demand that she should be among the
foremost of nations in her maintenance of such gardens.\textsuperscript{149}

Penhallow stressed the influence the garden would exert over the community:

The habit of reflection, which unconsciously springs from the frequent contemplation of natural objects, particularly when the prevailing laws are well defined, engenders higher ideals, a clearer moral perception and a less morbid disposition, and there is thus a constant tendency to turn men from the commission of deeds which are a disgrace to humanity, to the performance of that which is worthy of noble manhood.\textsuperscript{50}

He supported his statement with his findings that in communities with botanic gardens, citizens possessed a greater intelligence and refinement while crime had been reduced due to the elevation of the lower classes.

The garden would prove physically beneficial to the city by supplying trees to line the streets, offering the shade so often lacking in cities but vital for health and comfort, and bedding materials for public grounds, thereby extending its educational value to the citizens at large.

The Montreal Horticultural Society, consisting of twelve members, had only $525.00 in its coffers received from its members. The Society was asked to provide the city council with a list of its members, financial status, plans and estimated costs for buildings, annual maintenance fees, and potential funding sources. Citizens were kept abreast of developments in the daily newspapers and could follow the progress of the Society's plans. Alderman Stevenson objected to the idea of such a large tract of valuable property ceded with so little information known about the society and its funding sources. He was countered by Alderman Grenier who, quite satisfied with the information furnished by Penhallow, accused Stevenson of concealing dishonest interests, having heard a certain, undisclosed rumour.\textsuperscript{51}
Penhallow’s aims were supported by the Montreal daily newspaper The Herald:

Besides the educational and economic advantages which the establishment of a Botanic Garden in Montreal is capable of conferring on the inhabitants of both town and country, it will add greatly to the attraction of the city and will afford an innocent and elevating means of enjoyment to its citizens of all classes, ages and conditions. The taste for flowers is happily general and the gratification of it yields nothing but pleasure. It is, too, a cheap pleasure and is followed by no remorseful and depressing reaction. It is a pleasure that women and children can participate in. To have a garden within easy reach of his home to which he can take his wife and family, in which they can see and admire, and not only the flowers that flourish in our climate, but the rarest and the most lovely exotics which are now only accessible to the very rich, would add much to the citizen’s enjoyment of life and make the city more desirable than it now is as a place of residence. Such a Botanic Garden as the Association proposes to establish would be one of the principal and most enduring attractions of the city. Every sojourner in Montreal would make a point of visiting it and would spread its fame wherever he went.52

Although press accounts reveal that half of the city councillor’s were in favour of the proposed garden and it had garnered the support of at least two English newspapers, the Daily Star and The Herald, the garden was not planted.

Marie-Victorin and his Victory

It would be half a century before Montreal saw the resurrection of Penhallow’s ideals in the hands of the more politically astute French Canadian nationalist and botanist, Frère Marie-Victorin (1885-1944), member of the Frères Écoles chrétiennes. Born Conrad Louis Kéroack, he was the son of Philomène Luneau and Cyrille Kéroack, a prosperous grain and flour merchant, of the Saint-Saveur parish in Kingsley-Falls. He became a novitiate of the Frères Écoles chrétiennes at Mont-de-La-Salle in 1901 on the present site of the Montreal
Botanical Garden. After a bout with tuberculosis and a proscribed cure of rest and fresh air in 1903, Marie-Victorin became fascinated with botany. Armed with Abby Léon Provancher's *la Flore canadienne*, published in 1862, he spent his time outdoors identifying plants. He wrote, "Comme Linné, j'ai vu Dieu dans ses oeuvres; je me suis passionne pour elles, innocente passion que Dieu me pardonnera."^53

In 1920, Monseigneur Gauthier asked Marie-Victorin to establish a Botanical Institute at the University of Montreal. Two years later, Marie-Victorin completed his doctoral dissertation entitled *les Filicinées du Québec*. His involvement with the planning of a botanic garden began in December 1925 when the organization over which he presided, the Canadian Society for Natural History, recommended labelling trees in public parks. The city's Executive Committee refused. Four years later, on 14 December 1929, the society officially launched the project for a full-scale botanical garden. He declared on 16 December that the garden was not an unrealizable fantasy as he had read in a *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club* dating from 1886, of earlier efforts. Yet another bulletin, issued by the New York Botanical Garden dating from 1897 reported, "The Montreal Botanic Garden, begun in 1885 on about 75 acres of ground in Mount Royal Park, was soon abandoned, owing to political complications."^54

Attracted to the area for the richness of its soil varieties and his knowledge of the site, Marie-Victorin requested the annexation of 180 acres of Maisonneuve Park for the establishment of the botanical garden. The park was far from the anglo-elite preserves of the mountain in the highly industrialized ward of the city, Maisonneuve, which as an independent city in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, had proudly promoted itself as both the "Pittsburgh of Canada" and the "Garden of Montreal." As the second
largest manufacturing centre in Quebec and the fourth largest in Canada, Maisonneuve produced such goods as ships, textiles, footwear, candy, and cookies. Between 1891 and 1910, the population burgeoned from 1,000 to 20,000. To celebrate the economic prosperity and growth, an extensive beautification programme was adopted, inspired by the Daniel Burnham’s City Beautiful Movement of the 1870s in the United States, with the erection of monumental buildings, the development of parks, the planning of imposing boulevards culminating in impressive vistas and strict zoning laws. The changes were spearheaded by the team of mayor Alexandre Michaud and Oscar Dufresne (1875-1936), a wealthy industrialist and administrator.

The development of Maisonneuve was controlled by a small elite of French Canadian businessmen, a middle-class bourgeoisie composed of men with commercial, industrial and financial interests. Municipal policies protected the interests of the wealthy: between 1884 and 1915, at least one landowner sat on the municipal council as mayor or councillor. As the core of Montreal became congested, its population expanded outward. Industries in Maisonneuve were founded to attract workers and dwellings were constructed to encourage settlement near the factories.

By 1910, 150 acres had been acquired for Maisonneuve Park; in 1912 Oscar Dufresne planned to quadruple its size to create a park for east Montrealers on par with Mount Royal. He was inspired by European parks, and wished to incorporate cultural and athletic facilities. The grandiose plans for the park included a race track, amphitheatre, artificial lakes and casinos; educational institutions such as an art gallery with a museum and library and botanical gardens with an aquarium and zoo; and for amusement a variety of restaurants, even “a Japanese café with gardens adorned with fairy-like waterfalls.” Half of the
generated revenues would return to the municipality; the other half to be distributed to hospitals, schools and charitable organizations. His plans were approved by the provincial government with the condition that the park be administered by a commission separate from the municipality.

The Frères des Écoles chrétiennes sold Mont-de-La-Salle to the City of Maisonneuve on 13 December 1913 for $1.5 million. An additional 450 acres of land were acquired between 1913 and 1916. Through the many land speculation deals, in what came to be known as the “Scandal of Maisonneuve Park” the total cost of the park was an incredible $6,445,615. The city’s growth was halted by World War I; Maisonneuve was in enormous debt having to borrow money to pay interest on loans in 1916 and 1917. By provincial decree, it was annexed to Montreal in 1918.

Marie-Victorin’s desire to establish a botanical garden recalled Penhallow’s. In 1930 he declared:

Montréal, il faut l’admettre pour avoir les désir d’y remedédier, est une ville sans beauté, une ville adolescente et dans toute la fadeur de l’âge ingrat. Sans le mont Royal, déjà défloré, et que son indurcible syénite défend seul contre les pires vandalisms, sans nos eaux fluviales que nous n’avons guère la possibilité d’enlaidir, note ville serait un énorme faubourg sans caractère et sans originalité, attrayant seulement pour certaine classe de touristes sensible surtout aux omniprésentes vitrines de la Commission des liqueurs.

He enlisted the support of mayor Camillien Houde, (1889-1958) a former student of natural sciences from his teaching days at Collège Longueuil. Houde promised a botanical garden to the city in his 1930 campaign for re-election. Both Marie-Victorin and Houde felt the garden would “put Montreal on the map” as a place for recreation, an educational institution and a tourist attraction.
The call for the creation of the botanical garden came at the beginning of the Great Depression which had an immediate impact on Montreal. In 1929, the net-funded debt of the city, which had tripled in size during the first three decades of the century, was $182.5 million, or $238 per capita. Accustomed to solving revenue shortages by extensive borrowing, the city lacked an adequate tax base with an economy based on low-wage, labour intensive jobs, rather than modern industries. Montreal was a magnet to unskilled labourers -- those most vulnerable to unemployment during harsh economic times.

In 1930 Houde organized a slate of candidates and campaigned against Desroches with charges of maladministration and scandalous conduct. His programme included facilities to improve public health, lower transit fares and reduced utility rates. Little attention was paid to the high unemployment of the winter season in the faith that conditions would improve in the spring. Houde and his slate received a majority of 40,847 votes in the 1930 election, the largest in the city's history. Between 1930 and 1931, most municipal, provincial and federal relief was channelled into public and architectural works projects with only a small provision for direct assistance. The city borrowed over $20 million at a rate of six percent to pay for its expenditures on relief projects. Public works money was spent with scant regard to accounting practices. By June 1, 1931, twenty percent of the male labour force was without work and during the winter of 1930-1, more than 100,000 Montrealers were on relief.

Houde claimed that by 1932, 18,000 additional men, "the majority taken from the ranks of the unemployed" were working on public projects initiated by the city. One project was the Botanical Garden and the extent to which its creation relied on Houde's support is demonstrated by the fact that when he was ousted from office, work ceased on its
construction. Yet another supporter was Louis Dupire, editor of *Le Devoir*, who, displeased with the lethargy displayed by the younger generation, championed Marie-Victorin's efforts with the Cercles de jeunes naturalistes in 1930. In the early stages of the planning of the Garden, Dupire wrote editorials geared to appeal to municipal pride in editorials comparing the city's insignificant parks budget to that of Toronto and Philadelphia. He quoted Mr. Blanchard, the director of Municipal Public Works, as stating "Je ne crois pas, a-t-il, qu'il y ait eu jamais un projet plus populaire à l'hôtel de ville." Parks, Dupire believed, had a positive effect on the moral and physical health of youth. Furthermore, work on the garden would alleviate the economic crisis. He wrote, ... "notre jardin botanique sera tout cela et, en plus, un précieux médium éducationnel, pour nos propres enfants et un attrait considérables pour les touristes."  

The Executive Committee of Montreal gave the Botanical Garden project $100 000 on 4 March 1932, permitting initial drainage and levelling, the construction of a small central pavilion and the first service greenhouse. The work was to be completed under E.P.J. Courval, designer and chief architect for the city. The first plans for the building, which had been commissioned on 11 February 1932, were signed by Albert Mercure and depicted an austere, classical and unadorned structure. The architect had envisioned a Palladian academic building in granite with a central section and simple forms inspired by the Palais Montcalm in Quebec City (Robitaille et Désmeules, 1931). On 20 April 1932, the Executive Committee rejected Mercure's plans, demanding that city architect, Lucien Kéroack, (1886-1951), a cousin to Marie-Victorin, prepare new plans. This move may have resulted partly from nepotism: the times were very difficult as architect Hazen Sise (1906-1974) remembers the predicament: "You have only to look at any North American city --the
whole city, not just the central core -- to realize that even in the best of times architects are regarded as a luxury. In a depression, architects are amongst the first to suffer and the last to recover." In 1929, Montreal architectural firms employed 1180 assistants and designers; by 1931, this number had dwindled to 710.

Kéroack was, however, an accomplished architect. A former student of the École des Beaux-Arts de Montréal, he pursued architectural training in New York where he won the Robert Goelet prize, enabling him to spend two years at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris in the studio of Victor Laloux, architect of the Gare d’Orsay (1898-1900). He lived in Georgia, USA, before returning to Montreal where he worked in the office of J.-O. Marchand, the first French Canadian graduate of the Paris École des Beaux-Arts, and in the office of Ross and Macdonald where he prepared drawings for the Dominion Square building and Mount-Royal Hotel. He later practised in Boucherville where he lived, and completed the plans of a number of schools in Chambly.

For the main pavilion Kéroack drew up plans which reflected current international trends in architectural form. Sise complained about the conservatism of Montreal architecture in the 1930s: a revolutionary period in Europe with the teachings and works of Le Corbusier, Walter Gropius and Mies van der Rohe, modernism in Montreal generally meant the Scottish baronial style exemplified by McGill’s Physiology building, (Nobbs and Hyde, 1922). Kéroack’s design was in the Art Deco style, first defined at the Paris International Exposition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Art in 1925, which emphasized a monumentality and axial symmetry derived from Beaux-Arts planning principles. The style found favour in large buildings constructed during the Depression era and was used for public projects, not only in Canada, but extensively by the Works Progress Administration in the United States, to
project a spirit of optimism, modernity and luxury. Kéroack's plans “exhibited his skill in not making the structure too conventional in appearance,” wrote a journalist in The Gazette, who, addressing a general public, hastened to reassure the readers that while, “The style of the pavilion is classed as ultra modern, [it] need not imply that it is ugly.” (Ill. 5)

In contrast to the previously dominant Art nouveau style characterized by sinewy organic forms, deco architecture utilized the geometric ziggurat form (Ill. 6), with decorations inspired by native American motifs. Kéroack's design incorporated bas-relief coloured terracotta panels created by sculptor Henri Hébert (1884-1950) depicting indigenous peoples and plants: ‘Le mais’ represents a native woman crushing corn; ‘Le bouleau’ an Algonquin man steering a canoe; ‘L’érable’ a maple tree being tapped’ and ‘Le Nenuphar’ a moose standing in a pond with water lilies (Ill. 7). The corners of the building were crowned by copper ‘ziggurat-like’ projections, as were the entrance gates to the Garden. A series of fountains with stepped cascades and a large pool at its base, on axis to the main entrance of the building drew attention to the symmetry of the composition. The upper fountain was decorated with a bas relief sculpture of beavers and a representation of Neptune. For the simple buff brown brick structure, which would house a library, herbarium, auditorium and the classrooms and laboratories of the Botanical Institute of the University of Montreal, Kéroack borrowed the H-shape used in religious and educational buildings to bring maximum luminousity into the interior.

In the municipal election of 1932, Fernand Rinfret (1883-1939) a former minister under Mackenzie King, ran for mayor with a platform based on financial reform. Houde lost the election, including his home ward of Ste. Marie, which, considering his attempt to combat unemployment, reflected that those who remained employed regarded loss of work
a sign of personal failure. The election coincided with a decline in government support for public works expenditures as a form of relief in favour of direct assistance (dole).

In 1933, all work was suspended on the Botanical Garden, an enterprise thought “Houdiste.” Civic authorities took over relief administration in August 1933 and found 60,000 names on various relief rolls and estimated that 205,000 persons were dependent on dole. By late 1933, one quarter of the male labour force was on relief.

One of the fundamental economic drains on the city resulted from the large number of autonomous municipalities within and around Montreal which used the urban area without contributing to the city’s maintenance. Ironically, the predominantly working class towns of Verdun, Lachine and Montreal East survived the 1930s in better fiscal shape. The winter of 1933-4 was the worst of the depression: the number of municipal relief dependents rose to one quarter of a million. Most relief recipients were blue collar francophones who worked in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations. In the early teens, Errol Bouchette had written of the plight facing most francophones, who ... “detached from the soil by the loss of their lands and unprepared for industry by their education: the two careers which create riches are thus closed to them, and even commerce, by which wealth is accumulated.”

Houde, upon his re-election on 9 April 1934, fulfilled his campaign promise to bring the best qualified administrators to the city’s aid and appointed Brigadier-General E.B. de Panet from the Canadian Pacific Railway to introduce modern business practices into relief administration. The dole-system was soon overturned in favour of public works spending.

That same day, Marie-Victorin addressed the Diggers and Weeders Garden Club in Westmount. He presented a slide lecture introducing gardens from around the world, to demonstrate their attractiveness as public places for tourists and children, as well as centres
for the distribution of knowledge of a country's flora. He solicited support by stating that Canada possessed no such garden, the closest approximation being at the University of British Columbia.

It was not until 1936, however, when Maurice Duplessis became the premier of Quebec and his party the Union nationale came into power with a mandate committed to providing public works jobs, that construction on the buildings and gardens resumed. On 24 April 1936, the Executive Committee of Montreal created the Botanical Garden Committee, composed of Committee Chief Ovide Taillefer, President and Secretary Marie-Victorin, Director M.M. George-W. Scartch, head of McGill's Botany department, M.J.-A. Savoie, president of the Quebec Liquor licensing board, and M.J.-Elie Blanchard, Director of the Municipal Public Works. Marie-Victorin was appointed scientific director. The committee hired German-born Henry Teuscher (1891-1984) to serve as Chief Horticulturalist and Superintendent.

Teuscher, like Marie-Victorin, had suffered poor health as a youth and had been encouraged to spend time outdoors. He undertook a voluntary internship at a Berlin horticultural institute which confirmed his future vocation. He trained for two and half years under Professor P. Graebner at the Dahlem Superior College where he earned both a certificate to teach horticulture and a Master's degree in landscape architecture. During World War I, he served as a Lieutenant in the artillery, after which he worked as a landscape architect reconstructing parks in Hamburg. He then returned to Berlin to assist Dr. Alfred Engler, Director of the New Botanical Garden in Dahlem, established ca. 1897 where he began formulating his ideas for a botanical garden and taught evening classes in horticulture. He left the country because, "life in Germany was very restricted and rather dreary"... the
"economy was way down, and slow to recover." He wrote his compatriot, Alfred Rehder, employed as dendrologist at the Arnold Arboretum in Boston who shared the letter with its founding director Professor Sargent. Teuscher emigrated to the United States where he worked under Rehder; he also planned and realized the Morton Arboretum in Chicago and in 1930 was hired as director of the newly established Boyce Thompson Arboretum in Yonkers, N.Y.

Marie-Victorin first met Teuscher in the spring of 1932 and offered him the position of Chief Horticulturalist of the Montreal Botanical Garden. Having visited many gardens including the Jardin des Plantes in Paris, Kew, and botanical collections at private estates, Teuscher was well versed with what he considered the limitations of these gardens and thought Montreal offered an opportunity to learn from the past. He eagerly accepted the challenge yet later recanted due to the low salary offered, his premature enthusiasm, he wrote Marie-Victorin, stemming from the prospect of laying out a new botanical garden "along entirely modern lines." However he offered free advice to Marie-Victorin, and requested a topographical map of the grounds. The two men corresponded between 1932 and 1936, and visited when possible -- Teuscher coming to Montreal at Marie-Victorin's or the city's expense to oversee the garden's progress.

To create an ideal botanical garden Teuscher believed four things to be necessary: a scientist at its helm who paid equal attention to botanical and horticulture science, recognizing that the latter held greater appeal for the general public; a sufficiently large tract of land; adequate funds with at least $100,000 in the first year; and that it should, ... "in close cooperation with the scientist in charge -- be designed, laid out [sic] and superintended by one and the same man." The flaw common to many gardens, Teuscher
wrote, was that they were planned by a landscape architect who knew little about the particular needs of botanical gardens, under a scientist who knew little about landscape architecture. The inability of the two to communicate would cause the landscape architect to leave with the gardener left in charge having limited knowledge of landscape design practices. Teuscher's training, as landscape architect and horticulturalist provided him with the necessary skills of both professions. In addition, he was trained in the fundamentals of botanical science. He presented these facts to Marie-Victorin who could in turn use them to impress the City Council. By hiring Teuscher, they would get the expertise of three men in one.

Marie-Victorin sent Teuscher a plan of the grounds, indicating the location of existing trees, and the elevations above sea level, and a "very provisional" plan for planting around the building. He wrote, "Tell me if, in case we might be obliged to proceed early with some terracing, this could be done without engaging the future too much. For the sake of public opinion, we will have to do something this fall, of course." 85

Teuscher responded quickly:

Please, do not do this sort of thing, whatever you do. It will be regretted forever after. I do not want to say anything against the architect, but this is the design of a builder who is used to work [sic] rule and compass and known [sic] nothing about plants. 200 years ago official gardens used to be laid out in this fashion and, thanks [sic] heaven, they are gone. The first greenhouse which you build would, of course, have to be a propagating house, and, I believe, that it would be very unfortunate, if you would have to set in [sic] in a crazy angle in the middle of the landscape, only because that pleased the designers [sic] fancy who could not get out of the rut of angles in which he stepped because the building happens to be sitting across a corner. 86

He asked Marie-Victorin to explain whether the "sake of public opinion" was born of a desire
to prove that the Botanical Garden project was in progress or the need to employ men. Construction of the nursery and propagating department should take precedence with terracing begun only after a complete plan of the whole garden was finished. Of Kéroack he stated, "I wish I could meet this man as I feel confident that I could talk him out of his plan. I have always been very successful in dealing with oldfashioned [sic], suspicious people of which he undoubtedly is." In his post-script, he emphatically re-stated, "The whole garden must be designed in one piece or mistakes are unavoidable. Do you realize what a grand vista you would and should have from the building over the whole width of the garden? But there is the powerhouse right in the middle of it, spoiling it for ever [sic]." Two days later he wrote recommending that should any conservatories be built, they be combined in one block with the heating plant close by: if scattered not only would there be great heat loss, but fuel bills twice the cost. He closed, "You can not [sic] get away from the necessity of designing the whole garden in one piece without making serious mistakes."

Marie-Victorin wrote back informing Teuscher that the "building is already sticking out of the ground," and while he shared the opinion on the placement of the heating-plant and greenhouses, it would be difficult at that point to change their location. He had, however, arranged to send Kéroack to New York to meet with Teuscher, and discuss these problems, explaining diplomatically that, "Mr. Kirouac is an architect of repute, but of course he is in no way familiar with botanical gardens."

After both Kéroack and Teuscher expressed satisfaction with their meeting, Marie-Victorin wrote Teuscher, "If the thing is really to succeed, it will be in the future by the hearty cooperation of the three of us." Teuscher agreed, "I am sure that the three of us would be able to make a real success of this Botanical Garden, if we could only get our hands on it."
Marie-Victorin had hoped the economic climate would benefit the construction of the garden as early as 1933. He wrote Teuscher, "There is some probability that the system of direct assistance (dole) will soon be done with and that unemployment money will be voted for public works. This is our chance."90 Yet another obstacle stood in their way:

The great difficulty is with your quality of alien. There is some opposition among the Executive of the City; some people cannot believe that we cannot find within the city limits an expert on botanical gardens. Of course this is my fight and I will wage it. Your part for the moment is patience. It would be prudent for you to organize your summer entirely outside of us.91

When the Boyce Thompson Arboretum was discontinued in 1933, Teuscher became Arborist at the New York Botanical Garden. He continued to make it clear that should he be offered an adequate salary, he would relinquish his duties in New York and move to Montreal. Marie-Victorin continued to lobby the government and garner public support while the garden lay dormant. It would be three years before Teuscher was appointed and public works funding allocated to the garden.

Teuscher published his **Program for an Ideal Botanical Garden**, a later version of his 1934 series of articles "The Botanical Garden of the Future," in 1940, wherein he described his plans for the Montreal Botanical Garden and outlined his beliefs about the function of a botanical garden in contemporary society. Education was foremost: "in order to justify its existence in a modern community the modern botanical garden must widen the scope of its educational activities."92 The concentration of people in large cities had resulted in a gulf between people and nature, imbuing the garden with a "valuable task helping the uprooted city dweller regain or keep a healthful relationship to nature."93 City parks were inadequate and, in lacking an educational mandate, were subject to vandalism. What was
needed was systematic education, in simple, attractive displays, where the public would learn without realizing it was being taught. He concluded that two points were necessary to attract people and deepen interest in plant life: the display of local, native flora and flower gardens. He believed that through an understanding of plant life, people would reach a greater understanding of their own existence. He wrote that the modern, misunderstood notion of nature having to be conquered was childish because, “Man is not a part of nature but rather its supreme master.”

Teuscher’s ‘Master’ plan

There were fewer than 2 000 landscape architects practising in the United States during the 1930s and the dominant style was Beaux-Arts, in which European axial forms were combined with the Romantic and informal ideas popular in late nineteenth century England. In the United States, “Modern landscape work relentlessly enclosed, encoded, patterned, and abstracted nature.” Teuscher’s plans for a botanical garden laid out “along modern lines” did not reflect the “spartan geometry of the modern era” with the rejection of Beaux-Arts methods in favour of utilizing “space, form and graphic techniques [which] responded to the influences of cubism”... Nor were they influenced by the modernism of young German, Dutch and Scandinavian landscape architects practising in the early twentieth century. According to Jacques de Laplante, “Il était un authentique chercheur de la vieille école européenne.” His conservatism is reflected in his lack of innovation and the classicism of his plans (Ill. 8).

The majority of Teuscher’s designs were based on the French Beaux-Arts with an emphasis on imposing vistas. The entrance gardens of annuals planted in front of the main pavilion and paths were symmetrical corresponding to the axial symmetry of the cascades,
fountains and main building and the "elegant and sober lines" earned Teuscher a comparison to André Le Nôtre (1613-1700), the French landscape architect of Versailles (1661-1688) and other baroque gardens.\textsuperscript{98} Teuscher employed bedding, a nineteenth century garden fashion which had been a revolt against the informality and naturalism of the eighteenth century as a return to the formality of garden planning of the seventeenth century. The display gardens were grouped together not only to facilitate their care, but to help visitors identify plants of particular interest (Ill. 11). He encouraged more freedom in other parts of the grounds, suggesting that specific literary themes, borrowed from the Bible or Shakespeare, perhaps, be used for inspiration.\textsuperscript{99} Should a Japanese garden be added, he recommended that it be placed near the Asiatic section and the services of a Japanese gardener be secured to "avoid vague imitations by occidental gardeners."\textsuperscript{100} He wrote Marie-Victorin:

If I am allowed to continue the development of this garden along the lines which I have followed up to the present you may rest assured that the Montreal Botanical Garden when completed will stand unique not only for the unusual educational opportunities which it offers but also for its attractive landscape design and general beauty.\textsuperscript{101}

The land reserved for the botanical garden was "almost completely flat containing few scattered trees and providing no scenic interest whatsoever. Therefore, it was decided to arrange plant displays in a series of formal gardens. ... Only the alpinum and a number of ecological groups of native Canadian plants, which occupy the center of the garden ... (Arboretum) are entirely informal."\textsuperscript{102} Two small mountains were built to showcase the flora of the Gaspésie and the Laurentien mountains. In homage to the English picturesque tradition, the ponds area featured two artificial lakes around which were planted flora from
the St. Lawrence river and Laurentide lakes.

The medicinal garden was divided in four sections, the largest containing plants, "which the American Indians used for medicinal purposes before they came into contact with the white man. Since the Indians used the bark and leaves of various trees, these trees have been disposed in a sort of grove surrounding an open glade. A small pond and brook have also been constructed." ... "A log cabin and totem pole lend local colour to the scene." 103

With the renewed activity at the garden, the local press carried constant reports on its progress. Marie-Victorin published an article announcing the opening of the main pavilion, closed since its completion, thanking Le Devoir and Houde, amongst others, for making his dream a reality. He wrote that the garden was a place for both young and old, but particularly for, "les yeux émerveillés de nos enfants, le Livre admirable de la Nature que viendra enluminer chaque printemps nouveau." 104 An unidentified journalist wrote that the study of the natural sciences guaranteed morality, was of economic necessity and proved a satisfying pastime, "De plus le jardin botanique attirera ici une foule de touristes et d’étrangers." 105 In August 1936, the garden opened for visits from two until five o’clock each afternoon.

Teuscher addressed the Horticultural Society of the Town of Mount Royal in February 1938. The garden, considered an unnecessary luxury by many, was defended by Teuscher as a place useful to the average citizen as human life depends on plant life. The Botanical Garden would not function solely as a show place or experimental station. The columns in the ornamental fence surrounding the garden, criticized for their costliness, were made from artificial stone, and the work was employing men who had been previously without incomes. 106

35
The word garden is derived from fence, sharing the root in Old English, *geard* which denotes an “enclosed space.” The fence is an essential feature of the garden, both for what it includes and excludes, and it figured prominently in Teuscher’s design. A columnist for the Montreal Star reported:

Great care is being taken by Mr. Teuscher and his assistants to completely isolate the gardens from nearby districts which in certain directions, are mostly occupied by industries. To give the gardens the full atmosphere of being located in wild areas far from large cities, a huge mound has been build near the bounding iron fences. With trees and shrubs planted on these mounds, the thousands of telephone and telegraph poles which surround the garden will be hidden from the visitor’s view.

Excitement for the Botanical Garden was generated in articles which stressed the number of men put to work. The Montreal Standard reported, “With 700 men constantly at work” Montreal would “soon be able to boast one of the world’s most elaborate and attractive botanical gardens.” By 28 May 1938, the gardens were referred to as “a project which, under the Hon. William Tremblay [Quebec’s Minister of Labour] is aiding some 1200 unemployed find themselves again.” The size of the garden was increased by twelve to fifteen acres in the spring of 1938 in order to create the arboretum requiring the demolition of twelve houses, which were reported as attractive and in excellent condition, on Desjardins and Dandurand streets. In July 1938, across the street on the site now home to Olympic Park, an extension to the gardens was landscaped according to designs by Teuscher, “thus providing still more activities for the former unemployed.” Between 1936 and 1939 an estimated 2 000 men worked on the Botanical Garden.

Most work on the garden and its extension had been finished by 1939 at a cost of $6 million. A new threat now faced its completion. With the start of World War II, the Minister
of National Defence wanted to use the land and administration building for air defense training. Duplessis, whose government had lent strong financial support to the garden, lost the election to Adelard Godbout whose administration was opposed to the garden and halted work, demanding that the garden be ceded to the city for $1.99. Marie-Victorin was able to protect the garden through political connections. Lucien Dansereau, father of botanist Pierre Dansereau, was a member of Godbout’s cabinet and petitioned on the garden’s behalf. The administration building was used as a court for delinquent boys for a short time, but the garden was ceded to the city in 1941, the 300th anniversary of Montreal’s founding, for the symbolic sum of $1.00.\textsuperscript{113}

P.A. Chandler, in an article published in Kew’s \textbf{Bulletin of Miscellaneous Information}, 1940, lauded the garden’s accomplishments ... “the Montreal Botanical Garden promises to become eventually an institution of which the British Empire can be proud.”\textsuperscript{114} Chief amongst its attractions were the “colourful entrance gardens” which lured visitors in and “plants used for food by the American Indians,” thought to be of particular interest to foreign tourists.\textsuperscript{115}

In a 1942 booklet entitled \textbf{The Montreal Botanical Garden} signed simply, “the Director” Marie-Victorin explained the purposes of a botanical garden and the services it rendered:

\textit{As an educational institute}, it offers courses and lectures to adults as well as to children of all ages. It spreads the knowledge of plants and teaches the appreciation of nature as well as practical gardening. \textit{As an experimental and research station}, it examines minutely the native flora of the country in which it is located, thus keeping close check on all natural plant resources and their possible exploitation. \textit{As a center of display} for the most desirable garden flowers, it offers an incentive to those who garden for themselves, which serves to beautify the city. \textit{As a}
beautiful park -- much more diversified in its contents than any other park can ever be -- a botanical garden provides, for its visitors, relaxation and release from the continual mental tension which civilization exacts from the city dweller.\textsuperscript{116}

As for encouraging a nation’s economic welfare through botanical research, he chose the example of the Para rubber (\textit{Hevea brasiliensis}), first introduced to the Indies via Kew which had raised 1 900 plants from seeds collected in Brazil: “The enormous wealth which this plant alone created makes the expense of equipping and maintaining all the botanical gardens of the world appear insignificant.”\textsuperscript{117} What he failed to mention was that the fortune made reaped for England undermined the economy of Brazil.

Marie-Victorin died in an automobile accident in June 1944 at the age of 59. He left three great legacies: the Botanical Institute at the University of Montreal; scholarly texts including his masterpiece \textit{la Flore laurentienne}, published in 1935 for which he was awarded the Prix de l’Académie des Sciences de Paris, and the Gold Medal from the Société Provancher d’Histoire naturelle in 1936; and the Montreal Botanical Garden which may never have existed without his dedication and ability to court government officials, influential members of the press and the public.

Two years later, ten years after the Garden’s official founding, M.A.J. Livinson celebrated the garden as “the city’s gift to harassed citizens who seek relaxation, to school children who are acquiring knowledge and to horticulturalists and botanists who yearn for perfection.”\textsuperscript{118} Livinson reported that although the public showed great interest with Sunday attendance rates of 10 000, the garden still lacked the funds to make it one of the world’s best.

Marie-Victorin’s death had a profound impact on the garden. Societies he had
founded, or of which he had been a member, suffered greatly from his loss. Among these were the Natural History Society and the Circle of Young Naturalists; the Horticultural School closed and many cultural and scientific activities of the Botanical Institute came close to losing their places at the garden. When Teuscher retired in 1962, “He remained critical of the Montreal Botanical Garden administration and lamented that it had declined to the point where it was no more than a pretty park.” With the establishment in 1975 of the Société d’animation du Jardin et de l’Institut botaniques, under the combined leadership of horticulturalist Pierre Bourque and ecologist André Bouchard many former activities were revived.

With the creation of the Montreal Botanical Garden, the efforts of Olmsted, Penhallow, and the fathers of Maisonneuve finally bore fruit. For Penhallow, the creation of such a garden would have ensured Canada’s place in the British Empire as a colony able to make a noteworthy contribution; for Marie-Victorin, the garden was first and foremost a place in which to learn about the flora of Quebec and Canada, and would project, in a sense, the country’s coming of age. Born the year Penhallow’s editorials were published, (1885), more than a generation gap divided the two botanists. Marie-Victorin ardently wished to encourage the study of the natural sciences amongst French-Canadians: a survey conducted by the alumni of the University of Montreal science faculty between 1929-3 revealed the ratio of English speaking botanists to French Canadian botanists at 67:2.

The Montreal Botanical Garden is the culmination of four centuries of western botanic garden planning. With its emphasis on the divinity of god, expressed through works of nature and the creation of an earthly paradise, it is a fitting tribute for the deeply religious Marie-Victorin to have made. Its affiliation with the Université de Montréal from its infancy
ensured the importance of the scientific study of plants begun in Renaissance gardens. As a moralizing agent and place for the recreation of a burgeoning city’s inhabitants and an attraction which would elevate the status of Montreal as a tourist mecca, the garden responded to its predecessors of the late nineteenth century. In the next chapter, changes and additions to the garden made between the years 1988-1994 will be discussed with the intention of determining if and how the garden has lived up to the ideals of Marie-Victorin.
Chapter Two

Tourism

Preparations for Montreal’s 350th anniversary in 1992 saw tens of millions of dollars poured into the Botanical Garden with the opening of the Japanese garden, completed in 1988 (over $2 million); the building of the Insectarium, a museum devoted to entomology which opened in 1990 ($5 million); the construction of the Chinese garden, opened in 1991 ($8 million); and the conversion of the 1976 Olympics Velodrome into the Biodome in 1992 ($56 million). These initiatives were supported and their costs borne by the city’s administration, the provincial government, Ottawa, the Ministry of Tourism, and donations from the private sector. The additions were created in the midst of an economic recession with tourism and education the main rationale behind their construction. Jean Doré (1944-) mayor of Montreal from 1986-1994, outlined his vision which mirrored Houde’s of the 1940s. Doré believed these enhancements would alleviate the unemployment rate and create jobs, particularly in the tourism industry. Enhancing Montreal’s ‘quality of life’ would in turn attract potential investors to the city. Doré was quoted in The Gazette:

As for the eastern part of the city, by the year 2000 the Botanical Garden will have become the second largest in the world after we add a Chinese garden. In 1990, the Insectarium will have opened. And the new project we’re working on is changing the Velodrome into a Biodome. ... So we would have an aquarium, a zoo, and a botanical garden in one major natural science centre. It will be a unique facility. And it will change the character of eastern Montreal as a tourist destination.\textsuperscript{121}

The breadth of the project reflects the origin of western botanic gardens as a site for natural history enquiry and education. It furthermore reiterates the desire to capture all of the natural world in a “chamber” now made possible through technology.
An unnamed journalist supported these initiatives by writing of Montreal’s need for a nature centre to edify schoolchildren and appeal to tourists. The local exhibits would, in particular, “contribute to more public concern about the fragility of our environment.” It would also generate much needed revenue. Admission to the Garden was free until 1983; ten years later a visit to the gardens and glasshouses during peak tourist season would cost an adult $7 with entrance to the Insectarium and Biodome a further $4.

The Biodome recreates four ecosystems: a tropical rainforest, polar region, flora and fauna of Quebec, and the marine life of the St. Lawrence river, replete with the animals which inhabit them. Nancy Levinson reviewed this latest creation which for André Vallerand, Quebec’s Minister of Tourism represents, “A tangible example of Quebec’s tourist positioning along a nature/culture axis.” Levinson asked:

Is it sustainable to build roofed-over recreations of nature that require quantities of mechanical energy to maintain? Or would the money have been better spent protecting Brazilian rainforests? Do projects like the Biodome constitute an ironic atonement for our destruction of the real thing? Or do they offer a tamed and diminished version of nature, a kind of eco-Disney?

Pierre Bourque, director of the Garden from 1979 until 1994 when he left to direct the city as mayor of Montreal, responded that the facility provided “a very powerful way of beginning to learn about nature. And we believe that knowledge leads to respect -- those who understand nature will be more likely to learn to protect it.” Landscape architect and cultural historian Alexander Wilson studied similar institutions of display and offers a less romantic view: “Zoos, safari parks and aquariums are explicit, even intentional, models of relations between human cultures and the natural world. Like parks, they are constructed
environments that often tell us more about ourselves than they do about what we’re ostensibly looking at.”126 In documenting the history of zoos as a mode of confinement from an institution of spectacle for the wealthy to the present day when they are open to all who can afford the admission fees, he concluded that they “no longer represent the vastness of empire or the abundance of the natural world... [The] exoticism is an exoticism of imminent loss.” Following Levinson, he queried, “By rescuing some endangered plants and animals from an impending development... are we discouraging responsible ways of living on the earth?”127

The creation of these exhibits can be credited to tourism, an industry which has played an extremely important role in the development of the Montreal Botanical Garden since its inception and continues to exert an influence evident through new attractions added each year. The audience is drawn in by improved reception pavilions, the construction of new greenhouses or renovation of existing greenhouses, and inspired feats of imagination in horticultural displays. In the tourist literature produced by the City of Montreal, it prides itself as home to the second largest and hence second most important botanical garden in the world, following only Kew, a claim Bourque substantiates by referring to attendance rates, the quality of its services and scientific research and the scope of its collections.

There are several types of tourism: ethnic, appealing to those who wish to view the customs of indigenous, “exotic” peoples; cultural, placing an emphasis on “local colour” or the picturesque; historical or educational tourism, the museum-monument-cathedral circuit; and recreational tourism, most popular with pleasure seekers.128 Common to all is the desire for spectacle, whether of natural phenomenon or unusual ritual: “Without exception, the mass tourist demands novelty and uniqueness of place. The marketing of any given tourist
attraction must therefore emphasize the distinctiveness of place.”129 Where a unique attraction does not exist, it can be invented, as exemplified by the Biodome. The Montreal Botanical Garden promises something for everyone, through offering exotic plants in a variety of settings ranging from reconstructed garden styles to dioramas of ‘natural’ scenes, didactic panels placed throughout the gardens relating a plant’s history or symbolism, and relaxing landscapes where visitors can literally stop to smell the flowers. Performances and displays are presented in the Japanese garden and its pavilion which functions as the Japanese Community Centre, and in the Chinese garden, to reflect native cultural traditions.

A botanical garden is a place where, “art and science merge on public ground.”130 With an increasing emphasis on entertainment, the public often cannot make the distinction between a botanical garden and a public park. Although recreation is now an auxiliary to Kew Garden’s scientific purposes, its director Nigel Hepper reports that few of its million annual visitors realize it is a botanic garden with a collection of plants primarily grown for study.131 Instead, “Kew with its exotic plants and buildings has been a sightseer’s mecca for the past two hundred years.”132 Laddie Dennis, reflecting on his visits to the Montreal garden in the 1930s, did not foresee the evolution of the site into what he also now refers to as “a tourist mecca.”133 As late at 1980 Dorothy Sangster, writing of the Montreal Botanical Garden as the third largest following Kew and Berlin, noted it was “far from the usual stomping ground of tourists.”134 Doré’s desire to build up the east end into a major tourist destination fulfilled the dreams of the founding fathers of Maisonneuve and their pre-World War I plans for Parc Maisonneuve.

For Bourque the mandate of the Garden is to provide a place where visitors can learn about Quebec’s vegetation, pay homage to nature and become acquainted with different
styles of gardens, floral and landscape designs. He defined his role as director: “to open the Garden to the people, to make it more esthetically pleasing and more educational. Most people live in cities, in a concrete jungle. They need to come to a dreamier atmosphere sometimes.”

The purpose, as outlined by Bourque, falls short of what the garden could teach people about ecology and the impact humans have upon the landscapes which they create. Tourism has had an enormous impact on how society views nature and its place in it. By the year 2000, it will be the world’s largest industry in both employment and trade, having profound consequences on the environment through its visual consumption, the voyage of people to distant lands and the transformation of existing sites with the construction of tourist attractions and support structures. Protection of nature and its resources, from the perspective of tourism, is more often concerned with the marketing and consumption of its diversity than with environmental ethics and global responsibilities.

Although the scientific vocation of most botanic gardens defines a particular purpose, for example Southern tropical gardens have specific conservation roles to play, all major cities display collections of flora and fauna which have been divorced from their natural, historical and cultural contexts and implanted with other displaced things and people. Public and national parks are symptomatic of the guilt which accompanies the urge to destroy, tame or capture nature. After destruction, the parks and gardens created in the place of wilderness re-stage the nature/society opposition now framed entirely by society.

Since the mid-eighteenth century, nature has been defined the “‘countryside,’ the ‘unspoiled places,’ plants and creatures other than man.” As nature was associated with the pastoral rather than natural it was expected to serve as a place of leisure and relaxation
offering spectacular sights and visual titillation. The paradox inherent in the garden is that it is both real and artificial. For Simon Pugh a garden serves as the “consummate image of holiday and travel to exotic places, relaxation, leisure, retirement. However he wryly notes, “In a capitalist society, what is natural is that which is profitable.”141 “The garden is not, has never been,” he enjoins, “a product of nature but a symbolic structure of meaning. In the post-lapsarian world, the garden is the return of nature through art.”142

The shift from an industrial to post-industrial society was concomitant with a transition from work to leisure as the centre of modern society. Dennison Nash notes that while not strictly confined to modern, industrial society it is only within such a society that tourism “becomes a pervasive social phenomenon.”143 Leisure industries organize leisure activities according to principles which pursue profit rather than societal needs.144 Marxists assert that leisure is the organization of non-work time as determined by the relations of capitalist production, “The culture industry” produces forms of mass entertainment to exploit an individual’s leisure time, and ensure, according to Adorno and Horkheimer, that “leisure is the prolongation of work.”145 Yet for those who can afford to obtain the necessary passports and visas, tourism is felt to be a measure of their “quality of life.” As an institutional practice, tourism assures loyalty to the state through displacing all grievances, discontent or alienation a tourist may feel towards society.146

A tourist experience is composed of three elements: the tourist, the marker and the sight. The tourist, is a “temporarily leisured person who voluntarily visits a place away from home for the purposes of experiencing a change.”147 The marker, a piece of information about the sight, can be on-site such as a signpost or commemorative plaque, or off-site, such as a promotional brochure or postcard. These often idealized images promoted on postcards
and in guidebooks can lead, ironically, to a greater appreciation of the tourist marker than the sight itself.

Anthropologist Dean MacCannell believes that people make sense of the world as a series of touristic spectacles—"tourism is a ritual performed to the differentiations of society." In an attempt to comprehend fragmentation, the tourist views the world as a series of equivalent spectacles with each society having idiosyncratic monuments, lifestyles, cultural practices and scenery. Each culture is understood as a series of signs. He concludes that "sightseeing is a kind of collective striving for a transcendence of the modern totality, a way of attempting to overcome the discontinuity of modernity... [yet it is] doomed to eventual failure: even as it tries to construct totalities, it celebrates differentiation.

The structure of tourism is derived from ritualistic behaviour. Traditionally, MacCannell reports, ritual has been understood in two ways: ethnologists, following Darwin, consider ritual as an exaggerated, stylized act of communication to effectively signal some state of the organism; those after Durkheim, view it as the conventionalized expression of obeisance to a sacred being or object, operating symbolically as a substitute for a system of socially approved relationships. "Ritual acts," writes Suzanne Langer, "are a natural act to human beings and satisfy the basic human needs for expressive acts which transmit value."

Nelson Graburn links tourism to ritual expression, whether societal or individual, as revealing deeply held beliefs concerning health, freedom, nature and self-improvement. Tourism is, "a recreation which parallels pilgrimages and other rituals in more traditional, pervasively religious societies." A tourist, therefore, is half-pilgrim; a pilgrim, half tourist. The ritual act of tourism commences with the tourist leaving home and terminates in the
presence of the sight.

The tourist gaze is attracted to features of landscape which differ from daily experience. "Unconsciously," writes social geographer John Jackle, "sightseers seek in landscape the elements of pictorial composition communicated subliminally in the paintings and photographs they consume." Due to the emphasis on the gaze, tourism is concerned with spectacle and cultural practices. The focus on scenery as entertainment enforces "society's dissociation from nature and the processes that shape the land in its scenic variety." Through the proliferation of signs and the focus on the gaze, tourists become amateur semioticians who read cities, landscapes and cultures as sign systems. These are signifiers of accepted and universally understood signs, such as the quintessential English garden, gathered through the discourses surrounding travel and tourism. To see the world is to grasp each culture as a series of signs itself.

Theories on the development of landscape practices and how they have been socially conditioned and constructed have been central to the investigation of a number of recent scholarly texts. In Landscape and Power, editor and contributor W.J.T. Mitchell states,

Landscape is a marketable commodity to be presented and represented in "packaged tours," an object to be purchased, consumed, and even brought home in the form of souvenirs such as postcards and photo albums. In its double role as commodity and potent cultural symbol, landscape is the object of fetishistic practices involving the limitless repetition of identical photographs taken on identical spots by tourists with interchangeable emotions. As a fetishized commodity, landscape is what Marx called a social hieroglyph, an emblem of the social relations it conceals.
Operating within a limited budget, the marketing department of the Montreal Botanical Garden entered a partnership with the Greater Montreal Convention and Tourism Bureau (GMCTB) to stretch publicity dollars and introduce the Garden to the international market. In 1992, members of the Garden’s staff began attending six to eight trade shows annually, such as Rendezvous Canada and Bienvenue, which has resulted in higher attendance rates and group reservations. The Garden plays a significant role in the GMCTB’s bi-annual campaigns and is considered one of the city’s chief attractions. As most visitor stays are short, the Garden must compete for its share of visitors with other museums. Its marketing department promotes four institutions: the Botanical Garden, the Biodome, the Insectarium and the Planetarium. While there is a desire to add more promotions with Olympic Stadium, the latter falls under provincial rather than municipal jurisdiction leading to bureaucratic complications. 300 000 brochures are yearly placed in hotels, tourist information centres and at other attractions. Many hotels and restaurants offer joint promotions with the Garden. More than 60% of the Garden’s visitors, who number between 800 000 to 1 000 000 per year, are received during the summer months.158

The mission of the GMCTB is to attract and greet visitors and provide media relations. The Botanical Garden holds a prominent place in the city’s brochures, five million of which are distributed internationally each year. Montreal plays host to nine million tourists annually and is marketed as a cultural destination offering four distinct experiences: historical; metropolitan; artistic; and environmental, the last focussing on the concept of island- mountain- river.159 A provincially government-funded promotional video refers to the Botanical Garden and the Biodome as asserting, “the supremacy of nature in the heart of
the city.”

The role of the ground operator, to sell attractions to client, has become of great importance in contemporary tourism. Group travellers leave their tour-planning and scheduling to a professional in exchange for a fixed-price, fixed-itinerary tour. In addition to day trips undertaken by social clubs, Paul Uline of VP Maestro has tapped into the rapidly expanding tourist group of convention-goers. In his experience with the Montreal Botanical Garden, the 30 minute tramtour which gives an overview of the garden, peppering its passengers with recorded historical information over a public address system, is extremely popular and people “buy like crazy in the gift shop.”

Each year the Pom Bakery publishes a guide to the Montreal’s attractions. In addition to printing editorials on the sights, La Tournée POM des Grands Sites de Montréal, offers coupons for entrance fees, two-for-one bicycle rentals and so forth. Approximately 20,000 people annually receive reduced rates on their entrance fees to the Garden which the Pom Bakery Guide calls a “Garden of Earthly Delights” where “a stroll through the greenhouses is a trip around the world!!”

The Montreal Botanical Garden produces its own pamphlets, available on- and off-site. Some feature specific aspects of the garden, such as the Chinese garden, while others provide general information, maps or suggested tours. In “Discover the Montreal Botanical Garden!” Montreal’s garden is billed “second only to London’s” and “one of a kind.” The conservatories are home to “Glass-enclosed gardens rather than glass-covered collections of plants” stressing the aesthetics of landscape planning over formal and scientific arrangements. The “huge indoor garden” is a place “where visitors can take a trip around the world, exploring tropical forests and desert regions.” The “Wonder of the Seasons”
pamphlet listing monthly blooms in the outdoor and indoor gardens reiterates the promotional video's claim that "A stroll through the gardens at any time of the year offers visitors a chance to discover nature in the heart of the city."

A contemporary of the Montreal Botanical Garden, and a fellow product of the Depression, the Royal Botanical Gardens in Hamilton, Ontario, publishes a number of brochures with similar hyperbolic rhetoric, the standard lexicon of tourism. Hamilton's garden promises "tours that intoxicate the nose and dazzle the eye ... ". Within its 2700 acres\(^\text{161}\) lay cultivated landscapes, such as the Lilac Dell and Rock garden, and the Barbara Laking Heritage garden, a recreation of a southern Ontario Garden ca. 1900. The Rock Garden, Arboretum, Rose garden and Laking garden sport "Kodak Picture Spots", areas marked on the map to help visitors find the best vantage points for their photographic souvenirs. Thus Kodak not only sells the film to the tourists, it frames their photographs fulfilling Mitchell's prophecy of the endless repetition of images from a limited perspective. The garden's administrators chose not to create a Japanese garden because surveyed Japanese visitors expressed a desire to see something new -- to experience Canada's "big nature."

Concordia Master's of Business Administration student Jack Stuart completed his thesis, *A Marketing Study of the Montreal Botanical Garden* in 1983. From a survey undertaken during a nine day period in July, he determined that of the 538 respondents, 55.9% were first-time visitors, 57.9% of trips were initiated by women, and almost 50% of the garden's visitors had received some university education.\(^\text{162}\) Most were attracted by the serenity and beauty offered, and the basic plant information available. The indoor gardens were much more popular than the outdoor gardens. Principal complaints included the
admission fees and the musical decor. Local visitors, attracted by exotic plants and greenspace lacking at home, expected more from the gardens and resented paying admission fees. Most polled had visited Olympic Park, Old Montreal, downtown, and the Expo '67 site, leading Stuart to conclude, "The presence of the Garden on this unofficial circuit tends to underscore the touristic rather than horticultural aspect of the Gardens."\textsuperscript{163}

Because sightseers seek novelty most trips are non-recurrent. To encourage repeat customers, new sights/sites must be constantly developed. Bourque reported that between 1986-93, nearly $3 million dollars had been invested in visitor improvements. These included the Chinese greenhouse inaugurated in 1985, a new $1 million exhibition greenhouse, the largest in Canada, featuring a balcony level, inaugurated in 1986; and the conversion of the central greenhouse into the Molson Hospitality pavilion\textsuperscript{164}. Other additions and improvements would follow.

Culture

The Montreal Botanical Garden is a complex of gardens where nature is manicured and manipulated and where a variety of cultures are represented through the medium of landscape architecture. In each season elaborate expositions are mounted in the main exhibition greenhouse, the displays having been inspired by fairytales, floral fantasies, and even a Hollywood production. Small architectural structures and façades, garden furniture, statues and urns are used throughout as decorative elements. The plants change seasonally; in spring the greenhouse is filled with tulips, daffodils and hyacinths and in summer coleus, Caladium and impatiens are in full bloom. Fall features chrysanthemums and for the last decade, the main greenhouse has sports Esmeralda and her "Great Pumpkin Ball" an
exhibition of outlandishly decorated pumpkins entered into a contest for Halloween. In December, *Pointsettia*, Jerusalem Cherry and various Christmas cacti are displayed.

Also popular in the exhibition greenhouse have been displays featuring foreign countries with architectural backdrops and garden structures imitating the 'national style' of a particular place, a notion relying on stereotypes. In the past, for example, Switzerland has been represented with a mock mountain village, Brussels by a flower market, Greece with Doric temples, and Mexico by a marketplace. These exhibitions, often sponsored by the represented country, provide the background for plants which are seasonally available but which are not necessarily native or widely cultivated in that country leading to a visual rupture in the attempt to create the appearance of a realistic, if conventionalized, landscape.

The creation of 'ethnic' sets and 'historical' backgrounds has infiltrated the design of permanent displays. In the Hacienda pavilion, designed by Carlos Martinez, landscape architect in charge of new projects at the Botanical Garden, a white washed church-like bell tower with a stained-glass window predominates with a clay tiled roof over a white half wall providing a backdrop for succulents and cacti. "The decor" reads The Educational Guide of the Montreal Botanical Garden, *A World in a Garden*, "is reminiscent of a Mexican inner courtyard and includes plants one might expect to find there."165 A Hacienda, however, is the name given to the elaborate homes of the privileged classes, and as such is not a common domicile. The plants here may be as exotic to the Mexican native as to the foreigner. The exotic is a socially, as well as culturally, determined concept.

Martinez received a merit prize from the Canadian Association of Landscape Architects and an honourable mention from the Quebec Association of Landscape Architects in 1987 for his design of the greenhouse displaying Teuscher's prized collection of South
American orchids. The “Colonial Spanish setting” is oddly decorated with Victorian cobalt blue wrought iron lamp standards and planters interspersed amongst Romanesque vaults constructed of cobble stones recycled from Old Montreal. A didactic panel reads:

The setting calls to mind the ruins of an ancient fortress which is slowly being overgrown by plants. With time, as in nature, the Orchids and Aroids will take route between the ancient stones, which are over 300 years old. ... The luxuriant vegetation will eventually dominate the landscape.

The designs of the Hacienda and Orchid pavilions, in taking their inspiration from Spain’s colonization of Central and South America, offer a pedagogical opportunity to trace the impact of the Conquistadores in the 16th century and their explorations of the ‘New World.’ Yet this aspect of botanical history is not presented. In a postmodern flip, the architectural backdrop in the greenhouses becomes a façade, concealing rather than revealing how nature has been conceived and treated within the cultures being portrayed. Nature here is merely decorative, and the few didactic panels give little valuable information save for the name of a plant and its place of origin.

Anthropologist Miles Richardson recognized that the perception of nature within a culture is deeper than that which may appear. He applied the analysis of George Herbert Mead to the Spanish American plaza, in order to understand its significance and found that, “by the very nature in which nature is arranged within it, the plaza encourages the participants who stroll its walkways to distance themselves from the alternative realities that constitute Spanish-American culture.”¹⁶⁶ The plaza provides a place for people-watching, with participants playing roles very different from those of their daily lives. In the plaza nature is not seen as a commodity, as in the market, nor sacred, as in the church, but as an
ornament to leisure time which projects an "image of urbane, civilized man bringing nature...under control."\(^{167}\)

As documented in chapter one, the history of western botanic gardens is interwoven with the history of colonial domination. In the Tropical Economic Greenhouse, devoted to plants of economic value, the few explanatory panels ignore the violence with which botanical treasures were captured and cultivated. The pavilion houses over 120 species including chocolate and bananas of which the Educational Guide merely states, "The Spaniards transported the cultivation of chocolate to Africa at the time of the conquest, the beginning of the 16th century."\(^{168}\) and "... brought bananas to Latin America."\(^{169}\) In its silence, the Montreal Botanical Garden is complicit with the colonial heritage of its predecessors and misses a valuable chance to educate the public about the devastating economic impact explorations had on the south, particularly the derisively labelled banana republics. An ill-placed Torii -- the Shinto gate situated outdoors to mark the entrance to a temple without walls, is used in this greenhouse as a decorative element. Displayed indoors like an exotic architectural relic or curiousity, the gate is stripped of its symbolic function, revealing a lack of knowledge and/or respect for its place in Japanese worship.

The historical period and class within a society chosen for representation are rife with political and economic ideologies. These aspects are entirely disregarded in the Garden's educational programme and exhibition pamphlets. The rest of the chapter is devoted to exploring how China and Japan are represented through their garden practices and staged spectacles. It will be argued that while these gardens may entertain the visitor, the extent to which they provide crucial information regarding how nature is conceived, constructed and controlled within the history of these Asian cultures is limited. The representation
becomes more disjointed with the introduction of people into the gardens, not to garden which would at least demonstrate the amount of human intervention required in maintaining the carefully composed landscapes, but to provide calligraphy and flower arranging demonstration, furniture and art exhibits, and musical performances -- in short, cultural activities.

**Celestial Greenhouse**

As the visitor follows the dictated route through the greenhouses, from the Hacienda pavilion, he or she is translocated northeast across the globe to China in the Celestial Greenhouse. After winning fourth place in the 1980 Floralies internationales, the People’s Republic of China presented the Montreal Botanical Garden with a valuable *p’en ching* collection.\(^170\) The 350 trees, dwarfed through the regular pruning of roots and branches and the continuous pinching of new shoots to retard growth, are inspired by trees which live in harsh climates which stunts their growth through natural means.

The decor consists of deep red railings, grey curving eaves, framed scrolls with Chinese characters, stylized *p’en ching* cut-out panels in the walls, and screens (Ill. 13). The experience offered within is preordained: “Entering a Chinese garden is penetrating a universe brimming with symbolism -- man goes to the mountains and sky to meditate and renew a feeling of oneness with nature.” Chinese music is piped into the garden, the architecture of which “is inspired by Chinese gardens and ... exudes a feeling of sobriety and harmony”. A wall panel strives to inform the “occidental” visitor and bridge the cultural gap:

> For a period of many centuries, oriental civilizations have strived for harmony between man and nature. Their way of life today is based on two constants: growth and fulfilment. Conscious of the
complicity which prevails between man and nature, the Chinese have set out rules dictated by nature. Their peaceful frame of mind, their happiness despite space restrictions, and their self-discipline are all desirable characteristics that have evolved from their life philosophy.\textsuperscript{171}

Wu Yee-Sun, one of the main benefactors to the Celestial garden, donated 30 p‘en chings to the original collection in 1984. He is recognized with a plaque bearing his name with a reprint from \textit{La Presse} describing the magnate as "charming. He even takes visitors by the arm and leads him around the garden like a child."\textsuperscript{172} Wu is a wealthy industrialist and founder of the Bank of Hong Kong. The subtle albeit latent racism, emphasized in italics, while disguised in complimentary tones, validates Edward Said’s assertion that one, “aspect of the electronic, postmodern world is that there has been a reinforcement of the stereotypes by which the Orient is viewed”\textsuperscript{173} and begs the question: does being closer to nature mean a culture is less developed and sophisticated? To generalize that every Chinese citizen lives in harmony with nature, “despite space restrictions,” is akin to stating that all Canadians are expansive in personality, because of the vastness of the country. Furthermore, one cannot conceive the characterization of a western born internationally renowned banker or business giant, such as Donald Trump, as “charming” or “child-like.”

Stuart’s study had revealed the highest level of dissatisfaction with the outdoor gardens. The addition of “exotic” gardens have proven to be crowd pleasers. The completion in 1988 of the Japanese garden and pavilion was followed by the re-creation in 1991 of a Ming dynasty era Chinese garden. These gardens have diplomatic roots in both the Montreal Japanese and Chinese communities, and ties with the two countries integral to their funding and construction. The Asian gardens form the heart of the garden. A path through
the rose garden is the recommended point of entry to the Chinese garden, in order to heighten the sense of entering a different world. According to the Pom Bakery Guide, the Chinese garden provides a “source of constant enchantment” and “To stroll through the Chinese Garden is to experience exotic Asia ... It is also an introduction to a fascinating culture revealed through a variety of art and cultural exhibitions presented in the Friendship Pavilion.” Visitors are beckoned: “Come. Admire the many exotic delights of the Chinese garden!” The Japanese garden section is subtitled, “Simplicity and Refinement” and prepares the visitor for a different mood, “To enter the Japanese Garden is to discover art and nature at its most beautiful.” It is “quiet and graceful.”

The Japanese Garden

The Japanese garden was initially conceived in 1967 as a gift from the Montreal Japanese Committee for Canada’s Centennial but did not come to fruition under Mayor Jean Drapeau’s administration. The Japanese garden at the Expo ’67 site was abandoned which Bourque believes led to scepticism in Montreal’s Japanese community concerning the city’s respect for Japanese garden tradition wherein a garden does not reach maturation until it has aged three hundred years. In 1987, Reverend Takamichi Takahatake, leader of Montreal’s Japanese Buddhist community, wishing to forge a link between his homeland and Canada, proposed the creation of a garden with a pavilion housing a library, art gallery, and tearoom to exhibit Japanese culture. The governments of Canada and Quebec, through an auxiliary agreement on tourism, embraced the project with Takahatake responsible for securing Japanese partners/investors and Bourque soliciting the municipal and provincial governments.174 Seiichi Kataoka, Deputy for the Takaoka electoral district, a former minister and member of the Japanese Diet, met Takahatake, a former constituent, and
Bourque while in Montreal on official but un-related business. Upon his return to Japan, Kataoka enlisted investors for the Montreal project. His contribution was recognized at the garden’s groundbreaking ceremony in June 1987 when he was named an honorary citizen of Montreal.175

Ken Nakajima, landscape architect of the Japanese garden at Expo '67 and the aborted centennial project, was commissioned. He designed three contemporary Japanese landscapes: a cha-niwa or tea garden (Ills. 15; 16), a dry or zen garden (Ills 17; 18), and a small outdoor gallery where bonsais are displayed during temperate months. Nakajima, a graduate of the Tokyo Landscape Architecture College in 1937, where he completed extensive studies on the Kyoto Imperial gardens (ca. 1500), became an assistant-professor at his alma mater. In 1957 he founded his own company, Consolidated Garden Research Limited. After passing the examination for the department of Sciences and Technology in 1965, he became an engineering consultant. He has designed Japanese gardens for Rome, San Diego, and Moscow.176

Nakajima altered his original 1967 plans due to changes at the Montreal Botanical Garden and experiences he had gained in the twenty years since its conception. His work in Moscow was particularly useful for designing a garden which could sustain subzero temperatures with plants hardy enough to survive long winters. The climatic conditions limited his choice of Japanese cultivars yet he included more flowers than found in traditional Japanese gardens. As the latter are usually attached to temples where flowers might interfere with meditation, such is not the case in a botanical garden. He “actively used flowers and ... incorporated their colours in the design, in such a way as to bring out a serene Japanese feeling.”177
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He designed two pergolas or rest arbours from which strollers can view well-planned prospects of the garden. In each a wall text written by Bourque reads: “In summer as in winter this garden will welcome thousands of visitors, it will hear their whispers and remarks and give them a few magical hours when they can feel and grasp the essence of a simple and refined beauty which the Japanese describe as the “SHIBUI”. 178

Bourque and Takahatake paid a visit to Japan in June 1987, sponsored by Quebec Minister of Tourism, Yvon Picotte, to raise media interest in the planned Japanese garden, the Botanical Garden and the city of Montreal. 179 A meeting in Osaka with the Fujiki Komuten architectural firm procured free services and blueprints for the main pavilion designed by Hisato Hiraoka. The pavilion links a series of spaces for exhibitions (Ill. 19), a conference room, a library housing volumes pertaining to Japanese art, architecture, gardens and history, and the tearoom. Again the climatic differences between countries led to alterations in building materials yet Japanese design strategies are evident through the colours chosen, the unique adaptation of materials and the stress on horizontal eaves. The Kiwari principle was employed which specifies that room measurements be based on the tatami-module, a straw mat measuring one by two metres. A didactic panel outside the pavilions explains that it combines the classical and modern styles, taking its form from the traditional Japanese Sukiya home, with hues influenced by wealthy farmhouses.

Work on the garden commenced in July 1987. Officially opened on 28 June 1988, a press release announcing the occasion largely credited its creation to tourism. “To be underlined are the important role [sic] played by the tourism departments of the Canadian and Quebec governments and that of the minister responsible for the Office de planification et de développement du Québec (OPDQ), who believed in the immense tourism potential of
the Botanical Garden and in the importance of the Japanese garden.”

Cultural activities which take place in the garden include demonstrations of origami and ikebana (Ill. 20 ), Noh theatre (Ill. 21), exhibitions of calligraphy, zen archery (Ill. 22 ), and the tea ceremony which is performed twice a day during the peak tourist season (Ills. 23; 24). In a small handout available at the reception desk of the pavilion Bourque states, “Through the tea ritual, focal point of the pavilion, visitors are soon swept away to an oasis of peace and harmony where each movement is an expression of grace and beauty.”

During the week of 21-27 July 1988, a visitor survey conducted at the Botanical Garden revealed a marked improvement in visitor satisfaction over the results documented by Jack Stuart in 1983. The findings, presented by Normand Julien, showed that the majority of visitors were between the ages of 25-34; 59.2% of visitors were women and 30.1% had secondary education. 48.3% of the visitors were Montrealers; 60.8% of whom had visited the garden before, 32.8% three or more times within the past year. Nearly one third had come specifically to see the newly completed Japanese garden which they considered particularly attractive. In response to the question: “Selon vous, le jardin botanique représente-t-il pour Montreal un attrait touristique international?” 87.5% answered “oui”. Olympic Park had been visited by 32% and the Chateau Dufresne received 10.3% of garden’s visitors on the same day confirming Stuart’s conclusion that the Garden was included on the tourist circuit.  

The Chinese Garden

The foremost selling point of an exhibition or site is its uniqueness. Where uniqueness is lacking, it can be created. A pamphlet produced by the Montreal Botanical Garden on the Chinese garden describes it as “eight artfully sculpted landscapes” and the
six acre site a place where the “shores of the Dream Lake create an oasis for cultural exchange where Western visitors come to absorb the art, philosophy and culture of China.” It is an invitation to: “Step through the moon gate, cross the zigzag bridge and follow winding pathways to the other end of the world where gardening is sheer poetry. The Chinese garden is imbued with the power to “transport visitors to a serene and timeless corner of China.” In the Main Attractions section of Discover the Montréal Botanical Garden!, the Chinese Garden with, “its bridges, plants and architectural curiosities, not only gives visitors a welcome change of scenery, but also unfolds before them a fairyland-scape.”

In 1986, Jean Drapeau signed a friendship agreement with Jiang Zemin, mayor of Shanghai, laying the ground for the garden. Doré, although taking credit for the project, merely renewed the accord in 1987. Plans for the Meng Hu Yuan, meaning Dream Lake Garden in English, a joint venture between the Montreal and Shanghai Botanical gardens, under the patronage of then Governor General Jeanne Sauvé, were nearly cancelled in 1989 due to the uprising in Tien’anMen Square when students protesting for democratic reform were brutally crushed by the communist government. The project was placed on hold from June to September until Joe Clark, then Minister of External Affairs, sanctioned projects which would promote positive relations between the two countries. The garden was completed in 1991 in time for the city’s 350th anniversary. An “authentic” recreation of a Ming Dynasty era (1368-1644) scholar’s garden from the Yangzi region, as rendered by Le Wei Zhong, president of the Shanghai Landscape Architecture Design Institute, it was planned according to the principles of feng-shui which can be broadly defined as a respect for the flow of vital energy which courses through the earth and nature.
Chinese gardens are generally smaller than two acres. Suchou during the Ming era was home to the country’s most notable poets and painters, explaining the number and quality of the gardens, which provided their owners with a physical and spiritual escape from urban life. They were created by wealthy scholars and aristocrats as a retreat from rules and rituals into a realm of solitude and functioned as outdoor extensions to the house. Halls and buildings were constructed to hold banquets; performances were staged in the courtyards; studios were built for painting and poetry composition and towers raised from which to enjoy distant views. Symbolism was employed in the garden: piled rockeries serve as mountains, a pool a large lake. Inspired by Taoist sense of unity with nature, the scholars attempted to re-capture the garden and life of Tao Chien, an official living in the 5th century who had retired from the court to his country cottage, in their walled gardens in the city.\textsuperscript{184}

The $10 “fully illustrated” Chinese Garden of Montreal guide, produced by the Chinese Garden Society of Montreal,\textsuperscript{185} offers its readers “insight into China as it was, and as it is today.”\textsuperscript{186} It defines the symbolism, the garden’s composition, its major plants and architectural elements, providing an itinerary to lead the spectator from one building to the next. To enhance visitor appreciation for the poetry and scenes the titles of the pavilions evoke, the Chinese characters on pavilion façades are translated. In recognizing women’s invisibility in garden history and literature, the guide makes a token effort to draw attention to the contributions made by “three women whose work extended beyond traditional female roles”\textsuperscript{187} in a one-page section under the somewhat demeaning title, “Architecture with a Woman’s Touch”. Wendy Graham of the Montreal Botanical Garden staff organized the construction site; Yu Wei and Zhang Jie from Shanghai completed the technical plans, selected and placed the plants in the garden.
In order to build the pavilions throughout the Chinese garden, regulations in building codes were waived due to specific construction methods and Canadian labour laws relaxed. According to Wendy Graham, "Things like the dimension of the doorways, or the height of the steps in a pagoda, things like that which conform to the Chinese way of doing things instead of our stricter standards."\textsuperscript{188} The Chinese workers, who brought their own wheelbarrows, pick-axes, and tools, were admitted into Canada by the Immigration Department as craftsmen, not as construction workers.\textsuperscript{189} The fifty Chinese artisans who assembled the garden structures, which had been prefabricated by 300 workers in China, were paid two hundred dollars a month, twice the salary paid in China. Had wages been at Canadian scale, the garden would have cost twelve instead of eight million dollars,\textsuperscript{190} which vaguely echoes the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century when the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway was made possible through the hiring of cheap Chinese labour. China donated a number of gifts including the Friendship Hall. In return, staff from the Montreal garden will provide technical expertise in greenhouse construction to their Shanghai counterparts. The costs were borne by Shanghai and Montreal, each of which provided $2.5 million for the project; and the federal and provincial government which each paid one million dollars. A public fundraising campaign led by Paul Desmarais, president of Power Corp. and Raymond Wong, head of the Montreal Chinese Association, raised an additional $600 000.

The creation of the garden has been seen as an important victory in raising the city’s profile leading Luc Desroches to write that through the cultural entente between Montreal and Shanghai which preceded its creation, Montreal became known on the international scene.\textsuperscript{191} Paquet and Hallé state that more than a mere landscape, "le jardin de Chine sera aussi un centre de référence sur la culture chinoise et confirmera la vocation du Jardin
botanique comme ambassadeur de Montréal auprès de cette grande civilisation.”

The emphasis on the extraordinary leads to competition amongst similar tourist destinations throughout the world in order to attract visitors. Montreal journalists were confident in their comparisons: “The garden is only the fourth of its kind to be built outside China. The other two that are said to be comparable are in Singapore and Sydney, Australia. A much smaller version, the Dr. Sun Yat-sen Garden, was opened in Vancouver in 1986, but the experts said it can’t even begin to compare with Montreal’s.” One could argue, however, that the Sun Yat-sen garden, designed by Zhou Buo Sun and Wang Zhu Xin, and inspired by Suchou’s Garden of the Master of the Fishing Nets, (1140 Southern Song dynasty) is more appropriately situated on a block adjacent to Chinatown. The site was approved by the Chinese delegation because of its proximity to the Chinese community, in a public and non-profit space. In 1980, The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, reproduced the Peony courtyard from the Fishing Nets garden as the Brooke Astor Chinese Garden Court. It has been described by Stephen Bann as, “an outstanding, indeed hyperbolic, demonstration of the search for absolute authenticity in all material details.” However, Bann argues that such painstaking authenticity severs the relationship between cultural and historical experience, thereby nullifying any historical significance, “since the historical dimension is almost entirely subsumed in those of the spectacular and the exotic.”

Bourque and the contacts he made at Floralies were instrumental in the realization of the garden. Two of the delegates from China he met in 1980, Wang Dajun and Wei Zhen Quian, had attained prominent positions: Wang now heading Shanghai’s Botanical Garden; Wei in charge of Shanghai’s parks department. With the donation of p’en chings from China
and from Hong Kong business tycoon Wu, Bourque's 1985 visit to China was preceded by the reputation as the man who had amassed the largest p'en ching collection outside China.197

The Chinese garden received a Prix Orange by Sauvé Montréal in the Urban design category in 1991, which welcomed it as an attractive addition to the city. Montreal architect Susan Bronson has written that the garden can be appreciated on four levels: "as pure poetry, as a lesson in landscape design, as an example of adaptation and, finally, as an exercise in cross-cultural collaboration."198 The garden, she postulates, can be appreciated for what it reveals about the traditional Chinese approach to landscape as a cultural expression, and for lessons on harmoniously combining nature and architecture, the result of Chinese architectural education wherein students design both landscape and building promoting a greater interaction between site and structure.

In July 1995, the American Association of Botanic Gardens and Arboreta held its annual meeting in Montreal. After the session entitled "Transplanting Nature and Culture" which dealt specifically with the Japanese and Chinese gardens, a participant questioned André Bouchard, then Director of the Botanical Garden, whether he considered it "ethnically correct" and authentic to reproduce a Chinese garden in Montreal. Bouchard responded that as an ecologist, he believes plants are best seen in meadows, yet he removes them from their natural context to plant them in a garden. His analogy did not adequately address the historical, geographical and cultural dislocation of the plants in the gardens, nor that of the people who add to the spectacle.

According to Bouchard, the garden was built as a living landscape with cultural activities, to make it appear as though in China rather than Montreal.199 The presence of the
Olympic Tower somewhat undermines this effect. An effort was made to keep the tower behind the spectator in most views. In addition to modifications in botanical specimens due to climate, wider paths were constructed to allow for wheelchair accessibility. A five year agreement made with China supplies performers. Described by Jean Marchand of the International Affairs Office in Montreal, as a “very colourful people” they offer music, song and dance, “to transport visitors straight to the heart of China.” Among the spectacles, are the Magic of the Lantern festival in October exhibiting over 900 lanterns from Shanghai (Ills. 29-31) and the Ice and Lights Festival which features ice sculptures sculpted by artisans from Harbin who carve their crystalline works in late winter (Ills. 32-33). Tourists can observe 30-minute performances staged three times on summer afternoons (Ills. 34-36), and chess tournaments.

The range of activities offered in the Japanese and Chinese gardens exemplifies the concept of “Instant Asia,” a term used by the Singapore tourist board and state authorities to describe the distillation and packaging of cultures. For Tony Leong, “Tourism is an example of the way a culture can be mined, manufactured, manipulated and marketed for the joint purposes of economic development (the cultural image of the nation presented to the international market as exotic) and nation building (the cultural image of the nation presented to the international polity as distinctive from other nations).”

While tourists generally claim to value authenticity, many will observe and enjoy ceremonies with no understanding, or interest, in its ritual significance. Increasingly a ritual may be oriented to an external public, shortened to fit foreign attention spans or adopted to foreign tastes — “secularized and sanitized” for the tourist industry; authenticity is “eclipsed by estrangement” as dance and other rituals become performances rather than integral
parts of the social life of its participants. In a more positive light, what once served as a
religiously significant ritual for its performers may become a culturally significant self-
representation before its observers.

The Asian gardens attract the greatest number of spectators. The advertised cultural
attractions of these gardens are defined by their difference, authenticity, and their
‘otherness.’ Their exoticism is marketed and presented as spectacle for tourist consumption.

**Difference**

The differences in appearance between the gardens of western Europe and China and
Japan are regularly and summarily dismissed as representing divergent attitudes and
relationships with the natural world. The European tradition, wherein nature is seen as
subordinate to man, is juxtaposed with Asia, whose peoples are said to live harmoniously
and at one with nature. This dichotomy is visually demonstrated through comparing formal,
geomeric European gardens, such as those planted by Albert Magnus (1193-1280) where
trees follow straight avenues, flowers grow in rectangular beds and round fountains spray
into square pools; to the asymmetrical and therefore “naturalistic” Chinese garden. Yet
the geographer is more aware of China’s historical mistreatment of nature and can cite
examples of deforestation and erosion, the pollution of streams, and the building of rice
terraces and cities. Mountains were deforested due to construction needs, timber the
dominant construction material, and to destroy the habitats of feared animals such as tigers
and leopards. Unfortunately fires and the rebuilding of cities required even greater quantities
of wood.

The construction of any garden requires that an area’s natural topography is erased
or at the very least, displaced Yi-Fu Tuan notes that “in an obvious but not trite sense,
civilization is the exercise of human power over nature.\textsuperscript{296} The subsequent contrition often leads to an aesthetic appreciation of nature. In Asia, as in Europe, nature is remembered with nostalgia after its destruction which often results from industrial progress.

As well, all gardens share conceptual similarities which are related in their schemata. Psychologist Jean Piaget developed the theory of schema which when applied by architectural historian Christian Norberg-Schulz revealed that each culture conceives its spatial environment according to schemata or mental diagrams which have qualitative properties. Space can be defined in terms of enclosure, penetration, separation, connection, repetition, and proximity; qualities which do not rely on particular angles, dimensions or figures. Oppositions between symmetrical and asymmetrical, or natural and geometric become irrelevant. A conceptual similarity exists between circle and a square as both designate a schema of enclosure and security. Garden designs with different figural relations may thus be comprised of the same schema.

Three groups of conceptual similarities are widely shared by European and Asian gardens. The first is the notion of unlimited space so that the garden appears as large as possible by removing vertical visual obstacles from the garden boundaries, by employing a camouflaged garden wall or other vertical separation to block direct views of the land outside, or borrowed scenery, whereby distant views are incorporated thus visually expanding the dimensions of the garden. The second convention is that the garden must seem somehow otherworldly and to this end often representations of foreign scenes are included so that the garden appears dramatically different from its surroundings. The third similarity is that a visit to the garden must contain surprise, and emotions are to be conjured up -- as one walks through the garden suspense is mingled with delight as the secrets of the garden
Religion has had a profound impact on how nature is viewed within society. Christianity, being anthropocentric, stresses the duality of man and nature and insists that it is god's will that man exploit nature. Teuscher's belief that man is the supreme master over nature was not unique to him or to his time. The attitude is historically and geographically widespread and is responsible for many of the present environmental crises. During the Middle Ages, both Platonists and Aristotelians accepted the axiom *Opus naturae est opus intelligentiae* [the work of nature is the work of intelligence.] While Platonists by-passed works of nature to contemplate the divine intelligence, Aristotelians, such as Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) embraced nature as a work of god and a means of attaining him. Aquinas believed man both a part of nature and continuous with it.

Karl Marx (1818-1883) criticized the split between country and town due to capitalism because it disturbed the metabolism between man and earth. He recognized that "with the economic transition from medieval to bourgeois society, nature began to appear, epistemologically speaking as 'made', rather than simply 'given.'" Although he viewed nature in relation to human activity in terms of economic benefit, and believed man was inherent in nature, he thought the "universality of man is signified by the fact that he can appropriate, as least potentially, the whole of nature." Leslie Kanes Weisman contends this is a result of a particularly male sensibility; referring to Genesis 1:26-28 wherein god commands man to go forth and multiply, subdue the earth and hold dominion over all living things, "According to this domination theology, man is separate and above nature; and it is his right and responsibility to control, subjugate and bend the environment according to his own greater human purposes and needs."
Western humanists have commonly viewed China’s relationship to nature through its Taoist and Buddhist traditions which stem from a more ecocentric rather than homocentric or egocentric world view.\textsuperscript{212} Elizabeth Kassler writes that unlike the creation story in Genesis, “[t]he Chinese and the Japanese were given no divine assurance of dominion over the earth. For them man was part of universal nature, and no more particularly fashioned after the likeness of God than are the fish of the sea and the fowl of the air; no more than trees, flowers, grasses, rivers, hills, clouds; no more than rocks.”\textsuperscript{213} Through the rejection of geometry, their gardens are read as “an unsentimental effort to penetrate the essence of nature.”\textsuperscript{214}

It is not only westerners who believe in the disjuncture between east and west. While stating that the tradition of representing “the oriental way of thinking as spiritual, introverted” in contrast to the “occidental as materialistic, extroverted” is simplistic, Hajime Nakamura, In Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples, asserts that Chinese history has been relatively peaceful because the culture regards man as part of nature, and as such nature is not opposed to man.\textsuperscript{215} The Japanese, according to Teiji Itoh, cannot conceive nature as hostile due to the country’s mild climate, nor do they perceive nature perfect in and of itself. “The imperial gardens of Japan,” writes Marc Treib, “while posing as natural systems, are in fact only naturalistic, every square inch of their limited domains maintained at the level of the pruning shears if not scissors.”\textsuperscript{216}

The conflicting opinions over the cultivation of bonsai reveal how divergent views toward nature and artifice can be read in one and the same convention. In an early work on Japanese gardens, Jiro Harada wrote: “Bonsai, [the] cultivation of dwarf trees, is still another evidence of our Nature-loving character. The art has been highly developed so that the trees
are not only stunted to live in small pots for generations, but they are made to assume the shape and dignity of ancient trees according to their species."217. With the opening of the Chinese greenhouse in 1985, Bourque stated that bonsais, "represent the greatest homage a man can make to nature." Bonsais were received from Japan, "Thanks to these bonsais, the Botanical Garden has helped to created [sic] a cultural bridge between the East and West in just a few years."218

In contrast Tuan believes that ... "the Oriental's ultimate triumph is symbolized by the miniature garden, where the wild nature is reduced to the scale of a dwarf landscape that can be fitted into a bowl. Complete artifice reigns: in the narrow confines of a bowl, shrubs are tortured by human skill into imitating the shape and posture of pines, the limbs of which may have been deformed by winds that swept the China Seas."219 Riley concurs, "Bonsai, the miniature and maybe ultimate garden, is an expression in which not only nature's forms but nature's basic laws are under human power, the rhythms of growth and change slowed to near stasis for human delight."220 Bonsai is the horticultural equivalent of the 11th century practice of foot binding when the retardation of the natural growth of women's feet was considered the aesthetic ideal.

**Authenticity**

The distinction between the authentic and the inauthentic, the natural and the "touristy," is an important semiotic operator within tourism.221 An authentic touristic experience involves not only connecting a marker to its sight, but participating in the collective ritual of connecting one's own marker to a sight already marked by others. However, as authenticity is what the tourist expects to experience in the presence of the sight itself, the markers are deemed "inauthentic" reproductions. Once a sight is marked as
authentic, it is by the very fact of being marked no longer quite as authentic: the desire for authenticity leads to the marking of new sights as, “the traveller grows ever more desperate for a pure experience, something authentic ... exotica is not merely a relative concept; it is fundamentally relative, the very definition of relativity.”

Authenticity in tourist attractions is sought most often by those who question the authenticity of their interpersonal relationships in modern society. The alienated tourist is more likely to seek that which appears to be primitive and natural, or that least touched by modernity. In a televised guide to the Caribbean islands, Stuart Hall stated that tourism “distorts reality, obliging people to produce themselves for tourist consumption.” However, the social analyst and the tourist may conceive authenticity, which is socially constructed, differently. Those less concerned with authenticity in their tourist experiences will accept as “authentic” a cultural product or attraction which other tourists, applying stricter criteria, will reject as contrived. Authenticity is found in consumption: entrance fees, participation in staged rituals, meals in the restaurant and trinkets from the gift shop all require real dollars. The tourist, notes Umberto Eco, is an authentic consumer.

The Japanese garden is billed as “an authentic reflection of the country’s art and culture” and “the only public place in Montreal where the traditional tea ceremony is performed”. Participants who pay $5.00 for the experience are served in front of spectators. A tea garden is supposed to provide a place for the preparation of both body and spirit for the tea ceremony, yet few would know to first pause at the hishaku or cold water basin, to cleanse one’s hands in anticipation. Dating from the sixteenth century, following the teachings of Sen no Rikyu (1522-91), the most widely acknowledged tea master, the origins of the tea ceremony are steeped in Zen philosophy. It attained most if its form during a time
of civil strife when mastering the ceremony was considered the highest level of achievement. Attended by intimates of the host, its specially designed small and simple gardens simulated a lonely mountain trek through dense woods to the tea pavilion. Itoh laments that "[t]oday we seem only to give attention to the etiquette of the ceremony, and we tend to forget that it was more than anything else a condensation of all that was best in the culture of late-Muromachi and Momoyama times." [1392-1600]

The social life which takes place in a landscape cannot be recreated, especially within an artificially constructed space where visitors seldom delve into a deeper relationship with the "nature" put on display. A wall text posted between two narrow windows through which the visitor may view the zen garden states, "Zen philosophy ascribes great importance to silence, poetry, humility and intuition." Yet as Dr. Hennig notes, "a zen garden is not only a private place to attain enlightenment through meditation, but provides in its exacting maintenance, a daily field for monastic labour." Here the garden can only be observed and a strong visual divider is enforced by the wall and the glass. This problem could have been partially solved by the provision of an outdoor deck, or viewing platform such as that found at the Ryoanji temple in Kyoto. By remaining inaccessible, the garden takes on a preciousness, like an object which can be admired but not touched (Ill. 42).

What may be the most authentic aspect of the Japanese garden is the idea of simulcrum and microcosm. Within many Japanese parks stand small replicas of Mt. Fuji and the principle of microcosm is evident in bonsai and garden designs. In Tokyo's Rikugien, an Edo-era garden in Komagome, the 88 classical sites are featured in miniature, with panels explaining their association to Chinese or Japanese history. Theme parks with travel motifs are also extremely popular: in southern Japan, one is based on a Dutch town,
complete with tulips and windmills; in central Japan, the architecture of Spain is reproduced and on the northern Hokkaido Island, Canadian World features a recreation of Prince Edward Island's *Anne of Green Gables*, (L.M. Montgomery's novel being popular with Japanese girls) which annually attracts approximately 140,000 visitors. Activities in Canadian World include horseback riding, shooting bows and arrows and a visiting a pavilion dedicated to antique organs. Crew and Sims justly note that:

> Authenticity is not about factuality or reality. It is about authority. Objects have no authority; people do. It is people on the exhibition team who must make a judgement about how to tell about the past. Authenticity -- authority -- enforces the social contract between the audience and the museum, a socially-agreed upon reality that exists only as long as confidence in the voice of the exhibition holds.

The 'Other'

People have been put on display as early as 1501 when members of an Inuit community were exhibited in Bristol. In 1823, William Bullock upon his return from Mexico constructed an attraction to replicate his travel experiences complete with ruins, ethnographic objects, plant and animal specimens -- even a Mexican youth who inhabited a cottage and garden thus serving the dual purpose of specimen and docent. Proponents for reconstructing lifestyles and reenacting ceremonies, which serve as surrogate travel, include Valene L. Smith who believes these models "offer a more accurate ethnographic view than reflected in modern native culture, and allow the visitor to wander and photograph." The camera is an instrument of surveillance. In contemporary tourism, it "serves as the central portable element of distancing and self-definition" allowing the spectator to choose the distance from what, or from whom, the gaze is directed. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett argues that "live exhibits tend to make people into artifacts because the ethnographic gaze
objectifies," 236 -- and looking often turns to staring. She notes that many of the performances staged for visitors are exported to encourage foreigners to visit their place of origin yet recognizes that, "to know a society only in its festival mode, filtered through the touristic lens of spectacles," [propogates] "the illusion of cultural transparency in the face of undeciphered complexity and the image of a society always on holiday. To festivalize culture is to make everyday a holiday." 237 She wonders whether what is presented is folk-loric or fake-loric and concludes that ... “spectacle, by its very nature, displaces analysis, and tends to suppress profound issues of conflict and marginalization.” Kenneth Hudson finds the practice akin to animating ethnographic museal displays and questions, “Whose fantasy world does it represent, that of the performers or that of their audience? I find it degrading and I wonder if the dancers and singers do, too.” 238 He places the blame squarely on the world’s fastest growing business:

The tourist industry demands that the past shall be kept alive because it is what its customers expect to see, and the result is the perpetuation of bogus culture throughout the world. How many tourists, however, realize that it is bogus, that Zulus and Fijians and Maoris no longer behave like this left to themselves in their home territory and that to bribe them to do is to indulge in romantic escapism of a patronizing and not particularly pleasant kind? 239

The Montreal Botanical Garden is unique in having both a Japanese and Chinese garden; most botanic gardens showcase only one or the other of these often competing cultures. 240 The Environmental Prototype Community of Tomorrow (EPCOT) developed in Florida in 1982, boasts both garden styles and invites its visitors to “Stroll through a Japanese garden” and “Discover the mysteries of the East in China.” EPCOT features include Kodak picture spots, stereotypical “national style” architecture, and artificial lakes in an
attempt to replicate the built environment and the natural world. Although these gardens may lack a scientific vocation, Florida's more temperate climate allows for the display of a greater number of Asian plants and thereby could be construed as more "authentic." The gardens at EPCOT and in Montreal are like world fairs offering simulated travel. The popularity of visiting such attractions is "based upon the happy thought of geographical convenience: all the interesting localities on earth located at one spot."\textsuperscript{241} A recent television advertising campaign for British tourism exploits this concept. The initial images of a Ming era scholar's garden are accompanied by a text which reads, "Is this China?" followed by images of gondoliers, bridges, and canals, "Is this Venice?" The message is clear: one does not have to go to China or Venice, but can experience both, and much more, in Great Britain.

In the Montreal Botanical Garden, the visitor can "Tour the World" in the greenhouses; "Relive the splendor of the Chinese court" in the Chinese garden and "Meditate and drink tea" in the Japanese garden. The chance to visit and experience different places may result in what David Harvey has called time-space compression to refer to the way in which changes in the organization of capitalist labour-time have transformed space, suppressing dissimilarities between places. He outlines that among its effects is a denial of the complexity of the world which becomes "sloganized" and filled with "depthless images" deployed to capture complex meanings. "Travel," Harvey asserts, "even imaginary and vicarious, is supposed to broaden the mind but it just as frequently ends up confirming prejudices."\textsuperscript{242} As a result, "urban design (and note that postmodernists design rather than plan) simply aims to be sensitive to vernacular traditions, local histories,"\textsuperscript{243} yet effectively "draw[s] a veil over real geography through the construction of images and reconstructions... staged ethnic festivals, etc."\textsuperscript{244} Yet in order to attract people, "an architecture of spectacle,
surface glitter and transitory participatory pleasure, of display and ephemerality, of jouissance — essential to the success of ethnic festivals in city’s to avoid or negate racial tensions,” is constructed.

The didactic texts found in the Garden of Weedlessness, and throughout the Chinese and Japanese gardens provide no critical self-awareness and do not address the sensitive issues surrounding the reconstruction and recontextualization of gardens with specific histories in a time and place different from their origins. In the simplified generalizations, little is done to undermine what Homi K. Bhabha has defined as racist stereotypical discourse. “Stereotyping,” he writes,

is not the setting up of a false image which becomes the scapegoat of discriminatory practices. It is a much more ambivalent text of projection and introjection, metaphoric and metonymic strategies, displacement, overdetermination, guilt, aggressivity; the masking and splitting of ‘official’ and fantasmatic knowledges to construct the positionalities and oppositionalities of racist discourse.”

The maps and signs placed throughout the gardens which lead the spectator from site to sight, confirm Pugh’s finding, “that nature as landscape is known first through writing, legitimated at each turn of the corner by an inscription that the spectator must read before looking at the landscape.” Ostensibly they are placed in the gardens to enhance the visitor’s appreciation of that which is being experienced but they also serve to direct the gaze which in contemporary tourism has become increasingly signposted. Much is edited from the history lesson. The spectator is not told who was responsible for maintaining the gardens upon which these are based and how those people were treated. Historically the exercise of power over nature has resulted equally in power exercised over people. Many
suffered under the rule of those who walked the pathways of gardens, meting out punishments during the building of their vast pleasure gardens. Who experienced the pleasure is a question that should be addressed.

The lack of critical commentary may be due to the diplomatic mission of these gardens, and the fact that they were, to a great extent, donated by Japan and China and citizens from those countries now living in Montreal -- one does not look a gift horse in the mouth. However, there is no critical discourse surrounding any issue in the garden, including major conservation needs, leading to a theme park atmosphere where ‘nature’ takes centre stage, entertains the visitor and assuages any sense of moral responsibility to the environment. In the gardens, the relationship of Chinese and Japanese societies to the natural world is idealized and has little to do with the realities of landscape practices in contemporary post-industrial Asia. For example, there are few public parks and residential greenspaces in today’s urban Japan. Until the 1930s, most of the country was laid out and maintained as a series of inter-related garden parks. The interest in nature by Japanese tourists when travelling abroad can be partly attributed to the rapid economic growth and industrialization of post-war Japan which led to overcrowding and pollution. The population explosion and abrupt transformation from an agrarian to industrial society has led to uncontrolled development with scant regard given to land planning and zoning. John Simonds, writing in 1976 determined that traditional spiritual values had been usurped by materialism, and warned that, “In no other land today is the cultural integrity of a people or the quality of their living environment as seriously threatened as in Japan.”

In recent years, annual “Green Promotion Fairs” have been held in new or existing urban parks which, according to Akira Sato, president of the Parks and Open Space
New design philosophies are evolving which consider regional identity and natural landscape features reconciled with traditional Japanese forms. Site conditions, user needs and the surrounding context have become decisive planning factors. Ironically, the Japanese are becoming fascinated with landscape practices derived from other cultures, particularly the English who are admired for the naturalness of their gardens in contrast to, "the classic Japanese garden ... a formal arrangement of ornamental shrubs, rocks and running water. [which] is usually very controlled and [where] scented plants are rare." "The important point about English-style gardening," according to Rina Matsunaga, a Tokyo-based florist, "is to create through careful planning a garden that seemingly has no pretensions and artifice. The twisted forms of Japanese topiary" she concludes, "are a world away from a British herbaceous border." Questions of taste and perception, however, vary according to the whims of society and era. As Maggie Keswick has pointed out: "Chinese gardens are based on a deep appreciation of the natural landscape -- but what is seen as 'natural' in one culture can sometimes look strangely artificial in another."

How Should a Botanical Garden Grow?

Writing in the early 1970s, Howard S. Irwin, then director of the New York Botanical Garden believed that the primary challenge facing botanical gardens "is to tell the place of plants in a man-dominated world." As urban institutions, American botanical gardens had been based on European models, thereby perpetuating nineteenth century tastes and mores, "sanctifying the privilege of wealth and leisure." In his experience people, particularly New York's African-American community, were tired of having things planned for them rather than with them. This resulted no doubt from a post-World War II recreation-boom
enjoyed predominantly without the participation of people of colour.

The relationship of the Japanese and Chinese gardens to their supporting Asian communities in Montreal is widely lauded as being sensitive to the needs of these cultures for a place where they can celebrate their histories and their presence in Canada. Yet it was not until 22 September 1987, three months after the official opening of the Japanese garden in the Montreal Botanical Garden, that the Canadian government made a formal apology acknowledging its inhumane treatment of people of Japanese ancestry during World War II when, following the bombing of Pearl Harbor on 8 December 1941, Canada entered war with Japan. *Issei*, or Japanese immigrants, and *nisei*, their children, were forced into internment camps. Takahatake, living in Canada only within the last twenty-five years, would perhaps be less sensitive to, and resentful of, federal governmental policies which had enforced the: "disenfranchisement, detention, confiscation and sale of private and community property, expulsion, deportation and restriction of movement, which continued after the war, ... [and which were] influenced by discriminatory attitudes. Japanese Canadians who were interned had their property liquidated and the proceeds of sale were used to pay for their own internment." After the war, only a few hundred Japanese settled in Montreal; today they number 2100.

Chinese immigrants to Canada have suffered. Welcomed as cheap labour during the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they were subjected to a government imposed a Head Tax after the railway’s completion. In 1885 the tax was $50; by 1903 it had risen to $500, then equal to more than two years of wages. China was the only country whose citizens were charged such a tax. Approximately $23 million was collected in Head Tax from 81 000 Chinese Canadians. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1923 closed its doors to all
Chinese immigrants and was not repealed until 1947.

The Chinese community in Montreal, (comprised today of approximately 25,000 members), was ghettoized and mistrusted until WWII. During the late 1950s and early 1960s speculators bought old buildings in Chinatown, demolishing them to turn the vacant spaces into parking lots. The Chinese Presbyterian Church, The Chinese Pentecostal Church, a Chinese food factory, several Chinese grocery stores and homes were razed. By the mid-1970s, only a few hundred senior citizens lived in Chinatown. The Dufferin School was replaced by the Guy Favreau office complex, destroying a vital social centre and meeting place. Yet each year the Confucius Festival runs from 8 - 17 June near the Sun Yat-sen park in Chinatown. This tiny, unkempt park has a small pavilion with flared eaves and a plaque commemorating Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925), considered the father of Chinese democracy.

Jennifer Bennett ignores the contradiction between festival-like appreciation of a culture and respect for a people's daily life, when she writes that “Visitors of all nationalities come to see the Chinese and Japanese gardens, but for the local Asian community, the gardens are not simply places to visit but public centres that celebrate their cultures.” It is difficult to believe that Montrealers have great respect for Chinese traditions when so little of Chinatown remains. With the razing of buildings to make space for office complexes certainly no respect was accorded to the principles of feng shui.

In late August 1996, Bourque attempted to redress the treatment of Chinatown's citizens by introducing a programme which would have seen $2.3 million invested in increasing the residential area of Chinatown through the construction of 500 housing units. The mayor also called for “Chinese-style” street lamps in order to “re-create the magical aspect of Chinatown.” An additional $1.7 million was targeted for subsidies for businesses
and to renovate existing residential buildings. Less than eight months later, in April 1997, the plans to renew Chinatown were removed from Bourque's agenda, leading opposition councillor Sammy Forcillo, whose St. Jacques riding includes Chinatown, to claim, "Mayor Bourque is abandoning the Chinese community."260 Bourque's desire to spruce up Chinatown appears to have been motivated by a desire to capture foreign investors from Hong Kong and Taiwan, now attracted to Toronto and Vancouver which have thriving Chinatowns, rather than Montreal's much partitioned and beleaguered area. Bourque's emphasis on the magical aspect of Chinatown and such superficial enhancements as fanciful lamp standards does not seem deeply influenced by the respect he so often claims for Chinese culture.

Today's botanical gardens, writes Walter Byrd, "should be living libraries and museums. Like the best of those institutions they should be integral parts of the large civic composition."261 This requires a well-defined mission as "overextension may result in patchwork quilts, a smorgasbord of experiences reduced to the equivalent of a theme park or botanic shopping mall."262 He points out the danger in homogenization when each botanic garden features a roses, rocks and a Japanese garden, set within an Olmstedian/English pastoral landscape. The following debate occurred over the ubiquitous Japanese garden between designers and experts during a forum on botanical gardens. Moderator Ian Robertson, associate professor of landscape architecture at the University of Washington in Seattle, stated: "Part of being ethical, then, is being responsive to the place where you are,263 I also believe that if we continue to use outmoded styles and forms, we may be unwittingly sending the wrong messages to people, saying, 'Destroy what you've got there and put something else in.'"264
White: "I'm philosophically sympathetic to that view, yet I can't help but feel that we're enriched by a whole palette of styles, and that Japanese gardens are appropriate in some places.

Robertson: "Yes, they're appropriate in Japan."

White: "But the Japanese garden in St. Louis might draw people into deeper meaning of rocks in a garden, not many are going to get to Japan to see such a garden."

Koller: "The Japanese garden also helps people understand what nature means spiritually and from a civilization standpoint to the Japanese people. It's a cultural statement."

Robertson: "Should we dig ditches because most people can't get to the Grand Canyon? How far do you carry it?"

Bourque would answer as far as possible. For the FloraJes in 1980, half an acre of frozen peat bog was transported from James Bay to Ile Nôtre-Dame so people could see northern Canadian flora. The latest technology is used to ensure the success of his elaborate 'natural' exhibits. 10 000 rose bushes, many of which are too delicate to withstand the extreme temperatures of Montreal, are protected with polystyrene foam cones under a layer of insulating blankets. In the Biodome, four distinct eco-systems and the animals which inhabit them are captured and displayed. These are in fact unnatural displays where the predators are separated from the prey and plants are protected from disease. The climates are artificially controlled; the animals are regularly fed.

With the spread of mass-culture regional context is often discarded in order to produce a "world-class" institution. Byrd believes the physical design and a garden's location within its larger context must manifest itself as an expression of cultural values in built form. In the Montreal Botanical Garden, the layers of government, with their influence, funding, and collateral diplomatic functions, are more firmly rooted in the garden than the plants which are brought from the far reaches of the globe. It is the politics underlying the creation of the buildings, greenhouses and displays, rather than the genius loci, or spirit of
the place, which most distinguishes the Montreal Botanical Garden from others.

Reviewing the Garden in 1994, Sylvie Rivard wrote that the upcoming years, “will be devoted to transforming the Montreal Botanical Garden into a ‘natural science complex’ and to surpassing Kew Garden in Surrey, England, which presently holds first place.” The goal, she stated, was to make it the world’s greatest international environmental centre by the turn of the century. In 1994, the administration building received a 22 million dollar facelift and expansion by architects Jean Laberge and André Leonard to provide larger visitor reception areas, a space for permanent exhibitions, a bigger giftstore to sell more tourist trinkets, and a botanical research wing. In 1996, a tree interpretation centre, called the Tree House, opened in the arboretum. An additional greenhouse is planned for 1998 to showcase Chinese medicinal plants used with a mock pharmacy, with a Chinese restaurant to open at the entrance of the Dream Lake Garden in 1999.
Conclusion

Traditionally the other, what MacCannell calls the “radically other” -- classes and ethnicities present in the landscape only as gardener or caretaker -- has been excluded from the garden.\textsuperscript{270} In the Montreal Botanical Garden, the opposite occurs: “otherness” is embraced and exoticized, but with didactic panels stressing the affiliation these cultures have with nature, the cultural other is naturalized and thereby neutralized. The didactic aims of the Montreal Botanical Garden would be greatly enhanced with the provision of critical panels which interpret and re-interpret the gardens and their histories. Rather than emphasizing the aesthetics in design practice, stress could be placed on the elements necessary for the construction and care required by these landscapes.

Mitchell recognizes that “Like imperialism itself, landscape is an object of nostalgia in a post-colonial and post-modern era, reflecting a time when metropolitan cultures could imagine their destiny in an unbounded prospect of endless appropriation and conquest.”\textsuperscript{271} The administrators of the Montreal Botanical Garden work operate under a delusion similar to that of their Renaissance predecessors: that the whole of the natural world can be replicated. Should humans continue their abuse of the environment, replications will be the sole survivors as nature becomes a “museum piece.” Small, “Disneyfied” artificial recreations of the Amazon rainforest, scattered as tourist attractions around the globe, will be the only reminder that such a forest once existed; plants on the verge of extinction will be artificially propagated in laboratories and grown in botanical gardens, as animals are already bred in captivity in the Biodome.

“Urban health” writes Michael Hough “has traditionally been examined from the fixed viewpoint of human health alone” ... “the ‘pedigreed’ landscape has little connection
with the dynamics of natural process, but is valued in the public mind as an expression of care, aesthetic value and civic spirit. It is to the public mind that the Montreal Botanical Garden owes its existence, and to the municipal, provincial and federal levels of government which continue to support its expanding complex of exhibitionism.
Notes


3. Nelson H.H. Graburn, “The Anthropology of Tourism,” *Annals of Tourism Research* 10 (1983): 18. Tourism employs a spatiotemporal strategy which Mikhail Bakhtin has called “exotopy” -- one leaves a designated home region to come into contact with a cultural other, and to return with some sign of loss or gain resulting from the experience.


6. Prest 38.


10. Prest, 42.

11. Tomasi, “Botanical Gardens” 82

12. Prest, 47.


14. Foucault, 131.

16. Prest, 44.

17. Fowler and Mooney, 177.

18. Fowler and Mooney, 178.

19. Fowler and Mooney, 179.


21. Fowler and Mooney, 179.

22. Fowler and Mooney, 179.


27. Foucault, 134.

28. Foucault, 128.


30. Prest, 92.


32. O’Malley, 290.


34. O’Malley, 294.
35. O’Malley, 298.
41. Bennett, 78.
42. Kohlmaier and von Sartory, 7.
44. Frederick Law Olmsted had included a botanic garden in his 1874 plans for Mount Royal which was not realized due to funding restraints during an economic depression between 1877 and 1881. The plans for the mountain itself had been considered luxurious by many of Montreal’s inhabitants who numbered just under 108,000. The mountain was also perceived as the preserve of the bourgeois, composed almost exclusively of anglophones, where the residents of the Square Mile had built their summer villas away from the city’s squalor. The park, it was thought, would further benefit these citizens as there was little access to the mountain from other parts of the city. Jules Helbronner, a journalist for La Presse, advocated the use of Île Ste. Hélène as a park instead of the mountain.
45. Herald must find source
47. Penhallow does not give examples of these educational institutes, but with his anglo predilections, I expect he is referring to McGill University, where he taught, and perhaps the Museum of Fine Arts or the Ecole des Beaux-Arts.
48. Penhallow, 6. Penhallow here exhibits his euro-centrism and ignorance of Japanese garden history, which had included, at the time of his writing, the tea gardens of Sen no Rikyu (1522-1591) the gardens surrounding the Katsura Detached Villa, and the dry garden at the Ryonaji temple, (all of which would provide the inspiration for the Japanese garden completed 100 years later in Montreal.) Japan cut itself off from the world in 1638 when it expelled Portuguese traders who had landed in 1542. Its goods were known and prized in Europe through its lacquer and porcelain manufactured for trade with the Dutch. Commodore Perry pried the

90
country open in 1851. The rage for *Japonisme* which took place during the second half of the 19th century in Europe and to a smaller extent in Canada is herein ignored by Penhallow, as is the complex character of Japanese culture.

49. Penhallow, 7.

50. Penhallow, 8.


57. Linteau, 316-317.

58. Linteau, 316.


63. Copp, 148.

64. Copp, 149.


70. Bergeron, 108.


72. Sise, 192.


74. Bergeron, 113.

75. Copp, 150.


77. Copp, 150.


79. Copp, 152.


82. Teuscher, *Memories* 54.


84. Teuscher to Marie-Victorin, 14 Apr. 1932.
85. Marie-Victorin to Teuscher, 12 Jul. 1932.
86. Teuscher to Marie-Victorin, 3 Aug. 1932.
89. Teuscher to Marie-Victorin, 22 Sep. 1932.
90. Marie-Victorin to Teuscher, 29 Apr. 1933.
91. Marie-Victorin to Teuscher, 29 Apr. 1933.
97. de Laplante adds that Teuscher was a difficult character, a disagreeable man who avoided cliques and whose interests were embellishing the garden and his prized collection of orchids. He returned to the garden often after his retirement, using the library and researching orchids in the greenhouse until he moved to Toronto in 1980.
100. Teuscher, “Program,” 19.
103. This early attempt to produce a Native atmosphere through intermediate structures is curious. Teuscher chose an artefact from the Pacific northwest coast, a totem pole and coupled it with a log cabin which would have been the domicile of the “white man” leads me to suspect that “local colour” was based in a fantasy of his European and colonialist imagination rather than any historical precedent. It is recognized that Teuscher is at a temporal remove from the current.
ideological debates surrounding representation of Native Canadians. The totem pole and log cabin is no longer extant and the presence of Canada’s First Nations’ peoples is conspicuously absent. There have been recent talks with Natives about establishing a new garden to recognize their cultures to be implemented when funding permits.


111. La Presse (5 mai 1938): n.p.


115. Chandler, 152.


120. André Lefebvre, Marie-Victorin: Le Poète éducateur. (Montréal: Les Publications de la Faculté des sciences de l’éducation, Université de Montréal, 1987) 57. The other sciences also did not fare well: the following ratios again listed English to French: Astronomers 14:0; Physicists 20:0; Chemists 84:4; and Zoologists 100:1.


125. Bourque in Levinson, 94.

126. Wilson, 246.

127. Wilson, 247.


132. John Harris, "Exoticism at Kew" Apollo 18 (1963): 103. The use of the word mecca in tourist discourse emphasizes the ritualistic and almost religious reverence with which the sites are viewed.


135. Sangster, 8.


142. Pugh *Garden*, 103.


   This article is primarily a review of MacCannell’s seminal text *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*.


148. Van der Abbeele, 10.


160. Paul Uline, “Working with the Tourism Industry,” 25 Jul. 1995. Ellen Posner, architecture critic for the *Wall Street Journal* is critical of tram tours. In her review of the Chicago Botanic Garden she writes that the tour “keeps visitors at a distance from the plants, uncertain of scale, enveloped in noise and peppered with anecdotes. At a time when our natural environment is in increasing danger, this little ride serves to turn the botanic garden into a Safari park for plants.” (Posner, “Botany or Business”: 55)

161. Size, apparently, has nothing to do with largeness but with perceived quality and merit. Other botanical gardens, including that at Hamilton are much greater in area than the Montreal Botanical Garden. In 1936 Montreal’s garden was considered the second largest in the world, following the largest which was based in Calcutta. By then the Royal Botanical Garden as Hamilton had been established so I do not understand how they could justify the claim. It is strange that neither Marie-Victorin nor Dupire mentioned the Ontario garden -- perhaps this was due to nationalistic pride.


163. Stuart, 40.


167. Richardson 176.

168. LePage and Bowllan, 36.


170. *P’en* translates as in a tray or platter/ching as there is a mountain landscape. The Japanese also cultivate these small trees and call it *bonsai*. 

97
171. Emphasis added.

172. Emphasis added.


178. According to Donald Ritchie, shibui means astringent, pleasant but sober, elegant and plain but distinctive. Its dictionary definition is “severe good taste.”


183. Meng in Chinese sounds like Montreal while hu sounds like an abbreviation for Shanghai so it also translates as the Montreal-Shanghai garden.


185. The Chinese Garden Society is a non-profit organization responsible for programming the activities which take place in the garden and running courses such as Mandarin, Chinese calligraphy and painting. The Society holds fund raising events and is open to interested members of the public. Its first president and founder is Raymond Wong.


188. Hustak, E2.

189. Hustak, E2.
190. Hustak, F2.


193. Hustak, F2.


197. Hustak, F2.


200. Jean Marchand, “Transplanting Nature and Culture” 23 Jul. 1995. Perhaps his choice of the word “colourful” was unfortunate but his presentation, following Bouchard’s, did little to boost the credibility of any sensitivity and awareness the Montreal delegation may have had for their Chinese colleagues. Bouchard had reported that upon their arrival in China they had been asked what they desired for the Montreal garden. The Quebeckers expressed an interest in pagodas. Their request was met with polite silence. After three days of touring Chinese gardens, no pagodas had been seen. It was explained gently the structure serves a specifically religious function and would be out of context in a pleasure garden. Why the Montreal team was ignorant of this is beyond comprehension.

201. Harbin plays host to an annual international Ice Sculpture Festival which runs from 5 January to 8 February. Teams of competitors from Canada, Japan and other countries come to carve.

202. Leong, 373. Leong finds irony in the fact that while targeted at foreign visitors, natives are affected when visiting attractions in their own country. Indoctrinated by their own “national heritage” the sight doubles as a site for nationalism and national tourism.

203. Leong, 370.


206. Tuan, 184.


211. Leslie Kanes Weisman, *Discrimination by Design: a Feminist Critique of the Man-made Environment*. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992) 20. I should make it clear that from the research undertaken, landscape and the construction of nature are dealt with using gender-specific language. Ideologies expressed such as “man against nature” as a keystone in western culture in contradistinction to “man in harmony with nature” in Asian practices -- both reject the place of women in the landscape and the imprint they have made. Only recently has the notion of gender entered the discourse of tourism. Veijola and Jokinen suggest that gender has been ignored due to the overwhelming emphasis on the gaze -- the rest of the body is forgotten (in Swain, 258). Theorists now recognize that certain activities are marketed according to sex. For example, the rugged terrain of a national park is projected as a challenge to be conquered, usually by men, while the gentler space of the garden is apparently more appealing to women. In tourism brochures, men are closely associated with action, power and ownership while women are identified with passivity, availability and being owned (Swain, 249). Many images distributed by the Montreal Botanical Garden show women and families, and female Japanese animators, decorating the landscape while the men are shown in skilled demonstrations such as zen archery.


219. Tuan, 177.

220. Riley, 162.

221. Culler, 131.


224. Boniface, 5.


228. Quoted in Miller, 67.

229. My thanks to Marc Leger for suggesting I see Wim Wenders’ film *Tokyo Ga* which highlights the love the Japanese hold for replication. Also gratitude to Rhonda Meier for giving me Donald Ritchie’s book which examines the notion of kitsch and simulcras. Both film and book helped me in trying to see the relationship or context in which this garden is Japanese despite its geographical placement.


101
232. Crew and Sims, 163.


237. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 419.


240. In Montreal, the Chinese delegation insisted that their garden be as large as the Japanese garden and that it be placed close to the parking lots. Far more promotional literature is produced for the Chinese garden which is considered “more popular” than the Japanese garden as it attracts a greater number of visitors. While the language in the literature is no more “exoticizing” in its description of the Chinese than the Japanese garden, and both are seen as celebrations of their respective cultures, more emphasis is placed on the “magical” aspect of the Chinese garden, while the Japanese garden is promoted as “peaceful” and meditative.

241. Ritchie, 41.


243. Harvey, 66.

244. Harvey, 87.

245. Harvey, 91. Harvey illustrates with the example of Charles Moore’s Piazza d’Italia in New Orleans, 1979. Place des Ameriques by Montreal’s Carlos Martinez borrows similar conventions for the public meeting place.


252. Quoted in Hindell, I12.


255. Irwin, 50.


258. Bennett, 64.


262. Byrd, 43.

263. From my reading it appears that regionalism is a concern in the Pacific Northwest. The landscape architecture programmes at both the University of Washington and the University of British Columbia in Vancouver stress using plants native to the region in landscape design. While I am unfamiliar with east coast design schools, the Montreal Botanical Garden's Michel Marceau, oversaw the construction of the New Brunswick Botanical Garden and was inspired by the concept of "Romance." No mention was made about regional identity; greater attention was spent choosing the musical selections for the rose garden which will feature Mozart piano sonatas.

265. Ian Robertson, "Forum," 74. Participants quoted are Gary Koller, managing
horticulturalist and supervisor of the living collections at the Arnold Arboretum, Jamaica Plain,
Massachusetts and Peter White, plant ecologist and director of the North Carolina Botanical
Garden, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

266. Sangster, 19.

267. Bennett, 63.

268. Sylvie Rivard, "The Botanical Garden and the Biodome -- Observing Plants and Animals
in the City-Centre, Forces (Spring 1994) 77.

269. Bourque ran for mayor in 1994 on a platform of "Turning the City into a Garden." A
charge could be made that with the amount of funding he has allocated to the Garden and its new
attractions, he is turning the Garden into a city. He has closed libraries, municipal pools and cult
the budget of the network of Maisons de la Culture. He has been accused of a "lack of vision"
with his gaze firmly planted on what are alleged to be his pet projects: the Treehouse and other
installations at the Montreal Botanical Garden.


2. (Right) Detail of the third quarter at Padua showing the lay-out and numbering of the beds.
P. Paaw Hortus publicus acadamiæ, Lugdunum-Batavae, 1601.

H. Boerhaave Index alterplantarum, 1720.
(Left) Kérouack's pavilion housing the Montreal Botanical Garden and the Botanical Institute of the Université de Montréal. The fountains and cascades highlight the axial symmetry of the composition.

(Below left) View of the Pavilion from display gardens. Post card ca. 1940.

(Below right) Detail of Hébert's terracotta bas-relief panels.
8. (Top) Teuscher's 1936 plan of the Garden.

9. (Centre) Frère Marie-Victorin (l) and Teuscher, ca. 1939.

11. Formal, symmetrical display gardens with pergolas, fountain and bedding.

12. The entrance gardens with Sylvie D'Aoust's sculpture of Marie-Victorin, unveiled in 1954.

14. The Master of the Fishing Nets Garden, Suzhou (1140) upon which the Dr. Sun Yat-sen Garden in Vancouver is based (1986) and the inspiration for the Brooke Astor Garden Court at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, (1980).
15. View of the Japanese tea garden showing one of the rest arbors and stone lantern.

16. The smaller rest arbor with bridge in the foreground.
17. The dry rock or zen garden, nestled in the Japanese pavilion.

18. The garden from the window through which it can be viewed.

20. Ikebana demonstration in the tea room.

22. Demonstration of zen archery in the tea garden.
23. Preparation for the tea ceremony.

24. The tea ceremony performed for paying participants and before observers.
25. Japanese cultural animators 'decorating' the garden.

26. The bamboo dipper where one stops for refreshment before the tea ceremony.
27. Stone lantern, bridge and rest arbor.

29. The Friendship Hall during the Lantern festival. Olympic Tower rises in the background.

30. Dragon in the Dream Lake.
31. Lantern hanging in the Friendship Hall.

32. Ice sculptor from Harbin.
33. Ice sculpture in the Garden.

34. Musicians perform in front of the Friendship Hall.
35. Musicians and dancers perform before the Friendship Hall.

36. A dancer performing for spectators in front of the Friendship Hall.
37. The Canada-China Doorway in the Entrance Courtyard.

38. The Springtime Courtyard.
39. From left to right: The Friendship Hall, Stoneboat Pavilion, Stone mountain and Tower of Condensing Clouds.

40. The Pavillon of Infinite Pleasantness.

42. Gardeners maintaining the zen garden.
Montreal: where the Land of Oz meets winter's reality.

43. Gazette photo essay highlighting the "Fantasy-land" aspect of the Garden.

LA MAISON DE L'ARBRE

44. Zoom card, available free in restaurants and shops, used to promote the Tree House.
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