

Managing the “Matchless Wonders”



A HISTORY OF ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENT IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK, 1872–1965

Historic Resource Study, Volume III
Park Administrative History, Part I

By Kiki Leigh Rydell and Mary Shivers Culpin

National Park Service
Yellowstone Center for Resources
Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming
YCR-2006-03



Managing the “Matchless Wonders”

A History of Administrative Development in Yellowstone National Park, 1872–1965

Historic Resource Study, Volume III
Park Administrative History, Part I

By Kiki Leigh Rydell and Mary Shivers Culpin

National Park Service
Yellowstone Center for Resources
Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming
YCR-2006-03

Design and layout: Virginia Warner

Editor: Alice Wondrak Biel

Content review: Lee Whittlesey and Elaine Hale

Photos courtesy of Yellowstone National Park photo archives unless otherwise noted.

Cover photo: Madison Museum, YELL #44321. *Inside cover photo:* Norris Boardwalk, YELL #41214.

Photo research: Bridgette Case, Kiki Leigh Rydell, and Lee Whittlesey.

Suggested citation: Rydell, Kiki Leigh, and Mary Shivers Culpin. 2006. *Managing the “Matchless Wonders”: A History of Administrative Development in Yellowstone National Park, 1872–1965*. National Park Service, Yellowstone Center for Resources, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, YCR-2006-03.

Contents

Preface.....	v
1. “To Protect These Matchless Wonders”	1
2. Management by Fits and Starts, and the Pressure for Preservation	13
3. The War on Vandalism	25
4. Administration in Turmoil	51
5. “Nature is the Supreme School-Teacher”	75
6. Refuge in Rusticity	109
7. “A Hodgepodge Where, Instead, There Should Be Uniformity”	137
Appendices.....	161
Notes	175
Bibliography.....	211
Index.....	214

Preface

The administration of Yellowstone National Park, created in 1872 by an act of Congress, has, from the beginning, been dedicated to protecting the park's resources and providing opportunities for visitor enjoyment—the latter, specifically, through interpretation and improvements. To protect and interpret the park and to provide services to the visitors who have chosen to explore its natural splendors, park administrators over the course of time have orchestrated both the construction of a built environment and a constellation of policies that have allowed park officials to implement and coordinate their various tasks. This historic resource study and administrative history of the park discusses the ways successive administrations facilitated the park's practices of protection, improvement (public access), and interpretation by crafting what is, in effect, a cultural landscape—a built environment with a concomitant set of protective, interpretive, and public-access-oriented policies.

There can be no doubt of a clear relationship between broad trends in policy and the historic structures one sees today in Yellowstone. For example, the U.S. Army—and after that, subsequent civilian administrations—built, throughout the park, a set of snowshoe cabins “at a distance of about 10 miles from the outlying outposts [the soldier stations],” a distance one park official, in 1908, “considered to be a fair day's travel for . . . men on snowshoes through the mountains.”¹ These cabins were created to serve a specific protection goal—that is, to allow soldiers and then rangers to oversee the park more easily from these outposts and thus, better protect park wildlife and other natural phenomena from poaching and vandalism—and have since become part of the park's cultural landscape and historical legacy. Similarly, Yellowstone's museums and visitor centers—for example, the rustic museums at Norris, Fishing Bridge, and Madison Junction, or the Mission 66 visitor center at Canyon—have also served policy goals of providing visitors with information and interpretation of the park's natural environment and history.

In addition to reflecting policy, the structures built in the park also reflected aesthetic goals or philosophies important at the time of construction. For example, the buildings at Fort Yellowstone were examples of typical army architecture, considered appropriate and commanding of respect. The museums built in the late 1920s and the early 1930s were of a specific rustic design, a style *au courant* during that period, especially in national park architecture across the nation.

When the U.S. Congress passed Yellowstone's Organic Act on March 1, 1872, it withdrew a large area near the headwaters of the Yellowstone River to be used as a public park and stipulated that the land “reserved and withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or sale” be used as a “pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.” The act further stated that the park would be under the direction of the secretary of the interior, who would “make and publish rules and regulations” for the care and management of the same. These regulations would provide for the “preservation from injury or spoliation, of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders within said park, and their retention in their natural condition.”² They set in motion a dual mandate, as well as an enormous experiment in federal land management that has served as an example worldwide. The park's Organic Act also set the stage for an often-contentious debate on how simultaneously to preserve and promote enjoyment of—in short to both protect and use—a national park.

The National Park Service Act of 1916 did little to resolve the matter. Like Yellowstone's Organic Act, it also contained contradictory goals, ordering the newly created National Park Service to “conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life [in the parks] and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.”³

Thus, all government structures built in the park and physical changes made to the park over the years have

been intended to serve either—or ideally, both—of these mandated goals: protection of, and the provision of public access to the park's treasures. Balancing the two sides of this mandate has not been without hard questions. For instance, how can a building intended to inform visitors be compatible with preserving the park's natural conditions, when a building, per se, is not natural? Any history of the administrative facilities built in the park must address these tensions. The complexities set in motion by the language of both Yellowstone's Organic Act and the National Park Service Act have been central to the administrative history of the park, and thus, to the

history of the park's administrative facilities.

This study begins with the first administration of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, and ends around 1965, with the nominal end of the so-called Mission 66 program, a massive effort to revamp national parks with adequate facilities designed both to accommodate and to educate masses of Americans eager to explore them. This document examines the structures built during the first 90 years of the park's history, and the policies adopted by the various administrations both to protect the park's resources and to interpret those same resources for visitor enjoyment.

CHAPTER ONE

"To Protect These Matchless Wonders"

The Administrations of Nathaniel Langford and Philetus Norris

Oh, for wisdom in this council
Of our nation great
To protect these matchless wonders
From a ruthless fate!¹
—Philetus W. Norris, 1878

In March 1872, just seven years after the end of the Civil War, the United States Congress passed Senate bill 392, the Organic Act that created Yellowstone National Park.² The first part of this act sought to preserve matchless natural wonders from "settlement, occupancy, or sale," as well as "from injury or spoliation," and to retain these same wonders "in their natural condition."³ The second part of the act mandated that these wonders should be enjoyed by the public; the park was to be a "pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."⁴ To this end, the park's Organic Act stipulated that "the Secretary [of the Interior] may in his discretion, grant leases for building purposes . . . of small parcels of ground, at such places in said park as shall require the erection of buildings for the accommodation of visitors."⁵ Money from the granted leases would then be used to manage the buildings and build further improvements, such as "roads and bridle-paths."⁶ Thus, from the beginning, those working to create the park had in mind the area's improvement for public use. However, the park's early civilian administrators had little time for improving the park; they had their hands full with the first part of the mandate, the protection of the park's wonders. The task was enormous, and unfortunately, Congress provided little assistance in the form of funding to aid improvement efforts.

The Park's First Leaders

The park's first superintendent, Nathaniel Pitt Langford, was born on August 9, 1832, in Oneida County, New York. He was educated in a rural county school when he was not busy with chores on his family's farm. After establishing himself as a banker in St. Paul, Minnesota, Langford moved west to join an expedition to the Idaho gold fields, and then settled for a time in Alder Gulch (Virginia City), Montana Territory. He served for several years as an internal revenue collector in the territory, and aspired—unsuccessfully—to be its governor. After visiting the Yellowstone region as part of the Washburn expedition in 1870, Langford pushed for establishment of the park by lecturing in the East on its many wonders. President Ulysses S. Grant appointed him to be the park's first superintendent in May 1872, and he served in that capacity until April 1877. During and after his stint as superintendent, Langford carried on his job as U.S. bank examiner for the territories and Pacific Coast states. In 1885, he entered the insurance business, finally resuming public service as president of the Ramsey County, Minnesota, Board of Control in 1897. He died on October 18, 1909, at the age of 79.⁷

The park's second superintendent, Philetus Walter Norris, was born on August 17, 1821, in Palmyra, New York. He spent his early youth exploring the area around the great falls of the Genesee River before moving with his family to newly opened land in Michigan, where Norris was obliged to forgo formal schooling to help on the farm. Several years later, he settled on his own frontier acreage in northern Ohio, and helped to

establish the town of Pioneer, serving as the town's first postmaster. In May 1862, Norris left Ohio to volunteer his services to the Union cause, but was injured so seriously in West Virginia that he had to resign his position as captain in January 1863. After the war, he purchased 1,900 acres of improved swampland in Hamtramck Township, Michigan, and laid out a town in his own name—Norris, Michigan.

Once he had moved his family to Michigan and begun a successful real estate business and newspaper, the *Norris Suburban*, Norris spent his time and money exploring the West. After making a trip through the Yellowstone area in 1875, Norris criticized the job Langford was doing in his newspaper, and was subsequently asked to serve as the park's second superintendent. He remained in that position until February 1882. According to former Yellowstone historian Aubrey L. Haines, Norris spread the park's appropriations too "thinly in an attempt to give immediate access to most of its interior," and consequently failed to maintain adequate roads in the area. After he was replaced, Norris returned home and devoted his remaining years to writing (*The Calumet of the Coteau*, 1883 and 1884) and to scientific exploration. He died on January 14, 1885.⁸

A Park Without a Purse

It was clear to Nathaniel Langford, the park's first superintendent, that one of his duties was to "survey the park" for possible lease sites for visitor accommodations; it was equally clear to him that it would take money to accomplish the task.⁹ Langford also needed money to help protect the park's features for visitor "comfort and pleasure."¹⁰ Unfortunately, money for surveying the park, for building any roads or facilities to help protect the park, or even for such basic things as his own salary was not forthcoming, and would not be for all five years of Langford's tenure as superintendent. Consequently, Langford's term in office was unproductive in both arenas: protecting the park's wonders and making them accessible to tourists.

One problem was that Congress had been promised that no money was necessary. According to historian Louis C. Cramton, Professor Ferdinand V. Hayden—one of the proponents of the congressional act to create the park and the leader of an important exploratory visit to the area in 1871—"had been compelled to give [to Congress] 'a distinct pledge' that 'he would not apply

for an appropriation for several years at least.'" Furthermore, according to Cramton's account, "passage of the bill [creating the park] would have been very doubtful," had Hayden not promised to refrain from asking for appropriations.¹¹ Early park historian Hiram Chittenden concurred; Congress, he argued, would not "have created this reservation had it not believed that no additional public burden was to be incurred thereby."¹² Hayden and other early proponents of the Organic Act had apparently argued that the park would be self-supporting—that income from leases would pay for its management. However, it is clear that managing the park without appropriations was impossible. Thus, for the first five years, a period of time long enough to allow detrimental effects on the park's wonders, Langford's "hands were tied."¹³

It appears that Langford may have been unaware of Congress's plans to forgo appropriations, because he kept asking for them.¹⁴ He even tried to convince Congress that some up-front investment would increase the potential for returns later on. "With a liberal appropriation now for roads, and a few other needed improvements, it is impossible to foresee what will be the future of this remarkable aggregation of wonders," he wrote in his report to Secretary of the Interior Columbus Delano in 1872, the first of a long series of annual reports originating in the park superintendent's office, but the only one Langford would write.¹⁵

Public funds would have to be expended for Langford to do his job and for the park to remain a protected place for visitors to enjoy. The "duty of preserving the Park from spoliation . . . cannot be performed without moneyed aid," he argued. Because the park was worth preserving, the money would be well-spent: "Our Government, having adopted it [the park]," he argued, "should foster it and render it accessible to the people of all lands, who in future time will come in crowds to visit it."¹⁶

Langford's comment about crowds of visitors would, of course, prove true. However, while early visitors might not have come in droves, they were plentiful enough to cause harm to the area. They killed game, shot birds, and fished to excess, provoking one critic to despair: "there will be none [game] left to protect."¹⁷ They also destroyed thermal features in their search for just the right souvenir.¹⁸ Langford had to do something. With an empty purse, however, his only recourse was with the pen. Thus, he called for laws to strengthen the park's rules and regulations—laws that would be enforced

by means of fines and imprisonment.¹⁹ Unfortunately, during Langford's tenure, any such laws remained as elusive as appropriations. The park was being pillaged, and there was little he could do about it.

Having no funds for salary or expenses, Langford did not remain long in the park.²⁰ In fact, there was no administrative presence in the park during most of Langford's five years in office.²¹ In the absence of any police protection, wanton destruction of both wildlife and scenic features increased. Toward the end of 1873, Henry Horr, local resident and partner of J. C. McCartney in the crude hotel built at Mammoth Hot Springs prior to the creation of the park, wrote to Secretary Delano, alerting him to the fact that elk and deer were being killed in the park for their tongues and skins. Horr suggested that Jack Baronett, owner of the Yellowstone River toll bridge (also built prior to the creation of the park), be given some authority to aid in year-round park protection, stating that only Baronett and Horr himself "would hibernate in this national domain." Secretary Delano also received requests from Governor John A. Campbell of Wyoming Territory, and Governor Benjamin F. Potts of Montana Territory, seeking appropriations not only to construct roads and provide for protection of the park's wonders and curiosities, but also to employ a

resident superintendent.²²

The situation had not improved by 1875; in fact, it had worsened. Montana territorial delegate Martin Maginnis decried the destruction of the park's curiosities. "From members of Secretary [of War William W.] Belknap's party who came down recently," he wrote, "I learn that the spoliations in the park are great. There is at present no way of checking them. Several of the geysers are now nearly ruined and the Government should take some action to preserve these wonderful and beautiful curiosities before it is too late."²³ In August, Captain William Ludlow visited the park with scientists George Bird Grinnell and E. S. Dana. In his report, Ludlow complained about the lack of supervision of the nation's park. He spotted tourists "prowling about with shovel and axe, chopping and hacking and prying up great pieces of the most ornamental work they could find."²⁴ He recommended that the "care of the Park, at least temporarily [be entrusted] to the War Department; at least until such time as a Civilian Superintendent, living in the Park, with a body of mounted police under his orders, can suffice for its protection."²⁵ Things were so bad that a daily newspaper in Bozeman, Montana, about ninety miles north of the park, asked, "must this robbing the Park of its treasures be kept up continuously . . . ? Where's Langford?"²⁶

Whether one agrees with Chittenden, that Langford's "hands were tied" and that he was "unjustly charged in the public press with responsibility for a condition of things for which he was in no sense to blame," or with others who claim the park's first superintendent was too detached to be effective, it is clear that Langford's tenure as superintendent was unsuccessful in terms of protection. To his credit, his own ineffectiveness in office troubled Langford; as Chittenden put it, it was "of great annoyance to him."²⁷

Just as he lacked money to protect the park's natural features, Langford was equally poorly positioned to make any improvements. Although he envisioned a road leading to all the great wonders in the park, and wanted to build "at least one stopping place for tourists," he received no support from the Secretary or Congress to realize his plans. Furthermore, he refused to grant leases for private "improvements" until he had surveyed the area and had a better sense of Congress's intentions.²⁸ Some have criticized Langford's unwillingness to grant leases. Park historian Aubrey Haines, for example, claimed that Langford did not grant leases because of his connection to the railroad interests that he hoped would



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES/YELL #147202

Buffalo hunting, date unknown.

obtain those same leases later in the process.²⁹ Haines also speculated that the lack of leases cost Langford his job.³⁰ Langford also opted against private roads, or toll roads, in the park. The park's roads should be "free to all who [wish] to visit this wonderful region," he wrote.³¹ Thus, what was already in the park upon its creation—the few private structures, the road, and the toll bridge—stood as the only "improvements" in the park when Langford was replaced in 1877.

Help On the Way

Langford's successor, Philetus Norris, had visited the park twice prior to becoming the park's second superintendent on April 18, 1877.³² Norris's appointment was a clear response by new Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz to cries for better protection of Yellowstone. Norris had been one of many who spoke out in protest as Yellowstone's treasures were marred or stolen during its first five years as a park. Thus, Norris was invited to accept what Haines referred to as "the thankless responsibility" of serving as superintendent.³³

In effect, Norris had been called to the rescue, and he succeeded to the extent that he could, with little money and few helping hands. In fact, according to Chittenden, "the real administration of the Park" began with Norris's "term of service."³⁴ He left his mark on the park in several important areas. To protect the park, Norris re-wrote the park's official rules and regulations and, for the first time, actually implemented and enforced them. To open the park to visitors, he oversaw construction of a road to Norris Geyser Basin, and of several administrative facilities (none of which, with the exception of the Queen's Laundry bathhouse, to be discussed, have survived). With development of the park's first tourist trails, he also took some of the first steps toward providing interpretation of its scenic features. Furthermore, he extended the administrative duties of park management to a new arena—scientific investigation. By exploring the park, studying its various facets, and writing extensively about its cultural and natural history, Norris set the precedent for future park administrations to promote serious study of the area. He also accumulated ethnographic and natural history collections, which he donated to the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History. Finally, he left his name on several features in the park, most notably Norris Geyser Basin.³⁵

Protection: The First Pillar of Park Management

Norris's efforts to protect the park and its resources were extensive. Despite a lack of guidance from the Department of the Interior, and inadequate funding from Congress, Norris believed it was his duty to call attention to depredations against the park's wildlife, timber, and scientific resources. His concern for protecting the park resulted in several important achievements. First and foremost, he immediately requested "practical legislation and rules" for park management. In his 1878 report to the secretary of the interior, Norris expressed apprehension concerning his ability to guard the park against all types of transgressions, including unlawful hunting, unauthorized disfigurement of the park wonders, and potential threats from nearby American Indian tribes. In this and subsequent years, Norris forwarded an array of requests for legislation that would enable the park's administrators to enforce the rules and regulations necessary to manage the park. In 1881, he tried to strengthen the rules and regulations themselves, by rewriting them in an expanded format and in much more forceful terms. To the list of regulations, for example, he added, "The sale of intoxicating liquors is strictly prohibited," and to other rules he added the words, "strictly forbidden by law."³⁶

Second, he advised the Department of the Interior that Congress should appropriate funds for a salary for a resident superintendent, for a survey to mark the park boundary, and for the construction of roads and bridle paths to lessen the potential for wildfire damage to timber.³⁷ Norris noted in his report that "careless use of fires ha[d] destroyed vast groves of timber," and he believed the construction of bridle paths and roads would help prevent further destruction.³⁸ Congress had been right, he believed, to set aside the park, but it had been wrong not to fund its protection. The problem was "not what Congress has done, but what it so long neglected to do," he wrote in 1878. Norris also claimed that it was Congress's "failure to make moderate appropriations for [the park's] protection and improvement until leases could be made to assist in rendering it self-sustaining, which compelled its first superintendent, N. P. Langford, to abandon all efforts for its protection."³⁹ Congress heard Norris's plea, appropriating \$10,000 in 1878.⁴⁰

Norris agreed with Langford that neither protection nor improvement could proceed successfully without the expenditure of time, energy, and funds for

exploration. Indeed, exploration, Norris argued, should precede improvements so the latter could be planned expeditiously. He wrote in 1879,

While, by the language of the [1878] act appropriating funds, as well as my instructions for its expenditure, protection and improvement of the Yellowstone National Park appear more prominent than its explorations, still, practically, considerable of the latter is indispensable for an intelligent and judicious performance of the former; the real danger, indeed, being a deficiency rather than an excess of knowledge of the local peculiarities of that wonderful region prior to expenditure upon buildings, roads, bridle-paths, and other permanent improvements.

Against his better judgment, but because he was bound by the intentions of Congress and the appropriations bill, Norris agreed to “push improvements,” thus devoting “less time and funds to exploration,” though he believed the latter would “ultimately [be] the most beneficial to the park.”⁴¹ When Congress increased the park’s appropriation to \$15,000 in 1880, Norris took full advantage of the opportunity to resume his explorations and pursue further scientific studies.⁴²

Exploration was essential for sound decision-making about improvements, but it was also important as a way to enhance scientific learning. The park, according to Norris, was a scientific laboratory, and studies of its inhabitants, geology, weather, history, and wildlife would enhance the nation’s understanding about the region. Thus, to the two pillars of management mandated by the Organic Act—preservation and use (which required improvement)—Norris added his own: scientific study. From Norris’s term in office to the present, Yellowstone National Park has been a center for research, and in 1998, the U.S. Congress, in the form of the National Parks Omnibus Act, provided a clear mandate for parks to use the highest-quality science to aid managers in making decisions.⁴³

Immediately upon becoming superintendent, Norris urged the secretary of the interior to support a boundary survey. The survey was necessary, according to Norris, because of potential incursions from nearby mining interests. Norris knew of the mining areas just north of the Gardner and Yellowstone rivers (today’s Jardine, Montana), and speculated that the narrow canyons of Crevice, Slough, and Soda Butte creeks might contain

valuable mineral resources. Furthermore, he had visited the active mining camps at the head of Little Rosebud Creek and the Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone River, and thus was well aware that dealing with mining interests could be challenging. He told the secretary that “the entire character of ownership and development of all these mining interests are so dissimilar to the anomalous rules and regulations necessary for the management of a wild national pleasure resort, that antagonism and annoyance so arises and increases at every phase of their contact.”⁴⁴ A boundary survey would help keep the two interests separate, he argued. An added benefit, according to Norris, was that surveying and marking a northern boundary would help keep local mountain men from disobeying the park’s rules and regulations.⁴⁵

Once the northern boundary was surveyed, Norris argued, the northern and western boundaries should be changed “to conform to those of Wyoming Territory, thus at once severing an unnecessary 3-mile strip upon the west, and also the 2½-mile strip of mining region upon the north, and leaving the park clear of an antagonistic mining population, questions of jurisdiction, and [with] its two most important boundaries run, well marked, known, and recognized by all parties, without cost to the park.”⁴⁶ He did not get the boundary adjustment he advocated, but his request for a survey was granted. The survey, completed by R. J. Reeves in 1879, had the anticipated results. “[I]t has greatly assisted in restraining lawlessness within and adjacent to the park,” Norris wrote in his report of 1879, “and in checking the influx of ranchmen upon the southeastern border of the Crow Indian Reservation and determining the true location of the mining camps across the Yellowstone, from the main portion of the park where the Crow Indians seldom go. . . .”⁴⁷

While Norris was wary of skirmishes with miners and ranchers, he was more charitable toward the Crow tribe. Norris respected the Crow Indians and believed they should be treated fairly and recompensed for their land. He argued for an “honorable treaty” through which the Crow would “obtain a recession of the old Sheepwater mining portion of the Great Bend of the Yellowstone [present Livingston, Montana] . . . by satisfactory remuneration if necessary. . . . [This to be done] in the interest of humanity towards the Crows, who . . . have as a tribe ever been our true friends.”⁴⁸

Norris’s attitude toward other native inhabitants of the Yellowstone Park region—and his prescription for the relationship between those natives and the whites

who managed and visited the park—was more complex. He was both interested in furthering the peaceful side of the relationship and also well aware of the potential for trouble. As he saw it, the park was a place where tourists should be free of worry and annoyance, not to mention “molestation” by local American Indian tribes. Thus, while he marveled at his discoveries of various Sheepeater haunts, he was also grateful for the regional military presence that kept local native inhabitants under a watchful eye.

In some ways, native tribes were the least of Norris’s worries. Faced with so little congressional support for legislation concerning park protection—Congress had appropriated funds but passed no rules and regulations—Norris immediately began to enforce the five rules established by previous secretary of the interior Columbus Delano.⁴⁹ These rules prohibited the following: (1) hunting, “except for purposes of recreation, or to supply food for visitors or actual residents”; (2) building fires “except for necessary purposes,” and/or leaving those fires before extinguishing them; (3) cutting timber without written permission from the superintendent; (4) breaking the deposits surrounding or in the vicinity of thermal features; and, (5) residing permanently within the park without permission from the Department of the Interior. Norris had these rules printed in No. 62 of the newspaper he wrote and published from his home in Michigan, the *Norris Suburban*, and he had “several hundred copies [of the same] . . . gratuitously distributed throughout the regions adjacent to the park during the spring of 1877.”⁵⁰ As an added warning against unlawful behavior, Norris had a “large number of spirited cautions against fire and poaching in the park printed upon durable cloth and affixed to trees, and otherwise at prominent points of interest therein and the adjacent places of resort.” Furthermore, because the superintendent still did not remain in the park through the winter, Norris appointed entrepreneur J. C. McCartney to act in his absence as his resident assistant, primarily in the capacity of enforcer of the park’s rules and regulations.⁵¹

Because one area of real concern to Norris was poaching, he took specific and immediate steps to preserve the park’s large animals. In his first report to the secretary of the interior, Norris estimated that during the spring of 1875, more than 2,000 elk hides, plus many bighorn sheep and antelope hides, had been taken from the park, and hundreds of bison and moose had been slaughtered. He also predicted that “within a decade the buffalo, the bison, and, in fact, most of these

larger animals will be either extinct or extremely rare elsewhere in the United States.” The time was right for action, he argued. “[I]f our people are ever to preserve living specimens of our most beautiful, interesting, and valuable animals,” he intoned, “here . . . is the place and now the time to do it.”⁵²

The difficult part of protecting wildlife was that these same wild animals were a source of food for visitors and area residents.⁵³ Thus, many animals were not only valued as part of the scenery in the park, but also as an essential source of sustenance. Norris recognized this dichotomy and responded by railing against the wanton slaughter of large animals in the park while arguing for the domestication of some for food.⁵⁴ “Why not thus utilize a waste corner of our . . . National Park by timely protection of our rarest animals, our national bird of valor, and our matchless speckled trout?” he asked in 1877.⁵⁵ In 1878, Norris again called for domesticating some of the large animals in Yellowstone. The bison “could be reasonably reared as domestic cattle, . . . and with the excellent and abundant timber material, inclosures can be cheaply made for preservation of a few specimens of the elk, antelope, and other animals of great interest to future tourists.”⁵⁶

In 1879, he repeated his call for the protection and domestication of wildlife. While he believed the numbers of game had increased a bit, Norris knew the increase was not enough to offset the continued destruction of herds. “[W]ith the rapid influx of tourists and demand for such food,” he wrote, “this [increase] cannot long continue, and hence the more evident and pressing necessity for systematic and permanent protection of all, and domestication of some of the most rare and valuable of animals in the eastern portion of the park.”⁵⁷ When his domestication plan was not approved, Norris resorted to arguing for increased protection. As part of his case for tougher federal protection and a management plan, he applauded Montana Territory for enacting legislation to protect bison in certain counties.⁵⁸

One way to make it more difficult to poach wildlife was to restrict the use of long-range rifles in the park. Norris advocated such a restriction, arguing that only government agents or employees should carry such weapons with them, especially as visitors need not worry about self-protection or securing food now that the park—no longer “a haunt of hostile savages”—contained “roads, hotel [and] other conveniences of civilization,” Norris reasoned. He believed that an appeal to the national pride for the preservation and protection of the noble animals



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #3574

Harry Yount, Yellowstone's first gamekeeper.

that roam through this great National Park” would be enough to convince local mountain men to stop hunting big game in the parks, and that visitors could be turned to fishing and bird hunting for their enjoyment.⁵⁹

Watching over the park's wildlife, Norris recognized, was too big a job for a seasonal superintendent. It was a job for a resident superintendent with a number of assistants. For one thing, an increased government presence would make poaching more difficult. Hence, Norris followed up on his plea for adequate funds to house and support a resident superintendent in 1877 with a call in 1880 for a “force of determined police” to enforce park rules and regulations and “to properly protect the park, its contents, officers, and visitors.”⁶⁰ To help with this protection effort, Norris used an increase in appropriations in 1880 to hire a gamekeeper, Harry Yount, who when not protecting game, was to make explorations into the unknown sections of the park.⁶¹ During the summer months, a log cabin was built for Yount above the mouth of Soda Butte Creek. The cabin, which had an excellent view of the creek and the “East Fork of the Yellowstone” (today the Lamar River), was strategically

placed to protect the game, particularly elk and bison, from Clarks Fork miners and other local hunters living near and in the east side of the park.

Yount, who began his duties in July 1880, found his previous visits to the park helpful as he began to explore the areas surrounding Yellowstone, Shoshone, Lewis, and Heart lakes. At the end of his first season, Yount reported that all sections of the park needed protection. He also called for “the appointment of a small, active, reliable police force, to receive regular pay during the spring and summer at least, when animals are liable to be slaughtered by the tourists and mountaineers.” Yount advised Secretary Schurz (in language similar to that used by Norris) that this force could also assist the superintendent in “enforcing the laws, rules, and regulations for protection of guide-boards and bridges, and the preservation of the countless and widely scattered geyser-cones and other matchless wonders of the Park.”⁶² Personnel were also needed to help prevent and extinguish human-caused wildfires.⁶³ When Yount resigned his position at the end of the 1881 season, he again suggested to Superintendent Norris that the latter needed a small group of men, most of whom could be discharged at season's end, to assist in the protection of the park.⁶⁴ But while Norris was waiting for both “the speedy enactment of laws” and assistance in the form of a police force, he supervised the construction of bridle paths and roads that would make the park more accessible for enforcement efforts.

Scientific Study: The Second Pillar Under Norris

Norris spent countless hours on horseback, getting to know the park and its resources. On all such trips, he was vigilant in his observations and notations of the area's cultural history, natural history, and geology. His curiosity about the park's story was part of the much broader interest in history and natural history that Norris brought to Yellowstone. His reports to the secretary of the interior can be read as natural histories of the region, drawn from the kind of notes kept by nineteenth-century natural scientists while out in the field. They were long, detailed, and filled with data on just about every field of study necessary for exploring a new region, understanding its past, and predicting its future. Norris kept meteorological records and drew sketches; he wrote descriptions and dissected fish. His annual

report for 1880, for example, comprised 65 pages of such details as the “true origin” of such prominent wonders as “spouting or intermittent geysers” and “hot-foaming or laundry springs”—which he believed had incredible cleansing properties. He also included sketches of such things as the rock formations at “Hoodooos, Or remnants of erosion in the golden Labyrinths.”⁶⁵ In 1881, he filled eighty-one pages with such insights.

Norris’s favorite fields of study were probably anthropology and archeology. He was interested in the cultures of the native peoples who lived in or near the park, and he arrived freely at various conclusions regarding their practices and habits—many of which have subsequently proven to be errant. He claimed, for example, that the Crow, Shoshone, and Bannock tribes had made little actual “use” of park land, and speculated that they refrained from venturing into the park, “deterred less by . . . natural obstacles than by a superstitious awe concerning the rumbling and hissing sulphur fumes of the spouting geysers and other hot springs, which they imagined to be the wails and groans of departed Indian warriors who were suffering punishment for their earthly sins.”⁶⁶ He found traces of the “timid and harmless Sheepstealer Indians,” which he recognized as connected somehow to the Bannock and Shoshone tribes. “[T]heir . . . traditions and the similarity of their languages and signals indicate a common origin, or, at least occasional intermingling,” he wrote under the heading “Aborigines of the Park” in his report for 1880.⁶⁷

On his first visit to the park in 1870, Norris had examined the “small rude stone-heaps, and . . . many mining shafts and drifts of some prehistoric race” near Trail Creek Pass in the Yellowstone (Paradise) Valley north of the park. Because Norris did not possess the necessary tools to complete a detailed study of such artifacts, he collected and sent all remains—arrowheads, rock specimens, obsidian tools, and other implements—from these archeological sites to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C.⁶⁸ Norris did not eschew disturbing and collecting such remains as long as they were “in public or private museums . . . greatly adding to a correct knowledge of, and desire, to visit, the matchless ‘wonder-land.’”⁶⁹

During a later venture in the Mount Washburn area in 1878, Norris found “the ruins of an ancient, once-loopholed, earth-roofed block-house some 16 by 20 feet in diameter and of unknown origin.” He immediately reported this and other evidence of pre-park human activity to the secretary of the interior. For example,

he reported finding a corral near Amethyst Mountain; the remains of ancient tree stumps used for breastworks [fortifications]; “foot-logs” across Crevice, Hellroaring, and other creeks; and Hudson Bay-type martin steel traps near “the Indian arrowhead quarry at Beaver Lake.”⁷⁰ He continued to collect specimens for the Smithsonian Institution and the Anthropological Society of Washington. On one expedition, he and his work crew unearthed “a circular deposit of several bushels of beautiful white bead-like shot or pebble specimens.” At the end of the season, Norris took the samples with him to investigate their origins. He entertained theories that the pebbles might be the petrified eggs of some ancient reptile or, “as [he] was inclined to believe, the berries of juniper or cedar, doubtless long antedating those of Solomon, from Lebanon.”⁷¹

On another expedition, this one to the eastern portion of the park, Norris found the upright poles of an American Indian lodge, and the remains of nearly 40 others. The sites, located between Miller and Hoodoo creeks, and on the side of Parker Peak, also produced remnants of blankets, bed-clothing, apparel, and china. He also found pathways lined with decaying brush or poles, used by American Indians for driving game, mostly in the northern part of the park. One such “driveway” was on a south-facing cliff overlooking Rustic Falls, and another was near Swan Lake.⁷² Aware of the importance of preserving and studying the park’s past, Norris instructed his road construction crew to carefully scrutinize “all material handled in excavations; and all arrow, spear, or lance heads, stone axes and knives, or other weapons, utensils or ornaments. . . .” Each day, all such objects were to be collected and presented to the officer in charge of each crew, so Norris could send them to the Smithsonian.⁷³ The materials Norris sent to Washington were varied and extensive.⁷⁴

By 1881, Norris had learned quite a bit about the park’s history; in fact, he felt confident enough to write a 15-page section devoted to the “History of the Park” in what was to be his final annual report. In this section, he traced the park’s history from the time of early native peoples to the trappers who entered the park just a few years before it was set aside. He also drew a rendition of a stump he found with the initials and date (J. O. R., Aug. 29, 1819) of an early white explorer to the region embedded in its wood.⁷⁵

Norris’s interests also included the life sciences. In a report on the fishes of the park, for example, after describing the ease with which “the yellowish speckled

salmon trout” could be caught—they took “the hook so near boiling pools at various localities along the shore line,” he wrote, “that they may with ease be cooked in them upon the line without the fisherman changing position”—he described a parasite that infested most of them. He also noted a change in the occurrence of the infestation. “The proportion of them thus diseased,” he wrote, “has increased from something over one half in 1870 until all are apparently infested.” He was so curious about the relationship between the infestation and an increase in the growth of a certain weed along the lake’s shore that he “sent the skin, a portion of the meat, entrails, and worms of one of these trout, . . . and some of the sprigs of this weed, . . . as well as porous yellowish stone tubes of some worm or insect . . . found in abundance along the bank of the lake, to Prof. S. F. Baird, director of the Smithsonian and National Museum, and United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries.”⁷⁶

Norris so strongly believed that science should play a role in park policy and administration that he argued for employing a resident scientist in the park. In his 1877 annual report, he made his case for such a position:

having an ambitious scientific signal-officer at the Mammoth Hot Springs or the Geyser Basin, or both, might with little additional duty or expense, greatly aid science in solving many interesting and practical questions connected with the origin, character, duration, and decadence of . . . various classes of hot springs, the degree of their connection with the earth’s internal fires, and their combined influence upon the climate of the park.⁷⁷

Norris knew early on that Yellowstone would eventually “become and remain the chosen resort” for student and scientist.⁷⁸ Indeed, that has proven to be the case.

Improvement: The Third Pillar of Park Management

While Norris had intended to spend the park’s first appropriation largely on building a headquarters at Mammoth Hot Springs, he changed his plans in favor of constructing a road from Mammoth to the lower Firehole River. This road, which would link Fort Ellis, near Bozeman, Montana, to Henry’s Lake in Idaho, would provide the U.S. Army with a direct route through the

park to head off conflict between the Bannock Indians and white settlers.⁷⁹

When he was able to start building the park’s first official structure—an administrative headquarters—Norris chose a site near Mammoth Hot Springs. In his report to Secretary Schurz, Norris described the site, with its abundant grass, wood, and water, being ideal for the park headquarters, where Norris planned to construct a “plain but comfortable residence with the necessary outbuildings.” With that in mind, Norris, using the balance of the 1878 appropriations, began to stockpile the necessary lumber and other building materials so construction could begin early in the 1879 season.⁸⁰

Upon arriving at Mammoth Hot Springs for his third summer season in June 1879, Norris, accompanied by a new assistant, C. M. Stephens, and a crew of thirty men, immediately began work on the headquarters project. He selected a large “natural mound” that provided a commanding view of the Mammoth Hot Springs area and all approaches to the park headquarters. Norris described the site as being one that “commands the entire mound, valley, and terrace, within range of rifle or field artillery.” The mound, approximately 600’ in length, 300’ in width, and 150’ high, also had a natural depression, ideal for a reservoir, and “smoothly eroded depressions” on either ends, useful for carriageways.⁸¹ The site is known today as Capitol Hill.

By July 1879, Norris’s crew had erected “a genuine Montana fence,” nearly two miles long, using pine, fir, and cedar from the nearby terrace, to enclose headquarters and a sheltered pasture.⁸² They also used timber and shingles, both of which had been hewn upon the mountain terraces and hauled to the top of the mound, to erect the 40’ × 18’, two-story blockhouse with three side-wings and an eight-foot balcony facing the terraces. Sitting atop the main building was an octagonal “turret or gun-room, 9’ in diameter and 10’ high, well loopholed for rifles, and all surmounted by a national flag 53’ from the ground, upon a fine flag staff or liberty-pole passing from a solid foundation through and sustaining all the stories, turret, and roof thereof.”⁸³ Upon completing the blockhouse, the workers began constructing the reservoir “fronting” the mound, and a stable and corral.⁸⁴

Elsewhere in the park, with the help of some irrigation, Norris experimented with the planting of turnips, potatoes, and “other hardy vegetables in a half-acre garden one quarter mile below McGuirk [*sic*] Springs.” The production of vegetables was satisfactory, but vandalism prompted Norris to plan a fence around

future gardens and to locate them nearer the blockhouse. This garden experiment was the beginning of what later became known as the “Chinaman’s Garden.” Norris also left his trainmaster (foreman) J. E. Ingersoll and a crew to build “a loopholed, earth-roofed log-house and other improvements” with a stone chimney in a grove of trees between Beehive Geyser and Castle Geyser in 1879. Norris planned to spend time there during the winter to observe the Upper Geyser Basin year-round, but bad weather with heavy snow caused him to abandon the idea.⁸⁵

Subsequent years in Norris’s tenure as superintendent saw the addition of a few more buildings to the park’s cultural landscape. At Mammoth, Norris had his crew build a blacksmith shop, barn, and bathhouse.⁸⁶ He also helped to select a good mail route from the park’s West Entrance, and to establish the site for a mail station and hotel (never built), along with an earth-roofed cabin and barn—in the Norris area, as well as a mail station and barn where the new “cut-off [road] would strike the Madison [River] at Riverside.”⁸⁷

Only one of the structures built during Norris’s time has survived to this day: a half-completed public bathhouse, known by the name of the spring by which it was built, Queen’s Laundry. Surrounded, and all but consumed by thermal features today, the Queen’s

Laundry bathhouse was, according to park historian Aubrey Haines, “the first government building constructed specifically for the use of the public in any national park.”⁸⁸

Norris had his workers begin construction of the bathhouse, intended “for the free use of the public,” in 1881, west of the forks of the Firehole River. The hot spring by which the remains of the structure stand today had attracted Norris’s attention during the previous summer, during the construction of the road from the Riverside Mail Station (near the West Entrance) to Marshall’s mail station by Nez Perce Creek, in the Lower Geyser Basin.⁸⁹ Construction of the two-room, earth-roofed bathhouse, which boasted “wooden troughs for conveying [hot]water thereto,” was not finished before Norris was replaced as superintendent, and subsequent superintendents chose not to complete the structure.⁹⁰

The Queen’s Laundry bathhouse was, however, used for a brief span of time. In a guidebook he wrote after leaving the park, Norris explained that one could travel from Marshall’s Hotel “through largely groves and glades, and amid unique geyser and other hot-spring cones to . . . a bath-house which I constructed in 1881, or hopefully a better one, [and] test for themselves the velvety feel and cleansing properties of these waters.”⁹¹ Another guidebook—W. W. Wylie’s *The Yellowstone National Park, or the Great American Wonderland*—published in 1882, recommended that guests visit the bathhouse while staying at Marshall’s hotel, which was situated two miles away.⁹²

Though never completed, the building’s remains are evidence of Norris’s farsightedness, and serve as



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #129257

Norris blockhouse.



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #36540-3

Queen's Laundry ruins, ca. 1960s.

testament to the “humble beginning to a policy of accommodating tourists in the national parks.”⁹³ Indeed, it is the oldest, and thus the “earliest recognition that providing for visitor accommodation was a legitimate use of federal funds within a National Park.”⁹⁴ It remains today as the only building left from the pre-military administrations.

In 1964, the park’s administration considered removing the remains of the bathhouse because it “impinge[d] upon a thermal feature.” Aubrey Haines, at the time a retired park engineer turned park historian, objected and, in fact, argued that the structure be restored and interpreted. “If this unusual structure cannot be interpreted within the present scope of planning,” he wrote to the park naturalist, alluding to the administration’s emphasis on protecting thermal features, “it should at least be allowed to remain to a time when it will be better appreciated.” He believed that the proposal to remove the bathhouse was “a purist approach which is both unrealistic and destructive, and I hope it will receive no further consideration.”⁹⁵ Haines won the argument—the building was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2001, and its ruins remain in place today.

Though few of Norris’s physical improvements to the park remain intact, his legacy lives on in the form of a less tangible, yet equally important kind of improvement: visitor assistance in the form of signs, trails, and informational writings. Norris firmly believed that one of his duties was to “assist tourists with information and guidance,” and he accepted that responsibility with relish.⁹⁶ Among other things, he took the first steps toward interpreting the park by building guide boards and affixing them to trees, rocks, and posts. Placed in 1879, the park’s first informational signs were “well-dressed, painted white, and then black-lettered with the names of the most important streams, passes, geysers, etc., and tables of distances between them.”⁹⁷ While the signs “proved . . . of great value to all persons visiting the Park,” many unfortunately were destroyed by “opponents of improvement,” according to Norris.⁹⁸

Even when they remained standing, however, visitors needed more than signs for a successful visit to the park. They also required access to the area’s most spectacular features. Hence, Norris suggested to the interior secretary that trails, both bridle and foot, be built throughout the park. For example, he asked the secretary to support the building of a trail through the upper Gibbon Canyon so tourists could view the numerous springs

and geysers there.⁹⁹ While visiting Mount Washburn, Norris envisioned a trail facilitating visitor appreciation: “No tourist should fail in securing this enchanting view,” he noted. He also added amenities to the foot trails built under his supervision. For example, in 1881, he had a trail bridge constructed at Crystal Falls and Grotto Pool (in the Lower Falls of the Yellowstone River area), along with ladders, pole railings, and some benches. He planned to have more substantial timber railings installed there as the supply of lumber permitted.

By the end of that year, visitors could walk six miles of trail on Terrace Mountain (near Mammoth Hot Springs), one mile of trail to the falls of the “East Gardner” River, one mile of trail at Monument Geyser (west of Gibbon Canyon), approximately 200 yards of trail to the head of the Lower Falls (then called the “Great Falls”) of the Yellowstone River, and about 200 yards of trail to the river below the “Great Falls.”¹⁰⁰ Eight bridle trails covered 234 miles of country; Norris listed them for the secretary in his report for 1879: “Middle Gardiner [*sic*], Forks of the Yellowstone, Clarks Fork Mines, Fossil Forrests [*sic*], Stinking Water, Yellowstone Lake and Falls, Mount Washburn, and Grand Canon [*sic*].”¹⁰¹

At this point in the park’s history, only local guides were available to help tourists locate the park’s spectacular features. These guides were often of questionable experience or character. Norris called them a “small but despicable class of prowlers” who preyed on tourists’ desire to see “this peerless region of wonders.”¹⁰² Because he was concerned about deceptions foisted off on visitors by some of these local guides, and because of his experience in the publishing business, Norris made plans to produce his aforementioned guidebook and a good map of the park; he also proposed granting licenses and issuing badges to qualified persons to protect visitors against such unscrupulous behavior.

Norris had at least one plan for “improvement” that never came to fruition. In his report to Secretary Schurz in 1880, Norris expressed his desire to reactivate the Liberty Cap “geyser-cone” by “cheaply convey[ing] into the ancient supply pipe of the cone . . . a sufficient quantity of water from the much more elevated Mammoth Hot Springs . . . in order to throw an ornamental column of water to any desired height.”¹⁰³ In accordance with the German chemist R. E. W. Bunsen’s theories of thermal features (the park’s Bunsen Peak bears his name), Norris believed that the “terrace-building properties of the water would soon encase this interesting cone with the inimitably beautiful[ly]-bordered pools of the

terrace formation, and also ultimately surround it with an effective and permanent support.”¹⁰⁴ A few years prior to this report, Norris had inserted a piece of lumber to support the cone, which he was sure would fall over without assistance from park management. There is no evidence that this reactivation plan, however, was ever implemented.

All in all, Norris managed to “improve” the park quite a bit, considering the time, energy, and funds he also devoted to protection and exploration. While Norris was pleased with his accomplishments, especially the new blockhouse—he was troubled by the possibility that he had chosen the wrong site for park headquarters.¹⁰⁵ By 1880, because the Utah Northern Railroad was making greater progress toward reaching the park from the west than the Northern Pacific was making from the north, Norris questioned whether the headquarters should be nearer the West Entrance instead of at Mammoth Hot Springs, because it appeared that the West Entrance would receive more use than the North Entrance. He went so far as to suggest that his assistant could occupy the original headquarters at Mammoth while an alternative headquarters was established.¹⁰⁶ With this idea in mind, Norris suggested to the secretary that land be reserved in the Firehole area, but as Norris’s tenure as superintendent was cut short, this plan never materialized.

Conclusion

Toward the end of the 1881 season, Norris made plans for the following year. He thanked his “own personal assistants” and the secretary of the interior for the “uniform kindness and assistance” he had received from the department. He concluded his report—what he called his “fair and full statement of facts . . . made to show to Congress and the people of the United States, that the slender appropriations which have been made for the protection and improvement of the distant nearly

unknown Wonder Land have not been misappropriated or misspent”—with respect and hope for the park’s future.¹⁰⁷ But that future did not involve Norris. Whether it was because of pressure from officials of the Northern Pacific Railroad, who suspected Norris of showing favoritism toward the Utah Northern Railroad, or because of political favoritism in Congress, or because of poor road conditions in the park, Norris was dismissed from his position as Yellowstone’s second superintendent before the park opened in 1882.

He left a lasting legacy, however. He laid out a primitive road system, initiated the early stages of a wildlife management program, conducted and supported scientific observations, and built the first administrative facilities in the park. His hiring of Harry Yount as the park’s first gamekeeper sparked the genesis of a ranger corps (Yount’s idea). He also took the first steps toward education and interpretation for visitors. He got the park’s record-keeping program underway and instigated some of the earliest scientific experiments in the park. While some of these programs were demanded by politicians and government scientists, Norris’s interest in the protection and betterment of the park complemented such external demands. His achievements have been best described by Haines, who wrote:

The second superintendent of Yellowstone National Park was a fortunate blend of the pioneer and the scientist—just the right man to open a wilderness. He was practical enough to see the immediate need for trails, roads, and buildings, and scholarly enough to record the area’s human and natural history; in everything he was enthusiastic and sincere, and his achievements were monumental.¹⁰⁸

By any standard, Norris rose to the challenges presented to him and broke administrative ground, facilitating park developments and protection under future administrations.

Management by Fits and Starts, and the Pressure for Preservation

The Administrations of Patrick Conger,
Robert Carpenter, and David Wear

According to the authors' extensive research, Superintendent Philetus Norris's departure from Yellowstone could not have come at a less opportune time. Both railroad and mining interests were pushing for the right to enter the park area, and an equally pressing concern was the rush by an organization called the Yellowstone Park Improvement Company, a subsidiary of the Northern Pacific Railroad (whose tracks were drawing ever closer to the park) to take control of major concessions in the park, primarily in the form of hotel construction and operation.¹

With growth in tourist numbers outpacing available facilities, and with lawlessness in and around the park on the increase, more federal resources were badly needed. What early civilian administrators received instead was a continued lack of support from the federal government. As historian Richard A. Bartlett has noted, "So restricted were superintendents by the limited powers granted them, so poorly were they supported by Washington, and so overwhelming were their problems that only men of unusual managerial abilities would have coped successfully with the situation."² Clearly, these challenges required a strong administrative response. Unfortunately, the first two civilian superintendents to follow Norris—Patrick Henry Conger and Robert E. Carpenter—were not well-suited for the job, and the third, David W. Wear, who showed signs of being a better manager, was given little time and opportunity to prove himself.³ The four years when these men held the office represented a period of instability in early park management. Nevertheless, efforts to protect and preserve Yellowstone's resources did gain some momen-

tum; Hiram M. Chittenden, who served in the park for a number of years as captain of the Corps of Engineers and later wrote a history of the park, correctly perceived that the sad state of affairs of this period "aroused public sentiment and paved the way to reform."⁴

A Failure to Protect

Born in Vermont in 1819, Patrick Henry Conger moved westward at the age of twenty-two to settle in Iowa, where he first farmed and then served in the U.S. military in several minor positions during the Civil War. After the war, he held several patronage positions, one of which was agent for the Yankton (Sioux) Indian Reservation. Patronage also influenced his acquiring the superintendency of Yellowstone in April 1882.⁵ His brother, Edwin Hurd Conger, was a leading Republican congressman from Iowa, and the man who recommended Conger's appointment to President Chester Arthur, William B. Allison, was a Republican senator from the same state.⁶ As it turned out, Conger accomplished little while at the helm of the nation's first park. Chittenden noted that superintendents Norris and Conger "were as unlike in personal characteristics and views of official duty as it is possible to conceive." He called Conger's administration "weak and inefficient," and stated that it "brought the park to the lowest ebb of its fortunes."⁷

In his first report to new secretary of the interior Henry M. Teller, Conger commented on the extensive vandalism of the park's wonders. "The cones of the great geysers," he wrote in the autumn after his appointment,



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #1526

President Arthur (far left) and party, July 1883.

“are already badly defaced, and vast tracts of the beautiful forests that adorn this Wonder-Land are laid waste by fire annually through the wanton carelessness and neglect of visitors.” He also decried the poaching of wildlife. “Another source of great annoyance is the hunters in the Park,” he wrote, adding “I am sure you will agree with me that it is not possible for a single game-keeper to guard so vast a territory as the National Park and prevent the breach of the laws in regard to the killing of game. When we consider the temptation, and the opportunity which these vast solitudes afford, we need not wonder that the laws are broken, and the orders disobeyed.” While he hinted that assistance was needed, he did not propose any solutions to the problem. Rather, he left it to “the superior wisdom of the Secretary of the Interior to suggest some remedy for these evils.”⁸ In fact, recommendations for remedies would soon come from several prominent people in General Philip H. Sheridan’s tour party of 1882.

After visiting the park that year, Sheridan, former Civil War general and strategist in the ongoing wars against the Plains Indians, filed a report on the condition of the park, calling for enlarging the park’s boundaries to provide a “secure retreat” for game. He also called for one or two companies of cavalry or mounted police to protect the park and its wildlife and to enforce its rules and regulations. His fellow officer, General D. B. Sackett, called for five or six men to patrol the geyser basins so as to protect the cone and geyser formations. Sackett felt, for example, that one troop of cavalry could spend two-and-one-half months during the summer just protecting the formations and extinguishing forest fires.⁹

Sheridan’s report caught the attention of George

Graham Vest, a U.S. senator from Missouri, who took up the cause of preserving the park and solving its problems. Over the course of his career, Vest had introduced countless pieces of legislation in Congress, with an eye toward “protect[ing] property and enforc[ing] the laws” in the park and “combat[ing] all proposed encroachments.” According to historian Louis Cramton, he deserved recognition “as the outstanding champion of proper protection and development of the park.”¹⁰

In early 1883, Vest used Sheridan’s report to draft a bill whereby the park’s “rules and regulations were given the force of law, and the Park was placed under the laws of Montana and the jurisdiction of Gallatin County, with penalties prescribed for violations.”¹¹ Yet according to historian Aubrey Haines, the bill made no headway, despite a bevy of supporters that included the governor of Montana Territory, many scientific societies, and the press.¹² Senator Vest next offered an amendment to the Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill for 1883 that provided money for employing the superintendent and ten assistants (\$2,000 for superintendent and \$900 for each of 10 assistants), and for deploying an engineer to supervise the construction and improvement of the roads and bridges. It also included a clause that authorized and directed the secretary of war “to make the necessary details of troops to prevent trespassers or intruders from entering the Park for the purpose of destroying the game or objects of curiosity therein, or for any other purpose prohibited by law, and to remove such persons from the Park if found therein,” if so requested by the secretary of the interior.¹³ In addition to serving as an escape clause, these words lent authority to earlier voices—notably Captain Ludlow’s in 1875, and General Sheridan’s in 1882—calling for military help with policing the park.

Creating the assistant superintendent positions was an act intended “to correct the most troublesome deficiencies of the original Park act,” but it didn’t quite work out that way.¹⁴ The assistants’ duties—ranging from dealing with tourists who forgot to put out their fires to catching poachers in the act—were almost impossible to accomplish. Several assistants, James H. Dean and D. E. Sawyer, for example, tried hard to execute these duties, but on the whole, most were failures. As one newspaper put it in 1884, “There were some good men among them but as a whole they have proven very unsatisfactory.”¹⁵

According to Haines, Conger shared responsibility for the failure of his assistants. First, “[i]t seems likely that . . . Conger thought of [them] as interpreters” or guides, and not as a police force.¹⁶ However, the misun-

derstanding may not entirely have been Conger's fault. Although the Sundry Civil Appropriations Act for 1883 stated that the assistants' duty "shall be to protect the game, timber, and objects of interest" in the park, it is not clear that Conger ever received a copy of that act, and the letter he received on July 14, 1883, informing him of the money he and his assistants would receive, did not spell out job descriptions.¹⁷

Second, it appears that Conger was unable to manage his assistants: his record of paying on time was abysmal and, in some of his dealings with them, he was "petty," and even lied.¹⁸ There is evidence that Conger withheld part of Samuel S. Erret's salary because of a disagreement between the two men.¹⁹ Erret was a "dismal failure" as an assistant, but withholding pay, according to Secretary Teller, was outside the "authority of law for such action on the part of [Conger]."²⁰ Conger also neglected to pay a loyal and respectful assistant, William Chambers, who wrote to Conger on several occasions asking for the money owed him. "[I have] written two letters for you to send my money," Chambers wrote in March 1884, "and have received no answer from you. . . ."²¹

Conger had an especially poor relationship with one assistant, George L. Henderson, who, while partially responsible for the disagreements between himself and Conger, played an important role in the park's development. According to Bartlett, Henderson was the park's second interpreter—after Philetus Norris. Park historian Lee Whittlesey, however, has argued that Henderson was Yellowstone's first real interpreter.²² Henderson "explained, described, visualized, and gave names to things," and "made Mammoth Hot Springs a lot more interesting," wrote Bartlett. For example, Henderson "installed progressive trails leading from one wonder to another, with explanatory signs along the way."²³ He was also ahead of his time in understanding "people control," according to Bartlett. Henderson "advocated the widest use of printed circulars and guideposts," met incoming parties and informed them of the park's rules and regulations, and "reported on park conditions, especially on the roads."²⁴

Though Conger was not an effective manager (in fact, he was a difficult personality), he was not responsible for all the problems associated with his assistants. Several factors interfered with the success of his assistant superintendents that were clearly not his fault. First, because his assistants were political appointees (like Conger), they were not necessarily well-suited to the rigors of the job. There were no experienced mountain

men among them.²⁵ According to Bartlett, "two or three understood the task and by trial and error fashioned a routine of policing the park," but most lacked the necessary skills and were, in the words of Hiram Chittenden, "not only inefficient, but positively corrupt."²⁶

Second, while Congress appropriated money for their salaries, there was none available for their housing or equipment. This caused difficulties for Conger, who felt protection could best be provided if men were "stationed by twos at five of the most important points in the Park." He also thought the men should be "suitably uniformed and equipped," "well-mounted," and provided with comfortable cabins, as the law required permanent residency.²⁷ Money for cabins did finally arrive at the end of the summer from Secretary Teller, but the assistants had to use their own resources until then.²⁸

Third, extreme lawlessness prevailed in and around the park, and the rules and regulations, even when enforced, were weak, because Congress had failed to provide penalties for transgressions and there was no jurisdiction within which to try offenders. Thus, the options were limited. Assistant superintendents could "expel 'trespassers' from the area," but they knew well that the miscreants would soon return.²⁹ The assistants could also confiscate goods, but as James H. Dean noted in one letter to Conger, that punishment was relatively ineffective. "In the performance of my duties," he wrote, "I find it difficult to enforce the law, there being no penalty but confiscating the outfit of the offenders. I have warned the offenders time and time again, that the Law would be strictly enforced. They laughed at the idea of confiscating their outfits which consisted of their wearing apparel."³⁰ In another complaint, a different assistant declared, "I know nothing can be done now [about a poacher] but if we should be empowered to enforce the laws soon, I should dearly love to snatch the son of a *Bitch* Baldheaded."³¹ Things were so bad that at one point, James Dean ended a missive to Conger, "Let the military have charge of the Park."³² In his annual report for 1882, Conger decried the lack of "legal machinery [and] physical force to compel the obedience to the rules and regulations issued . . . for the government of the Park."³³ He and his assistants knew what was required. "If the penalty was a fine or imprisonment," one wrote to Conger, "there would in my opinion, be no trouble to put a stop to violations of the law."³⁴ Although this situation would improve, the change did not come soon enough to help Conger's attempts to curtail lawlessness.

While such tools for law enforcement were not



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #147652

Hunters, ca. 1882.

forthcoming, the Department of the Interior did ask Conger for input regarding changes in the rules and regulations, themselves. The secretary made this request in August 1883, and after receiving no reply, again in March 1884. While there is no record of the response Conger claimed to have given, he apparently felt that changes to the rules and regulations were secondary to the need for “the legal machinery” to enforce any rules or regulations.³⁵

One legal move forward that did occur during this period was a change, in January 1883, in the rules and regulations regarding hunting and fishing. In a letter to Conger, Secretary Teller gave notice that the regulations “in regard to killing game in the Yellowstone National Park are amended so as to prohibit absolutely the killing, wounding or capturing at any time, of any buffalo, bison, moose, elk, black-tailed or white-tailed deer, mountain sheep, Rocky Mountain goat, antelope, beaver, otter, martin, fisher, grouse, prairie chicken, pheasant, fool-hen, partridge, quail, wild goose, duck, robin, meadow-lark, thrush, goldfinch, flicker or yellow hammer, blackbird, oriole, jay, snowbird, or any of the small birds commonly known as singing birds.” Fishing regulations were also amended, “so as to prohibit the

taking of fish by means of seines, nets, traps, or by the use of drugs, or any explosive substances or compounds, or in any other way than by hook and line.”³⁶ These provisions ended the previous state of affairs, whereby hunting, according to Chittenden, was allowed “to supply the wants of camping parties,” and was “practically operated as an unrestricted license.”³⁷ Thus, Conger and his assistants could confiscate the catch or quarry of anyone using unfair hunting or fishing practices—but again, because there were no laws supporting the park’s rules and regulations, there was not much officials could do beyond confiscation, and the offenders were free to poach time and again.

Conger entered the park earlier than usual in 1883—on the first of March, because of reports that had reached the secretary regarding the slaughter of game. In his annual report for that year, however, Conger stated that those reports had been “greatly exaggerated.” “[A] few elk and deer had been killed by parties contracting to furnish meat for the hotel company,” but the hunting had stopped immediately when he informed them of the new regulations.³⁸ “Hunting here has been practically suspended ever since, except what may be done by stealth,” he wrote, turning a blind eye to his assistants’ reports. Conger surely knew of the poaching his assistants observed. William Chambers, for example, wrote to Conger in November 1883, “I hear from men coming in that Reeder [a notorious poacher] is . . . slaying the game up on *Slew* [*sic*] creek.”³⁹ Edmund I. Fish wrote a note to Conger reporting that another notorious poacher, who had “slaughtered the elk on Specimen Ridge last Jan[uary],” was “at or near the bridge now on a fishing trip.”⁴⁰

Conger’s poor record of protection was especially evident when it came to protecting the park from shady improvement schemes. At the time of his removal, Norris had been protesting plans by the Yellowstone Park Improvement Company (YPIC) to develop sites in the park in ways that clearly disadvantaged the public. “The arrangement called for the company to pay a rental not to exceed \$2 per acre for the land occupied in the Park, which was to include tracts of 640 acres (one square mile) at each of the seven most desirable sites in the park,” wrote Haines of the deal.⁴¹ Referring to the development scheme, General Sheridan wrote, “I regretted exceedingly to learn that the national park had been rented out to private parties,” in his report of 1882.⁴² Thanks to General Sheridan—and congressional representatives like George Vest and Anson McCook from New York, who

worked closely with Vest, Congress put a damper on the bigger plans of the YPIC. The 1883 sundry appropriations act stipulated that the secretary of the interior was only “to lease small portions of the ground in the park not exceeding 10 acres in extent for each tract, no such leased land to be within one-quarter of a mile of any of the geysers or of the Yellowstone Falls.”⁴³

Conger, at least initially, offered little resistance to the plans of the YPIC. He told Secretary Teller, in glowing terms, that the company’s “Mammoth and magnificent Hotel” (the National Hotel) was “substantially constructed and of modern architectural design and an ornament to the Park.” He also lamented that the “work would soon be suspended entirely and the whole enterprise abandoned” because of “unfriendly legislation,” that is, the language of the sundry act that limited and regulated lease agreements. He did not favor granting “extensive, exclusive privileges to any company in the Park,” he wrote. “Yet I deem it necessary wholly in the interest of the Public that the most liberal concessions at all compatible with the Government contr[ol] [sic] of the Park be granted this Company rather than have them at this stage abandon the enterprise.”⁴⁴ In his report to the secretary, written six months later, Conger still waxed eloquent about the improvement company. He called the hotel they were constructing “very commodious and designed to be first class in every particular,” and considered the company generous for having sold the park lumber for his own projects in the Mammoth area. He also took the side of the YPIC against people who complained that the company held “the exclusive right and privilege to do all business of whatever kind or character (aside from that which is done by the Government) within the limits of the Park.”⁴⁵ According to Haines, Conger seemed to be in collusion with those trying to monopolize private improvement in the park. At other times, however, especially later on in his two-and-a-half-year term, Conger acted in ways that interfered with creating that monopoly. In particular, he took issue with “over cutting of timber for the company sawmill and the killing of elk in the Park to feed the construction crews.”⁴⁶

Because of complaints from all sides, Secretary Teller decided to hire Special Agent W. Scott Smith to report on conditions in the park. Smith issued a straightforward recommendation: replace Conger.⁴⁷ It is also likely that the secretary, who had worked closely with the YPIC to develop the park’s tourist sites and who, according to Bartlett, had helped lead “the Northern

Pacific and hotel monopolists to believe that they had carte blanche to do whatever they wished to get their monopoly in Yellowstone functioning profitably,” did not like the squabbling between the company and his superintendent. According to Bartlett, Conger’s failure to fully grasp the “ambivalent attitude of his superiors” to hotel monopolists in the park cost him his job.⁴⁸

Conger was also ineffectual when it came to squatters, like John Yancey in Pleasant Valley, Jim Cutler and George J. Jackson in the Lamar Valley, and J. B. Tate and Winfield Scott close to Soda Butte, who, according to Haines, had settled in the park in the hopes of occupying a piece of land if Congress re-aligned the park boundary in a manner similar to that which Norris had suggested, thus opening those lands for settlement.⁴⁹ Yancey, Jackson, and Billy Jump all operated stage stops on or near the road from Mammoth Hot Springs to Cooke City, Montana. Conger supported the men’s presence in the area because he felt that the stopping places they provided for tourists were necessary for that part of the “uninhabited wilderness.” All three men had built cabins in the park (either in 1882 or 1883), had helped suppress forest fires, had given copies of park rules and regulations to visitors, and had even provided accommodations to the public. Although Conger had no public complaints about the men, he suspected they might secretly be killing game.⁵⁰ When, in August 1884, Secretary Teller asked Conger to remove the squatters from the park under Wyoming law, he failed to do so. Conger’s days as superintendent of Yellowstone National Park were numbered.⁵¹

Conger’s Accomplishments

Patrick Conger’s two-year term, marred by insubordination and inconsistencies, was not without accomplishments. During the first summer of his tenure, he improved the condition of the park’s roads. Upon arriving in the park in late May 1882, he immediately hired one crew to improve the headquarters building and a second, headed by his son, C. M. Conger, to work on the road between Riverside (on the Madison River near the west boundary) and the Firehole Basin. A third crew, headed by Captain E. S. Topping, worked on roads around headquarters and on the road from Mammoth south to the Firehole area.⁵² Road maintenance was essential to the accessibility of the park, and it was something Norris had neglected.⁵³

The crew working on the Norris blockhouse had their work cut out for them. Upon his arrival, Conger had found the headquarters “in a sadly dilapidated condition, and hardly habitable.” His crew set about whitewashing the inside, Conger reported, “thereby destroying the vermin that infested the premises in such vast numbers that no person with a cuticle less sensitive than that of a rhinoceros could live in them through the summer months.”⁵⁴

Conger also settled on an alternative—or “summer”—site for administrative headquarters. Because Conger arrived in the park via the West Entrance and stayed two nights at Marshall’s Hotel, west of the Firehole River, he understood the popularity of the geyser basins for park visitors. Visitor needs in the geyser basins, and his road crews’ needs for a base for supplies and storage prompted Conger to plan an additional headquarters site in the area. During the summer of 1882, his crews began work on the park’s “summer headquarters” in the Firehole Basin, a centrally located site that was a day’s distance from other areas in the park. They built a two-room, one-story, 34’ × 22’ storehouse of hewn logs. The storeroom, separated from the front room by a solid log partition, was floored with 5” thick hewn logs, closely fitted for protection against vermin and squirrels, and had a strong door and one window. The front room did not have a wooden floor during the first summer, but Conger installed an old cooking stove to provide warmth for road crews and visitors passing through. This room, which had two windows and an exterior door, was also used by visitors to store their luggage as they enjoyed the park’s interior wonders.⁵⁵ As part of the same development, the crew built a 20’ × 20’ blacksmith shop of similar construction to the storehouse, and a 10’ × 15’ coalhouse. Both the blacksmith shop and the coalhouse were chinked on the interior and daubed on the exterior; the roofs were earth-covered.⁵⁶ Before Conger left the Firehole Basin in mid-September, his crew added three hewn timber footbridges over the Firehole River. One of the bridges, 50’ in length, was constructed near the storehouse over the “Little Fire Hole” River (today’s Nez Perce Creek). The other two, 130’ in length, were built over the “Great Fire Hole” River. All three bridges were built with handrails along one side.⁵⁷

When Conger arrived for the 1883 season, he found the March weather mild enough to begin construction of additional support buildings at the Mammoth headquarters. Aided by the hotel’s offer of cut lumber from their sawmills, Conger was able to build

a 20’ × 16’ blacksmith shop, with a 10’ × 16’ addition used as a cowhouse; a 16’ × 37’ storehouse; and a 16’ × 20’ carpenter shop. With rejected lumber and slabs, Conger had a wagon shed, harness house, and large corral built. All of the buildings were covered with board and batten, but he hoped to make them rainproof by applying shingles at a later date.⁵⁸

By that summer, Conger had decided that the log headquarters buildings of which Norris had been so proud were totally inadequate as well as poorly located. Thus, he advised Secretary Teller that he would soon provide him with an estimate of how much it would cost to remedy the situation, to be presented to Congress as an appropriation request. Conger complained that the blockhouse was exposed to high winds and situated a long distance from a water source and wood. Because he believed the park was free from potential attacks by American Indians—Norris’s primary reason for locating the buildings where he did—Conger hoped to replace Norris’s headquarters with a grander administrative building. “Heretofore these rude cabins were all that were required,” he mused in his report to the secretary, “but all is now changed here. We have railroads, the telegraph, and great hotels, with all the crowd [*sic*], business, and fashion that these wonderful civilizing agencies imply.”⁵⁹

Unfortunately for Conger, finding money for construction remained a problem during his tenure as superintendent. In his first annual report (completed in December 1882, after his first summer of duty), he had reminded members of Congress that the park needed adequate funds if it was to be enjoyed by present and future generations. He asked them to consider how far \$15,000 would go toward road construction and maintenance in their own states, notwithstanding the park’s remote location, which greatly inflated the cost of building materials and other supplies brought from elsewhere.⁶⁰

With passage of the sundry appropriations act of March 1883, Congress authorized more money for “the protection, preservation and improvement” of the park, in the amount of \$40,000. Of that sum, \$11,000 was earmarked for the salaries of Conger and his assistant superintendents. Responsibility for the remaining \$29,000 rested in the hands of an engineer officer, assigned by the secretary of war. This position was filled, initially, by First Lieutenant Dan C. Kingman of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Secretary Teller advised Conger of the arrangement in July 1883: “I deem it advisable that your

duties be confined to a general supervision of the park and control of the Assistant Superintendents, leaving to the engineer all matters relating to the improvements contemplated.”⁶¹ Conger disliked the plan, and did not hesitate to share his frustration with his superior. In his annual report, written two months later, Conger decried the situation, calling it “unwise.”

[O]ne responsible head [is necessary] for the transaction of business here as elsewhere. By the operation of this law the Superintendent of the Park is left without a dollar for any incidental expenses whatever for the care of these headquarters, no provision for the Government horses and mules, repairs of the buildings and fences, and many other things which I need not enumerate. . . . I cannot believe it was the intention of the makers of this law that the Superintendent should be left without the means to protect and preserve the property of the Government intrusted to his care and keeping.⁶²

Conger later worked out an arrangement with Kingman that provided him \$5,000 “for contingent expenses for the protection and management of the Park.” Teller agreed to the adjustment.⁶³

Another of Conger’s continued concerns was the housing of his assistant superintendents. He had first suggested that housing be constructed in September 1882, in his initial annual report. However, it took months to get permission from Washington to begin construction. In late fall 1883, Conger converted the stage station occupied by Billy Jump near Soda Butte into a government station for use by his assistants. Other assistants were housed in the new blacksmith shop, in Conger’s residence at Mammoth Hot Springs, and at a “shanty” (the cabin Norris built in 1879) in the Upper Geyser Basin.⁶⁴ At roughly the same time, a full year after he had made the initial request, Secretary Teller finally authorized Conger to plan the construction of “a sufficient number of cabins, at such points as might be required for the use of the assistants.”⁶⁵ Conger planned to build “five comfortable cabins” throughout the park.⁶⁶ Not until the following spring, however, were the plans approved and could construction begin.⁶⁷ According to a Montana newspaper, four of the cabins, or “stations,” were being built in July 1884: at the “[Mammoth Hot] Spring[s], Norris, . . . Firehole basin, the Great Falls and the Lake.”⁶⁸ Except for the cabins at Norris and Lake,

however, it is not clear how many of the five were actually constructed, because in October 1884, Secretary Teller had to re-authorize Conger’s replacement to build cabins for his assistants.⁶⁹

From the beginning of the 1883 building season, controversy marked the construction process. In August, in accordance with the sundry appropriations act passed that March, First Lieutenant Kingman arrived with his assistants to supervise construction of the park’s roads and bridges. Shortly afterward, conflict erupted between the Department of the Interior and the Department of War over authority in the park. Prior to his departure from the park that fall, Lieutenant Kingman had left orders that the superintendent could not use any lumber from the Corps of Engineers’ recently installed sawmill. Conger, who was eager to provide housing for his assistants and begin improvements to the Mammoth headquarters buildings, and who liked Kingman personally, was aware that the army controlled appropriations for the mill’s operation, but still felt there must be “some mistake.”⁷⁰ A few months later, Kingman wrote Conger announcing he would issue a special order allowing the superintendent to use the sawmill during off-season months—for a small usage fee.⁷¹ In December 1883, Conger asked the secretary of the interior to “instruct me just what my authority is in regard to the public property here including the buildings.”⁷² In April 1884, Teller responded to Conger’s plea for clarification. “[Kingman] only asks that you shall, before obtaining any considerable quantity, have his order for its delivery,” Teller equivocated. “Under the circumstances the Department does not regard his requirement as unreasonable or as evincing any inclination to infringe the scope of your rightful authority over the park,” he wrote.⁷³

While none of the buildings constructed during Conger’s tenure as superintendent are extant, the locations he identified as important were considered equally so by subsequent administrations. The Department of the Interior gave superintendents of the time almost complete responsibility for choosing the locations of administrative buildings, and for approving or even selecting sites for leased structures as well.⁷⁴ Because there were no required or recommended building standards or architectural styles, superintendents chose the size and style of the administrative structures themselves. For example, when Conger discussed his building plans for the structures erected in 1882, he wrote, “After having resolved to build, and decided upon the size and style of the buildings, I drafted the plans and set part of the

men to getting out the timber for the proposed buildings.”⁷⁵

During the early part of 1884, Conger, like Norris, became entangled in a political web—one that proved similarly fatal to his own superintendency. After refusing to follow the order from Secretary Teller to remove the “squatters” from the park, and accused of neglect in protecting the park, Conger was asked by Teller for his resignation in July. Much of the criticism against Conger was based on his failure to prevent illegal practices. According to one newspaper, W. Scott Smith’s report to the secretary complained that hunting had been going on “openly” in the park, and that “[n]o notices against hunting were posted.” Smith also asserted that “[n]o officials were at the principal objects of interest to protect them from specimen seekers.”⁷⁶

In fact, Conger had asked the Interior Department for copies of the rules and regulations for distribution in the summer of 1883, but had been told he should make suggestions for amendments before the department would go ahead with a reprinting order.⁷⁷ Conger defended himself in an article published in a local newspaper. “[Conger’s] force of assistants . . . was small,” according to the article, “and had to travel afoot. He was constantly interfered with by the hotel people, the extent of whose powers he did not know as he had not been provided with any copy of the lease privileges. Moreover he [was] misrepresented by Secretary Teller inasmuch as only that part of his correspondence [was] published which was of a condemnatory character, the explanations being entirely suppressed.”⁷⁸ These efforts were fruitless, however, and Conger’s replacement, Robert E. Carpenter, arrived in the park in September 1884.

The Mandate for Protection

Born in 1834, in Harford, Pennsylvania, Robert Carpenter graduated from Pennsylvania’s Wyoming Seminary and tried business, gold seeking, and teaching before serving briefly as part of an Iowa regiment in the Civil War. His brother, Cyrus C. Carpenter, Governor of Iowa, secured his position as Yellowstone’s fourth superintendent.⁷⁹

Shortly after Carpenter arrived in the park, Acting Secretary of the Interior Merritt L. Joslyn instructed him to keep the Department apprised of his “operations and of affairs generally in the Park.” Joslyn invited Carpenter to make suggestions about how the park might be bet-

ter managed “with a view to the full accomplishment of the purpose for which it was set apart.” The extent of Joslyn’s disrespect for Patrick Conger was evident when he asked Carpenter to enforce “a more strict obedience than has heretofore been required by the Superintendent (your predecessor) to the regulations which have been established and the instructions given by the Department from time to time.”⁸⁰ In particular, Joslyn was referring to the fact that Conger did not remove the squatters as he had been ordered to do.

If Joslyn, at least, sought a greater degree of protection for the park, ironically, by all accounts, he got less. Chittenden’s view of Robert Carpenter’s term as superintendent was grim. “[Carpenter] went upon the theory,” Chittenden wrote, “that the Park was created as an instrument of profit to those who were shrewd enough to grasp the opportunity.”⁸¹ Indeed, Superintendent Carpenter’s ten-month tenure was plagued by a scandal resulting from his association with the Yellowstone Park Improvement Company. In their respective histories of the park, Bartlett and Haines chronicled the questionable alliances Carpenter made with the YPIC’s Carroll T. Hobart, which tarnished any role Carpenter might have played in promoting fair and unbiased park management.⁸²

Scandals aside, Carpenter’s days were numbered when the Democrats won the U.S. presidency in November 1884. Thus Carpenter—who arrived in the park in September 1884, spent the winter in Washington and was dismissed on May 29, 1885—contributed minimally to the park’s protection and improvement. He did, however, remove the squatters’ cabins in the Lamar Valley—those to which Joslyn had referred in his letter—and some poachers’ cabins in isolated areas of the park.⁸³ The job was not an easy one—Joslyn had even offered to “invoke the assistance of the army as authorized by law” if Carpenter had wanted it. But Carpenter managed to oust the trespassers without the help of the secretary or any troops.⁸⁴

Yellowstone’s fifth superintendent was David W. Wear. Born in Missouri in 1843, Wear became a lawyer before turning twenty-one. When the Civil War broke out, he enlisted on the Union side, and rose quickly to the rank of colonel. After the war, he practiced law and was elected to the Missouri legislature, where he served two terms as state senator.⁸⁵

From the outset, Wear knew that protecting the park from vandalism, poaching, and disreputable development would be his major task. He was chosen by

Senator George Vest, who had written to Lucius Q. C. Lamar, secretary of the interior under President Cleveland, pleading with him to replace Carpenter: "I have received information recently which satisfies me that unless some change is made in its management, this park will become absolutely worthless for the purposes intended by Congress. . . . I beg that . . . some one may be put in the place of Carpenter. His retention in office is equivalent to the destruction of the park."⁸⁶

Wear also had the support of another long-time park protector, geologist Arnold Hague. Probably the single most important visitor to the park during Conger's tenure as superintendent, Hague had led the Yellowstone National Park Survey for the U.S. Geological Survey and then, in his capacity as U.S. Geologist, outfitted Senator Vest with information for an articulate report to park supporters in December 1883. The report outlined for all Americans the significance of the park's resources and the potential threats to "maintaining the forests, the protection of the game, and the preservation of the natural curiosities of a scientific interest."⁸⁷

Some of the most intense pressure for park protection had come from U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) scientists, particularly Hague. The USGS had been in the park since 1883, completing work on geologic and topographic surveys. While Superintendent Carpenter was still in charge of the park, USGS Director John Wesley Powell had sent a letter to the interior secretary elucidating the importance of the park to science:

[The park] is . . . of great interest from the standpoint of meteorology. . . . It is also of great interest as a natural-history region, . . . it is the habitat of many Arctic species of plants and animals; and having been reserved as a park, it is desirable that it should remain as a secure retreat for many animals that now roam through the Rocky-Mountain region, but which must eventually become extinct during the progress of settlement and civilization unless a continuous existence for them is secured under the protection afforded by the Park. Again, in the progress of exploration in the Park it has been discovered to be a region of much archeological interest, as it was formerly inhabited by tribes of Indians having many interesting arts adapted to the peculiar conditions of life therein presented. . . . I beg to suggest that the Park hereafter be utilized as a scientific station in the following manner: 1. That

a superintendent be selected, who shall not only be a man of good business qualifications but also a person interested in scientific research and competent to direct natural history surveys. 2. That the superintendent be authorized to select for his assistants persons competent to make collections and studies in natural history, observations in meteorology, and observations on the physical phenomena presented in the geysers."⁸⁸

Powell called for a year-round force of assistants who, with their superintendent, "could at the same time accomplish much work for science without in any way diminishing their efficiency as guards."⁸⁹

By 1885, protecting the park had clearly become a national concern, as many popular magazine articles drove home the severity of the park's situation.⁹⁰ Wear understood his responsibility. As he described it, his job was to "protect the game and the objects of interest in the Park, which had apparently been little thought of except for the purpose of spoliation or total destruction."⁹¹ An article in the *Livingston* (Montana) *Enterprise* quoted President Cleveland as warning Wear, "If you don't take care of the park, I shall have to turn you out."⁹²

Unbeknownst to him, Wear had received some temporary—and eventually controversial—help on the protection front. In 1884, the state of lawlessness in the park had caused Wyoming's territorial governor, William Hale, no small measure of concern. To prevent destruction in the park, he asked the legislative assembly to extend Wyoming law into the area. They did as much on March 6, with legislation "to render operative and effectual the laws of the Territory of Wyoming within that portion of the Yellowstone National Park lying within said Territory, and to protect and preserve the timber, game, fish, and natural objects and curiosities of the park, and to assist in preserving the rights of the United States therein."⁹³ However questionable it was to place a national park under a state's system of law, this legislation did add a degree of enforceability to the park's rules and regulations. Assistant Superintendent Josiah W. Weimer, for example, wrote to Conger, who was still superintendent at the time, that he thought the Wyoming legislation would help curb vandalism. "You can tell governor Hale, if he is still there that his law adds another object of interest to tourists," he wrote, "in the shape of a club in my hands. The scheme works well even as a bluff and when properly applied will work much good."⁹⁴ Unfortunately, according to Haines, the

men assigned by the governor to uphold the law in the park were “almost unlettered products of the frontier, capable of meting out only the rudest justice, and certainly strangers to the finer points of the law.” This fact, coupled with the provision in the law that half of the assessed fines would go to the attending officer, witness, or informer, made it little more than a matter of time before the legislation failed.⁹⁵

To better protect the park, Wear attempted to improve his work force of assistants. This was no easy task, given that decisions about who should be hired or fired did not lie with him. “The Secretary of the Interior names my subordinates. You had better state that,” he told the press in June 1885, just a month before he took over the superintendency. “I am liable,” he quipped, “to have trouble if the wrong impression gets out that I have so much patronage to dispose of.”⁹⁶ Even the *Livingston Enterprise* recognized the inadvisability of this situation. Just the month before, it had editorialized that if the park was to have efficient assistant superintendents, “more power over his assistants [should] be conferred upon the superintendent.” In particular, the assistants “should know that disobedience or opposition to his directions may lead to immediate suspension from duty and possible discharge,” the paper warned. It acknowledged that much of the trouble with Conger’s administration derived from his lack of control over his subordinates. “The lack of such power in the superintendent has led to trouble in the past, and will have the same effect in the future,” the paper predicted.⁹⁷

Even with this handicap, however, Wear was determined to make significant progress. On the day after his arrival in the park, he penned a letter to Secretary Lamar, telling him that many of the assistants were “old, worn out, and utterly unfit.” Wear wanted men that were “sober . . . truthful, brave, and well versed in woods or mountain craft,” with experience and integrity counting most among the selection criteria.⁹⁸ The previous group of assistants had lacked integrity, he noted, and had colluded with the poachers. Game “had been shot with impunity,” he wrote to the secretary, “and marketed at the hotels without any interference on the part of the officers whose sworn duty it was to protect and prevent its destruction.”⁹⁹

An exacting employer, Wear expected much from his assistants, and acted quickly when they did not measure up. For example, just a month after hiring William J. Marshall to replace Daniel E. Sawyer in July 1885, he obtained permission to release him.¹⁰⁰ After demanding

the dismissal of several men, Wear hired experienced mountain men Jack Baronett and Edward Wilson to help him.¹⁰¹ The results looked promising, as the “revitalized force began to perform quite credibly,” wrote Haines.¹⁰² The new employees brought a sense of lawfulness to the park, as poachers, really for the first time, were brought to trial—albeit under Wyoming law—and had their guns confiscated. The *Livingston Enterprise* extolled the virtues of this new management: “The officers of the Park are vigilant and energetic in the discharge of their duties and ever on the alert to catch all trespassers and while it gives the superintendent or his assistants no pleasure to punish anyone they have a sworn duty to perform, and will do and are doing it fearlessly.”¹⁰³

In addition to improving the make-up of the protective force, Superintendent Wear also tried to increase its size.¹⁰⁴ In his first report to Secretary Lamar, Wear asked to increase the number of assistants from ten to fifteen, and to increase their annual pay from \$900 to \$1,000. He also suggested that each assistant receive \$100 per year for furnishing his own horse and equipment. Stock and equipment would be better cared for, he reasoned, if they belonged to the assistants instead of the government.¹⁰⁵

Despite Wear’s attempts to increase protection, he was pressured to do even more. Park visitors began to write to the secretary of the interior, complaining, for instance, about the lack of signs and notices regarding park rules and regulations. One visiting attorney from Circleville, Ohio, noted that he had traveled for more than two hundred miles throughout the park and “did not see in any place the slightest notice of any kind in regard to the government of the Park.” To remedy this situation, Wear requested permission to hire someone to prepare guide boards and paint signs during the winter of 1885.¹⁰⁶

So busy was he with matters of protection, and so short was his tenure as superintendent, that Wear had little time to accomplish any structural improvements in the park. In September 1884, Superintendent Carpenter had hired Silas McMinn (who was developing the McMinn Coal Mine on the flanks of Mount Everts) to whitewash the blockhouse and paint the roof. McMinn never completed the job, however.¹⁰⁷ Thus, the blockhouse remained in poor condition when Wear assumed the superintendency. He did occupy the building after making it “passably comfortable for the summer,” and then built an addition onto one of the assistant’s houses for the winter.¹⁰⁸ He also informed the secretary of the

interior that a new superintendent's residence should be built as soon as possible.¹⁰⁹

One of the most troublesome issues for Wear was the matter of laws governing the park. Wear believed that enforcing the territorial laws of Wyoming in a national park was "of very questionable validity, even within that portion of the Park lying wholly within Wyoming Territory. . . ." The situation with respect to jurisdiction was worse than dire, he contended. A national park needed national laws and a national tribunal for enforcement. "[U]nless some stringent enactment is made, and that at the earliest possible time, it will be too late," he wrote to Lamar. As a remedy, Wear suggested creating "a court within and for the Yellowstone Park, with exclusive jurisdiction of all misdemeanors, and with power to examine and hold to bail all cases of felonies, to be tried at the nearest court having criminal jurisdiction." He thought that if his assistants could be "ministerial officers," there would be "comparatively little trouble in protecting and keeping the Park in a state of preservation beautiful to look upon." Wear urged expediency in the creation of this court.¹¹⁰

Regarding jurisdiction, Arnold Hague recommended to the interior secretary that the Interior Department have an agent review the condition of the park with respect to its protection, preservation, and improvement. Lamar chose Attorney W. Hallett Phillips, of Washington, D.C., and asked him to make suggestions about how to improve park management and better provide for its enjoyment. Phillips, like Wear, recommended exclusive jurisdiction of the park and the employment of a sufficient number of competent assistants.¹¹¹

The jurisdiction issue was ultimately resolved, but not before it cost David Wear his superintendency. In the summer of 1885, a party of visitors, including a judge, a congressman, and the editor of the *Chicago Tribune*, Joseph Medill, were apprehended and then fined for not adequately extinguishing their campfire, even though they had evidently made reasonable efforts to do so. The Wyoming constable and judge in charge of the case were ridiculed in the local paper for their "Much-Ado-About-Nothing" approach to the administration of justice, and Medill argued, using the *Chicago Tribune* as his forum, that "in a national park



Tourists camping, ca. 1880s.

the national laws and regulations should be enforced by a national tribunal."¹¹² Those complaints, coupled with Phillips's report, served as the last straw: the Territory of Wyoming repealed the act permitting use of Wyoming law in Yellowstone on March 10, 1886, and Wear's role in the affair came under fire.¹¹³

There were those, however, who supported Wear. The *Livingston Enterprise*, for example, reported that Wear had made every attempt to deal with the inappropriate fine issue fairly and in-house. "When the party [of visitors] got back to Mammoth Hot Springs and laid the case before Superintendent Wear," wrote the paper, "he peremptorily discharged Joe Keeney from his official position [as the constable under Wyoming law at the Lower Geyser Basin] and said that Hall [the judge under Wyoming law] would receive the same medicine."¹¹⁴ The paper further argued that "Wear does not desire to persecute tourists or see any ultra-legal process carried on by professional informers and prosecutors. He merely wants the laws enforced against the Park and the Park protected."¹¹⁵ In the following year, the paper opined that "Superintendent Wear's administration has inaugurated a new and, as we think, desirable regime in the Park. With the exception of Norris, former superintendents have done little or nothing by which to earn their salaries. Col. Wear has adopted a much more vigorous policy and has thereby invited wholesale criticism."¹¹⁶ Wear's problem, according to the paper, was not administrative policy; it was politics. The defendants had been Republicans, and Wear was a democratic appointee, simple as that. "Perhaps this political chain may somewhat account for the vehement criticisms that are being made on the present condition of affairs in the Park," chided the paper, "all

of which have grown out of the alleged affront to the sacred person of the Illinois statesman.”¹¹⁷

The situation in the park grew worse after repeal of the law that had placed the park under the jurisdiction of Wyoming Territory. With no laws to punish offenders, depredations substantially increased. According to Haines, local mountain men, tourists, and even park employees were “emboldened by the obvious fact that they could once more defy the rules and regulations with impunity.”¹¹⁸ Whether because of the chaos that ensued once Wyoming law was rescinded, politics, or a distrust of civilian park management, the fate of Wear’s superintendency was sealed. When, in August 1886, Congress did not appropriate any funds to maintain the park or pay for the salary of the superintendent, Wear stepped down, and Secretary Lamar, in accordance with the 1883 sundry appropriations act, was forced to ask for assistance from the War Department.¹¹⁹ Thus, the summer of 1886 marked a major shift in park management, with a transition from civilian to military authority.

Montana’s territorial delegate in Congress approved of the change. When asked why Congress had not appropriated money for the superintendent’s position, Joseph K. Toole replied: “Merely because the leading men of both houses who had visited the park felt as if there was a sort of ring there that ought to be broken up.” For Toole, the decision to call in the military was a logical one. The idea was hardly new—both Generals Philip Sheridan and D. B. Sackett, and Captain William Ludlow had publicly advocated turning to the War Department, and Toole was convinced that the change “would work well.”¹²⁰ While no one could foresee just how well a military administration would work, it seemed to many to be the best solution for protecting the park from vandalism and political maneuvering. Thirty-two years would pass before civilian authority returned to the park.

Conclusion

Very little progress was made protecting the park and developing an infrastructure to improve public access during the superintendencies of Patrick Conger, Robert Carpenter, and David Wear; indeed, the first two tended to be plagued by inefficiency. However, several important issues surfaced during this time that had long-term ramifications. One was the type and number of assistants who should protect the park. Scientists

such as John Wesley Powell and Arnold Hague of the U.S. Geological Survey had called for trained, educated men; Wear and others desired men from the West who were experienced in mountaineering and woodcraft. Articles in *American Naturalist* and *Scientific American* had proposed an increase in the “guards or patrol” in the park from 15 to 25, and Smithsonian Institution Secretary Spencer Baird had called for the employment of a naturalist for the park.¹²¹

A second, and perhaps more important issue concerned the nature of park protection. As protection became a central concern for the scientific community and the nation at large, pressure mounted for improvements in the management and preservation of the park. Calls for “protecting and keeping the Park in a state of preservation beautiful to look upon” were common.¹²² For example, in a letter to Senator Charles Manderson of Nebraska, a member of the Committee on Territories, Hague urged Congress to enlarge the park in order to preserve its watershed and provide sufficient habitat for wild animals.¹²³ George Vest, among many others, also continued to speak out numerous times in favor of protecting the park.

Some influential politicians argued against any form of improvements to the park as a way to protect it. In the summer of 1885, a special committee from the House of Representatives, including Representative William Holman of Indiana, visited Yellowstone to investigate park affairs. While the committee’s report argued strongly for keeping the park under Wyoming law and even rethinking its national park status, it also recommended that Yellowstone’s grandeur be protected by sparing it, “so far as possible . . . the vandalism of improvement.”¹²⁴ These comments may have been inspired by the nation’s experience with over-development of other popular tourist sites, like Niagara Falls, which had lost much of their natural appeal at the hands of commercialization.¹²⁵ Yellowstone National Park’s “great and only charms,” the report continued, “are in the display of wonderful forces of nature, the ever varying beauty of the rugged landscape, and the sublimity of the scenery.” “Art,” it concluded, “cannot embellish them.”¹²⁶ Indeed, this growth in national interest in park protection was perhaps the most critical development in this four-year period of the park’s administrative history. Growing demand for protection had set the stage for the transfer of management of the park to the U.S. Army.¹²⁷

The War on Vandalism

The United States Army Takes Control of Yellowstone National Park 1886–1906

The Canyon of the Yellowstone . . . is the artistic culmination of Nature's efforts there. She held them long in her safe-keeping, until she could give them as a precious possession to a great People.¹

—Arnold Hague, 1904

During the first eight months of 1886, a struggle over management of Yellowstone National Park took place in Washington, D.C. In the halls of Congress, politicians debated how to handle the controversies that swirled around the park, and passed an appropriations bill that did not provide any money for salaries of the superintendent and his assistants. Without these funds, the Interior Department was forced to request that the U.S. Army take over administration of the park. On August 6, 1886, Secretary of the Interior Lucius Lamar, under the authority of the Sundry Civil Appropriations Act of March 3, 1883, wrote Secretary of War William C. Endicott, requesting a detail of troops to aid in protecting Yellowstone from vandals and poachers who were killing the game and destroying the park's natural features. Three days later, Lieutenant General Philip H. Sheridan recommended to Endicott that Troop "M," First U.S. Cavalry, stationed at Fort Custer, Montana Territory, be ordered to the park under the command of Captain Moses Harris.² Thus began three decades of military control of Yellowstone National Park. While there were some setbacks throughout the period of army control, the military succeeded to a large extent in protecting the park's natural curiosities and much of its wildlife (albeit

only those species deemed worthy of protection at the time), and in building an infrastructure of administrative facilities that is still in use today.

Several factors contributed to the military's success. First, the army brought a proven management structure that encouraged accountability and responsibility. In his last annual report, the first acting superintendent during the military period (technically, all military superintendents were referred to as "acting superintendents" until 1907, when S. B. M. Young returned for his second stint as head administrator in the park and was called superintendent), Captain Moses Harris, wrote that "by the use of an organized and disciplined force, respect for the established rules and regulations and the rights of life and property can be maintained," and he believed this had been proven by the improved state of the park's affairs during his tenure.³ Second, the military, with more manpower, could achieve a parkwide presence. Anywhere from 34 to 136 men—a considerable increase over the handful of assistant superintendents on the payroll during previous administrations—were now stationed in the park at any given time. Third, the military already commanded respect from both Congress and park visitors. Finally, while not all military superintendents were equally successful, most were at least good managers of people. Thus outfitted, the military was in a good position to fight vandalism, to build the park's administrative infrastructure, and to adopt the sorts of wildlife and tourist management policies necessary to ensure success.

The Acting Superintendents

All that said, Captain Harris still had a tough assignment. The park faced many threats, especially after repeal of the act that had provided for enforcement of the park's rules under Wyoming law; vandalism, poaching, and arson had subsequently increased.⁴ By all accounts, however, Harris was up to the job. According to historian Aubrey Haines, Harris "brought to the assignment the courage, integrity, and common sense that were needed to rescue the park from a difficult situation." Little is known about Harris's life prior to his enlistment in the U.S. Cavalry in 1857, but his record as a military figure revealed his abilities. He rose quickly through the ranks, received the Congressional Medal of Honor, and was made captain in 1864.⁵ Harris brought the qualities that had helped him succeed in the military to his post in the park. Considered "austere, correct, unyielding and a terror to evil doers," Harris was able, nevertheless, to appear fair, reasoned, and judicious.⁶ He was, moreover, a consummate diplomat, possessed of an ability to get along with the Department of the Interior. Senator George Vest called Harris "a gentleman of intelligence and justice and high character."⁷ Harris's annual reports demonstrated both a deep appreciation for the park and a philosophy about how best to preserve it that echoed that of the Holman Select Committee. "In my opinion," he wrote in 1887, "this 'wonderland' should for all time be kept as nearly as possible in its natural and primitive condition. No appliances of art and no expenditure of money can improve upon this condition."⁸

Harris's successor, Captain Frazier Augustus Boutelle, was not blessed with Harris's temperate qualities, especially when it came to diplomacy. Born in 1840, in Troy, New York, Boutelle also joined the military with the outbreak of the Civil War. He, too, rose to the rank of captain, and was cited for meritorious conduct during the Indian Wars. But controversy, not competence, marked Boutelle's brief assignment in the park, which began on June 1, 1889. According to Haines, "impolitic actions" were at issue; Boutelle criticized the secretary of the interior for failing to provide firefighting equipment in the park, and was resented for his opposition to the proposed installation of an elevator in the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone River.⁹

Boutelle was replaced on February 16, 1891, by Captain George Smith Anderson. The first West Point graduate to hold the park's acting superintendent position, Anderson was, according to Haines, "one of the

most capable officers to manage its affairs." Born in 1849, on a New Jersey homestead, Anderson graduated fifth in his class from the U.S. Military Academy in 1871, and was assigned to the Sixth U.S. Cavalry as a second lieutenant. He distinguished himself at every turn during a career of challenging assignments that included serving as an acting engineer officer for the Department of the Missouri (1875), as assistant professor of natural and experimental philosophy at West Point (1877–1881), as U.S. Army captain (1885–1915), and as commissioner for a detail that took him to Europe (1889). Haines wrote that Anderson's experience and training as an officer, his European experience (which helped him to develop "his social graces"), and his "commanding physical appearance" all contributed to his success in the park. "His was a vigorous administration," Haines concluded, one "that left the Park in very good order at the time of his transfer to other service on June 23, 1897."¹⁰

Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Baldwin Mark (S. B. M.) Young came to Yellowstone from Yosemite National Park, where he had served as acting superintendent and, like Harris, posed "a terror to local wrongdoers," according to Haines. Born in 1840, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Young enlisted as a private just two weeks after the Civil War began. He also rose quickly through the ranks to brigadier general by the war's end, and was "brevetted three times for gallant and meritorious service in action." After the war, his achievements continued until he became lieutenant colonel in the Fourth U.S. Cavalry. A "large, blunt, rather positive man," according to Haines, who "knew exactly what he was about all the time," Young oversaw a successful, albeit short, administration of the park.¹¹ Divided between two brief periods, Young's stint in Yellowstone ran from June to November 1897, and then again from June 1907 to November 1908.

If Young's administration was short, so were the administrations of his four successors: James Brailsford Erwin (November 1897–March 1899), Wilber Elliott Wilder (March–June 1899), Oscar James Brown (June 1899–July 1900), and George William Goode (July 1900–May 1901). While these men had distinguished military careers, their tenures as acting superintendent were too short to have had much impact. Incompetence was not the issue. Rather, circumstances surrounding the country's foreign affairs, in particular the Spanish–American War and the military's expanding role in the Philippine Islands, led to troop displacements throughout the military establishment. Unfortunately, the park's interests were not served by this constant

shuffling of acting superintendents; as the troop commanders changed, so did the troops. Hence, there was little continuity at any level of park management.¹²

Stability returned to the park in May 1901, when Yellowstone's ninth military officer to serve as acting superintendent, Colonel John Pitcher, arrived in the park.¹³ Born in Texas in September 1854, Pitcher entered the U.S. Military Academy in 1872, and became a second lieutenant upon graduation. His time in the military was spent in campaigns fighting American Indians and Filipinos. Pitcher, according to Haines, was blessed with favorable conditions in and around the park during his six years in office. Pitcher's "tour of duty . . . correspond[ed] with the golden years of the military administration," Haines wrote. "[T]hat aura," he concluded, "probably was due as much to the coincidence of many favorable factors as it was to his efforts." Pitcher's tenure as acting superintendent came to an end in July 1907, when he was transferred to another post.¹⁴

Military Infrastructure

The military years saw the construction of two forts: a temporary one, Camp Sheridan, and one built to last and still standing today, Fort Yellowstone, as well as numerous outposts, called "snowshoe cabins." Both the forts and the outposts provided the necessary infrastructure for waging war against vandalism.

Upon their arrival in the park on August 17, 1886, Captain Harris and his 50 soldiers established a tent camp at the base of the terraces at Mammoth Hot Springs. On September 16 of that year, Captain Harris was allotted \$3,000 to construct barracks for his troops in the Mammoth area. Ever vigilant as self-appointed park protector, Arnold Hague reminded Acting Secretary of the Interior H. L. Muldrow that "great care should be exercised in the selection of the proper site and no buildings should be allowed to be erected at the springs without the approval of the Department of the Interior who still has the maintenance of the Park in their charge." Hague feared that the number of buildings and stables required for the troops could "easily cause irreparable injury to the formation unless carefully chosen."¹⁵ Shortly thereafter, Muldrow requested that Captain Harris submit his list of building sites to the Department of the Interior for approval, and advised him against selecting a site on the "hotel terraces" or near "any object or place of curiosity."¹⁶ Harris responded that he did not intend

to locate the structures near the hotel or the approaches to the Mammoth Hot Springs formations. Instead, he had selected a site on the west side of the road about two hundred yards south of the house recently occupied by former superintendent Wear, and about one half-mile from the hotel, where the buildings "would not be visible from the 'hotel terrace,'" nor "obstruct either the view or approaches to the Hot Spring formation."¹⁷ In this latter assessment, Harris was wrong; surely, he could have seen that the new Camp Sheridan buildings were to be situated right at Marble Terrace.¹⁸

Camp Sheridan, named for General Philip H. Sheridan, was soon turned into adequate temporary quarters. By the end of 1886, Harris's troops had erected several frame structures—a 10' high, T-shaped barracks (130' × 24', with a 55' × 18' extension), a 10' high, 100' × 24' storehouse, a 10' high, 26' × 20' guardhouse, a 10' high, 150' × 26' cavalry stable, a 10' high, 50' × 25' quartermaster's stable, and a hospital—all clad in vertical board and batten.¹⁹ Although the army's quartermaster general was nominally responsible for the construction of army installations at the time, this was not the case at Camp Sheridan, probably because it was a small, temporary post. Instead, Harris supervised the work done at the fort.²⁰ By 1887, he had received funding for construction of a headquarters office and a double cottage for officers' quarters. Until that time, officers had been living in two structures built by the Department of the Interior: Philetus Norris's 1879 blockhouse on "Capitol Hill," and a frame cottage, described by Harris as being "considerably out of repair, small and uncomfortable."²¹ Edwin C. Mason, acting inspector general of the army, believed that because the buildings were owned by the Interior Department rather than the War Department, the army could not repair them.²² Constructed of rough lumber "with battened outside," all of the newly built structures at Camp Sheridan were "covered with a wash of lime and lamp black to improve as far as practicable their rough appearance."²³ While their roughness was hard to conceal, they looked, as Mason reported, "neat and comfortable."²⁴ By 1888, a stone magazine, an amusement room, and several unidentified buildings had been added to Camp Sheridan.²⁵

Because Harris viewed the arrangement whereby the military managed the park to be temporary, his estimations of appropriations were always made with that in mind. When he completed his first annual report and figured the appropriations required for the next fiscal year, he assumed, for example, "that the civil



Camp Sheridan, ca. 1900.

administration of the affairs of the Park would be continued" the next year.²⁶ He therefore included a request for \$32,300, for salaries for one superintendent, one gamekeeper, ten assistant superintendents, one chief of police, twenty policemen, and one clerk.²⁷ Likewise, when he prepared to leave the park in the hands of a successor in 1889, he prepared a budget for the return of civilian leadership.²⁸

During his administration, Harris found this temporary and uncertain arrangement for managing the park increasingly troublesome. In his annual report for 1889, Harris wrote that the uncertainty associated with the situation precluded "the establishment of a military post . . . of sufficient capacity for a garrison large enough to perform the duties of Park protection well and efficiently without risking any impairment of military efficiency in the force so employed." The troops, he pointed out, were overextended by a situation that "necessitate[d] the employment of temporary and less-effective means with a maximum of discomfort to the troops so employed." He referred to the situation as "an exceedingly anomalous condition of affairs which ought not to prevail indefinitely and as a matter of course." The authorities, Harris believed, should resolve the situation immediately. "The time would seem to be fully ripe for definite settlement of the question as to the means to be employed in the protection and government of the National Park," he wrote, inviting resolution of the matter, "and as my connection with the Park ceases with the rendition of this report, I deem it a suitable time to urgently invite your attention to the importance of this subject."²⁹

By the time Harris's replacement, Captain F. A. Boutelle, arrived, the War Department had developed

plans to erect buildings in the park for a permanent post. While this move might seem to have alleviated the problem of troop discomfort, and to some extent resolved the question of whether or not the military occupation was temporary, it raised an equally vexing question: who really controlled the park? When, in October 1890, officials at the Department of the Interior learned of the War Department's plans to develop a permanent post, they immediately ordered Boutelle not to permit any work to proceed on the buildings without first submitting "an accurate description of the locality and grounds whose occupation is contemplated, with your own report as to the eligibility of the same" to the Department of the Interior for approval.³⁰ The War Department had been put on notice: the Interior Department was still, at least on paper, in charge of the park.

What kind of structures did the Department of War envision for the park? The designs they chose said a lot about their plans to stay or to go. From correspondence between the Office of the Chief Quartermaster and the Quartermaster General in Washington, D.C., it is clear that the army intended to build "good, permanent and durable buildings." But the chief quartermaster obviously had more than permanence on his mind when he asked to see the intended plans. He also advocated planning for the expansion of the Yellowstone post: "As this Park embraces quite a vast area in a section of country that is rapidly becoming settled, and is being visited by an increased number of tourists each year, it is thought to be the intention to provide buildings of a substantial character, and place them in a manner to admit of the proper location of others, which may be required in the future, in order to shelter additional Troops necessary in



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #40990

Fort Yellowstone. 1897.

protecting the public interests in this park.”³¹

In January 1891, Brigadier General Thomas Ruger, Commander of the Department of Dakotas Headquarters, recommended that the secretary of war request the Interior Department to sanction a tract of land for use by the military.³² “The tract should,” he wrote, “. . . be somewhat larger than that merely required for placing the buildings near each other in regular order, owing to the fact that hollow spaces exist in places below the crust deposits of the surface formation in the park, and it may, in consequence, be necessary to scatter the buildings somewhat, depending upon experimental tests for foundations.” Like the chief quartermaster, Ruger wanted to maintain the option of adding more buildings at a later date, to accommodate the structural needs of possibly larger future troop deployments.³³

The War Department also wanted permission to use and control the waters of Clematis Creek as a water supply for the garrison. The army planned to dam the creek and construct underground water pipes, and then to maintain control of the creek and adjacent land so as to guard against pollution of the creek. Finally, the War Department would need permission to “procure, in the vicinity, such materials, lumber, logs, rock, limestone, sand, etc.,— as may be required in the construction of the buildings.”³⁴ The following month, Interior Secretary John W. Noble granted permission.³⁵

While Boutelle was instrumental in choosing the site for what was to become Fort Yellowstone, he did not remain in the park long enough to see any actual construction on the project. Plans and estimates were well underway when he managed the park, but it was not until after he was replaced by Captain George Anderson

in February 1891, that construction began.³⁶ The fort was officially established on May 11, 1891; construction of the approved buildings began that summer.³⁷

Before construction began, Anderson asked First Lieutenant George H. Sands to investigate the site. Sands confirmed that it was the “proper place for permanent military quarters.”³⁸ Sands’s opinion, however, stood in stark contrast to that of one U.S. Geological Survey employee, who “advised against the site, since it was located on an old formation of the hot springs, which was perhaps not stable enough to support heavy buildings—” just as Ruger had worried.³⁹

By autumn 1891, these concerns had been put aside, and a total of twelve buildings had been constructed on the site chosen by Boutelle, located “on the eastern edge of the terrace, northeast of Capitol Hill and a short distance from the tourist facilities, about three-tenths of a mile northeast of Camp Sheridan.”⁴⁰ Several buildings were ready for occupancy in November of that year: an administration building, two duplexes of officers’ quarters, a guard house, a barracks capable of housing 60 soldiers, a commissary storehouse, a quartermaster storehouse, a granary, a bakery, a stable, and two non-commissioned officers’ quarters.

The design of these early buildings, according to historic preservationists R. Laurie Simmons and Thomas H. Simmons, was “typical of western military posts of the era, [being] of a generally spartan appearance with a few Queen Anne Style domestic elements, described by many as ‘cottage style.’” The structures were one-to-two-and-a-half stories high, of “frame construction with drop siding and stone foundations, with evenly spaced double-hung sash windows, and prominent porches.”



Officers' Row. 1896.

The guard house had “sweeping eaves and tiny cupolas, which would be repeated in later buildings.” The buildings for the noncommissioned officers “were similar in appearance to middle class houses built across the country during the late Victorian era, and were notable for their columned porches with decorative friezes and balustrades, shingled gable ends, hipped roof dormers, and large paired windows.”⁴¹ Many of these buildings are still standing today.

These additions to the new Fort Yellowstone pleased Anderson. “The post makes a slightly and attractive addition to the place,” he wrote in his annual report in August 1892. The one drawback was its small size. Anderson wanted more buildings for the company, Troop D of the Sixth Cavalry, that had arrived in May to help manage the park.⁴² Until the new barracks were finally constructed in 1897, these soldiers summered in the Lower Geyser Basin and wintered in the old barracks of Camp Sheridan.⁴³

By July 1893, Fort Yellowstone had acquired a hospital, a residence for hospital personnel, and a large hayshed. In 1894, the park acquired its first stone structure to house the U.S. Commissioner called for by the Yellowstone Game Protection Act, or “Lacey Act,” which had officially placed the park under federal jurisdiction and finally created a way for park personnel to arrest law breakers and bring them to trial. The building was “a one-and-a-half-story sandstone dwelling with gable-on-hip roof with through-the-cornice dormers and a full-width columned porch.” Its design was “restrained and dignified,” according to Simmons and Simmons.⁴⁴ John W. Meldrum served as the first U.S. Commissioner,

staying on the job and in the house for 40 years, until June 1935.⁴⁵ At roughly the same time, construction began on the jail at Mammoth Hot Springs.

By the middle of the 1890s, the issue of the fort’s size still had not been resolved. In April 1894, Captain Anderson continued to appeal for funds to construct more facilities for his troops. Noting in a letter to the adjutant general that army management had “proven so generally satisfactory that a return to the old Civil Government [was] not at all probable,” he asked permission to vacate the unsuitable, temporary structures at Camp Sheridan and build quarters near the new post, Fort Yellowstone. The distance between the two sites, particularly during long winters, proved to be a disadvantage, he wrote. Citing lack of funds, the adjutant general refused this request.⁴⁶

By 1897, the War Department’s attitude had changed, and the additional barracks (to house the second detachment detailed to Yellowstone) became a reality. Colonel S. B. M. Young, acting superintendent at the time, oversaw the contract negotiation and the construction, but left the park shortly thereafter, in November 1897. Along with new barracks came the concomitant housing needed for commanders: two duplex officers’ quarters and two noncommissioned officers’ quarters. An additional stable, a post exchange, and various service buildings were also added. The frame structures resembled the earlier post buildings, and were equally characteristic of the time. The barracks, for example, had a “hipped roof with flared eaves which sheltered a full-width wrap-around porch, . . . multiple hipped roof dormers, and . . . alternating brick chimneys

and cupolas.”⁴⁷

Little construction took place at the post during the next four years, as acting superintendents came and went. With the exception of a small morgue built near the hospital (both since demolished), no buildings were constructed during this period. In 1899, Captain Oscar Brown proposed adding an entrance gate and station house at the North Entrance. Captain Wilder, Brown claimed, had argued for the addition of these structures in a report written to the department on April 19, 1899. The interior secretary, however, did not approve the \$1,200 Brown thought he would need for the project.⁴⁸ Brown also sought funds to build four-and-one-half miles of fencing along the northern boundary near Gardiner, Montana, in hopes of protecting the winter range of antelope and mountain sheep and keeping the town's horses and cattle from entering the park.⁴⁹

When Captain John Pitcher took over as acting superintendent in April 1901, construction of administrative facilities resumed. Pitcher found Fort Yellowstone to be “one of the most neatly built and attractive-looking little posts in the country,” but like those before him, he found it “too small for the growing needs of the park.” He recommended that the fort be enlarged to accommodate a squadron, and called for the construction of a house for the commanding officer (acting superintendent) suitable for entertaining the park's many distinguished visitors.⁵⁰ Even if he did not achieve all he wanted in this arena, Pitcher accomplished a great deal over the next few years.

With the help of Engineer Officer Hiram Chittenden from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, who had served in the park under Captain Anderson, Captain Pitcher oversaw the construction of many of the Mammoth-area features we recognize today: the landscaped and improved plateau known as the parade ground, the office of the Army Corps of Engineers (known as the “pagoda”), and the North Entrance arch (a.k.a. Roosevelt arch), through which many of Yellowstone's millions of visitors have entered Wonderland.

Construction of buildings was within the purview of the construction quartermaster (with input from the acting superintendents), so it was unusual for an engineer officer, whose duties since the 1883 Civil Appropriations Bill had centered around the construction of roads and bridges, to be associated with the creation of administrative properties. But as David G. Battle and Erwin N. Thompson pointed out, “the engineer officer had considerable funds, equipment, and labor” at his dis-



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #J36806

Hiram Chittenden. 1910.

posal, and he “often could, if he were interested, stretch his responsibilities to include undertakings that at most posts would be done under the quartermaster's direction.” Chittenden “was just such a man.”⁵¹ Chittenden's good relationship with Pitcher, his creation of a new water system and reservoir, and his enterprising, creative genius helped him add significantly to the improvement and attractiveness of the headquarters area.⁵² Chittenden recognized and appreciated the mark he left on the park, but his ambivalence toward “improving” the park was evident in his writing: he had transformed nature out of necessity, he maintained, and thus had tried to strike an appropriate architectural tone. “This [the Mammoth area] is the only point in the Park where an extensive transformation of natural conditions by the work of man has been permitted,” he wrote of the headquarters area in his 1905 history of the park. “Yet it was unavoidable here, and in yielding to this necessity,” he argued, “the effort has been made to provide a substitute that would be in harmony with the natural surroundings, and would be in itself a feature of interest.”⁵³

In the very dry summer of 1901, a lack of water at headquarters for both the hotel and the fort prompted Chittenden to construct a 1.8-million-gallon reservoir, complete with a ditch connecting Glen Creek to a

reservoir below Marble Terrace, and to pipes connected to the existing system. This system made the Mammoth Hot Springs plateau irrigable, and added permanence to the headquarters area. Chittenden suggested constructing “proper sidewalks” to complement the rebuilt and realigned roads at headquarters.⁵⁴ Colonel Young had been hesitant to improve the plateau, as the area was just outside the military’s grounds at Mammoth, but with Chittenden’s return to the park in 1899, and a landscape plan that had been produced pro bono by Massachusetts landscape architect Warren H. Manning, work began on the improvement of the plateau.⁵⁵ As historian Linda Flint McClelland has noted, there was a movement in landscape architecture at the end of the nineteenth century to “conceal construction scars, to blend built structures with natural vegetation, and to screen undesirable objects from view.”⁵⁶ Manning, who was part of that movement, may have had such motives in mind when he drew up plans for the parade ground. However, it was not part of Manning’s approach, at this time, to restrict designs to the use of indigenous plants. Thus, lawn and shade trees—even, as Haines noted, “extensive groves and semiformal walks to scenic points”—were part of Manning’s plan, which formed the basis for future work, but was never fully executed.⁵⁷ The actual results were scaled down to fit budgetary and environmental constraints.

In 1902, Chittenden followed through with his plans to improve the plateau directly in front of officers’ row and the concession area. According to Battle and Thompson, he “realigned the roads, laid 8,337 feet of concrete sidewalk . . . , developed a series of irrigation ditches and water sprinklers for both the plateau and the post itself and cleared the debris from about 40 acres of ground,” which was then graded, enhanced with manure and loam, and seeded with grass.⁵⁸ Shade trees were planted, some in the fall of 1902, and the rest in the spring of 1903.⁵⁹ The residence and barn of well-known Yellowstone photographer Frank J. Haynes, which were located on the plateau, were moved in 1902, with Haynes’s cooperation, adding to the improved appearance of the headquarters.⁶⁰ Chittenden supervised improvement of the area around the officers’ quarters and barracks, as well; lawns were planted and ditches were dug for the maintenance of shade trees.⁶¹ According to Major Pitcher, the newly planted lawns at Mammoth did much to control the blowing sand and dust that had previously been a source of much complaint in the Mammoth area.⁶² By 1904, the irrigated grounds at

Mammoth promoted a good growth of turf, and park officials planted more shrubbery. Pitcher believed that within two years, the turf would have a sufficient hold to decrease the necessary amount of irrigation water.⁶³ These improvements in landscaping were made possible by the reservoir and water system that the Army Corps of Engineers had begun to develop under Chittenden in 1901, which provided “adequate water for all the domestic needs of the fort and the concessioners, with water to spare for irrigation and power generation.”⁶⁴

Power generation was exactly what Chittenden next addressed. Using overflow from the reservoir and water from the hot springs at Mammoth, he constructed a water-powered electric light plant—with a capacity of 100 kilowatts—approximately 300 yards from the fort. He called this new powerhouse “in every particular first class and as good as any in the United States for its size.” Upon its completion in 1902, the fort was converted from oil to electricity, which added measurably to the appearance of the headquarters area.⁶⁵

Another of Chittenden’s projects was the U.S. Engineer’s Office—a distinguished, resilient building that exemplified the attractive pragmatism of the military’s involvement in the park. Chittenden chose the site—north of the plateau and the army post—where the handsome structure still stands today. This second stone building to be built in the park (the U.S. Commissioner’s house/office, constructed in 1894, had been the first) was designed by the firm of Reed and Stem of St. Paul, Minnesota, and built of gray sandstone with “distinctive green roof tiles and . . . bellcast eaves [that] lent the design an exotic appearance, earning it the nickname ‘the Pagoda.’”⁶⁶ The engineer’s residence, a frame structure behind the office, was also built at this time.⁶⁷

The year 1903 also saw the construction of another Yellowstone mainstay: the masonry arch at the park’s North Entrance. The North Entrance had become very important after the Northern Pacific Railroad extended its park branch line to Cinnabar, Montana (a few miles north of the railroad’s eventual terminus in Gardiner), in 1883. Furthermore, Mammoth Hot Springs had become ever more firmly established as the business and administrative headquarters of the park. Thus, Chittenden and Pitcher thought it “fitting . . . to provide some suitable entrance gate at this point.” According to Chittenden, in his report to the chief engineer on the “Improvement of Yellowstone National Park” for 1903, a suitable entrance would also spruce up an otherwise drab part of the park. The arch was important, wrote Chittenden, “because



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #79

President Theodore Roosevelt laying the cornerstone at the dedication of the arch. 1903.

the natural features of the country at this portion of the boundary are about the least interesting of any part of the Park, and the first impression of visitors upon entering the Park was very unfavorable.”⁶⁸

Once completed, the arch certainly gave visitors the feeling of entering a different space, even if the country on both sides remained the same. Constructed of columnar basalt—what Chittenden called “lava rock”—the arch bears part of the park’s original mandate, “For the Benefit and Enjoyment of the People,” spelled out on a tablet above the keystone, and the words “Yellowstone National Park,” and “Created by Act of Congress, March 1, 1872” on tablets on either side of the opening.⁶⁹ President Theodore Roosevelt was present on April 24, 1903, at the Masonic ceremony held to dedicate the arch and lay the cornerstone. He gave a rousing speech lauding the beauty and democratic nature of the “great national playground,” and reminded the audience and the country that the preservation of such a treasure was in their hands. “The only way that the people as a whole can secure to themselves and their children the enjoyment in perpetuity of what the Yellowstone Park has to give,” he warned, “is by assuming the ownership in the name of the nation and jealously safeguarding and preserving the scenery, the forests, and the wild creatures.”⁷⁰ The arch was completed in August 1903, and relatively quickly after that, it began to be referred to by many as the Roosevelt Arch.⁷¹



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #43656

The Roosevelt Arch. 1905.

The arch cut an impressive figure against the stark backdrop of the sagebrush flats. Chittenden and Pitcher softened this effect somewhat by tinkering with the arch’s immediate environment. Wing walls extended to the park’s boundary, and a “small park [was] laid out within [the] loop at [the] terminus of [the] Government road.” “Arch Park” was fenced and “ornamented with [a] small pond provided with running water.” Officials seeded the park and planted trees. Furthermore, the road from the arch “to the bluffs of the Gardiner [*sic*] River [was] newly built over an even plain, . . . planted with shrubbery on both sides.”⁷² “The whole effect,” wrote Chittenden in his report to Brigadier General G. L. Gillespie, “[was] to give a dignified and pleasing entrance to the Park at the point where the great majority of visitors enter[ed] it.”⁷³

During the summer of 1904, the “barren and unsightly waste” flat area in front of Gardiner and at the park’s North Entrance (referred to today as “the triangle”) was transformed into “a beautiful green field.” Pitcher thought it presented “a very pleasing picture to the tourists as they enter the park.” Under Chittenden’s direction, the 50-acre field, fertilized with manure, was planted in alfalfa, and plans were made to erect a strong fence nearby to store food for winter use by antelope and other game animals, if needed. Chittenden thought the field would yield 100 to 200 tons of hay. The main ditch, built in 1903 to bring water from the Gardner

River to the field, was enlarged in 1904. Chittenden attributed the heavy cost of the ditch work to constructing an escape ditch for storm and snow water to prevent the destruction of the alfalfa field. The escape ditch carried the water around and beyond the railroad station, built beyond the Roosevelt Arch, releasing it in the valley below. Chittenden's estimate of costs for the fieldwork during 1904 was \$2,100.⁷⁴

To improve the arch area further, six of twelve sequoia trees shipped to the park by the Interior Department, "with a view to their propagation in the park," were planted near the arch in 1905. Pitcher believed that if the park were "successful in growing these trees, they [would] in the future be a matter of great interest to the tourists."⁷⁵ The recent creation of Sequoia National Park in 1890—a spot where tourists gathered just to admire the great trees—was undoubtedly the incentive behind this experiment. Pitcher's interest in transplanting sequoias to the Yellowstone area was also in keeping with landscape designers' ideas at the turn of the century. While the sequoia was not native to Yellowstone, it was an indigenous American species, and the idea of propagating native American species—as opposed to exotic species from overseas—was popular at the end of the nineteenth century.⁷⁶ It would be another three decades before park officials realized that species not native to the region did not belong in a national park. Pitcher's sequoia experiment failed; while native to America, the species could not adapt to the Yellowstone area's arid conditions. Much to Pitcher's chagrin, and despite great efforts and a professional gardener who followed all the instructions attached to the trees, the twelve small sequoias died.⁷⁷

To learn more about the region's weather, the chief of the U.S. Weather Bureau, Professor Willis L. Moore, suggested that a weather station be established on Capitol Hill at Mammoth Hot Springs, with a substation at Lake. Pitcher readily agreed. In 1903, a "handsome frame building" was constructed between two other newly built structures: the Army Corps of Engineers' office and the Yellowstone Park Transportation Company's stables. The weather station was used for several decades.⁷⁸

By 1904, the issue of the fort's size had arisen again. For Pitcher, the fort was just too small to be both comfortable and functional. It "was built and equipped," he lamented to the secretary of the interior, "for the accommodation of two troops of cavalry, but it is now garrisoned by three." The park required the manpower of three garrisons, and really should have four, Pitcher

argued. The problem was that additional troops would require additional quarters. Pitcher was aware that the existing fort had been designed to allow for expansion, and that "the plans for the necessary buildings [were] on file in the War Department." He tied his request for more space to issues of aesthetics and national pride. "This post is seen and visited by many distinguished people from all over the world," he wrote, "and for this reason, if for none other, it should be made a model post in every way."⁷⁹ There were other reasons, of course, to expand the post: the protection of the park depended on the military's being able to use as many men as possible to police the territory, and four troops were better than three. Also, the army would benefit, as better military instruction could take place "in and about the post, which would be of benefit to the men, and also give our many visitors some idea of what is being done in the Army in the way of drill and instruction."⁸⁰

Pitcher's request was not granted immediately, causing him to repeat his complaint and concomitant request for additional housing for troops throughout his last three years as acting superintendent. In his annual report for 1905, for example, he advised the secretary of war that when the fort was established in 1892, there were about 4,000 visitors, in contrast to the more than 26,000 visitors counted that year. The population of the surrounding region had also increased dramatically, and the army's protection and conservation activities had grown. Finally, he directed the secretary's attention to the fact that since 1903, the army's board of general officers, the commanding general of his department, and the chief of the general staff (in 1904) had all recommended the enlargement of Fort Yellowstone.⁸¹ Unfortunately, Pitcher would leave the park before his wish was granted.

Between 1903 and 1905, additional structures were built in the park; they were just not the ones Pitcher was looking for. In 1903, the U.S. Fish Commission constructed "a small frame building at the West Thumb of the Yellowstone Lake, for the purpose of eyeing the eggs of the black-spotted [cutthroat] trout."⁸² In 1904 and 1905, a new post exchange was built to replace the old one, which was deemed too small by Pitcher and the various inspectors general who had visited the post over the years.⁸³ This new post exchange was well-built, and included a much-needed gymnasium and library, even if the inspector general who saw it under construction was disappointed that it was not "a more splendid structure built of stone."⁸⁴ The assistant adjutant general from the



Fort Yellowstone Post Exchange. 1917.

U.S. Army Headquarters Department of Dakota in St. Paul, Minnesota, agreed: “It is respectfully submitted,” he wrote to Pitcher, “that at this station, the one which is probably seen by more foreigners than any other, save, perhaps, West Point, a more dignified shelter for the troops of the country would be in better keeping with the hundreds of thousands of dollars which are annually spent on the improvement of the park.” Specifically, he regretted that the new post exchange was of frame construction. “This seems to me to be a mistake,” he equivocated, “with good stone for building purposes within reasonable distance.”⁸⁵ His disappointment was in keeping with the War Department’s notion of the normative nature of structures built at military posts. Already “[b]y 1893,” wrote the authors of the *Context Study of the United States Quartermaster General Standardized Plans, 1866–1942*, “the Secretary of War noted that in ‘all posts which give the promise of permanency it has been the aim of the Department to construct buildings of brick, stone, or other enduring material and of solid workmanship.’”⁸⁶ While not built entirely of stone, the exchange was of solid enough workmanship to last for more than a century. Visitors can still see it today when they tour Fort Yellowstone.

The exchange’s design, consistent with other post architecture of the time, was Colonial Revival, a style that, as the *Context Study* explained, was popular “as a wave of patriotism, combined with an increasingly mature national awareness and a desire to return to the ‘good old days’ swept the country.” Just as “the middle class was attracted to Colonial Revival buildings, new in

the 1890s and 1900s,” the report continued, “so were the architects who designed them for the Army and the members of congress who appropriated funds for their construction.”⁸⁷ The exchange was one story, with a raised brick foundation and frame, lap-sided walls, and a wooden-shingled, hipped roof. Its T-shaped plan allowed for a rear wing that housed the gymnasium. The most prominent feature of the building, according to Battle and Thompson, whose study of the fort buildings serves as the leading reference on the subject, is “a colonnaded entrance portico centered on the east elevation. The pediment of this portico,” they continued, “was covered with wood shingles, with a circular window centered on it.”⁸⁸

As the authors noted, the post exchange was an important building for the troops stationed in Yellowstone during the area’s long winters.⁸⁹ The facility provided a welcome source of entertainment and relaxation during what must have been a difficult period of privation. But if the life of a soldier stationed at the fort carried with it particular challenges, so did the life of a soldier stationed in one of the many outposts scattered throughout the park.

Soldier Stations and Snowshoe Cabins

Even with the presence of Camp Sheridan, and later, Fort Yellowstone, it would have been impossible for the army to police the park effectively without a system of outposts built throughout Yellowstone. Work

on constructing this additional protective front began during Superintendent Patrick Conger's tenure, but did not proceed in earnest until the army took control of the park and began building, throughout the park, a system of soldier stations and snowshoe cabins—named so after the snowshoes (actually long wooden skis) that soldiers and guides wore to maneuver through snow. Soldier stations were manned year-round, while snowshoe cabins were used only by soldiers on patrol. These cabins were built about ten miles, or a day's trek, from one another throughout the park, which allowed soldiers to cover quite a bit of territory without having to carry too much gear.

Within a couple of weeks of arriving in the park, Captain Moses Harris began work on a system of protective measures still in use today: year-round, regular patrols from outposts throughout the park. Harris immediately stationed detachments at all of the sites that former Superintendent Wear's assistants had occupied—Norris Geyser Basin, the Lower Geyser Basin, the Upper Geyser Basin, the Lower Falls of the Yellowstone, Riverside, and Soda Butte on the Cooke City Road.⁹⁰ While bad weather forced Harris to withdraw most of his men to Camp Sheridan during that first winter (the men stationed at Soda Butte remained at their post), he very soon established a winter-use program for the cabins.

Similar to park rangers today, Harris's men stationed at these outposts received orders to protect the park, its wildlife, and its visitors. In his annual report for 1887, Harris reported that the troops at the detached stations had been instructed not only to enforce all rules and regulations of the Department of the Interior, but also "to discover and prevent the spread of forest fires, to protect visitors to the Park from any abuse or extortion by stage drivers or other persons, and generally to preserve respect for law and order."⁹¹

To help him and his men negotiate the unknown territory of the park, Harris used one of his predecessor's assistants as a scout and guide. He had wanted to hire three guides—C. J. Baronett, William McClellan, and Edward Wilson—but received the authority and funding, in 1886, to hire only one at a time.⁹² First, Harris hired C. J. "Jack" Baronett. When Baronett resigned in the summer of 1887, Harris hired Edward Wilson, whose "zealous and untiring . . . discharge of his duties" greatly impressed all the acting superintendents with whom he worked until his suicide in July 1891.⁹³ According to Haines, Wilson "made the first winter patrol for protective purposes (1888), thereby proving that winter travel

in the back-country was practicable."⁹⁴ Indeed, after Wilson's experience, soldiers used these early stations and the later snowshoe cabins year-round as bases for backcountry excursions.

By the fall of 1890, Harris's replacement, Captain F. A. Boutelle, had plans to extend the outpost system by building additional cabins where necessary. He envisioned a series of cabins from which soldiers could pursue their efforts to protect park resources. Indeed, Boutelle was responsible for creating the network of snowshoe cabins found throughout the park today. Interior Secretary Noble approved the building of six additional cabins, but authorized Boutelle to spend no more than \$100 on each one.⁹⁵ In a decision that would come back to haunt the department, Noble denied Boutelle's request for \$75 for sleeping bags, on the grounds that they were too expensive. He asked Boutelle to look into purchasing ones that would "answer the purpose" for "considerably less."⁹⁶

Shortly after Boutelle was replaced by Captain Anderson on February 15, 1891, President Benjamin Harrison set aside the nation's first timber reserve, the Yellowstone Timber Land Reserve, a large area that wrapped around part of the park and extended 25 miles to the east and 8 miles to the south. Because Anderson bore responsibility for providing the same protection for this new reserve as he did for the park, he felt it was important to establish a new outpost near the park's southern boundary, close to the junction of the Lewis and Snake rivers. The park's large elk herds, and the increase in settlements near Jackson, Wyoming, and Henry's Lake, Idaho, also influenced his decision. Anderson sent a crew to the area during the spring of 1892, to build a "hut" (a regular station) and stables at Polecat Creek, just south of the park boundary, and to supply the station with sufficient hay for use during the winter of 1892–1893.⁹⁷ In his report of 1892, Anderson mentioned that he would keep the station at Polecat Creek "garrisoned by a dismounted party, with snowshoes, all winter," because, as he put it, he "fully realize[d] that poaching in that vicinity need[ed] increased attention." He also mentioned that he had added an outpost at West Thumb and a year-round station in the Riverside area.⁹⁸

Despite the army's efforts to stop poaching, the slaughter of game persisted. The problem was not necessarily the number of outposts, or the number of men stationed at them; rather, it was finding the right men for the job. "My great trouble," Anderson wrote, "is to

get uncommissioned officers to put in charge of [the soldiers] who are able and disposed to cope with the class of men who form the poaching population. . . . I need at least two more scouts for this purpose.”⁹⁹ The use of scouts—men experienced in the ways of the mountains and familiar with poachers—was essential to the success of the snowshoe cabins as protective devices. As Haines wrote, “The scouts passed along the lore of their way of life, the use of skis, how to dress and what to carry on patrols, where to travel and what to look for, and, occasionally, how to get out of a tight scrape.” Haines believed that these scouts were essentially training “a nucleus of rangers for the civilian National Park Service when it took over administration from the army.”¹⁰⁰

Indeed, regular soldiers on duty at headquarters sometimes lacked necessary preparation for their mission. For example, in 1899, when a lieutenant colonel of the Sixth Cavalry visited the fort as acting inspector general, he noticed that “a number of the men, particularly the recruits, need[ed] . . . more of the individual [cavalry] drill.” The officer attributed this need for remedial work to “the nature of the duties at this post, and the limited time for instruction, . . .” and recommended that, “as far as practicable, only well instructed men be assigned to the troop at this post.” While they were on the whole good men, he noted, they were rather young and inexperienced.¹⁰¹

In his annual report for 1894, Captain Anderson greatly regretted that he did not have the manpower to protect the park and the new timber reserve and still have his men “perform all of their ordinary military duties.” He also decried the fact that he still had only one citizen scout to aid in all this protective work. He felt that a station near the mouth of Thorofare (then “Thoroughfare”) Creek would be a great help in this effort, but didn’t feel it was feasible at the time due to his limited personnel and the site’s long distance from the supply source at Mammoth Hot Springs.¹⁰² Remoteness was also a problem with the outpost on the Snake River, which had proven less successful than Anderson had hoped. “It is too far away to be easy of supervision,” he wrote. “It is located in a part of the country much frequented by hunting parties, and the section under its protection is too extended and too rough to permit very effective scrutiny.”¹⁰³

By 1895, things had improved, and Anderson was well pleased with the park’s system of outposts and the work done by the men stationed at them. While the work was hard, “involving much riding in summer,

exposure to heat and to cold, much snowshoe work in winter, and the incurring of many dangers,” a “better class of soldiers” was drawn to the station life, Anderson reported, and they were eager to apply for “this sort of service.” Anderson recognized that it was the “freedom and the ease of the life that [made] this duty very popular.”¹⁰⁴ That same year, Anderson added one station for winter use by one sergeant and three men near the Mud Volcano area. “The object of this new station,” he explained, “was the protection of the bison that winter in the Hayden Valley.”¹⁰⁵

Anderson also received authorization in 1895 to use park appropriations for “improvement in the employment of additional scouts.” This approval may have been the result of Anderson’s increasing impatience with the lack of funds available for administration and protection of the park. Since the failure of Congress to appropriate funds for the administration of the park in 1886, acting superintendents were only allowed to expend incoming lease revenues. In 1894, Anderson was allowed, as he put it, “the munificent sum of \$250,” which was nearly all used for cleaning up trash and other detritus left behind by roadside campers. He even had had to use his own funds to pay for his soldiers’ meals, because both the War Department and the Department of the Interior refused to approve funding. Anderson placed the blame squarely on the shoulders of the Interior Department, as the expense “was incurred in the proper ‘management’ of the Park,” even if, as the department argued, the “bills were incurred by people in military service.” “A consequence of such [Department of the Interior] rulings,” Anderson seethed, “must be to dishearten and discourage any superintendent, who, no matter what his enthusiasm may be, will naturally feel averse to paying a tax on his own efficiency.”¹⁰⁶

By 1897, visitation to the park, which had been down for several years due to the 1893 depression and railroad strikes, increased again, and all of the troops were kept on the park’s main roads to prevent traffic accidents. The increase in visitors prompted Colonel Young, Anderson’s successor, to ask for one additional troop of cavalry or one company of infantry. Because the army ignored this request, Young had to abandon “two important summer outposts.”¹⁰⁷ Luckily, the fire threat was not high during the 1897 season. In a letter to the interior secretary that July, Young asked for money to construct three additional outpost cabins, some temporary shacks for snowshoe parties, and provision boxes for the temporary shacks.¹⁰⁸

Despite the continued lack of staff, Young made at least one major contribution to the station system: he instituted a method of recordkeeping for each of the outposts, a tradition still in place today. Soldiers were required to keep a logbook with an accounting of the day's events, including numbers of miles traveled; numbers of men used; destination of travel; type of travel (snowshoes, skis, horseback or foot); number, location and kind of game seen; and weather statistics. They then had to compile and send to headquarters a monthly report based upon this accumulated data.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, Young gave his men instructions regarding use and care of the snowshoe cabins:

All persons are enjoined to use the rations in the snowshoe cabins only in case of necessity; never under any circumstances to waste any of them and to always to leave the cabins and their contents secure and in good condition. The ax and shovel must be left inside, the comforts hanged [sic] up, the cooking utensils left clean and dry and the food in its box secure from mice, etc. Enough dry wood for one night should always be left in the cabin.¹¹⁰

Young's successor, Captain Erwin, lauded the protective system put in place by his predecessors. "The system of enforcing [the rules and regulations] by means of soldiers stationed at nearly regular distances on the usually traveled routes, and who patrol these routes . . . and . . . who are always present at the most interesting points, preventing their desecration and the destruction of the natural phenomena, has been established for some years, and no better could be devised," he wrote in his 1898 annual report. Soldiers also recorded information about visitors to the park.¹¹¹ Such records helped the administration to track and monitor tourists' movements.

In 1899, nine stations were in use (at Norris Geyser Basin; the Lower Geyser Basin; the Upper Geyser Basin; West Thumb; Lake Station, near the Lake Hotel; the Grand Canyon; Soda Butte; Riverside; and Snake River).¹¹² Captain Brown, who replaced Captain Wilder (who had replaced Erwin), proposed adding two more: one "in the extreme northwestern corner of the park" (what would become Gallatin Station in 1910), "and the other in the southwest corner" (what would become Bechler River Station in 1910). "Under the present conditions," he argued in his proposal to the interior



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #22735

Norris Soldier Station, pre-1908.

secretary for an additional \$1,912.50, "these sections where there is much game must be protected by the detachments from Riverside and Snake River, respectively, which are too distant to do this efficiently."¹¹³ In the meantime, he was able to "modify dispositions" somewhat for the winter of 1899 by "abandoning the Thumb and Upper Geyser Basin as stations [and] changing the number of men at others." Furthermore, he intended to "establish within a few days [of writing his report] a new station about 10 miles northeast of [Mammoth], on the east side of the Yellowstone River, to cover what is known as the Hellroaring country."¹¹⁴

To facilitate patrolling from these well-spaced stations, "a number of snowshoe cabins [were] constructed at about a day's trip apart." According to Brown, these snowshoe cabins and the supplies they contained—"a small amount of food . . . together with bedding, fuel, matches, cooking utensils, etc."—were indispensable. Without them, as he put it, "trips of only one day at a time, or at most only two or three days, could be made from permanent stations, as the travel has to be made on skées [sic], . . . and such short scouts would leave a large part of the game country entirely unprotected."¹¹⁵

Patrolling the park from these outposts—stations and cabins alike—differed markedly depending on the season. In the summer, anywhere from three to ten enlisted men and one noncommissioned officer were positioned at each station. During these busy tourist months, they patrolled primarily along the park's main roads. During fall and winter, the number of men at each station varied, as did the areas they patrolled. Brown noted that "frequent trips" were made from the stations and cabins "by small detachments, accompanied by the

civilian scouts”; there were “from two to four of these parties out continually during the hunting season.” They scouted areas “where the game usually range[d] and where the poaching would most probably be done.”¹¹⁶ According to Brown’s “Instructions for winter patrolling,” which included a list of snowshoe cabins used at the time, soldiers were supposed to take certain routes into the country around their cabins on a regular basis, so as to patrol the park effectively. By 1900, there were 21 cabins, including the following: Coulter Creek Cabin, Boundary Creek Cabin, Lewis River Cabin, Park Point Cabin, Astringent Creek Cabin, Proposition Creek Cabin, Trappers Creek Cabin, Trout Creek Cabin, Willow Creek Cabin, Hellroaring Creek Cabin, and Bartlett Cabin.¹¹⁷

Captain G. W. Goode, who replaced Brown in July 1900, decided to retain use of the Thumb station late into the fall, to monitor hunting parties returning from the Jackson Hole area, and to cover the areas thought critical by Brown by putting a “detachment with a civilian scout at Knowles cabin [near Crevice Creek] to watch the Hellroaring country, and have the southwest corner of the reservation frequently scouted from the Snake River station during the fall and winter.” Like Brown, Goode found the cabins highly useful: “they are most effective as a means of protection during the fall and winter,” he wrote, “the scouts being enabled to cover practically the entire reservation and penetrate to localities which would otherwise be inaccessible at a time when poachers are at work.” In his recommendations, Goode made a strong case for the stations Brown had wanted, plus some others. His proposal included a station near the southwest corner of the park (on the Bechler River), one at the southeast corner (on Thorofare Creek), one near the northwest corner (on the Gallatin River or Fan Creek), one where the southern boundary crosses the Snake River—“present Snake River station to be abandoned,” he wrote—and one at the town of Gardiner, Montana.¹¹⁸

Goode appreciated the contributions made by civilian scouts—“their work, in conjunction with that of the local magistrate, has been . . . the salvation of the game,” he wrote—and he recommended increasing their number to ten. These civilian scouts “know the country and are trained woodsmen in all seasons,” he reasoned, “whereas the soldier, as a rule, is replaced before he has time to become proficient in such duties.” In essence, Goode argued for a permanent force of expert park employees who could enforce the rules and provide

assistance to visitors no matter which acting superintendent was in office. Goode advocated providing “suitable quarters” for scouts at Fort Yellowstone and the Lower Geyser Basin, and dividing the park into districts “to be constantly patrolled . . . after the manner of game wardens.”¹¹⁹

When Captain Pitcher replaced Goode as acting superintendent in May 1901, he and Chief Engineer Chittenden, whose men also used the stations, recommended enlarging and improving them to be “as neat and comfortable as possible.” These changes were necessary, Pitcher wrote, “for the men who occupy them suffer many hardships, especially during the winter, when they are entirely cut off from the outside world for several months.”¹²⁰ Pitcher and Chittenden also recommended adding stations so the total number was “12, and possibly 13.” At \$2,000 each, including outhouses, and considering the substantial distances across which many of the building supplies would have to be transported, Chittenden figured that the project would cost \$25,000.¹²¹ But a shortage of carpenters during the following year prevented any major improvements to the stations, and without authorization to enlarge stations and add new ones, Chittenden’s men could do little more than repair the present station houses, which they did between 1901 and 1903. In 1902, Chittenden’s men tore down the soldier station on the Snake River and removed it “to a point where the road crosses the boundary of the park.”¹²² In 1903, Chittenden wrote that a new station house and stable would be built at Gardiner before the end of the year.¹²³ He also told Pitcher in September of that year that in 1904, he would erect “three good buildings at Tower Falls, and one in the Gibbon Canon.”¹²⁴

Three new station houses were built in 1904 and early 1905: one at the Thumb of Yellowstone Lake, one east of Sylvan Pass on the East Entrance road, and one at Soda Butte, along with an officer’s “dog house” and barn. Chittenden had planned to build the Soda Butte station nearer to Cooke City, Montana, before the snow closed down operations for the year, but did not.¹²⁵ His men also constructed “small quarters for officers’ use” at eleven of the stations.¹²⁶

When the inspector from the Adjutant General’s Office visited Yellowstone in September 1904, he recommended rebuilding the post’s sheds and corrals “in a neat and substantial manner, suitable to the surroundings,” and reserving a small amount of money “to improve the interior finish [of the patrol stations] and render the lodges cheerful in winter.” The inspector maintained

that the men who lived in the stations were “isolated for at least six months in the year, and [therefore] extra allowance should be made for their comfort and contentment.”¹²⁷ In September 1905, an inspector again noted some deficiencies in the stations: the station at the Upper Geyser Basin had a latrine and bathroom built out over the same stream from which, just 50 yards below, the men procured their drinking and cooking water. There was also a problem with the water supply at the Tower Fall station, and because the structure there was old, with a dirt roof, the inspector recommended building another station where there was more water. He also recommended extending telephone lines to every station, and had one final complaint: “The enlisted men on patrol duty along the roads wear shirts and no coats while on said duty.” In the days before a cooler summer wardrobe was added to the uniforms of military officials, this complaint proved difficult to remedy.¹²⁸

Wildlife Policy and Tourist Management

During the twenty-odd years this chapter covers, acting superintendents enforced a number of policies, including those passed down from the Department of the Interior and Congress and those of their own making with respect to wildlife, fire, and visitor management. These policies affected both the natural and the built environment as small steps were taken toward providing better public access to sites so visitors could appreciate the park’s unique features. For example, additional trails and comfort facilities were built during this time, as were a fish hatchery, enclosures for game animals, and informative signs. Finally, active management of the park began, as the acting superintendents undertook control of both a rudimentary budget and a vital force of men in charge of protecting the park and its visitors.

While decisions regarding wildlife and tourist management and a public access infrastructure took longer to evolve, protective policies affecting the park’s thermal features were developed right away. For example, one of the first decisions Captain Harris made was to forbid free-roaming livestock in the park, as the danger that livestock posed to thermal features had been evident as early as 1883, when John Dean, an assistant superintendent to Patrick Conger, had observed that the “cattle belonging to the Park Improvement Company [were] giving much trouble and doing considerable damage by

running over the formations.” “The Company should have a herder with them at all times,” he wrote that July.¹²⁹ Because the problem remained unresolved in 1886, Harris chose to act. “I have . . . found it necessary to forbid the turning loose of stock to graze in the vicinity of the Hot Springs and Geyser formations,” he wrote in his first annual report. “This practice,” he added, “was not only a source of annoyance to visitors, but of much injury to the formations.”¹³⁰

Of course, Harris had more to worry about than just free-roaming stock when it came to the defacement of thermal features. Tourists, in search of souvenirs and a “good time,” habitually marred the park’s curiosities. Harris had little patience with these “shallow-minded visitors” who took pleasure in etching their names into the formations, and broke off pieces to take home. “It may be said without exaggeration,” he reported in 1886, “that not one of the notable geyser formations in the Park has escaped mutilation or defacement in some form.” Another favorite pastime of offenders was disrupting eruptions of the geysers by throwing sticks, logs, and other debris into them.¹³¹ “Nothing short of the arrest and expulsion from the Park of a number of these offenders, who have the outward appearance of ladies and gentlemen, will probably be effectual to stop the practice,” Harris lamented in 1887.¹³²

In fact, arrest and expulsion was the only recourse available to Harris and his troops for these and other offenses in those days prior to the Lacey Act, and Harris relied on the practice as “indispensable to the proper protection of life and property.”¹³³ He felt it was effective to have “some punishment, or at least inconvenience,” follow any violation of the rules and regulations, and faithfully attempted to make those rules and regulations known. “By a liberal distribution and posting of the published rules and regulations and by timely admonition and warning,” he wrote in 1889, “it has been the endeavor to prevent the commission of offenses rather than to seek opportunities to inflict penalties.”¹³⁴

With the Lacey Act still seven years away, Harris pleaded for “an established form of government for the Park,” with “such legislation as shall define the jurisdiction of the Territorial courts within the Park, so as to permit the same powers which they now have with reference to other reservations, and the enactment of a stringent law for the protection of [for example] the game.”¹³⁵ Harris did not benefit from such legislation while he was acting superintendent, and he regretted it: “The inadequacy of mere rules and regulations, unsup-

ported by any appearance of force or penalties for their infraction soon become apparent,” he declared, “and there has been hardly a report rendered relating to the Park during the 18 years of its existence in which the necessity of some further provision of law for its preservation and government has not been urged.”¹³⁶

In addition to “some definite and well-considered scheme of government,” Harris also wanted more troops.¹³⁷ This appeal was answered in July 1888, by Secretary of War Endicott. Beginning that summer, an additional company of soldiers, the Twenty-second Infantry, under the command of Second Lieutenant T. M. Moody, were on duty in the geyser basins and other points throughout the park. Harris told the secretary of the interior that the additional force would “greatly facilitate the enforcement of the established rules and regulations” in areas of the park “previously unguarded.”¹³⁸

Troops patrolling the park and stationed at the outposts were responsible for many tasks. Protecting the park from vandalism was just part of their regimen. They also had to watch out for fire and poachers, and were responsible for a rudimentary form of wildlife management. As Haines noted, the military officers in charge of the park’s welfare around the turn of the century became actively involved in “The Yellowstone Crusade,” the “new policy of absolute protection of the Park’s wildlife.”¹³⁹ The acting superintendents were largely responsible for this crusade. Historian Paul Schullery has acknowledged that several were conservation-minded, noting that some “were made honorary members of the Boone and Crockett Club and became eloquent spokesmen for the conservation movement.”¹⁴⁰

Harris’s interpretation of the policy of “absolute protection” amounted to feeding elk along the roadways and instigating close observation of buffalo “for several years to determine with any certainty the number of these animals, [and] whether or not they are diminishing in numbers.”¹⁴¹ Unlike his successors, Harris did not include a predator control component in his approach. While he believed there were animals “not worthy of protection, chief among which is the skunk,” Harris did not succumb to popular worries that carnivores were decimating the park’s herds of elk or bison. “[T]he fears of those who think the game animals may be exterminated by the carnivora may be considered as without present foundation,” he wrote in 1888.¹⁴²

Harris also did not favor the introduction of wildlife to the park, even with the goal of augmenting its diminishing numbers of bison. When he was invited

to purchase bison and place them in the park as part of an effort to conserve the quickly disappearing species, he declined, replying: “It is not the policy of the government to endeavor to make this Park attractive, by making a collection of domesticated animals, but rather to preserve the reservation in its natural condition and to promote the existing game animals so that they may breed in security.”¹⁴³

Harris was so successful in deploying troops to protect the park that by the end of his tenure as acting superintendent in 1889, the park had a system of well-equipped and well-mounted patrols to protect its wonders and wildlife. At one point, a visiting Harvard scientist, Charles Sargent, complimented the military presence and suggested that “the guardianship of all the nation’s forests should be confined to the Army and that forestry should be taught at West Point.”¹⁴⁴

When Captain Boutelle took over from Harris, he found the park in good order. “Harris’s management has left matters in the Park in so healthy a condition that little trouble is apprehended in its government,” he wrote in his “Supplemental Report” in the summer of 1889. Because the winter snowfall had been light, and the spring early and dry, Boutelle’s immediate concern was a lack of firefighting equipment. Boutelle maintained that a raging fire could wreak havoc on a watershed and resulting water flow to the surrounding area, and he feared the worst. He was also concerned about potential harm to the beauty of the park. Accordingly, Boutelle sought an appropriation to cover the cost of clearing all downed timber at least 100 yards from either side of the roads and trails. He also advocated the creation of a system of regularly controlled camp sites located at intervals of a few miles. These, he felt, would facilitate regular patrols and make it easy to ensure that campfires were extinguished. His wishlist also included two additional water wagons, more rubber buckets, axes, and shovels.¹⁴⁵

Unfortunately, Boutelle did not receive the extra equipment he needed in time. After a private citizen paid \$40 for the purchase of rubber buckets—“Would that Congress would take such an interest in the protection of the Park before it is too late,” Boutelle chided in his annual report for 1890—Boutelle pressed his request for “two tanks and the necessary number of draught animals for the transportation of water.” “Congress should deal generously with [the park],” he wrote. “Language and art have so far failed to properly paint the beauty of the Grand Canon,” he reminded the secretary of the interior; “a single fire would seriously mar its grandeur by



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #1659

Soldiers with captured poacher Ed Howell and Howell's dog. 1894.

destroying its fringe of forest.”¹⁴⁶ When Boutelle looked at a forest, he saw a water storage system. For him, the forest fire that wiped out timber spelled drought to all those “dependent upon a generous flow of the streams after the cessation of spring rains.”¹⁴⁷ Hence, Boutelle desired to expand the system of snowshoe cabins for fire control as well as protection from poaching.

If Harris’s position on wildlife management favored the “preservation” aspect of the park’s mandate, Boutelle’s position was strong on the “enjoyment” angle. With just a small appropriation, for instance, Boutelle felt he could erect a roadside enclosure for elk, deer, and antelope, to be viewed by passing visitors. “The only expense attending [the animals’] support,” he wrote, “would be a little hay for winter.”¹⁴⁸ In 1890, to offset the game’s habit of seeking “the high points during the fly season,” he proposed an elk enclosure on Swan Lake Flat, and a bison enclosure in Hayden Valley so that “all [tourists] may at least see a sample.”¹⁴⁹ Boutelle also believed that predator populations should be reduced by extermination, and sought permission from the secretary of the interior for his troops to take part in an extermination plan.¹⁵⁰ “While they [predators] may be something of a curiosity to visitors,” he wrote, “I hardly think them an agreeable surprise.”¹⁵¹ Secretary Noble opposed Boutelle’s plan to kill predators: “Upon further reflection, I have to say that I deem the killing of animals of any kind, whether savage or others, in the Park, will be a step in the wrong direction. You are directed not to permit the same under any circumstances,” he wrote to Boutelle in August 1890.¹⁵²

While Boutelle’s plan to reduce predator numbers was quashed, his interest in capturing wild animals for human viewing and enjoyment bore fruit—though not in the way he intended. During the fall of 1890, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution Samuel P. Langley took up correspondence with Interior Secretary Noble about the prospect of supplying animals from Yellowstone National Park to the National Zoological Park in Washington, D.C. Noble asked Boutelle to carry out the plan of sending animals forthwith. “I may add,” Noble penned to Boutelle, “that it is in my opinion a most desirable thing to do for the good of the people and one in which I shall take great pleasure in having hearty co-operation in.” He would, he wrote, supply monies from the contingency fund to offset any hardship incurred in the capture and transfer of the animals. “This will accomplish one of the purposes for which the Yellowstone Park was established,” he concluded.¹⁵³ Indeed, supplying animals for distant zoos was part of what historian James Pritchard referred to as “the older natural history approach to understanding wildlife in the park.” The practice of supplying “excess” animals to zoos, and for restocking range outside the Yellowstone region, was continued until well after the National Park Service was established in 1916.¹⁵⁴

Another proposal of Boutelle’s, and one upon which he acted very soon after arriving in the park, was the introduction of non-native fish into park waters. Boutelle’s plan received a favorable response from Colonel Marshall McDonald of the U.S. Fish Commission. In his history of the park, Haines wrote that McDonald’s



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #36953

Bison heads confiscated from poacher Ed Howell. 1894.

“interest in Boutelle’s proposal stemmed from his fledgling organization’s need of a proper outdoor laboratory in which to exercise its science.” McDonald was interested in developing “a sport fishery in what was then the only area of wild land under federal management.”¹⁵⁵ Boutelle’s mission was very similar: he wanted to improve fishing within the park and throughout the region fed by the waters originating in the park. Thus, in addition to the possibility of “pleasure-seekers” being able to enjoy fishing “within a few rods of any hotel or camp,” Boutelle believed that “the stocking of these waters [would] add vastly to the breeding-grounds of the tributaries of the Missouri and Snake Rivers and add immeasurably to the food supply obtained from those waters.”¹⁵⁶

Colonel McDonald began his fish-stocking project almost immediately. Seven thousand young, non-native trout were put in the west and middle forks of the Gardner River above Osprey Falls, the Firehole River above Kepler Cascades, and in the Gibbon River above Virginia Cascade.¹⁵⁷ By the end of July 1890, McDonald hoped to have 150,000 trout and salmon planted in the park’s rivers and lakes. An eager angler himself, Boutelle appreciated having park waters stocked with fish. It was “very desirable that all waters of this pleasuring ground for the people should be so filled with fish that all who come may enjoy the sport,” he wrote.¹⁵⁸

One area of wildlife policy upon which Boutelle and Harris agreed was the need for legislation supporting enforcement of the park’s rules and regulations. As Harris had before him, Boutelle chastised the Department of the Interior for failing to create a legal framework for

dealing with problems as they arose in the park. “The most embarrassing features of Park administration,” he wrote just after taking office, “appear to be the want of any law except such as is vested in the Secretary of the Interior in establishing rules and regulations.” Boutelle complained that this rendered the superintendent unable to distinguish legally between offenses as diverse as “breaking a small piece off a formation” and “carrying away a tourist’s trunk.” Boutelle had no suggestions at that time to remedy the situation; he merely wanted to “suggest that something should be done.”¹⁵⁹ In the following year, he recommended that Congress provide a civil commissioner “before whom . . . lawbreakers may be brought and properly punished.”¹⁶⁰

When Captain George Anderson came on duty in February 1891, he encountered the same troubles Harris and Boutelle had experienced: tourists continued to deface thermal features and disrupt geysers, poaching remained an issue, and there was still no framework within which to deal satisfactorily with legal issues. By the time Anderson left, however, two of those three problems were resolved.

In his first report, Anderson complained bitterly about tourist vandalism. “The most ceaseless vigilance is needed to prevent tourists from mutilating the beautiful formations in the Park,” he declared. “I do not believe,” he quipped, “10,000 men could *entirely* accomplish it.” While the ladies were the most notorious specimen hunters, according to Anderson, men had a bad habit of their own, namely “the persistence with which [they] will write their unlovely names on everything that is beautiful

within their reach. This form of barbarism is confined almost entirely to men, and, if we may judge from the writing, to the boorish and illiterate.”¹⁶¹

To deal with poaching, Anderson wanted to prohibit firearms completely within the park, “leaving with the superintendent the right to make carefully considered exceptions.” He also made no secret of his frustration about the lack of legislation to back the park’s rules. “It is a serious matter that so simple and much-needed a statute as the one granting legal force to park regulations can not be passed,” he complained. “It can antagonize no interests,” he reasoned, “except those of the poachers, with whom no friend of the park can have sympathy.”¹⁶²

The law for which Anderson and others had clamored for so long finally came about due to a poaching scandal that forced Congress’s hand. In March 1894, the “fortunate capture” of notorious poacher and scofflaw Ed Howell, whose numbers of illegal takings were enormous, brought the poaching issue to the front pages of newspapers and to the attention of the American people. As Anderson noted in his annual report for 1894, the “feeling aroused in the minds of the public by [Howell’s] act[s] of vandalism stirred Congress to prompt action, so that on May 7 an act for the protection of game in the Park received the President’s signature.” The Lacey Act, named for Iowa Representative John F. Lacey, created the framework necessary for punishing poachers. As Anderson noted, the Howell affair was, in one sense, “the most fortunate thing that ever happened to the Park, for it was surely the means of securing a law so much needed and so long overdue.”¹⁶³ The Lacey Act made illegal “all hunting, or the killing, wounding, or capturing at any time of any bird or wild animal, except dangerous animals, when it is necessary to prevent them from destroying human life or inflicting an injury.” It also authorized punishment for other crimes committed in the park and gave exclusive jurisdiction of the park to the United States. Thus, 22 years after the park’s creation, the secretary of the interior was finally able to publish rules and regulations with legal backing.¹⁶⁴

Anderson continued Boutelle’s policy of supplying animals for the National Zoo in Washington, D.C. In 1894, however, after passage of the Lacey Act, he stopped shipment temporarily, awaiting authorization from the Interior Department to continue—authorization he received shortly thereafter. While animals were awaiting shipment to the nation’s capital, Anderson noted, they provided a great source of interest and enjoyment

for tourists.¹⁶⁵ Because he had received some money for enclosures (\$300 in 1892), he drew up plans for a more elaborate structure and asked Secretary Noble for additional funds.¹⁶⁶ The acting secretary of the interior apparently thought the price tag for this new enclosure too high, however, and in 1894, Anderson reported that “nothing would probably be done in the matter.”¹⁶⁷

Corralling some animals for viewing and sending others off to zoos were not ways to guarantee the continued well-being of native species, and it was not long before Anderson realized that the park’s bison herd was in danger. In 1892, he acknowledged the difficulty of preserving their numbers, but promised to “devote my best energies to it.”¹⁶⁸ According to his reckoning, the herd had numbered about 400 until 1894, when, as he put it, the animals had “been more carefully watched and more accurately counted than ever before,” and only numbered about 200.¹⁶⁹ When their population had not apparently increased in the following year, Anderson proposed to spend \$3,000 in appropriations to construct an enclosure and feed as many bison as could be driven into it during the upcoming winter. In this way, Anderson believed that the park would be able to “retain a small herd and keep them nearly in a state of nature.”¹⁷⁰ This plan failed, however, when gamekeepers failed to capture the few animals that entered the enclosure as they waited for more to arrive.

By 1896, Anderson’s optimism about the bison had waned dramatically. He was only able to ascertain the existence of “25 or 30, and possibly 50.” His chances of saving the herd, he lamented, were doubtful. “The forces of nature and the hands of man are alike against them,” he wrote sadly, “and they seem to be struggling against an almost certain fate.”¹⁷¹ In addition, poachers continued to take bison scalps as quarry, speeding the population’s decline. But with the conviction of some poachers in 1896, Anderson felt better. “The effect of these trials and convictions has been most salutary,” he wrote, “and depredations will hereafter be less numerous. . . . Poachers will be more cautious in the future, as they are well aware that they will not again escape with so slight a punishment.”¹⁷²

While bison numbers dwindled, the introduction of non-native fish, especially trout, into the park’s streams, rivers, and lakes was, according to Anderson, an unmitigated success. Over the course of his tenure as acting superintendent, Anderson requested that more fish be introduced, or “planted.” In particular, he desired to see black bass introduced into some of the park’s lakes.

Although several attempts were made, none succeeded. The non-native trout did take, however, and as Anderson reported in 1894, it was “the general verdict of all who have fished here that no better fishing can be found anywhere in the world.” Until 1895, Anderson did not advocate any restrictions on fishing, which he felt was “sufficiently limited by climatic conditions.”¹⁷³ That year, however, he proposed to limit the minimum length of trout caught to six inches.¹⁷⁴ The size restrictions appeared in the *Instructions to Persons Traveling Through Yellowstone National Park* printed in 1897: “All fish less than 6 inches in length should at once be returned to the water, with the least damage possible to the fish,” the rules read. Also, anglers were instructed to collect no more fish than they needed for food.¹⁷⁵

The introduction of fish into the park’s waters might have led to good fishing, but not all have agreed over time that the program was a “success,” or even a good idea. While it would be some years before park officials began to see the fish planting program as a problem, it is now clear to historians and ecologists that the program, as Haines put it, was “not well coordinated and [was] . . . ill-conceived, if not [indiscriminate]—particularly the introduction of exotics at the expense of native species.” Haines referred to much of the program as “an impairment that must now be corrected through selective fishing.”¹⁷⁶ In his environmental history of Yellowstone, Paul Schullery wrote that “[t]he ‘Johnny Appleseed’ mentality of many land users, whether managers or the public, has done irreparable harm to native landscapes.” “Aquatic ecosystems,” he continued, “are exceptionally vulnerable to invasions of nonnative species.”¹⁷⁷ Schullery added that these early efforts on the part of “park enthusiasts for recreational fishing resulted in the serious alteration of the fauna of many of Yellowstone’s watersheds[:]; the native fish populations were disastrously damaged by overharvest and by the introduction of nonnative species; [and] some native species were extirpated.”¹⁷⁸

Anderson shared Boutelle’s concern for protecting the park from fires, and ordered that patrols leave regularly from cabins and stations to check for signs of conflagration. “The system of daily patrols from my numerous outposts has done much to prevent fires,” he proclaimed in 1895. “My rule is to have a man start every morning from each of these stations, carrying with him a bucket and a shovel with which to thoroughly extinguish any smoldering embers that may be found in the abandoned camps of tourists,” he explained.

“These patrols continue on their way until they meet similar patrols from the neighboring station, when, after a short halt, they retrace their steps in the afternoon to their own proper home.” By the middle of the season in 1895, soldiers had arrested numerous violators of the rule to extinguish all fires, and with the force of law behind them, officials made twelve convictions. Anderson cited the thoroughness of his system as the source of these good results.¹⁷⁹

Acting superintendents Young, Erwin, Wilder, Brown, and Goode also made policy decisions that affected carnivores, aquatic fauna, and bison in the park, and they, too, were appalled by tourists’ penchant for defacing park property. Colonel Young, for example, noted in 1897 that visitors seemed to suffer from a “mania for carving and writing names on guard rails, benches, etc., placed for the safety and convenience of visitors.” “It is contemplated,” he wrote wryly, “to erect a large bulletin board for the convenience of visitors next season affected with this insane passion, with columns for name and address, and a heading, ‘All fools and idiots required to register here only.’”¹⁸⁰

With respect to predators, Colonel Young believed that coyotes were especially destructive of young antelope, and he thus advocated poisoning them. With this move, he acted against the better judgment of “a few friends of the park,” who contended that “if the coyote is exterminated the gopher in time would eradicate the grass from the winter valley ranges.” “I do not concur in this opinion,” Young retorted, “and, request authority to reduce the number [of coyotes] so that they will not hunt in packs.”¹⁸¹ Captains Erwin, Brown, Goode, and Pitcher agreed with this policy. By 1904, Pitcher also believed it was necessary to exterminate cougars from the park; in that year alone, fifteen were killed.¹⁸² Of the next year, Pitcher wrote that carnivores such as “mountain lions, lynx, and coyotes” were “destroyed whenever the opportunity affords.” As he put it, predator control was “a matter of business and not of sport.” Only scouts and “certain good shots among the soldiers” were allowed to conduct the killing. Pitcher did not favor providing a general permit to kill predators, believing it “would result in endless trouble in the matter of protection of other game.”¹⁸³

Young and his immediate successors also supported the non-native fish introductions. In fact, Young and Erwin suggested that a fish hatchery be built in the park, and a few government men be trained in artificial propagation of trout.¹⁸⁴ This view was not shared by the

U.S. Fish Commission, but Erwin persisted. He believed that the park's position as a "reservoir drained by the principal rivers of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," made it "the most appropriate and suitable place in the United States" for a hatchery. As his predecessors had done, Erwin called for adequate appropriations to maintain the park both as a "pleasuring ground" for tourists and as source and supply of "natural phenomena." It "will be seen," he wrote:

that the park as a game and fish preserve has not its equal in the world; the variety is great, and it is eminently fitted to sustain this variety under the protection of the Government. An increase in appropriation means an increase in the means and facilities of protection, and as a national game preserve, which not only holds secure the remaining wild animals and game birds of this country, but enables them to breed and multiply, thus supplying the needs of neighboring States, it is deserving of an increased fund for this purpose.¹⁸⁵

With the fish planting program well underway, calls for a hatchery continued. Finally, in 1902, "a fish egg collection station was authorized."¹⁸⁶ While the head of the U.S. Fish Hatchery in Spearfish, South Dakota, selected a site on "Willow Creek" (today's Obsidian Creek) for the park's first hatchery, the West Thumb site (mentioned earlier) was chosen instead.¹⁸⁷ D. C. Booth, superintendent of this fisheries station for the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries, reported great success at collecting eggs, shipping them elsewhere—even as far as North Wales—and planting fry. In 1906, Captain Pitcher oversaw improvements at the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries buildings and grounds at West Thumb. The hatchery building got new windows, a cornice, and cedar shingle siding, which was left to weather while the trim was painted white. A log cottage and barn were also built on the premises.¹⁸⁸

While the park's exotic fish thrived, its native bison teetered on the brink of extinction. By 1897, the population had dwindled to around 24.¹⁸⁹ Publicly, Second Lieutenant Elmer Lindsley, who was in charge of the outposts and scouting duties during that period, hoped that with the poaching under control, bison numbers could increase. Privately, he remained skeptical. "Whether they will still decrease on account of natural causes only time can tell," he reported.¹⁹⁰ Acting Superintendent Erwin

was convinced that genetics were the problem, and recommended purchasing a few good bulls "to prevent the extermination of this herd from the evils of inbreeding."¹⁹¹ In 1901, Captain Pitcher echoed Erwin's call for new blood. He also guessed that the herd consisted of no more than 25 animals, and advocated starting a new herd and keeping it corralled, "turning the animals loose gradually as the herd increase[d]."¹⁹²

Congress provided \$15,000—half of what Pitcher estimated he would need—for the purchase of 30 to 60 bison and the construction of an appropriate enclosure for them.¹⁹³ This enclosure was larger and more substantial than the one Anderson had envisioned. Furthermore, Interior Secretary F. A. Hitchcock created the position of park gamekeeper, and in July 1902, the post was filled by Charles J. "Buffalo" Jones, a "crotchety" sort who got along well with Pitcher in the beginning, but ended up alienating him and others before resigning in September 1905.¹⁹⁴ While they were still on good terms, Jones and Pitcher set up a spot for the corral close to Mammoth Hot Springs, and purchased 15 to 18 cows from the Allard herd of Flathead Agency in Montana, and three bulls from the Goodnight herd of Texas. They also built a smaller corral near Pelican Creek, where the calves of the wild herd could mingle with purchased animals. Pitcher believed it would be necessary to familiarize the bison with humans so they did not flee the park when the summer season arrived. He also wanted to "feed and handle the new herd of buffalo in the same manner that domestic cattle are handled in this country," he wrote, "and before turning them loose to brand them 'U.S.' in such a way that they can always be identified as United States property."¹⁹⁵

By 1904, the new herd of bison numbered 39, and by 1906, 57. In that year, the young bison were moved to a spot on the Lamar River (at the mouth of Rose Creek), where it was possible to raise hay and keep them until, as Pitcher put it, "they have become thoroly [*sic*] at home." "After this has been accomplished," he continued, "they will be gradually turned loose, and it is believed that they will not wander far from the haystack which will at all times be kept on hand ready to be fed out to them." The older bison would remain at Mammoth, and in this way the herds would be divided "so that in case of sickness or disease of any kind in either band it would not necessarily be communicated to the other." Pitcher had a log cabin built for the gamekeeper at the Lamar River site, and a roughly one-square-mile parcel of "fine grazing land" enclosed for the bison.¹⁹⁶



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #27190

Antelope feeding in hay field on Gardiner Flats. 1904.

Thus began what would come to be known as the Lamar Buffalo Ranch.

The idea of feeding game animals was not new. Harris had entertained it, as had other acting superintendents. By 1906, several species were being fed artificially, especially during the winter. An alfalfa field at the North Entrance, for example, was, according to Pitcher, the salvation of the antelope herd.¹⁹⁷ In conjunction with the alfalfa field, Pitcher had a four-mile-long wire fence erected along the park's northern boundary to keep antelope in and domestic stock out.¹⁹⁸ Deer and mountain sheep were also fed. Pitcher thought it not unusual or even logically inconsistent to feed wild animals in this way. In fact, he thought it perfectly within the purview of park policy. "In order to be successful in keeping wild game on any reserve," he wrote in 1905, "it is absolutely necessary either to preserve their natural feed . . . or to supply them with hay. . . . [E]ven where the natural supply of feed is preserved it is well to have a supply of hay on hand, in order to help out the weaker animals each spring . . . when the old grass is nearly all gone and before the new grass is ready for use. . . ." Another benefit of this policy, according to Pitcher, was its effect on animal behavior around humans: "[the feeding] has rendered them exceedingly tame and caused them to recognize man as their friend instead of an enemy," he wrote.¹⁹⁹

Pitcher did not favor close relations between all animals and humans, however. He found the situation at the hotels and camping sites where bears lingered, waiting to be fed, very dangerous. "It is a difficult matter to make some of the tourists realize that the bear in the park are wild," he wrote in 1902, "and that it is a dangerous matter to trifle with them." To warn tourists, he published and posted an official circular that

prohibited "the interference with or molestation of bear or any other wild game in the park, etc." It also forbade feeding bears "except at regular garbage piles." Pitcher wanted these prohibitions incorporated into the park's regulations so that violators could be brought before the U.S. Commissioner assigned to the park.²⁰⁰

A Public-Access Infrastructure

As it turned out, acting superintendents and their troops had more to manage than animals. It was becoming increasingly clear that managing people—and their garbage—was a full-time job. In 1887, for example, Captain Harris asked Congress for money to clean up the park. Whenever he could justify it, he told the secretary of the interior, he ordered his troops to clean up the geyser and hot-springs grounds, roadsides, and camping grounds, but he acknowledged that these acts were "a labor of love," rather than part of his men's official duties.²⁰¹ The modest sums he requested (\$3,000 in 1887 and 1888) were not asking too much, he asserted: "No other public pleasuring ground . . . of ever so humble a character, is maintained without the expenditure of a dollar for decency's sake," he chided in 1888. "Eminent men from all parts of the civilized world, scholars, law makers, divines, and soldiers come here, attracted by the fame of this land of wonders, and by the invitation implied in its dedication as a National Park, to have their senses offended and their enjoyment of nature's most wonderful and beautiful gifts destroyed by the presence of unsightly filth and rubbish."²⁰² Funds for such purposes, however, had not been granted since 1886, and would not be forthcoming for several more years.

Harris also wanted to improve information dissemination—in particular, to provide sign boards warning park visitors about dangerous places, and displaying the names of geysers and other points of interest. He unsuccessfully requested appropriations for this purpose and "generally to keep in order and in a decent condition this large reservation which has been by law declared 'a pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.'"

Harris's men also had to protect tourists from the twin perils of park tourism: the fickle forces of nature and commerce. Tourist numbers grew markedly during Harris's tenure—about 6,000 people visited the park during the 1888 season—and seeing to their safety and comfort was no small undertaking. Troops, with their

“polite but firm and decided manner,” had to ensure that visitors were safe both from the dangers of a wilderness experience and from exploitation by those who provided lodging and transportation in the park. Military order number 37, for example, disseminated on June 2, 1887, commanded troops “to protect visitors to the Park from any abuse or extortion by stage drivers or other persons.”²⁰³ Harris himself inspected the park’s accommodations to determine whether service was adequate. In his 1887 annual report, he urged the secretary to require that park lessees provide better accommodations for visitors.²⁰⁴ While he praised the lessees when their services were commendable, Harris remained alert for missteps on the part of private enterprise. In one of the first statements on record warning against potential avarice on the part of private concessioners, Harris wrote: “. . . I have been very forcibly impressed with the danger to which [the park] is subjected by the greed of private enterprise. All local influence centers on schemes whereby the Park can be used for pecuniary advantage. In the unsurpassed grandeur of its natural condition, it is the pride and glory of the nation; but, if, under the guise of improvement, selfish interests are permitted to make merchandise of its wonders and beauties, it will inevitably become a by-word and a reproach.”²⁰⁵

Later acting superintendents worried less about problems with private enterprise and more about problems with tourists. Anderson’s tenure in the park saw a decrease in the number of tourists entering the park. He attributed the decline, in part, to the 1893 economic depression and national rail strike, but reckoned that economic conditions could not be solely to blame, because the European-bound steamers were full of American tourists. Instead, he felt the general American public was either unaware of the park itself, or unaware of the ease with which it could be reached. Several times, he complained to the secretary that Americans did not know about the park, whereas foreigners did. He cited as an example the fact that information about the park was being taught in German public schools, and suggested producing a publication that would make “the mass of the people . . . realize what a store of wonders and beauties they have within their boundaries.”²⁰⁶ He wanted the publication to be written by a government employee and distributed for free.²⁰⁷

By 1897, travel to the park had increased such that more careful and exacting accounting measures were needed. An official with the U.S. Geological Society told the secretary of the interior that if all people entering the

park were registered and required to carry an entry permit to be shown throughout their travels, those entering with bad intentions might be discouraged.²⁰⁸ In 1898, Captain Erwin set up a system, involving outposts, to register visitors as they entered and traveled through the park. He then compared the numbers with those from previous years to see if the park was fulfilling its mission of being a “pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.” Not taking into account the anomalous year 1897, when the Christian Endeavorers came through the park on their way home from San Francisco (boosting park attendance to 10,680), park visitation was increasing satisfactorily, Erwin concluded. Indeed, the numbers rose to more than 6,500 in 1898.²⁰⁹

Unclean campsites had long been a significant problem in the park, and with so many people touring and camping in the park, the trouble worsened. While Captain Boutelle had favored the creation of a system of regularly controlled campsites, Anderson was reluctant. In June 1892, Secretary Noble instructed him to “establish proper camping places” on roads connected to the main road. Recognizing that people would otherwise choose to camp in scattered locations, Noble believed that prepared campsites might encourage usage.²¹⁰ However, Anderson opposed a proposed system of semi-permanent campsites, citing the potential that the sites would become “ill-kept, unsightly structures, [and] fit breeding places for vermin of all kinds.”²¹¹ He felt that camping parties were the “source of many annoyances in park management,” found them negligent in leaving campfires and careless about cleanliness, and stated that they were, in many cases, the worst offenders of specimen hunting and disfigurement of the park’s features.

By 1895, Anderson’s irritation at camping parties abated somewhat, after he initiated a registry system whereby he could better track their whereabouts.²¹² By 1896, he granted a license to W. W. Wylie, of Bozeman, Montana, to establish four “permanent camps,” which he found preferable to the previous situation, in which transportation operations had created camps that were unsightly and difficult to supervise.²¹³

Colonel Young also grappled with how best to deal with campers. In 1897, he stationed troops at frequent intervals along the roads, “to prevent accident and imposition and preserve good order.” But these guards could hardly manage the huge fields of spontaneous campsites that had sprung up throughout the park. These fields of campers were too hard to monitor, he felt, as it was difficult to “fix the responsibility of unclean camps and

unextinguished fires on the proper parties.” Young’s solution—to forbid free camping in the park for longer than two nights and to forbid camping or grazing stock at all between Gardiner and Mammoth—might have seemed drastic to some, but his reasons were sound. First, his solution would “prevent undue monopoly of the choicest camping places;” second, it would preserve winter feed for game. The area between Mammoth and Gardiner had become so popular that its cover of grass, vital to the antelope and mountain sheep that wintered there, was all but gone.

Young also took measures to improve safety, as well as the park’s appearance relative to campers. In the “Instructions to Persons Traveling through Yellowstone National Park,” he forbade camping “at a less distance than 100 feet from any traveled road,” and the hanging of any article “liable to frighten teams” within that area. Furthermore, he ordered that “[c]amp grounds must be thoroughly cleaned before they are abandoned, and such articles as tin cans, bottles, cast-off clothing, and other debris must be either buried or taken to some place where they will not offend the sight.”²¹⁴

Such stringent measures for dealing with careless campers were temporary, however. As a long-term solution, Young, like Boutelle, proposed setting up permanent camping areas. In a “Supplemental Report” issued three months after his annual report, Young told the interior secretary that he had recommended to park concessioners the Yellowstone Park Association (YPA) and the Yellowstone Park Transportation Company (YPTC) “a proposition to establish permanent camps, suitable in neatness, comfort, and convenience for a large number of visitors who desire to experience that mode of an outing in the park.”²¹⁵ Instead of YPA or YPTC taking on the camping concession, however, W. W. Wylie, with permission from the Interior Department, established permanent camps at Apollinaris Spring, the Upper Geyser Basin, Yellowstone Lake, and Canyon. The Wylie company also operated lunch stations at a point midway between Norris and the Lower Geyser Basin, and near Yellowstone Lake.²¹⁶

Even after these changes, campers remained a concern. Acting Superintendent Erwin noted that they were his troops’ primary people of concern in regard to policing and protecting the park.²¹⁷ The situation did not change much over the next few years. Though many people chose to see the park “The Wylie Way,” staying at the Wylie camps, others still camped on their own, with their own supplies. By 1906, when Captain

Pitcher managed the park, soldiers were still cleaning up the campsites of these latter visitors. When he realized that campers were not going to dispose of their refuse properly, Pitcher asked his men to dig holes “in order to afford camping parties places to dispose of cans and refuse.” He hoped to make “suitable signs” that winter “to instruct campers where to make their disposals.”²¹⁸

Camping was not the only issue raised by growing numbers of tourists. The lack of visitor facilities allowing public access to the park’s wonders was another. In 1897, Colonel Young requested that a commission composed of a U.S. Geological Survey employee, a private citizen, and an Army Corps of Engineers officer be appointed to advise park officials on the selection of saddle trails that would enable visitors to view the wonders and scenery of the park.²¹⁹ U.S. Geological Survey Director Charles D. Walcott reported to the secretary of the interior that it would be “a great addition to the Park to have a good horse trail constructed to some of the prominent peaks and points of interest.” He suggested a trail from Mammoth Hot Springs to the summit of Bunsen Peak, and then down the Gardner River past Osprey Falls; another to the top of Electric Peak that involved the outposts; and a third from the Canyon area to the summit of Mount Washburn.²²⁰

In 1900, Captain Chittenden of the Army Corps of Engineers, who was making great strides improving the park’s system of main roads, also began planning side roads and trails in order to improve visitor access to points of interest. He had side roads built that year, for example, to Lone Star Geyser and Inspiration Point, and improved one to Great Fountain Geyser. In addition, Chittenden devoted time to clearing existing trails that had long been neglected and that, in many cases, were blocked by fallen timber. The trails were used mostly by patrols, but some camping parties also used them to reach sites well off the main road. Neither Chittenden nor the acting superintendent had any plans for extending the trails in 1900, but Chittenden felt that the existing trails should be maintained.²²¹

During his years in Yellowstone, Captain Pitcher made great strides toward providing better visitor facilities. By the end of 1904, his men had repaired all of the mileposts along the main road, and corrected new mileposts on the Mammoth-to-Grand Canyon road via Tower Fall. Several informative signs noting, for example, points of interest relating to the Nez Perce trek through the park in 1877 were also erected.²²² Pitcher also had a new, half-mile side road built to the two petrified trees

located about 17 miles from Mammoth Hot Springs, on the road to Tower Fall. Plans were made to enclose the trees with iron fencing mounted on a wall, but only one tree was so enclosed; the other was destroyed by vandals. South of Mammoth, an unloading platform for stagecoaches (about 100' in length) was built at Apollinaris Spring. The entire area was cleared of dead and fallen timber. The spring was "boxed up, and conveyed into a suitable well, constructed of rough stones, with drinking cups attached for public use." Blind drains were covered with gravel, and gravel footpaths between the loading platform and the spring were constructed.²²³ Two 50' coach platforms were built at Mud Geyser, one for loading and one for unloading. Another 50' platform was built at the head of the newly built Upper Falls stairs, and large platforms with viewing seats were placed at the bottom.²²⁴

Pitcher rightly sensed that many interesting places were inaccessible to those unable to manage rock climbing, or to those who did not feel secure unless they were walking or standing on a well-built structure. Thus, he built a new Lower Falls stairway, 360' in vertical height and 700' long, with numerous seated landings along its descent, as well as a 150' stairway and a small seating platform at Grand View. Inspiration Point also got a new stairway with a viewing platform, and a small unloading platform at its top. At Artist Point, a viewing platform was erected on top of existing rocks, with a stairway leading to an unloading platform.²²⁵ All new stairways were built with heavy, 4' wide planks with an easy rise, "in order to allow people to ascend and descend who can not go unassisted."²²⁶ At Mammoth, a stairway was built to the floor of Devil's Kitchen (cave), and "an attractive well" was built near Orange Spring Mound.²²⁷ By the end of the 1906 season, Pitcher planned to have all the newly built structures stained a color that would "blend in with the surrounding rocks, in order that they may not detract any from the beauty of the canyon."²²⁸ This early call for harmony between the built and natural environments, first championed by the Army Corps of Engineers, would echo through the years as park officials grappled with the notion of building in what was supposed to be a haven of natural beauty.

In addition to new viewing facilities, new outhouses were built. Anderson's administration had made some improvements in this area. In 1892, he had built, along the tourist routes, "conspicuously marked retreats for ladies and gentlemen," and installed "fresh and

legible" signs for improved public access.²²⁹ Later, during Pitcher's administration, outhouses were built at Apollinaris Spring, Gibbon River, DeLacy Creek, Mud Geyser, and Dunraven Pass.²³⁰

Conclusion

Between 1886 and 1894, the military's acting superintendents, like their civilian predecessors, were challenged to protect the park without sufficient legal authority and funds. Despite this lack of support, acting superintendents developed a permanent headquarters for park administration and a series of outposts for increased park protection. They initiated year-round patrols from these strategically placed permanent outposts, which significantly helped protect park wildlife. They also set in motion a series of policies with respect to nature, wildlife, and tourist management with which future administrations would have to come to terms; they began stocking the park's rivers with fish, exterminating carnivores, supplying zoos with animals, and monitoring wildlife. In addition, Camp Sheridan's Acting Assistant Surgeon G. L. Cline continued Philetus Norris's work by compiling a meteorological record for the park.²³¹ This effort was continued with the weather bureau built at Mammoth Hot Springs in 1903.

Additional advances in the area of park protection were made between 1894 and 1906. After 22 years, the park was finally given authority to punish violators of rules and regulations by the passage of the Lacey Act, which prompted an increase in the number of patrol cabins, and new methods in park patrol, both in the backcountry and on well-traveled routes. In efforts to protect vegetation and reduce fire threats, a system for campsite usage was established. A concerted push for protection of game ensued during these years, as park officials became aware of the tenuous situation of the park's bison population and took steps to reinvigorate it. Also, the first fish hatchery was constructed, and efforts were made at the North Entrance to provide protection and food for the antelope and elk herds. Furthermore, to provide visitors with expanded opportunities for viewing and appreciating park wonders, saddle trails, secondary roads, stairways, and other amenities were created. These actions laid the foundation for park management in the new century.

Administration in Turmoil

Yellowstone's Management in Question 1907–1916

In 1905, Hiram Chittenden, in a revised version of his earlier history of Yellowstone National Park, declared that the U.S. Army's efforts to manage the park had been very successful; he also foresaw a long, bright future for the military management of the nation's first park. "The system thus inaugurated still continues with every prospect of permanency," he wrote, and "it is not probable that public opinion will ever sanction a return to the old order."¹ While Chittenden's optimism was not unfounded, the combination of two federal departments trying to administer a single government unit was proving problematic. Acting superintendents were beholden to the Interior Department on matters pertaining to the management of the park, and to the War Department when it came to military issues. To add to the confusion, construction in the park was the job of the Army Corps of Engineers. It was, in short, time to begin deciding whether managing the nation's parks was really a military matter.

In 1907, park management turned in a new direction. When former acting superintendent and recently retired army Lieutenant General S. B. M. Young returned to Yellowstone at the request of the Department of the Interior and assumed command from Major John Pitcher on June 1, 1907, he inaugurated a new, transitional era in park management. With Young overseeing the loosening of the military's hold on national park management, acting superintendents Harry Benson and Lloyd Brett watched and, in some important ways, aided in the completion of the process. By the time Brett served his last years as acting superintendent, the transfer back to civilian—albeit professional civilian—management

was an accomplished fact. The last years of military involvement in Yellowstone also saw some major positive developments: the Interior Department became more involved with the parks it oversaw, several landmark structures were built in Yellowstone, a system of park museums was conceptualized, and a civilian ranger force was inaugurated.

The Last Military Managers

In 1907, three years after General Young retired from military service, Secretary of the Interior James R. Garfield asked him to return to Yellowstone, where he had served briefly as acting superintendent, to take over John Pitcher's command and serve as superintendent of the park. Young's main accomplishment during his second term was his proposal to replace the military presence in the park with a corps of what he called "civil guards" working for the Department of the Interior.² For a variety of reasons—chief among them the fact that neither the Department of War nor the Department of the Interior was ready for the change—his proposal was not acted upon, and in November 1908, Young was replaced by Harry Coupland Benson.

Born in Ohio before the Civil War, Benson earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from Kenyon College before entering the U.S. Military Academy in 1878, and graduating in 1882. He served in several military efforts before assuming the acting superintendency of the park: the campaign against the Apache Indians in 1885–1886, the Spanish–American War, and the military's presence

on the Philippine Islands. He was also provost marshal of San Francisco after the 1906 earthquake and fire. His tenure in the park was only two years, but it was very successful. According to historian Aubrey Haines, Benson was “a true intellectual” and “a good soldier and administrator.”³

In October 1910, Lloyd Milton Brett, the last military officer to serve as Yellowstone’s acting superintendent, took over Benson’s post. Born in Maine in 1856, Brett graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1879. His service in wars with the Sioux Indians earned him the Congressional Medal of Honor, after which his military career continued with service in the Apache Indian Campaign in 1885–1886, the Spanish–American War, and the Philippine Insurrection. A respected military officer, Brett took up a “doubly difficult” challenge in the park, overseeing two crucial transitions: “from horsedrawn to motorized transportation and from military to civilian administration.”⁴

The Rocky Road to Civilian Administration

Historians Aubrey Haines and H. Duane Hampton have both discussed, in great detail, the story of the movement from military to civilian governance of Yellowstone National Park.⁵ In short, from 1907 to 1916, erratic and frustratingly slow progress was made toward returning civilian management to the park. During this decade, park managers—military officers—advocated a return to civilian rule, while the War Department, the Department of the Interior, and Congress took turns blocking the road to change.

A major roadblock to civilian control of Yellowstone Park was its firmly entrenched military leadership. By 1907, civilian “park rangers” had assumed duties in all other national parks except Yellowstone. As the nation’s first park, Yellowstone continued to be operated by the army at a time when the newer, California parks—Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant (today’s Kings Canyon)—unsuccessfully tried to convince the War Department, already stretched thin by the Spanish–American War and the Philippine Insurrection, to spare soldiers for duty in their parks. Conversely, Yellowstone had only a small contingent of civilian employees. Lack of adequate Congressional appropriations for administration and protection of the park in 1886 and 1894 meant that the park was able to employ only a few civilians as scouts,

buffalokeepers, and their assistants. Without a core of non-uniformed rangers on duty, Yellowstone could not build a force of civilians large enough to assume significant power or influence before transfer of the park from military hands on October 1, 1916.

This delay in developing a civilian corps of park rangers was troublesome, given how clear it was to General Young and other acting superintendents—even as early as Moses Harris in 1887—that having soldiers police Yellowstone furthered the interests of neither the military nor the park. Harris had expressed these sentiments in the 1880s, as he was turning over the park’s administration to his successor, F. A. Boutelle.⁶ Twenty years later, Young echoed Harris when he argued, in October 1907, that military management was problematic for both the army and the park. First, it was “injurious to the Army” in that regimental and squadron organizations were disrupted. Young also asserted that the necessity of breaking the men into small, far-flung parties, “separated for indefinite periods of time without the personal supervision of an officer,” was demoralizing to the troops. Nor were the park’s interests met: “The enlisted men of the Army are not selected with special reference to the duties to be performed in police patrolling, guarding, and maintaining the natural curiosities and interesting ‘formations,’ . . . [nor] in protecting against the killing or frightening of the game and against forest fires,” Young noted.⁷ In addition, Young clearly believed that “divided responsibility and accountability” was advantageous to neither the army nor the park, and should not continue. “Under existing conditions,” he lamented, “the superintendent is answerable to the Secretary of the Interior, while at the same time the troops acting as park guard are held to accountability and discipline as is contemplated and provided for in the United States Army.”⁸

Young alluded to a problem that Horace Albright, in 1917, as acting director of the National Park Service (NPS), called “a great big three-headed monster that it has been next to impossible to control.”⁹ Hampton also found this metaphor useful. “[W]ith the roads under the direction of the Army Engineers, the cavalry under control of the Secretary of War, and the Acting Superintendents serving both the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior,” Hampton wrote, the management of the park was both unwieldy and costly.¹⁰ To slay the monster, General Young proposed that control of the park be put back into a single set of hands—those of a “civil guard” of specifically suited, selected, and trained men who would serve under

control of the Department of the Interior. The traits of the men who would form the civilian guards were clear to Young.¹¹ "It is quite obvious," he wrote,

that any man assigned to duty in any capacity in the park should . . . be by natural inclination interested in the park and its purposes. In addition, every man should be an experienced woodsman, a speedy traveler on skis, an expert trailer, a good packer who with his horse and pack animal could carry supplies to subsist himself for a month alone in the mountains and forests, and besides he should be of a cool temperament, fearless, and independent character, and handy with his rifle and pistol to enable him to find and overcome the wily trapper and the ugly large game head and teeth hunter. He should be well informed in the history of the park and thoroughly cognizant with all the curiosities and points of interest therein; he should also be qualified to pass a reasonable examination in zoology and ornithology. [Furthermore,] [a] visiting tourist should always be favored by an intelligent and courteous answer on any subject pertaining to the park from any guard interrogated.¹²

"Two years' experience in governing the park with troops and comparing the results of enforcing due observance of all rules, regulations, and instructions through the troops, and through the few scouts that in reality are civil guards, leaves no doubt in my mind," Young wrote in his 1907 annual report, "about the superiority of a trained and well-governed civil guard for this particular and difficult duty."¹³ Young also argued that the soldiers actually resented "being required to subserve both the military interest and the interest of the park on their small pay," and that the existing system of dual command was certainly more costly to the government. He suggested that either the entire responsibility should be given to the War Department or the troops should be withdrawn.¹⁴

President Theodore Roosevelt instructed Young to devise a plan for "a civil guard to replace the military in the park." However, according to Hampton, "[b]y the time the plan had been drawn up and presented to the Secretary of the Interior, the President had changed his mind and the Secretary of the Interior was not willing at that time to request an increased appropriation."¹⁵ Thus, like that of others before him, Young's advice was

left unheeded, and would not receive a fair hearing for another eight years.

By 1908, during conversations regarding expansion of the post, the issue of the size of the military reservation came to a head. This was really a question of which department had control of the land contained within and immediately around the fort, and General Young and Major H. T. Allen, commander of the troops in the park, took opposing sides. Young favored the Interior Department, while Allen stood squarely on the side of the War Department. In January of that year, the War Department's Major General J. F. Bell warned Young that "Allen is right in his views, and I hope they are not inconsistent with yours. Tho[ugh] there may never be any probability of trouble between you and Allen, there is fruitful opportunity for trouble in the situation, and serious trouble might ensue were it not for the personality of the present occupants of the two positions held by you and Allen respectively." "[T]he reservation," Bell continued, "certainly ought to include all the buildings belonging to the military authorities, and ought to include grounds which can be used as a drill ground."¹⁶ Young disagreed. "My dear General," he began, "there may possibly be authority for making a military reservation inside the boundaries of the Yellowstone Park, but I have failed to discover such." He continued to say that there was "no probability of any friction between Allen and [himself]" and that he even would suggest that Allen become superintendent when he left. He ended his defense of the Interior Department's exclusive and complete control of the park with this view of the situation: "You need not entertain any apprehension of having another civilian superintendent so long as troops are used in the park," he wrote. "There is no salary, and my work is simply a labor of love."¹⁷ In another letter to Secretary Garfield, Young wrote, "It seems to me, under existing law, the Secretary of the Interior cannot relinquish absolute control, nor can the Secretary of War acquire exclusive control over any part or parcel of land within the boundaries of Yellowstone Park."¹⁸

By late summer of that year, the issue had reached the White House via President Roosevelt's friend, Alexander Lambert. While spending 10 days in the park that summer, Lambert noticed the tension between General Young and Major Allen, not to mention the third "head of the monster," the Army Corps of Engineers' officer in charge of road construction. Lambert championed Young's position and noted that he had all of the responsibility, but none of the authority to do his job effectively.



Mounted cavalry drill on Parade Ground at Fort Yellowstone.

He also discussed the lack of knowledge, discipline, and experience of most of the soldiers. Finally, he promoted Young's 1907 idea of using civilian guards instead of troops, and told the president that Young would not stay in the park under the current conditions.¹⁹

In September 1908, Young met with Interior Secretary Garfield about the park situation. In a letter to President Roosevelt, Young stated that at that meeting, he had agreed to stay on as superintendent, and "await action by Congress." However, he added, if Major Allen was not reassigned, Young would resign his own position. In his annual report the next month, Young "beg[ged] to renew the recommendation made in my last annual report to place the government and protection of the park under a selected and well-organized civil guard." Again, his request met with no success.²⁰ Instead, Young's position as superintendent appeared to be in jeopardy. Roosevelt's friend, Lambert, had written to Secretary Garfield expressing his opinion that "at present the Park is worse cared for than it has been for the last ten years. The game in the Park is not being properly and honestly protected and some campers even suggested that the soldiers were killing the game, particularly the grizzly bears."²¹

Garfield, who also visited Yellowstone during the summer of 1908, was convinced that the "Government should adopt a more advanced policy respecting [the park's] maintenance, improvement, and operation." He supported an extension of roads, trails, and structures that enabled the public to "obtain the benefits" of the

park's scenic beauties, and believed future appropriations should be given to the Department of the Interior, rather than the War Department for disbursement. This procedure would transfer the control and supervision to the Interior Department. On the other hand, he found the system of using regular army troops for patrol to be "highly satisfactory."²²

In November 1908, Major Harry Benson took over Young's position.²³ Under Benson's tenure as acting superintendent, the issue of a military reservation within the bounds of Yellowstone Park was settled—at least temporarily—in favor of the War Department, but the fate of a civilian administration remained inconclusive.²⁴ The debate was revived in 1910. In April of that year, new Secretary of the Interior Richard A. Ballinger responded to Missouri Congressman Harry Coudrey's request for a trained civilian force, by stating that the park was "very efficiently patrolled by three troops of cavalry of 100 men each, with the assistance of three civilian scouts." He felt that "it was inadvisable to substitute civilian employees for soldiers for the protection of the reservation."²⁵ Immediately thereafter, Secretary Ballinger requested that Secretary of War Jacob Dickinson assign one additional troop of cavalry and a full pack train to the park for the 1910 season. Dickinson, however, demurred. Officially, he argued that the fourth available troop was needed at Fort Duchesne, Utah, to "preserve order on the Indian Reservation." Privately, he was reluctant to make Fort Yellowstone a priority because he felt that the soldiers on duty in the park "have little, if any, time for proper

military training, and it is very desirable, for this reason, to keep the force so employed at the minimum number."²⁶ Further, the War Department was reluctant to assign enough soldiers to police the park adequately because a tour of duty in Yellowstone was poor preparation for "real" military service.

In August 1910, Secretary Ballinger received word that Major-General Leonard Wood, Army Chief of Staff, wanted to transfer Major Benson and the three troops of Fifth Cavalry to the Hawaiian Islands, and to replace Benson with Major Lloyd Milton Brett and his First Cavalry troops. Ballinger was sorry to lose the capable Major Benson, but he did not feel it was his prerogative to dictate personnel assignments to the War Department. Thus, in October 1910, Yellowstone received what was to be its final military superintendent.²⁷ Shortly before Major Benson left, the chief clerk of the Department of the Interior, Clement Ucker, made an inspection of the park. In the conclusion of his report, he strongly recommended that a civilian superintendent be appointed with continued use of soldiers for patrol. He also called for all employees in all national parks to be brought under civil service rules, and for "the appointment of the superintendents [to] be taken out of the realm of politics."²⁸

Throughout the summer of 1911, the question of Yellowstone's administration, as well as the administration of the rest of the national parks, kept the Department of the Interior busy. Department officials explored questions of whether any law existed to "prevent the Secretary of the Interior from appointing a civilian Superintendent," and of how such a civilian superintendent would be paid—that is, if he would be paid from the appropriations by the Sundry Civil Appropriations Act, approved March 4, 1911, for the following fiscal year.²⁹

By that time, forces outside the park and its military management were advocating the development of a civilian management plan. For example, J. Horace McFarland, president of the American Civic Association, took a leadership role in convincing both the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) and Secretary Ballinger to support the establishment of "a bureau to administer the national parks." McFarland believed that park policies should be driven by professional decisions, not political ones. His views held sway: the ASLA began to educate the public on the issue, and Ballinger recommended the creation of such a bureau in his annual report for 1910.³⁰ Haines wrote that Ballinger's report led to a conference organized to deal with problems in the na-

tional parks. The conference was convened by Ballinger's replacement, Walter L. Fisher, who continued Ballinger's investigation into the idea of a national park bureau. Held in Yellowstone in September 1911, the conference was intended to study the national park problem and help promote the creation of a bureau.³¹

The subject of park administration was indeed one of three main issues on the agenda of the first National Parks Conference, the other two being concessions and transportation. "The purpose of the conference," the proceedings stated, "was to consider all the questions that arise in the administration of these reservations in order that the department [of the Interior] might be able to make such changes in the regulations and to foster such development as might be for the best interest of the public."³² The assembled officials, representing concessions, parks, the Interior Department, and other interested groups, discussed at length the idea of a central bureau to administer all of the parks. Yellowstone's Colonel Brett diplomatically declined to take sides on the issue, instead commending both types of park governance. Brett averred that the military, with its organization and discipline, was "as well suited for this kind of work as it is for any other military work, because," as he put it, protecting the park was "military work," but conceded that a civilian administration would win out in the end simply because it would have more staying power. "The only argument," he stated, "which can be adduced for replacing us by the other form [a civilian administration] is that the other form should have more permanency."³³

Another conference held in 1911, the annual meeting of the American Civic Association (ACA), had as its primary focus "a federal Bureau of National Parks." This conference, organized by the association's leader, J. Horace McFarland, who had also attended the National Parks Conference, featured an address by President William Howard Taft, who fully endorsed the creation of a bureau of national parks. "If we are going to have national parks," Taft proclaimed, "we ought to make them available to the people, and we ought to build roads . . . in order that those parks may become what they are intended to be when Congress creates them. . . . And we cannot do that, we cannot carry them on effectively, unless we have a bureau which is itself distinctly charged with the responsibility for their management and for their building up."³⁴

While President Taft supported a national parks bureau, Congress did not.³⁵ Shortly after the conferences

concluded, Colonel Brett used his annual report to call on the secretary of the interior to decide upon a fixed policy regarding military versus civilian management in order to proceed, as he put it, with a “stable and progressive administration.”³⁶ It had been four years since an official directly involved with the administration of Yellowstone Park had rallied for the cause of civilian management. It was time for the War and Interior departments to decide, Brett wrote, “if the park shall continue to be policed by United States troops or if they shall in the near future be replaced by a civilian organization.”³⁷ Brett repeated this recommendation verbatim in his 1915 annual report.³⁸ His efforts to persuade others to move on the matter can thus be read as an attempt to convince Congress to do the same.

By 1913, the Interior Department was providing more leadership in the drive to improve the situation in the nation’s parks. That year, President Woodrow Wilson appointed a former city attorney from San Francisco, Franklin K. Lane, who possessed “informed concern for the national parks and an active agenda for their improvement,” to be his secretary of the interior.³⁹ One concern common to national parks at the time stemmed from their deplorable sanitary conditions.⁴⁰ Yellowstone’s problems with sanitation and stream pollution were serious, and Acting Superintendent Brett felt that the problem “must be met by some general plan in the near future.”⁴¹ Lane, for one, appeared ready to listen to park administrators and rectify the situation. According to historian Ethan Carr, Lane, “[f]aced with limited resources for park planning . . . improvised and sought out cooperative agencies” to help him solve such problems as park sanitation.⁴²

While officials at the Interior Department were moving in the direction of civilian administration, they were also reluctant to offend the War Department. Thus, when Brett concluded, toward the end of the 1913 season, that the War Department’s attitude toward the park was “a menace to the efficient management of this reservation,” the Interior Department attempted to defuse the conflict. In a letter to Secretary Lane, Brett quoted the War Department Inspector’s report: “it is my belief that this is not a proper duty for the Army. The Army should be withdrawn from this park and from all national parks.” Brett believed that this attitude affected the men on duty. Furthermore, he felt frustrated in his attempts to maintain order in the park, as the Quartermaster Department, for example, would not allow him to make needed improvements at the soldier stations. Brett urged

a definite policy regarding soldiers and their duties. The response from the Department of the Interior was not reassuring: “Your letter received. There seems to be no occasion for the anxiety you express. Have heard nothing here of contemplated change and can doubtless arrange matters satisfactorily should occasion arise.” A few days later, Secretary Lane’s assistant explained to Brett that perhaps Brett was “exaggerating the disposition of the War Department,” and that War Department Secretary Lindley Garrison “seemed disposed to cooperate as far as possible with us in giving the park an effective administration.”⁴³

While downplaying the tensions surrounding the park’s administration, the Interior Department seemed ready to act on other issues by providing the necessary leadership for change. In 1913, for example, Lane appointed Adolph C. Miller, an economics professor from the University of California, as assistant secretary in charge of national parks. Horace Albright—the future superintendent of Yellowstone National Park—began his NPS career as assistant to Miller.⁴⁴ In 1914, Miller chose Mark Daniels, a San Francisco-based landscape architect who had helped him devise a plan to develop Yosemite Valley in a non-disruptive, view-enhancing, and aesthetically pleasing way, to be general superintendent and landscape engineer for all national parks.⁴⁵ These men would play decisive roles in promoting and crafting the new civilian service devoted to administering the nation’s parks.

By the spring of 1914, officials in the War Department began seriously to re-assess the army’s presence in Yellowstone. In a letter to his counterpart in the Interior Department, the secretary of war indicated that he would send a modified cavalry detachment of 250 troops to protect the park. Unlike the soldiers who were usually sent to Yellowstone, these “selected cavalymen, preferably those having experience in the . . . Park and having a natural taste and aptitude for the character of duties which they are to perform there,” would be well suited to their duty. With World War I already underway in Europe, the secretary of war was clearly preparing for the eventuality that a civilian force would take over administration of the park. “[S]hould circumstances arise necessitating a substitution of civilian rangers for cavalymen in guarding the park,” he wrote, the Interior Department “could take over such of these experienced men as it might need, they being discharged from the Army for that purpose should their service be needed.”⁴⁶

In July 1914, the Second Squadron of First Cavalry

was withdrawn from Yellowstone and sent to its new station at the Presidio of Monterey, California. The squadron was replaced by 200 cavalymen drawn from nine regiments on duty posts across the country. Secretary of War Lindley Garrison then took additional steps toward a civilian takeover. In a letter to the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, he explained that the cost of administering and supplying Yellowstone was one reason why the War Department "should be relieved of carrying the burden of national parks." He believed the Interior Department was ready to "take over the burden, provided Congress will appropriate the money necessary to bring this about." He also offered to turn over to the Department of the Interior "the complete plant which has been established, barracks, quarters, telephone lines and all free of cost, with the idea that the Army may be relieved entirely from all police work in the parks."⁴⁷ In an earlier letter, Garrison had mentioned that Brett would remain on duty until October 31, 1915, at which time "the arrangements contemplated to permit the complete withdrawal of the army from the Park" would be completed.⁴⁸

The secretary of the interior's office was also preparing for significant changes. In 1915, Secretary Lane hired Stephen Tyng Mather—a Chicago businessman, preservationist, and mountaineer who would later become the first director of the NPS—to be his assistant in charge of national parks.⁴⁹ As historian Linda McClelland has written, many saw this as "a hopeful sign that park matters would gain increasing attention and that the much needed improvements would receive congressional funding."⁵⁰

With the appointment of Mather, and with Albright and Daniels already at work on national park matters, the movement to create a bureau for parks was moving steadily forward. In May 1915, Mather established a system of communication between the parks, the office of the general superintendent, and himself to handle regular monthly reports, requests for funds, and any important questions regarding policy.⁵¹ Before the year was out, he created a park filing system to preserve in order of receipt and to cross-reference either the original or copies of all orders and instructions and other correspondence dating back to January 1, 1907.⁵²

Mather and Albright were also working on the issue of withdrawing troops from Yellowstone, and identifying the particular needs of Yellowstone's future ranger force. Major General Hugh L. Scott, who was then chief of staff of the army and who agreed with Mather on the need

to remove the troops from the park, joined with Acting Superintendent Brett in these discussions.⁵³ "The plan contemplated the release of a number of sergeants and corporals," Albright later recalled, "who had had such experience in leadership and had shown real interest in Yellowstone Park, these men to be appointed park rangers. Other rangers [were] to be recruited from stage drivers, scouts who were on duty to help the soldiers . . . etc."⁵⁴

The stumbling block in creating a civilian administration for Yellowstone at this point was Congress. "Congress had placed Yellowstone Park under protection of the military and intended . . . for it to remain that way," some representatives argued. In addition, despite all evidence to the contrary, some politicians believed civilian management would cost more.⁵⁵

What finally tipped the balance in favor of civilian administration was the introduction of automobiles into Yellowstone National Park in the summer of 1915. Behind Mather's decision to allow cars into the park was the notion that the increased revenues would help offset some costs, and thus make the idea of a civilian administration of the park more financially feasible.⁵⁶ Also, because the War Department refused to let soldiers work at the entrance stations, the Department of the Interior had to hire "four park rangers" to do that work.⁵⁷ As the Judge Advocate General put it, the troops were allowed "only to prevent trespassers from entering the Park, and to remove those who did gain entrance," meaning that all other tasks—from working on roads to stocking streams and fighting forest fires—had to be performed by "a large civilian force." Thus, in an era of incipient automobile tourism, the military became a less-suitable entity for managing parks.⁵⁸

In the meantime, Mather and Albright took steps to create the park's ranger force. Mather's plan envisioned all rangers being employed by the soon-to-be-created National Park Service instead of by specific parks. With knowledge gained by work experience and training, each ranger could be transferred to other parks during his service. The idea was to create an atmosphere in which a person would want to make the job his career; thus, "each man would have the fullest incentive to give his best service, knowing that advancement would be based solely on character and general efficiency." Persons who possessed tact and a good temperament would be chosen after they had passed a civil service examination that would test for educational qualifications.⁵⁹

During the spring of 1916, discussions were



NPS

Visitors on open coach.

underway at the Interior Department on how to proceed with removing troops from Yellowstone. Because the Sundry Civil Appropriations Act of March 3, 1883, had authorized the secretary of the interior to request the use of “temporary” troops from the War Department, no legislation was necessary for the transfer back from the War Department.⁶⁰ In July, just one month before the NPS would be formally created on August 25, 1916, Interior Secretary Lane wrote to Secretary of War Newton Baker requesting that the troops be relieved of duty after the end of the 1916 season. According to Lane, both departments agreed that certain “selected cavalrymen” would be available to remain as civilian rangers upon their official discharge from the army. The men, selected by Colonel Brett, would be “appointed first-class park rangers at a salary of \$100 per month.” Also, all property constructed and maintained by the army would be transferred to the Department of the Interior. Secretary Baker responded that he would arrange for the transfer of troops to take effect on October 1, 1916. The men selected for the civilian ranger corps would be officially discharged on September 29, in order to begin serving in the NPS on October 1.⁶¹

Adjutant General W. M. Wright directed the transfer of all army clothing, camp, and garrison equipment to the Quartermaster’s Depot in St. Louis, Missouri. Based upon an inspection and valuation of the army, the Interior Department was offered any desired stores or supplies remaining at Fort Yellowstone. The disposition of the remaining supplies, stores, and transportation was to be supervised by the commanding general of the Western Department. After an inspection by Superintendent of National Parks Robert B. Marshall (also chief geographer of the U.S. Geological Survey), Wright



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #493

Tourists eating beside automobile atop Mount Washburn, ca. 1920s.

wrote to Mather suggesting that the Interior Department purchase \$65,000 worth of goods from the army. That amount, however, did not include the post’s hospital equipment, for which the Department of the Interior later had to pay the War Department.⁶²

The transfer of the park from military to civilian hands proceeded smoothly, but was not without occasional bumps along the way. For instance, it was not clear whether the Army Corps of Engineers’ buildings were included in the transfer agreement. The disagreement was cleared up when an arrangement was made for the Interior Department to reserve “one double set of stone quarters, two double sets of officers wooden quarters, two sets of noncommissioned officers quarters, and the equivalent of one-half the double stone barracks and blacksmith shop” from the corps.⁶³

Developments in the Built Environment

Several developments occurred in the park’s built environment during the last decade of military management. Fort Yellowstone was completed, several soldier stations were built, a museum system was conceptualized, and landscape architects began to influence the planning and improvement of park structures and landscapes.

Fort Yellowstone took on its present characteristic appearance, as important new buildings were added between 1908 and 1913. In 1909, the post was enlarged to house the four-troop detachment long deemed necessary to protect the park. Four troops (a troop consisted of 60–100 men) had lived in the park before, but under unsatisfactory conditions. To house four troops comfortably, additional barracks and officer quarters were



VNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #23562

Double cavalry barracks, ca. 1915.

needed. Seven buildings were added in 1909: a double cavalry barracks, a bachelor officers' quarters, a duplex for two captains, a field officer's quarters, two large cavalry stables, and a building for both a stable guard and a blacksmith shop. These buildings were made of stone, which was readily available, relatively cheap, fire-resistant, and permanent. All seven structures had walls of local sandstone; lintels and sills of dressed stone; painted wooden trim, eaves and soffits; and, hipped roofs of red-clay tile.⁶⁴ Also in 1909, Superintendent Norris's blockhouse was removed, being inadequate for further army use.

The barracks—the largest building at Fort Yellowstone—had a capacity of two troops, or 200 men. With “a U-shaped plan . . . the central wing running north south, and transverse east–west wings at either end,” the building was “generally symmetrical about an east–west axis.” It was “originally divided along this axis from basement to attic,” wrote architect David Battle and historian Erwin Thompson, “each company occupying one end of the structure.” It had three floors, each having “a covered porch . . . along the west elevation of the central wing, and along all three walls facing the court on the east.” For decoration, a band of dressed stone “extend[ed] around the entire building just above the first floor windows.”⁶⁵ The design of these buildings is noteworthy because for the first time, the Quartermaster Department employed civilian architects who brought with them design ideals inspired by the Beaux Arts movement. Thus, Fort Yellowstone's architecture from this period included such typical Beaux Arts elements as formal site plans, classically inspired designs, and “formal symmetrical building layouts arranged around axes.”⁶⁶

Because Fort Yellowstone was still considered a

permanent post in 1909, military authorities decided to build a bachelor officers' quarters (BOQ). Fort Yellowstone's BOQ was a two-story, T-shaped structure with the major wing running north–south and a smaller wing centered on the east side. “A large roofed porch extend[ed] along the major portion of the west elevation,” wrote Battle and Thompson, and a stone gable with “a semi-circular attic window set in an arched opening” added a gentle touch to the strongly classical and linear features of all buildings in this set.⁶⁷ For this building and others of its time period, the quartermaster adapted the Colonial Revival Style.⁶⁸ The building's plan was typical for bachelor officers' quarters, with apartments for six single officers and “an officers' mess or club.”⁶⁹ Fort Yellowstone's BOQ—as was common with most such structures at similar military installations—faced the parade ground, and was placed near the other officer housing.⁷⁰

Fort Yellowstone's bachelor officers' quarters were probably built because each permanent installation needed a BOQ, not necessarily because more officers' quarters were needed. According to Battle and Thompson, “there were more than enough officers' quarters at Fort Yellowstone for the permanent staff” when the BOQ was built. The building was also intended to house visiting army officials and staff, including the dental surgeon, the inspector general, and courts martial boards.⁷¹

There was some question as to the appropriate size of the field officer's quarters. During the planning stages, Major Allen, the commanding officer at the time and the person who would reside in the building, wrote to the War Department commander that he needed a bigger residence than plans called for. “I beg to state,” he wrote, “. . . this place, like West Point, Fortress Monroe, Fort Meyer, and probably a few other posts, is annually visited by a large number of people (10,414 last year) and that it is incumbent upon the Commanding Officer to be prepared to house more persons than would be possible with a field officer's set.”⁷² He preferred plans for a commanding officer's house, which would have cost more and was “designed for colonels and above at regimental or larger posts.” His request was turned down, but an extra bedroom and bath in the attic were added to the otherwise standard plans for the field officer's quarters.⁷³

Allen's request ran squarely into the army's concern with rising construction costs, largely the result of “[n]ew systems of heat, water, and sewerage and electric or gas lighting.” “To manage these changes and reduce new



Double officers' quarters. 1918.

construction costs,” wrote the authors of *Context Study of the United States Quartermaster General Standardized Plans, 1866–1942*, “existing plans were rearranged and wasted space eliminated to create smaller buildings ‘without sacrificing convenience.’”⁷⁴ On the first floor, the plan for the field officer’s quarters called for a library, dining room, and parlor for socializing, as well as the necessary kitchen, entrance hall, and pantries. There were four bedrooms and two baths on the second floor, and two bedrooms in the attic, with space for an additional bedroom and bath, which in this instance were added immediately to the plan.⁷⁵

The double set of captains’ quarters, a two-story duplex facing the parade ground to the west, had a covered entrance porch and a back porch on each side of the duplex. The plan for this building was also symmetrical “about a central east–west axis.”⁷⁶ The two cavalry stables were symmetrical “about both [their] major and minor axes.” They had a rectangular, two-story plan with “a gabled roof over the clerestory at the loft, and shed roofs over the wings on either side.” Both stables could hold 94 horses in either boxes or stalls.⁷⁷ The one-story blacksmith shop, also rectangular and basically symmetrical, was intended to serve the two cavalry stables, and was outfitted with saddle shops, blacksmith shops, and guard rooms for both.⁷⁸

Although money was appropriated in 1909 for a new hospital, Battle and Thompson reported that it was not built until 1911, because the Surgeon General did not approve of the site selected. Instead, a one-story, frame hospital annex, intended as quarters for personnel

assigned to hospital duty, was built in 1909. It had the capacity to hold 12 men.⁷⁹

In 1911, the so-called “new,” one-story, concrete guard house (jail) was built. Designed as a rectangle, the structure was one and one-half stories high, with a covered porch running its full length. Although the structure was designed to be built of stone, concrete was ultimately used instead. Stone probably proved to be too expensive; as authors of the *Context Study* confirmed, concrete was often used at this time to reduce costs.⁸⁰ As with most other buildings built in this period, double-hung, wood windows were used throughout. Bars were embedded into the concrete of the prison windows and toilet for added security.⁸¹

The building with perhaps the most interesting history at Fort Yellowstone is the chapel. Construction began in 1912, but plans for the building dated back several years. In 1897, a concerned citizen wrote to the acting superintendent lamenting “the lack of facilities for public worship at Fort Yellowstone,” and offered to build a chapel. Colonel Young, in his first stint as acting superintendent, refused the offer, explaining that the limited amount of land available for military use precluded the construction of buildings unrelated to “purely military purposes.”

Religious enthusiasts were not so easily deterred. Just after the turn of the century, an Episcopalian missionary named John Pritchard established himself near what is now Emigrant, Montana, and held occasional services in a troop mess hall at Fort Yellowstone. Inspired perhaps by the success of Pritchard’s operation, two

“ardent churchmen”—Acting Superintendent Captain John Pitcher and U.S. Commissioner Judge John W. Meldrum—joined forces to get a chapel built. But after funds were appropriated for fiscal year 1909, park superintendent General Young again caused the project to be delayed. Finally, while many army personnel and civilians thought the post would be better served by the construction of a recreation hall, which could have hosted worship services and also served many other purposes, legislation “For the Construction of a Chapel in or Near the Military Reservation Within Yellowstone National Park” was introduced, passed, and signed into law.⁸² While many at the fort saw no need for a chapel, there were plenty in the Department of the Interior and the War Department who approved of the idea of turning soldiers’ minds from the worldly distractions of drink and gambling to an otherworldly arena. On his trip to the park in 1910, Clement Ucker, for example, complained about the number of saloons and “dives” at Gardiner, Montana, a number similar to that found at many other types of federal reservations—military and naval—as well as at some other national parks. He believed that temptation to the soldiers should be removed, and even promoted the idea of having the Montana legislature pass a law preventing the operation of saloons or gambling houses within two miles of a park entrance.⁸³

By the early twentieth century, chapels were relatively common on military posts throughout the nation, and chapel designs were even standardized. Most chapels built during this period were in the Gothic Revival Style and, according to the *Context Study*, stood as “major examples of high artistic expression.”⁸⁴ According to Haines, the plan for the Yellowstone chapel was “essentially that of a cruciform church, though its arrangement is indicative of an Episcopalian origin—possibly from a standard plan of that denomination.”⁸⁵ The church was constructed of native sandstone, quarried from the bluffs overlooking the Gardner River. The stone used for the chapel was handled differently from that used in other park structures. It was “roughly squared and coursed as opposed to the ashlar construction found elsewhere, and the finished stone [was] hand-tooled rather than machine finished.” With its pitched roof “supported by wooden trussed arches and roofed with slate shingles,” the chapel was finished in January 1913, and was the last building constructed at Fort Yellowstone.⁸⁶

The story of several structures not built in Yellowstone is perhaps as telling as that of those that were. For example, in 1911, Acting Superintendent Brett asked the

adjutant general for 15 new buildings, listed in order of importance. First on the list was a riding hall. Over the course of Brett’s and other commanding officers’ tenure at Fort Yellowstone, inspectors general had criticized the fort’s troops on several fronts. In March of that year, the inspector general found “all troops slow in work with sabre and showing need of more practice.”⁸⁷ Conceding that Yellowstone’s inclement winter weather prevented outdoor training, Brett requested an indoor riding arena, arguing that his troops were held to “a standard of efficiency that [was] high considering the handicaps of extreme cold weather extending over more than half the year, deep snow, and the absence of a riding hall.”⁸⁸ Requests for a riding hall continued to dominate Brett’s wish-list, but the quartermaster general’s office predictably responded, “No funds are at present available for the construction of a riding hall at Fort Yellowstone, Wyo., and no item for such a purpose has been included in the estimates for the fiscal year.”⁸⁹

In September 1912, Inspector General Alonzo Gray made a more forceful plea for a riding hall. “There are many posts in the country provided with a riding hall where it is not needed to the extent that it is needed here,” he argued. “The lack of a riding hall reduces the military efficiency of this command, which is used as park police during the open season.”⁹⁰ Perhaps the War Department was unwilling to put more money into the Yellowstone post when political winds were shifting toward civilian management of national parks.

One other building government officials hoped to construct during this period deserves mention. During the last decade of military management, there were plans to build a new administration building. One architect involved with the project was Robert Reamer, the Northern Pacific Railroad’s architect who had designed the Old Faithful Inn and the railway station at Gardiner. When Chief Clerk Ucker visited Yellowstone during the summer of 1910, he got a glimpse of Reamer’s plans for the administration building, which Ucker found to be the “most artistic and appropriate building in every respect that could be erected.” He urged the Department of the Interior to approve the plans and secure funds for the building’s erection. While in the park, Ucker requested Reamer to prepare plans for a substation and residence at the West Entrance.⁹¹ Congress and the Interior Department did not take action in regard to either building at that time, but discussions continued about the construction of a new administration building.

In November 1913, Colonel Brett revived the issue

of a new administration building when he wrote Interior Secretary Lane concerning suggestions to improve park access. Apparently, Mr. Richard T. Greene of New York City had complained to the secretary about travel conditions and accommodations in the park. While Brett dismissed most of Greene's displeasure, claiming, for example, that Greene's request for boardwalks would lead to the "unthinkable" outcome of having the park "resemble Atlantic City," he did agree that the park could do a better job of informing the public about notable park features. "That information of all the natural objects is not well disseminated is correct," he admitted to Lane. "This feature is turned over to guides, bell boys, and porters, by the hotels and camps," he continued, "and such information as they are able to give is not of much value." Conceding that park officials needed to offer the public more in the way of information, Brett lobbied for a new administration building by coupling it with the idea of a museum. Greene's "complaint," he told Lane, "emphasizes the necessity for an administration building, housing all that is interesting in historical data and specimens of natural curiosities, etc." He even advocated that "[s]mall branches of the administration building in the shape of bungalows . . . be erected at Norris, Upper Basin, and the Canyon," to be staffed by persons "able to give intelligent information."⁹²

While it would be several decades before Brett's dream of an administration/museum building came to fruition, his proposal is noteworthy. For one, it marked the first time a government official called for museum space in Yellowstone. Second, because Brett's vision entailed branch museums, he, in effect, advocated an organized system of museum and administrative facilities spread throughout the park that could provide useful information to visitors, such as exists today. Finally, his model of putting a museum under the same roof as administration offices was an early version of what was to become a park staple in the 1950s: the visitor center, a building combining protective, administrative, and informative functions. While none of these buildings was built at the time, it is clear from Greene's complaint and Brett's proposal that the need for such facilities was great. It would be only a question of time before they were put back on the drawing board.

If government officials could not come up with funds for museum space, they did find money for bolstering the park's protective infrastructure. Integral to the administration and protection of the park, several soldier stations and so-called "snowshoe cabins" were

built during this period. The importance of such cabins for patrolling the park both in winter and summer was outlined in a 1908 letter from Acting Superintendent Young to Secretary Garfield:

there are scattered throughout the park, in what are intended to be secreted points, cabins called snowshoe cabins. These cabins are at a distance of about 10 miles from the outlying outposts. It is one of the duties of the enlisted men and of the scouts who may be out on outpost, to cross the country on snowshoes, and these cabins are placed at distances which are considered to be a fair day's travel for the men on snowshoes through the mountains. The work of climbing the mountains is so difficult that it is impossible for the soldiers and scouts to carry anything on their backs. For this reason the Interior Department purchases for the funds appropriated for the maintenance and protection of the Yellowstone National Park, a small amount of rations which is stored in these cabins and is used by the scouts and soldiers during the nights spent in the cabins on the occasions when they visit them.⁹³

Military acting superintendents after Young agreed with this assessment, and made every effort to improve the cabins and even add to the system throughout the years.

In 1912, a snowshoe cabin was built on the shore of Buffalo Lake, within the state of Idaho, one mile east of the park's west boundary. The one-story, one-room log structure "atop a mortar and cobble foundation" initially had a sod roof, later replaced by an overhanging gabled and wood-shingled one. As was customary at the time, the cabin's logs were saddle-notched.⁹⁴ Still standing today, the cabin at Buffalo Lake is, according to most scholars, the park's oldest existing snowshoe cabin.⁹⁵ Several soldier stations built at the time, for example, those at Norris and Bechler River, are also still standing.

The present, third soldier station at Norris was built in 1908, after the second station burned to the ground that February.⁹⁶ The presence of a government structure at Norris dates to Patrick Conger's administration (1882–1883), when he had a cabin built for his assistant superintendents, as one of his "five comfortable cabins" throughout the park.⁹⁷ That structure served Conger's and subsequent administrations until Colonel Young, during his first tour of duty in the park, replaced



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #199

Norris Soldier Station, ca. 1916.

the station with a better structure in 1897.⁹⁸ When Captain Chittenden recommended to John Pitcher that the stations be enlarged and improved, the Norris Soldier Station was one of the first to receive attention. Pitcher considered the Norris station to be “the poorest station we have,” and commenced drawing up plans for its improvement in 1901. The Norris station was enlarged at that time, however, by only a separate small structure known to the troops as the “officers’ dog house.”⁹⁹

According to R. Laurie and Thomas H. Simmons, Robert Reamer, architect of the Old Faithful Inn, volunteered to draw up plans for the third Norris soldier station, but because “there are a few discrepancies between Reamer’s design and the building as constructed,” it is not clear if Reamer’s plan was implemented.¹⁰⁰ The building’s T-shaped plan also resembled, with modifications, Pitcher’s 1901 drawing, which had two rooms for officers only accessible from the porch, not from the station’s living quarters.¹⁰¹ Simmons and Simmons reported that Lieutenant Cox and Mr. Rowlands, from the Quartermaster Department, completed the drawings and specifications for the building.¹⁰²

The building, designed in Rustic Style, was a one-story log structure with “a roof of intersecting gables clad with wood shingles, overhanging eaves and exposed rafter ends.” According to Albert H. Good, editor in 1933 of *Park Structures and Facilities*, rustic design represented a style that “through the use of native materials in proper scale, and through the avoidance of rigid, straight lines, and over-sophistication, gives the feeling of having been executed by pioneer craftsmen with limited hand tools. It thus achieved sympathy with natural surroundings

and with the past.”¹⁰³ Another name for this architecture is Adirondack Style, which Linda McClelland has suggested involved “the use of native logs and rock in a rustic unfinished form, naturalistic siting of structures, incorporation of porches and viewing platforms, the climatic adaptation of using native stone for the foundation and lower story and native timber above, stone chimneys with massive fireplaces and mantles, open interiors with ceilings of exposed rafters and trusses, and a multitude of windows.”¹⁰⁴

Indeed, the Norris station has many of these characteristics: one of the four chimneys is stone (the others are brick); the logs have “square notches with three surfaces cut at the ends, except for those on the porch, which are flush cut”; the log ends “extend beyond the plane of the building in a tapered fashion, creating a battered appearance”; some logs are unpeeled; the doors are vertical boards with “hand wrought metal straps”; there are “two burled tree trunk posts supporting the roof” at the front; and there are numerous windows.¹⁰⁵ The Norris Soldier Station remains standing, and currently houses the Museum of the National Park Ranger—after having been “rebuilt from the ground up, log-by-log” in 1976 as part of a U.S. centennial exhibit.¹⁰⁶

The Bechler River Soldier Station, built largely in 1910, is also still standing. The station and barn are frame structures with hipped roofs clad with wood shingles. The offset front porch has square columns and a stick balustrade. The ranger station on the site is the officers’ quarters “dog house” built at the Thumb Soldier Station in 1904, and moved to the Bechler River site in 1946. According to Simmons and Simmons, this officers’

quarters structure “may be the only remaining of the officer quarters associated with each of the soldier stations except [for] the one at the North Entrance.”¹⁰⁷

Several other soldier stations were built or improved during the last decade of military involvement in the park; a number of these structures were either revised extensively or replaced at a later date. In 1907, for example, the old station near Rainy Lake at Tower Fall was demolished and replaced with a new station, a cabin, and stable built nearer the junction of the Grand Loop and Northeast Entrance roads.¹⁰⁸ This is the oldest soldier station still standing, even if it has undergone much revision and improvement.¹⁰⁹ In 1910, contractor J. B. Cain of Bozeman, Montana, built a second station, formally referred to as “the new Gallatin Station,” in the northwest corner of the park.¹¹⁰ This station, a frame house with a lath-and-plaster interior and painted green on the outside, included a stable large enough to house twelve horses.¹¹¹ The station was replaced after a destructive fire in 1918.¹¹² In 1912, a new soldier station was built near the park boundary on Crevice Mountain, east of Gardiner.¹¹³ In 1914, a new Snake River Station (one-story log building, 16' × 50', with an 16' × 24' addition forming a T-shape) was built in late summer near the South Entrance, to replace the one that burned on August 7, 1914.¹¹⁴ According to Haines, by the end of the military era, there were 16 soldier outposts (snowshoe cabins or soldier stations). Not counting the cabin at Buffalo Lake, which was not part of the system at that time, there were cabins or stations at Soda Butte (1886; 5 men), Grand Canyon (1886; 14 men), Norris (1886; 15 men), Riverside (1886; 10 men), Lower Geyser Basin (Fountain) (1886; 14 men), Upper Geyser Basin (1886; 15 men), Lake Outlet (1887; 15 men), Snake River (1892; 5 men), Thumb Bay (1897; 11 men), Tower Fall (1901; 7 men), Gardiner (1903; 6 men), Sylvan Pass (1904; 5 men), Cooke City (1904), Gallatin (1908; 4 men), Bechler (1911; 5 men), and Crevice (1901 and 1912; 3 men).¹¹⁵

Improvements to the stations and cabins were numerous over the years. In 1910, for example, the army's acting adjutant general consented to the construction of bathing facilities. Previous requests for such facilities had been rejected. For instance, Major Cheatam of the Quartermaster's Department in Washington, D.C., withheld permission because he figured the soldiers, whom he thought only manned the outposts during the summer months, could bathe in the rivers.¹¹⁶ While some sanitary improvements were made after 1910, conditions



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #48569

Canyon Soldier Station. 1906.



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #22439

Soda Butte Soldier Station. 1905.

in most cases remained less than adequate.¹¹⁷ In 1912, the inspector general's report included the following suggestion: “All sub stations need a bath house built on and a hot water tank attached to the kitchen range. At present the men bathe under conditions which will be absolutely impossible in winter. The result will be that, in winter, they will not bathe.”¹¹⁸ Running water was needed at the stations for another reason—fire. Running water “would not only add to the comfort of the men who are cooped up within these stations for from five to eight months, and who do their patrolling and scouting upon skis,” wrote the inspector general, “but would add an additional protection against fire, which, if it should burn [their] skis, would probably sacrifice [*sic*] the lives of the men at these posts.”¹¹⁹

While these reports drew attention to the dismal condition of many soldier stations, the reports of other, more aesthetically minded critics found fault with the appearance of the soldier stations and snowshoe cabins. For example, when Chief Clerk Clement Ucker visited



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #129313

View of Fort Yellowstone from Capitol Hill, ca. 1915.

the soldier stations as part of his 1910 tour of the park, he found that “no similarity in style of architecture had been followed.” He urged the interior secretary to erect suitable stations for the soldiers’ use, in a style of architecture that would conform to the style chosen for the new administration building (which, as has been noted, was not built).¹²⁰

Other complaints regarding the outposts focused on their appearance as well. In August 1911, Brigadier General Marion Maus, the commanding general of the Department of the Columbia, inspected Fort Yellowstone and its outlying stations and cabins. The outlying posts were “neither creditable nor satisfactory,” he wrote. Arguing for the construction of permanent structures, he recommended relocating and possibly reducing the number of the fifteen stations.¹²¹ Thumb and Fountain should be relief—not permanent—stations, he believed, and Riverside should be relocated to the West Entrance of the park. In regard to the appearance of the stations, he argued that they should fit in with their surroundings and “have a uniform, artistic, and dignified appearance.”¹²²

Shortly thereafter, in October 1911, the inspector general reported that “each of the Outlying Stations of the Loop” should have “buildings and shelter, of an appropriate design in keeping with other buildings of the park . . . in place of the improvised and unsightly shacks now used for the purpose.” Each of those stations should be “so enlarged that . . . there should be a kitchen and dining room, properly screened against flies,” and at least 16 men should be comfortably accommodated with the necessary buildings: “a bathroom, horse equipment storeroom, a shelter that will accommodate at least 25 animals, a shed that will accommodate at least

8 months’ supply of firewood, proper toilet facilities, and proper storage for an 8 months’ supply of beef and an 8 months’ supply of rations.”¹²³ Brett agreed with the inspector general’s recommendations: “I earnestly advocate all that is suggested by the Inspector General on these subjects,” he wrote the adjutant general. “The fifteen outlying soldier stations must be recognized as a part of the barracks and quarters of this command.”¹²⁴

Commanding General Marion P. Maus agreed. In October 1912, he wrote again to the adjutant general about the state of affairs at Fort Yellowstone. His comments addressed the very question the military needed to ask itself: what was its future in the park? “If the sub stations are to be permanent in this park,” he remarked, “it is strongly recommended that a portion of ground for each station be set aside and allotted specially for the use of the military, in order that there may be a permanency as to these locations.” “If it is the policy of the War Department to maintain troops in the Yellowstone National Park,” he chided, “an adequate allotment should be made for a riding hall, stable for pack train, machine gun platoon and barracks for teamsters and packers; also suitable ground at sub-stations should be declared part of the military reservation and allotment made for constructing suitable and creditable habitations for men and animals.”¹²⁵ Just how permanent the military presence would be remained at issue, however. Permanence required an allotment and, furthermore, a commitment.

The army’s commitment to the post was also questioned by Colonel J. L. Chamberlain, serving as inspector general in 1913. He complained that soldiers on duty at the soldier stations were not warm enough in the winter,

and recommended that quilts be used instead of army blankets, which the inspector had found to be inadequate in very cold weather, no matter how many were used. Furthermore, men working under such conditions “at points beyond touch with the post should be provided with a double outfit of special clothing except the coat: that is, with two mackintoshes instead of one and two pairs of socks.”¹²⁶ It is hard to believe that for 17 years soldiers working at these posts were not given more than one pair of socks.

The fish hatchery was also improved during this period, as the park was still considered the world’s most important source for black-spotted (today’s Yellowstone cutthroat) trout eggs. In 1913, the Department of Commerce constructed a 34' × 60' fish hatchery near the Yellowstone Lake outlet. The shingle-covered, hewn-log building was furnished with modern equipment capable of eyeing 30,000,000 eggs, and a loft for use as quarters and, once other proposed buildings were constructed, as storage. About 400' upstream, a small dam was constructed across a creek, with a 12" wooden stave pipe installed to draw water. In late summer, a 14' × 30' quarters and mess building with a 10' × 12' ell in the back was constructed at Clear Creek, a tributary on the east shore of Yellowstone Lake. This building, constructed from local timber and finished with drop siding, was used by the employees “taking fish spawn from Clear and Cub creeks.”¹²⁷ Permission was also granted to construct buildings similar to the ones at Clear Creek at a site farther south, near Columbine Creek on the lake’s east bank. The secretary of the interior’s office reminded the secretary of commerce that the buildings must “be of a permanent and slightly character.”¹²⁸

In the early spring of 1913, the U.S. Geological Survey began to collect data about the streams in the park. By September, four gauging stations had been erected—one each on the Madison River near West Yellowstone, Montana; the Gibbon River at Wylie Lunch Station; the Yellowstone River above the Upper Falls; and the South Fork of the Snake River at the south boundary. At all except the Snake River station, a vertical staff gauge was installed; the Snake River station had an overhanging chain gauge. All except the Gibbon River station were located near soldier stations, so that soldiers could make daily recordings. The Gibbon River station, which was located just below the bridge at the Terrace Road crossing, was read by a Wylie company employee; the gauge was relocated at the time of the bridge’s construction in late August 1913. Occasionally, hydrographers were

housed at the soldier stations without cost.¹²⁹

In 1914, the Bureau of Fisheries completed a one-and-one-half-story log residence on Columbine Creek, along with a bungalow and a frame barn to house four horses and sufficient storage for grain and hay near their hatchery in the Lake Hotel area. As officials recognized that the hatchery was becoming an attraction for many travelers, the bureau improved its lawn and tidied up fallen timber and debris. The bureau also devoted considerable time to explaining the plant’s operation to interested tourists. “[T]he workings of the plant have become a matter of interest to so many tourists as to require at times the services of one of the attendants constantly in showing them around,” wrote Brett in his annual report.¹³⁰

Other miscellaneous administrative facilities constructed during this period included an addition to the Lamar Valley Buffalo Ranch, and several checking stations. The buffalo ranch received a new building in 1915, when park employees constructed a log home, with addition, near the mouth of Rose Creek for the buffalo keeper. This one-story house had a dining room, living room, and three bedrooms, with a brick chimney in its center. A one-story addition with another brick chimney was built along the front. The building’s interior was finished with beaver board, and its roof was shingled.¹³¹ Because the park was opened to automobiles on August 1, 1915, the crew of the engineer officer (of the Army Corps of Engineers) constructed three checking stations for automobiles: one at Madison Junction, one at Dunraven Pass, and one at the West Entrance. Until more checking stations could be constructed, the Army Corps of Engineers’ road crew buildings at Beaver Lake and at DeLacy Creek were used for this purpose. Brett used allotments from park revenues to fund the project. At the West Entrance, workers built a 14' × 14' log building with “tarred paper and graveled roof” at a cost of approximately \$200. At “the north end of Dunraven Pass about 11 miles from Canyon Junction,” they constructed a similar building, but only costing \$100. Finally, they erected a 14' × 28' log building at Madison Junction about fourteen miles from the west boundary at a cost of approximately \$250.¹³² The checking stations are no longer standing.

In addition to constructing administrative facilities, park officials considered it their responsibility to improve the park’s trail system as well. For example, during the summer of 1907, soldiers built an outhouse and horse railings on Mount Washburn and replaced

the old wooden signs scattered around the park with approximately 600 new enameled steel signs affixed to iron stakes set in cement. Other improvements for visitor safety and enjoyment included “Platforms for accommodation of tourists getting out of coaches . . . built at Norris, Mud Geyser, Upper Yellowstone Falls, Inspiration Point, and at the Great Falls and Keplers [*sic*] Cascade; Stairways were built in connection with the two latter,” wrote Young in 1907. Many toilets were also built throughout the park. Young noted that all improvements were stained “to harmonize with the surroundings.”¹³³

The idea of harmonizing buildings with their surroundings in Yellowstone was first associated with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the 1880s. It became an institutionalized practice in national parks around the turn of the twentieth century, when landscape architects—professionals who made it their business and mission to create or preserve park-like landscapes, and had previously been involved primarily with private estates—became more interested in working in the public arena. As the nation devoted more of its time and resources to its public parks, landscape designers were called upon more frequently to address conflicts between built and natural environments in the public sphere. In fact, landscape architects like Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., were instrumental in the development of the NPS, and after the agency was created, played an essential role in shaping the national park idea—namely, the preservation of national parks for the benefit and enjoyment of the public.

Landscape architect Mark Daniels, appointed general superintendent and landscape engineer for all national parks in 1914, was the first of his profession to be officially associated with the national parks.¹³⁴ His career with the still-evolving NPS was not lengthy, but it did have a lasting impact. Central to his vision was the belief that any national park development should be planned in a comprehensive manner, and that such plans should be drawn so that they would “suit . . . not only topographic features, but all the various physical conditions.” Scenery, after all, was a crucial part of national parks, he argued, and it had to be preserved: “the scenery or natural phenomena are of such a character to be largely educational,” he claimed, and it was the educational nature of this scenery that made national parks important. Scenery, Daniels believed, would lead the “mental horizon” of visitors to be “broadened materially.”¹³⁵ Daniels advocated orderly development of the

parks, and drafted preliminary plans for such development; he also designed the first uniforms for the new civilian park rangers.¹³⁶

Daniels influenced the design of administrative facilities in national parks as well. Even if his ideas were not put into practice during his tenure with the Department of the Interior, they remained on record to influence later NPS plans. First, Daniels believed that development in the parks should take the form of planned “villages.” As the number of visitors grew in the national parks, Daniels claimed, a “community ceases to be a camp; it becomes a village. . . . It has municipal problems . . . [and] will demand some sort of a civic plan in order to properly take care of the people who visit.”¹³⁷ Second, he argued, buildings in the parks should have a common architectural theme. According to Linda McClelland, “Daniels’s efforts . . . established the concept of an architectural scheme whereby a type of architecture is determined [in Daniels’s own words] ‘in light of a careful study of the best arrangement of the buildings and for picturesqueness.’”¹³⁸ Daniels did not design any villages for Yellowstone, but his experience in Yosemite and his plans for Glacier, Mount Rainier, and Crater Lake national parks were important contributions to national park landscape architecture.

The 1916 annual meeting of the American Society of Landscape Architects was of signal importance for the national parks. Much of what was said underscored the dual—and potentially contradictory—mandate to protect the parks and to open them up for the enjoyment of the public. The resolutions passed at the conference foreshadowed how important landscape architects would be to the process of developing—also called “improving”—the parks while protecting their scenic values. “The need has long been felt not only for more adequate protection of the surpassing beauty of those primeval landscapes,” one resolution stated, “but also for rendering this landscape beauty more readily enjoyable through construction in these parks of certain necessary roads and buildings for the accommodation of visitors in a way to bring the minimum of injury to these primeval landscapes.” The conference resolutions clearly advocated the use of landscape architects in this process. James Sturgis Pray, who cautioned against the “over-exploitation” of the parks, reminded conference attendees to heed the words of Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., (son of landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted, who had created Central Park and authored a plan for Yosemite Park in 1865), who was instrumental in

drafting the National Park Service Organic Act:

The National Parks are set apart primarily in order to preserve to the people for all time the opportunity of a peculiar kind of enjoyment and recreation, not measurable in economic terms and to be obtained only from the remarkable scenery which they contain,—scenery of those primeval types which are in most parts of the world rapidly vanishing for all eternity before the increased thoroughness of the economic use of the land. In the National Parks direct economic returns, if any, are properly the by-products; and even rapidity and efficiency in making them accessible to the people, although of great importance, are wholly secondary to the one dominant purpose of preserving essential esthetic qualities of their scenery unimpaired as a heritage to the infinite numbers of the generations to come.¹³⁹

In the years after 1916, landscape architects would become integral to the design and planning of the built environment in national parks, particularly in regard to structures, campgrounds, roads, and roadside kiosks.

Policies to Protect the Park's Treasures

The policy issues of concern between 1907 and 1916 recalled those of the two previous decades: protecting wildlife (especially game species and those in danger of extinction); managing people around wildlife; responding to fire; planning campground management; and informing visitors about, while at the same time protecting, the park's natural wonders. Unfortunately, the challenges involved with using soldiers to manage and police a national park proved to be an impediment to progress in these areas. In the last decade of military management of Yellowstone, this problem reached its apex.

What had been clear to Major Moses Harris at the beginning of the military era was even clearer to leaders during the army's last decade of park management: namely, that accomplishing the dual tasks of military training and park policing put too much strain on the troops. Inspectors general often noted examples of this problem in their lists of "irregularities and deficiencies." Some comments were relatively easy to respond to and rectify. "In practical test in field at Gardiner, Montana,

March 29th [1911]," noted one inspector, "the bread baked in field bakery was not of best quality, showing that bakers need practice in this work."¹⁴⁰ "Many men had dirty breeches," and "Four men[s] collar ornaments were not properly worn," observed another. While such comments might seem insignificant, they revealed concerns that soldiers at the post were not being trained effectively. Some inspectors identified more serious issues. "The deployment into line of skirmishes was poor," commented one inspector. "The failure to [use the clock figures to indicate the position of the enemy] resulted in many men aiming at wrong target." "When the command 'charge' was given, the men broke badly," was another criticism.¹⁴¹ Inspector J. L. Chamberlain wrote, "In the exercise for fire control and fire discipline the command did not demonstrate careful training and efficiency or a full appreciation of the true meaning of the terms."¹⁴²

Was excelling in military training while protecting the park too much to ask of the men? Was one actually detrimental to the other? Many commentators felt that the two tasks did not complement one another and, in fact, interfered with each other. "The command is regarded as efficient," cautioned one inspector, "but its training is not what it would be if nearly all of its drill season were not necessarily used in patrol work as park policemen."¹⁴³ "The garrison has been employed extensively in road work in the park," complained Inspector Chamberlain. "Beside being detrimental to military instruction and training, such employment I believe to be improper and unwarranted."¹⁴⁴

Another problem was the issue of morale: service at Fort Yellowstone was not for everyone. "There have been a large number of desertions in this park," wrote Commanding General Maus, "and the duty here does not appear to be as popular as it should be." "If men were properly selected, and their accommodations improved, I do not believe there would be desertions," he added.¹⁴⁵ Inspector Chamberlain also noted the reluctance of "a considerable [number] of men" to be posted at the fort. Many were there against their wishes, he reported.¹⁴⁶ Only "a selected class of men," the inspectors noted, who had expressed interest in the park, were able to withstand the hardships posed by the post. Furthermore, Maus noted, the troops stationed in the park really should be "show troops." "Many thousands of prominent citizens, not only of our country, but of foreign countries, annually visit the park, and are escorted on their way by details of men, who also are seen patrolling



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #12731

Haying operation near Gardiner. 1912.



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #7

Bison corral at Mammoth. 1903.

in all directs and at the hotels, and are therefore under prominent observation.” The post needed a better class of men than those who often found themselves serving at the stations—the “recruits who have not had time to be trained or disciplined.”¹⁴⁷ The only way to solve this problem was to separate the duties and create a corps of civilian rangers to handle issues related to park management. Thus, between 1907 and 1916, a few civilians were added to the ranks—but the process, as noted above, was frustratingly slow.

With respect to wildlife issues, the military followed

the precedent of encouraging the perpetuation of some species while discouraging, and often killing, others. Favored species included bison, deer, elk, and pronghorn (called “antelope” by most observers of the day), and the policy of feeding these ungulate populations continued. Wolves, coyotes, mountain lions, and most other predators were deemed unworthy of such protection. During the spring of 1910, a meadow at the North Entrance was plowed, under plans of returning it to an alfalfa field. Because it would have taken about two years of plowing and cultivating to prepare the field, however, the ground was seeded with spring wheat. The field produced 80 tons of wheat hay for use in winter 1911. By that year, the meadow was overrun with foxtail and weeds. A 40-acre meadow near the Lamar Valley Buffalo Ranch was plowed in 1909, and seeded with timothy, which also provided about 80 tons of hay.¹⁴⁸ In 1910, an irrigation system was constructed in the 40-acre meadow and in an adjoining field of several hundred acres.¹⁴⁹ More and more park lands were converted into hay fields as acting superintendents attempted to keep up with increases in the herd of “tame” buffalo and the elk herds that ate the hay intended to sustain the pronghorn population during hard winters. Clearing, grubbing (digging up of roots), breaking, and seeding of meadow land “should be done each succeeding year for four years, in order to secure sufficient winter supply of hay for a constantly increasing herd,” wrote Superintendent Young in 1908.¹⁵⁰

During 1915, the field near the North Entrance arch was disked (worked with a disk harrow), reseeded, and dragged. Two hay cuttings were obtained from the field, producing about 120 tons; almost 220 tons of hay were cut from the fields near the buffalo ranch. With the increase of the bison herd to 276 animals, it was necessary to add more irrigated, seeded meadows to those existing near the ranch. That land was targeted for seeding and irrigation later in 1915 or in the spring of 1916.¹⁵¹

Fencing was used to protect the buffalo ranch area in Lamar Valley, to keep cattle and dogs out of the park, and to keep antelope from leaving the park in winter. An old wire fence that extended westward along the north boundary from the junction of the Yellowstone and Gardner rivers was responsible for preserving the antelope herd, Young believed.¹⁵² In 1914, approximately four miles of fence was replaced at the buffalo ranch and from the North Entrance arch eastward to the Gardner River. In the latter case, 2,000 feet of a five-foot steel picket fence were built under contract.¹⁵³

At the buffalo ranch, the herd continued to thrive

and increase, numbering 276 animals by 1916.¹⁵⁴ Starting in 1908, around 15 older bulls were transported each spring from the Lamar herd to a corral at Mammoth, where they were put on display for tourists as a “show herd.”¹⁵⁵ “This was done for two reasons,” wrote Major Benson: “First, to remove the bulls from the herd in which the calves were present, as the bulls were continually fighting and endangering the lives of the calves; second, in order that the visiting tourists might be able to view them.” “Probably 10,000 tourists drove to the buffalo corral this summer [1909] in order to see these buffalo, it being the main feature of the stop at Mammoth Springs,” he added.¹⁵⁶

Mountain lions, coyotes, and later, wolves, considered harmful to calves of elk, deer, buffalo, and antelope, were vigorously hunted and killed. In 1907, Young wrote that the “mountain lions have been almost exterminated,” allowing him to sell the pack of dogs used for hunting them in 1908.¹⁵⁷ Several packs of wolves were seen on the elk ranges in 1915, and as they were considered dangerous to elk calves, Brett wrote that “[a]rrangements [were] being made to systematically hunt” them.¹⁵⁸ As many as 270 coyotes were killed one year, and in 1916, U.S. Biological Survey employees killed 180 coyotes, 12 wolves, and 4 lions.¹⁵⁹



Bear feeding at Lake Hotel. 1910.

YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES: YELL #9105

Park officials had more complex sensibilities about bears. Since the 1880s, visitors had been enjoying the spectacle provided by bears feeding at various garbage dumps around the park. But as bears became more accustomed to people, and thus less afraid of them, they also became more destructive of property, and even dangerous. “They frequently become so tame,” wrote Benson in his annual report for 1910, “that they do not hesitate to destroy tents or go through windows into houses to secure food, and sometimes refuse to be driven away.”¹⁶⁰ But because the creatures were not considered harmful to the park’s beloved game animals, most acting superintendents of the time did not consider killing a bear unless it had a serious conflict with humans. In 1910, for example, after a bear bit and scratched a member of a road-sprinkling crew near Excelsior Geyser, and after “many requests” to “kill some of these vicious bear” were received from visiting parties who suffered bear-related property damage, officials considered doing away with overly “friendly” bears. But, as Benson wrote in his annual report, “this was not resorted to.”¹⁶¹ In 1911, although two grizzlies and three black bears were killed because they were considered “dangerous to life and property,” park officials also completed investigations of one or two cases wherein men who became “too bold” with bears were attacked and severely injured. Because park officials determined that the bears in question had been defending their cubs, the bears were not blamed.¹⁶²

By 1913, however, the number of bears feeding at dump sites was alarmingly high. For example, “[t]hirty-two grizzlies,” wrote Brett, “were noted at one time on the garbage dumps at the canyon on August 20” of that year. As the number of bear–human conflicts rose, so too did the number of “necessary” bear killings; thus, officials killed five bears deemed “dangerous to life and a menace to property” in 1913, and “six black bears and two grizzlies” in 1916.¹⁶³ The less-than-hygienic conditions at the dump sites were a source of concern for Mark Daniels, general superintendent and landscape engineer of the national parks. After visiting Yellowstone in 1914, Daniels suggested to the secretary of the interior that perhaps “some method of bringing the bears to the bear dumps could be devised which would accomplish the ends desired without making the dump a most unsanitary and filthy looking hole.”¹⁶⁴ Many years later, Daniels’s recommendation was incorporated into the elaborate infrastructure associated with the bear feeding ground at Otter Creek (see Chapter 6).

Another important wildlife development during

this period was the purposeful introduction of non-native species by park officials. More than 310 million native and non-native fish were introduced to the park's waters from 1881 to 1955, largely to please visitors who wished to fish in areas that were historically fishless.¹⁶⁵ In 1916, for instance, "seventeen thousand eastern brook trout were planted" in the park.¹⁶⁶ Park officials also toyed with the idea of introducing non-native mammals to the park. In 1907, for example, just before he left his command at Yellowstone, Major Pitcher received a letter from Interior Secretary James Garfield approving his plan to procure "white goats" from British Columbia or elsewhere, and to "domesticate" them in the park.¹⁶⁷ Superintendent Young, who pursued Pitcher's "white goat" idea fervently, if unsuccessfully, also had high hopes of introducing this non-native species, and managing the animals in the same fashion as the bison were managed, such that, as Young put it, "the park herds will in due time restore some of the progeny to the former near-by haunts of their kind." Young also sought to "improve" the park's wildlife spectacle. "Only such species of animals and birds as were found in the park when originally laid out and set aside exist here to-day," he mused, incorrectly, in 1907. "With intelligent management and comparatively little expense," he continued, "a greater variety of birds and animals could be successfully added and propagated within the park, and under the protection of a specially trained body of scouts such animals as buffalo, that have been exterminated, and mountain sheep and antelope, that are rapidly being exterminated in the United States outside the park, will undoubtedly increase in the park."¹⁶⁸ Pitcher's and Young's idea of introducing goats into the park survived as late as 1915, as park historians Lee Whittlesey and Paul Schullery have observed.¹⁶⁹ "The general mood of these and other recommendations was that more was better—that nature could be enriched, indeed improved upon, by the judicious actions of humans," they noted.¹⁷⁰

Along with new wildlife policies came new policies regarding fire control and management. In the 1910s, in addition to the park's basic policy of regulating campers' fires and patrolling camping areas daily—sometimes twice daily during dry and busy summers—two new developments arose: the establishment of a series of trails and roads for fire management, and a cooperative agreement between the departments of Interior, Agriculture, and War, drawn up on August 14, 1912, "for the prevention and suppression of forest fires along the park boundary."¹⁷¹

Prior to these innovations, park officials could do little more than hope for both a wet year and responsible campers who followed the park rule to extinguish all campfires. These were years when superintendents felt "indebted" to frequent rains, and at the mercy of dry weather and "frequent violent electric storms."¹⁷² In 1907—a wet year, as luck would have it—Young asked for \$30,000 to pay for removal of slash and dead timber within 150 feet of the park's roads. He also circulated the following policy edict:

Hereafter within the boundaries of this park, whenever a tree—dead or alive—is felled for telegraph or telephone construction, railway, roadway, or any right of way, for fuel, for building, bridging, or for any purpose whatever, the brush and tops must be lopped and piled in a cleared space, and—if conditions are favorable for burning without danger of the fire spreading—will be burned.¹⁷³

During the dry year of 1910, Acting Superintendent Benson sent troops out twice daily to patrol roads and campsites for any sign of fire.¹⁷⁴ While Chief Clerk Ucker was inspecting the park that summer, several major fires occurred, leading him to recommend that a comprehensive system of trails and roads leading off the main road be developed, and that more money be dedicated for the system's development.¹⁷⁵ That fall, 25 miles "of new trails or fire lanes" were built in the park's southeast corner, and during the summer of 1911, "similar passageways were built from Snake River Station, on the south line, west to near the southwest corner, thence north along the west boundary line and northeast via Summit Lake to Upper Basin." As Colonel Brett noted, the purpose of these trails was to facilitate easier movement of scouts and patrols in the course of protecting game and preventing wildfires. When Brett's patrols found campfires burning, they either extinguished them themselves or, if they could locate the guilty parties, marched them back to put them out.¹⁷⁶

While the summer season of 1912 was relatively wet, Brett realized that all years would not be so good. He therefore asked for funds for "[f]orty-eight miles of additional firelanes" for fiscal year 1913 (no new fire lanes or trails were constructed in 1912 "[o]wing to lack of funds"). He also gave credit, in his annual report, to the newly created agreement between the departments of Interior, Agriculture, and War that intended to

create “an efficient system of fire patrols in connection with the rangers in charge of the forests adjoining the park.”¹⁷⁷ In 1913, the army built 58 miles of new trails or fire lanes “along the western boundary line and from Gallatin Soldier Station to headquarters via Sportsman Lake.” Such trails made patrols of the newly organized districts assigned to various soldier stations much easier. Soldiers made caches of fire-fighting tools at each station and coordinated their efforts with U.S. Forest Service employees.¹⁷⁸ In 1914, a new fire lane was constructed through timber from the Snake River station east toward the southeast corner of the park. Several other extensive fire lane projects were undertaken that year, which, as it turned out, was a very dry one.¹⁷⁹ Acting Superintendent Brett reported that both road crews and crews assigned to construction of fire lanes were called upon to help fight the numerous serious fires burning in the park. Two of those fires qualified as boundary fires, allowing the new multi-departmental agreement to be activated.¹⁸⁰ The summer of 1915 was unusually wet, allowing fire lane crews to complete the fire lane projects started the year before and repair nearly all the established fire lanes in the park.¹⁸¹ By the end of 1915, more than 150 miles of fire trails had been built.¹⁸²

As might be expected, many of the fires with which park officials had to deal were ignited by careless campers or, in dry years, by campfires that had been extinguished correctly but continued to smolder underground.¹⁸³ Campers, careless or not, were having a big impact on the park. In addition to building campfires, they created garbage, required toilet facilities (called “earth closets” in those days), demanded improvements for their comfort, and necessitated government intervention to protect park land from overuse. Throughout the last decade of military presence in the park, several camps (not yet called campgrounds)—first for travelers by horse and later for those traveling by automobile—were erected, and policies designed to improve sanitation and minimize campers’ impact on the land were developed.

Earlier in Yellowstone’s military management period, concessioners had operated the only permanent camps. Travelers, however, were allowed to set up camp wherever they desired, as long as they abided by the rules and regulations established by the military and Department of the Interior in 1897, during Captain Erwin’s administration. Camp had to be made at least 100 feet from a traveled road, and campsites had to be “thoroughly cleaned before they [were] abandoned.” Pits were provided for all trash; anyone making camp

in an out-of-the-way place without pits, had to hide all refuse “where it [would] not be offensive to the eye.”¹⁸⁴ New camps housing park road crews, called road camps, were established in 1907 at Canyon, Trout Creek, Beaver Lake, Beryl Spring, the Upper Geyser Basin, West Thumb, Excelsior Geyser, and near the Lake Hotel. Tent floors, side walls, and frames to support canvas covers were installed, as well as mangers and feed boxes.¹⁸⁵

When General Young took over the superintendency from Major Pitcher, he continued Pitcher’s program of campsite cleanups and enforced the rules regarding “camps” that previous acting superintendents had devised. Furthermore, Young noticed the effects of campsites on the sanitary condition of the park. To prevent contamination of the Fort Yellowstone and Mammoth Hotel water supply, he closed Swan Lake Flat, which drained into Glen Creek, to camping and grazing.¹⁸⁶

Clement Ucker’s visit to the park in the summer of 1910 convinced Young that sanitation remained an unsolved problem. He recognized the need to hire someone to assess the park’s garbage disposal and sewage needs.¹⁸⁷ While this recommendation was not acted upon until 1913, a more thorough inspection of camps was ordered later that summer, and suggestions were made that fall for improving their upkeep. Acting Superintendent Benson asked Major Wallace DeWitt, a surgeon with the Medical Corps, to inspect the “temporary camps”—those not operated by concessioners—and report back with recommendations. DeWitt found that sites at the following locations seemed to have been in use year after year: at Mammoth Hot Springs, near the power plant; near Apollinaris Spring; on the freight road from Fountain Station to Excelsior Geyser; at Lake, one-half mile south of the soldier station in the meadow across the road; at Snake River station; and on Tower Creek above Tower Fall. The upkeep of these camps was poor, he reported. Consequently, he insisted that campers traveling the main road use only designated camping places. He furthermore suggested that the government provide signs marking specific areas of a camp—latrines, dumps, stock-watering spots, lavatories, and drinking water. Finally, he recommended that park officials post rules and regulations governing camping at each camp and hand them to each camping party at park entrances.¹⁸⁸

Subsequent acting superintendents also contrived solutions to the sanitation problem.¹⁸⁹ In 1912, for example, Colonel Brett came up with two ways to improve sanitation concerns in the park. First, he had medical



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #31927

Visitors posed in front of tents at Wylie camp. 1912.

officers stationed at Fort Yellowstone serve as sanitary inspectors for the entire park, including soldier stations and all concession facilities.¹⁹⁰ Second, he devised a system whereby a regularly scheduled cleaning team of two men attended to garbage disposal and upkeep of the earth closets. This represented the beginning of restroom maintenance in Yellowstone. The two men, with their single team and wagon, operated along the tourist route during August and September. Brett was so pleased with their work that he planned for the system to be used “hereafter” during three months of the year—July, August, and September.¹⁹¹ The system was implemented during summer months for the remaining years of military control of the park.

In 1913, the Wylie Permanent Camping Company established a new camp near the East Entrance, and a second concessioner, the Shaw & Powell Camping Company, which had operated in the park since 1898, was authorized to establish camps in the park, as well. The latter company started that year to build the necessary structures—“kitchen, dining room, storehouse, laundry, wagon sheds, stables, blacksmith shop, granary, bathhouse, etc.”—at “Willow Creek, near Gibbon Falls, on Nez Perce Creek near Fountain Station, Upper Geyser Basin, West Thumb of Lake, Grand Canyon, and near Tower Fall.”¹⁹²

Sanitation in the park continued to concern Colonel Brett that year. “The question of sanitation and stream pollution,” he wrote to the secretary of the

interior, “is a very important one, which must be met by some general plan in the near future, as park travel increases.”¹⁹³ Worried as he was about increased pressure from campers on the park’s sanitation systems, Brett could only watch as tourist numbers ballooned. Between 1904 and 1915, the total number of park visitors grew from fewer than 14,000 to more than 50,000 annually.¹⁹⁴ Brett realized that existing conditions were not sustainable. His need for help was confirmed when Interior Secretary Lane sent out the department’s chemist, R. B. Dole, who after making “a very thorough sanitary inspection,” assented that conditions were awful.¹⁹⁵

In 1914, the Shaw & Powell Camping Company increased the number of sleeping tents and other facilities connected with their camps to meet the needs of more and more tourists.¹⁹⁶ Brett also noted in his annual report that the Department of the Interior was taking measures “to prevent the pollution of the drinking water used by visitors to the park.” “[I]t is important,” he emphasized, “that [measures] be put in[to] operation before the fine health record of the park is broken.” That summer, General Superintendent Daniels made what Brett called “his first annual inspection.”¹⁹⁷

As mentioned earlier, the summer of 1915 marked the entrance of automobiles and other gasoline-powered vehicles into the park. To meet the needs of these new visitors, Brett called for the establishment of three “special sanitary camps” to be built at Mammoth Hot Springs, Upper Geyser Basin, and the Canyon area.

These “camps,” proposed to be established specifically for those traveling in private automobiles with their own camping equipment, were to be provided with “a few conveniences” and located near the points of interest, but at some distance from existing, concessioner-run permanent camps and hotels. At a time of tight budgets, Brett could easily rationalize such an expense: “[A]s the automobile tickets of passage, for which a charge is made by the department, are a source of considerable revenue, it seems that an expense for this purpose is warranted,” he wrote in his annual report.¹⁹⁸

In January 1916, Brett sent Interior Secretary Lane a map marked with four proposed sites for the new automobile camps: the three previously suggested locations and one at the Yellowstone Lake outlet. The secretary’s office requested an estimate for a fifth site at Tower Fall, which Brett did not recommend, and asked Brett to contact the mayors of Medford and Ashland, Oregon, regarding their automobile camps, which were thought to be exemplary. In April of that year, Brett was notified that \$1,500 had been approved for constructing camps at his four original locations. The assistant secretary requested that the campgrounds be completed by the beginning of the 1916 season.¹⁹⁹ Each camp served twelve automobiles and their passengers, and consisted of a large pole and frame shed (60’ × 32’, 8’ high at the eaves) that served as a car shelter and was roofed with 28-gauge corrugated painted steel roofing and divided into six double stalls. Ladies’ and men’s toilets, dry wood, and cooking

grates were provided at each camp. Running water and electricity were provided only at the Mammoth camp.²⁰⁰

Conclusion

The last decade of military involvement in Yellowstone was marked by major developments in park infrastructure and protection policies. Also, as the job of protecting the park from poaching was replaced with the task of “guiding and policing tourists,” military leaders sought to escape the yoke of park management. Concurrently, conservationists and the Interior Department lobbied for the return of Yellowstone and all national parks to civilian management. These movements culminated in the creation of the NPS on August 25, 1916. The mandate and philosophy of the new bureau were drafted by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., as part of the National Park Service Act. “[The NPS’s] fundamental purpose,” wrote Olmsted, “is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.”²⁰¹ The task for the next generation of Yellowstone administrators, now statutorily enacted, would be to guide the development and improvement of park facilities in a way that helped visitors enjoy the park’s natural beauty and scenic features while at the same time preserving this beauty and these scenic features from exploitation.

"Nature is the Supreme School-Teacher"

The National Park Service in Yellowstone National Park 1917–1929

The creation of the National Park Service on August 25, 1916, brought major changes to Yellowstone. Reorganization of the park's management from military to civilian governance, although not actually complete until the end of 1918, allowed the administration once more to focus on Superintendent Norris's three original pillars of park management: protection, improvement, and scientific study and education. Before the new civilian administration could begin to manage, however, it needed to craft a management team and ranger force. Once this force was in place, the administration was ready to take on the challenges of the park's fifth decade. And challenges there were.

Between 1917 and 1929, numerous issues confronted the new administration. First, Yellowstone's civilian managers had to accommodate record numbers of a new kind of visitor—one who toured the park by automobile. Second, in this new era of park reorganization, any new accommodations or other improvements had to harmonize with the park's beauty, not detract from it. Third, in addition to accommodating new tourists, the park's new civilian managers had to educate them. While the park superintendent was no longer alone in trying to protect, improve, and educate—the NPS now coordinated measures and provided assistance to the individual parks—the superintendent was responsible for making day-to-day decisions and responding to the needs of the public.

Much of the NPS's work toward improving the park for visitors and protecting its resources was guided by the idea that the park was to become an "all-summer resort." The goal was to "convince the general traveling

public that it [was] worth while to spend more than five or six days in [this] great playground." To that end, much was done each year to entice the public to visit and stay in the nation's oldest national park. "Yellowstone Park has tremendous recreational advantages that are only just beginning to be appreciated," wrote Horace M. Albright, who as assistant to Stephen Mather, the director of the NPS in 1917, stood in Mather's stead as acting director when Mather was unable to assume the duties of director due to illness. While dreams of "the establishment of golf links and tennis courts" would fall by the wayside as the park's focus shifted from recreation alone to recreation and education, other projects took shape.¹ The park's free, or "public," automobile camps were improved and expanded, and museums and educational institutions were built. Landscape architects continued to inform park managers' decisions about how to design Yellowstone's cultural landscape.

The New Decision-Makers

The first two years of Yellowstone's new civilian administration were made especially difficult for several reasons: Congress failed to appropriate money for the newly created NPS, there was political unrest in Montana over the removal of troops from the park, and wartime conditions prevailed across the United States following the nation's entry into World War I on April 6, 1917. According to Aubrey Haines, the park was fortunate to have Chester Allinson Lindsley, who had worked as a civilian clerk in the park since 1894, to assume the role



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #19200

Superintendent Horace M. Albright. 1920.

of park “supervisor” and guide the park through the first period after the transfer to civilian administration.

Born on January 25, 1872, Lindsley was hired by Acting Superintendent George Anderson to serve as civilian clerk at Fort Yellowstone in the autumn of 1894. “He served in that capacity under all the succeeding military superintendents,” wrote Haines, “providing continuity of administrative activities (which would otherwise have suffered from the frequent and complete changing of the detachments stationed in the Park).” From October 1, 1916, until June 28, 1919, Lindsley served first as acting supervisor then as acting superintendent of the new civilian administration of the park. Once Horace Marden Albright was appointed superintendent in 1919, Lindsley became assistant superintendent. In 1922, Lindsley transferred to the Post Office, where he served as postmaster for the park until his retirement in 1935.²

Horace Albright was one of Yellowstone’s most important shapers. Born in Bishop, California, on January 6, 1890, he graduated from the University of California’s law school in 1912. In June 1913, he became a confidential clerk to the secretary of the interior and worked on the creation of a national parks bureau. After completing graduate work in 1914, Albright worked as assistant attorney and close advisor for Stephen Mather, who was then “assistant to the secretary responsible for the national parks.” Haines wrote that Albright played “a considerable, perhaps even crucial role in the passage of the National Park Service Act of 1916, and as assistant director (and acting director in 1917–1918) of the new organization, he shepherded it through the initial years.”

Albright was superintendent of Yellowstone National Park from June 28, 1919 until January 12, 1929, at which point he took over from Stephen Mather as director of the NPS. He retired from the Park Service in 1933, to become general manager and director of the United States Potash Company, but retained an active interest in NPS affairs until he died on March 28, 1987.³

A Management Structure and Infrastructure

The 1916 National Park Service Act authorized civilian administration of the nation’s parks. In line with this decision, the secretary of the interior authorized removal of the military detail from Yellowstone National Park and creation of a civilian ranger force. Thus on October 1, 1916, with the “hearty cooperation” of the War Department, the Department of the Interior took over Fort Yellowstone. The troops stationed there were sent for duty at the Mexican border.⁴ The new ranger force—“composed partly of scouts long connected with the administration of the park, and partly of certain soldiers who, because of their special qualifications and intense interest in the development of the park, were discharged from the Army to join [the NPS]”—was on duty through the winter of 1916–1917, but then had to “disband because of adverse legislation.”⁵

The “adverse legislation” was a 1917 sundry civil bill that purposely did not provide any funds for protection of the park. This omission necessitated “the recall of the Cavalry to the park” and the “regarrisoning” of Fort Yellowstone.⁶ Congress, in 1917, “on the facts then before it,” decided “that Fort Yellowstone ought not to have been abandoned by the War Department, and that it could be better protected by soldiers than by rangers.” In fact, local residents, resenting the loss of income they expected would result from the departure of the army, had encouraged Montana’s congressional delegation, in the person of Senator Thomas H. Walsh, to take before Congress a petition to “again police the Yellowstone National Park with officers and soldiers of the regular army to the end that it shall be well protected.”⁷ Thus, 450 men belonging to the Seventh U.S. Cavalry returned to the park and again took up residence in the fort facilities.

This halting transition from military to civilian leadership created more problems in the development of an administrative force and ranger corps in Yellowstone

than it did in other parks. In 1917 and half of 1918, for example, the Department of the Interior controlled concessioners, supervised admission of automobiles to the park, took care of wild animals, and oversaw water, electric, and telephone systems in the park. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers oversaw all road and trail construction, and protection of the park was “intrusted to the soldiers” and the War Department. Acting Superintendent Lindsley was “supposed to be the executive of the park, yet he ha[d] no control over the improvement or protection of his reservation.” “He can not even open the park at the beginning of the season,” complained Director Mather in 1917, “yet the Park Service is charged by the traveling public with every failure to make conditions for touring satisfactory.” In all other national parks, except Crater Lake, the director continued, the NPS’s mandate to supervise, manage, and control the nation’s parks was exercised by the Interior Department alone, not in combination with the War Department and Army Corps of Engineers.⁸

Acting Superintendent Lindsley wasted valuable time and energy negotiating with the park’s other controlling agencies. In January 1918, an issue arose concerning the use of officers’ quarters at the fort. In a letter to the assistant director of the NPS, Lindsley referred to the chief of engineers as “utterly selfish” and disingenuous, as the latter tried to control all the officers’ housing at Fort Yellowstone for use by his own employees.⁹ Lindsley also contested the ownership of one particular building. While it was clear that the furniture in the building belonged to the Interior Department, the building’s rightful owner was unclear. As Lindsley noted, the building had been “officially invoiced to [the Interior] Department when the post was abandoned and [had] never been officially returned.” Thus, “the question of ownership [was] in doubt,” and Lindsley felt “warranted in making strenuous objections to the occupancy [by the army engineers’ office] of this building.”¹⁰

Further, when Major Verrill, the district engineer, advised Lindsley that he intended to build a “fire-proof garage and certain residence quarters for members of his office force and engineering staff,” NPS Director Stephen Mather asked the acting superintendent to “advise the District Engineer that all of the land in and about Mammoth Hot Springs is subject absolutely to the control of the Department of the Interior, and that no structures of any character can be erected anywhere in the park except upon the authority of this Department.”¹¹ The issue became quite contentious, forcing the secretary of

the interior himself to demand that the park’s administrators work “in harmony with engineers” so as not to block the proposed garage.¹² First Assistant Secretary of the Interior Alexander Vogelsang wrote to the secretary of war insisting that the proposed structures “harmonize in general with the appearance of the other improvements” in the area, and that the Interior Department be given the opportunity “to inspect and pass upon” any plans and specifications.¹³

Fortunately for both the army and the NPS, the army’s return was not long-lived.¹⁴ Assisted by the officers of the army, who were “especially anxious to rid [themselves] of the duty of maintaining old fort Yellowstone and providing for the protection of the park,” Director Mather gathered additional data relating to the “inadvisability of using troops in the protection of national parks, devoting considerable attention to the cost of maintaining a military force in [an] isolated post where there was no opportunity for troop drill or other army work.”¹⁵ Furthermore, “public disapproval of such nonmilitary use of troops when the nation was at war created dissatisfaction that even a stubborn Congress could not overlook.”¹⁶ Thus, on July 1, 1918, troops were authorized to withdraw from the park. Fort Yellowstone was officially turned back over to the NPS on October 31, 1918, when the army left the park for the final time.

Once the 1918 Sundry Civil Appropriations Act placed the NPS “in complete control of the administration, protection, and improvement of the park,” the tense situation was relieved. Director Mather heralded this move as “not less important than the organization of the new ranger force.” To underscore his authority, he also made the former U.S. Engineers’ Office, also known as the “Pagoda,” constructed by Hiram Chittenden in 1903, the official headquarters of the National Park Service in the park.¹⁷

After the park was returned to civilian governance, work began assembling its new ranger force. Compared to the large number of soldiers (450) that had been assigned to police and protect the park, the number of assigned civilian rangers (50) was small.¹⁸ Mather made much of the fiduciary appeal of replacing army troops with NPS rangers: “The military force necessarily had to maintain a semblance of army organization in the park,” he wrote, “hence its outposts were garrisoned with squads of men, only one or two of whom regularly patrolled each district. Under the new organization, rangers are assigned in pairs to districts and each is required

to do patrolling work. Thus the cost of protecting the park has been reduced enormously.”¹⁹ The new ranger force of 1918, “composed largely of members of the force developed in 1916,” was efficient, cost-effective, and capable of protecting the park, he emphasized. The rangers—described ideally as one chief ranger, four assistant chief rangers, and 25 rangers of the first class, supplemented by 25 “temporary rangers, traffic officers, and automobile checkers” in the summer, were “all hardy men of the mountains, skilled in forestry, and woodcraft, accustomed to the hardships of the severe winters, trained in the use of snowshoes and skiis [*sic*], and thoroughly familiar, in most cases, with the entire park area.”²⁰ The chief scout during the army’s last days, James McBride, was appointed the first chief ranger in October 1919.²¹

By 1920, a year after he became superintendent of the park, Horace Albright had organized Yellowstone’s operations into ten departments: (1) the administrative department, consisting of the assistant superintendent and purchasing agent who “handle[d] matters in the general headquarters office . . . attending to the multitude of . . . matters naturally appertaining to a large Government office and required by the laws, rules, and policies governing the NPS”; (2) the engineering department, with a resident engineer who supervised “the

road maintenance and construction and other physical improvements”; (3) the protection department, with the chief ranger who was “in charge of the protection of the park, the operation of the buffalo and hay ranches, the care of wild animals, the fighting of forest fires, and similar activities”; (4) the information department, with a park naturalist who was “in charge of the information office and all scientific work carried on in the park, either under the Park Service or by scientists working in the park under authority from the Department”; (5) the mechanical department, with a master mechanic who supervised and controlled the mechanical shops; (6) the property and transportation department, with a master of transportation who had “charge of all freighting operations”; (7) the electrical department, with a chief electrician; (8) a mini-department consisting of the chief lineman in charge of the telephone lines in the park; (9) the sanitation department, with a master plumber; and (10) the painting department, with a master painter.²² In 1921, Albright consolidated activities and supervision of the chief lineman, thus reducing the number of departments to nine: Administrative, Engineering, Protection, Information, Mechanical, Electrical, Property/Transportation, Sanitation and Painting.²³

By 1922, the ranger organization, which, Haines noted, stressed “the line-of-authority of a military organization,” was led by Chief Ranger Samuel T. Woodring, a veteran of the Spanish–American War and former army packmaster. Woodring had only one year of ranger experience when he was promoted to chief ranger, but as Haines wrote, he was a natural leader and an able organizer.²⁴ In 1922, Albright commented that Woodring oversaw the protection department with “great efficiency.”²⁵ Woodring worked with three assistant chiefs (one for each of the three ranger districts: north, south, and west—by 1926 there were four assistant chiefs); from 24 to 27 park rangers (both first-class rangers—those in charge of the important stations in each district—and the permanent park rangers under the first-class rangers); and from 42 to 58 temporary rangers who served during the travel season.²⁶

By 1925, the permanent rangers were selected on the basis of a series of civil service rules and a civil service examination. Seasonal ranger positions were filled by appointment. According to Haines, the position was so “glamorized” that a form letter was issued to warn “young men,” who anticipated “a sinecure with nothing resembling hard work to perform,” or a “pleasant vacation amid the beauties and wonders of Yellowstone



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #27701

United States Engineer Office (center), also known as the “Pagoda,” ca. 1915.

Park, with very frequent trips about the park and innumerable dances and other diversions to occupy one's leisure hours," and who had hopes "of making and saving considerable money," that the situation really was otherwise.²⁷

The routine of a ranger's day in the 1920s was "sharply differentiated between a short summer season, with problems created by a massive visitation, and a long 'off' season (much of it winter) in which the protection of the Park and its wildlife [was] the principal occupation."²⁸ Activities in a ranger's day included checking automobiles at the several entrances, patrolling for speeders, informing the public about the park's natural features, lecturing on subjects of interest to the public, wildlife management, protective patrolling, and housekeeping at one of the cabins or stations during the off-season.

The rangers used the army's former soldier stations and snowshoe cabins while patrolling the park, protecting its wildlife, and managing—helping, informing, and policing—its visitors. By the mid-1920s, as the park's focus on recreation was modified to include an equal emphasis on education, the ranger's role as educator under the direction of a new park naturalist grew, as did the park's Department of Information. The built environment changed, as well: community rooms, or meeting places where lectures and other educational sessions could take place, were added to the NPS's free public automobile camps, and a series of museums was built.

Enhancing the Built Environment

The buildings added to the park's administrative infrastructure during the late 1910s and 1920s were primarily snowshoe cabins, ranger stations, campground meeting rooms, and museums. In the new civilian era, landscape engineers and landscape architects played important roles in crafting the built landscape. In 1905, when he revised his chapter devoted to the park's administrative history, Hiram Chittenden suggested that no continuing outlay be devoted to "beautify and adorn" the park. "Nature has attended to these matters herself," he wrote. "The further policy of the government in regard to the Park should be strictly negative," he continued, "with the sole object of preserving it unimpaired, as its founders intended, for the 'benefit and enjoyment' of succeeding generations."²⁹ A decade later, landscape architects agreed: "The [landscape architect as] national

park designer cannot, of course, design the mountains," wrote Henry Vincent Hubbard, Harvard professor of landscape architecture. "But, if he is from long and humble study an interpreter of natural beauty, he can present the mountains to the observer effectively."³⁰ But as more and more people visited the park, and as the NPS decided that educating the visiting public was a priority, adding to the park's administrative infrastructure became essential.

To minimize the impact of the new buildings on the park's scenic and natural features, the NPS asked its landscape engineers to build structures that harmonized with their environment. "All of the improvements in the parks must be carefully harmonized with the landscape," NPS Director Stephen Mather wrote in 1918, "and to this end engineers trained in landscape architecture and fully appreciative of the necessity for maintaining the parks in their natural state must be employed to supervise and carry out all improvement work. New improvements must be planned carefully and comprehensively in advance of execution."³¹ Mather's words fit nicely with Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane's seminal NPS policy letter of 1918 (drafted by Albright during his stint as acting director of the NPS during Mather's illness). "In the construction of roads, trails, buildings, and other improvements," the letter declared,

particular attention must be devoted always to the harmonizing of these improvements with the landscape. This is a most important item in our program of development and requires the employment of trained engineers who either possess a knowledge of landscape architecture or have a proper appreciation of the esthetic value of park lands. All improvements will be carried out in accordance with a preconceived plan developed with special reference to the preservation of the landscape, and comprehensive plans for future development of the national parks on an adequate scale will be prepared as funds are available for this purpose.³²

In their studies of landscape architecture and the national parks, historians Linda Flint McClelland and Ethan Carr provided detailed discussions of the role landscape architects played in the development and maintenance—improvement and protection—of our national parks. "Beginning in 1918," according to McClelland, the NPS hired landscape architects to "plan

and design park villages, campgrounds, roads and trails, and facilities and to provide advice on issues affecting the scenery of the parks.”³³ Landscape architects not only helped parks provide access to visitors, they also helped them preserve the very scenery those visitors were seeking. As Carr wrote, landscape architecture was critical to “successfully develop[ing] parks in ways that would assure the preservation of scenic qualities.”³⁴ In 1917, Frank Albert Waugh, a professor of landscape architecture at Massachusetts Agricultural College, rhetorically asked, who better to deal with national parks “except the men best trained in the love of the landscape and in the technical methods by which it alone can be conserved, restored, improved, clarified, made available and spiritually effective in the hearts of men and women?”³⁵

According to McClelland, landscape engineers “forged a cohesive style of naturalistic park design . . . rooted in the fundamental twofold philosophy, first, that landscape be preserved, and second, that all construction harmonize with nature.” This design style held to several principles: “Construction was to disturb the ground as little as possible. Improvements were to be of native materials and rustic in character. Obtrusive development was to be avoided altogether or placed in inconspicuous locations and screened from public view.”³⁶

The first landscape engineer appointed by Mather was Charles P. Punchard, Jr. A student of landscape design at Harvard University, and a partner in his own firm, Punchard at the time of his appointment was in charge of landscape development for all of the public parks in Washington, D.C. Through this work, Punchard gained experience dealing with both politics and the restrictions of a government budget that would prove useful after he entered the employ of the NPS.³⁷ He was, as Mather wrote of him, “of the ability and willingness to take a very practical view of the problems to be solved, and to attack them always with full appreciation of the limitations of the park appropriations and the relation of these problems to other features of improvement of the park system.”³⁸ The other part of this new “field engineering” division of the NPS was civil engineer George E. Goodwin, who served as chief engineer and point person for “surveying, contracting, and building park roads and trails.”³⁹

Punchard described the role of an NPS landscape engineer in an article he wrote for the journal *Landscape Architecture*, “Landscape Design in the National Park Service.” The landscape engineer “is a small fine arts commission in himself,” he noted,

for all plans of the concessioners must be submitted to him for approval as to architecture and location before they can be constructed, and he is responsible for the design of all structures of the Service, the location of roads and other structures on the ground which will influence the appearance of the parks, ranger cabins, rest houses, checking stations, gateway structures, employees’ cottages, comfort stations, forest improvement and vista thinning, the preservation of the timber along the park roads, the design of villages where the popularity of the parks has made it necessary to provide certain commercial institutions for the comfort of the tourist and the camper, the design and location of the automobile camps, and so on through the many ramifications of all these problems.⁴⁰

By all accounts, Punchard was very successful in his short tenure as landscape engineer for the NPS—he died less than two and one-half years after his appointment. As McClelland noted, Punchard was a troubleshooter with a gift for concealing unsightliness and cleaning up messes already part of the cultural landscape in older parks such as Yellowstone.

Punchard’s goals for cleaning up Yellowstone followed his assessment of the park’s appearance during the summer of 1919, and amounted to the first efforts at planned landscape improvement for the park. He outlined his suggestions for improving “some of the more important parts of the park” in a ten-page memo to Albright. His approach was to work “in the vicinity of the important centers first, and as these sections assume[d] the appearance desired and the most important improvements [were] made, continue to work out from these centers along the roads and in time accomplish the desired result.” “Many of the suggestions I shall make,” he wrote,

are matters of policing and maintenance which have escaped the attention of the persons in charge, and although many of them may seem small and unimportant in themselves and perhaps could be done away with in the light of larger and more conspicuous undertakings, nevertheless, collectively they are of the greatest importance in the general appearance of the park, and when they are once attended to and the work well done, the area will require very little atten-

tion from year to year for maintenance.⁴¹

Punchard provided a detailed analysis of the park's appearance and specific suggestions for improvement.

He recommended starting at Mammoth Hot Springs, clearing the area to make it more attractive and to lessen any danger of fire. He suggested mowing in front of the hotel, cutting all dead wood out of the trees on the parade ground, and removing "old stumps and branches" from the "old geyser craters." Furthermore, he felt, removing the old employee buildings along the road from Liberty Cap to the Mammoth Camp, and building new quarters in the row of buildings formerly used as quarters for the non-commissioned officers behind the stables would go a long way toward improving the appearance of the area. He also suggested remodeling many of the unused buildings in the fort area "for dwelling purposes," thus reducing the higher cost of new construction.⁴²

Punchard also recommended developing "the Gardiner [North] Entrance to the Park . . . at an early date and follow[ing] up until it has been made as attractive and interesting as possible." In this, Punchard concurred with Director Mather, who believed in marking park entrances "with appropriate gateway structures," to give "the American tourist" the "sense of pride and thrill of pleasure that are inspired . . . as he passes through imposing pillars or arches that announce to him that he is entering a great playground that belongs to him and to all America."⁴³ The proposed construction of an office building at the North Entrance in 1920 would be "a step in the right direction," Punchard thought.⁴⁴ He also designed the East Entrance in 1919, but its construction was delayed because of a lack of funding; as McClelland pointed out, the construction of gateways often depended upon special appropriations. Punchard's design for the East Entrance "featured a portal of massive local logs which was in scale and character with the surrounding forest and modeled after the Mount Rainier arch."⁴⁵

Punchard received permission from the U.S. Weather Bureau to remove an old snow gauge and other weather instruments from the parade ground because they were no longer used, and were "unsightly." He also had a solution for enhancing the Wraith Falls area, where the vista had been created by cutting "many trees" that still lay on the ground. Punchard suggested that they be chopped up and used as firewood for campers, who would otherwise have cut wood improperly near the

camping areas. Other vistas needed cleaning up, as well: the observation stations and platforms in the Canyon area were, according to Punchard, "unsightly and unattractive." He suggested replacing them with ones constructed of lava rock or formation stone, and providing some protection from the sun for "people desiring to spend considerable time at these observation points."⁴⁶ He wanted all "inadequate and unattractive" structures removed and replaced with "more attractive," appropriately integrated structures. For example, he argued, the seating accommodations at Old Faithful Geyser should be replaced with rustic equivalents.⁴⁷

Punchard also was not loathe to recommend policing the movements of tourists. He argued, for example, for "so protect[ing] areas that tourists can not reach them," and erecting structures that might even "mar [a feature] materially," because "some such precaution is necessary, [as long as] the . . . method is as satisfactory and inoffensive as it is possible." For example, visitors sometimes tended to drive right up to the edge of pools and other features, and thus threaten these features' beauty, integrity, and very existence. Punchard himself had seen "visible evidence of an automobile having been driven within *one inch* of the edge" of Morning Glory Pool.⁴⁸ Constructing unobtrusive barriers around such features was considered a lesser evil than allowing visitors to destroy them.

The following year, Punchard found that the park had a "healthy appearance," in contrast to what he had seen the year before. Both park staff and concessioners had made an effort at improvements, he noted in a letter to Albright. In the same letter, he made recommendations for the colors of paint to be used by the NPS and



Warning sign at Old Faithful. 1920.

YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #23951

its concessioners.⁴⁹ Log buildings, for example, should be painted a dark brown, and roofs of the ranger stations should be stained green.⁵⁰ Painting the sprinkling tanks located along the roads a light green color would harmonize them with adjacent foliage, he argued, and the ones located in open spaces, such as on Swan Lake Flat, should be painted a light grey.⁵¹ The newly built filling stations had an attractive design, he argued—so attractive, in fact, that “it seem[ed] a pity to erect a flaring, bright red pump in front of them.” “Competition being eliminated,” he wrote, “there is no reason for extensive or original advertising schemes to obtain business.” He believed that the stations should be painted a dark green, grey, or dark brown.⁵²

Some buildings were to be painted so as to make them as inconspicuous as possible. Others were to be painted to harmonize with the color scheme of what Punchard called a “village.” For example, when asked to comment on the painting of buildings in the Mammoth area—or Mammoth Village, as he called it—Punchard suggested using a grey paint or stain to match the color of Harry Child’s house, which was built in the vicinity of the hotel he operated. The roofs then should be stained or painted green, Punchard argued. While he liked the idea of painting Fort Yellowstone’s red tile roofs green to match the Engineer’s Office building used as park headquarters, he did recognize that, as he put it in a letter to Albright, “in doing so we would be destroying an expensive tile roof and [thus] might arouse some local criticism.”⁵³

Punchard also weighed in on the policy, adopted by the NPS in 1920, of using standardized directional signs for all parks. The new signs, having a white field with green lettering, were of metal and thus considered indestructible; they were to be mounted on posts “instead of being affixed to growing trees.”⁵⁴ In Yellowstone, an order for 465 of the new signs was sent to the Hardesty Manufacturing Company.⁵⁵ As they were consistent with the color scheme he advocated, Punchard approved of the signs, and specified that they should be raised to at least five feet above the ground for easier recognition by passing motorists.⁵⁶

Scenic views were so important to Punchard that he recommended using a curb in place of a higher barrier along the Canyon rim drive, “because it will be of sufficient height [one foot above the grade] and strength to keep cars from jumping over and will be low and not obstruct the natural appearance of the rim, as much as a series of posts might.” “[I]n the Grand Canyon,” he

concluded, “the less conspicuous the barrier is made, the less it will interfere with local conditions.”⁵⁷

Local conditions were also critical when building and landscaping around the park’s soldier—now called “ranger”—stations and snowshoe cabins. The condition of these outposts was deplorable. Mather stated as much in his 1919 annual report: “Most of the ranger stations were built many years ago for the summer housing of troop detachments,” he wrote. “They are not fitted for the use of rangers, and several of them are in such dilapidated condition that it would be false economy to repair them instead of constructing new buildings.” He wanted to build “new ranger stations and information offices in connection therewith at Upper Geyser Basin, Yellowstone Lake, and Grand Canyon” in 1920.⁵⁸ Punchard agreed that the ranger stations needed considerable work. In 1919, he told Albright that several stations should be relocated to improve traffic control—the stations at Old Faithful and Norris, in particular. He made a strong case for rethinking the entire system of ranger stations.⁵⁹ Work on new stations was not begun until the summer of 1921, shortly before Punchard passed away in November; in the meantime, existing ones were painted and refurbished.

While work on the stations was put on hold, work did begin on the snowshoe cabins. Mather had complained that these cabins were “old, in bad repair, poorly located, and unsatisfactory from every standpoint.” Of all national parks, Mather argued, Yellowstone, “where the weather conditions are more severe in winter than in any other member of the system,” should have “dry, sanitary quarters” for its ranger force, which needed “the means of overcoming the effects of exposure while on long patrols in below-zero weather.” Mather communicated the gravity of the situation when he wrote: “This is frankly an appeal in the interest of humanity.”⁶⁰

With Albright’s coaxing, Mather made such a forceful plea for help that the NPS received adequate funding for seven new cabins—four replacing older ones—and for repairing four others. A new cabin was added to the fleet of snowshoe outposts at Frost Lake, near the east boundary; at Harebell Creek, on the south boundary; and near the park’s Northeast Entrance. Older cabins were replaced at Cascade Creek, on the south boundary; at Lewis Lake (actually, the new cabin was built on Aster Creek instead of again being “badly located near Lewis Lake”); at Park Point; and on Thorofare (now called Thorofare) Creek, in the park’s southeast corner. They were built of “peeled logs, well-chinked



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #3 1597

Harebell Snowshoe Cabin. 1932.

with mud,” with doors and window shutters made of “2-inch plank to provide protection from bears.” The floors were of poles “flattened on three sides,” and all but two had roofs of “rubberoid, laid over hewed poles and covered about 6 inches deep with earth.”⁶¹ Cabins at Sportsman Lake, Buffalo Lake, Grayling, and West Line (south of Riverside) received new roofs, floors, doors, and window shutters. That year, Albright reported, nineteen snowshoe cabins were “rationed or otherwise supplied for winter use.”⁶²

The Harebell and Thorofare cabins are still standing. The cabin at West Line, now called South Riverside, was built by the army, but received its last major overhaul in 1920. The new cabins, now represented by the cabin at Harebell Creek, exhibited the design characteristics later associated with Rustic, or Rocky Mountain, architecture—alternatively referred to as pioneer, or vernacular, style—and were simply the easiest and cheapest kind of cabin to build in areas far from the beaten path. Cost was clearly a factor; Congress had placed a limit of \$1,500 on any park building “unless special appropriations were granted.”⁶³ These structures were also designed to use native materials, so as to be harmonious with their surroundings—a clear goal of the landscape architects of the time.⁶⁴ The use of these materials ensured that the buildings would look natural, and thus like attractive outgrowths of the surrounding environment.

The cabin design for these snowshoe outposts was uncomplicated. They were one-room, chinked log structures (18.8' × 16.2') with overhanging roofs (1' along the sides and the back and 4' in the front) to prevent snow buildup on the concrete foundation and possibly

to keep a supply of wood dry. The building materials for the cabins—except the two six-light side-hinge windows, one on each side—were by and large available at the site. There were modifications to this one-room model. The Thorofare Creek Cabin was built to accommodate two rangers for the whole winter, and was thus longer (16' × 30'), with two rooms: a kitchen and bedroom. The old cabin it replaced was used thereafter as a stable.⁶⁵ The front porch and wooden shingles this cabin now boasts were added in 1932, as part of a process to standardize backcountry cabins.

Before the advent of landscape engineers in the NPS, “park superintendents or civil engineers designed buildings for a park or approved the work of architects or builders hired by concessionaires.”⁶⁶ After 1918, landscape engineers were involved in the process. Mather made their involvement mandatory in 1919, when he stipulated that “[l]ocations for buildings of all kinds, whether they are to be erected by the Government or by the business interests catering to the needs of the public, are selected by the superintendents of the parks in conference with the landscape engineer on the ground, and all timber of the parks necessary in construction of such buildings is selected and marked for cutting by these officers.”⁶⁷ Requiring the involvement of a landscape engineer relieved pressure from some superintendents and annoyed others, but it most certainly added time and some measure of inconvenience. In 1922, Mather wrote to all park superintendents, admitting that this new provision added time to the process—he asked that requests for project approval be sent two or three months ahead of time—and that it removed some sense of authority

from the superintendents. He reminded them, however, that landscape engineers played an invaluable role in ensuring that structures “fit into the park environment in a harmonious manner,” and that the superintendents would “be held responsible to the Director for the faithful adherence to the details of the design as worked out” with the landscape engineer.⁶⁸ Superintendent Albright wrote a short perfunctory note back: “I am glad to advise you,” he wrote to Mather, “that in conference with Landscape Engineer Hull [Punchard’s replacement], . . . I advised him of the work that ought to be done for Yellowstone Park . . . and as far as I know the Yellowstone landscape needs are receiving full consideration.”⁶⁹

Besides being involved with siting and designing buildings, Punchard worked on the expansion and improvement of automobile camps in Yellowstone. These camps were separate from the facilities previously run by two separate concessioners, W. W. Wylie and the Shaw & Powell Camping Company, which were consolidated into the Yellowstone Park Camping Company in 1917, during the major reorganization of concessions that took place when the NPS took over management of the park.⁷⁰ The park had operated auto camps since 1916; already in 1917, officials had noticed a substantial increase in the number of tourists entering the park by automobile and making use of the camps.⁷¹ In 1919, Mather reported that Punchard had spent considerable time on the “extremely important task” of locating and improving these automobile camps. For Mather, the potential revenue from automobiles entering the parks represented a significant addition to the NPS budget—money that could then be used for the road improvements. “[T]he increase in automobile revenue,” he wrote in 1917, “means better highways in the [Yellowstone] park.”⁷²

Automobiles would raise money, Mather argued, and more importantly, they would allow everyday Americans to visit their national parks.⁷³ To Mather’s way of thinking, automobiles democratized the parks by allowing Americans of all socio-economic levels to visit them. In 1921, Mather observed, “the advent of the automobile with the opportunities for its use freely in all the parks in the past five years has been the open sesame for many thousands.”⁷⁴ Yellowstone stood to benefit from these new tourists, as well. “The private camping outfit of the motorist,” Mather wrote in his *Annual Report* to the interior secretary, “has gained for the Yellowstone widespread recognition of its great resort possibilities.”⁷⁵ To accommodate these new thousands, Yellowstone, in his view, needed to expand and improve its automobile

camps—and that is what Punchard and Albright set about doing. “Plans already outlined by the landscape engineer of the service and the superintendent,” Mather wrote, “call for the improvement and maintenance of over 50 large camp grounds reasonably adjacent to the park roads.”⁷⁶ In his 1919 *Annual Report*, Albright referred to a “crying need for the immediate construction of several large new automobile camp grounds” and called for “progressively extend[ing] and improv[ing] year by year” this improvement schedule, so that “as soon as possible not less than 50 major camps should be made available.”⁷⁷ By this time, approximately 25,000 people (60 percent of visitors) annually toured the park in their own cars, and with their own camp equipment.⁷⁸ This “complete camp system” for Yellowstone National Park did not materialize for quite some time, but work on it began in earnest the very next year when, according to Albright, “excellent progress was made.”⁷⁹

Work during those early years consisted of getting “a good supply of pure drinking water, and adequate sanitary toilet facilities” to the major camps. New sites on the knoll near Canyon Junction (formerly the site of a Wylie Permanent Camp at today’s Brink of Upper Falls road entrance) and at the Upper Geyser Basin, “in the thick timber on the opposite side of the road from Old Faithful,” received water and sanitary earth closets. The established site at Mammoth Hot Springs (northeast of the power house) proved to be more popular with tourists than the site at the old barns (in front of Marble Terrace), which was abandoned. The power house site also received more toilets and a better water supply.⁸⁰ In July 1920, Punchard suggested that Albright consider installing flush toilets, especially for the Mammoth automobile camp. “The time is coming,” he admonished. He also recommended “[c]amp-fire talks, the installation of letter boxes and perhaps at some time when conditions demand, the erection of a small branch store in these camps where a few staples can be carried, and a campers’ register kept.”⁸¹

Punchard was also heavily involved with construction projects at the concessioner-run private camps. He had advocated a “group system of cottages, with central toilet facilities” for the Mammoth Camp (Mammoth Lodge) of the Yellowstone Park Camping Company, and in 1920, was happy to see the plans coming together. He was critical of the architectural style, however. A visit to Glacier National Park had convinced Punchard that a Swiss-chalet type of architecture was fitting for the camp, and he shared that information with both the

concessioner and the NPS: “It [the Swiss chalet type of architecture] would be . . . [a] particularly interesting setting and a thoroughly satisfactory type to adopt from the point of view of the concessioner and the Service,” he wrote to Albright in July 1920.⁸²

On August 1, 1920, Mather appointed Daniel R. Hull to be Punchard’s assistant. When Punchard died of tuberculosis in November of that year, Hull became the senior landscape engineer and served as the NPS’s “principal planner and designer” until 1927. Mather lamented Punchard’s passing and, in his report to the interior secretary, paid tribute to Punchard’s “sterling worth,” his “proven ability,” “splendid enthusiasm,” and “rare personal qualities” that had “won for him the respect and affection of all with whom he came in contact.”⁸³ In February 1921, Hull in turn acquired an assistant landscape engineer, Paul Kiessig.

Hull graduated from the University of Illinois in 1913, with a bachelor of science degree in agriculture—specifically horticulture, and then in 1914 from Harvard with a master’s degree in landscape architecture. At the time of his appointment, he was working in Milwaukee, Wisconsin; before that, he had been employed as a landscape engineer in San Francisco, and as a camp and hospital planner during World War I. According to McClelland, Hull “had fine drafting and architectural skills, which supplemented Punchard’s strong philosophical outlook.” “Unlike Punchard,” McClelland wrote, “[Hull] wrote few reports, and those he did were brief.” “There is little question, however,” she continued, “of the achievements of the landscape program during his tenure.” Kiessig also graduated from the University of Illinois with a degree in agriculture, but three years earlier than Hull. He worked for the NPS for two years, after which Thomas Vint, hired by Hull in November 1922, took over as assistant landscape engineer. Vint was trained as a landscape architect at the University of California at Berkeley.⁸⁴

By 1921, two new ranger stations were complete. Punchard’s design plan for these and any other new ranger stations rested on a conceptual reorganization of the park’s *modus operandi*: he advocated combining new ranger stations with community rooms for campers. Albright, too, wanted stations “large enough to accommodate several park rangers, a divisional highway engineer, and a large information office in which maps, national park circulars of information, and other data useful to the public [would] be made accessible to tourists.”⁸⁵ Mather had called for something similar, a combination ranger



NPS PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #32495

Mammoth Automobile Camp. 1929.

station/information center in 1919. Punchard’s design for a community room/ranger station would bring the ranger and his information right to the public.

Funding for building the ranger station/community centers was secured by the end of the summer of 1920. Mather thanked the House Appropriations Committee, and even gave credit, in his annual report of 1920, for the conceptualization of the new stations to the chairman of the committee. “That these stations should contain large central rooms, to be maintained as information headquarters and community centers for campers, was the farsighted suggestion of Chairman Good, of the House Appropriation Committee,” he wrote.⁸⁶ The plan, as Haines described it, was to keep interpretation of the park’s natural features “low-keyed and entertaining.” These ranger station/community rooms were thus a way to personalize and demystify learning about the park. “This rustic hall [the community room],” Haines wrote, “adorned with elk antlers, sheep horns, and bison skulls, served an information purpose by day: a place where visitors could get their bearings and any other help they might need. In the evening it became the scene of a folksy gathering by a log fire. There, visitors could listen to a ‘lecturer’ talk about the Park and join in group singing. It was a personalized experience with great appeal,” he concluded.⁸⁷

Planning the buildings was not without controversy and disagreement. Records of these arguments illustrate how involved Mather was with the minutiae of his job as NPS director, and also how useful it was to have an expert in the field of landscape architecture involved with planning NPS structures in Yellowstone. In April 1921, Acting Landscape Engineer Hull sent Mather a plan and prospectus for the “rangers’ quarters

and community rooms” to be built at Canyon and Old Faithful that summer. The layout, as Hull described it, was “developed along simple lines keeping in mind the requirements of the structure” and was “one of two requested by Superintendent Albright.”⁸⁸

Mather responded to Albright, basically approving the layout, but suggesting revisions for Albright’s and Hull’s consideration. He wanted a fireplace “flush with the wall of the room, or nearly so,” and not recessed, as Albright and Hull had planned, so more heat was thrown out “far enough into the room.” He also wanted a provision for heating the rangers’ dormitory. “I would like to have the rangers have their own complete privacy,” he noted, “but surely when they return to their quarters after a hard day’s work, perhaps chilled and wet, a fireplace or stove will be as much a necessity in their quarters as in the community room.” He suggested floor plan changes such that the rangers could use “the same chimney of the community room fireplace for a fireplace in [their] dining room.”⁸⁹

Hull responded to Mather’s suggestions by defending the original plan: “The problem of a fire place for heating is one which always presents difficulties,” he wrote, “but from my observations at the various camping company camps in Yellowstone, I believe the solution indicated on our plan would be quite satisfactory,” he argued. “If the night is cold, and the fire a large one,” he explained further, “the ingle nook would be too warm, but the larger room should be quite comfortable for dancing, and I think the unobstructed floor area might be an advantage. With the smaller fire which would be burning ordinarily, heating the room would not be the primary motive, and in that event, I do not believe the recessed opening would be objectionable.” With respect to the fireplace for the rangers, he also disagreed with Mather’s suggestion: “In this layout we have assumed of course that the community room would be used only during the park season while the rangers’ quarters would likely be used throughout the year. In this connection a chimney has been provided in the end of the kitchen store room which will give flue connections to the three main rooms of the rangers’ quarters. Stoves I think would be more satisfactory here than an open fire.”⁹⁰

Albright also had ideas about the design of the ranger station/community centers. Regarding the proposed Old Faithful Ranger Station, Albright wanted the design to reflect the architecture of Old Faithful Inn, with the use of “special windows, dormers and brackets under the rafters; these perhaps to be of bent limbs of Lodgepole

trees.” The design should also “impart something of the character of the central building of Old Faithful Camp, possibly through using the stairstep method of cutting off the ends of the logs.” Albright preferred peeled logs and told Hull so; logs with bark tended to attract vermin, he explained, and eventually the bark would come off anyway.⁹¹

While it was necessary to secure the best bid for constructing the stations, Albright knew who he wanted to build them—Merritt I. Tuttle of Fromberg, Montana. “Very frankly,” Albright wrote, “. . . there is only one man in this region who can build these log structures just as we want them to be built[: Tuttle].” Albright reminded Mather that Tuttle had built “the splendid central building of the Lake Camp,” today’s Lake Lodge. Albright also noted that it was Tuttle who had “erected the new dining room and kitchen of the Canyon Camp, which [Mather had] inspected . . . [as well as] Camp Roosevelt.” Tuttle was, according to Albright, “not only a builder, but an architect,” and he had “far more artistic sense and more appreciation of woodland values than any ordinary architect or builder.” He had, Albright added, “vast experience in building log structures,” and “a deep affection for the park itself.”⁹²

Tuttle was awarded the contract for two ranger stations/community centers.⁹³ But further disagreements were at hand—this time with Landscape Engineer Hull—over the placement of the stations/centers. Correspondence regarding this issue illustrated the power that landscape engineers had been given, as well as the kinds of considerations taken into account when locating structures in the park. A concerned Albright wired Mather on July 27: “Hull and I are in Friendly but direct conflict over location of new ranger stations at Canyon and old faithful,” Albright complained. “[H]e wants them back in trees where they cannot be seen[.] I want them out in the open[:] if the buildings are attractive why hide them[?] [I] have held up work on canyon station and wired Hull but he will not change his decision and I will not agree to his site[.] please wire your decision as contractor has sixteen men waiting.”⁹⁴ A “terribly disappointed” Albright had wired Hull the day before to say that he did not like the location of the Canyon station under construction: “No chance of our getting tourists to see it and use it,” he had written. “Am convinced must have it in open where everybody can see it. . . . Rangers discouraged. Please wire permission to change site. . . . Also wire permission to use shingles. Shakes will cost three thousand dollars. Must close contract.”⁹⁵

Perhaps Mather was thinking of this dispute when he addressed the issue of how differences of opinion between landscape engineers and park superintendents should be handled in a letter to all superintendents in January 1922. “In such cases where a friendly difference of opinion exists,” he wrote, “the matter can be referred to the Director for the final decision, and the decision when given will constitute no reflection on the judgment of either—it is simply that there were two possibilities and the best one in the Director’s opinion was followed.”⁹⁶ As it was, the issue between Hull and Albright regarding the location of the Canyon station/center was resolved in Hull’s favor—the station was built at the Brink of the Upper Falls. Albright’s opinion of Hull improved immensely after resolution of this affair. “I am so thoroughly delighted with the work that Mr. Hull has done in the Yellowstone,” he wrote in a letter to Mather, “I feel more than ever, if that is possible, that his work is second to no other in the NPS. In this respect I frankly confess to a revision of some views that I had last fall,” referring perhaps to the issue over siting of the Canyon station/center.⁹⁷ In a letter to Hull in October 1922, Albright went out of his way to emphasize that structures built in the park were in accordance with Hull’s input regarding design and location. For example, when describing plans for building the Lake ranger station/community center, Albright noted that the structure was “built according to your plans and specifications and on the site selected by you.” For every building he described in that report, Albright confirmed that it had been built according to Hull’s plan and on Hull’s recommended site.⁹⁸

In October 1921, Albright wrote to Paul Kiessig concerning the construction of a barn near the Canyon station/center. In that letter, he emphasized that he was

very pleased with the outcome of the building. “The entire improvement at the Canyon constitutes a thing of beauty,” he wrote.⁹⁹ Mather was also pleased with the outcome, and proudly described the “community buildings” in his report to the secretary. They “consist of quarters for the rangers and a large community room for the visitors,” he wrote. “The structures are built of logs, the community rooms for social gatherings and information headquarters containing huge fireplaces and other comforts.”¹⁰⁰ Albright also praised the structures at Canyon and Old Faithful. “Architecturally,” he wrote to Hull, “they are the peers of the finest buildings in the park.” He also conceded that Hull had been correct in the locations he had chosen for both buildings, which he “observed to be right.”¹⁰¹

Plans for a ranger station/community center at Lake were underway in 1922, as were plans, using identical floor drawings, for a station/center at Cooke City, Montana, and a fish hatchery at Trout Lake. The Tuttles, a father-and-son duo, would construct the Lake ranger station/community center, while Chief Ranger Woodring and First Assistant Chief Ranger Trischman would build the Cooke City station and the hatchery. The Bureau of Fisheries and the NPS split the costs for the hatchery.¹⁰²

The Lake community center/ranger station, according to Mather, was “a triumph in woodland architecture, being built of logs and having its community room octagonal in shape with perfect jointing of logs.”¹⁰³ Albright, too, was pleased: “You will be greatly pleased with the work on this building,” he penned to Hull, who was in California at the time. “It has been done in a most creditable manner and with the most careful consideration of landscape values.”¹⁰⁴ Both Mather



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #31716

Old Faithful Ranger Station. 1929.



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #31713

Old Faithful Ranger Station fireplace. 1923.



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #31680

Lake Ranger Station. 1923.

and Albright were especially pleased with the “indoor campfire” in the octagonal community room. “The Lake Station has become one of the talked-of structures of the park,” Albright proclaimed in his annual report for 1922.¹⁰⁵

When all three community center/ranger stations were painted, the color scheme worked out a little differently than proposed. The outside walls were to be stained a dark color with diluted creosote, while the windows, doors, trim, inside walls, and shingles were to be a light color.¹⁰⁶ When Albright notified Hull that the outside walls actually came out lighter than the trim, Hull was unconcerned: “Our chief desire is to kill the new effect of the buildings,” he wrote back to Albright, “and if the wall color is dark enough for that, we can let the other work out as it may.”¹⁰⁷ Only the ranger station/community center at Lake still stands. The station at Canyon “fell a victim to progress in 1959,” as did the station at Old Faithful, to make room for a visitor center in the 1970s.¹⁰⁸

In addition to the ranger station/community centers, several other examples of Rustic Style architecture were constructed in the park during Hull’s first year as landscape engineer. In particular, Hull was involved with the Upper Slough Creek ranch house, which was intended to house the assistant buffalokeeper during a time when the park was expanding its haying operations to include the Slough Creek meadows; two snowshoe cabins, one on Hellroaring Creek, the other on Fox Creek; and a ranger station on Crevice Mountain. Each of these structures remains as visible evidence of the type of architecture considered to be in keeping with the

park’s landscape: the structures were a harmonious fit to both their environment and their function as part of the National Park Service’s protective mission.

During the spring of 1921, Albright corresponded and held discussions with Hull regarding the type of log architecture that was appropriate for “out-of-the-way” places in Yellowstone. Hull favored an “old time log cabin effect.” Albright suggested that Hull study the design of the cabins built by park rangers, arguing that the rangers’ design “admirably fits their needs and it certainly harmonizes with the environment.” His examples were a ranch house built by Warren “Peck” Hutchings at what was by then called the Lower Slough Creek horse (or hay) ranch, “some five miles off the Cooke City road and



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #122423

The log work on the corners of the Lake Ranger Station. 1923.

twelve miles by road and trail from Camp Roosevelt,” and a “hurriedly built” cabin constructed near the south boundary in the fall of 1920.¹⁰⁹ Both projects were log constructions picturesquely located in the backcountry. Albright mentioned to Hull that such designs should be used for any new structures built in “the distant isolated sections of this Park,” because rangers had to work on such projects and materials had to be readily available on site.¹¹⁰

Albright also told Hull that a new Slough Creek hay ranch (what became known as Upper Slough Creek hay ranch) was being planned for the upper regions of the Slough Creek valley. He wanted to be able to use a design similar to the cabins he had mentioned by way of example, for he believed that all buildings and corrals belonging to the new ranch should be constructed of logs, as it “would make a picturesque log establishment that ought to be very interesting to travelers on the Slough Creek Trail.” “If the cabins that I have described, strike you as worthy of adoption without fundamental modifications,” he wrote to Hull, “I wish you would wire me to that effect, and if the modifications desired do not require too elaborate an explanation, perhaps you could include them in a telegram.”¹¹¹

By June 1921, plans were underway to construct the cabin at a site recently turned over to hay production for the park’s elk population—the Upper Slough Creek hay ranch. “A log cabin and log barn will be constructed on Slough Creek about four miles above the present hay ranch [Lower Slough Creek hay ranch] at a site where it is proposed to put up additional hay for winter use of the elk,” wrote Albright in his monthly superintendent’s report for June 1921. “The house is to be about 16 × 30 feet, and the barn about 40 feet long by 18 feet wide. Both floors and ceilings will be of boards, and the roofs will be of boards covered with rubberoid.” As Albright noted, Hull had approved the design plan.¹¹²

Just before the cabin at Upper Slough Creek was built, a “substantial log cabin was built on Hellroaring Creek” in March and April by “the regular ranger force” to replace the cabin built by Captain Erwin in 1898, which had become uninhabitable.¹¹³ The 15' × 32', two-room cabin and 12' × 27' log stable were, according to Albright, “better built and considerably superior to the ordinary snowshoe cabin” —a necessity, he claimed, “in view of the fact that last winter it was found desirable to keep two or three men in this station for a large part of the winter to herd back the elk, to keep them inside the park, and in the vicinity of the Slough Creek feeding

grounds.”¹¹⁴ One noteworthy feature of the Hellroaring Cabin was that it lacked an extended front porch, as did the one at Thorofare.¹¹⁵

In August 1921, park ranger Harry Anderson and his crew built another “very substantial and comfortable” snowshoe cabin, this one at Fox Creek.¹¹⁶ From an architectural standpoint, the Fox Creek Cabin is considered “interesting and somewhat unique” for its “dovetail notches at the corners and the cleat daubing technique between the logs.”¹¹⁷ One design difference between these cabins (both the snowshoe and the herder’s) built in 1921, and those built both before and after was the use, in 1921, “of two purlins between the ridgepole and wall as compared to just one in the earlier examples.”¹¹⁸ Thus, the herder’s cabin at Slough Creek, which was also referred to as the Lower Slough Creek Patrol Cabin, as well as the Hellroaring and Fox Creek Snowshoe Cabins, contained an extra purlin.

The ranger station at Crevice Mountain was also built in August 1921. Thomas H. Lewis of Jardine, Montana, constructed the three-room, T-shaped building, which was called a ranger station even though it did not serve the “public contact function” other ranger stations did. Albright referred to the cabin as “one of the more picturesque in the park.”¹¹⁹

Whether Hull conceptualized, or just approved the design rangers came up with for the cabins built in 1921, is not known. Other structures that Hull did design and were constructed during 1921, but no longer stand, are a shelter and fire lookout on Mount Washburn—both built of native rock and timber—and a new stone checking station just inside, and compatible in design with, the North Entrance arch. (The Washburn lookout was replaced in 1940, and the North Entrance checking station was replaced in the late 1930s.) This 1921 checking station was built to replace the “unsightly tent arrangement” that had formerly greeted visitors arriving from the north.¹²⁰

Other park improvements during the summer of 1921 addressed the needs of the ever-increasing number of automobile campers. New automobile camps at Lake Outlet (Fishing Bridge) and Mammoth Hot Springs were added, while the site at Canyon was extended for nearly one-half mile across the Canyon-to-Norris road. The first camp at Lake Outlet received a new cement reservoir that stored water from a nearby spring to provide water to the campground via a 4,000-foot galvanized-iron pipe and eight faucets located in the camping area. The water supply for Camp Number 2, constructed on the east

side of Fishing Bridge, was more than one mile away; a large concrete tank was built that stored the spring-fed water before distributing it to camp's eighteen faucets. Earthen toilets were installed at both sites. The extended Canyon Camp offered three faucets for camper use; two earthen toilets were installed there, as well. Albright recommended to Mather that two new big camps be built, one at Tower Fall and the other at West Thumb, and that numerous smaller ones be scattered around the park.¹²¹

The year 1921 also saw a change in the color scheme at Mammoth. The trim on the stone buildings on Officers' Row received two coats of white paint, and the window sashes were painted black. The remaining quarters on Officers' Row were painted a light grey, with light green roofs; the chimneys were painted a terra cotta color. While Albright considered the change an improvement over the dark red roofs and chimneys—"it harmonizes much better with the surroundings than did the old colors with a dark red roof," he wrote—this clearly represented a departure from historic colors.¹²²

In the Lamar Valley, work on the buffalo ranch operation moved forward as park officials erected a drift fence, constructed of heavy logs, from Opal Creek to the rim of Mount Norris and down the Lamar Valley to the ranch proper at a cost of approximately \$1,000. The 7-foot-high "worm" fence had 22-foot panels with a two-section floating boom anchored with cables over the river crossing. The ranch also received a new blacksmith shop.¹²³

During a July 1921 visit to the park when he was especially busy with the ranger station/community centers at Canyon and Old Faithful, Hull brought along the well-known landscape architects Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and Harlan P. Kelsey. After their tour of the park, Hull gave Albright numerous suggestions for improving the park's appearance, including the removal of elkhorn fences around ranger stations, particularly at West Thumb and West Yellowstone. He advised Albright that "[s]imple, natural condition should be maintained rather than freak exhibits of craftsmanship."¹²⁴ Hull's views on this issue were part of a larger move away from the embellishment of park structures. He and others considered the use of adornments, such as antlers, "as an impractical and undesirable affectation," preferring "more sturdy, functional, and unadorned structures." According to historian Linda McClelland, this "movement away from ornamented designs reflected the emergence of the 'form follows function' principle of the twentieth

century, urged by [Modern architects] Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright."¹²⁵ Hull's views aside, antlers continued to adorn buildings in the park through the 1930s and, unofficially, long after that at selected patrol cabins.¹²⁶

By 1922, the NPS's new Landscape Engineering Division had profoundly influenced the park's development at both the concessioner and government levels. All plans were reviewed by the division to ensure that sites and buildings "fit into the park environment in a harmonious manner."¹²⁷ Furthermore, the division began developing standardized plans for some park buildings, including a standard-type comfort station for auto campgrounds, three of which were built in Yellowstone in 1922—one at Lake and two at the Old Faithful auto camps.¹²⁸

In 1922, approximately 50,000 motorists camped in the park's public campgrounds. The improved, expanded system now offered facilities at Madison Junction, Tower Fall, and West Thumb in addition to those at Mammoth, Old Faithful, Canyon, and Lake. The expansion of the system relied on increased coordination of the sanitation work between the park, the U.S. Public Health Service, and the Smithsonian Institution, which was directing mosquito control in the park. Sanitation work was extensive, and consisted of reservoirs and pipelines for the auto camps, sewage systems, disposal plants, sedimentation tanks, bacteriological analyses of water and milk, and the beginnings of drainage and other work for mosquito control at Old Faithful and Lake.¹²⁹

In addition to the nearly 50,000 campers, another 50,000 tourists visited the park in 1922. Such record numbers put pressure on the park's trails system, as horse and pack trains logged a record number of miles. The NPS built an additional 88 miles of trails, including the Howard Eaton Trail in honor of pioneer guide and famous game conservationist Howard Eaton (of Eaton Ranch, Wyoming), who died on April 5, 1922. By the end of the season, Albright could proudly proclaim that the park had 781.5 miles of trails, and that greater landscaping considerations were given to the trails built in 1922 than ever before.¹³⁰

Remodeling the ranger station at Tower was the top landscape project for the 1923 season. Because of cost, Albright wanted to remodel the existing 1907 station instead of building a new one. He asked Hull to work up a design that conformed to the new Haynes Picture Shop, which he felt was "very artistic and . . . one of the prettiest structures in the Park."¹³¹ In his 1923 annual

report, Albright noted that the old ranger station would be rebuilt later that year, in October.¹³² Work actually got underway in September 1924, when Albright noted in his monthly report, “The old Tower Falls Ranger Station was rebuilt to make it conform in appearance to the other buildings in that section. A porch was built across the front, a false stone foundation laid around the buildings, the roof was extended 18 inches at the ends, and log rafters placed and the old shingles replaced with 24 inch shakes.” The doors were also replaced with ones made of “2 inch plank with heavy iron hinges and latches.” What really gave the station a different look, one more similar to the structures that surrounded it, was “[a] false log frame [that] was placed around the building to give it a paneled appearance.”¹³³

A variety of other buildings were added in 1923, and auto camps were overhauled and expanded. New additions included a 16' × 26' log mess building at the Lewis River maintenance camp, a standard 12.5' × 22' comfort station and a similarly sized laundry facility at the Mammoth Automobile Camp, and four regular comfort stations of similar size at Canyon. Plans were made to build “a frame barn with log trim” at Dunraven Pass and “a combined winter ranger quarters and summer mess hall at Old Faithful.”¹³⁴ At the auto camps, in conjunction with the U.S. Public Health Service, Yellowstone’s sanitation department completed a new water system at the camp at Tower Fall, improved the water supply to Mammoth’s and Old Faithful’s auto camps, started work on the new water system at Canyon, and opened up new areas with toilets and a water supply at Madison Junction and at “the two mile post inside the park’s east line.”¹³⁵

In 1924, flush toilets were installed at Canyon (31 toilets), Lake (8), Fishing Bridge (16), and Tower Fall (8). Five comfort stations were built that year— “two at Fishing Bridge camp, one at Lake auto camp, one at Tower Fall, and one at West Thumb.” Dunraven Pass received a new, log-trim, frame bunkhouse “for use of snow crew in the spring and maintenance crew in summer,” and a log-trim, frame ranger station and information office.¹³⁶

The East and West entrances received new checking stations, actually combined entrance and ranger stations. The idea originated with Chief Ranger Woodring, who supervised their construction. Acting NPS Director Arno Cammerer praised the design of the checking stations. “I cannot resist the impulse immediately to write you a letter of congratulations on what I consider

to be one of the finest achievements in small structure work in the Parks,” he wrote to Albright in 1924. “It is a corker and the fact that your own men built it makes it doubly interesting.” “[I]t is the type of building that will give great credit to the NPS,” he concluded.¹³⁷ The West Entrance station was intended to be permanent, while the East Entrance station was merely “a temporary expedient until a permanent structure can be designed and built.”¹³⁸ A new ranger/entrance station was built in 1932 to replace this 1924 structure.

Two new snowshoe cabins were built in 1924, as well: a 30' × 16' two-room cabin at Heart Lake (to replace the one built in 1901), and a smaller, one-room, 18' × 15' cabin at Cache Creek.¹³⁹ The snowshoe cabin at Heart Lake was constructed of unhewn, peeled, and stained logs with saddle-notched corners. The wood shingle roof was front-gabled, but without intermediate purlins; its ridge pole was decorative and V-notched. The roof hung out over the front of the cabin by six feet, thereby creating “a large open one bay porch, in the Rocky Mountain Style.” The Heart Lake Cabin represented “the snowshoe cabins built in Yellowstone National Park after creation of the NPS but before adoption of standard plans.” It illustrated the “evolutionary changes in cabin design that occurred during the 1920s,” and was “one of three 2-room snowshoe cabins built during the 1920s.”¹⁴⁰ Chief Ranger Woodring also personally oversaw the construction of this cabin.¹⁴¹

The Heart Lake Snowshoe Cabin exhibited several important design differences from cabins built earlier in the park. Its extended front porch was deeper, “which required vertical log posts to support the extended wall purlins,” and its roof, rather than being of “hewn log poles covered with ‘rubberoid’ and then a layer of dirt,” was made of wood shingles over lumber sheathing that was in turn supported by log pole rafters.¹⁴² The cabin at Cache Creek was “almost identical in design to the first cabins built by the park in 1920.” In fact, it did “not exhibit the evolutionary design changes seen on the cabins constructed in the intervening year, or the Heart Lake Snowshoe Cabin” constructed in the same year.¹⁴³ Albright wrote, in his monthly report for August 1924, that the cabin was “of the standard size and equipment.” It was designed “to facilitate winter patrols in an important game district and [made] easily accessible a region heretofore remote and difficult to cover.”¹⁴⁴

Pressure on the auto camps continued in 1925, as over 90,000 visitors used their facilities. Water pipes, sewer systems, and comfort facilities were expanded at

a number of sites. Furthermore, a new campground equipped with all the latest comforts was constructed at West Thumb; its water came from Duck Lake.¹⁴⁵ At West Thumb, referred to as “Thumb of Lake” by Albright, rangers built a new, three-room log summer station using a design provided by Hull. Hull had recommended to Albright in March of that year that the design be the same as for the log building scheduled to be built at the Belton entrance to Glacier National Park. He had recommended “using log trim frame construction instead of logs.”¹⁴⁶ This plan had to be altered, however, due to a lack of funding. In its place, a three-room, L-shaped snowshoe-cabin-type structure was built. The L-shaped “footprint [was] created by two intersecting gabled components, joined by a wood-frame breezeway.”¹⁴⁷

A unique, two-room snowshoe cabin was built that year at the mouth of Blacktail Deer Creek.¹⁴⁸ Built by rangers under the supervision of the chief ranger, the Blacktail Deer Creek Snowshoe Cabin was unique for where its main door was placed—on a longitudinal rather than latitudinal side. According to a survey of snowshoe cabins done in 2001, “[t]he cabin’s [unique] design may have been influenced by its location along the Yellowstone River, one of the more temperate snowshoe cabin locations in the park. The extended gable porch found on the other cabins, which protected the front door from snow buildup and provided for wood storage,” the report continued, “may not have been required here.”¹⁴⁹

The most important landscape project in the park in 1925 took place at Apollinaris Spring, where Hull worked together with H. B. Hommon, sanitary engineer of the U.S. Public Health Service, to improve sanitary conditions at the spring and actually create a landscape by “building a spring effect using large rocks. . . .”¹⁵⁰ Hull came to the park that June to personally supervise and direct the project.¹⁵¹ Choosing limestone slabs from the Hoodoos near Mammoth Hot Springs, Hull’s crews fashioned new approaches to the spring. Large blocks of obsidian and granite boulders were used in wall construction. Hommon designed the watercourses and plumbing, working out a system whereby the public could consume the water before it was collected for use in a sprinkling tank. Hull designed the landscape plantings. A concrete basin was constructed around the spring to provide for overflow from another spring discovered during the project.¹⁵²

At the end of the month, Superintendent Albright called Apollinaris Spring “the most beautiful piece of landscape work that has been done in the national



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #29733-3

Superintendent Albright on the steps of Apollinaris Spring, 1925.

parks as far as I know.”¹⁵³ Park visitors also appreciated the new work. Many, as Albright noted later that summer in a letter to Hull, were seen photographing the springs and then climbing “up through the shrubbery . . . look[ing] at the concrete reservoir, monkey[ing] with the valves, and in general regard[ing] this beautiful piece of landscape work as a child would regard an elephant cage in a circus.” This enthusiasm occurred much to the detriment of the landscape plantings, which were ruined and “tramped . . . up worse than ever before.” Albright hoped that “nature during the fall, winter, and spring [would] so restore natural conditions around the spring as to satisfy the curiosity of the tourist and cause him to let the situation alone.”¹⁵⁴ While the spring development came in “over-expenditure” by \$264.66 (total cost was \$1,464.66), Albright felt “it was worth it.”¹⁵⁵ Not only was the spring area more beautiful, it was also much more sanitary: “[O]f course from the standpoint of sanitation, it is equally as effective [as from the standpoint of beauty],” Albright wrote to Hull after the latter had returned to California, “because without doubt the old Apollinaris Spring was the most unsanitary thing we had.”¹⁵⁶



NPS PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #124701

Two men, one a park ranger (right), at Apollinaris Spring. 1925.

More recognition for the spring's development project came in 1926, when Superintendent Albright received high praise from Gilbert Stanley Underwood, graduate of Harvard University with a master's degree in architecture and Union Pacific Railroad's architect of several lodges in national parks such as Zion, Bryce Canyon, and the Grand Canyon's North Rim, as well as the Union Pacific Dining Hall in West Yellowstone, Montana.¹⁵⁷ In a letter to Albright, Underwood wrote:

I am tremendously impressed with the fine character of the rock work and of the scheme in general. Now if you can only develop the handkerchief pool in some sort of fashion which will eliminate the rather unpleasant symmetry and smooth concrete finish, you will have two very wonderfully developed waterscapes in Yellowstone. My heartiest congratulations on, not your efforts, but your attitude toward the right sort of atmosphere in the Parks [*sic*] development.¹⁵⁸

Not all national park superintendents received such praise from the NPS's landscape engineers. Around the time he left office as Hull's assistant, Paul Kiessig wrote an essay explaining to the general public why landscape engineers were essential to the existence of national parks, and why it would perhaps be better if park superintendents were trained in landscape engineering. In response to the question often asked of park landscape engineers, "Landscape Engineering in the National Parks? Why paint the lily?" he responded that landscape engineers

could actually help keep the nation's parks beautiful. "Keep" was the operative word. "It is not a landscape engineer's purpose to add anything to nature's achievement," he wrote, "but to restrain the human inclination to desecrate and destroy, and where human construction is necessary, to keep it as unobtrusive or inoffensive as possible. It is not easy for most of us to understand why the intelligent human species needs this restraint," he added. "But it does."¹⁵⁹ Before publication, he sent a copy of his article to, among others, Albright and Arno B. Cammerer, who, at that time, was assistant to Mather and would become director of the NPS himself in 1933.¹⁶⁰

In his note to Albright, Kiessig apologized in advance for saying something that might offend Albright. When he advocated choosing park superintendents from the amongst the ranks of landscape engineers so as to preserve parks in the scenic sense, he assured Albright, he was not meaning to criticize Albright. "What I have said about [superintendents] applies less to you than anyone else we came in contact with. You at least did not profess landscape judgement and were always openminded," he acknowledged. In fact, Kiessig felt Albright might even agree with him: "I think you may see too that nearly every project a superintendent undertakes has some bearing on the plan or appearance of the park."¹⁶¹ If Albright agreed, he did not let on. "In the position of Superintendent of a National Park," he responded to Kiessig, "I do not see how the training of a landscape engineer could possibly fit him for the intricate and detailed executive work of one of these places." He granted Kiessig one

point, however. "Aside from the position of National Park Superintendent there are very few, if any, positions in Government service requiring executive ability and business experience as well as an appreciation of things beautiful and keen sympathy with the policy of complete conservation," he told Kiessig.

Albright also took umbrage at Kiessig's use of photos of Yellowstone's "mistakes" in the built landscape to illustrate his points: "I think it would be very unfair to use pictures of structures and improvements erected in the National Parks prior to the establishment of the NPS," he complained. "No one dislikes Fort Yellowstone and many other structures in Yellowstone National Park worse than I do, not alone from the landscape point of view but from the standpoint of economy and utility, but the work is done and represents a heavy investment and must stay for many years to come." He did admit, however, to making one "landscape mistake of not very much importance" since he had been superintendent: "the establishment of the walks in Black Sand Basin." But he defended his decision as one of necessity in the face of disaster: "I waited for a year to get promised suggestions from the landscape Department," he wrote, "while people waded in water to their shoetops. Something had to be done so I started the cheap method of laying down concrete curbs and filling in between with formation material."¹⁶²

Black Sand Basin housed Handkerchief Pool, the problem area to which architect Underwood had referred in his letter praising the work around Apollinaris Spring. The pool was already popular around the turn of the twentieth century, when tourists—and even the troops protecting the park—would put handkerchiefs down the pool in hopes of watching them come gushing out again a few minutes later, washed clean.¹⁶³ Kiessig shared Underwood's dismay with Albright's decision to lay concrete around the area. "No doubt increasing traffic made necessary some provision for the concentrated treading here," he wrote, "but certainly this is not a happy solution. . . . [L]andscape advice would have been of some advantage here. The nature lover's reaction to the improvement is probably like that he would get from a stuffed deer. The vitality here is pretty well lost."¹⁶⁴ After defending his decision to "improve" the Black Sand Basin area, Albright ended his letter to Kiessig on a positive note: he felt that superintendents would get easier to work with as time went by. "[F]rom now on the Landscape Engineering Department is going to have absolutely nothing to worry them so far as co-

operation from the superintendents and concessioners is concerned," he concluded.¹⁶⁵

Albright remained true to his word. He relied on Hull more and more to help him make such decisions as, for instance, which trees to cut so as to open up a vista or make room for a structure. For example, in 1925, Albright had Hull "[m]ark the trees that [were] to be cut in front of the Lake Hotel and around the Lake dormitory . . . [as well as those] to be cut in making the fire lane between the Lake camp grounds and the Lake Hotel." Albright wanted Hull to make two marks: "one plain mark that the wood-choppers can distinguish and one secret mark only known to the rangers in order that the wood-choppers may be prosecuted in case they cut more trees than we want them to cut."¹⁶⁶

Albright's tenure as superintendent clearly marked a high point in the symbiotic relationship between landscape engineers and park superintendents in their joint effort to conserve and preserve the parks. Albright is known to have defended landscape engineers in the face of controversy and condemnation from higher positions.¹⁶⁷ He also acknowledged, before a crowd of fellow superintendents at the annual superintendents' conference in November 1922, the important role that Hull, as landscape engineer, had played in Yellowstone's improved appearance.¹⁶⁸

In November 1922, Hull hired Thomas Chalmers Vint to be a second assistant in the Landscape Engineering Department. When Kiessig left the department in early 1923, Vint remained as the only assistant, a position he filled until 1927, when he took over from Hull, who left the office when operations moved from Los Angeles to San Francisco (also home to the offices of the divisions of civil engineering, education, forestry, and sanitary engineering).¹⁶⁹ Vint became the third chief landscape architect of the Landscape Division, the newly created "group of specialists whose job [it] was to advise the director and park superintendents on matters related to park development and management." Vint had graduated from the University of California at Berkeley with a degree in landscape architecture in 1920. He amassed a dossier of experience in the landscape field before joining the NPS, where he learned the ropes by acquiring "field experience working out practical and aesthetic solutions" for the nation's parks.¹⁷⁰ McClelland wrote that the reorganization of the Landscape Division helped "the landscape architects of the service, and particularly Vint . . . [to assume] official responsibility over location, character, and quality of all park construction."¹⁷¹

Vint hired several assistants to help him, including Ernest A. Davidson, “whom [Vint] assigned to work in Glacier, Yellowstone, and Mount Rainier,” and Kenneth McCarter, who was assigned to the field. Vint wanted his staff to be “capable in landscape matters, the design of buildings and structures, community planning, and the design of bridges.” Their training was “in the general principles of landscape architecture and city planning [with] . . . a general knowledge of the fundamentals of architecture.”¹⁷² He described the work of his division in this way:

The work of the Landscape Division . . . is a different character than the general practice of the landscape profession. Although landscape work predominates in the work, it merges into the field of architecture. We have little use for landscape men whose experience is limited to the planting of shrubbery and allied to landscape work. There is little planting done within the National Parks and what is done is limited to the transplanting of native shrubs and trees, so the general commercial stock is not used. The work has to do with the preservation of the native landscape and involves the location and construction of communities, buildings, etc. within an existing landscape.¹⁷³

While Vint could not be everywhere and do everything—and thus had a growing and wide-ranging staff of capable assistants—he did keep in constant contact with his crew, and he personally oversaw as many projects as he could.

“By July 1929,” wrote McClelland of Vint’s tenure with the NPS, “Vint had transformed the Landscape Division into a design office with an increasing emphasis on general planning. . . . The division was involved to some degree in all phases of park development.”¹⁷⁴ Vint had six assistant and two junior landscape architects by this time. He felt, moreover, that the division had made “good landscape men” out of the park superintendents, and good “national park men” out of “even the best-trained landscape architects.” He assigned his assistants to various parks for the purpose of overseeing projects. In June 1929, Vint appointed Kenneth McCarter to his field position in Yellowstone National Park.¹⁷⁵

Vint had visited Yellowstone in 1926, along with Hull, who was at that point still chief landscape engineer. They had read of plans to build a combined equipment storehouse and bunkhouse at the Lower Slough Creek

hay ranch. Engineer A. W. Burney had drawn the plans, and Chief Ranger Sam Woodring had suggested the location for the building.¹⁷⁶ While in the park, Vint and Hull must have approved the plans and perhaps added suggestions for siting and design improvements.¹⁷⁷ The combined storehouse/bunkhouse was a 16' × 30', two-story “Rustic Vernacular Style building,” designed both to harmonize with the built and natural environments and to serve as a practical solution to real storage and lodging problems at the Slough Creek ranch.¹⁷⁸ Its log structure rested directly on the cement foundation (there was no foundation on the north side, the section that was to be used to store equipment) and extended to the second story (11'), which was used as “a bunkhouse or sleeping quarters for the hay crew during haying season and for storing equipment during winter months.”¹⁷⁹ Those using the bunkhouse entered via a small, uncovered porch on the building’s south side.¹⁸⁰ A second structure, which Vint called a “new stable 20 × 40 to accommodate twenty head of horses, hay and grain storage,” was also built at the Lower Slough Creek hay ranch in 1921. As Vint wrote, the new structure would allow the NPS to “dismantle” the old stable and corral in the area.¹⁸¹

In 1927, the Lamar buffalo ranch received a new, two-story “hay and horse barn.”¹⁸² This magnificent barn (52' × 32' × 28') joined the ranger station built in the area in 1915. Constructed of logs with saddle notches and chopper-cut ends, the building rested on a stone-faced concrete foundation and incorporated five fifteen-light awning windows along each side elevation. The gambrel roof had exposed log rafter and purlin ends and wood shingles, which were doubled every course. Both gambrel ends contained double and pedestrian doors of vertical board construction and “massive wrought-iron strap hinges.”¹⁸³

Four new snowshoe cabins were also built in 1927: at Fawn Pass, Mary Lake, Crystal Spring, and Shoshone Lake. All of the cabins, consisting of one story and one room, were uniform in design, a design that broke slightly from tradition. Their extended front porches were deeper, and their roofs were of wood shingle over lumber sheathing, except over the porch, where the roofs were of round poles laid with the slope of the roof, and they had windows only on the front and back walls.¹⁸⁴ Albright found the cabins “attractive in appearance, securely and stoutly built and splendidly adapted to the uses intended.”¹⁸⁵ The cabin at Crystal Spring was bigger than the others.¹⁸⁶ The cabins at Fawn Pass and

Mary Lake still stand, and the cabin at Crystal Springs was moved to Three River in 1993, and to its present location at Three River Junction in 1995. Concurrently, a cabin was built by the U.S. Forest Service along Dailey Creek; it was later added to the park when a portion of the Gallatin National Forest was transferred by Congressional action to Yellowstone in March 1929. This cabin was constructed at low cost, and was not intended to be a permanent structure.¹⁸⁷ When it became one of the park's snowshoe cabins in 1929, the Dailey Creek Cabin served the northwestern corner of the park.

Other landscape issues in 1927 centered around cleanup and planting in various areas of the park, and improvement of the park campgrounds. In 1924, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had visited the park and been impressed with the need for cleaning up the roadsides. Asking to remain anonymous, he "authorized the expenditure of sufficient funds to clear up as much of the road south from park headquarters . . . as could be accomplished" that season.¹⁸⁸ Rockefeller, to whom Albright referred in correspondence as "the eastern friend of the park," again supplied funds for roadside cleanup in 1927. In addition to the cleanup that year, Ernest Davidson and Thomas Vint supervised extensive plantings in the Gardiner and Mammoth areas.¹⁸⁹ Improvements to the campgrounds included building comfort stations and installing sewer systems, earth toilets, and tables. As more and more people took to visiting the nation's parks as campers, these areas required constant expansion and modernization.¹⁹⁰

It was also at this time that Rockefeller, who had initiated major roadside improvement projects in national parks, influenced the future of NPS architecture. During his visit to Yellowstone in 1926, he discussed "the need of a commission to develop a special type of national park architecture and supervise plans for the development of the parks." Rockefeller, who believed he could get the country's best architects and engineers to serve on the commission, offered to fund the entire cost.¹⁹¹ Over the next few years, many noted architects and landscape architects visited the park.

For example, landscape architect Harold Caparn visited the park in 1926, to give his "professional opinion on a boundary dispute along the Bechler River." He used the visit to make suggestions for improving "the landscape character of the . . . observation decks along the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone." McClelland wrote that "Caparn urged that the wooden stairways, ramps, and railings that had been installed about 1920

be replaced with earthen paths and masonry parapets of native stone."¹⁹² Assistant Landscape Architect Davidson sketched plans to replace the wooden structures in the Canyon area with rockwork. These plans, according to McClelland, were the "first consideration of the area from a 'landscape standpoint.'" While Davidson's plans were not followed immediately, they were included in the 1932 master plan for the area, and finally implemented in modified form in the mid-1930s.¹⁹³

Vint and his staff worked on several plans for standardized park structures between 1927 and 1929. Structures such as "patrol cabins or comfort stations," McClelland wrote, "could follow a common design that was repeated throughout the park. The same design might be used again and again in one park, provided the external characteristics of the structure fit harmoniously into the natural setting."¹⁹⁴ Comfort stations were standardized in 1927, and in 1929, housekeeping cabins were standardized after Albright asked Vint's division to "make a special study of housekeeping cabins and draw up plans for a cabin suitable for the automobile tourist in the national parks."¹⁹⁵

During 1928, one mess house and three bunkhouses were constructed for use by road maintenance crews at Madison Junction, Norris Junction, and the Lewis River. The mess house at the old Norris road camp still stands, though it has been modified—the old front porch on the south elevation has been enclosed. It is one and one-half stories, frame, and on a concrete foundation.¹⁹⁶ Directly adjacent to the mess house at Norris was the bunkhouse, a one-story, wood-frame, rectangular structure, which is also still standing.¹⁹⁷ Two "standard" snowshoe cabins were built as well, at Cascade Creek and at Fishing Bridge, but only the one at Fishing Bridge still stands.¹⁹⁸ The cabin—a "classic [NPS] Rustic design: one-story, log construction, with a simple rectangular footprint disrupted only by the open, inset porch entry"—was modified and moved in 1932, as part of the park's first master plan.¹⁹⁹ Finally, a "standard duplex" ranger station was built at the South Entrance to house "the permanent rangers stationed there all year round for fire and game patrols and [the] temporary summer ranger checkers."²⁰⁰ The building was replaced in 1941, after a destructive fire in 1940.²⁰¹

In 1929, a one-story, log bunkhouse was built near the Lamar Buffalo Ranch Ranger Station (1915) and horse barn (1927) to house rangers working with the bison that fed in the area during the winter. The rectangular building had a large dormitory on the east

end that was separated from the lounge/winter kitchen on the west end by a bathroom and three private bedrooms. This rustic structure was built on a foundation of concrete with stone facing. The logs had ventral saddle-notching and chopper-cut ends. The front-gable roof featured exposed purlin ends and wood shingles, doubled every sixth course. After 1963, the interior of the bunkhouse was remodeled so it could serve as a mess hall and classroom facility for researchers and later, the Yellowstone Institute.²⁰²

The major construction project at decade's end was a museum at Old Faithful—one of what would be four trailside museums in the park, to be discussed later in this chapter. Before these museums were even dreamed of, however, Albright was hard at work on an educational component for the park.

For the Benefit—and Education—of the People

When the NPS took over management of the parks, its mission in Yellowstone, in addition to protecting the park's natural and cultural resources, was to provide opportunities for recreation and the enjoyment of nature. The park, after all, was considered a playground for the American people, and offered "tremendous recreational advantages that are only just beginning to be appreciated," as Mather wrote in 1917.²⁰³ The more people who enjoyed the park, the more time and money they would spend there, and the more they would support the NPS. Mather understood this when he wrote, in 1918, "One of our chief duties is declared to be the encouragement in the national parks of all outdoor sports, except hunting and other activities which may impair the parks or injure their wild life. . . . Recreational use of the parks is to be stimulated by any means possible."²⁰⁴

Recreation, however, was only part of Mather's vision for the parks. He was also convinced that parks had tremendous educational value. Both Mather and Albright recognized this value and sought ways to maximize it. "From the standpoint of education," Mather continued in his 1918 annual report, "classes in science are to be afforded special opportunities to study in the national parks, and museums containing specimens of their flora and fauna are to be established as funds are provided for this purpose."²⁰⁵ By 1919, both Mather's sense of how the parks could be used for educational purposes and his efforts to promote the idea of parks as

educational places was becoming clearer. In that year's annual report, he called the parks underutilized by schools and universities and by individual scholars and scientists. He was "extremely anxious that steps should be taken in several of the largest parks next year [1920] to demonstrate the practicality of conducting studies of the natural features at reasonable expense to students availing themselves of the opportunities for the field laboratory work that the parks afford." He also cited Columbia University's addition of a national parks study course to its curriculum as a model for other institutions to follow, and mentioned the LeConte Lectures at Yosemite, campfire talks at numerous parks, the publication of a natural history series, and the establishment of park museums in several parks, one of which—albeit a very rudimentary one—was housed in Yellowstone's park headquarters.²⁰⁶

Albright also had a strong interest in promoting Yellowstone's educational value. According to researcher Denise Vick, in her study, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, Albright had a particularly keen interest in developing the educational component of park operations. In fact, Yellowstone served a leadership role in the area of educational programming. Vick wrote that while Yosemite National Park might have been important for the development of educational ideas and programs, it was "in Yellowstone that the idea of an integrated educational component for the Park Service was fully developed."²⁰⁷ Thus, before education became a system-wide priority, officials at Yellowstone were making real attempts to educate visitors.

The story of Yellowstone's efforts to educate its visitors began with its attempt to inform them. From the time the NPS took over management of the park, the superintendent's office had housed an information desk where visitors could purchase U.S. Geological Survey contour maps and obtain other information on the park free of charge. "The Government information circular is a very popular pamphlet, of inestimable value to travelers," wrote Albright in his first annual report in 1919. "It is in great demand and its publication and free distribution should under all circumstances be continued." But the park had no sector specifically charged with disseminating information to visitors until the following year. Thus, during the summer season of 1919, tourists used the services of photographer and concessioner J. E. Haynes, who maintained "a free information bureau for the benefit of the public."²⁰⁸

In 1920, Albright set up an information bureau

under the charge of Milton P. Skinner, whose life story was tightly interwoven with that of the park. Skinner had first served as a guide while employed by the Yellowstone Park Association at the Upper Geyser Basin in 1896. He later became involved with an effort to interest the secretary of the interior in establishing an educational service and museum in the park, an effort that succeeded in generating interest but no money. In early 1919, however, in "one of his first official acts as superintendent of Yellowstone National Park," Horace Albright asked Skinner to organize an educational program for the park and appointed him park naturalist—the first in the history of both the park and the NPS.²⁰⁹ Skinner immediately set about opening the information office and preparing and posting "monthly bulletins on birds, animals, flowers, and geology . . . in all public places in the park." The office was supplied with "photographs, a ground relief map . . . a collection of wild flowers on the walls . . . a few geological specimens for exhibition . . . [and] maps, pamphlets, and circulars for free distribution and for sale." Albright called the public's response "astonishing." Approximately 10,100 visitors used the bureau in 1920, and "appeared very much pleased with the service rendered." In addition to distributing general informational circulars, pamphlets, and maps, information officers disseminated Skinner's popular monthly bulletins, the "Yellowstone Nature Notes."²¹⁰

In 1921, Skinner's small information office was expanded and moved to its present location in the former bachelor officers' quarters at Fort Yellowstone (now the Albright Visitor Center).²¹¹ This information office also doubled as the park's first museum (the one to which Mather referred in his 1919 annual report). Albright mentioned the museum in his own 1921 annual report, saying that it would be developed "as fast as funds can be spared for the purpose."²¹² Over the three years he served as park naturalist, Skinner collected numerous specimens for display in the museum, and by the time he resigned in September 1922, the collection was so extensive that Skinner deemed the space too small and began using a room behind the office as museum space.²¹³ Albright lauded the display exhibits, noting in his annual report, "To make the exhibits as interesting as possible, far more than the usual care was taken in the preparation of the descriptive labels."²¹⁴

Yellowstone's first museum was established, as were most early national park museums, to "aid tourists in gaining an understanding of the geology of the [park] and to assist them in identifying flowers, trees, birds, and

animals." The displays essentially informed visitors by showing them "what the [park had] to offer and what [could] be seen there by the observant visitor."²¹⁵ The idea of adding historical exhibits that would illustrate "the pioneer days of the West and the changes that have taken place since the times of the early explorers," appears to have come from American writer and long-time park visitor Emerson Hough. Among other exhibits Hough suggested was one focused on early transportation in the West: the park could exhibit examples of an ancient Indian travois, a stagecoach, an early pack saddle, a bicycle, old snowshoes, and other equipment showing "changes in transportation since the development of the West began." Intrigued by the idea, Mather suggested the park solicit contributions of items for use in such an historical exhibit.²¹⁶

Albright touted a "further most valuable feature of the Information Service and one which was highly appreciated by tourists," in his annual report for 1920: "the giving of free half-hour talks or lectures by Park Ranger Isabel Bassett Wasson three times daily" in the Mammoth area.²¹⁷ A graduate of Wellesley College and Columbia University, Wasson had impressed Albright when he heard her speak on geysers and hot springs during the summer of 1919.²¹⁸ He had thought her then "a splendid public speaker . . . [with] the ability to hold a large audience while discussing scientific problems."²¹⁹ When Albright hired Wasson, she became "the first seasonal park ranger to be hired in the park by the NPS to give lectures."²²⁰ The title of Wasson's lecture that year was "How the Yellowstone Came to Be." It was a "short discussion of the geological formation of the park expressed in non-technical language," Albright wrote. This and other topics of interest to the traveling public were covered in Wasson's lectures that first year.²²¹

Mather referred to such programs as "Camp fire educational talks."²²² "Like other quests of knowledge," Mather wrote, "an intelligent study of nature is greatly assisted by direction. Many persons who visit the parks are thoroughly responsive to their influences," he continued, "but they lack the incentive born of knowledge to delve into a real understanding of things." Such lectures and guided tours were designed to stimulate that incentive, according to Mather.²²³

When Wasson was unable to return to the park in 1921, Albright hired park ranger Mary Rolfe to give the daily, free, half-hour lectures on the park's natural features. These lectures occurred on the porch of the Mammoth Hotel and later in the evening at the Mam-

moth Camp.²²⁴ Rolfe, according to Albright, was “a fine enthusiastic girl, who tried very hard to please,” but her lectures, he felt, “were considerably more technical than [Wasson’s].” “[N]ot having [Wasson’s] training as a teacher of geology,” Rolfe, he believed, “had some difficulty presenting her subject.”²²⁵ However, he deemed the park’s educational work “satisfactory on the whole.”²²⁶ Indeed, the educational program of the 1921 season was extensive: a total of 83 lectures were delivered at the hotel, 77 at the camp, 54 in the public campground, and 66 at other points in the park.

Specially trained park rangers also began providing guided trips to different points in the park. Thus was born the idea of NPS rangers, rather than park concessioners, being the park’s official guides. As Albright put it, he began using rangers as official guides “to furnish visitors with accurate information [and] to do away with the tipping practice . . . thus preserv[ing], as far as possible, the dignity of the park as one of our greatest national play grounds.”²²⁷ “The furnishing of guides from the ranger force,” Albright wrote in his monthly superintendent’s report for June 1921, “is a new idea, this service having been furnished heretofore by the hotels and camps.”²²⁸ During the 93-day travel season, 32,068 tourists took a total of 703 guided trips. Albright recorded that the “service was very popular with the public, and brought many expressions of praise from travelers.”²²⁹ In addition, rangers also provided useful information and distributed maps and pamphlets at the checking stations and “loop” ranger stations.²³⁰

When Rolfe was not rehired for the 1922 season, temporary park ranger Frank E. A. Thone took over and delivered 232 lectures to about 60,000 tourists on “the park, its geology, flora, fauna, history, etc.” at Mammoth Hot Springs.²³¹ Visitors also made use of the other educational programs offered in the park. Nearly 30,000 people visited the information office and museum at Mammoth Hot Springs that year, and close to 40,000 tourists were guided by rangers “over the formations” at the Upper Geyser Basin or at Mammoth Hot Springs while they listened to talks about these and other natural features.²³²

The recently completed ranger stations/community centers at Old Faithful, Canyon, and Lake were also used as venues for these lectures. According to Haines, these facilities were perfectly suited to the “low-keyed and entertaining” approach to education that the park initially adopted out of an “official fear lest suggestion of lessons and study would keep people away from the



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #128954

Two park rangers. 1922.

Parks.”²³³ Later, the NPS would confirm this soft-pedaled emphasis in a statement of its philosophy regarding education in its general plan of administration for the education division:

[W]e are engaged in a specialized field of education in which our main objective is not primarily to raise the intellectual standard of our visitors in the academic sense. . . . Our function lies rather in the inspirational enthusiasm which we can develop among our visitors—and enthusiasm based upon a sympathetic interpretation of the main things that the parks represent, whether these be the wonder of animate things living in natural communities, or the story of creation as written in the rocks, or the history of forgotten races as recorded by their picturesque dwellings.²³⁴

The next park naturalist, Edmund J. Sawyer, appointed in March 1924, was an artist and ornithologist who, with the help of Jack Haynes, kept the Mammoth museum afloat until NPS officials had completed the

larger-scale education program on which they were working, with specific objectives and a methodological plan of action.²³⁵

Progress on the education front at the national level had been steady since 1917. In 1923, Ansel F. Hall, park ranger, educational officer, and first park naturalist at Yosemite National Park, was appointed chief naturalist of the National Park Service, and put in charge of educational programs in all the national parks. In 1924, Frank R. Oastler, a physician from New York and a member of the National Conference on Outdoor Education, was hired as a collaborator and consultant to work with Hall on “an organizational plan for the educational division.”²³⁶ An actual division of education became a reality in 1925, and took its place on the NPS’s administrative chart at a level equivalent to the Engineering and Landscape divisions.²³⁷

Great strides in educational development were made across the national park system following the creation of the Education Division in 1925, including the establishment of a programmatic approach to educating the public. Education was also one of the two major topics discussed at the 8th National Park Conference in November 1925. The NPS’s new educational focus crystallized that year, when Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work ranked “education with recreation as a NPS objective.”²³⁸ In his annual report, Mather quoted the secretary’s comment that “[n]ature is the supreme school-teacher as well as the master textbook. From nature can be learned the scheme of creation and the handiwork of the Great Architect as from no other source.” The secretary had also described the educational effort as “a new mission . . . which opens up a new field for the propagation of knowledge never before realized.”²³⁹

The other important factor in the growth of the NPS’s educational emphasis was the development of a museum program. Museums were essential to educating visitors because they both helped inform visitors about what they would see as they traveled the park and answered questions about what they might have already seen. In effect, museums prepared visitors to “use . . . parks and their resources as instruments of instruction.”²⁴⁰ Visitors who used parks as places of instruction—as classrooms essentially—would be inclined to linger, Mather believed, and their visits would be more enjoyable. “Knowledge creates interest,” he wrote in his annual report, and “[i]nterest adds to enjoyment.” Furthermore, he argued, a “museum is a most valuable factor in drawing visitors, in awakening their interest,

and in prolonging the length of their stay. . . . It serves the visitors, and it serves the community as well.”²⁴¹

Museums were not to be the showplaces they were in urban areas, however. They were merely venues for learning about the real source of interest: the park’s natural areas. “The national parks themselves are the real museums of nature,” Mather wrote in his 1925 annual report, “and the park museum in each will simply serve as an index to the wonders that may be studied and enjoyed on the ground by the observant student of nature.” In this sense, park museums served a specific, circumscribed role. “[T]hey are to be regarded as places to stimulate the interest of visitors,” Mather wrote, “in the things of the great outdoors by the presentation of exhibits telling in a clear, consecutive way, the story of the park from its geological beginning through all branches of history up to and including the coming of man and his works. All extraneous material is to be excluded.”²⁴²

In fact, a museum had been opened in Yellowstone that year: the Buffalo Jones Museum, housed in the log cabin built by buffalokeeper C. J. “Buffalo” Jones at the show herd area at Mammoth Hot Springs. Exhibits included photographs and specimens relating to the life of Buffalo Jones, and to the early history of bison in the park.²⁴³ Behind the buffalo museum and near the buffalo corral, a zoo was established where animals were displayed for visitors’ enjoyment and education. Ansel Hall, in his annual report for 1926, noted that animal exhibits were part of the NPS’s educational program, specifically mentioning zoos (“mammals in captivity”) and “attracting and taming animals” as acceptable educational activities for national parks.²⁴⁴ In 1927, there were “15 adult buffalo bulls, a yearling bull, a calf, a small band of adult elk, the captive bear Juno, a calf elk, a fawn, [and] an antelope kid,” at the Yellowstone National Park zoo.²⁴⁵

Assistance from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and the American Association of Museums was crucial to the agency’s educational plan to construct numerous museums in many NPS units. The memorial first granted money for constructing a museum in Yosemite National Park in 1924; the museum was completed in 1926. At that point, with the exception of the bison-specific Buffalo Jones Museum, Yellowstone was still making do with what Albright referred to as “some interesting exhibits at the headquarters information office, which with some chagrin, we call a ‘museum.’”²⁴⁶ When Albright observed how helpful the museum at Yosemite was to visitors’ understanding of that park’s

natural features, he wrote the interior secretary to garner support for obtaining funding through the American Association of Museums. "The Museum is interpreting the Yosemite to the people in a very effective way," he wrote, "and not only are our visitors leaving it with a wider knowledge of the park and its natural features, but, unquestionably they are leaving it with a greater reverence for this great playground which is reflected in their recreational use of it." Albright wanted a "museum at headquarters, branches at other points, and good equipment" to be "on a par with the Yosemite."²⁴⁷

Albright also asked Chauncey J. Hamlin, president of the American Association of Museums, for help constructing "small local museums" at Yellowstone to ensure that those visiting the park "receive information which will make their sojourn educationally as well as recreationally profitable."²⁴⁸ At about the same time, Interior Secretary Work also asked the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial for help with "a complete educational unit" that would in turn "serve as an example and index for all future educational development in the other parks." In particular, he requested funding for "a small outdoor auditorium and museum at Old Faithful, a general museum, reading room, and educational center at Mammoth Hot Springs, small trailside museums . . . 'shrines' placed at points of vantage throughout the park," and other minor expenses.²⁴⁹ Work's idea of using small museums "advantageously placed and equipped for the definite purpose of giving popular instruction" fit Hall's and Oastler's concept of creating museums with branch—or "trailside"—museums associated with them, as outlined in their 1925 administration plan for the education division.²⁵⁰

During the summer of 1928, Frank Oastler compiled a study entitled, "Report on Educational Survey, National Park Service." In it, he explained that parks were not set aside for recreation alone, and that the full value of parks could be presented through education, which would "enable those who visit the National Parks to obtain an accurate interpretation of the natural phenomena . . . of an unusual character not found elsewhere." Oastler called for creating branch museums to be located at significant points, and observation stations at particular sites for the purpose of demonstrations. He believed that the proposed museums should inspire and stimulate investigations; be used for reference and scientific investigations; and provide information such as published guides, visual education, and scientific material. Oastler cautioned that the museums should

in no way detract from the "main exhibit which is the park itself and its story."²⁵¹

In 1928, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, which had first given money to the American Association for Museums for a museum in Yosemite National Park in 1924, provided the full \$118,000 requested by Secretary Work for construction of the park's new museums, with two stipulations: first, that any balance unexpended as of December 31, 1929, revert to the memorial, and second, that no public announcement be made of the gift.²⁵² Horace Albright's "deep personal interest" in the value of park museums and his personal relationship with John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and family likely contributed to the memorial's decision to fund the four museums in Yellowstone.²⁵³

With these funds, the trailside museum concept flourished in Yellowstone—even without the existence of a main museum. As Haines pointed out, these branch museums were intended to "provide a 'hook-up between an object or spectacle charged with dynamic information and a mind that is receptive to informational impulses.'"²⁵⁴ They were to be located "at points where some special features of natural history can best be demonstrated."²⁵⁵ Hence, each branch museum was to have a theme. At Old Faithful, the theme was thermal activity; at Norris, geology and mineralogy; and at Madison Junction, history. The museum to be built at Fishing Bridge would specialize in fauna and some geology.²⁵⁶

The first museum to be started was the one at Old Faithful, designed by Herbert Maier, architect for the American Association of Museums. Construction on the \$8,500 building began in August 1928, and while it was scheduled to be completed before the end of the year, it was not until 1929 that the museum was "ready for occupancy." Vint, McCarter, and noted landscape architect Ferruccio Vitale, of the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts, were in the park that summer to settle on the exact location of the museum.²⁵⁷ Albright praised the structure, saying that in his judgment, it was "finer than the one at Grand Canyon and far finer than the one at Yosemite." "The rock and log work is superb," he concluded.²⁵⁸ Before the museum was finished, architect Maier decided to use a brown stain instead of experimenting with grey stains for the exterior.²⁵⁹ In 1929, the museum, known as the Museum of Thermal Activity, opened to the public and remained operational until it was torn down and replaced with a new visitor center in 1971.²⁶⁰

Maier also designed museums for Madison



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #44321

Madison Museum. 1930.

Junction, Fishing Bridge, and Norris Geyser Basin. The smallest of the three was the museum at Madison, built in 1929. A one-story, T-shaped structure with a gabled and shingled roof, it had “[b]attered rubble masonry” reaching to sill height and double-coursed shingles covering the rest of the structure. Finishing touches included gable ends finished “with tree shapes and diamond patterns sawn into the boards,” and a “wrought-iron sign stating ‘trailside museum’” hanging over the front entrance. Outside, a “flagstone terrace enclosed by low walls” extended out from the museum and overlooked the confluence of the Madison and Gibbon rivers. Two plaques embedded in natural stone memorialized important elements of Yellowstone’s history and legend. One commemorated Stephen Mather, who resigned in 1929 due to health problems, and the other commemorated the fireside discussion purported to have taken place among members of the Washburn/Langford/Doane expedition in September 1870, that was long claimed to have generated the Yellowstone Park idea (the veracity of this story has come to be questioned).²⁶¹ Albert Good, author of a catalogue of park architecture, referred to the Madison Museum as “[m]inor in size, but not in its contribution to park architecture.” He especially lauded the museum’s natural look and its ability to draw the inside out and the outside in. “The pitch of the roof and the texture of the selected logs conspire with the rakish buttressing of the well-scaled rock work to deserve unqualified acclaim,” he wrote. “The spacious ‘landscape’ window serves to project the outdoors into the museum

interior, an illusion to be sought wherever the objective is the interpretation of surrounding Nature.”²⁶²

The museum at Norris, also started in 1929, has been called “the most architecturally imposing” of the three. The one-story, rectangular structure featured an open-air foyer in the center that led to a flagstone terrace overlooking the geyser basin, and stone steps leading down to it. The wings of the building were used for exhibit, office, and living space. Shingled, hipped roofs covered the wings, while a shingled gable roof—the main roof—covered the foyer. The exterior consisted of stone walls with “extreme batters which emphasize[d] the fluid, irregular shapes of the boulders” below and double rows of wood shingles above. The interior of both the Norris and Madison museums consisted of “exposed . . . massive posts with their knots and growths worn smooth by the thousands of visitors who run their hands across them each summer as they pass through the building.” A wrought-iron sign reading “Norris Museum” was hung over the front entrance.²⁶³ The Fishing Bridge Museum, planned in 1929 but built in 1930–1931, will be discussed in the following chapter.

Maier’s museums were, according to Laura Souliere Harrison, architectural historian and author of *Architecture in the Parks*, significant contributions to national park architecture for two reasons: “First, the buildings are the best structures of rustic design in the National Park System,” and second, “because of their exaggerated architectural features and organic forms, the buildings served as models for hundreds of other

buildings constructed throughout the nation in state, county, and local parks under the auspices of the NPS during the work relief programs of the 1930s.”²⁶⁴ Harrison contended that “Maier’s buildings were perfect solutions for an architecture appropriate to the outdoors: informal, through their use of natural materials and horizontal lines, but loaded with a strength of design and heavy-handed expression that subconsciously suggested the smallness of man in relation to nature.”²⁶⁵ Maier accomplished this effect through design elements common to both traditional bungalow structures—his “battered stonework, clipped gables, and low, horizontal emphasis,” for example—and a new architectural notion of fitting structures into the nature of their immediate surroundings. As Harrison explained, Maier’s buildings “responded to their sites . . . and appropriately fit the contours of the landscape.” “[I]n Maier’s buildings,” she wrote, “the onsite and locally-available materials were left more in their natural condition, reflecting the scale and roughness of the surrounding wilderness.” She listed the design attributes that helped achieve this “response” and “appropriateness:”

The enormous logs of the Yellowstone museums were peeled but not sawn, and their rustic knots were left in place giving a tactile richness to the building form. The boulders of the heavily battered walls were left in their natural shapes. Their massive sizes and irregular shapes were emphasized, like the irregularities in nature . . . Maier banked all three museums into the gentle contours, and provided observation terraces that were at least half the size of the interior floor spaces. He even provided tree wells in the terraces to accommodate the larger specimens that existed on the sites prior to construction. The terraces encouraged visitors to spend more time outside enjoying the local features and, hopefully, to reflect on what they had learned and seen in the museums.²⁶⁶

Maier’s buildings best exhibit the notion that structures of any kind in a national park should harmonize with nature to the point of being almost unnoticeable. Maier himself claimed that buildings in national parks were “necessary evils,” and argued that “even the finest building . . . is somewhat of an intruder.”²⁶⁷ As Harrison wrote, Maier’s success lay in his ability to minimize “that intrusion by maximizing the use of indigenous building



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #44325

Norris Museum construction. 1930.



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #44327

Ranger and visitors viewing exhibits at Norris Museum. 1930.

materials in a way that seemed as if the building had just grown of its own accord on the site.”²⁶⁸

While branch museums had become a reality, Superintendent Albright still wanted a “big headquarters museum” to house the displays on exhibit at the old bachelor officers’ quarters at Mammoth Hot Springs.²⁶⁹ In his 1928 annual report, Albright wrote that the site for the Mammoth museum had “been temporarily located and [would] . . . be built upon next spring.”²⁷⁰ Plans were upended, however, when Vitale suggested that “everything . . . at Mammoth Hot Springs ultimately be scrapped and replaced by a new plan” in the NPS’s attempt to “develop a general plan for the reconstruction of the Yellowstone Park headquarters.” Albright argued in favor of keeping the fort as the headquarters: “The more I think about the proposition, the more I think it is of tremendous interest to the public to have here in the

park an old army fort, and that we could do a lot worse than keep the old fort,” he wrote to Acting Director Arno Cammerer in August 1928, against the creation of a new plan.²⁷¹ “I am frank to say . . .” wrote Albright, “that I have no particular enthusiasm for the new plan, largely for the reason that I think it is going to be a good many years before anything can be done in the way of carrying it out. The investments here are simply too heavy to consider as being subject to expensive change in any reasonable period of time.”²⁷² His practical concerns were real—and as it turned out, correct—and work on the headquarters museum was postponed indefinitely.

In the meantime, Albright suggested that the Landscape Department work out “a general design of the future buildings to be erected at Mammoth Hot Springs and adopt a type of architecture and build along the lines laid down by such design, rather than count on ultimately replacing all of the buildings we have at these headquarters.”²⁷³ But his suggestion—even with Cammerer’s tentative approval—did not go forward. “If insuperable difficulties occur whereby certain buildings [such as the museum] must be up in the public interest before such a plan is finished,” Cammerer wrote back to Albright, who was then both superintendent of Yellowstone and assistant field director of the NPS, “they may be permitted on approved locations ‘temporarily’ with the understanding that if any changes are desirable as regards to site when the new plan has been approved, it will be done later.”²⁷⁴ The NPS chose to postpone construction of the museum, which disappointed Albright: “I still hope we can get the situation here cleared up so the big museum can be erected here next summer,” he wrote to a museum supporter in 1928. “We certainly need that building very, very badly.”²⁷⁵

Another educational facility built in the park in the 1920s was the new fish hatchery at Yellowstone Lake. This facility, which was largely constructed with private funds from one V. N. Corey, was designed by the NPS’s Landscape Division, and included what Albright called some of the best log work he had ever seen. In a report on the construction of the new museums and hatchery, Albright stated that it was built with “special consideration for the needs of the educational division” in that it would “be possible to take large crowds through the building under the guidance of a ranger naturalist, without in any way impairing the operations of the Bureau of Fisheries.”²⁷⁶

Another way for visitors to “hook up” to the park’s spectacles was through ranger-led guided tours.

Visitors had been receiving NPS ranger-guided tours of the Old Faithful and Mammoth formations since 1921. In 1924, when Albright hired experienced teacher and naturalist H. S. Conard of Grinnell College, Iowa, to direct activities and field trips at Camp Roosevelt, their options for guided tours expanded to the Tower area as well.²⁷⁷ As nature guiding became an educational priority in 1925, the rangers who led these tours became known as ranger naturalists, a title that was codified in 1926, when the first *Ranger Naturalists’ Manual* was published.²⁷⁸ The manual, considered “an accomplishment of great importance,” was intended to help ranger naturalists and park rangers with their guiding and lecturing responsibilities, and was compiled by Jack Haynes, who continued to serve as unpaid acting director of the park’s museum.²⁷⁹

In the 1927 edition of the manual, Albright referred to the ranger naturalists as “the faculty of the biggest summer school of nature study on earth—a school of 200,000 pupils!”²⁸⁰ According to historian Paul Schullery, these ranger naturalists did “more to shape the public impression of rangers than all the rest [of the rangers], because each of these men . . . talked to thousands of tourists, contributing much to the image of the ranger as both self-reliant woodsman and expert naturalist.”²⁸¹

It soon became clear to Chief Naturalist Hall that ranger naturalists were only able to serve roughly 80 percent of the park’s visitors—“this in spite of the fact that they were conducting parties of as many as 200 over the formations [at Old Faithful, for example] at one time.”²⁸² Hall then instituted three projects which in turn set in motion a whole system of nature and self-guiding trails: the “complete labeling of the [Mammoth] Formation Trail . . . [t]he complete labeling, in the same manner, of the Black Sand Basin Trail . . . [and] [t]he construction and maintenance of a Nature Trail to Observation Point, Solitaire [*sic*—Solitary] Geyser, and other points of interest.”²⁸³ By 1929, enough trails were in place for ranger naturalist Newell R. Joyner to write of the system, “Self-guiding trails have been established on the formations at Mammoth and Old Faithful and on the nature trails at those places. Self-explanatory signs are placed so that they are a help to those who find it impossible, or who do not care to accompany the Ranger Naturalist who conducts the guide party. These self-guiding trails are another effort to render all the service possible to the guests of the park.”²⁸⁴

By 1928, three additional developments colored



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #44328

Norris Museum. 1930.

the education picture at Yellowstone: the creation of a Committee on Study of Educational Problems in National Parks, with the well-known biologist John C. Merriam as chair; the appointment of Dorr G. Yeager as head naturalist and chief of educational programming in the park, replacing E. J. Sawyer; and the agreement that Carl P. Russell, park naturalist from Yosemite, would help with educational programming in Yellowstone. Merriam's committee underscored the idea that "the purpose of national parks is to be found in their inspirational and educational values," while Yeager, an early graduate of the Yosemite School of Field Natural History (a naturalist training program established in 1925), oversaw the construction of the park's premier trailside museums and stayed active in the park for three years.²⁸⁵ Russell, a naturalist at Yosemite National Park, was dispatched to Yellowstone at the recommendation of Hermon C. Bumpus, chairman of the American Association of Museums, to advise, among other things, on exhibit installation at the new trailside museum at Old Faithful. Bumpus intended for Russell, who was considered the museum specialist in the education division, to help with "several problems connected with the general educational program, such as the strengthening of the lecture system, the improvement of the field work, and the creation of facilities the better to meet the needs of those visiting the park in their own cars, accompanied, as many are, by younger members of the family."²⁸⁶ Albright was thrilled at the prospect of having Russell, who did not actually start work in Yellowstone until 1929, on site in the park, and considered Russell's work "as being of

very high order and absolutely indispensable [*sic*]."²⁸⁷

In the summer of 1928, Frank Oastler completed a survey of educational needs in Yellowstone. He found that the most important story at the park was its geology, followed by its wildlife. Oastler suggested that a main museum be built at Mammoth, trail museums at Clematis Gulch (at Mammoth), Grand Canyon, and Camp Roosevelt, and an observation station at Capitol Hill. He recommended an auditorium and library to complement both the Mammoth and Old Faithful museums, and noted that the park was currently exhibiting historical objects as well as natural history displays, in the form of an old stagecoach situated outside the small museum at Mammoth.²⁸⁸ Oastler also recommended wildflower gardens, with labeled beds, at each important point; he disliked the "zoo" approach but recommended that "every effort be made by planting food, salt, seed, bird baths, etc. in certain places to attract wild life about the areas where the people gather." He also encouraged the construction of nature trails.²⁸⁹ Most of these ideas bore fruit.

By 1929, guided tours had been added at Lake (1926), Canyon (1928), Fishing Bridge (1929), and West Thumb (1929). That year alone, 87,192 visitors were instructed by means of these tours.²⁹⁰ The lecture service was expanded by then to include "twelve lectures . . . daily at the main points of the loop": three at Mammoth, two at Old Faithful, one at West Thumb, two at Canyon, two at Lake, one at Fishing Bridge, and one at Tower. In addition to these lectures, a ranger naturalist gave several talks throughout the day on Mount

Washburn.²⁹¹ The ranks of ranger naturalists had also grown. During the summer months, park naturalist Dorr Yeager and his head ranger naturalist were joined by sixteen ranger naturalists and one park ranger.²⁹² Even with an increase in the number of ranger naturalists and the existence of self-guiding trails, there were still too many tourists trying to fit into too few guided tours. Thus, each year park officials called for more money for more ranger naturalists.

Protection

While ranger naturalists were responsible for the education of visitors, park rangers were responsible for protecting the park's resources, chief among which were wildlife and park thermal areas. The protection department also established and implemented policies regarding the protection of the park's natural and cultural features. The first decade of NPS administration saw little change in the park's position on wildlife preservation. The tame bison herd was still tended on the reserve on the Lamar River, and hay was still harvested for its use and for feeding herds of elk, deer, and pronghorn. Predators—in particular mountain lions, wolves, and coyotes—were still being exterminated, while bears were considered a major park attraction and were thus exploited for tourist pleasure.

When the NPS took control of Yellowstone's wild residents, its position regarding wildlife closely resembled that of the military: to protect game species from the rigors of winter, predators, and the encroachment of human habitation, and in doing so, to create herds of wildlife unafraid of the human presence. "We may now invite the traveler to visit Yellowstone," Mather wrote in 1917, "... where there is ... opportunity for communion with nature, its wild flowers, its trees, and its rippling streams, where wild animals, gentle and unafraid, are to be seen in abundance, and where all is fresh and calm and beautiful."²⁹³ Mather's "gentle and unafraid" wild animals were herds of deer, antelope, elk, and bison. They were most certainly not the wolves, mountain lions, and coyotes that also called the park home, but rather were targeted for extermination. Thus, the park's policy of wildlife protection included game animals and, at least most of the time, bears. "The killing of wild animals, *except predatory animals when absolutely necessary*, is strictly forbidden in Yellowstone Park by law," Mather wrote in 1917.²⁹⁴ Park officials felt it was "absolutely necessary"

to kill predatory animals, as evidenced by the numbers of predators killed during this time and the comments accompanying these statistics. "An intensive campaign to destroy predatory animals, such as the wolf, coyote, and mountain lion, has met with gratifying success," Mather wrote in 1918, a year when 190 coyotes and 36 wolves were taken.²⁹⁵

Predatory species were exterminated primarily because Superintendent Albright, his superiors, and his rangers believed that those animals did "much damage to other game."²⁹⁶ Their job, they believed, was protecting wildlife even if that wildlife had to be protected from the natural process of predation. In an era before ecosystem relationships were well understood, their view was not unusual. But there was something else at work: politics. Put simply, wildlife protection was popular. "The development and protection of the wild animal life in the park, which was only considered of secondary interest for many years, has become [*sic*] to be generally known as a feature of utmost importance to the public," Albright wrote in 1918. "Our animals are becoming tamer and more is seen of them from year to year."²⁹⁷ Albright's positive spin on the notion that the park's wild animals were becoming "tamer" is indicative of the vastly different value system and management philosophy espoused by the NPS at the time, compared to today.²⁹⁸

According to former NPS employee C. C. Presnall, predator control was not questioned in the agency until about 1930. To that point, he wrote, "a great majority of people, including NPS officials took it for granted that complete protection of wildlife involved elimination or drastic control of all predators. The term 'extermination of predators' appears often . . . in official business."²⁹⁹



"Pete" the mule deer begging for food at a Mammoth Hot Springs residence. 1920.

Thus, while some ecologists outside the park were beginning to revise their thoughts about predator control and coming to very different conclusions from Albright's and Mather's about the value of predators in ecosystems, the NPS continued to support predator control in order to remain true to Albright's and Mather's understanding of the park's mandate.³⁰⁰

By 1926, this policy was relaxed to include mildly stated concerns about possible extermination, but the end result remained the same: "It is contrary to the policy of the service to exterminate any species native to a park area," Mather wrote in his annual report, "but it is necessary to keep several of the predatory animals, such as wolves, mountain lions, and coyotes, under control, in order that the deer, antelope, and other weaker animals may not suffer unduly from their predations."³⁰¹ Albright's term as director of the NPS (he followed Mather in the position from 1929 to 1933) resulted in no immediate change in either the park's policy or practice of extermination: "While no species of animal indigenous to a park is ever exterminated," he wrote, "those that prey too heavily upon the weaker animals are reduced in number, in an endeavor to retain as nearly as possible the balance of nature."³⁰² The "balance of nature" idea, popular with many ecologists of the 1920s and 1930s, would prove to be a double-edged sword in Yellowstone.³⁰³ As is indicated by Albright's use of the term as a justification for continued tinkering with predator-prey relationships, it would lead, on the one hand, to decades of interventionist wildlife management, including the removal from the park of 26,400 elk between 1923 and 1968 by means of live shipping and direct reduction, out of concern that they were overgrazing the park's northern range.³⁰⁴ On the other hand, it provided the seeds of later, more sophisticated ecological thinking that served as the basis for putting a complete halt to the killing of predators and elk (and bison) reductions and, much later, for actually restoring a major predator—the wolf—to its rightful place in the park. But in Albright's time, the "balance" remained clearly tipped toward the game species.

Meanwhile, the park's herds of bison and elk grew. By 1922, officials believed that there were "surplus" bulls in the managed bison herd. Two years later, the herd had grown to 780 head and the NPS was looking for ways to "dispens[e] of buffalo meat in large quantities" (today's population hovers around 4,000 animals).³⁰⁵ Though park officials were by this time convinced that the growing size of the park's elk herds threatened the

"balance of nature," they remained concerned that the herds were vulnerable. Thus, the park increased its efforts to turn land to hay-raising and the NPS increased pressure on Congress to extend the park's boundaries, thereby creating additional winter range. Haying continued in the Lamar Valley, both at the buffalo ranch and at Slough Creek, with additional acres irrigated there as well as on the 45-acre tract at the North Entrance.³⁰⁶ In 1925, private citizens, organized into the Gallatin Game Preservation Company (GGPC), contributed \$50,000 toward the purchase of lands north and west of Gardiner, Montana. This land was intended for use as foraging ground for the "dwindling" pronghorn and elk populations. Because the group knew that any plan Superintendent Albright might propose to extend the park's boundaries would likely be hindered by government bureaucracy as well as local politics, the GGPC, which had already purchased one large ranch, planned to turn the land over to the park. It was hoped that the government would purchase an equally large section of land. This purchase involved the Reese Creek and Stephens Creek areas.³⁰⁷

In March 1926, President Calvin Coolidge signed "An act to make additions to the Absaroka and Gallatin National Forests and the Yellowstone National Park and adjacent lands, and for other purposes," which enabled the GGPC to turn over land already purchased to the government and supported the NPS's efforts to add more land to the park for pronghorn and elk preservation, to cultivate hay, and to establish winter feeding grounds. The previous November, the W. M. Hoppe ranch (approximately 1,000 acres) had been purchased, and nearly 135 tons of hay produced.³⁰⁸ The GGPC continued to raise funds for the addition of more land in this area. The effort to extend the park's boundaries was successfully completed in 1929, when the park "was enlarged by 78 square miles through boundary revisions on the north and east."³⁰⁹ These boundary adjustments were made at the recommendation of the President's Coordinating Commission on National Parks and National Forests.³¹⁰

At the root of such attempts to improve the park's herds of game species lay a simple equation: more animals equaled more tourists. Frank Oastler, in his survey of educational opportunities for Yellowstone, recognized the value of guaranteeing visitors a vista replete with grazing animals. Thus he suggested that a "hidden fence" be constructed in the Lamar Valley near Mount Washburn to enclose buffalo and elk for visitor viewing.³¹¹ Accord-

ing to Schullery, Albright implemented this suggestion and “arranged for the construction of several miles of carefully placed corral in the Antelope Creek drainage on the lower north slopes of Mount Washburn.” “Much of the fencing was obscured by trees, giving the effect of open range,” he added.³¹² Furthermore, throughout this period, bison continued to be kept in captivity at Mammoth Hot Springs as a popular tourist attraction.

Superintendent Albright’s efforts to protect game species extended to another creature, one that has come to be recognized as the symbol of Yellowstone—the bear. Albright knew that the public’s fascination with the bear enhanced visitation to the park. Thus, he considered it a species to be “protected” and controlled only when human life or property was threatened. “I doubt if anything in the park creates a more lasting interest and pleasure in the minds of most tourists,” wrote Albright in 1918, “than does a small herd of elk or a few scattering deer seen along the road; a herd of bison in the pasture at Mammoth, or on Lamar River, where the main herd is kept; a porcupine along the roadside, which the driver will be careful to avoid, if his car is not equipped with puncture-proof tires; and best of all, the bears, which frequent the camps and hotels, where they beg for food, although they are already so fat that they can hardly climb a tree if startled.”³¹³ The park superintendent considered it good news when bear numbers or sightings were up; bears were clearly regarded as a “never-ending source of pleasure to the tourists.”³¹⁴

Albright’s attitude led to the institution of one of the park’s most historically notorious activities: the staging of bears feeding at garbage dumps around the park. In 1921, Albright wrote in his annual report, “[t]he garbage dumps at Mammoth, Old Faithful, Lake, and Canyon were used as [feeding sites], and were regularly visited by people from hotels and camps.” While there

was an obvious need to keep bears from harming any tourists—hence the positioning of park rangers armed with rifles at the dumps during “visiting hours”—tourists were encouraged to watch the show. In 1925, special bear feeding platforms were constructed at each dump ground to facilitate viewing of these NPS-sanctioned events.³¹⁵ Bear watching, Albright recognized, was “one of the most interesting features of the park,” but it was an inherently risky business.³¹⁶ By the 1930s, as bears’ wariness of humans decreased and their dependence on human foods increased, park officials admitted that Yellowstone had a serious “bear problem.” But the bear shows continued until 1941, when they were finally ended for good.³¹⁷

Conclusion

The beginning of a new decade heralded change for Yellowstone. In 1929, Stephen Mather resigned as director of the NPS, and Horace Albright returned to Washington after ten years in the park to take over as the new director. Roger Toll, superintendent at Rocky Mountain National Park, replaced Albright at the helm of Yellowstone’s administration. Furthermore, October 1929 saw the beginning of the Great Depression, which had a tremendous impact on Yellowstone (and the entire nation) for twelve years. But even with these radical changes, the management of the nation’s first park forged ahead. With its solid foundation in educational programming, Yellowstone was positioned to remain an important component of the nation’s recreational arena. And with experience gained in planning and aesthetically coordinating the park’s built environment, park officials were prepared to make continuing adjustments to the park’s cultural landscape.

Refuge in Rusticity

Yellowstone National Park in the Great Depression

The 1930s brought considerable change to Yellowstone National Park. While the nation reeled from the effects of the Great Depression, the park continued its mission of providing recreational and educational opportunities for an ailing nation. During this period, the public viewed the park alternately as an unnecessary luxury, as an opportunity to get America back to work, and as a place of refuge. Each of these viewpoints in turn forced park officials to adjust their plans for park improvements. The result was an adventure in rusticity—a built landscape and educational programs that emphasized the rustic splendor of Yellowstone.

As Superintendent Roger Toll (1929–1936) understatedly put it: “An unsettled state of affairs throughout the country had its effect on the travel and business in Yellowstone National Park.” Initially, fewer tourists visited the park, causing notable financial strain on concessioners who “found it necessary to retrench considerably.”¹ When tourist numbers rebounded, they did so largely because financially strapped Americans realized they could recreate in the park for relatively little money. “In the present trying times, as never before,” wrote National Park Service (NPS) Director Horace M. Albright, travelers “appreciated our varied accommodations built to meet the requirements of all pocketbooks.”² Visitors, according to Albright, “unquestionably found life in the mountains and woods and along the streams and lakes restful and healthful and in every way worth while, and at the same time realized that simple camp life offers more opportunities for the practice of economy than oftentimes can be found at home.”³ Thus, while concessioners suffered serious losses, bringing some projects to

a standstill, and as rail travel and hotel visits plummeted, a record number of Americans opted for roughing it by driving to the park and making use of its free public campgrounds. Park officials responded with more and better-equipped campgrounds.⁴

To provide opportunities for refuge, recreation, and education, the NPS continued to improve Yellowstone’s infrastructure and educational programming. Initially, a reduction in federal park appropriations resulted in a decrease in funding for construction projects and a cut in professional manpower to manage the park’s resources. With the New Deal, however, the government came to the park’s rescue in the form of Emergency Conservation Work (ECW), undertaken by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Public Works Administration (PWA). Support from these agencies inspired NPS officials to forge ahead with a master plan for the park, which was completed in 1933. The notion of coordinating and planning all aspects of the park’s built environment continued throughout the period, resulting in tremendous growth and programmatic changes in the Landscape Architecture Division under Thomas C. Vint. The division grew considerably during this period as, according to one account, it “found itself on the cutting edge of the New Deal.”⁵

During this period, the NPS emphasized rustic architecture with unobtrusive structures made from native materials that fit into a park’s natural surroundings. While the details of this rusticity were carefully worked out by Vint and his co-workers, it is hard to call it a style. Rather, as William C. Tweed, author of *Parkitecture: A History of Rustic Building Design in the National Park*

System, 1916–1942, wrote, rustic architecture “was a number of styles sharing a central concept or ethic.” The point was to create structures made from local materials that harmonized with but did not overpower the natural surroundings. The architects practicing this rusticity referred to “their numerous design styles” as “parkitecture.”⁶ The “parkitecture” of Yellowstone was log—or log-frame—construction of simple design that harmonized with its immediate surroundings.

The park’s informational and educational programs also emphasized a form of rusticity by giving more tourists the opportunity to learn about, experience, and appreciate the park—albeit through structured tours and programs whose formats were derived from modern life. Adjusting to the times, the park created a new kind of guided tour: the auto caravan. Yellowstone officials also spent a considerable amount of time and money developing a popular, but highly unnatural, “educational” program—the bear show. Thus, just as Americans “. . . sought and found . . . diversion, recreation, and rest” in the nation’s first national park, so they found that diversion in a “naturalistic” built and educational environment that emphasized rusticity.⁷

The Administrators

Roger Wolcott Toll was appointed superintendent of Yellowstone on February 1, 1929, following Albright’s departure to become NPS director in January of that year. Toll, superintendent of Rocky Mountain National Park at the time of his transfer to Yellowstone, was an engineer by training—he had attended the University of Denver and Columbia University—and had joined the NPS in 1919 as superintendent of Mount Rainier National Park. Toll was superintendent during the largest road building project to date in Yellowstone, and one of the most active periods of building construction. Wilderness areas were set aside during his administration, and Toll extended NPS wildlife protection to include previously persecuted predators such as the pelicans and coyotes.⁸ In addition, it was Toll who recognized that Yellowstone had a serious “bear problem,” and called in biologists from the NPS’s Wildlife Division to assess the situation and make recommendations for improving visitor safety and natural conditions in the park.⁹ However, because Toll left the park each winter to tackle servicewide issues from an office in Denver, his seven years as superintendent of Yellowstone were, according to Aubrey Haines,



Superintendent Roger Toll. 1929.

“less outstanding than they might have been.” Toll was on such a mission “to investigate the possibility of establishing international parks and wildlife refuges along the Mexican–American border,” when he and Wildlife Division Chief George Wright—two of the brightest and best of the second generation of park managers—were killed in an automobile accident near Deming, New Mexico, on February 25, 1936.¹⁰

During Toll’s many absences, two assistant superintendents, Guy D. Edwards and John W. Emmert, managed the park. Emmert had a long tenure with the NPS. A student of electrical engineering, he was employed at Yosemite National Park from 1912 until his transfer to Yellowstone in 1934. Upon Toll’s death, Emmert served as acting superintendent of the park until May 1936, when Edmund Burrell Rogers, following in

Toll's footsteps by leaving the superintendency of Rocky Mountain National Park, became Yellowstone's third NPS superintendent. Rogers's tenure as superintendent was of record-setting length—twenty years. His administration, according to Haines, “began on the hopeful side of the Great Depression, struggled through the doldrums of World War II, and had to settle for preserving park values during the postwar resurgence of travel.” Haines noted that Rogers was efficient and diplomatic, and that his administration handled a threefold increase in visitation (nearly 1.5 million people visited Yellowstone in 1956), with relative success, “despite [the] appalling obsolescence of physical facilities.”¹¹ Rogers accepted the job of special assistant to the director of the NPS in 1956, and retired in 1960.

These administrators had their work cut out for them. Overseeing the nation's first and largest park during a time of economic catastrophe certainly proved challenging, but in several important ways, the government response to that same disaster actually made Toll's and Rogers's jobs easier. Assistance—both in the form of funding and manpower—provided by New Deal programs resulted in numerous park improvements.

The Civilian Conservation Corps Makes Its Mark on the Park

The decade of the 1930s dawned grey and dreary for Yellowstone. The “unsettled state of affairs throughout the country” quickly clouded the park's future: a 12-percent decrease in visitors in 1931, followed by a 3-percent decrease the following year, and a 29-percent decrease in 1933, meant fewer Americans would benefit from the park's instructive and recreational benefits and fewer dollars would arrive in concessioners' and the NPS's coffers.¹² Park funds, already severely reduced by forest fires in 1931, were hit hard by a considerable cut in appropriations. The effects on park improvement and protection were significant. Personnel pay cuts of 8 1/3 percent in 1932 were increased to 15 percent in 1933.¹³ Building maintenance and construction projects were also affected by reduced appropriations. In 1933, there were 245 government buildings in the park, many of which required considerable maintenance work, and an allotment of only \$12,000 to cover expenses. This represented a 15-percent decrease in appropriations—a worrisome reduction, because a majority of the buildings were many decades old.¹⁴

What the park needed to continue its improvement and protection schedule was a large infusion of money and manpower. It received both from the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), the force of unemployed men and youth put to work on resource-related public projects as part of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Emergency Conservation Work (ECW). The ECW program was enacted on March 31, 1933, just weeks after Roosevelt's inauguration. Under the provisions of Roosevelt's executive order, the unemployed were put to work “in the construction, maintenance and carrying on of works of a public nature in connection with the forestation of lands . . . the prevention of forest fires, floods and soil erosion, plant pest and disease control, [and] the construction, maintenance or repair of paths, trails and fire lanes in the national parks and national forests. . . .”¹⁵

The CCC proved vital to park operations. As Matthew Redinger wrote in his study of the CCC in Yellowstone, “Faced with reduced appropriations in the depth of the Depression, any park expansion or development to accomplish the end of making the parks more attractive seemed unrealistic. The establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1933 changed all that.”¹⁶ The NPS recognized the CCC's essential contribution to the well-being of the park, and made ready use of the organization. The “CCC boys,” as they were called, provided the park with tens of thousands of “man-days” of work that it would not have had otherwise. As Superintendent Rogers explained in his 1936 annual report, “All work accomplished by the companies located here has been very much worthwhile and of great benefit with lasting result.”¹⁷

All CCC and ECW work was supervised by landscape architects working in each park. “The CCC technical staff—architects, landscape architects, and engineers—were actually employed by the National Park Service through ECW funds,” wrote historian Linda McClelland.¹⁸ Thus, all improvement work—structural, landscape, and trail—fit a landscape improvement plan devised by Vint's office. One CCC undertaking was the construction of smaller-scale projects. Workers built cabins, cottages, comfort stations, and garages. According to Timothy Mann's 1981 summary of their work in Yellowstone, the CCC took responsibility for most of the construction at the Lamar buffalo ranch and the residential area just below Mammoth headquarters.¹⁹ Furthermore, the CCC built, maintained, and improved trails throughout the park. For example, they worked

each summer on the 157-mile Howard Eaton Trail along the Grand Loop Road, “blasting out tripping hazards (rocks and logs) and grading for a more comfortable [horse] ride.”²⁰

CCC workers also helped with the protection activities of Yellowstone’s rangers. The shortage of money meant fewer seasonal rangers, which led to a heavier workload for permanent employees. By assuming some of the “easier” enforcement and protection-oriented tasks, CCC workers allowed park rangers to devote their time to tasks requiring expertise, experience, and training. For example, they staffed entrance stations and helped out in the museums. In addition, they helped maintain Yellowstone’s burgeoning elk herd by providing better cover and browse areas with reforestation projects and their involvement with elk feeding. They also participated in efforts to cull the elk herd when park officials began to recognize that “too many elk” would prove harmful to the park’s resources.²¹ At the Lower Slough Creek Ranch, CCC workers set up spike camps, then built elk traps and slaughtered animals selected by NPS rangers for removal.²²

CCC workers also worked on protection projects aimed at eradicating whitebark pine blister rust and bark beetle infestations, and on fire hazard reduction projects.²³ By 1936, they had built and were staffing eight fire lookouts. They also constructed fire caches, cut fire breaks, and built fire trails.²⁴ In fact, during the years the CCC was active in the park, fire control and protection activities were at an all-time high. According to Redinger, the “CCC provided the Park Service with a source of manpower and finances that enabled the Service to implement the increased fire protection plans of the Forest Protection Board.”²⁵ Stephen Pyne, author of a history of fire and firefighting in America, claimed that the CCC fire work amounted to a revolution in fire management, providing the basis for “practically all of the organized crews so essential to modern fire control.”²⁶ In 1938, according to Redinger, “the height of CCC fire protection in [Yellowstone], each camp had a flying squad and a backup on call for two days each, and each ranger station had a small smokechaser crew.”²⁷

As part of their fire suppression work, CCC workers busied themselves with roadside cleanup, another job that required little experience or training, and little supervision.²⁸ In addition to the garbage they removed, CCC workers cleared dead wood from burned areas in the park and removed “stumps from within sight of park roads.”²⁹ Called “fire presuppression” work, this

cleanup effort fit closely with landscape architects’ notion of park beautification, and was informed as much by their concern for scenery preservation as for fire hazard elimination. Later in the decade, however, the cleanup was criticized by biologists studying ways to keep Yellowstone’s fauna both wild and available for public viewing. Later still, such cleanup efforts were actually considered ecologically harmful.

The range of projects undertaken by the CCC to make the park “more attractive and comfortable for visitors” is daunting.³⁰ They built and ran a large nursery on the newly acquired section of land just northwest of Gardiner, Montana, then called the “Game Ranch” (added to the park in 1932 after the Gallatin Game Preservation Company spent several years buying up private holdings between Gardiner and Reese Creek, now referred to as the Stephens Creek area) for purposes of raising trees for the reforestation of campgrounds and burned areas in Yellowstone and Glacier national parks.³¹ This nursery, a very important ECW project, was the source of all plantings—trees and shrubs—used to beautify the park and to hide traces of human disturbance throughout the park. Plantings also concealed construction scars and helped blend developments “harmoniously into the surrounding environment,” wrote McClelland. “So successful was landscape naturalization,” she continued, “that, in most [cases], it is impossible today to distinguish the planted vegetation from the natural and the construction site from its undisturbed setting.”³²

Plantings were also used to improve the appearance of the park’s campgrounds. Under guidance from the landscape architects, CCC workers developed and improved campgrounds in the park for “greater beauty and utility.”³³ Developing and extending campgrounds involved more than planting; it entailed “paving the forest for parking spaces to accommodate the new onslaught of automobiles, building and improving roads, relocating the trails around the project areas, and developing the water and sewer lines to accommodate the increased bathing facilities and comfort stations.” Campers also benefited from new fireplaces, grills, picnic tables, benches, garbage dumps and pit toilets.³⁴ According to the first director of the EWC, Robert Fechner, the CCC’s improvement, development, and expansion of campgrounds made it possible for Yellowstone to accommodate more visitors, and made “it easier and more pleasant for men, women, and children to visit and enjoy America’s most scenic and historic spots.”³⁵ In fact, according to Fechner, the NPS determined in 1935 that “through Emergency Conserva-

tion Work, the development of the Nation's recreational areas has been advanced farther than would have been possible in 10 to 20 years under the old order."³⁶

Reconstructing the Campgrounds

Throughout the 1930s, most of the work on campground reconstruction in the park was done by the ECW. Reconstruction work was necessary because of the extensive pressure put on Yellowstone's campgrounds during the 1920s—in 1929 alone, 166,500 visitors used them.³⁷ Park administrators agreed in 1930 to a comprehensive study of the state of existing campgrounds, including recommendations for change. This study, completed in 1933 by Fred Johnston, assistant chief ranger in charge of forestry in the park, agreed with many of the findings of Dr. Emilio P. Meinecke, principal pathologist of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, who advocated a system whereby campground sites were chosen according to their suitability to withstand use and their attractiveness for visitors. Thus, according to Meinecke's principles of campground protection, regulation, and reconstruction, changes in the park's campgrounds were infused with a scientific approach to camp reconstruction, regulation, and planning. Campsites were to be constructed in such a way that campers' use of the land was regulated without their sense of pioneer spirit being diminished. Restrictions on driving, parking, and building fires were necessary, Meinecke argued, but should be "drawn so unobtrusively that [the camper] hardly recognizes them as such." "The art of distributing such heavy obstacles where nature has not provided them lies in the automatic and immediate conveyance of the instruction to the [camper] and in avoiding at the same time the impression of artificiality," he wrote in his "Camp Planning and Camp Reconstruction."³⁸

Meinecke's guidelines for campgrounds—designed to achieve "protection and permanence" while encroaching "as little as possible upon that legitimate degree of personal liberty which the camper has a right to enjoy"—fit neatly with the NPS's landscape architectural emphasis on rusticity and unobtrusiveness.³⁹ In order of importance, these regulations consisted of one-way roads through campgrounds, "the fixation of the [camper's] car in its parking spur," and the fixation of the fireplace and table.⁴⁰ The obstacles used to direct traffic, keep automobiles within their respective parking spots, and delineate individual campsites were to be placed neither

uniformly nor decoratively. "The object is not at all to make the camp look pretty," wrote Meinecke. "When people go camping they want nature as unspoiled as possible," he reminded park officials. "The object of improving a camp ground is certainly not to embellish it, but to introduce just that degree of order which is necessary to make a camp ground permanent, safe and pleasant, and no more."⁴¹ Meinecke also advocated "a system of camp rotation" whereby "endangered" camps were "temporarily closed" in order to sufficiently recover "either naturally or by artificial means."⁴²

Johnston's study found that many of the park's eight major campgrounds and "numerous minor or undeveloped camp grounds" had suffered due to the constant pressure of repetitive camping and the fact that campers were allowed to select their own camping spots. He referred to the situation as "grave" and called for "drastic steps toward camp ground regulation."⁴³ He recommended closing some portions of campgrounds "for the purpose of artificial restoration," and called for an end to the practice whereby campers freely selected their own sites.⁴⁴ He urged park administrators to begin the process of campground regulation at Mammoth first, because that area had received the most abuse. Mammoth's campground was so far gone, he argued, that it should be used for only as long as it would take to prepare a new area for future use as a campground.⁴⁵ The Old Faithful and Fishing Bridge campgrounds should be next on the list, he opined, while others should be inspected regularly. His recommendations for these areas followed Meinecke's principles: extensive regulation of traffic (one-way with spurs for parking), barriers to enforce traffic patterns and parking, and fixed table and stove arrangements.⁴⁶

Responses to Johnston's report were mixed. Acting Superintendent Guy D. Edwards claimed that most of Johnston's recommendations—for example, placing obstacles and closing part of certain campgrounds for restoration—were already planned but were not yet implemented due to a lack of funding. He also disagreed that the Mammoth Campground should be moved, arguing in favor of restoring the current campground.⁴⁷ Concerns regarding abuse of campgrounds were certainly not resolved with this study. In fact, the issue of how to improve and regulate the camping experience in Yellowstone remained open throughout the decade. In the summer of 1934, for example, park officials debated which style of fireplaces to construct at campgrounds.⁴⁸

The Meinecke system of campground planning

and restoration did become the blueprint for Yellowstone, however. In 1934, Meinecke himself spent several days in Yellowstone discussing campground problems with park rangers. George F. Baggeley, chief ranger and, at the time, acting superintendent, noted that Meinecke's visit had been helpful for rangers and asked that additional copies—enough for each permanent ranger—of Meinecke's two campground bulletins be sent to the park.⁴⁹ In 1935, Superintendent Toll told NPS Director Arno Cammerer (who had replaced Albright in 1933) that the park “planned to develop [the] larger campgrounds along the lines suggested by Dr. Meinecke.”⁵⁰

One campground issue on which park officials couldn't look to Meinecke for guidance was the question of how to deal with permanent campers—those who set up camp for an entire season and surrounded themselves with ramshackle structures and other debris. Campers had been establishing themselves at sites in this way for years, and park officials were growing weary of the mess. In May 1935, resident landscape architect Frank Mattson reported to Vint that “permanent campers” were becoming “a greater problem each year.” The “type of structures they throw up are a disgrace to any campground,” he wrote. He wanted the NPS to establish regulations or a code “by which the standard of camp construction [could] be controlled.”⁵¹

As might be expected, factions of the public did not respond favorably to the NPS's attempts to limit and regulate their camping experiences. Several complained that prohibiting campers from finding their own sites limited their freedom. “Considering the large amount of space available,” read one petition to park officials, “we feel that the reproduction of urban crowding is both unnecessary and contrary to national park ideals.” The authors of this petition also did not like “the impression that the so-called seasonal camper is not entirely welcome,” and complained that “[r]estrictions and regulations are becoming more numerous and irritating.”⁵² By 1937, the NPS had instituted a thirty-day limit on camping in the same spot, and the complaints kept coming.⁵³ Park officials stuck to the thirty-day limit but remained lenient of campers who were determined to choose their own site as long as it was not visible from the roadways.

“Auto camp trailers” posed another vexing problem. These larger vehicles required more space for camping, plus more space for maneuvering. When Director Cammerer asked the parks for suggestions regarding ways to deal with the problem, Mattson responded that



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #123285

Mammoth Campground. 1939.

although the park could not deny entrance to people pulling the trailers, it could enact some restrictions with regard to safety, load, and even “objectionable features such as gaudy colors, sign boards and advertising.”⁵⁴ In 1938, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes authorized the sale of electricity to trailer tourists by means of coin-operated machines.⁵⁵

That year, Johnston again presented a report on the condition of campgrounds in the park. He argued for a greater ranger presence in the campgrounds, so that campers would “become better acquainted with the Service ideals and objectives and [that] protection ideas [could] be more easily put across.” He also suggested that foresters and landscape architects be involved with the planning of new campgrounds and improvements of older ones.⁵⁶

While not all campground issues were resolved in the 1930s, much progress was made on the enlargement and beautification of most sites. None of this would have happened without the CCC. But while very involved with restoring campgrounds and constructing small, relatively out-of-the-way structures, CCC workers did little in the way of constructing major projects, especially in the early years of the ECW. As Tweed put it, “The skills required in rustic construction were thought to be too complex for efficient execution by young and generally unskilled enrollees.” Another problem was “an administrative dictum that structures erected by the E.C.W. in the national parks could not cost more than \$1,500.”⁵⁷ There was a branch of the Roosevelt administration, however, that did get involved with bigger projects: the Public Works Administration. The PWA awarded

grants to various federal agencies for constructing “roads, water and sewer systems, buildings, and other physical improvements.”⁵⁸ In this way, PWA building allotments were used on numerous NPS projects in Yellowstone.

Landscape Architecture and the Development of a Master Plan

Despite the shortage of available cash, the 1930s witnessed an expansion of Yellowstone’s built environment. All construction during this period remained under the purview of the Landscape Division. Thomas Vint, chief landscape architect, chose Kenneth C. McCarter, a hydraulic engineer from Grand Canyon National Park, as assistant landscape architect for District Six (which included Yellowstone), and Frank E. Mattson as McCarter’s assistant, or junior landscape architect.⁵⁹ McCarter, who resided in Yellowstone during the construction season and was thus considered the park’s resident landscape architect, accepted the position with the Landscape Division in 1930.⁶⁰

Vint’s division changed dramatically over the decade. First, in 1933, the division was renamed the Branch of Plans and Design, and it was charged with producing building designs and plans for all park structures. Second, Vint’s staff grew exponentially between 1933 and 1937, as the branch’s scope of activity increased. Records from this period indicate that there were numerous landscape architects working in the park. One ramification of this growth was that after 1933, Vint was less involved with his associates in the field, and thus had less control over their projects and designs. Another result was that Vint’s office manager, William Carnes, born and raised in Montana, and with a degree in landscape architecture from University of California at Berkeley, became the person in charge of the Western Division of the Branch of Plans and Design when Vint moved, in late 1934, to Washington, D.C., to establish a headquarters for the branch.⁶¹

One of the first projects landscape architects worked on during the early years of the decade was a master plan for the park. Official planning had been a part of NPS policy since 1925, when superintendents were encouraged to draw up five-year plans, with the help of landscape architects Hull and Vint. These plans outlined “the expansion and improvement of developed areas of the parks.”⁶² It soon became clear, however, that the scope of a five-year plan was too limited in its vision.

Each park needed a plan “that viewed the park holistically in terms of geography, visitation, and landscape protection, all in relation to the service’s many developing programs: fire control, interpretation and natural history, and engineering.”⁶³ Such a transition to “master planning” was orchestrated under Vint’s leadership, and by 1929 these so-called “park development plans” were mandatory. Park development plans were described in this way:

Such a plan will give the general picture of the park showing the circulation system (roads and trails), the communication system (telephone and telegraph), Wilderness areas, and Developed areas. More detailed plans of developed areas (villages, tourist centers, etc.) will be required to properly portray these special features. These plans being general guides will naturally be constantly in a state of development and should be brought up to date and made a matter of record annually. Their success depends upon the proper collaboration of study and effect on the part of the Park Superintendent, the Landscape Architect, the Chief Engineer, and the Sanitary Engineer. The resulting plan will not be the work of any one but will include the work of all. Since Park Development is primarily a Landscape development, these plans will be coordinated by the Landscape Division.⁶⁴

NPS Director Albright first officially referred to these development plans as “master plans” in 1932, during a presentation before a meeting of agency officials in Hot Springs, Arkansas.⁶⁵ Coming as it did in the middle of the Depression and just after passage of the Employment Stabilization Act (1931), which asked “government bureaus to prepare six-year plans for needed construction,” the NPS’s efforts to revitalize its “planning initiative” were timely.⁶⁶ By the end of the year, master plans were completed for all the parks, including Yellowstone. They consisted of a “park development outline, a general plan, and a six-year program,” the details for which were provided by park superintendents who had outlined the park’s existing “areas”—including specific and characteristic “components”—as well as a wish list of “what they needed to develop an area properly over several years assuming funds were available.”⁶⁷ Vint explained the function of a park’s master plan by comparing it to a city or regional plan: “Its use is to steer the course

of how the land within its jurisdiction is to be used. Nothing is built directly from it. Each project, whether it be a road, a building, or a campground, must have its construction plan approved. In the course of approval it is checked as to whether it conforms with and is not in conflict with the Master Plan.”⁶⁸ The Landscape Division, under Vint’s direction, prepared the plans, which “took the form of a series of large color drawings and an accompanying narrative, the development outline.”⁶⁹ Besides providing basically a list of “existing facilities” and “proposed facilities,” each plan broke the park landscape into distinct areas or land-use categories: “developed areas,” “research areas” (areas where human activity and access were restricted as “areas where scientists could find ‘things in a normal, natural condition’”), “sacred areas” (areas of limited size “around major attractions [. . .] that precluded any construction”), and “wilderness areas” —defined by Albright and Vint simply as “the rest of the park.”⁷⁰

According to a memorandum Superintendent Toll sent to Albright in 1932, Yellowstone’s first master plan should include five “research areas”: Electric Peak, Petrified Tree, Fossil Forest, Mirror Plateau, and Bechler River. According to Toll, each of these areas “contain[ed] some particular type of flora or fauna or [had] some particular geological history not common to the surrounding country.” “Sacred areas” in the park were numerous: Mammoth Hot Springs, Norris Geyser Basin, National Park Mountain, Lower and Midway Geyser Basin, Old Faithful, Shoshone Lake, West Thumb, Heart Lake, Grand Canyon, and Tower Fall. No development that would “in any way deface the formations or detract from the scenic value” was to be allowed.⁷¹

“Wilderness areas” set aside in 1932 included the Upper Yellowstone River, the Lamar River–Mirror Plateau, and Cutoff Peak. Of these, Toll wrote: “These are great areas in the more remote sections of the park which are to be forever maintained in their present state of improvement and development and which will be accessible only by trail. . . . These areas are to be kept in their present state as near as it is possible to do so.” Recognizing the tremendous pressure motorized tourists put on the parks and the need to keep some land untrammelled for future generations, Toll asserted, “The National Park Service realizes its responsibility to future generations and has taken these steps to insure great wilderness areas for coming generations.”⁷²

Except for three of the five research areas and the West Thumb sacred area, these recommendations

became part of the park’s first master plan.⁷³ Yellowstone’s master plan of 1933 was a beautiful document consisting of numerous large sheets of paper (3' × 4') with large-scale colored-pencil and pastel drawings of maps of developed and special areas, park roads, trails, and fire control facilities, and large plans of each developed area and proposed facility.⁷⁴ The sheets depicting the proposed developments were signed in 1934 by Vint or his assistant, Thomas E. Carpenter, a graduate of Harvard’s landscape school and former employee of the Olmsted firm.⁷⁵

While many of the master plan’s proposed developments were not implemented due to a lack of funds and changing interpretations and priorities, the plan did establish and record the NPS’s attitude toward land-use categorization in 1933. It is especially interesting to note the changes planned for developed areas. From the proposed changes, it is clear that many of the park’s existing improvements—some of its roads and older buildings—were considered obtrusive and obsolete.⁷⁶ The master plan offered a clear picture of how the NPS planned to reorganize developed areas in ways that would harmonize with the natural features of their surroundings.

One area to receive attention in the 1933 master plan was Old Faithful. The plan called for a new utility site as part of the government area of the development. This utility site would include such buildings as a mess house, laborers’ bunkhouse, and barn (constructed in 1931). The government area would include a ranger dormitory, a married ranger dormitory (partially complete in 1932), and a ranger naturalist’s residence (remodeled from an old mess house in 1932).⁷⁷ The plan also called for a new bear-feeding ground.

The master plan also addressed Mammoth Hot Springs. A closer look at the planning process for this area provides a glimpse into the competing interests at work in planning park administrative structures in the 1930s. Previous plans to modify the Mammoth area had culminated in 1928, in the efforts of Vint and Ferruccio Vitale (of the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts) to locate the appropriate venue for the new museum planned for the area. This search for the perfect museum site was transformed in 1930 into a much larger project when Vint invited landscape architect Gilmore D. Clarke, of the Westchester County Park Commission in New York, considered the “nation’s leading authority of parkways,” to spend ten days in Yellowstone devising a general plan for development in the Mammoth area. The general

plan would correct what many perceived as, and what McClelland has called, a “serious problem in park planning.” According to McClelland, the “village” at Mammoth “was marked by a discordant array of structures and buildings and a system of congested roads which contradicted the naturalistic principles that the national park designers sought to uphold.”⁷⁸

Actually, the Mammoth area was not so much the product of poor planning as it was the product of little planning. Clarke himself referred to his reorganization plan as “a basis for the better development of an area that has grown ‘like Topsy,’ and which is much in need of a new plan.” The plan—drawn up after intensive field work in the park, numerous conferences with Toll, Herbert Maier, Vint, and McCarter, and Clarke’s assistant, landscape architect Allyn R. Jennings—rested on the premise that the “Mammoth Hot Springs and the formations are the most remarkable in the world.” “Consequently,” Clarke wrote, “the setting should be unencumbered by artificial works of man.”⁷⁹

The plan indicated which of the area’s numerous buildings and roads were to be removed and where those proposed as new construction were to be built.⁸⁰ McClelland wrote that the plan

called for the removal of most of the former army buildings and the hotel and its related buildings but retained recently built park buildings such as the superintendent’s residence, a barn, and a ranger’s residence. The entire area was redesigned, changing the circulation system to one of curving streets around an open elliptical lawn on the site of the old hotel. The new concessionaire’s development was situated to the east in a radiating pattern, and the park administration area, residential area, and utility complex were located to the south in several tiers along curving roads. A road with diagonal parking and a median of several planted islands joined the park and concessionaire’s business areas.⁸¹

These recommendations found their way into the master plan for 1933, and appeared in subdued color as a reminder of a particular vision of the Mammoth area.

A major part of Clarke’s proposal advocated changing the “approach road to the park from the north entrance at Gardiner.” He promoted Route C as proposed in “Report of Reconnaissance Survey of Mammoth Entrance Roads,” written by A. C. Stinson,

chief engineer, in January 1930. Stinson’s reasoning was that this new route offered “the opportunity . . . of bringing traffic into Mammoth before making junction with another entrance road and of connecting with Mammoth at the logical geographic location, thereby affording the unacquainted tourist an exit from Mammoth in the direction he desires to go.”⁸² This part of the plan, implemented by the end of the decade, included a median-divided entrance to Mammoth from Gardiner that would separate the government area from the park operators’ buildings.

Other parts of the proposal met with limited success. While two new buildings were added to the area as per the plan, most of the older buildings—both government- and concessioner-owned—remained, and remain to this day, forming the central part of park headquarters (today’s Fort Yellowstone National Historic Landmark) and the tourist facilities of Mammoth Hot Springs. The story of the plan’s implementation success—or failure—was familiar: too little funding and too much disagreement between parties.

Disagreements started right after copies of the plan were disseminated to Toll, Albright, McCarter, Vint, and a host of interested parties ranging from concessioners to other government officials (the director of the U.S. Weather Bureau, for example).⁸³ McCarter explained the “primary assumption” of the plan to John Nolen, a professor of landscape architecture at Harvard with extensive experience in state park planning. “Mammoth itself should be the junction of the three roads [from Gardiner, Norris, and Tower] in order that the hot springs formation will not be bypassed with traffic in any direction,” he wrote.⁸⁴ The premise upon which the plan was devised was that the natural setting of the area should not be dwarfed or “encumbered by artificial works of men.”

While most could agree that the Mammoth area should not be bypassed, views differed widely on how to improve the area while keeping natural features as its focus. The discussion revolved around whether government or tourist facilities were more important at Mammoth Hot Springs, and how much, and for what reason, development should occur. Concessioners were predictably unhappy with the recommendation that their buildings be razed and that they be required to live in quarters attached to their places of business. Vernon Goodwin and William Morse Nichols of the Yellowstone Park Lodge and Camps Company complained about the proposed removal of concessioners’ buildings while the



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #32687

Auto caravan, Mammoth Hot Springs. 1932.

government buildings were allowed to stay. “[I]t would strike an unbiased observer,” wrote Goodwin to Toll in September 1930, “that Mr. Clarke has been influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by the fact that the government is his client.” He also complained about Clarke’s proposal for the location of the hotel, from which guests’ rooms would no longer look out onto the Mammoth Terraces. “I can express only my personal preference,” he wrote, “but I would more thoroughly enjoy a leisurely view of this beautiful sight from a comfortable chair on the porch of the hotel or lodge than to catch a fleeting glimpse from a motor bus or the back of a horse.”⁸⁵

Nichols went further in his objection. It was the hotel and other tourist facilities and not the administration buildings that belonged at Mammoth, he wrote. “The reason for the hotel, stores or shops, is to serve the public desiring to view the Terraces and to stop over night and be taken care of. With the exception of Information Bureau, Museum and Post Office to equally serve the public at this point,” he fumed, “there is no reason why the government buildings should not be near Gardiner. The Park could certainly be as well administered from Gardiner as from Mammoth and with virgin ground at Gardiner any kind of a landscaping scheme could be laid out and built.”⁸⁶ Furthermore, Nichols countered Clarke’s plan to have traffic enter the Mammoth area to the north of the administration area. This, at best, would give tourists a “sideling [*sic*] view of the Terraces.” “Why not bring the road to a point opposite the center of the area through the present government buildings and make it a real approach to the Terraces?” he asked.⁸⁷ Nichols complained that implementing the plan would leave “the ugly government buildings” in place to “encumber the landscape,” and, after removal of all the buildings along the northwest side of the Mammoth area (the

concessions), it would merely give people a “view of some bare hills.” It all came down to money, he felt. Was removing the buildings worth the cost, and “if it should warrant such expenditure, who would furnish the money?” he asked.⁸⁸

George Whittaker, owner of the Yellowstone Park Stores, also did “not favor a change [in the buildings] unless it would be to remove the government buildings and build the hotel where the bachelor quarters and the front row of buildings are and have it face the terraces; then put the stores and gas station where the old hospital now stands.”⁸⁹ Anna K. Pryor, manager of The Park Curio Shop, called the plan “excellent,” but she noted that implementing it would mean that the government would need to compensate concessioners for the money they had invested in their operations. In the case of the Curio Shop, she wrote, the amount due would have been about \$28,000.

Pryor also complained that concessioners should not have to live in or over their places of business. “Inasmuch, as concessioners serve the public the same as government employees,” she wrote, “they are entitled to a site for a comfortable home.”⁹⁰ J. E. Haynes, who with his wife had lived for 18 summers above their shop, also objected to the idea of concessioners living on site. “I feel that some of us must have separate residences for the same reasons that you [Superintendent Toll] have a separate residence,” he argued.⁹¹

This issue of where to house concessioners was not unique to the Mammoth redesign plan. Also in 1930, Vernon Goodwin requested permission to use a building at Willow Park by the Obsidian Creek Bridge for his residence. While McCarter had “no objection to its use for such a purpose on a short term lease,” he was concerned that “it might be a dangerous precedent in the matter of scattering operators’ residences all over the park.” “If the operators object so strenuously to living quarters attached to their places of business to such an extent that they are willing to be removed several miles,” he reasoned, “it might be as well to require them to reside at Gardiner in relation to the Mammoth area in lieu of giving them rent-free government space within the park.”⁹²

Vint was bothered enough by this issue of concessioner housing that he wrote to Director Albright in September 1930 asking for clarification regarding NPS policy on the location of operators’ residences. The plan for revamping Mammoth “should be made to fit Park policy,” he wrote. Vint liked Clarke’s proposal (so much,

apparently, that in 1931, he sent McCarter for “two months of winter study” with Clarke), and argued for its implementation servicewide.⁹³ His concern was that “[a]s a rule the property occupied by such company officials is ‘sacred area’ to the nth degree.” He had, for example, noted instances “where residence sites for officers in operating companies [had] given the Park Service difficulties,” and he was worried the NPS would be setting itself up for trouble if it did not regulate concessioner housing.⁹⁴ However, Clarke’s solution was one of many parts of the plan not implemented.

Museum specialist Hermon C. Bumpus appreciated Clarke’s plan but feared that the proposal would not move forward. “[Clarke] has evidently approached the subject with an open mind,” he wrote, and he agreed that the “extraordinary natural features” of the Mammoth area should control recommendations for change in the area. But he also felt that Clarke was, as he put it, “optimistic” for thinking that there would “be any sweeping destruction of buildings that are privately owned.”⁹⁵

As it was, there was little destruction of operators’ or government buildings in the Mammoth area. While only a small part of Clarke’s design made it off the page, it was not for lack of approval or because operators’ wishes were considered paramount.⁹⁶ The plan was indeed approved with only one minor change and, after all the fuss, park operators’ objections were determined to “carry little weight.” In fact, expectations for completion of the plan were firm—but they were considered long-term. As Vint explained it, park officials considered the plan as “intended to show what to do when any particular unit is rebuilt,” “not in order to reconstruct.”⁹⁷ Toll himself, in March 1931, called the plan “a satisfactory plan toward which to work,” and acknowledged that it would “of course, be many years before some of the major items of the plan [were] constructed.”⁹⁸ The plan’s prospects for being used as a blueprint for development—or rebuilding—remained rather bright throughout the decade. The minor change made to the Mammoth plan in 1931 involved shifting the museum’s location to the “planted area in front of the residential row,” a location favored by Bumpus and Albright. They felt that the museum’s location should be near the road to and from Tower Fall, as it had been determined that more visitors entered the Mammoth area on that road than any other.⁹⁹

Clarke’s slightly modified ideas for Mammoth guided the 1939 master plan as well. The 1939 plan included revisions that, as authors wrote, “more closely coincided with present circumstances.”¹⁰⁰ By 1939,

park landscape designers had chosen a new location for the proposed museum: it would be combined with the administration building and be situated, again to accommodate traffic patterns, adjacent to the post office.¹⁰¹ Other changes in the 1939 master plans included alternative entrance/checking station layouts for the North and West entrances, a new proposal for the Bridge Bay development, and a new village at Canyon. According to the master plan, the entrance at Gardiner was to be modified extensively. While the main entrance for visitors arriving by train would remain the arch, a second entrance for motorists (never built) would give direct access into the park from Gardiner’s Yellowstone River bridge. The checking station (rebuilt in 1939 after extensive fire damage) would be razed and another built essentially where the entrance station is today.¹⁰²

The Bridge Bay proposal was intended to consolidate all boating operations at one point, a location considered “most desirable” because the bay was protected from storms. The proposal included a concessions area with a building devoted to “various retail operations,” and a campground and cabin area. While some officials felt the proposed development was “a natural setup for a developed area,” others, authors of the 1939 master plan acknowledged, “oppose[d] the development of another commercial area.” This opposition was “well-founded,” wrote authors of the master plan, considering “the policies of the Service.” Furthermore, they conceded, it was “very difficult to limit the size of any development.” “[T]he developments within the Park cannot expand indefinitely without serious damage,” they wrote. But at that point, the authors conceded, the Bridge Bay development plan was merely a proposal that would “require further field study and consultation with the Park Operators.”¹⁰³

The new village proposed for Canyon would return the Upper and Lower Falls areas to more natural conditions, protect the Grand Canyon area from further encroachment, and allow more tourists access to the area. For decades, the authors wrote, the original congressional act setting Yellowstone aside and prohibiting construction of facilities within “one-eighth mile” of a park treasure had been violated “to the detriment of the area and to the exclusion of thousands of tourists enjoying the area to the greatest possible degree.” The construction of a new village would “try to correct these mistakes” and would be justified aesthetically and economically, as well as on conservation principles. Among the many alterations proposed was the building of a

new ranger station “near [the] proposed retail area with possible museum wing and general contact station.”¹⁰⁴ Many of these changes were finally implemented after World War II as part of the park’s Mission 66 program (see chapter 7).

Changes in the Park’s Built Environment

While the Depression interfered with the implementation of much of the master plan, quite a bit of construction occurred during the period. The design of most of this construction bore the mark of the NPS’s love affair with rusticity and was part and parcel of Vint and his associates’ Branch of Plans and Design. Vint was in charge of enforcing this design style. According to Tweed, Vint himself trained his associates in the art of this “non-intrusive or ‘rustic’ design.” This burden fell on Vint, Tweed wrote, as “[e]ven the best landscape schools of the time included little in their curricula that prepared a student for National Park work.”¹⁰⁵

For several years, Vint and the Landscape Division had been designing structures that looked as if they “‘belonged’ in the often awesome natural surroundings” of the park.¹⁰⁶ This trend continued throughout the 1930s, reaching its peak before the decade ended. According to Laura Soulliere Harrison, author of *Architecture in the Parks, National Historic Landmark Theme Study*, Vint and his cohorts were “designers and onsite construction supervisors [who] carefully studied the natural materials in the surrounding landscape—the color, scale, massing, and texture—and incorporated what they could into their designs.”¹⁰⁷ They were “willing to seek out those design elements in their work which made the buildings necessary for park development as unobtrusive and harmonious as possible in their park settings.”¹⁰⁸

By 1935, this “harmonious” design style was so well-developed and so much in demand throughout the NPS that Ohio architect Albert H. Good published a catalogue, *Park and Recreation Structures*, intended to serve “as a training tool for new architects and landscape architects designing developments in parks.” This single volume was followed in 1938 by Good’s three-volume set, *Park Structures and Facilities*.¹⁰⁹ Good’s volumes “helped popularize and standardize compelling imagery for ‘appropriate’ park architecture.”¹¹⁰ McClelland referred to Good’s volumes as a “comprehensive index of national park principles and practices for naturalistic landscape

design and rustic architecture,” filled with “examples to foster imaginative harmonious solutions adapted to the needs and character of each situation.”¹¹¹

Good authored the text, but the ideas developed in the volumes represented the thoughts of a committee of architects—an editorial board that included, among others, Vint and architect Herbert Maier. While the architectural designs endorsed by Maier, Good, Vint, and other architects of the period were not of one style, they did exhibit general tendencies: such designs tried either to “blend into” or celebrate their surroundings by incorporating native materials; they emphasized the principle of horizontality, were to be made of native materials with “character,” and were built according to a scale appropriate to surrounding features. Horizontal structures were “less conspicuous and more readily subordinated to their settings,” Maier and Good believed, and reasonable “overscaling” of the structural elements of rustic construction to the “surrounding large trees and rough terrain” was appropriate in forested and mountainous regions. They eschewed straight, rigid lines “in favor of properly irregular, wavering, ‘freehand’ lines,” and advocated doubling roof shingles every fifth course to soften the effect and create a more primitive image. Furthermore, wherever possible, they argued, designs should incorporate inspiration from pioneering or primitive structures of the area. But log structures made from unpeeled logs had only “transitory charm,” Good wrote. “It is in the best interests of the life of park structures,” he continued, “as well as in avoidance of a long period of litter from loosening bark, and of unsightliness during the process, that there has come about general agreement that the bark should be entirely sacrificed at the outset.”¹¹²

Good somewhat reluctantly referred to the above style as “rustic,” a term already in place to describe the structures built in forested parks but one that, he felt, was “misused and inaccurate.” While he hoped a better word would gain currency, he also defined the term for posterity: “a style which, through the use of avoidance of severely straight lines and over-sophistication, gives the feeling of having been executed by pioneer craftsmen with limited hand tools. It thus achieves sympathy with natural surroundings and with the past.”¹¹³ One of the leading architects to employ this style was Herbert Maier, architect of several trailside museums in the park.

Maier’s career with the NPS was long and productive, his influence growing as his position changed from architect of museums to landscape architect and park



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #44364

Hermon Bumpus, Kenneth Chorley, and Herbert Maier. 1930.

planner. His philosophy of park architecture centered on the belief that the “concept of ‘improvement’ was an anomaly in park development.” To minimize a structure’s impact on its surroundings, he argued for “screening, the use of indigenous and native materials, adaptation of indigenous or frontier methods of construction, construction of buildings with low silhouettes and horizontal lines, avoidance of right angles and straight lines, and elimination of the lines of demarcation between nature and built structures.”¹¹⁴ Perhaps his greatest contribution to park design, according to McClelland, was “his mastery of rockwork, assimilating both the landscape gardener’s emphasis on naturalism and the architect’s vision of the construction potential of this material.”¹¹⁵ As Carr wrote, “Maier’s park architecture . . . could literally improve the view; it embodied the intellectual keys—scientific research and interpretation—that could open the experience of places to new dimensions of appreciation.”¹¹⁶

By the early 1930s, Yellowstone’s rustic architecture had become such a trademark that planners of state parks from around the nation often called on the park’s superintendents for advice on construction projects. Toll advised those interested in Yellowstone’s rustic designs to direct their requests to the Landscape Division in San Francisco.¹¹⁷ These state officials were most often interested in design plans for the park’s snowshoe cabins.

In fact, much of the rustic construction built in the park during the 1930s was in the form of snowshoe

cabins. Evenly spaced and strategically located throughout the park, these little structures were intended to enhance the protective mission of Yellowstone and were so important that park managers ordered them constructed, replaced, and maintained as needed. Superintendent Toll had, in fact, a “policy” of constructing two cabins a year because, by 1930, many of the cabins built in the military era were “past the stage of repairing.”¹¹⁸ Cracks in the walls and floors as well as decayed and settled foundation logs were common problems. “They are hardly fit for human habitation during the winter months,” Toll wrote in an outline of planned construction work, “but [they] are strategically located for winter patrols and winter studies of the geyser basins and are necessary to our work.”¹¹⁹

Most of the cabins built during this decade adhered to a design the NPS adopted as part of its effort to standardize plans for frequently built structures. Although Acting Superintendent Leroy Hill told Vint in 1927 that Yellowstone’s chief ranger, Samuel T. Woodring, did not want to submit or work from design plans for snowshoe cabins that were “to be built in remote locations and by unskilled labor,” Vint’s office had forged ahead and created a standardized design plan for snowshoe cabins that would reflect the agency’s intention that building designs be both functional and harmonious with the environment.¹²⁰

In 1930, the Landscape Division gave park officials three cabin design plans to review. All three cabins were

the same size (15' × 13') and shared a floor plan and such features as an eight-foot deep front porch; a stone chimney; built-in closet, cupboard and sink; and a little food cellar accessible by a trap door in the cabin's floor. The exterior designs, however, were different. The Type 2 Standardized Snowshoe Cabin—a log building with a four-light window on each sidewall, a porch roof carried on log posts, and three purlins resting on log uprights and a beam that spanned the log posts—was adopted by the park but modified immediately to reflect practicalities. A sliding sash window was substituted in the back wall, the interior furnishings were eliminated, a puncheon floor was chosen for the porches, and the stone chimney was replaced with a galvanized stove pipe.¹²¹ The last change likely disturbed the Landscape Division more than any other, as it detracted considerably from the romantic notion of rusticity. The list of construction details sent to the park upon adoption of the Type 2 plan, however, involved enough rustic features, including several that the park had incorporated in their cabins since the early 1920s, to keep the landscape architects happy: “stone piers, battered log crowns, axe-cut log ends, and purlins extending beyond the roof edge.”¹²²

In 1931, this standardized plan was again modified to meet the real-world needs of rangers using the cabins: “The stove was moved from the front to the rear of the cabin and the cellar was moved from a rear corner to near the front with the trap door opening just to the side of the entry door.” These changes allowed for a more practical placement of furniture. Also, the four-light sash window became a six-light sash. In addition, the rustic wood shingles, or shakes, were replaced with practical, snow-shedding, corrugated iron. This modified version of Type 2 standardized snowshoe cabin became the standard plan—referred to as Standard Snowshoe Cabin Drawing 3037—for cabins built in the park throughout the 1930s.¹²³

Before this standardized plan was put into effect, however, one last snowshoe cabin was built with “distinctive design characteristics” in the old style of the 1920s.¹²⁴ In the summer of 1930, a one-room cabin (22' × 20') was built at Miller Creek (variously referred to as the Calfee Creek or the Lower Miller Creek Cabin). The logs used for the walls, measuring 12–18 inches at the butt and at the chisel-pointing of the gable's log crowns (which were a continuation of the log walls from below), gave this cabin “architectural significance.”¹²⁵ According to a recent architectural assessment, the Miller Creek Cabin is “the oldest identified cabin in Yellowstone to use vertical

log posts beneath the purlins in the open porch gable.” This solution to the problem of how to support the extended porch roof was one of many plans with which the designers and builders had experimented over the years. The cabin's success in this arena apparently resulted in its “method of supporting the extended purlins” being adopted as a standard design feature in the NPS's standardized plan for snowshoe cabins.¹²⁶

Another anomaly, although less successful according to Assistant Landscape Architect McCarter, was the cabin's appearance. Its oversized logs and “steeply pitched roof” were “at odds with the National Park Service's philosophy that buildings be inconspicuous and readily subordinated to their setting.” McCarter criticized the cabin's appearance as it was being built; in particular, he did not like that the builders had used 14- and 16-inch logs when they ran out of 12-inch ones. He did, however, approve of the steep pitch of the roof and even the galvanized roofing, as he put it, “to eliminate some of the snow shoveling since the cabin [was] not visited very frequently during the winter and practically no tourists ever reach[ed] that territory.”¹²⁷ The galvanized roof was adopted as part of the standardized plan even if the practice of using such a steep pitch was discontinued.

The snowshoe cabins built in 1931—the Fern Lake and Upper Miller Creek buffalo herder's cabins—are the oldest extant examples of the Standard Snowshoe Cabin Drawing 3037. The cabin at Fern Lake was built, according to Guy Edwards, “for the purpose of having a comfortable station where rangers and other parties interested and assigned to game study work can make their headquarters.”¹²⁸ George Larkin, a contractor from Gardiner, Montana, submitted the low bid and was chosen to construct the cabins at Fern Lake and Upper Miller Creek.¹²⁹ The latter cabin was not intended for winter use, as it was built to house the herder responsible for monitoring the bison that spent the summer on the high open range of the Lamar River and Miller Creek.¹³⁰

When funding for NPS construction in fiscal year 1934 dried up, Toll used ECW funds to construct cabins, arguing that the cabins were necessary for protective purposes and that the park lacked resources to continue its program of building two cabins per year.¹³¹ In October 1934, three standard snowshoe cabins were built under NPS supervision: the Upper Lamar River Cabin (its site now occupied by the Lamar Mountain Cabin) on the Upper Lamar River at Saddle Mountain (moved to Lamar Mountain in 1992); the Buffalo Plateau Cabin on the park's north boundary; and the Cold Creek Cabin,



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #31591-8

Fern Lake Cabin. 1931.



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #31609

Upper Miller Creek Cabin. 1933.

close to the spot of the military-era cabin that burned down in June 1934. The cabins on Buffalo Plateau and the Lamar River were constructed under contract by George Larkin, who again submitted the low bid. They were felt to be “of particular strategic importance in protecting Yellowstone’s game animals from poachers.”¹³² The Cold Creek Cabin replaced one built by the army that burned in June 1934. Superintendent Toll wanted to rebuild right away, because the cabin was critical as a patrol point for rangers from the Lake and Soda Butte districts in winter, and for a fireguard in summer.¹³³ Also built in 1934 were a root cellar, barn, and outhouse (all extant) at the site of the Lower Blacktail Deer Creek Snowshoe Cabin.¹³⁴

In 1938 and 1940, two cabins were built in conjunction with the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries’ egg-collecting projects: one at Clear Creek and one at Peale Island. Of the several egg-collecting stations the bureau constructed around Yellowstone Lake, only these two cabins are still extant. The cabins built at these sites were intended to house the “egg harvesters” —or “spawntakers” —during

their time in the park. The cabin at Clear Creek, built in 1938, replaced a cabin built earlier—sometime between 1913 and 1925—that collapsed under the weight of a heavy snowfall during the winter of 1937–1938. Public Works Administration employees constructed the Peale Island Cabin in 1940. Both cabins became part of the park’s array of snowshoe and backcountry cabins when they were transferred to the NPS in 1961. Both cabins were frame structures. The Clear Creek Cabin was a three-room, rectangular (22.5' × 15'), log-frame building with a sleeping loft. The cabin at Peale Island was a four-room, wood-frame building, rectangular in shape (21.5' × 23.5') with decorative front and rear bargeboards supported by false purlins.¹³⁵

During this period, controversies concerning the color of structures’ exteriors, roofs, and walls were perceived as opportunities to encourage unobtrusive building practices. For example, in 1930, Assistant Superintendent Guy D. Edwards asked Superintendent Toll to contact Chief Landscape Architect Vint regarding the color scheme of park structures. As Edwards explained, “Almost everyone concerned, here, favors the green roof with the brown sides,” as opposed to the brown building/brown roof scheme dictated by the Landscape Architecture Division. Edwards also noted that all the buildings at Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Grand Canyon national parks had green roofs.¹³⁶ When Superintendent Toll approved the new standard “Park Service Green” paint for use on automobiles, signs, and buildings that year, he noted to Vint that in the past, both the walls and roofs of many NPS buildings had been painted with brown stain, creating an effect he called “not pleasing, as the color scheme looks drab and without interest or character.” He much preferred a brown-stained building with a green painted roof. In response, Vint explained to Toll that brown-stained roofs were preferred because the green faded more quickly. The intent, moreover, was for buildings to be two shades of brown. Thus, Vint continued to recommend that the roofs of the Mammoth Auto Campground buildings, for instance, be stained brown because that color would be less noticeable than green when viewed from the terraces.¹³⁷ Good and Maier agreed with Vint: both discouraged the use of green. “Strangely enough,” Good wrote in his catalogues, “green is perhaps the hardest of all colors to handle, because it is so difficult to get just the correct shade in a given setting and because it almost invariably fades to a strangely different hue.”¹³⁸ In short, green stood out, making a structure conspicuous.

Relative to roof construction, Vint preferred the use of 24" shingles or shakes, which, as he put it, tended "to get away from flimsyness [*sic*] in the ordinary roof." He also favored Good's and Maier's recommendation of doubling every fifth course to break up the "dull flatness" of the roof and using a pre-dipped shingle that he believed gave "a pleasing result by using two-third green and one-third grey, distributed at random." Twenty-four-inch shingles, doubled on every fifth course, were used for all park buildings built during this period except those at Old Faithful Utility Area.¹³⁹

Just as buildings were meant to blend with their surroundings, so, too, were the signs used in the park. The NPS erected "rustic signs" throughout the park and complained when concessioners' signs stood out too much.¹⁴⁰ In 1934, landscape architect Frank Mattson complained to Superintendent Toll about the increase in use of white signs throughout the park. Mattson was "under the impression," as he put it, "that the background of these signs would be very much like the color of the building they were on: generally a brown with the lettering a contrasting color." He argued against signs that drew attention to themselves and were intended to drum up business. "It is my understanding," he wrote, "that these signs are for information and not for competitive [*sic*] advertising as one would be impressed by their present use." He called for "some definite regulation regarding signs and advertising."¹⁴¹ Toll responded with a "Memorandum to Operators" that outlined such regulations. He reminded concessioners that "[a]ll details of the sign[s] [erected on operators' buildings] including size of the sign and size and type of the lettering and the color of the lettering and background, should be approved [by the resident landscape architect] in advance." He wrote that some signs used in the park were "appropriate and harmonious while others [were] not."¹⁴²

Ranger stations built during this period were also unobtrusive and rustic. The log-bearing West Entrance Ranger Station was built according to an "irregular plan" on a concrete foundation with "a battered stone veneer." Two smaller residential wings—the mirror image of each other—veered off a main rectangular block with its own intersecting "large central wing." The one-story, rectangular, log ranger station at the Northeast Entrance had a concrete foundation covered with a rough native stone veneer with a partial basement, a low pitched front-gable roof covered with cedar shingles, and doors of "tongue and groove construction with long metal strap hinges on the exterior." The ranger stations' rustic touches included

the typical features of most rustic park architecture at the time: ventral saddle notches joining the walls at the corners and log ends with a "chopper-cut end finish." Another rustic detail was that "the line of the log ends [was] cut so that they flare[d] slightly at the base." An "intersecting gable roof [with] wood shingles" and exposed purlins and rafters topped off the structures.

The Northeast Entrance checking station was also of rustic design, with three separate log saddle-notched buildings sharing a "sweeping side-gable roof." The central building, an office, was separated from the two smaller structures, which served as booths used to house park checking station attendants, by carports through which cars passed on their way into and out of the park. The gable of the office building was covered with vertical tongue-and-groove siding, and boasted a routed National Park Service sign under the roof's peak.¹⁴³

George Larkin was contracted to construct new ranger stations at the West (1932) and Northeast (1935) entrances, as well as a checking station at the Northeast Entrance. The designs for all three buildings emanated from the Branch of Plans and Design and combined a certain functionality with rusticity. In the summer of 1940, the Snake River Ranger Station burned. It was rebuilt, under the new NPS policy mandating frame-constructed buildings instead of logs; in 1939, agency officials had restricted the cutting of park trees for construction and decided to design all future buildings using milled lumber.¹⁴⁴

Fire also destroyed other important buildings during this period. In March 1937, the Gardiner checking station burned and was rebuilt to the original design. At that point, the station (quarters included) was located on the right side of the road just inside the park from the North Entrance arch.¹⁴⁵ In September of that year, the Thorofare Ranger Station was gutted by fire. A new floor, ceiling, and roof were built that fall, and all the furnishings were replaced.¹⁴⁶

At least five primary fire lookout stations were built during the 1930s as part of the park's efforts to protect forests, structures, and wildlife from fire. Lookout stations at Mount Sheridan (1930) and Mount Holmes (1931) were built as one-room structures, the design of which followed "standard No. 3 plans," with a stone foundation, "a small basement for the storage of water, a few tools, etc.," and a "lightning arrester."¹⁴⁷ Lookout stations at Pelican Cone and Observation Peak were built in 1937 using ECW labor.¹⁴⁸ These bigger lookouts were one-story, one-room "houses" with windows on all sides.

The lookout house at Pelican Cone was started by the ECW workers but finished by the park carpenter “in order to finish it up in good order.”¹⁴⁹

The lookout on Mount Washburn was discussed in 1938, and constructed in 1939. The principal point of discussion was whether to let the public enter the building.¹⁵⁰ Because it was decided that the public would be allowed access, “a more pretentious building was desired.” The plan included a building separated into two sections. One section consisted of a three-story tower with separate floors for an observation room (third), living quarters (second), and “a public comfort station of the chemical type” (first). The other section included “a duplicate of the regular fire locating equipment and tools to be used for instructing the public in the science of fire location, and also a small museum.”¹⁵¹ Construction of section one began in the summer of 1939, and was handled by Associate Architect Earhart.¹⁵² The building was “of reinforced concrete with a bush hammer finish on the outside.”¹⁵³

Work on improving the comfort stations around the park also continued apace in the 1930s. The Apollinaris Spring development, begun in 1925, was enhanced when a comfort station was added to the area in 1931, and in 1935, when fountains were built for tourists to drink “the best mineral water, readily accessible, in the park.” The 25' × 13.5' comfort station had walls of reverse board and batten with “exterior log framing in vertical, diagonal and horizontal patterns.” In 1931, as part of its efforts to standardize plans for park buildings, park officials chose this comfort station at Apollinaris Spring as the model or standard for comfort station construction throughout the park.¹⁵⁴ Several comfort stations were also built at West Thumb that year. The stations were built from standard plan No. 3034; each of the one-story rectangular buildings had a concrete foundation wall and an exposed log frame faced on the interior with board-on-board siding. The gable roof was covered with large wooden shingles.¹⁵⁵

The location of comfort stations became an issue at the beginning of the 1930s, when city planner John Nolen visited the park and subsequently recommended that comfort stations “be made an essential part of all public buildings and included under the main roof” of these buildings. Apparently he had found the situation at Norris and other points unaesthetic. Toll wrote to Vint that Nolen “criticised in a friendly manner the unfortunate appearance of a building to which much attention had been given to architecture, but in which

the general effect had been marred by the location of detached comfort stations in the immediate vicinity.” Toll concurred and suggested that in the future, each structure built by the NPS or by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial should include plans for a comfort station under its roof. He sent his recommendation to Herbert Maier, the designer of the Rockefeller museums in the park.¹⁵⁶

Assistant Landscape Architect McCarter wrote back, insisting that attached comfort stations would not work at areas of “considerable traffic congestion, and especially where traffic requires large comfort stations.” He was also concerned that the kind of structures Nolen and Toll were suggesting would make “the museum an addenda [*sic*] to a comfort station.” “In combining [the comfort stations] with the museums being built here in the park,” he responded, “it would seem to me that the buildings are too small to accommodate both units. If the comfort station is of sufficient size, approximately our standard station, it would put it on a par with the museum itself and the signs should read ‘Comfort Station and Museum.’” McCarter advised not including comfort stations in structures like the Fishing Bridge Museum, which was “comparatively small,” and where “accommodations [were] conveniently supplied elsewhere.”¹⁵⁷

The acting head of the Division of Landscape Architecture, Thomas Carpenter, raised another comfort station issue in 1931, when he disagreed with the location of a comfort station planned for the Mammoth Automobile Campground. Recalling the disagreement between Superintendent Albright and Landscape Engineer Hull over the placement of ranger stations at Canyon and Old Faithful years earlier, Carpenter wanted the comfort station in a less conspicuous location, but Acting Superintendent Edwards disagreed. “[O]ur opinion,” he wrote back, addressing his letter to Thomas Vint, “is that if a desirable looking building is constructed at this place there would be no objection. In other parks suitable log comfort stations are erected in different places with no effort made to conceal them,” he reminded Vint and Carpenter, “the idea being that they should be out where everyone can find them.”¹⁵⁸

The built environment of Yellowstone’s developed areas changed considerably in the 1930s. As noted above, changes at the Mammoth Hot Springs developed area were not as extensive as the master plan called for, but there were a few. While Mammoth did not receive the new museum for which Clarke and others had planned,



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #30601-4

Mammoth apartment house. 1936.

changes were made to the existing museum building in 1933. All offices were relocated to the north end of the building, and the portion under the offices was excavated and a stairway constructed leading to the newly relocated library. The old office and library were converted to an exhibit area for geology specimens, and the main basement was converted into storage and a workroom. During 1933, the Yellowstone Library and Museum Association was created to assist with donations and developing the library and museum.¹⁵⁹

Clarke's plan had included a new building for employee housing. This part of his design bore fruit when plans were drawn up for new NPS housing behind the 1911 guardhouse and jail. Adequate employee housing had been both a problem and a priority since the park's creation, and in 1933, Landscape Architect Vint suggested that a cottage group be built east of the utility area at Mammoth. A short time later, however, the discussion between Vint and the park turned toward the construction of a 20-unit apartment house, with Toll suggesting that the four residences on the lower row be removed upon completion of the apartment. Toll also tried to reassure Vint that the apartment did not take the place of a proposed new residential area they had discussed earlier.¹⁶⁰ Before construction began, Acting Superintendent Guy Edwards wrote to Acting Chief Landscape Architect Carnes, arguing that the building be made "as fireproof as possible, considering the limited quantity of water for fire protection at Mammoth and the lack of water pressure, which did not exceed fifty pounds. "With such a limited water supply," he reminded Carnes, "a catastrophe [*sic*] might arise if the building is made only fire resistant."¹⁶¹

Construction on the new apartment house began in 1935, and by March 1936, the first government building to be built at Mammoth since the army left in 1918 was completed. William Gebhardt oversaw the construction process, as inspecting architect.¹⁶² The "massive masonry bearing" building had an I-shaped footprint and "elaborate Tudor detailing" embellishing the simple concrete face, ornamenting the oriel windows, and breaking up the "symmetrical fenestration pattern" on the top floor.¹⁶³ Although none of these details can be considered rustic, the building's design did fit in with its eclectic, army-era surroundings.

The other two major buildings under construction in the "government" area of Mammoth Hot Springs that year—the new Mammoth Post Office, which was part of Clarke's plan, and a utility building—also tested the rule of rustic design.¹⁶⁴ Both were imposing concrete structures that did harmonize with the existing army-era structures. Gebhardt also oversaw construction of the utility building, which proceeded much more slowly than anticipated. While it was expected that the building would be completed by December 1936, it was not actually finished until May 1937. "While there was a great deal of grief [*sic*] for the Park and the Inspecting Architect on this project," resident landscape architect Sanford Hill wrote, "the final results turned out satisfactorily."¹⁶⁵ Construction on the post office was slowed by financial problems, but was finally completed in October 1937.¹⁶⁶ The building itself has been "cited as the only example of the French Renaissance Moderne Style in Wyoming." It is "a seven-bay, two-story, rectangular, concrete building on a raised basement," with a stucco finish and slate shingles on its steeply pitched hipped roof.¹⁶⁷

Not part of Clarke's plan for the area, but in the works nevertheless, the Lower Mammoth residence area, with its series of one-story frame houses, was also established between 1937 and 1939. These dwellings, built with CCC labor, were part of a host of residences built over time to house NPS employees and their families.¹⁶⁸

The Lamar Buffalo Ranch area also experienced change in the 1930s. In 1938, the Soda Butte Snowshoe Cabin/Ranger Station, built in 1930, was relocated to the ranch to be used as the assistant buffalokeeper's residence.¹⁶⁹ A bedroom/bathroom addition, accessible from both the outside and the kitchen, was added soon after relocation, creating an L-shaped plan.¹⁷⁰ Plans were underway at the end of the decade to use the ranch as a utility area for road maintenance as well as a site for bison management. Thus, Superintendent Rogers was "greatly surprised" to learn, in 1939, that the NPS, as part of its wildlife policy, intended to "eliminate the development at the Buffalo Ranch." "New water systems and other improvements are being made with full approval of all branches," Rogers complained in a memorandum to Cammerer, "and as far as we know everyone has agreed that this is the place for a utility area." Rogers suggested that Cammerer in the future refer questions of "wildlife policy as regards Yellowstone . . . to [his] office for an opinion before they [were] given wide publicity."¹⁷¹ Thus, Cammerer's plans for eliminating the ranch and restoring the "Lamar Valley to primitive conditions" were abandoned in favor of using the site as a utility area (and much later, as an educational area).¹⁷² Around 1940, a snowplow garage (used more recently as a powerhouse and, in 2000, removed altogether from the site) and two fire hose houses were built on the site.¹⁷³

Between 1933 and 1935, the Game Ranch (Stephens Creek area) acquired a new residence/office, barn, garage, and storage sheds. In 1934, a house was relocated to the area and remodeled extensively to replace the existing "tumbled down log structure which provide[d] shelter but scarcely anything more." The "new" house, originally built in 1917 and owned at the time the NPS purchased it (1929) by Ernest A. and Sybil Rife, underwent many changes. It received a new basement and concrete-wall foundation faced with "coursed, cut stone from the old Mammoth Stone quarry," a new addition to replace the "crude" one already attached, wallpaper, and changes to the doors and windows. Park landscape architect Frank Mattson was in charge of the remodeling project but remained skeptical about its success: he



NPS PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #44323

Fishing Bridge Museum under construction, ca. 1930.

believed that the \$10,000 project "did not meet the park standards in either construction or appearance."¹⁷⁴

Another area to undergo tremendous change was Fishing Bridge. The museum planned for Fishing Bridge in 1928 as part of the park's trailside museum project was finally constructed in 1930, but not without controversy. The educational staff, notably Dr. Hermon C. Bumpus of the American Association of Museums and assistant landscape architect Kenneth McCarter, favored a location on the lakeshore near the auto camp, while Superintendent Toll and Director Albright argued for a site by the hatchery, or at the very least, on the loop road between the hatchery and the proposed Lake Junction.¹⁷⁵ Toll and Albright felt that the lake location would exclude visitors without their own means of transportation—those staying at the Lake Hotel, for example—or visitors driving the loop road who were willing to stop only once, that stop being at the fish hatchery.¹⁷⁶ Both Toll and Albright agreed, however, that the decision should be Bumpus's—both, in short, were willing to "accept his judgment," and so the museum was built at Bumpus's proposed location off the main road by the lake.¹⁷⁷ When the museum received fewer visitors than other park museums in 1949, Superintendent Edmund Rogers attributed the lower visitation to the museum's location off the main road.¹⁷⁸

The building itself, the last of the four museums planned and designed by Herbert Maier, perfectly illustrated the NPS's rustic design concept. The one-story, stone and wood-frame structure had an elongated rectangular footprint of a central block with two unequally sized wings. The structure's "uncoursed rubblestone masonry foundation . . . extend[ed] to the window sills," and the frame section above was covered with "wood shingles set in a wave pattern." Wooden shakes covered

the gable roofs, which had large log purlins and rafters with exposed ends and log brackets supporting the central building's overhanging roof.¹⁷⁹ The three rooms, devoted to "Bird Hall" (the central room), "Lake Geology," and "Lake Biology" (the wings), were well-supplied with natural light from multi-light doors and casement windows. According to Albert H. Good's description, the "nature museum" was "well-planned and well-lighted." It was, he wrote, "a successful example of the employment of principles important in the creating of buildings suitable to natural areas—the value of the freehand line, the avoidance of underscale, and the pleasing quality of the furrowed and knotted log."¹⁸⁰

The museum was completed and opened to the public in 1931. In 1933, Superintendent Toll wrote to McCarter complaining about the native stone steps used to access the museums at Fishing Bridge and Norris. The irregular treads were particularly "unsatisfactory for the use of the considerable number of people that use these

museums," he wrote. While he "appreciate[d] . . . that these plans [for the steps] were not drawn up in your office," he asked that the NPS "take advantage of this experience and not use any more native stone for the treads in park buildings."¹⁸¹

Maier also designed the naturalist's residence located adjacent to the east side of the museum and resembling the museum in many ways. The residence, also one story and of wood-frame construction, had a cement foundation "faced with large-diameter uncoursed rubblestones that slope outward at each exterior corner in a naturalistic organic design." Wooden shingles in a wave pattern covered the frame structure above the stone-faced foundation, and, with every fifth course doubled, they also covered the roofs—both the hip roof of what is probably the original section and the shed roof of what might be the addition. Two factors led architectural experts to believe that the wing was an addition: its "unusual shed roof design and . . . minimal fenestration."¹⁸²

Additions were also made at the Norris and Lake areas. At Norris, two rustic buildings were constructed close to the museum in the first half of the decade: a one-story, log comfort station and a one-story, log bearing barn with a gable roof.¹⁸³ At Lake, a rustic comfort station was built. This one-story, one-bay log frame building had walls enclosed with vertical "shiplap" siding and a gable roof with "exposed rafter ends and purlins under the eaves."¹⁸⁴ The ranger station/community room was also altered. Plans were drawn up in 1931, and a north wing was added at a later date to accommodate permanent residents.¹⁸⁵

Herbert Maier was also involved with the construction of another mainstay of park architecture: the amphitheater. In fact, he elevated the amphitheater to "an architectural form in its own right."¹⁸⁶ Yellowstone was not the first national park to build an amphitheater, however. Already in 1920, Charles Punchard, the NPS's first landscape architect, had recommended use of the design "attractive, unique, and comfortable," and a simple one had been built in Yosemite in 1920. Furthermore, well-known landscape architect Frank Waugh had published articles and even a treatise on amphitheaters, *Outdoor Theaters: The Design, Construction, and Use of Open-Air Auditoriums* (1917).¹⁸⁷

Of the several amphitheaters built in the park during the 1930s, the earliest two were designed by Maier: one at the Old Faithful Museum and one at the museum at Fishing Bridge. Both were built with funds



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #44390

Fishing Bridge Museum. 1930.



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #44386

Fishing Bridge Museum interior. 1930.



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #123212

Old Faithful amphitheater. 1933.

provided by the American Association of Museums, and dedicated in the summer of 1932. Maier found and adapted prototypes of his outdoor theater design in the Greek Theater at the University of California–Berkeley (1903), and in architect Myron Hunt’s design for Pomona State College in California. His finished products were semicircular, rustic adaptations of the traditional Greek theater: aisles and rows of log seating radiated out from a center stage into a hillside. According to McClelland, “Maier’s semicircular designs with their log materials were better suited to the intimate woodland surroundings and use for evening lectures and slide shows than the massive stone and concrete prototypes.” Their smaller scale and “naturalistic” style “befitt[ed] [their] forested location.” Split logs formed the benches, and “scattered trees within the theater were left in position” to enhance the structure’s rusticity.¹⁸⁸

Not all the details were equally successful at blending in and being unobtrusive, however. Good found the “perching of the housing for the projector on log ‘piles’ . . . of interest,” and the placement of rocks along the path at the Old Faithful amphitheater so “unfortunate . . . as to force their eventual removal, unless Nature hastens to supply some ground cover to obliterate them in considerable degree.”¹⁸⁹ In the 1950s, as part of the “improvements” of the Mission 66 project, the half-log seats were replaced with “typical” plank seats on metal legs.¹⁹⁰ The Fishing Bridge amphitheater faced Yellow-

stone Lake; it had skulls and antlers attached to the projection screen that were later removed.¹⁹¹

In 1934, the CCC built two more amphitheaters around campfires: one at Mammoth for 200 people “on the hillside above the camping area,” and another, smaller one for 75 persons near the Madison Museum “at a point from which National Park Mountain is visible.”¹⁹² By 1935, after another for 125 people was added to West Thumb, five amphitheaters were in use.¹⁹³ In 1936, plans were made to build an outdoor theater at the Canyon Campground. These plans did not materialize, however, until September 1937, because the general plan for the Canyon area was being revised, which meant that the naturalist program—or “campfire lecture,” as it was called—at Canyon was held in the community room of the ranger station.¹⁹⁴ With all ranger-naturalist programs moved out of any operator’s or concessioner’s building, such as lodges and hotels, the NPS could rest assured knowing, as Superintendent Toll put it, that visitors finally had a clear choice regarding the quality of their instruction in the park. “We believe this to be an improvement,” he wrote in his annual report for 1935, “as the visitors now have a choice as to whether they will attend the naturalist program around the campfire or a ‘savage’ program in a lodge.”¹⁹⁵

Amphitheaters were just one result of the relationship between landscape architecture and educational programming, which bore fruit in the naturalistic

design and landscaping of numerous other elements of Yellowstone's cultural environment. These included the system of nature trails, observation platforms, and roadside exhibits—alternatively called markers, kiosks, or nature shrines—integrated into the park's landscape.¹⁹⁶ Rustic outdoor settings were created for each of these elements of Yellowstone's interpretive program. While other national parks were also busy with such interpretive developments, Yellowstone's program, according to McClelland, "led the service in integrating these features into the design and operation of museums throughout the park." The landscapes thus created "drew heavily from the traditions of rustic architecture and naturalistic gardening."¹⁹⁷

One example of how advances in landscape crafting and engineering guided the construction of an educational project was the nature trail across Norris Geyser Basin. In the summer of 1936, landscape architects and park officials followed the 1933 master plan for the area and devised a circular, naturalistic footpath in keeping with McCarter's 1929 recommendations for the trail at Old Faithful. The three stages of construction at Norris were "the installation of parallel rows of log curbing, the building of a boardwalk of planks supported on two-by-fours, and a final surfacing with concrete and gravel that blended with the natural coloration of the basin."¹⁹⁸ Work on the trail system at Canyon also emphasized the use of natural elements and followed the master plan. When, in 1936, park officials had to repair snow and ice damage to the Upper Falls lookout at the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone, CCC workers rebuilt the stairway and constructed a new overlook "in the form of a terrace that featured a naturalistic rock guardrail and was accessible by a sturdy log stairway and a log bridge."¹⁹⁹

Another mainstay of park educational architecture was the nature shrine (today known as a "wayside exhibit"). The park's first shrine was planned and built at Obsidian Cliff in 1931. In *Park and Recreation Structures*, Albert Good distinguished between signs and markers, or shrines as he called them, on the basis of their purpose and intent: "Signs function to direct, regulate, or caution," he wrote, "whereas the marker and its close cousin, the shrine or graphic guide, serve simply to further the public's understanding and enjoyment of the cultural aspects of a park."²⁰⁰

Shrines, according to Good, were the perfect educational device for several reasons. First, "[s]hrines or graphic guides are devices of bringing exposition to the very scene of an historic event or natural phenomenon,



NPS PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #41214

Norris boardwalk. 1936.

or to the natural abode of a faunal or floral species," he wrote. Second, "[t]hey are designed to 'answer questions.' The interpretive material displayed may be in the nature of specimens, photographs, charts, maps, and such other information matter, supplemented by legends and detailed explanation. . . . They can make possible a broader understanding of an area than endless tramping over the actual ground could give." Third, and most importantly, shrines provided education on the visitor's own terms. "Since guide and shrine devices are unattended," Good noted, "they are that perfect guide service—the park naturalist or historian par excellence—which, if found dull, may be 'walked out on' without reason to feel the pin prick of conscious rudeness." The shrines' inanimate nature necessitated an animated and to-the-point presentation of the material being delivered, however. "Being thus disadvantaged through their inability to frown at a yawning spectator or physically to force him to remain attentive until the last bitter fact is told," Good advised, "these inanimate guide facilities should be accorded by their devisers all the benefits of interesting presentation and clear, concise exposition. As interpretive media they are in theory and in fact truly transitional between the marker and the museum. They are at once glorified marker and museum in embryo."²⁰¹

Yellowstone's first nature shrine, built in 1933, explained the natural formation of Obsidian Cliff.²⁰² Carl Russell, the park naturalist and museum exhibit expert Albright had recruited to plan and organize exhibits at the park's new trailside museums, had the idea for the shrine; Herbert Maier designed the actual structure. Maier's design, according to McClelland, perfectly "illustrated the converging principles of rustic architectural design and landscape naturalization."²⁰³ Measuring 6' × 16', the shrine had walls "constructed of clusters of basaltic columns that had been carefully selected from a



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #123214

Wayside exhibit near Obsidian Cliff. 1933.

nearby formation and moved to the site.” The structure was open-sided, with glass covering the exhibit panels and a “wood-shingled overhanging roof . . . carried on exposed log purlins.” The whole area was made more attractive with flagstone paving inside a curb of basaltic blocks and native plants.²⁰⁴

According to Good, this “open air museum-in-miniature” was significant because it employed in its construction the materials it was designed to interpret. He also admired its design. “The novel motif,” he concluded, “is altogether amiable largely because it has been employed with logic and restraint.”²⁰⁵ The shrine has since been modified. The original exhibit case was removed and replaced with “two modern interpretive panels mounted on metal posts,” and a low stone wall was built between the two stone piers to support these modern panels.²⁰⁶

The nature shrine at Obsidian Cliff was the first of several interpretive kiosks located along Yellowstone’s Grand Loop Road. In 1933, Carl Russell and Herbert Maier also designed shrines at Tuff Cliff, Firehole Canyon, and Rhyotravertine Gulch (in the area of the Mammoth Hoodoos and Bunsen Peak). Other kiosks were constructed during the early 1930s at Swan Lake Flat, Beaver Dams, and Nymph Lake, but none remain.²⁰⁷ Still others were built to resemble Maier’s design, for example the Natural Bridge sign and kiosk. Like all the kiosks built during this period, the Natural Bridge kiosk consisted of two vertical logs supporting a sign case and a protective roof covered with hand-split shakes. The whole structure rested on a mortared stone foundation.²⁰⁸ Good’s catalogue included a photograph of a visitor standing beside such a kiosk; his description was of a

“typical shrine,” with “rustic, hooded frames housing glass-fronted cases to display specimens, illustrations, and printed matter pertaining to a natural phenomenon at hand.”²⁰⁹

It is important to note that the appearance of the nature shrines coincided with, and was in fact an outgrowth of the rise of auto tourism in Yellowstone. The 1920s had seen an explosion of the number of motorists touring the park, and the trend continued through the 1930s. Waysides with interpretive shelters and exhibits were but one response to this trend. It was just a matter of time before other educational programs were developed to meet the needs of auto tourism.

Changes in the Educational Programming

In 1930, park managers added a publication, *Trailside Notes for the Motorist and Hiker*, and the guided auto caravan tour to the list of educational services offered in the park. Introduced on an experimental basis in 1929, *Trailside Notes* was designed to help motorists obtain reliable information about the park and to sustain their interest in park features while behind the wheel. “Stop the car and look back,” read one instruction to motorists. “Go slow but do not park at the blazed post, and take in the wonderful view of Jupiter Terrace,” read another.²¹⁰ The publication was a tremendous success. One visitor from Galesburg, Kansas, opined that the *Trailside Notes* should be available at each park entrance, because “[t]ourists miss much that is of interest, that would be supplied in further descriptive notes.”²¹¹ Subsequent editions were indeed filled with many more details. By 1939, two volumes existed that interpreted the biology, history, and primarily the geology of the landscape through which visitors drove on the road from Mammoth to Old Faithful, through Norris, and back again through Canyon and Tower Fall.

Auto caravans gave “the moving crowd” and those with “an aversion to long hikes” an opportunity to experience a ranger-led excursion.²¹² They consisted of a lead car with a ranger naturalist inside and a string of cars following. The ranger would stop at points of interest and use a megaphone to “carry his message to those in the waiting cars.”²¹³ Ranger-naturalist Edward Jones recognized the need for such a service in his 1929 report on educational activities: “The desire of the average Park visitor to see as much as possible from his own car must



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #32689

Auto caravan on Mammoth Terraces. 1937.

be recognized and provided for,” he wrote, adding that the “increased number reached would definitely repay extra expense.”²¹⁴ Bumpus also commented on the need for auto caravans, noting that “Autominded parties are not given to hiking.”²¹⁵

The first auto caravan took place in the Mammoth area, and featured the buffalo show corral and the hot springs. It was such a success that regularly scheduled caravans were also conducted at Old Faithful, Tower, and Canyon the next year. Success, however, brought its own set of problems. The tours often became unwieldy—one Old Faithful tour reportedly included over 300 cars and 800 visitors—and concessioners complained that they were drawing potential customers away from their own tours.²¹⁶ To rectify the latter problem, the NPS allowed the transportation concessioner’s buses to join the caravans at Mammoth.²¹⁷

By the 1930s, the park’s fish hatchery activities were proving so popular that a uniformed guide was stationed at the Lake Hatchery to explain the process to visitors. During 1931, more than 24,500 tourists heard this presentation. Furthermore, a ranger for fishery activities was hired in 1931, something Fred J. Foster, district supervisor of the Bureau of Fisheries, had recommended the year before. Fishing was also gaining in popularity, which made Foster worry that without increased hatchery operations, the park’s waters might become less productive. In 1931, he announced plans to construct additional fish-rearing ponds at Old Faithful.²¹⁸

That year, another of the park’s interpretive programs developed a more formalized format and venue, as the practice of feeding bears for tourist enjoyment was built into the landscape. For a host of reasons, park officials moved the bear feeding site at Canyon from behind the hotel to a more distant location on Otter

Creek.²¹⁹ Superintendent Toll reported that this move “involved the construction of three-quarters of a mile of road, installation of rustic seats for spectators, and the construction of a concrete feeding platform with the necessary water and sewerage facilities.”²²⁰ This development marked the beginning of the bear shows at Otter Creek and the continuation of the uneasy relationship between managing wildlife for their survival and attracting them for the enjoyment of park visitors.

The Otter Creek feeding station, along with its access road and parking lot, were constructed in 1930–1931. The feeding platform, made of reinforced concrete and measuring 18' × 40', had a source of rinsing water at one end and a drain and cesspool at the other so it could be flushed and cleaned regularly.²²¹ A “small reinforced concrete dam” impounded the water of several small springs about 450 feet up the canyon from the feeding ground so it could be used for cleaning the platform. There was also a protective, eight-foot barrier of timber cut into the slope and hidden from view to “present an unbroken slope to the spectators” which, along with a wire fence added around 1933, protected the spectators from the possibility of attack.²²² Toll had recommended the retaining wall as a way to both protect and please the crowd. As he put it in a letter to McCarter, “If a retaining wall, which could act as a barricade, is constructed, it might be possible to gradually bring the feeding platform closer to the observation platform, which would of course add to its interest.”²²³

While park officials were utilizing bears as a tourist attraction both at the feeding grounds and in the form of roadside feeding, which was rampant by this time, they were also encouraging habits that were bad for both bears and people. Teaching bears to associate people with food rewards turned the animals into a source of both entertainment and trouble, and by the 1930s, bears had become a source of serious consternation to the NPS. In 1932, Toll wrote of the problems in his annual report: “Bears were numerous everywhere and were really the main source of grief to the park administration and campers,” he lamented. Without irony, Toll claimed that the bears had become “exceeding[ly] bold, particularly around the campgrounds and housekeeping cabin areas, doing considerable damage to cars and property belonging to visitors and park operators.” The situation was dire enough—the number of complaints had reached record proportions and there was “some loss in travel” (i.e., income), due to “the undesirable publicity which the park received from newspapers and visitors”—that



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #27353-7

Bear feeding grounds at Otter Creek. 1936.

Director Albright gave his permission for the “disposal of surplus bears, both black and grizzly.”²²⁴

At this point, NPS officials appeared to believe that once the few problem bears were disposed of, the problem would be solved. As noted above, it is difficult to detect in the official record any awareness of the irony of the situation. “Measures taken last year to dispose of the worst trouble makers have had their effect,” Toll wrote in 1933, “and fewer complaints and damages resulted this year.” At the same time, Toll wrote in glowing terms that the numerous mother bears and cubs “seen daily around the Canyon feeding ground . . . presented one of the finest wild animal shows to be found anywhere.” Striking the right balance was believed to be crucial: too many bears posed a problem, but more bears were definitely better. The fact that there were fewer bears at the Old Faithful “Lunch Counter for Bears” than at Canyon mattered enough to park officials to warrant mentioning in Toll’s 1933 annual report.²²⁵ Toll referred to the bear shows in 1935 as “splendid and spectacular,” and was pleased to report that “[e]ach year more bear are reported at the feeding ground at Canyon.” He reported that the “high count” for one night in 1935 was 48, as compared to the previous “high count” of 38.²²⁶

Bear shows were so popular that toward the end of the summer of 1934, plans for a new bear feeding ground were underway. An earlier suggestion of constructing one off the Black Sand Basin Road was overruled in favor of a new “bear feeding amphitheater” on the Firehole River, southeast of Old Faithful at the location of the old feeding grounds from the early 1910s, then called “Bears’ Playground.”²²⁷ Further discussions led to the opinion that to relieve congestion at Old Faithful, per-

haps the new bear feeding grounds should be closer to Lake instead.²²⁸

Before these plans could go any further, however, two grizzly maulings occurred: a visitor was injured while hiking around the Canyon area, and an employee was hurt at a picnic site.²²⁹ These encounters made the NPS nervous enough to close the Old Faithful feeding grounds and put any new feeding areas on hold. According to the new superintendent, Edmund Rogers, this was done because the Old Faithful feeding ground, which was closer to a developed area than the one at Otter Creek, “enticed grizzly bears into the crowded utility area, which . . . was considered . . . hazardous because of the nature of this species of bears.” Park officials also killed four grizzlies that year and shipped another four to zoos. In the same report, Rogers wrote that the feeding ground at Canyon was “very popular,” and that as many as 67 grizzlies were seen there on one night.²³⁰

By 1937, the bear feeding ground at Otter Creek was the only one operating in the park; consequently, it was very busy. Rogers reported that the area’s large parking lot had proven “entirely inadequate to accommodate the 500 to 600 automobiles in which visitors travel to see the bear show.”²³¹ He also noted that the amphitheater was packed with people. “During the year it was not uncommon,” he wrote, “for 1,200 to 1,500 persons to be seated in this amphitheater at one time.”²³²

There is no doubt that there was a contradiction between trying to attract bears and simultaneously keep them at a safe distance. Encounters between humans and bears continued; several grizzly bears were trapped and removed from campgrounds, and ten were killed in 1937. Black bears, habitually fed by tourists at the

park's roadsides, were the source of the vast majority of bear-human conflicts, however. Human injuries from black bears averaged 46 per year from 1931–1969, with 115 reported in 1937 alone. That same year, 41 black bears were killed as a result.²³³ NPS personnel developed an excuse as to why these encounters were occurring: tourists were not following precautionary guidelines for appropriate behavior around bears. "In practically all cases [of dangerous encounters with bears resulting in injuries]," wrote Rogers, "the injured persons have been feeding bears *or have failed to take due precautions when in the vicinity of where bears are being fed or photographed*."²³⁴ In other words, it was ostensibly acceptable for the park to provide visitors with opportunities to watch and photograph bears feeding on human food in designated areas, and for visitors and bears to interact to a certain degree, so long as people abided by strict behavioral guidelines.

Another development in 1937 was that bear feeding was moved from the Protection Department to the Naturalist Department (formerly the Education Department).²³⁵ With this move, the bear shows became an official part of the park's educational program. Thus, when the Naturalist Department gave lectures on the natural history of the black and grizzly bears at the feeding ground, they were understood to be "a blending of the recreational, intellectual, and spiritual."²³⁶ Long a popular attraction under the Protection Department, the lecture/bear show, in which a naturalist described "the life and habits of bears as they have been observed in Yellowstone," continued to be "[o]ne of the most popular lectures" given in the park.²³⁷ Due to the popularity of the attraction, park naturalists gave "two lectures each evening [at the feeding ground] . . . so as to accommodate a larger group of people."²³⁸ At the rate of two lectures per evening, assuming that many people didn't choose to sit through both lectures, as many as 3,000 people may have seen the Otter Creek bear show on any given night during the summer season.

The bear shows' days were numbered, however. Several factors converged to put an end to orchestrated bear feeding practices and to close the Otter Creek feeding ground after U.S. entry into World War II. One obvious factor was the increased danger humans and bears faced because of this unnatural arrangement. By the end of the decade, there were clear indications that the Protection Department and the park administration were becoming alarmed by the number of grizzly bears at the feeding ground. In 1938, Rogers wrote that the

amount of food on the platform at Otter Creek was being reduced "in order to overcome the heavy concentration of bears in one area." "To the end of the fiscal year, about 20 grizzlies were in the area," he wrote in his annual report, "and we hope to maintain this number and avoid the heavy concentration which presents a real hazard to park visitors."²³⁹

Tied to this change in park policy was the increased influence of ecological thinking in some sectors of the NPS.²⁴⁰ In 1929, George Melendez Wright, who had first joined the NPS in 1927, working as assistant park naturalist at Yosemite National Park under then-naturalist Carl P. Russell, proposed to Director Albright that a wildlife survey program be established for the National Park Service, to be funded personally by him until the program's value could be demonstrated.²⁴¹ Wright was joined in his proposal by biologist Joseph Dixon and naturalist Ansel Hall. Albright agreed, and the agency's Wild Life Survey was formed. Wright served as chief of the survey, which became the Wildlife Division in 1933, after Congress (instead of Wright) started funding the group's work. The survey was based out of Berkeley, California, in association with the NPS's Education Division (then under the direction of Hall). Wright was joined by fellow biologists Joseph Dixon and Ben H. Thompson, as well as secretary Mrs. George Pease.²⁴²

Dixon, Wright, and Thompson published the results of their work in a series entitled *Fauna of the National Parks of the United States*, with an aim toward "the preservation of the native values of wilderness life" in the national parks. In each park, an effort was made to determine original and current wildlife conditions, to identify causes of adverse changes, and to recommend actions that would restore park wildlife to its original status. The authors acknowledged that "the parks' faunas have been extremely sensitive to the influences of civilization," and their goal was thus to document the "conclusions of a general investigation of the vertebrate life of the national parks with emphasis on these human relationships."²⁴³ They proposed "a program of complete investigation, to be followed by appropriate administrative action."²⁴⁴

Fauna No. 1 identified eight negative repercussions of the bear feeding shows in Yellowstone: the spread of diseases or parasites encouraged by unnatural concentration of animals; the possibility that the garbage itself could introduce parasites to the bears; the possibility that feeding on unnatural foods could negatively affect bear physiology over time; the possibility that the

uneven distribution of food could have deleterious effects on bear physiology (garbage being plentiful at the height of the summer, but scarce in the fall, during hyperphagia, when bears need the most food just prior to hibernation); the unnatural advantage enjoyed by older bears in competition for food; the absence of bears from their natural niches during summer; habituation as bears lost their fear of humans and taught their cubs the same; and finally, a public relations problem. Due to the constant, vicious scuffles that took place as bears fought over garbage, “[b]ears appear at their worst on the garbage platform,” wrote the authors, “so that their characters, in the minds of the visitors, suffer as well as does very probably their physical well-being from this manner of presentation.”²⁴⁵

Wright et al. acknowledged the positive effects of the shows in fostering an appreciation for the wonders that the national parks had to offer, but averred that since the parks’ popularity was now securely established, it was time “to modify the old practices in the interests of the welfare of both people and bears.” Stating that the problem was worthy of further study, they recommended that in the meantime, it might be feasible to reduce the amount of food provided, and improve its content. Knowing fully that park managers would be reluctant to discontinue the wildly popular shows, they proposed that “[p]erhaps a natural bear food, such as honey, could be used to attract bears to certain places so that the visitor limited to a very short stay in the park could be assured of at least one good view of a bear.” Nudging the NPS toward the preservation and education of wilderness-like values, and warning the agency about the possibility of visitor “burn-out” relative to bear watching, the authors advised, “[t]he sight of one bear under natural conditions is more stimulating than close association with dozens of bears. Even now one hears more accounts of encounters with an individual bear than of the bear show.”²⁴⁶

Thus, NPS biologists tried to strike a balance between the conservation and enjoyment of the park’s resources, with the goal of calculating a policy to “secure the best values to the visitor from park wildlife” while “avoid[ing] destruction of the primitive status of that wildlife.”²⁴⁷ “[W]herever any animal has been garbage-fed, hand-fed, petted, and tamed, the results have been detrimental both to the animal and to man in the park,” they argued in 1934. “If we do not present park animals wild and in their natural background,” they continued, “we do not present a wildlife picture of national parks[’] significance.”²⁴⁸ In addition to advocating more natural

conditions for the park’s bears, Thompson’s and Wright’s greatest contribution to human/bear safety concerns may have been their recommendation to use bear-proof food storage and garbage containers in the campgrounds.²⁴⁹

They maintained concern for tourist enjoyment, however, and so they wrote that birds and mammals that frequented the park’s roadsides were “of relatively greater value because they are the ones which are most apt to be seen.” Because roadside cleanup efforts removed cover and debris used by wildlife, they advocated keeping such efforts to “the absolute minimum,” citing existing agency orders to preserve wildlife values even while in the course of emergency conservation programs. Essentially, they called for a three-pronged approach to improving the tourist–wildlife interface: first, “permitting” the wilderness to “come up as close as possible to human concentration areas;” second, not “pauperizing” or taming park animals; and, third, exercising “ingenuity . . . to introduce visitors to the animals’ environments without their presence having adverse effects.”²⁵⁰

Another wildlife show—this one at the Antelope Creek buffalo corral—was also modified to reflect the idea of naturalizing wildlife exhibits, thereby assuring that visitors would see wild animals while keeping conditions somewhat natural. In 1934, the NPS built a 4-acre show corral and a 300-acre pasture as a way to keep bison in place long enough for visitors to catch a glimpse of the creatures. By the end of the decade, park officials found a way to reduce the staged quality of the corral concept. The 1939 master plan proposed doing away with the show corral, which was easily recognized as unnatural, “and develop[ing] a buffalo show similar to [the] moose show on Mammoth to Norris Junction road” by keeping only the 300-acre pasture. This larger enclosure would be harder to notice and thus would more closely resemble natural conditions.²⁵¹

Other efforts to reduce the influence of unnatural conditions in the park were underway in the 1930s. In April 1930, Director Albright issued a memorandum to all parks regarding the planting of exotic seeds and plants. The new policy prohibited the introduction of foreign animals or plants in the parks “where they will not be under control.” While supporting the intent of the policy, Toll argued for allowing Yellowstone’s employees to have individual gardens with vegetables and flowers. For support, he cited nationally known landscape architect Grosvenor Atterbury’s suggestion that vines be grown on the buildings at Fort Yellowstone. Toll feared that if employees were not allowed individual gardens,

they would see this new policy as simply “one more regulation.” Furthermore, he felt that “the objective served was theoretical rather than practical.” “All buildings are artificial,” he wrote, “and I see no objection to having domestic vines and plants in their immediate vicinity.”²⁵² In November 1934, predator control policies came to an end.

While the NPS sought ways to reduce the impact of humans on the park, agency officials still held fast to several practices that would be deemed inappropriate in later decades. Park personnel still fought forest fires aggressively, controlled insect and blister rust infestations, took measures to generally decrease the number of insects around the park, and allowed domestic vines and plants at Mammoth.

Conclusion

While the decade of the 1930s was a period of change for Yellowstone National Park—park officials introduced master plans, standardized building designs, camping policies, and educational programs, for example—it was also a period of continuation and entrenchment. The park remained a protected area and actually grew in acreage in the face of economic catastrophe, and it remained a favorite haunt of tourists in search of their rustic roots. In fact, for countless Americans facing economic hardship, Yellowstone became a refuge in rusticity, a place where they could soothe the impacts of economic difficulties by experiencing America’s wild lands.

CHAPTER SEVEN

"A Hodgepodge Where, Instead, There Should Be Uniformity"

Mission 66 in Yellowstone National Park 1941–1965

The war years were difficult ones for the nation and the park. Attendance figures plummeted from 581,761 visitors in 1941 to 64,144 in 1943, leading to a curtailment of services provided by both concessioners and the National Park Service (NPS). The number of NPS employees also dropped, as many rangers entered military service and recruitment of seasonal employees became all but impossible. Furthermore, Yellowstone's infrastructure suffered as the federal government diverted attention and money away from park maintenance and construction to the war effort. There were also threats to national park resources, as military officials sought ways to acquire timber, minerals, and rangeland to fuel the war machine. When attendance figures rebounded more quickly than anyone expected after the war, Yellowstone was poorly equipped to serve those visitors.¹ Concession and government services were inadequate both in terms of quality and quantity, causing many visitors to complain to their congressmen. The NPS's response took the form of a service-wide modernization program called Mission 66. The legacy of Mission 66 was a series of programs and structures designed to serve large numbers of visitors and to move them efficiently, and with as little impact as possible, through the nation's parks. Another legacy of this program, which clearly favored the development side of the NPS's mandate, was the negative reaction it generated from supporters of wilderness and historical values in the national parks.

Educational programming, or interpretation as it came to be called, and natural resource management also expanded and changed in the postwar period. Torn between the dual pressures of preservation and provi-



YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES: YELL #43145

Superintendent Edmund Rogers. 1951.

sion of enjoyment, park officials moved during the later years of this period from providing for enjoyment and protection of resources to recreating "vignettes of primitive America," and emphasizing wilderness values. Park officials also grew to understand that the survival of an individual species was dependent upon the health and survival of its ecosystem—the larger and much more complex system of interconnectedness between organisms and their surroundings. Thus, the park's protection policies became more focused on ecological awareness and the conviction that rather than individual species, it was their habitat, as well as ecosystem processes, that required protection. At the same time, park officials came to believe that Yellowstone's forest resources and certain of its wildlife species (such as ungulates), both of

which had been actively protected for so long, actually required less protection. The latter years of this period brought major changes to the park's longstanding policies of maximizing visitor accommodation and promoting the well-being of selected species, as managers began to question whether the park could be developed in a way that would absorb visitation without damaging its natural treasures, and whether merely "protecting" those same treasures would really lead to their preservation. The challenges faced by Yellowstone's superintendents in those years of increased development and philosophical change required every bit of experience those leaders had amassed.

Leaders of the World War II and Postwar Period

It was up to Edmund Rogers to help the park adjust to the deprivation of World War II and the first shocks of the postwar period. For ten years after the war ended, the park tried desperately to welcome and entertain its war-weary visitors, who were ready for a vacation. Rogers's administration oversaw the first stages of construction at Canyon Village and made important decisions with respect to wildlife policy.

When Rogers became special assistant to the director of the NPS in 1956, his replacement was Lemuel Alonzo "Lon" Garrison, who arrived in the park after the 1956 summer season. Born in 1903 in Pella, Iowa, Garrison worked for the U.S. Forest Service throughout his college years. Upon graduation in 1932, he took a job at Sequoia National Park as a seasonal park ranger and then worked his way through several lower-level NPS jobs and assistant superintendent positions in Glacier and Grand Canyon national parks to the superintendency of Big Bend National Park in 1952. In 1956, Garrison became the first chief of conservation and protection for the NPS, and chairman of the steering committee appointed by Director Wirth to oversee implementation of Mission 66. That November, Garrison was asked to orchestrate Mission 66 in Yellowstone, and to serve as the park's superintendent. His effectiveness at dealing with a range of perspectives led to his becoming known as "the spokesman for the conservation movement in the northern Rocky Mountain region."² When he left the park in 1964 to head the Midwest Region of the NPS, he was replaced by John S. McLaughlin, another NPS veteran.

McLaughlin was born in 1905 in Fremont, Ohio, and graduated with a degree in forestry from Colorado State University. He went to work for the NPS in 1928, coincidentally as a ranger in Yellowstone National Park. After rising to the rank of assistant chief park ranger in 1930, McLaughlin left Yellowstone in 1931, only to return as superintendent 33 years later. He spent the intervening years as assistant superintendent of Rocky Mountain National Park, second lieutenant in the U.S. Air Force, and superintendent of three national parks: Mesa Verde, Grand Teton, and Grand Canyon. He also served as assistant regional director of the NPS's Midwest Region for five years. He dedicated his three years at the helm of Yellowstone, as Haines put it, to finishing Mission 66 and determining "further objectives" in the park.³

Yellowstone's superintendents faced new hurdles during and after World War II, when issues of staffing, land use, development, and management philosophy, and their attendant political pressures, all became more complex and intense. These issues played themselves out on almost every level of park management during the postwar years, making the superintendent's job highly challenging. The first task to accomplish after the war, however, was to get the park back on its feet.

The Effects of War on Yellowstone National Park

In addition to the severe drop in visitation, the first half of the 1940s was marked by closures of both private and public operations in Yellowstone. The park's last two remaining CCC camps closed in 1942, and many concession operations did not open during the war. In May 1942, the park's nursery, operated at the Game Ranch, closed. Prior to plowing, harrowing, disking, and seeding the area with crested wheat grass, CCC workers shipped 27,000 lodgepole pine transplants to Glacier National Park and transplanted some trees to the Mammoth area.⁴ Also in 1942, the U.S. Weather Bureau, which had operated in the park since 1903, ceased its activities. Rangers continued to make weather observations, however, by sending their data to the nearest station at West Yellowstone, Montana.⁵

In June 1943, NPS Director Newton Drury announced that the agency would comply with all federal policies brought on by the national emergency. Drury acknowledged that a definite curtailment of facilities,

both concession- and park-operated, would occur, but he wanted the parks kept open for the enjoyment and relaxation of the armed forces and for those people who could reach them under the current tire and gasoline rationing.⁶ Furthermore, he wanted it understood that the protection and the administration of the parks had not been reduced. Throughout his administration, Drury strove to prevent national park timber, mineral, and grassland resources from being commandeered for the war effort.⁷

As could be expected, park development projects were postponed during the war years. Several areas slated for change in the park's master plan of 1941 were put on hold. One notable change planned in 1941 was a revision of the traffic pattern at Madison Junction. Park officials envisioned a road system running completely outside of the "sacred area" designated in 1933 around National Park Mountain and the campfire site where, supposedly, plans had been discussed in 1870 to create the nation's first national park.⁸ At that time, the road from Madison Junction to Old Faithful ran between the museum and the Madison River before crossing the Gibbon River to follow the Firehole River to the Upper Geyser Basin. The idea of moving the road farther east was finally executed after the war, when manpower and funding returned to the park.

Also slated for change in 1941, but not actually accomplished until long after the war, was the relocation of the Norris road away from the geyser basin. Managers actually wished to relocate the road less out of concern for the thermal area than for visitor safety; the existing road required visitors to park near the museum and then cross the main highway to get to the geyser basin.⁹ Other changes recommended in the master plan of 1939 and again in 1941, such as the proposed revisions for the checking stations at both the North and West entrances and the new village development at Canyon, were also not implemented until after the war.

Another proposed alteration was the removal of park headquarters from the Mammoth area to the North Entrance. Initially considered as a way to conserve rationed items such as gasoline, tires, and other materials, the idea was much discussed, but did not come to fruition. In September 1945, Regional Director Lawrence C. Merriam asked Superintendent Rogers to make a recommendation about the proposed removal and provide alternative proposals to reduce Mammoth-area traffic congestion, should he not favor the removal.¹⁰ Rogers did not advocate the move. Arguments for

moving the headquarters arose again in 1960, when the *Billings* (Montana) *Gazette* reported that Wyoming's U.S. representative Keith Thompson (R) had sought House approval for moving park headquarters to Lake—a more central location, and one that would require park roads to kept open year-round, thereby increasing revenue opportunities for the park's gateway communities.¹¹ While the issue of keeping roads open did not disappear, efforts to move park headquarters ended after Director Conrad Wirth opposed the relocation plan.¹²

Construction work also slowed to a snail's pace until after the war. Only a few buildings were added to the roster of park administrative structures during the war and postwar periods. In 1944, the park's protection department received a new snowshoe cabin. The Nez Perce Snowshoe Cabin, built by the CCC and located just north of Nez Perce Creek about three-quarters of a mile east of the Madison-to-Old Faithful road, was remodeled and made ready for winter use. This was the only historic snowshoe cabin not made of logs; a 1939 decree restricting the use of logs for park structures resulted here in a frame, as opposed to a log structure. Although the Nez Perce Cabin retained most of the features of cabins built in the 1930s, including log porch posts that supported an extended front porch and exposed log rafter tails and purlins, it was made of lumber. The plan did call for log trim wherever possible, however, to carry forth the rustic style of the 1930s cabins.¹³

After the war, the prospect of welcoming a record number of visitors to facilities that had been virtually neglected for the previous several years was disturbing to both park management and concessioners. When a record 814,907 people entered the park in 1946, incentives to resume construction soared, but suffered immediately from a dearth of financial resources. During the 1930s and early 1940s, park staff had relied on public works programs, particularly the Civilian Conservation Corps, for much of the maintenance work and many of the small construction activities, and on the Public Works Administration for help with larger construction projects. In 1946, however, Yellowstone's superintendent had to pay his regular staff to improve and maintain park facilities from an all but empty purse.¹⁴

One postwar construction project that did receive funding was housing for park employees. Work on employee housing at Lower Mammoth resumed after park landscape architect Frank Mattson assessed the condition of housing in the area and called for "modern housing for all year use" in 1946. The master plan was revised in

1946 as well.¹⁵ But for three years after 1956, the situation again looked grim, and park employees took matters into their own hands. In response to inadequate park housing, many permanent and seasonal employees in 1957 brought their own mobile homes to the park, causing numerous problems for park management. Parking the mobile homes too closely together at the site of the old Mammoth CCC camp presented safety problems, in addition to unsanitary conditions due to lack of sewer connections. Citing these problems, and noting that the park was losing employees because of the housing situation and lack of laundry facilities, park officials called for a modern laundry facility with shower and bath to be built in the area, sewer and water connections to be installed, and for the purchase of ten new modern mobile homes.¹⁶ The housing problem was alleviated somewhat in June 1959, when the Cop Construction Company of Billings, Montana, was awarded a contract to build ten single-story, three-bedroom, frame residences, with full basements and attached garages at Lower Mammoth for a cost of \$176,700. The new residences were designed by Orr, Pickering Architects of Billings.¹⁷

The Naturalist Department also suffered extensively during wartime, as custodial and protective activities became the overriding concern of park administrators. While all museums remained open during the 1942 season, all but the one at Mammoth closed in subsequent seasons. Auto caravans, lecture series, guide services, campfire meetings, and the publication of *Yellowstone Nature Notes* were terminated, and many fewer naturalists were available for site interpretation or assistance of any kind as their numbers and departmental funding shrank to their lowest levels in years.¹⁸

Several visitor programs related to wildlife also stopped during these war years. For example, the bear shows were discontinued after the 1941 season; the Otter Creek bear feeding grounds did not open for business in 1942, or any year after that. While this closure could be called an unexpected result of wartime conditions, park officials had been looking for a way to close this chapter of the park's history for several years. The ostensible reasons for not opening the feeding grounds—the closure of most Canyon facilities, the shortage of ranger-naturalist talks, and the lack of park bus travel—were secondary to Superintendent Rogers's desire to put an end to what he considered an unnatural practice. Wartime conditions, with low visitation, limited services, and the nation's attention diverted, provided the perfect opportunity.¹⁹

In part, Rogers was responding to the findings of

wildlife biologists George Wright, Joseph Dixon, and Ben Thompson, who, in their 1930s series, *Fauna of the National Parks*, had entreated NPS officials to find less artificial ways for visitors to interact with wildlife in the parks. Other wildlife studies also influenced park policy during the war years. As a result of research by biologist Olaus J. Murie, for example, further changes were made to bear management, including the prompt removal and pit-burial or burning of all garbage, a practice started in 1943.²⁰ According to Rogers, Murie's research results were "very valuable in formulating a program which [would] discourage bears from frequenting the areas of human habitation and thereby reduce the friction between the visitors and the bears."²¹ In 1946, the bear feeding ground at Otter Creek was razed and the site graded. Superintendent Rogers called it "the end of a feature . . . [that has] provided a spectacular exhibition for those persons who were privileged to witness it." Rogers hoped that the end of the bear shows would "give the animals a chance to live in a more natural existence in keeping with the park and . . . tend to carry out the general policy of the NPS to allow all of the park wildlife to carry on without the assistance of man."²²

In the master plan of 1941, park officials also proposed changes to the Lamar Buffalo Ranch, provided that the buffalo herd could be proven self-sustaining. By 1944, as park officials became more confident that the herd no longer needed human assistance, they were ready to settle questions of whether further development of the ranch was necessary. Park managers also changed buffalo feeding practices. Use of the large pasture at Antelope Creek was discontinued, and fences, including the enclosure assuring visitors a view of buffalo and the drift fence near the ranch, were removed in April 1944.²³ According to Rogers, the drift fence had been used in connection with summertime buffalo roundups and wintertime reduction programs.²⁴ Such changes reflected a new approach to managing the park's natural resources.

By 1947, most of the vacant naturalist positions had been filled, and the new position of park biologist was occupied when Walter H. Kittams transferred to the park from the Billings, Montana, offices of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Naturalist Division was back to pre-war staffing and initiated a new program for children from 6 to 14 years of age that involved nature trips and some nature craft work.²⁵ In 1949, Naturalist Wayne Replogle researched the route of the Bannock Trail by hiking into the backcountry and interviewing long-time residents in the area, particularly in West



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #12535-2

Hay operations at Lamar Buffalo Ranch.

Yellowstone, Montana, and the Henry's Lake area of Idaho. By this time, all museums were operating on a normal schedule, though visitation numbers indicated that Fishing Bridge Museum, which was off the main travel route, received fewer visitors than the others. The outdoor exhibits were receiving rave reviews, especially the one at Artist Point and another devoted to beavers in the park.²⁶ But all was not necessarily well with the protection of the park's treasures.

After the war, as visitors returned to the park in droves, their large numbers taxed the Naturalist Division's ability to both interpret the park's splendors and protect them from overuse and abuse. According to historian Denise Vick, the new concerns were basically twofold: how to educate such large groups about correct park behavior, including instilling an appreciation of its many fragile areas, and how to protect the park (in particular, its thermal formations) from erosion caused by foot traffic. One solution—to increase the number of ranger-naturalists so groups could be smaller—was not implemented until 1953. These additional rangers came too late, and their numbers were easily offset by increases in interpretive program participation.²⁷

In 1949, park managers proposed an interesting solution to the problem of thermal-area erosion: the park would install movable, wooden "duckwalks" over the older trails, both to encourage visitors to stay on the trails and to lessen the impact of "aimless wandering about the thermal areas." These prefabricated walkways (4' x 8' wooden sections) proved popular with the visitors, offered improved safety, and protected these fragile zones from trampling. Plus, prefabricated sections, unlike older blacktopped walkways, were easily rearranged to accommodate changing conditions in thermal areas.²⁸

One goal of park officials during the postwar

period was to preserve the park by educating the public about how to appreciate its treasures. Vick attributed this thinking to a "system-wide concern for park values that reflected the philosophical stance of . . . NPS Director . . . Newton Drury."²⁹ Drury, director from 1940 until 1951, when the Eisenhower administration took office, was a preservationist. As past director of the Save-the-Redwoods League in California, Drury believed that the NPS should provide primarily custodial care of the parks, developing them as little as possible. This attitude was evident in Chief Park Naturalist C. Max Bauer's 1946 report decrying the extensive destruction of the park's formations and other features that occurred after the war. The "average visitor this year shows less appreciation or understanding of park values than ever before," wrote Bauer. His solution was an educational program that "emphasized some of these points rather than to emphasize the attractiveness of the parks for the purpose of getting more visitors."³⁰ This approach would change drastically beginning in 1951, however, with the appointment of NPS Director Conrad Wirth, creator of Mission 66, who remained in office until 1964.

Mission 66 in Yellowstone National Park

Mission 66 was the brainchild of Director Wirth. Wirth, who had studied landscape architecture under Frank Waugh at Massachusetts Agricultural College, and who had been strongly involved with the NPS's CCC programs, began conceptualizing the program almost as soon as he became director.³¹ Any serious program, he realized, would require congressional support and active compliance on the part of concessioners. In 1953,

he discussed a long-term building program with one important concessioner: Yellowstone Park Company president William Nichols. These discussions pertained to improvements in the proposed Canyon Village and Lake Lodge areas.³² The Yellowstone Park Company was entering the negotiating period for a new contract at the time.

In 1955, Director Wirth wrote to Nichols proposing changes in concession operations, as well as in the arrangement of existing facilities. He suggested that “drastic measures” might need to be taken at Old Faithful, including moving eating and sleeping accommodations out of the Upper Geyser Basin. Wirth realized that implementing any such “dream plan” would require sufficient private funds and government appropriations, and he told Nichols that for the NPS to meet the desires of the public for the next ten years, each park would have to examine its particular needs. Concerning his proposed program, Wirth declared,

This new look at the parks I am calling ‘Mission 66.’ I have outlined ‘Mission 66’ to the Congressional committees and the Department. They have shown considerable interest, and I am certain it will go forward. ‘Mission 66’ gets its name from the fact that the National Park Service will be 50 years old in 1966. The best way to celebrate that year will be to have the park organizations and facilities as they should be to meet the visitor needs. We have ten years to do it.³³

Wirth’s ten-year, multimillion-dollar plan was approved by President Dwight Eisenhower in January 1956. Designed to remedy the backlog of construction and maintenance projects in the nation’s parks and to bolster woefully inadequate concessioner facilities, the plan, as one agency publication put it, was “to meet the needs of a much greater number of visitors and at the same time safeguard fully the wilderness, scenic, scientific and historic resources entrusted to the National Park Service.”³⁴

The tension between the NPS’s dual mission of preservation and use increased under Mission 66, and took a definite turn toward use. According to historian Linda McClelland, the plan “unequivocally emphasized use over preservation and endeavored to enhance the quality of the visitor’s experience through the development of modern facilities.” She noted that Wirth’s own words pointed to the idea of preservation for enjoyment’s



NPS PHOTO ARCHIVES YELL #43016

NPS Director Conrad Wirth. 1956.

sake: “Protection, then, while an absolute requirement, is not an end in itself,” Wirth insisted in promotional material for his Mission 66 program, “but a means to an end—it is requisite to the kind and quality of enjoyment contemplated in the establishment and perpetuation of parks by the Nation. Thus, we complete our concept of park purpose: The primary justification for a National Park System lies in its capacity to provide enjoyment in its best sense, now and in the future.”³⁵

In an NPS manual for Mission 66, the Department of Interior clarified the connection between protection and use: “The law [the 1916 National Park Service Act] insisted that these areas were to be so managed that their natural qualities would remain unimpaired; for only if thus protected would they provide the fullest degree of enjoyment and inspiration for present and future Americans.” In these terms, protection of the park was important primarily as a means of achieving public use and enjoyment. As the manual described it: “Without the concept of public use and enjoyment the function of preservation and protection is without meaning.”³⁶ This passage emphasized an anthropocentric ideology of nature and preservation, indicating that the human need for recreation justified preservation.³⁷

According to author Brian C. Kenner, the Wirth administration could emphasize use of the nation’s parks because it added the word “maximum” to the mandate; the manual describing and justifying Mission 66 read, “It is the task of the National Park Service . . . to assure the American people opportunity for *maximum* beneficial use and enjoyment” [emphasis added]. As Kenner noted, “The use of the word ‘maximum’ perhaps best reveals

the approach of the Wirth administration toward park use. The word had not been used in policy statements prior to Mission 66.”³⁸

To ensure “maximum beneficial use and enjoyment,” new facilities were planned in many parks to house visitors and employees and to instruct visitors. Campgrounds, sanitary facilities, and roads would be improved, updated, and added where necessary, and educational or interpretive programs expanded. What shape would this new cultural landscape take? Whereas the emphasis during the 1920s and 1930s was on constructing rustic, non-obtrusive structures, Mission 66 planners, envisioning their program “as a bold and forward-looking initiative,” rejected these “picturesque prototypes” of the past, opting instead for newer, “modern methods of landscape and architectural design.”³⁹

Designers of these new structures, working under the guidance of William G. Carnes, head of the Mission 66 staff, placed a premium on efficiency, modernity, and cost-effectiveness. Wirth directed architects to “disregard precedent, policy, present operation and management procedures, traditions, and work habits,” to remember “only the fundamental purpose of national parks,” and to design projects that would move visitors quickly and efficiently through the park while getting the “greatest benefit economically” by saving “labor costs, materials, and equipment.”⁴⁰ Indeed, the Landscape Division, according to Wirth, had an important role to play in Mission 66. Landscape architects were “to see that, through the techniques of designing [and] constructing . . . the parks,” the visitor would obtain the “supreme enjoyment” of the national parks. These park officials, with the master plan as road map, would “steer the course of how the land [was] to be used.” The end result would be “an orderly and well-conceived development plan.”⁴¹

According to architectural historian Sarah Allaback, landscape architects of the Mission 66 era abandoned the rustic style of the past in favor of what has come to be called “Park Service Modern,” for several reasons: first, to construct a rustic structure in the 1950s and 1960s on a scale befitting the times would have cost the government considerably more than it could afford for both labor and materials. The CCC and PWA workers of the 1930s had provided cheap labor in a time when logs and stone were readily available and relatively cheap. By the 1950s, glass, steel, concrete, and asphalt, were significantly cheaper than the traditional materials. Second, the lines of modern, low-lying, and functional architecture were actually considered less conspicuous than a rustic

structure of a size appropriate for the increase in visitors using the facilities.⁴² Mission 66 buildings, at least at the outset of the program, were intended to be “simple contemporary buildings that perform[ed] their assigned function[s] and respect[ed] their environment[s].”⁴³ The Park Service Modern Style, argued Allaback, merely “reinterpreted the long-standing commitment to ‘harmonize’ architecture with park landscape[s].” At its best, Park Service Modern architecture, she wrote, harmonized with its setting in a new way: by being more “understated and efficient” than rustic design, and providing “more programmatic and functional space for less architectural presence.” Allaback also pointed out that if the Mission 66 structures had been designed in the rustic idiom, they “would have taken on the dimensions and appearance of major resort hotels”—hardly non-obtrusive structures.⁴⁴ Third, while rustic architecture had begun to take on “negative connotations of [being] dated, inadequate, and even unsanitary,” Park Service Modern architecture represented a forward-looking mentality of efficiency, hygiene, progress, and innovation—all values the NPS was eager to show it possessed.⁴⁵

The first structure built in Yellowstone during this period, a combined checking and information station for the West Entrance, was not a Mission 66 building per se, but discussions regarding its construction prefigured problems that lay ahead. When park officials corresponded in 1954 with Regional Director Howard Baker about the style of architecture planned—a prefabricated metal structure—they struck at the heart of the argument against modern architecture in the park. “The general design and appearance of the buildings, we believe, are admirable as buildings without considering their surroundings or use,” Rogers wrote. The design and materials “would appear to be very appropriate for an airport,” he wrote, but Rogers doubted their appropriateness for a national park. Rogers’s main concern was that the building did not look sufficiently park-like. “Our architects,” Rogers added, “have suggested that the park visitor or those seeking admirable park building styles should look to the parks for fresh and vital ideas. In other words, the parks should be the source for the best there is in rustic architecture.” “These [buildings] are the front door to the park,” Rogers reminded Baker. They should be welcoming visitors to a special place, a place that should feel different from its surroundings, he argued. A metal structure at the front door would not help create this impression. Furthermore, such an impression was harder to create in Yellowstone, where

the surrounding landscape was similar on each side of the boundary. Consequently, Rogers continued, the NPS depended largely on its roadsides and buildings to create a sense of difference and specialness.⁴⁶

Rogers was also concerned about the precedent the metal structure set. Would concessioners want to follow suit? What answer, after all, could NPS officials provide concessioners if the latter “point[ed] to these metal buildings and inquire[d] whether they could do something similar”? To park visitors, Rogers noted, officials could explain that the buildings were simply cheaper, but to the concessioner such an answer would not suffice.⁴⁷

Final plans for the information station and checking booths were revised several times, resulting in wooden frame structures designed by architects Francis R. Roberson and Robert B. Kemp that, while intended to be temporary—they were part of a pilot project assessing the best layout of a national park entrance area—were to have “design merit,” because visitors would not “of course be conscious that this [was] a pilot or experimental study.”⁴⁸ “We would like to have a building adequately designed, not an unworthy assemblage of CCC panels,” Baker wrote to Rogers in his letter introducing the architects.⁴⁹ The structures would also be on skids so they could be rearranged to assess which order of buildings—checking station before information station or vice versa—worked best for processing incoming visitors.⁵⁰ When word of the experimental layout got out, the superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park asked for copies of the plans to use as a guide.⁵¹

An interesting issue regarding the checking—or permit—stations was whether to keep the rangers standing in the booths or to let them sit. Regional Director Baker believed that the rangers should stand, because, as he put it, “uniformed personnel present their best appearance while standing.” He did not see any objection to “providing some sort of seating arrangement for slack periods,” however.⁵² Superintendent Rogers agreed that “a ranger on his feet makes the better ‘front’ for the Service than one sitting,” but he did not want “to preclude the operations being handled from a seated position.”⁵³

NPS officials believed information stations to be important parts of entrance areas or “toll plazas,” as they were called.⁵⁴ In a sense, the information station was an embryonic form of what would later be called a “visitor center.” The purpose of the station was to help visitors “orient themselves to the size, features, facilities, accommodations, scenery, wildlife and of very great value, an

introduction to the importance of conservation of the park,” wrote Acting Superintendent Warren Hamilton to the superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park. Because the information created an opportunity to make visitors aware and supportive of conservation, Hamilton believed that “the cost to the Service of this operation would then be well returned.”⁵⁵ Information and checking stations were completed in fall 1954; exhibits were made and installed the following summer. While the exhibits pleased NPS personnel, use of the information station proved disappointing, leading park managers to decide not to build any kind of larger visitor center in the area.

The information and checking stations at the West Entrance were not officially part of Mission 66, but they fit in with the overall pitch of the program: enhancing visitor enjoyment of the park through development. While the implementation of Mission 66 in Yellowstone had the effect of encouraging more development—the goal of the program, after all, was to accommodate increasing numbers of visitors—the intent of the program, in Wirth’s mind, was environmental preservation. Concentrating and directing use of important and fragile areas would, in effect, preserve them from “random” use, which was tantamount to abuse. Thus, while conservation groups complained about Wirth’s “aggressive construction program that included the development of recreational facilities (including . . . boat marinas),” Wirth defended it on the grounds of “upholding the visitor’s right to visit the [park] and do so in large numbers,” and claimed that the program’s landscape design and construction components would effectively preserve and protect the natural environment.⁵⁶ “[T]here is no surer way to destroy a landscape than to permit undisciplined use by man,” he wrote in an article for *National Parks* magazine in 1958, “and roads, trails, campgrounds, and other developments are one means, perhaps the most important one, of localizing, limiting, and channeling park use.”⁵⁷

Yellowstone’s official vision for Mission 66 appeared in April 1955, in the form of a report called “Statement of Current and Future Park Visitor Needs for Accommodations and Facilities in Yellowstone National Park.” While most of the document focused on concession development, the NPS’s role of providing campgrounds and picnic areas was also reviewed. In general, the committee that prepared the report called for planned development that would decrease “the infringement upon sacred areas as the need develops.” As



NPS PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #147313

Bridge Bay Marina, post-1961.

part of the review, the group suggested that development at West Thumb be abandoned in favor of a new facility to be called “Thumbay.” Here, the government would construct a public use building, an amphitheater, a campground, employee housing, roads, and trails, and provide the utilities. Ultimately, this development became Grant Village. Out of concern over excessive intrusion on the geysers and thermal features at Old Faithful, the group recommended a new developed area in the Lower Geyser Basin called “Firehole Village.”

The committee also recommended work at Bridge Bay, where the government would construct roads, trails, a boat landing, docks, employee housing, utilities, and an administrative center; at Tower Fall, where the campground would be relocated to the Tower Junction area; and at Madison Junction, where a new campground, new housing for rangers and naturalists, and a new amphitheater would be built, the museum would be enlarged, and the road camp would be relocated.⁵⁸

By the end of the decade, park officials published “Mission 66 for Yellowstone National Park,” a pamphlet outlining the NPS’s plans in the park. Arguing that the program would safeguard Yellowstone for future visitors, the pamphlet’s authors advocated a three-pronged plan. First, the park’s trails and roads would be improved, which meant relocating some roads “to improve views and opportunities for interpretation, and to reduce their intrusion on fragile and scenic features.”⁵⁹ Second, the authors planned for more facilities designed to accommodate visitors. Specifically, they proposed “more than twice the present campground capacity, double the present lodge accommodations, increased picnic areas,

and comparable increases in other visitor facilities.” Campground capacity would increase to nearly 1,500 campsites, and “rental trailer courts” would be available. Overnight accommodations would rise “to about 14,500.” But because, according to the authors, “visitors prefer[red] other than hotel-type accommodations,” no new hotels were proposed. “All present hotels will remain during their useful life,” the report stated, “but will ultimately be replaced as part of a future far-reaching plan.”⁶⁰ Finally, the NPS would improve its educational infrastructure and programming—its roadside information areas, amphitheaters, and visitor centers—to “enhance the visitors’ enjoyment” of park features.⁶¹

First on the list of new developments was Canyon Village, which had been initiated prior to Mission 66, closely followed by changes to Fishing Bridge that would include “an enlarged and modernized . . . campground . . . [and a] new rental trailer court,” and the completely new development, “Thumbay.” After those developments were completed, park officials planned to begin on “the new Bridge Bay area” and the removal of “encroaching facilities from the Old Faithful area to a proposed new Firehole Village.”⁶² The rationale behind these developments was “conservation . . . through preservation of the scenic and natural character of the Park,” and “developments for human comfort provided on lands of lesser Park value.”⁶³ The NPS estimated projected costs for the program to be approximately \$55 million, not including concessioners’ projected costs.⁶⁴

The idea of directing use away from fragile natural areas was not new to Mission 66. For years, Yellowstone officials had been planning to direct use away from

several “sacred” sites (in the parlance of prewar master planning), and they had outlined a plan to remove development around the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone to an area they called Canyon Village in the 1939 master plan. Furthermore, some park officials—resident landscape architect Frank Mattson for one—had also been concerned about development around West Thumb. While master plans for the early 1940s indicated the intention to expand development around West Thumb and call it West Thumb Village, there was active resistance to this idea. In 1946, Mattson met with Thomas Vint, chief of the Washington Office of Design and Construction, to discuss a proposal to move development away from West Thumb, but nothing happened officially until April 1955, with the “Statement of Current and Future Park Visitor Needs.”

Canyon Village was perhaps the best-known Yellowstone example of the NPS’s efforts to relocate development away from a fragile area to an “area better suited to such developments and [where one could] . . . allow expansion on a well ordered scale.”⁶⁵ Plans for Canyon Village included the relocation of all tourist facilities to the new village and the construction of a new ranger station near the “proposed retail area with possible museum wing and general contact station.”⁶⁶

Historian Mark Daniel Barringer has contended that when Yellowstone became the “showpiece” of Mission 66, Canyon Village became its “cornerstone.”⁶⁷ Others have agreed that Canyon Village was “presented as an example of what [Mission 66] would do for the national parks.”⁶⁸ Because work on the necessary roads, as well as water and sewer conduits to the village had been started years before Mission 66 was conceptualized, the village’s tourist facilities could be expedited relatively quickly and thus, for publicity’s sake, be ready for occupancy soon after inception of the program.⁶⁹ Thus, the village’s highly publicized groundbreaking ceremony on June 25, 1956, meant that Mission 66 “was finally, undeniably, underway.”⁷⁰

The Canyon Village project, formally dedicated in August 1957, proved problematic on several fronts: first, tourists preferred the old Canyon hotel, even though it was more expensive, to the new concrete-block-and-glass architecture. In response to this reluctance to patronize the new facilities, as well as the discovery that the hotel was structurally unsound, the Yellowstone Park Company partially closed the building as a way to “encourage” people to stay at Canyon Village. Second, the Yellowstone Park Company was experiencing such

serious financial trouble before, during, and after the construction process that it was reluctant to undertake other Mission 66 projects planned for the park.⁷¹ Thus, work on the other “villages” was either begun much later than planned, as in the case of Grant Village, or never got further than the planning stage, as in the case of Firehole Village.

The distaste expressed about the architecture of Canyon Village was reminiscent of the earlier debate concerning the West Entrance information station.⁷² In May 1956, a doctor from Billings, Montana, wrote to President Nichols of the Yellowstone Park Company, U.S. Senator Mike Mansfield (Montana), and the Department of the Interior to state “one man’s protest against the ‘chicken coop’ style architecture of the facilities to be built at Canyon Village.” “Such style of architecture is fine for Las Vegas gambling halls,” he chided, “but hardly fits in to our National Parks.” The writer preferred the rustic beauty of older park facilities. On a separate note—hastily penned on an unused prescription form—he commented that he had found no one who disagreed with him, but he doubted “if many [would] register a protest.”⁷³

In response to this criticism, Acting Director E. T. Scoyen assured Senator Mansfield that the design of park buildings was determined by a cadre of “architects, landscape architects, engineers, and administrative personnel of the National Park Service” who made “every effort to get the best solution of our problems considering all of the factors including that of cost.” Scoyen also reminded Mansfield that the project was not yet finished, and offered that the doctor’s opinion might be different if he saw the final result, including landscaping.⁷⁴ Scoyen made a point of noting that the NPS had not abandoned efforts to build structures that harmonized with their surroundings. Quite to the contrary, in fact: “We appreciate [the doctor’s] interest in maintaining the rustic beauty of the architectural facilities in the parks,” he told Mansfield, “and we wish to assure you that we shall do everything possible to guard all of the national parks against the construction of park structures which will not be compatible with their naturalistic surroundings.”⁷⁵

Complaints about the Park Service Modern Style continued, however. In 1961, an article appeared in *Atlantic Monthly* that put the lie to NPS claims that modern structures were harmonious with park environs. The article criticized the agency for disturbing the “proper atmosphere” of the parks. “Under Mission 66,” author

Devereux Butcher wrote, “too many of the parks are being cluttered with buildings of freak and austere design. No longer are the architects concerned with producing structures of beauty and charm that help to create a proper atmosphere and are inconspicuous and harmonious with their surroundings. Rather they seem obsessed with designing monuments to their own inventiveness. Widely criticized, these buildings are unlike any others in the parks and are creating a hodgepodge where, instead, there should be uniformity.”⁷⁶

The new Thumbay development did little to convince Butcher—or anyone else—otherwise. In 1957, Superintendent Garrison outlined detailed plans for Thumbay, known later as Grant Thumb in honor of President Ulysses Grant, and finally as Grant Village.⁷⁷ There were several reasons why NPS managers wanted the West Thumb development moved to this new site, 1.5 miles south of the existing facilities. First, they wanted to stop development from encroaching on the hot springs and pools in the West Thumb area. Second, they considered the soil and terrain in the West Thumb area too poor for “large capacity development,” which is what the agency was after. While West Thumb had been a small development, the new village, Garrison claimed, would have “provision for about 4,500 visitors in campgrounds, trailer courts and cabins.” Third, the NPS wanted to provide a more protected staging area for tourists eager to boat and fish on the lake.⁷⁸

As with the Canyon development, park officials wanted Thumbay to be an area of concentrated development. In early spring 1957, Superintendent Garrison communicated his approval of a “shopping center” type of arrangement to officials at the Western Office of Design and Construction (WODC), as it would allow visitors to move around the complex easily on foot.⁷⁹ He also wanted an NPS structure, instead of a gas station as originally planned, to have the strategic location at the junction with the main park road. “[T]hese [gas] stations are a general source of public information and [because] they do not have trained personnel to provide informational service,” he wrote, “the Park Service should have a strategic location of this nature for the best service to the park visitors.”⁸⁰

While Garrison appeared positive about the project in public, privately, he harbored some concerns. The project would, as Garrison put it, result in significant changes to the area. For one thing, the site would require “considerable alteration to fit it for use, as it [was] heavily timbered.” About 80 acres of trees would have

to be cleared. In addition, considerable dredging and re-channeling of the shoreline—to accommodate the planned harbor with its boat landings, docks, and marina—would be necessary.⁸¹ On one level, such changes to the environment troubled Garrison. “I cannot help wondering,” he told the regional director in April 1958, “if this is the proper kind of a development to introduce into a National Park—if we are not defeating the very basic purpose of Park protection and preservation by frankly concentrating so much use in one spot.”⁸²

But while he was troubled about the idea of reserving space for concentrated development, Garrison was even more concerned about sprawl. He realized that the alternative to concentrated development for meeting the park’s projected needs for 1966 would mean development scattered across the park that would actually result in more development per se; planners had estimated that less park space would be used if development were concentrated. Furthermore, the site for Thumbay (hereafter Grant Village), which stretched for two miles along Yellowstone Lake, was suitable for construction, and, while attractive, not so splendid that it necessarily merited preserving for scenic reasons. The “forest cover is basically about the same as that on a million or more acres nearby,” he wrote. For these reasons, Garrison felt that building Grant Village was, in some ways, the lesser of two evils.⁸³ Thus, work on Grant Village proceeded.

The development planned for Grant Village would resemble Canyon Village. Garrison called the site beautiful, “one of the choice locations scenically and recreationally, in the entire Park, and [thus one that] should have appropriate tone and treatment in the over-all development.” Accommodations would range from free public campgrounds to “more expensive cabins similar to modern motels outside the Park.” No hotels were planned for the area, but a lodge was later built. There would also be “three classes of eating services plus a lunch counter, a general store, a picture shop, a marina, saddle horses, camping and picnicking grounds, service station, footpaths and saddle horse trails, a visitor assembly hall which may be combined with an employee recreational room, visitor center with an amphitheater and auditorium, medical services, post office, ample public restrooms, public laundry and showers, employee residences and dormitories, public garage, ranger stations, utility buildings and services, storage space, and public telephones.”⁸⁴

The government would provide roads and utilities for both government and concessioner installations.

With these provisions and “no land purchase investment” on the part of the concessioner, Garrison felt, there would be “enough offset to the higher construction costs in this isolated location and with the short season to make this concessioner investment economically feasible.” If contracts were let for site clearing in 1958, the site would be ready for further government and concessioner development by 1960, Garrison believed.⁸⁵ However, the opening date was continually postponed—primarily by concessioner financial problems—until 1963, when the first phase of the village was dedicated in the form of a 383-unit campground, picnic area, and boat launching ramp.⁸⁶ Both the harbor and boat launch failed due to poor design, and although constructed, were never functional. Subsequent development, both on the part of the government (a visitor center and amphitheater, trailer village, and ranger station) and the concessioner, was accompanied by controversy and financial problems that continued to thwart the development’s progress. In fact, the final result differed significantly from original plans and did not come about until more than three decades after Mission 66 planners first imagined the development.⁸⁷

Mission 66’s “village” projects in Yellowstone clearly met with mixed success. In fact, Grant Village remained a problematic development at least until 1982, when lodging units were finally completed; and the third relocation project—the removal of most of the development around Old Faithful to the Lower Geyser Basin, where it would be called Firehole Village—was ultimately shelved by a committee of NPS personnel. Historians Barringer, Haines, and Richard Bartlett have contended that the stories of Canyon and Grant Village illustrated the role that concessioner resistance played in the questionable achievements of Mission 66 in Yellowstone National Park.⁸⁸ But other issues also led to the critical reconsideration of Mission 66, especially the changes in the NPS’s understanding of its mandate of protection and use, which in the 1960s shifted away from development and toward preservation.

Before those issues can be examined, it is important to look at two intertwined and longstanding achievements of Mission 66: the rise of the visitor center and the concomitant growth of the education department—or, as it increasingly came to be known, the Division of Interpretation. As McClelland wrote, “Education and interpretation took on particular importance in Mission 66. . . . For national parks the role of interpretation expanded from the communication of

a park’s natural history to become an important tool for park preservation.”⁸⁹ Central to this focus on education and interpretation was the rise of the visitor center, an innovative concept “designed as the hub of each park’s interpretive program.”⁹⁰

Museums and Ranger Stations Merge to Form Visitor Centers

The visitor center was intended to serve as the fulcrum for balancing use and protection in the nation’s parks by centralizing use and managing circulation of visitors. It was also meant to enhance visitor appreciation of the park. One Mission 66 publication, *Our Heritage*, described the visitor center as “one of the most useful facilities for helping the visitor to see the park and enjoy his visit.”⁹¹ In its early stages of development, the visitor center was referred to as an “administrative–museum building,” a “public service building,” or a “public use building.” Allaback claimed that the range of names considered “suggests the Park Service was struggling not only to combine museum services and administrative facilities but [also] to develop a new building type that would supplement old-fashioned museum exhibits with modern methods of interpretation.”⁹²

Anticipating a problem with the proposed construction of many of these new administrative–museum buildings, park headquarters, and public-use buildings across the country, Director Wirth called for uniformity in building terminology. He wanted all new public-use buildings and administrative–museum buildings to be called “Visitors Centers.” In a memorandum to NPS staff, Wirth asked that they use the term “visitor center” even instead of “park headquarters” when headquarters were located at major sites of visitor concentration.⁹³ At a design conference two years later, it was noted that the term proved confusing to visitors unfamiliar with the new facilities, who might be inclined to associate the term with shopping centers.⁹⁴ Confusion notwithstanding, the name stuck and has survived to the present.

Mission 66 visitor centers were prime examples of the Park Service Modern architectural style. Hailed by Allaback as “a distinctive new approach to park architecture,” Park Service Modern represented several architectural ideals: simplicity (most structures were stripped of any “overtly decorative or associative elements”); unobtrusiveness (the buildings maintained low, horizontal profiles and employed textured concrete, panels of stone

veneer, painted steel, and glass to be subordinate to the landscape and to “harmonize” with its surroundings in a more understated way than rustic architecture had); and, efficiency.⁹⁵ The visitor center’s efficiency lay in its centrality, in its concentration of functions in one place. Whereas planning in the park villages before Mission 66 had been decentralized, with museums, ranger stations, administration buildings, and comfort stations often residing in separate buildings, Mission 66 visitor centers combined these functions under one roof. Serving as a control point for “visitor flow,” visitor centers could serve even unprecedented numbers of tourists efficiently and well. And, by centralizing use, they would help preserve the park’s fragile areas from “random, destructive patterns of use.”⁹⁶

Between 1957 and 1965, two prototypical Mission 66 visitor centers were built in Yellowstone: one at Canyon Village and one at Grant Village.⁹⁷ They were designed to be open and spacious, so as to accommodate large numbers of people easily. They were intended to be readily accessed by ramps and other movement-facilitating devices. Their simple designs were unapologetically modernistic. Designers of the structures embraced the same contemporary, cost-effective materials (glass, concrete, and steel). The Canyon Visitor Center was built of colored concrete block, “plyscord” siding, “glu-lam” posts and beams, and a considerable amount of glazing.⁹⁸ The architect of the Grant Village Visitor Center, in fact, “over[did] it in using masonry block,” according to Jerry Riddall, chief architect of the WODC. Riddall suggested a restudy and “the use of wood siding on gables.”⁹⁹ Both buildings maintained a low, streamlined profile, with a horizontal emphasis. They also exhibited the same philosophical emphasis on creating a “balanced, ‘harmonic’ relationship with the environment” as modern architects in the mold of Richard J. Neutra.¹⁰⁰ Finally, they both concentrated all public-use functions within one building: restrooms, administration, visitor information, museum exhibit space, and auditorium. Thus, the visitor centers built in Yellowstone under Mission 66 and soon after “not only embod[ied] new park visitor management policies, but also the spirit which looked forward to an efficient Park Service for the modern age.”¹⁰¹

The Canyon and Grant Village visitor centers were designed, and their construction supervised for the most part by private architectural firms, as were many other Mission 66 visitor centers, for reasons of expediency and economics.¹⁰² Allaback wrote that these firms most often used preliminary WODC drawings

as the basis for their designs, but occasionally came up with the design in-house.¹⁰³ The architectural firm Hurt and Trudell of San Francisco, California, designed the Canyon Visitor Center, while the Grant Village Visitor Center was a combined effort of the architectural firm Adrian Malone and Associates of Sheridan, Wyoming, and the WODC.¹⁰⁴

As the focal point of Canyon’s visitor center, park and WODC officials had hoped to secure the original Thomas Moran painting of the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone that was hanging in the Interior Department’s Washington, D.C., conference room at the time. The painting belonged in the visitor center, park officials thought, “since at Canyon it would have the greatest impact upon its viewers.”¹⁰⁵ However, the park failed to acquire either that Moran or the other acceptable alternative, a similar canvas displayed at the National Gallery. Instead, it settled for a copy of the first painting.

In 1957, the WODC’s apparently garish choice of interior and exterior paint colors for the buildings—including the visitor center—at Canyon Village led Superintendent Garrison to question the veracity of Mission 66’s professed embrace of harmonious design—or in this case, harmonious coloration. The Canyon Visitor Center was constructed using pink aggregate blocks held together with dark pink mortar. In a letter to WODC Chief Thomas Vint, Garrison reminded Vint that none of the colors chosen for the Canyon Village buildings had been approved by the park, and questioned the wisdom of their choice: “The colors used on these buildings in the utility area cause us to wonder if there is a new policy in effect regarding the selection of colors for Park structures.



Canyon Visitor Center dedication. 1958.

YNP PHOTO ARCHIVES: YELL #32767-3



NHP PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #147304

Canyon Visitor Center. 1958.

We would like to know if it is still practical to use exterior colors which are softer and more harmonious with the surroundings.” Landscape architect Frank Mattson found the selections “good colors for a city subdivision. For use within the park, we believe they are not entirely appropriate. . . . We believe they should be somewhat darker and the colors held within the soft browns, greens, and grey or tan grays.”¹⁰⁶

Further emphasis of resistance to Mission 66 may have been evidenced when, for a period during 1960, the Canyon Visitor Center was renamed Canyon Ranger Station, “placing emphasis on ranger activities instead of interpretation.” No museum talks were scheduled at the center that year, and the audio-visual program was reported to have “seldom functioned due to mechanical failures.” While attendance figures at Canyon during the 1959 season had been carefully reported and tabulated to suggest “heavier attendance than any other visitor center,” unofficial attendance figures for the 1960 season were “disappointingly light.”¹⁰⁷ After hearing of these developments, Regional Chief of Interpretation M. E. Beatty sent a terse letter to Garrison, wanting to know why the cost of operations for naturalist services in 1960 was significantly higher than for 1959, “despite an apparent de-emphasis of naturalist activities,” and why attendance figures were not kept officially. “Without proper data,” Beatty wrote, “remedial action is impossible.” And finally, the point that annoyed Beatty the most: why had the name of the visitor center had been changed? Beatty charged that the name change, “alone, might well explain the alleged drop in attendance,” and complained that by instituting the change, park officials

were working at cross-purposes to the agency-wide goal of “getting visitors familiar with the Visitor Center as a logical first stop on their tour of an area.” Beatty suggested that “Canyon Visitor Center” be written in large letters with “Ranger Station” and “other pertinent information in smaller letters.” He also advised the use of either a tally counter or a visitor-count mat to determine visitation load.¹⁰⁸ The problems were resolved, and Canyon Visitor Center remained an important part of the interpretive program in Yellowstone.

While he did not design the Canyon Visitor Center, one of the principal architects working with the WODC during this period was Cecil John Doty, trained in architectural engineering and part of the NPS’s architectural staff since the early 1930s, when he worked under Herbert Maier at the CCC state parks program. In 1936, Doty moved from designing state park to national park structures, and in 1954, he became part of the WODC in San Francisco under Chief Sanford J. Hill and supervising architect Lyle Bennett.¹⁰⁹ His mark on NPS landscapes was a series of visitor centers throughout the West that exhibited “sensitivity toward location; a compact plan incorporating standard visitor center elements [i.e., exhibit areas, audio-visual space, a lobby, an auditorium, and restrooms]; the use of modern materials combined with wood and stone; and the impression of modesty that comes from a limited budget.”¹¹⁰ Doty drew up designs for two visitor centers in Yellowstone that were never built: at Mammoth and Madison Junction.¹¹¹

“The Mission 66 visitor center remains today as the most complete and significant expression of the Park



NPS PHOTO ARCHIVES, YELL #438799-1

Canyon Visitor Center. 1958.

Service Modern Style,” wrote Allaback, “and of the planning and design practices developed by the Park Service during the Mission 66 era.”¹¹² Doty probably would have agreed wholeheartedly. As he put it, designers of a park’s visitor center needed to be aware of the importance of the center’s effect, including its site and landscaping, on the public. In this sense, Doty was carrying forward into the Mission 66 era an important tenet of landscape architecture: just as good landscaping around a park structure could “add” to the building’s reputation, poor landscaping could just as easily detract from the structure’s effect on the public. At a visitor center planning conference, Doty warned designers that the “parking area, walks, terraces, and everything in and around the building are part of the Visitor Center ensemble, and are on exhibit as something constructed by the National Park Service.” “They can be more important than the exhibits themselves,” he noted.¹¹³

At the same time, it was the visitor center’s contents that mattered most. “The overwhelming purpose [of the centers] was luring people inside,” wrote Allaback.¹¹⁴ For this reason, the interior layout and thus general design of a visitor center was largely driven by concerns about how best to move visitors through the space while informing them about the park. Thus, NPS architects created building “circulation” or “flow” diagrams. To help them arrive at reasoned conclusions regarding circulation, park architects were encouraged to meet with the interpretation staff of a park, and other museum professionals. Thomas Vint, who remained chief of the

Washington branch of the Park Service’s Office of Design and Construction until 1961, was a major proponent of teamwork between curatorial and educational staff and the architectural staff.¹¹⁵ Thus, the surge in interest in creating visitor centers carried with it a wave of activity in the museum branch of the NPS.¹¹⁶

The location of a visitor center was also important. “Taken out of context, the visitor center had no inherent value,” Allaback contended, “but placed near a point of interest, it became indispensable to the curious park visitor.”¹¹⁷ WODC designers did not always have the final say on a visitor center’s location, but they most certainly could influence the decision. They usually chose visitor center sites in relation to a park’s overall circulation plan “in order to efficiently intercept visitor traffic,” and thus did not hesitate to incorporate the widening of park roads and the expansion of parking lots into a plan.¹¹⁸ Thus, according to Allaback, the “criteria for siting Mission 66 visitor centers . . . differed significantly from the criteria for siting and designing the rustic park villages and museums of the prewar era.”¹¹⁹ As a result, visitor centers were often located in what some critics believed to be sensitive historic or natural areas. Such siting was rationalized, however, on the basis of visitor edification and the hope that the “resulting understanding of sites would lead to greater support for preservation.”¹²⁰ The answer to the difficult question of where to locate a visitor center—close to the entrance so as to help visitors plan their park excursions, or at the site of interest to help visitors interpret a particular significant feature—was

not ever provided definitively, but many park interpreters favored placing visitor centers “right on top of the resource” to allow visitors to “see virtually everything from the visitor center.”¹²¹ As one park naturalist put it, “a visitor center should be ‘in touch’ with the feature it interprets.”¹²²

The Mission 66 visitor center embodied the NPS’s response to questions about how best to educate the public about the national parks and the need for their continued preservation in the modern age. They also affirmed the idea that the parks were to be used by the public, predicated as they were on the belief that visitor centers would instill an appreciation of a park’s natural or historical features, thereby enhancing visitor enjoyment. Thus, Mission 66’s stance on the importance of interpretation was central to its adoption of the visitor center as its core structure.

Mission 66 and the Change From Education to Interpretation

The decision to make education an integral part of Mission 66 was not made entirely by the NPS. The public had asked the agency to include it. When a public survey of attitudes concerning the park was conducted in April 1955, the need for “more information about the sights to be seen, [and] plaques, printed material, guide maps, lectures, etc.” was second only to the need for “more facilities for sleeping.”¹²³ One result was the visitor center; another was the institution of “interpretation” in the parks.

Educational programming at Yellowstone had changed little during the postwar and Mission 66 periods until the 1960s. Vick, for example, documented little distinction between the 1933 and the 1958 schedules of educational programming.¹²⁴ One reason may have been the continuity in leadership: C. Max Bauer, chief naturalist since 1932, was replaced in 1946 by David deLancy Condon, who remained in that position until 1959. The stability of the tenures of both men likely ensured a strong measure of uniformity during the postwar and Mission 66 periods.¹²⁵

What changed more significantly during this period was the terminology used by the NPS’s Washington, D.C., offices to refer to educational programming. The term that had evolved from “information” (1919) to “education” (1925), and then to “naturalist” (1932), finally settled in 1940 on “interpretation.” This change

in terminology was reflected in name changes in the NPS’s organizational structure. In 1938, the agency’s Branch of Research and Education became the Branch of Research and Information, only to become the Branch of Interpretation in 1941. By 1954, it was called the Interpretation Division.¹²⁶ Such name changes were reiterated in Yellowstone, where the Naturalist Department (which took over from the Education Department in 1933) became the Naturalist Division in 1942, and the Interpretive Division in 1955.¹²⁷

The term “interpretation” was chosen because instead of focusing on the presentation of information or on the intensity and rigor of education, it was “an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by first-hand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information,” according to author Freeman Tilden, who in the 1950s wrote several important books on the nation’s parks.¹²⁸ Tilden called interpretation “a voyage of discovery in the field of human emotions and intellectual growth.”¹²⁹

While interpretation was, in effect, an education of sorts, the NPS opted to disassociate itself from the idea of educating the public. The term “education” fell out of favor, according to Vick, because “it came to be too closely associated with formal schooling. Those involved in the educational work,” she wrote, “did not want the park visitor to think he was going to school when he came to a national park.” To associate park activities with education would, according to one park naturalist, “put the kiss of death, as it were, on what we were trying to do.”¹³⁰

Nor did the term “information” sit well with the NPS. While interpretation included information, it went much further: “Interpretation is revelation based upon information,” according to Tilden.¹³¹ There was a depth to interpretation that did not exist with the mere imparting of information, and it was this depth that Tilden and, increasingly, the NPS as a whole, appreciated. The true interpreter, according to Tilden, “[b]esides being ready in his information and studious in his use of research, . . . goes beyond the apparent to the real, beyond a part to a whole, beyond a truth to a more important truth.”¹³²

The “truth” NPS officials wanted visitors to see was the intangible value of nature. For Tilden, interpretation was “the primary means by which the National Park Service could generate an understanding of the visible and invisible values of the national parks.”¹³³ The “chief aim of Interpretation is not instruction,” Tilden wrote in

a discussion of his six principles of interpretation, “but provocation.”¹³⁴ “Through interpretation, understanding,” Vick quoted the widely known motto, “through understanding, appreciation; through appreciation, protection.”¹³⁵

Yellowstone officials put this process of provocation to work to achieve an appreciation of the natural values integral to preserving the park. While Vick claimed that the park did not officially revise any of its interpretive programming to include this goal of achieving protection through interpretive programs before 1968, Haines wrote that the “interpretive program developed under Mission 66 was conservation oriented, stressing wilderness values and ecological relationships wherever possible.”¹³⁶ Along these lines, Superintendent Garrison planned to introduce a wilderness appreciation theme into the park’s interpretive message at Grant Village. Grant, according to Garrison, “would become the wilderness take-off point,” with trails leading to Heart Lake, the Witch Creek [Heart Lake] Geyser Basin, upper Yellowstone Lake, and Flat Mountain Arm. Garrison also planned for a trail between Lewis Lake and Shoshone Lake, and “on into the Bechler river country.” According to Garrison, wilderness was a “popular topic of planning” in the early 1960s, but there were few points of access in Yellowstone. Grant Village would remedy that. Park visitors would also learn about the importance of and need to appreciate wilderness at the Grant Village Visitor Center, where the theme would be “The Wilderness and Ways to Enjoy It.”¹³⁷ Some of these plans, at least, came to fruition.

On other fronts, however, there was little significant movement. When Chief Naturalist Condon moved to Great Smoky Mountains National Park, he was replaced by Robert N. McIntyre, who served for three years, and then by John Good, who remained chief naturalist for five years. There were significant developments in Yellowstone during McIntyre’s short tenure, but they did not alter the status quo in terms of educational programming. First, at Superintendent Garrison’s urging, the park adopted a district management concept and three districts: North, West, and South. Attempts to “run everything out of headquarters with a Chief Ranger and a Chief Interpreter and a Chief of Maintenance simply broke down,” Garrison claimed after he retired from the NPS. “They were too far apart and [there were] too many things going on.”¹³⁸ Garrison followed the model set up by Dan Beard in Everglades National Park, with district managers in three districts—the same three districts that

Horace Albright had used in his quite similar program implemented in the 1920s.

This decentralized management structure embraced “all government activities—interpretive and maintenance as well as protective,” wrote Haines, “with all three branches under the supervision of a district manager who was, in effect, a ‘little superintendent.’”¹³⁹ As Garrison put it, “We delegated to them [the district managers] the authority to run this just like it was a little park. They set up their own programs . . . they had their own budget, and . . . they selected employees.” The system worked “quite well,” according to Garrison; it “put the decision making out where the problems were.”¹⁴⁰ Haines agreed that the system had its advantages, “particularly in buildings and utilities maintenance, where sending crews from headquarters often meant excessive travel.” But, he noted, the system also had its problems: lower efficiency and insularity.¹⁴¹ As it was, Garrison’s system was abolished for unclear reasons just about the time he left in 1963. “I never did know why it was killed,” Garrison remembered in an interview a decade later. “[N]obody had the guts to tell me what was wrong with it except that Connie Wirth . . . said, no.” Apparently, Regional Director Baker told Garrison that the system was “heavy on overhead.”¹⁴²

The second development McIntyre instigated was planning for new educational sites at Bridge Bay and Grant Village, as well as for a “Fishing For Fun” program (implemented in 1961). Third, park rangers began to conduct impromptu winter interpretation activities at the Madison and Old Faithful areas beginning in winter 1962–1963, as the number of snowcoaches and snowmobiles (first allowed into the park in 1955 and 1963, respectively) increased. Finally, two new positions were established (to be “redefined” in 1968 due to budget constraints), as Mary Meagher became museum curator and Aubrey Haines became park historian.¹⁴³ But these changes, Vick argued, did not affect the actual content of educational programming.

While Good was chief, several superficial changes concomitant with a growing program occurred. For instance, there were increases in the budget and the number of seasonal ranger naturalists hired. The new educational sites became a reality at Bridge Bay (1964) and Grant Village (1966), and the following publications were introduced: a new ranger manual, *Manual of General Information on Yellowstone National Park* (1963); an in-house document, *The Yellowstone Interpreter* (1963); and a commercially printed program brochure

that outlined the summer naturalist program and was distributed for free.¹⁴⁴

The Effect of Mission 66 on Yellowstone's Campgrounds

The people behind Mission 66 also set out to improve and expand the park's campgrounds—a reversal from the thinking just years before, when park officials had toyed with the idea of curtailing overnight visitation in the park as a solution to the problem of campground overuse. When the increase in visitors after the war had a measurable impact on the already-deteriorated campgrounds, Superintendent Rogers, in 1947, selected a committee to study the “trend of use, preservation of vegetation, and administration and control of campground populations.” The committee considered limiting individual stays to ten nights at any one campsite, and strongly suggested the “greater use of facilities outside the park rather than continue their extension within the park.” They even discussed a proposal to “work toward a program which would place all of the overnight facilities outside the park, including camping.”¹⁴⁵

Most of these recommendations were not acted upon, however, and by the end of the decade, the overuse of campgrounds had grown worse. As the tremendous pressure on campgrounds continued, considerable rehabilitation and even some expansion became necessary, particularly at Old Faithful, Fishing Bridge, and West Thumb. In 1948, for example, Superintendent Rogers estimated that there was a 40 percent overuse of campgrounds. “In other words,” he wrote, “where there was room for 10 people, 14 crowded in.”¹⁴⁶ In the 1950s, mature lodgepole pine trees in the Fishing Bridge area were cut to prevent a “blow-down” on a scale with the one in 1936, when a child had been killed, several people had been injured, and automobiles had been damaged. Park officials developed plans to close parts of the camping area for restoration and to open them once new vegetation had started to grow. When visitors complained that the plans constituted spiteful or retributive behavior on the part of the NPS, Regional Director Baker responded with pleas that they understand the agency's effort to maintain camping facilities in the park for generations to come.¹⁴⁷

Park officials employed whatever methods they could to solve the campground crisis without adding to the number of campgrounds or campsites. For example,

in 1958—ten years after Rogers's committee had proposed the idea—a 15-day limit was imposed on camping at one site, which halved the length of time that had been allowed for several decades.¹⁴⁸ Assistant Superintendent Luis Gastelum further proposed a “critical analysis . . . to determine if we should set a limit on the total campers we can accommodate at one time.”¹⁴⁹ Under the influence of Mission 66's philosophy of accommodation, however, it was decided that the solution was to increase capacity, especially given the fact that park officials wanted to close the campground at West Thumb, which had become “crowded and worn out.”¹⁵⁰ A panel of experts—the park engineer, assistant superintendent, chief ranger, assistant park naturalist, park landscape architect and district ranger—rejected a proposal, scandalous by today's standards, to build a campground in Hayden Valley. The panel found the proposal unfavorable because, first, the site could not accommodate enough campsites to relieve the pressure on established campgrounds, which were primarily in the Lake area. Second, the committee felt that the area “because of animal and bird life should be kept free of intensive developments.” Third, they acknowledged that “the installation of camping developments in this [Hayden Valley] area would literally preclude any withdrawal of such use in the future and actually call for more installations.” Instead, the panel recommended establishing a primitive campground at Pelican Creek and improving the camping possibilities at Lewis Lake.¹⁵¹

Thus, a primitive campground at Pelican Creek was built in 1959, and camping opportunities at Lewis Lake were expanded. In a letter to Superintendent Garrison, Acting Regional Director M. H. Harvey noted the “suitability of the terrain and vegetation” at Pelican Creek for possibly even a permanent campground. But officials also acknowledged that development in the area should be temporary until approved in the master plan.¹⁵² They also recognized that the addition of overflow camping at Pelican Creek did not solve the overall crowding issue. In a letter to a dissatisfied visitor, Superintendent Garrison acknowledged that between lack of funds and the increase in visitation, “overcrowded conditions have in some instances resulted in unsatisfactory sanitary conditions because of our inability to properly police the area.” As he explained, the recent percentage of increase in campground use—25 percent—far exceeded the percentage of increase in total visitation.¹⁵³

The new campground at Lewis Lake opened on August 1, 1961, with 100 sites and room to add 100

more. A new campground at Madison Junction opened that same year with 320 sites, and the campground at Fishing Bridge had already been expanded to 300 sites.¹⁵⁴ In 1962, the Indian Creek Campground was further developed with the installation of water pumps and pit toilets. Garrison suggested powering the water pump and hypo-chlorinator by small gasoline engines rather than electric motors; there was no requirement for electricity in the area because park policy “preclude[d] using comfort stations in campgrounds with less than 100 sites.”¹⁵⁵

By 1963, a record number of campers made use of the park. Camper days—the number of campers in the park on any given day—almost doubled in three years, from 450,000 in 1960 to 814,000 in 1963.¹⁵⁶ To alleviate overcrowding, officials actualized plans for a campground at Bridge Bay, which had been discussed for decades. In 1935, Superintendent Toll had asked Landscape Architect Mattson to draw up plans for a campground and boat dock at Bridge Bay. Toll recognized that obtaining a reliable, safe water supply for the area would be a major undertaking, and thus suggested that the campground “be included in the next ECW program and also be listed in the six-year program.”¹⁵⁷ But the project was put off. Finally, in the early 1960s, park employees began dredging the bay for the marina and constructing the multi-use/concessioner building and the campground loops.¹⁵⁸ The Bridge Bay Campground first appeared on the U.S. Department of Interior’s map of Yellowstone in 1965.

Even campground comfort stations were not beyond the reach of Mission 66 Style dictates. In 1956, Director Wirth sent out a memorandum on the use of “appropriate finishes for comfort stations compatible with their environments in the campgrounds.” He suggested that ceramic tile and paint colors such as pastel shades of pink, orchid, and blue be avoided and replaced with “more virile” colors: neutral gray, buff, tan, and terracotta. He also recommended quarry tile and gray or ochre ceramic tile to minimize tracking marks.¹⁵⁹ The following year, Vint, now chief of the Division of Design and Construction, notified Superintendent Garrison that Wirth now felt “strongly against the use of ceramic tile in Comfort Stations.” The director was impressed with Formica for wainscot and Marlite wall finish, both of which had recently been used at a comfort station at Cape Hatteras.¹⁶⁰

By the middle of the 1960s, however, cracks were appearing in the synthetic surface of Wirth’s campground

expansion program. As Garrison remembered many years later, NPS officials at the beginning of Mission 66, “were still operating under the principle that every visitor that wanted to come to Yellowstone, you’d let in.” “If he wanted to camp,” Garrison said, “you tried to provide a campground for him.” But, as Garrison remembered,

We got off of that before very long because it became obvious we had to do something in restriction . . . camping, for instance. We built the Madison Junction Campground, rebuilt it, enlarged it. We built the . . . Grant Village Campground, but it was so obvious that to really meet the forward demand, we would end up with a ring of campgrounds around Yellowstone Lake from Grant Village through to Mary Bay, which was about 33 miles, and they’d be full all the time.¹⁶¹

Thus, the agency was forced once again to re-evaluate the relative importance of use and preservation identified in its mandate. As Garrison realized, the “preservation” side would perish if the scales were tipped too far to the “use” side. The continuation of the campground expansion program was, as Garrison put it, “a perversion of the purpose of the park,” and so officials finally decided to stop increasing camp capacity. In retrospect, the move to have a campground in every geyser basin was wrong, according to Garrison. “[W]hy couldn’t we leave just leave one of them alone?” he asked rhetorically.¹⁶²

From Species Protection to Ecological Management

The pendulum began to swing toward preservation in 1963, with the release of the “Wildlife Management in the National Parks,” better known as the “Leopold Report” —a study of wildlife management issues produced by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall’s Advisory Board on Wildlife Management, chaired by A. Starker Leopold, a zoologist at the University of California at Berkeley.¹⁶³ According to Brian Kenner, “The Leopold Report can be regarded at least partly as a reaction to the rejection of Mission 66 philosophy by the interested public.”¹⁶⁴ Secretary Udall (1961–1969), himself, was no fan of Mission 66, and had told Director Wirth so soon after taking office.¹⁶⁵ With the help of a commit-



Black bear leaning on roadside barricade, with ear tag placed by bear researchers. 1965.

tee of wildlife experts, including such noted biologists as Stanley Cain and Ira Gabrielson, Leopold crafted a document that, according to historian Paul Schullery, became “much more influential and more frequently invoked in all subsequent management dialogues even than the [Yellowstone National Park] Organic Act or the National Park Service Act.”¹⁶⁶ According to one recent park superintendent, the Leopold report became “a kind of manifesto” for NPS personnel; it was adopted as official agency policy.¹⁶⁷

The Leopold Report was commissioned in response to the public outcry that occurred in the late 1950s and early 1960s in response to the NPS’s culling of Yellowstone’s elk herds.¹⁶⁸ The report called for active ecological management on the part of the NPS in an attempt to recreate in the national parks “a vignette of primitive America.” Thus, wilderness values or those that would maintain or return the park to “as nearly as possible . . . the condition that prevailed when the area was first visited by white man” were to be esteemed above values emphasizing enjoyment or use of the park. “The goal, we repeat,” Leopold wrote, “is to maintain or create the mood of wild America . . . but the whole effect can be lost if the parks are overdeveloped for motorized travel.” “If too many tourists crowd the roadways,” he stressed, “then we should ration the tourists rather than expand the roadways.” “Above all other policies,” Leopold wrote, “the maintenance of naturalness should prevail.”¹⁶⁹

Maintaining naturalness, Leopold argued, would be achieved not by protection per se, or even protection of specific species, but by active management of

an ecosystem. Since it had become a national park, Yellowstone’s natural features had been “protected” through active manipulation designed to maximize the survival of certain species. For example, at various times, park officials had “protected” elk by feeding them, by exterminating predators, and by killing elk in an effort to prevent them from “overpopulating” and “overgrazing” their range after those predators had been eliminated. Before the Leopold Report became national park policy, park forests were “protected” from fire, considered the enemy of forest health; park rangers attempted to extinguish all blazes.

The Leopold Report made clear that protecting particular species at the expense of others was counter-productive and even destructive to preserving naturalness. Protection of one part of what was really a much larger system of organisms and relationships was not the way to preserve the ecosystems of which parks themselves were really only a part. Already by the late 1950s, some in the NPS had been thinking that Yellowstone’s needs might be well-served by a staff ecologist. In 1957, George Baggley, then regional chief of operations but also former chief ranger in Yellowstone, advocated hiring an ecologist. “I have reached the conclusion,” he wrote the regional director, “that an Ecologist, or a man with ecological training and some park experience, would be of more value to the Park than would a pure biologist.” An ecologist, he concluded, “would have a much broader understanding of the floral and faunal communities than do most persons trained in general biology.”¹⁷⁰

Leopold’s particular contribution to this issue was

his ability to point out that preservation required not only recognition and understanding of “the enormous complexity of ecological communities and the diversity of management procedures required to preserve them,” but also “active manipulation of the plant and animal communities.”¹⁷¹ Active manipulation was necessary because the Yellowstone ecosystem had already been interfered with, resulting in a situation in which pure protection was no longer desirable or even possible. Thus, active manipulation for the sake of protecting certain species was replaced by the notion of active manipulation for the preservation of naturalness.

From Natural Preservation to Historic Preservation

Though the Mission 66 years were largely an era of tearing down the old to make way for the new, Yellowstone’s historic buildings did attract some attention during this period. However, because Mission 66 was largely completed by the time the National Historic Preservation Act became law in 1966, the park’s actions in regard to those structures were not driven by legislation. In July 1957, NPS historian Merrill J. Mattes wrote to Superintendent Garrison about potential historic buildings in the park. Garrison readily agreed with Mattes’s opinion that the Norris Ranger Station should be considered a historic building and thus receive a degree of consideration and protection in the face of development, but proposed further study on Mattes’s two other candidates, the Cottage Hotel and the Yancey Mail Station and Hotel. Regional Operations Chief George Baggeley concurred with Garrison that the Cottage Hotel and the Yancey property were “marginal . . . and need careful study before the Service [should commit] to their preservation and maintenance as historic structures.”¹⁷² Though some observers now believe they should have been preserved, the buildings were ultimately removed.

In November 1959, Regional Director Howard Baker requested the superintendent’s views on the historical significance of the Norris Soldier Station and also a report on any damage the structure may have suffered from the Hebgen Lake earthquake that had occurred in August of that year. Baker wanted assurance that Garrison felt the soldier station had sufficient historical significance and structural integrity to be converted into a historical museum, and suggested that a Historic

Structures Report be completed. One might read the undertones in Baker’s correspondence as reflecting a negative attitude toward the proposed Norris Soldier Station project. In his closing remarks, for example, Baker wrote, “The fact that this has now been tentatively earmarked for \$20,000 should in no way influence your judgment as to the feasibility of preserving this structure from historical and architectural viewpoints.”¹⁷³

Because Yellowstone did not have its own historian until late 1960, Regional Director Baker requested that NPS historian Ray H. Mattison “make an evaluation of certain historical buildings in the park and make recommendations for their preservation or disposition.”¹⁷⁴ Mattison ascribed the urgency to evaluate the park’s historic structures to two main points: first, the buildings were deteriorating rapidly—especially after the 1959 earthquake—and measures would need to be undertaken quickly to ensure their preservation. Second, facilities proposed under Mission 66 jeopardized several of these older structures. After careful study of the structures and their history, as well as consultations with Chief Naturalist Robert McIntyre and park engineer—and soon to become park historian—Aubrey Haines, Mattison recommended that the Norris Soldier Station be “rehabilitated for use in the interpretive system at Yellowstone.” Mattison also recommended that several structures at Yancey’s station be preserved or reconstructed, that the structures at the Lamar Buffalo Ranch located at the junction of Rose Creek and the Lamar River be destroyed, but only after a complete photographic record of them had been made, and that the Cottage Hotel and Mammoth caretaker’s cottage be obliterated. He also advocated placing historical markers at the sites of several demolished but important historic structures: McCartney’s cabin, the “Norris blockhouse” or original park headquarters, Camp Sheridan, McGuirk’s Medical Springs on the Gardner River, and Baronett’s Bridge.¹⁷⁵

After he became park historian in late 1960, Aubrey Haines evaluated Mattison’s recommendations. Haines basically concurred with Mattison’s findings, and asked that several other sites be given the same consideration: “the site of the civilian cemetery on the hill north of Mammoth, the site of the old ‘town’ of Soda Butte, on the Cooke City road, the wreck of the steamer *Zillah* [E. C. Waters] on Stevenson Island, and the Chinaman’s Garden on the Gardner River.”¹⁷⁶ Haines completed his own Historic Structures Report for the Norris Soldier Station in 1961, and in April of that year, officials at the

NPS's Washington, D.C., offices and the agency's chief architect commended him for his work.

The question of whether to preserve Fort Yellowstone also arose at this time. In his report, Mattison had recommended that only "certain representative type structures, such as the old Park Headquarters and one of the non-commissioned officers' quarters, be preserved." He wrote that while it "would be highly desirable to preserve the buildings of Fort Yellowstone if they were to be considered on their own merits" —they were after all, in his own words, "one of the best preserved and most complete late 19th and early 20th century military establishments in Region Two" —other factors had entered into the picture. It "is recognized," he wrote vaguely, "that revised landscaping factors in this primarily scenic area will make it impracticable to retain them as a group." Again, he recommended making an architectural record of the buildings before they were destroyed in case no original plans had survived.¹⁷⁷

Whether due to Mattison's report or not, rumors flew regarding the possible demolition of the fort. When former park superintendent and former NPS Director Horace Albright heard these rumors, he fired off a strong letter, softened only by its opening—"My dear Connie," he began—to Director Wirth condemning the idea of destroying the fort. "This letter of protest may not be in order because it may be based only on rumor," he wrote. "On the other hand, it may be in order, but futile because there may be no one who will care to consider it valid or important." He reminded Wirth about the fort's importance as a draw for tourists. "Tear [it] down," he warned, ". . . and twenty years from now, perhaps sooner, there will be projects developed to rebuild it in whole or in part." Besides, the Mammoth area, especially, needed all the tourist attractions it could muster, he reminded Wirth.¹⁷⁸ Seeking to offset the possibility that the fort had been damaged during the earthquake of 1959, Albright asserted, "I seriously doubt that the earthquake damaged the Fort, or that it is unsafe." Furthermore, he reasoned, there "is no more reason to tear down Fort Yellowstone than there is to tear down the old San Francisco Mint on the ground that even though it did not crumble in 1906, it might fall next time an earthquake comes along."¹⁷⁹

The style of any replacement architecture also troubled Albright. Would replacement headquarters "be of *modern* architecture, perhaps entirely out of harmony with what will be left of the Mammoth Hot Springs community?" Albright wanted to know. "I fear a new

Yellowstone headquarters may be far less attractive, or less commodious and far less interesting than the old Fort which can be made an important historical feature," he concluded. Using every tool he had, including a veiled threat, Albright admitted that "as a taxpayer," he "would regard the destruction of the Fort as a massive waste of good Government property, and the building of new headquarters as giving to Yellowstone largesse that many other park areas deserve[d] and need[ed]."¹⁸⁰

Finally, he was concerned with the bad name the NPS would acquire should it be associated with the demolition of the fort. "I honestly think that . . . the whole project is unsound from every standpoint and the Department and the Service can be seriously criticized if it secures money and goes ahead with it. Surely this project was not a part of Mission 66, and I would hope Mission 66 will not be identified with it." He asked that the agency's chief historian have a chance to study the matter before the NPS made any definitive move to destroy the fort.¹⁸¹

Almost a year later, Director Wirth responded to Albright's protest. Wirth admitted that there had been serious discussions of removing Fort Yellowstone to make room for "more orderly development of the Park headquarters and because of their possible weakening as a result of the earthquake," but, he wrote, "I don't feel that we should get hysterical about it." The first order of importance, he reminded Albright, was employee safety. "[T]he main thing is that we do not want to endanger the lives of our employees if the buildings have been weakened," he wrote. Furthermore, he added, "we have information indicating that the real old Fort Yellowstone of historical significance was removed back in the 20's and what we have there now is what might be termed the more modern Fort Yellowstone which was built after the turn of the century." Wirth concluded by agreeing that the project would be expensive and that the money was needed elsewhere, but he did say that they would "add to the Mammoth area headquarters such buildings as we need to carry on an efficient administration" and that the buildings would be "fit into a scheme that will allow us at a future date to remove the old Army buildings if it is found desirable to do so and replace them with more modern buildings that fit into a better scheme of management." The only reason to remove the older buildings, however, he reassured Albright, would be if he thought his employees were in danger from working in unsafe conditions.¹⁸²

A change that was implemented during this period,

however, was the move of the Superintendent's Office from the Corps of Engineers building to the three-story "new" barracks building built in 1909, the present home of the park's administration. According to Haines, "This move allowed grouping of the department heads close to the superintendent, creating a functional unity unknown when staff members were scattered among several buildings."¹⁸³

In 1960, Albright and others had reason to worry about the destruction of historic structures because, as Albright had noted in his letter to Wirth, the NPS's "policies with respect to preservation and interpretation" had not yet been developed.¹⁸⁴ Once the agency's mission with respect to the documentation and preservation of historic structures was established in 1966, as part of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), it became much easier to argue in favor of preserving Yellowstone's historic structures. But, as Schullery wrote, on the other side of the coin was the fact that with historic preservation, a new, costly, and often unwieldy element had been added to the NPS mission: the preservation of "structures no longer common elsewhere—from winding, low-speed auto trails to romanticized rustic architecture."¹⁸⁵ In essence, with the advent of the NHPA, the nation's parks also became "museums for really big objects." As Schullery noted, this added responsibility has proven to be an expensive challenge for parks such as Yellowstone. "While some hold that even the architectural and engineering legacy of the National Park Service itself must be preserved and protected in the parks, others worry that we risk turning too much of Yellowstone into sites for stockpiling neat old buildings, bridges, culverts, and other human constructions that were created in the first place only to enable us to enjoy other resources here." "The buildings in Yellowstone are both interesting and historic," Schullery reminded his readers, "but they were a side effect of the park's purpose. Now they have become a purpose in themselves, and one of the great challenges facing future managers will be coming to terms with that purpose."¹⁸⁶

Conclusion

The impact of World War II, with its immediate restriction on building and the lack of an adequate labor force, resulted in the neglect of buildings and structures in Yellowstone and across the national park system. When attendance figures soared after the end of the

war, the park struggled to meet visitor demands. Combined with a growing awareness of the implications of unplanned development on the natural resources of the park, a major planning effort, in the form of Mission 66, took place toward the end of this period. In Yellowstone, the program's emphasis was to move or relocate development away from significant or fragile areas of the park, resulting in the construction of Canyon Village (already planned, at least in part), the creation of Grant Village, and an unsuccessful plan for the removal of facilities at Old Faithful. With these developments came a new architectural style, Park Service Modern.

Was Yellowstone's Mission 66 program a success? Historian Richard A. Bartlett averred that the program "staved off the deterioration that was bringing the parks and monuments to the brink of disaster."¹⁸⁷ Historian Paul Schullery has written that the program's legacy is complex, and thus defies a simple thumbs-up or thumbs-down evaluation. "It did, indeed, upgrade many roads, bridges, and facilities, and no doubt visitors are now better served," he wrote, "but the program is routinely criticized for simply accommodating more traffic rather than trying to control or limit it." He also noted that environmentalists condemn the "biggest monuments of Mission 66, Canyon Village and Grant Village."¹⁸⁸ According to historian Aubrey Haines, the program's greatest accomplishments were improved access and the provision of administrative and employee facilities. "But in the matter of providing visitor accommodations," he wrote, "there was no real gain." For Haines, the unfinished components of Mission 66 perhaps "saved [the park] from unnecessary scarring."¹⁸⁹

Most have concurred, however, that the program was not perceived as a great success at its time. As Haines wrote, "Mission 66 passed quietly out of the picture," and was supplanted with a program called "Road to the Future," that de-emphasized large scale construction projects and promoted such long-range objectives as "[p]reserving the scenic and scientific grandeur of our Nation, presenting its history, providing healthful outdoor recreation for the enjoyment of our people, [and] working with others to provide the best possible relationship of human beings to their total environment."¹⁹⁰ According to seasonal park ranger Robin Smith, who wrote a historical study of Grant Village, "Mission 66 lost its cachet halfway through the program." By "1959–1960," Smith noted, "the NPS began to see what with all the roads and pillows they had added they still were not winning the battle to provide adequate facilities. To the

contrary, the situation was getting worse.”¹⁹¹

The public apparently did not perceive the program as a success, either. Indeed, throughout the Mission 66 era, NPS officials had to counter claims that the large-scale development program was hurting parks more than it was helping them. In February 1959, for example, Director Wirth sent a memorandum to all field offices asking them to expend greater effort “to present the Mission 66 program to the public in its true light.” “Specifically,” he wrote, “it is necessary that we use every available means to counter the misapprehension that Mission 66 is somehow damaging the Parks or that it is inimical to the purpose for which the Parks were created.” He called it “of the utmost importance that this concept [that Mission 66 was a program to carry out the basic purpose of the National Park Service] be firmly fixed in the minds of the American public.” Wirth asked the field offices “to develop more and better feature articles for publication designed to place the Mission 66 program in its proper perspective.” After reading the memorandum, Wirth wrote, officials were to destroy it, in an effort, perhaps, to deny that the program had ever been in trouble.¹⁹²

Indeed, Mission 66 was not popular with those who wanted the park used less and preserved more. In the end, the nation and the NPS came to see that “a continuing effort to accommodate all visitors in the traditional manner would eventually be destructive of park values.”¹⁹³ Schullery, for example, documented public sentiment in the late 1960s as being overwhelmingly in favor of limiting public activity in the nation’s parks to a level consistent with maintaining wilderness values in the park. Almost all who answered an informal survey in 1968 regarding how national parks should be run, “agreed that we should ‘determine what human influences are causing wildlife problems, and develop park management programs designed to offset man’s adverse impact.’”¹⁹⁴

Based in the modern belief that “good” develop-

ment would actually protect the landscape by concentrating use in areas less important for wilderness or esthetic values, Mission 66 was intended, among other things, to be a tool for helping protect the nation’s parks.¹⁹⁵ A park’s environment would also be preserved as the public became more informed about the need for preserving such areas; hence, the program’s push for interpretation. But the nation’s, and eventually, many agency officials’ evaluation of the program was essentially that it was anti-preservation and pro-development. According to Kenner, “the Service most certainly recognized that constructing facilities to keep up with visitation was no longer feasible, and probably also felt the need for an adjustment in policy.”¹⁹⁶ Even Mission 66 Steering Committee Chairman Lon Garrison “came to realize that, contrary to his original thinking, the NPS could not continue to expand accommodations for Park visitors.”¹⁹⁷ The park’s natural features and wilderness could not be adequately preserved if every visitor was accommodated.

While Yellowstone National Park has always boasted an eclectic architectural blend (the Prairie-Style Child House at Mammoth Hot Springs, the typical army-style buildings, the Anglo-Japanese Engineer’s Office, the Art Moderne Mammoth Hot Springs Hotel, the Colonial Revival Lake Hotel, and the former Canyon Hotel), its rustic influences outweighed these non-rustic buildings for many years. With the introduction of the modern buildings—along with modern bridges, bypasses, and the Old Faithful cloverleaf overpass—brought by Mission 66, Yellowstone began to take on another feeling and appearance. Along with these new developments was a change in the park’s approach to communicating knowledge and instilling appreciation—from education to interpretation—and later, a change in its wildlife management philosophy—from species protector to ecosystem manager—as well as its approach to historic structures. In 1965, the park stood poised for the challenges ahead, including threats to its ecology, its wilderness, and its historic buildings.

Appendix A

Government-Built Buildings Constructed in Yellowstone National Park 1879–1973

The following list of government-built buildings in Yellowstone National Park, 1879–1973, is not exhaustive, but meant to provide additional information for the purposes of this publication and reflect the research results available at press time.

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
1879		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blockhouse headquarters building at top of Capitol Hill in Mammoth Hot Springs • Earth-roofed log house and other improvements between Beehive Geyser and Castle Geyser in Upper Geyser Basin. Was used as home and office by civilian superintendents. With some added buildings, this became the Upper Geyser Basin Soldier Station in 1886. 		X X
1880		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mammoth Hot Springs barn, blacksmith shop, and bathhouse • Harry Yount's earth-roofed cabin upon the terrace south of the confluence of the East Fork of the Yellowstone (Lamar) and Soda Butte rivers • Mail station built at Norris by superintendent • Mail station built by John Goff and George Marshall at Forks of the Firehole River 		X X X X
1881		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mammoth Hot Springs hennery, near barn • Queen's Laundry, built near the confluence of the Firehole River and Nez Perce Creek 	X	X
1882		• Firehole Basin summer headquarters, coal house, and blacksmith shop		X
1883		• Mammoth blacksmith shop, cow house, storehouse, and carpenter shop		X
1884		• Norris civilian administration building		X
1886	Army No. 1 Army No. 2 Army No. 3 Army No. 4 Army No. 5 Army No. 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camp Sheridan (temporary army buildings in Mammoth) • Barracks • Warehouse • Guardhouse • Troop stables • Quartermaster stables • Camp Sheridan Hospital • Lower Geyser Basin Soldier Station • Upper Geyser Basin Soldier Station • Grand Canyon Soldier Station • Riverside Soldier Station • Soda Butte Soldier Station 		X (all)

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
1887	51	Camp Sheridan (temporary army buildings in Mammoth) • Officers quarters • Magazine • Fort Yellowstone No. 51 residence • Lake Outlet Soldier Station		X X X X
1891	8 9 10 11 12 24 29 30 31 32 33	The following are at Fort Yellowstone: • Army post headquarters (now residence) • Guardhouse (now residence) • Quartermaster storehouse (now residence) • Commissary (now residence) • Granary (now residence) • Bakery (now residence) • Troop workshop (now paint shop) • Non-commissioned officers' residence (now residence) • Non-commissioned officers' residence (now residence) • Non-commissioned officers' residence (now residence) • Non-commissioned officers' residence (now residence)	X (all)	
1892	6 7	• Officers' duplex quarters • Officers' duplex quarters • Snake River (Polecat Creek) station • West Thumb station • Riverside station	X X	 X X X
1893	4 5	• Officers' duplex quarters • Officers' duplex quarters	X X	
1894	14	• Hospital surgeon's residence • Fort Yellowstone hospital • Residence for hospital personnel (Mammoth)	X	 X X
1895	49	• Fort Yellowstone residence—U.S. Commissioner • Mud Geyser Soldier Station	X	 X
1897	26	• Fort Yellowstone barracks (Mammoth) • Norris Soldier Station (replaced 1883 station) • Thumb Bay station		X X X
1898	22	• Quartermaster shops (now plumbing shop)	X	
1899	27	• Cavalry barracks (now offices) • Lake Soldier Station	X	 X
1900		Snowshoe cabins in existence (based on the Yellowstone National Park and Forest Reserve USGS map for 1900, found in <i>Superintendent's Annual Reports</i> vol. 5, 1895–1900, in Yellowstone National Park Library, Heritage and Research Center, Gardiner, Montana) • Astringent Creek Cabin • Bartlett Cabin • Boundary Creek Cabin • Coulter Creek Cabin • Hellroaring Creek Cabin • Lewis River Cabin • Park Point (on the lake) Cabin • Proposition Cabin	X (all)	

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trappers Creek Cabin • Trout Creek Cabin • Willow Creek Cabin 	X X X	
1901		• Tower Soldier Station		X
1902	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fort Yellowstone residence (Chittenden House, now offices) • Mammoth—Water-powered electric plant (powerhouse) • Mammoth—Reservoir • Snake River Soldier Station 	X	X X X
1903	39 43 44 104	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fort Yellowstone, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Office (Pagoda) • Fort Yellowstone residence • Fort Yellowstone garage • North Entrance residence—previously a checking station • Mammoth weather station • Gardiner Soldier Station • West Thumb—U.S. Fisheries Commission building 	X	X X X X X X X
1904		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Thumb Soldier Station • Sylvan Pass Soldier Station • Soda Butte Soldier Station 		X X X
1905	35	• Fort Yellowstone Post Exchange (canteen)	X	
1906		• Lamar Buffalo Ranch	X	
1907		• Tower Soldier Station		X
1908	111	• Norris Soldier Station (replaced burned station)	X	
1909	1 2 3 16 34 36 37 38 50 56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fort Yellowstone bachelor officers' quarters (now Visitor Center) • Fort Yellowstone double captains' quarters • Fort Yellowstone field officers' quarters • Fort Yellowstone hospital annex • Fort Yellowstone cavalry stable (now supply center) • Fort Yellowstone double cavalry barracks (now administration building) • Fort Yellowstone blacksmith shop • Fort Yellowstone cavalry stable (now offices) • Fort Yellowstone quarters/duplex • Fort Yellowstone powerhouse 	X X X X X X X X X X	X
1910	231	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bechler Soldier Station • Gallatin Soldier Station 	X X	
1911	232 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bechler Soldier Station horse barn • Fort Yellowstone guardhouse (jail) 	X X	
1912	234 334	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffalo Lake Patrol Cabin • Commissioner's barn (now garage) • Crevice Mountain station (replaced in 1921) 	X X	X
1913	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fort Yellowstone Chapel • Lake fish hatchery, quarters and mess 	X	X
1914		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snake River Soldier Station (replaced burned one) • Bureau of Fisheries residence on Columbine Creek (bungalow and barn) 		X X
1915	218 227	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aster Creek Patrol Cabin • Lamar Buffalo Ranch log home • Cabin Creek Patrol Cabin (replaced by 719, 1974) 		X X

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
1915 (cont.)	219	• Dunraven Pass checking station	X	X
		• Harebell Patrol Cabin		
	291	• Madison Junction checking station	X	X
	292	• Thorofare Ranger Station (burned in 1937 and rebuilt)	X	
		• Thorofare horse barn	X	
1916	346 271	• West Entrance checking station		X
		• North Entrance checking station (burned and rebuilt in the late 1930s)	X	X
		• Lower Slough Creek Cabin		
1917	226 284	• Automobile camps: Mammoth, Canyon, Upper Geyser Basin, Lake		X
		• Park Point Patrol Cabin (replaced 1900 cabin, burned 1988)	X	
1920	266 267	• Pelican Creek Patrol Cabin (reconstructed 1935)		
		• Frost Lake Snowshoe Cabin	X	X
	138 241	• Hellroaring Ranger Station	X	
		• Hellroaring horse barn	X	
	291	• Northeast Entrance Patrol Cabin		X
		• South Riverside Patrol Cabin	X	
		• Tower Ranger Station	X	
1921	261 221	• Thorofare Ranger Station	X	
		• Lamar Buffalo Ranch blacksmith shop and stable		X
	229 191	• Canyon Ranger Station	X	X
		• Crevice Mountain Ranger Station (replaced 1912)		
	252 253	• East Entrance Ranger Station	X	
		• Fox Creek Patrol Cabin	X	
	160 161	• Lake Ranger Station	X	
		• Mt. Washburn fire lookout (replaced in 1940)		X
		• Northeast Entrance horse barn		X
		• Northeast Entrance quarters		X
		• Old Faithful Ranger Station		X
		• Old Faithful fire cache	X	
		• Old Faithful residence		X
1922	106	• Upper Slough Creek hay ranch		X
		• Automobile camps: Mammoth and Fishing Bridge (Lake Outlet)		X
		• Lamar Buffalo Ranch residence	X	
		• Northeast Entrance Ranger Station		X
1923		• Fish hatchery at Fish Lake (Trout Lake)		X
		• Automobile camps: Lake and Old Faithful		X
1924	278	• Automoblie camps (comfort stations): Fishing Bridge, Lake, Tower Fall, West Thumb		X
1925	265 235	• Cache Creek Patrol Cabin	X	
		• East Entrance checking station (replaced in 1932)	X	X
	184	• Heart Lake Patrol Cabin		
		• West Entrance checking station		X
1925	265 235 184	• Apollinaris Spring flagstones	X	
		• Blacktail Creek Patrol Cabin	X	
		• Boundary Creek Patrol Cabin		X
		• Canyon fire cache	X	

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
	185	• Canyon horse barn	X	
	189	• Canyon comfort station—old campground		X
	315	• Canyon comfort station—old campground		X
	316	• Canyon comfort station—old campground		X
	318–320	• Canyon comfort station—new campground		X
	146	• Dailey Creek Cabin (U.S. Forest Service cabin until 1929)	X	
	209	• Duck Lake pumphouse		X
	293	• Duck Lake pumphouse		X
	294	• Duck Lake pumphouse		X
	101	• North Entrance Ranger Station	X	
	103	• North Entrance horse barn		X
	511–516	• Old Faithful comfort stations		X
	139	• West Gallatin garage		X
	140	• West Gallatin horse barn		X
	141	• West Gallatin Ranger Station		X
	201	• West Thumb Ranger Station	X	
		• West Thumb Campground		X
1926		• Lower Slough Creek storehouse and bunkhouse		
1927		• Lamar Buffalo Ranch horse barn	X	
	349	• Crystal Spring Cabin (moved to Three Rivers)	X	
	350	• Fawn Pass Patrol Cabin	X	
	360	• Mary Mountain Patrol Cabin	X	
	151	• Old Faithful post office (razed in 1973)		X
	149	• Shoshone Lake Patrol Cabin		X
1928	220	• Cascade Creek Patrol Cabin		X
	301	• Fishing Bridge Ranger Station	X	
	311*	• Lewis River Road Camp quarters		X
	312	• Lewis River Road Camp messhouse		X
	58	• Mammoth bathhouse used as storage shed		X
		• Madison bunkhouse		
	112	• Norris residence	X	
	113	• Norris bunkhouse	X	
	114	• Norris barn	X	
	169–173	• Old Faithful Campground comfort stations		X
	176	• Old Faithful Museum		X
	179	• Old Faithful comfort station at amphitheater		X
		• South Entrance Ranger Station (burned 1940, replaced 1941)		X
	203	• West Thumb bunkhouse		X
	204*	• West Thumb messhouse		X
1929	107	• Lamar Buffalo Ranch bunkhouse	X	
	121	• Madison Junction Museum	X	
	441	• West Entrance bunkhouse, formerly building #143	X	
	142	• West Gallatin messhouse		X
	144	• West Gallatin bunkhouse		X
1930	303	• Fishing Bridge residence	X	
	304–307	• Fishing Bridge comfort stations—campground		X

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
1930 (cont.)	192–194	• Lake bunkhouses		X
	195	• Lake horse barn	X	
	197–198	• Lake comfort stations		X
	725	• Lake office	X	
	726	• Lake Fish Hatchery	X	
	732	• Lake Fish Hatchery garage	X	
	733	• Lake Fish Hatchery bunkhouse	X	
	66	• Mammoth incinerator (abandoned 1962)		X
	279	• Lower Miller Creek or Calfee Creek Patrol Cabin	X	
	214	• Mt. Sheridan fire lookout	X	
	115	• Norris Museum	X	
	116	• Norris Museum comfort station	X	
	162	• Old Faithful residence originally constructed as messhouse		X
	163	• Old Faithful bunkhouse	X	
	164	• Old Faithful dormitory		X
	168	• Old Faithful cabin	X	
	174	• Old Faithful residence		X
	175	• Old Faithful apartment		X
	147	• Teepee Creek Patrol Cabin		X
	238	• Tower Junction bunkhouse	X	
	242	• Tower Junction messhouse	X	
1931	94	• Apollinaris Spring comfort station	X	
	225	• East Entrance checking station		X
	222	• East Entrance Road Camp messhouse		X
	223	• East Entrance Road Camp bunkhouse		X
	224	• East Entrance Road Camp barn converted to bunkhouse		X
	283	• Fern Lake Patrol Cabin	X	
	302	• Fishing Bridge Museum	X	
	727	• Lake Fish Hatchery spring house		X
	728	• Lake Fish Hatchery spring house		X
	730	• Lake Fish Hatchery residence	X	
	731	• Lake Fish Hatchery residence	X	
	117	• Mt. Holmes fire lookout	X	
	239	• Tower Junction garage	X	
	240	• Tower Junction fire cache	X	
	245	• Tower Junction horse barn	X	
	470	• Upper Blacktail Cabin	X	
	280	• Upper Miller Creek Patrol Cabin	X	
	204*	• West Thumb horse barn		X
	205–208	• West Thumb comfort stations	(X— 207 only)	X
1932	729	• Lake Fish Hatchery residence	X	
	63	• Mammoth chlorination house		X
	65	• Mammoth residence	X	
	469	• Upper Blacktail barn	X	
	133	• West Entrance Ranger Station	X	

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing Bridge amphitheater • Old Faithful amphitheater 	X	X
1933	228	• Trail Creek Patrol Cabin	X	
	243	• Trail Creek barn	X	
1934		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antelope Canyon buffalo corral • Buffalo Plateau Patrol Cabin • Bunsen Peak fire lookout • Cold Creek Patrol Cabin • Upper Lamar Patrol Cabin • Madison Amphitheater • Mammoth Amphitheater • Old Faithful bunkhouse • Snake River fire lookout • South Entrance horse barn • South Entrance fire cache • Trout Creek Hatchery, old Fish and Wildlife bldg. • West Yellowstone fire lookout • Promontory fire lookout 	X	X
	237		X	
	347		X	
	281		X	
	282		X	
			X	
			X	
	178			X
	699			X
	212		X	
	215		X	
	902			X
	348			X
				X
1935	233	• Bechler pumphouse		X
	148	• Cougar Creek Patrol Cabin	X	
	262	• Crevice Mountain horse barn	X	
	296	• Duck Lake Cabin		X
	704	• Lake shop and storage bldg.	X	
	62	• Mammoth chlorination house	X	
	251	• Northeast Entrance Ranger Station	X	
	254	• Northeast Entrance checking station	X	
	256	• Northeast Entrance shed	X	
	200	• West Thumb powerhouse	X	
		• West Thumb amphitheater		X
1936	264	• Blacktail Creek horse barn	X	
	324–327	• Fishing Bridge comfort stations—campground	X	
	190	• Lake fire cache	X	
	273	• Lamar Buffalo Ranch garage (snowplow/generator storage)		X
	70	• Mammoth apartment	X	
	78	• Mammoth storage shed	X	
	272	• Slough Creek, lower washhouse (Elk Tongue cabin)	X	
	250	• Tower Fall comfort station (replaced in 1975 with #249)		X
1937	108	• Lamar Buffalo Ranch residence	X	
	109	• Lamar Buffalo Ranch horse barn	X	
	23	• Mammoth vehicular repair shop	X	
	52	• Mammoth shed		X
	55	• Mammoth chlorination house	X	
	75–77	• Mammoth garages	X	
	84	• Mammoth residence	X	
	1000	• Mammoth post office	X	
	346	• North Entrance checking station (rebuilt due to fire)		X

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
1937 (cont.)	855	• Observation Peak fire lookout	X	
	724	• Pelican Cone fire lookout	X	
	99	• Stephens Creek garage	X	
	102	• Stephens Creek residence	X	
1938	736	• Clear Creek cabin—used by Fish & Wildlife fish trap attendant (replaced an earlier cabin built between 1913–1925 that collapsed under heavy snowfall in winter 1937–1938)	X	
			X	
	199	• Lake powerhouse	X	
	126	• Madison residence		X
	59–60	• Mammoth Campground comfort stations		X
	80	• Mammoth residence	X	
	81	• Mammoth residence	X	
	97	• Mammoth magazine	X	
1939	98	• Mammoth magazine	X	
	72–74	• Mammoth Campground comfort stations	X	
	79	• Mammoth garage	X	
	82	• Mammoth residence	X	
	83	• Mammoth residence	X	
	85	• Mammoth residence	X	
	86	• Mammoth residence	X	
	87	• Mammoth residence	X	
	290	• Mt. Washburn fire lookout	X	
	159	• Old Faithful powerhouse	X	
1940	213	• South Entrance checking station		X
	323	• Canyon messhouse	X	
	734	• Lake boathouse	X	
	88	• Mammoth residence	X	
	89	• Mammoth residence	X	
	523	• Old Faithful utility bldg.	X	
1941	954	• Peale Island residence		X
	322	• Canyon powerhouse	X	
	952	• Grebe Lake hatchery		X
	288	• Lake pumphouse	X	
	735	• Lake washhouse	X	
	737	• Lake storage shed	X	
	122*	• Old Faithful office—moved in from Madison Junction	X	
	211	• South Entrance Ranger Station—rebuilt after fire	X	
1942	901	• Trout Lake residence, old Fish & Wildlife Bldg.		X
	686	• South Entrance garage	X	
1944	152	• Nez Perce Creek Patrol Cabin	X	
1945	122*	• Madison Junction bunkhouse		X
	123	• Madison Junction messhouse		X
1946	129	• West Entrance residence	X	
1947	351	• Canyon bunkhouse	X	
	330	• Mammoth residence	X	
	332	• Mammoth residence	X	
	333	• Mammoth garage	X	

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
	417	• Purple Mountain fire lookout		X
1948	95	• Mammoth residence	X	
	216	• South Entrance bunkhouse	X	
1949	196	• Lake cabin at incinerator site	X	
	258	• Old Faithful apartment	X	
	368	• Old Faithful apartment house		X
	217	• South Entrance permit booth		X
1950	268	• Lake messhouse	X	
	269	• Lake bunkhouse	X	
	130	• West Entrance residence	X	
1951	352–355	• Old Faithful Campground comfort stations		X
1952	356–358	• Old Faithful Campground comfort stations		X
1953	359	• Old Faithful Campground comfort stations		X
	361	• Old Faithful Campground comfort stations		X
	236	• South Entrance residence (originally a messhouse converted in 1962 to #690)		X
1955	721	• Lake pumphouse		X
	362–366	• Old Faithful Campground comfort stations	X	
	435–438	• West Entrance checking station		X
	439	• West Entrance Visitor Center		X
	440	• West Entrance pumphouse	X	
1956	821	• Canyon pumphouse	X	
	846–854	• Canyon Campground comfort stations	X	
1957	801	• Canyon residence	X	
	802	• Canyon dormitory	X	
	803	• Canyon utility bldg.	X	
	804	• Canyon apartment house	X	
	805	• Canyon apartment house	X	
	806	• Canyon washhouse—employees' trailer court	X	
	807	• Canyon pumphouse	X	
	808	• Canyon chlorination house	X	
	846–854	• Canyon Campground (new) comfort station	X	
	741–754	• Fishing Bridge Campground comfort station	X	
	691	• South Entrance bunkhouse	X	
1958	822	• Canyon Visitor Center	X	
	825	• Canyon Ranger Station—campground	X	
	951	• Divide Mountain fire lookout	X	
	371–375	• Mammoth residences	X	
	607	• West Thumb bunkhouse		X
1959	755	• Fishing Bridge Ranger Station—campground	X	
	706	• Lake washhouse and comfort station	X	
	709	• Lake apartment house	X	
	336–344	• Mammoth residences	(X—339)	X
	522	• Old Faithful washhouse	X	
1960	809	• Canyon pumphouse	X	
	702	• Lake horse barn	X	
	703	• Lake utility bldg.	X	

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
1960 (cont.)	707	• Lake dormitory	X	
	708	• Lake residence	X	
	710	• Lake apartment house	X	
	953	• Lewis Lake pumphouse	X	
	418	• Madison apartment house	X	
	419	• Madison mess hall/dormitory	X	
	471–479	• Madison Campground comfort stations	X	
	480–483	• Madison pumphouses	X	
	369	• Mammoth washhouse—employee trailer court	X	
	376–385	• Mammoth residences	X	
	401	• Norris residence	X	
	517–521	• Old Faithful residences	X	
	524	• Old Faithful shed	X	
	443	• West Entrance pumphouse	X	
1961	793	• East Entrance residence	X	
	794	• East Entrance residence	X	
		• Fishing Bridge Campground expansion		X
	608–618	• Grant Village comfort stations	X	
		• Lewis Lake Campground	X	
	420–425	• Madison Campground comfort stations	X	
	426	• Madison Ranger Station—campground	X	
	427	• Madison utility bldg.	X	
	386–389	• Mammoth “Transa-home” residences	X	
	392	• Mammoth apartment house	X	
	393	• Mammoth apartment house	X	
	394	• Mammoth residence	X	
	395	• Mammoth residence	X	
	390	• North Entrance residence—“Transa-home”	X	
	391	• North Entrance residence—“Transa-home”	X	
	247	• Northeast Entrance residence—“Transa-home”	X	
	248	• Northeast Entrance residence—“Transa-home”	X	
1962	463	• Bechler pump- and powerhouse	X	
	661–668	• Bridge Bay comfort stations	X	
	669	• Bridge Bay pumphouse	X	
	670	• Bridge Bay Ranger Station	X	
	671	• Bridge Bay pumphouse		X
	619–624	• Grant Village comfort stations	X	
	625	• Grant Village Ranger Station	X	
	626	• Grant Village chlorination house		X
	627–628	• Grant Village control houses		X
	93	• Indian Creek pumphouse	X	
	711	• Lake apartment house	X	
	712	• Lake residence	X	
	713	• Lake hospital	X	
	714	• Lake dormitory	X	
	396–398	• Mammoth sheds	X	
	399	• Incinerator		X
	299	• Mt. Washburn radio equipment room		X

Year	Bldg. No.	Structure	Extant	
			Yes	No
	402–405	• Norris Campground comfort stations	X	
1963	672	• Bridge Bay multi-use building	X	
	860–867	• Canyon comfort stations—campground	X	
	860–867	• Fishing Bridge comfort stations—trailer court	X	
	705	• Lake pumphouse	X	
	484	• Madison washhouse—Employee Trailer House	X	
	550	• Mammoth residence	X	
	551–555	• Mammoth residences	X	
	556	• Mammoth School	X	
	557	• Mammoth Clinic	X	
	406	• Norris chlorination house		X
	230	• Pebble Creek chlorination house	X	
	131	• West Entrance storage (burned 1970)		X
1964	673	• Bridge Bay sales bldg.	X	
	674	• Bridge Bay pumphouse	X	
	311*	• Fishing Bridge administration bldg. at trailer court	X	
	629	• Grant Village apartment house	X	
	630	• Grant Village washhouse—trailer court	X	
	631–632	• Grant Village comfort stations	X	
	715	• Lake residence—“Transa-home”	X	
	716	• Lake residence—“Transa-home”	X	
	738	• Lake incinerator bldg.	X	
	537–540	• Lamar Buffalo Ranch—“Transa-home”		X
	558–562	• Mammoth residences	X	
1965	563–567	• Mammoth residences	X	
1971	444	• West Entrance wash/shower building (replaced No. 131, which burned in 1970)	X	
1973	717	• Shoshone Lake Patrol Cabin (west end of lake)	X	
	718	• Shoshone Lake Patrol Cabin (east side of lake)	X	

**Note: Building Nos. 122, 204, and 311 are each listed twice here. At press time, it is unclear whether such dual building numbers are the result of structures being moved within the park, or the use of multiple numbering systems.*

The following sources provided the above information (it should be noted that dates often conflict, partly due to the disparity in the notation of either the construction start date and the construction completion date):

Battle, David G. Fort Yellowstone: Historic Structures Report. Denver, Colo.: National Park Service, 1972. This source provided information on Camp Sheridan and Fort Yellowstone.

“Building and Utility List, 1995.” The existence of these government buildings was determined by this list which is in no way exhaustive, completely accurate, or current.

Haines, Aubrey, and Verne Andrews, “Register of Buildings, Yellowstone National Park, March 1959.” file “D-3423-Buildings (Other including building reports) 1957–1962,” box D-158, Yellowstone National Park Archives, Heritage and Research Center, Gardiner, Montana.

“Register of Buildings, Yellowstone National Park.” September 1964, file “D-3415-Buildings (General) 1963–64,” box D-159, Yellowstone National Park Archives, Heritage and Research Center, Gardiner, Montana.

Appendix B

Government-Built Buildings Removed

CANYON		
Bldg. No. 180	Cascade Creek pumphouse (new utility area)	
Bldg. No. 181	Ranger station and quarters	1965
Bldg. No. 182	Chlorination house behind Haynes	
Bldg. No. 183	Garage at ranger station	1965
Bldg. No. 186	Bunkhouse at incinerator	
Bldg. No. 187	Cascade Creek pumphouses A, B, & C for (rams and gasoline engine for pumping)	1968
Bldg. No. 188	Storage for dynamite	
Bldg. No. 189	Comfort station	1965
Bldg. No. 315	Comfort station	1965
Bldg. No. 316	Comfort station	
Bldg. No. 318	Comfort station	1965
Bldg. No. 319	Comfort station	1964
Bldg. No. 320	Comfort station	1964
Bldg. No. 313	Chlorination house	

Unnumbered bldgs.

- 23 single-room shacks and tent frames in new Canyon Utility area. The structures were given to the park by the Yellowstone Park Company in 1947. They provided needed housing after World War II, but were being replaced by Mission 66 development.

CUB CREEK		
Bldg. No. 230	Patrol cabin	1965

Unnumbered bldg.

- The log road camp building at Lake Eleanor, abandoned in the 1930s, was dismantled and hauled to borrow pit for burning in 1958.

DUNRAVEN PASS		
Bldg. No. 260	Patrol cabin and another “relic” from the road camp that occupied the site—both had been abandoned for a number of years.	1958

EAST ENTRANCE		
Bldg. No. 221	Ranger station	1966

Bldg. No. 222	Messhouse	1968
Bldg. No. 223	Bunkhouse	1968
Bldg. No. 224	Old barn/bunkhouse	1968
Bldg. No. 225	Checking station	1968

FISHING BRIDGE		
Bldg. No. 304	Comfort station	1965
Bldg. No. 305	Comfort station	1965
Bldg. No. 306	Comfort station	1965
Bldg. No. 307	Comfort station	1965
Bldg. No. 328	Pumphouse—housekeeping area	
Bldg. No. 329	Pumphouse	

LEWIS RIVER ROAD		
Bldg. No. 311	Bunkhouse	
Bldg. No. 312	Messhouse and quarters	1961

MADISON JUNCTION		
Bldg. No. 122	Bunkhouse	
Bldg. No. 123	Messhouse and cook's quarters	1978
Bldg. No. 124	Comfort station	
Bldg. No. 125	Comfort station	
Bldg. No. 126	Residence	1965

MAMMOTH HOT SPRINGS		
Bldg. No. 15	Post hospital-apartment house (built in 1893)	1959
Bldg. No. 18	Hospital	1964
Bldg. No. 21	Warehouse: plumbing/heating equipment	1959
Bldg. No. 26	Army barracks/warehouse	1962
Bldg. No. 41	Quarters/residence	1959
Bldg. No. 42	Storage: road equipment	1965
Bldg. No. 43	Quarters/residence	1967
Bldg. No. 44	Garage (employees')	1967
Bldg. No. 45	Storage for road material/garage	1965
Bldg. No. 47	Employees' two-car garage	1956
Bldg. No. 50	Quarters/duplex residence	1966
Bldg. No. 51	Quarters/residence	1960
Bldg. No. 53	Quarters/residence	1959
Bldg. No. 54	Quarters/residence	1959
Bldg. No. 57	Public laundry	

Bldg. No. 58	Public shower	
Bldg. No. 63	Chlorination house	
Bldg. No. 64	Chlorination house	
Bldg. No. 65	Bunkhouse for incinerator attendant	1966
Bldg. No. 66	Incinerator for garbage disposal	1963
Bldg. No. 67	Gasoline and oil house	1966
Bldg. No. 68	Hook and ladder storage house	1963
Bldg. No. 69	Quarters at Mammoth water intake	
Bldg. No. 88	Quarters/residence	
Bldg. No. 90	Barn/automotive storage	1958
Bldg. No. 91	Storage shed	1958
Bldg. No. 92	Storage shed built before 1890 for use as troop barracks. At the time it burned in 1958, it was used for a warehouse.	1958
Bldg. No. 93	Storage shed (built circa 1890 to serve as Army messhall)	1958
Bldg. No. 97	Explosive magazine storage	
Bldg. No. 335	Garage and coal storage for Bldg. 41	

Unnumbered bldgs.

- 9 former CCC buildings on site of employee trailer development. Sold and removed in 1958.
- 6 seasonal ranger cabins on site of apartment building scheduled to be completed in 1960 were sold and removed from the park. The cabins had been given to park in 1947 by the Yellowstone Park Company, which considered them “worn out.”
- Coal shed behind Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 40, removed in 1958. The building served two sets of quarters but became redundant after the park converted to oil fuel.

NORRIS		
Bldg. No. 119	Storage shed	1965
Bldg. No. 120	Storage shed	1965
Bldg. No. 127	Storage shed	1965
Bldg. No. 128	Oil house	1968

NORTH ENTRANCE		
Bldg. No. 103	Horse barn	1965
Bldg. No. 104	Checking station/quarters	1937
Bldg. No. 244	Checking station	

NORTHEAST ENTRANCE		
Bldg. No. 252	Horse barn (burned in winter of 1967 or 1968)	1968
Bldg. No. 253	Old ranger station/messhouse (burned	

	same time)	1968
Bldg. No. 255	Shed (burned same time)	1968

OLD FAITHFUL		
Bldg. No. 151	Public bathhouse/vehicle storage	
Bldg. No. 160	Fire cache (scheduled for removal by Dec. 1969)	
Bldg. No. 161	Ranger station and quarters	
Bldg. No. 162	Messhouse and quarters	1969
Bldg. No. 164	Dormitory	1969
Bldg. No. 165	Quarters east of No. 174	1961
Bldg. No. 166	Horse barn	1969
Bldg. No. 174	Residence	1969
Bldg. No. 175	Apartment building	
Bldg. No. 176	Museum (scheduled for removal by Dec. 1969)	
Bldg. No. 177	Incinerator/storage	
Bldg. No. 178	Bunkhouse (scheduled for removal by Dec. 1969)	
Bldg. No. 511	Comfort station in tourist cabin area	1968
Bldg. No. 512	Comfort station in tourist cabin area	1968
Bldg. No. 513	Comfort station in tourist cabin area	1968
Bldg. No. 514	Comfort station in tourist cabin area	1968
Bldg. No. 515	Comfort station in tourist cabin area	1968
Bldg. No. 516	Comfort station in tourist cabin area	1968

Unnumbered bldgs.

- CCC washhouse in newly developed employees' trailer area was removed to make way for liquefied petroleum storage tank installation—removed in 1958.
- Gasoline power plant shelter in the CCC area was proposed for removal to Lewis Lake campground for use as water pumphouse at the new development on the lake shore.

SNAKE RIVER		
Bldg. No. 699	Fire lookout	1968

SOUTH ENTRANCE		
Bldg. No. 213	Checking station (building removed from boundary line to just north of ranger station when the road was widened to four lanes in 1949.)	

Bldg. No. 217	Checking station bldg./kiosk	1989
---------------	------------------------------	------

TOWER FALL

Bldg. No. 249	Comfort station (campground)	
Bldg. No. 250	Comfort station near store	1975

TROUT LAKE

Bldg. No. 901	Fish hatchery	1968
Bldg. No. 902	Fish hatchery	1968

WEST ENTRANCE

Bldg. No. 131	Cabin/storage (Riverside)	1975
Bldg. No. 132	Riverside ranger station	
Bldg. No. 134	Checking station	
Bldg. No. 136	Pumphouse	1974
Bldg. No. 137	Barn	1968

WEST GALLATIN

Bldg. No. 139	Garage	1968
Bldg. No. 140	Barn	1968
Bldg. No. 141	Ranger station	1968
Bldg. No. 142	Messhouse (Bacon Rind Road Camp)	
Bldg. No. 143	Bunkhouse (Bacon Rind Road Camp)	1968
Bldg. No. 144	Old barn (Bacon Rind Road Camp)	

WEST THUMB

Bldg. No. 209	Water pumphouse (Duck Lake) (scheduled for removal by Dec. 1969)	
---------------	---	--

Bldg. No. 210	Bunkhouse at incinerator	1988
---------------	--------------------------	------

Bldg. No. 293	Water pumphouse (Duck Lake)	
Bldg. No. 294	Water pumping station (Duck Lake)	
Bldg. No. 295	Sewer pumphouse (campground)	1975

Bldg. No. 296	Bunkhouse ("Duck Inn," Duck Lake) (scheduled for removal by Dec. 1969)	
---------------	---	--

Bldg. No. 297	Incinerator	1968
---------------	-------------	------

Some of the information regarding the removal of buildings during the 1950s–1960s period came from documents stored in the Yellowstone National Park Archives, Heritage and Research Center, Gardiner, Montana, in box D-158, file "D-3415 Buildings (General) 1959–60," and box D-160, file "D-34 Buildings (other than concession and historical) Construction, Maint., and Disposal 1969." Information for most building removal dates was provided by the 1995 "Building and Utility List."

Memorandum to Regional Director from Superintendent Lemuel Garrison, January 23, 1959. Memorandum to Frank Elliot from Aubrey Haines, September 7, 1960. Memorandum to District Maintenance Supervisors North-South-West from the Chief of Park Maintenance (no date).

Notes

PREFACE

1. Major, Fifth Cavalry, Superintendent, Letter to the Secretary of the Interior, December 14, 1908, document #8249, item 29, Yellowstone National Park Archives.

2. From the Yellowstone National Park Organic Act, “An act to set apart a certain Tract of Land lying near the Head-waters of the Yellowstone River as a public Park,” March 1, 1872, 42nd Cong., 2nd Sess., as given in Appendix A of Louis Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone National Park and Its Relation to National Park Policies* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932), 76.

3. From the National Park Service Act, “An Act to Establish a National Park Service, and for Other Purposes,” 64th Cong., 1st Sess., H.R. 15522.

CHAPTER 1

1. Philetus W. Norris, *The Calumet of the Coteau* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1883), 190. Norris attributed this stanza to a poem he wrote in 1878, while trying to secure the first appropriations for Yellowstone National Park..

2. Several good accounts of the park delve into the reasons why the park was set aside and the process involved. See for example, Louis Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone National Park and Its Relation to National Park Policies* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932); Hiram Martin Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park: Historical and Descriptive*, 5th ed. (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1905); Aubrey L. Haines, *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*, revised ed. (Niwot, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1996), vol. 1 [hereafter Haines, vol. 1 or 2]; Paul Schullery, *Searching For Yellowstone: Ecology and Wonder in the Last Wilderness* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997); Paul Schullery and Lee Whittlesey, “Yellowstone’s Creation Myth: Can We Live with Our Own Legends?” *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 53(1)

(Spring 2003): 2–13; and Paul Schullery and Lee Whittlesey, *Myth and History in the Creation of Yellowstone National Park* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003).

3. “The Original Yellowstone Park Act,” in Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone National Park*, Appendix A, 76.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Haines, vol. 2, 448–449.

8. Ibid., 449–450.

9. Nathaniel P. Langford to the Secretary of the Interior [C. Delano], May 20, 1872, as quoted in Haines, vol. 1, 180, and Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone National Park*, 38.

10. Ibid.

11. Ferdinand V. Hayden, Letter, in H. Ex. Doc. 75, 45th Congress, 2nd Session, as quoted in Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone National Park*, 37.

12. Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 108.

13. Ibid.

14. Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone National Park*, 38.

15. Nathaniel P. Langford, *Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park to the Secretary of the Interior for 1872* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1873), 4, hereafter *Annual Report for [year]*.

16. Langford, *Annual Report for 1872*, 4.

17. W. E. Strong, *A Trip to the Yellowstone National Park in July, August, and September, 1875* (Washington, D.C., 1876), 92–93, as quoted in Haines, vol. 1, 208.

18. William Ludlow, *Report of a Reconnaissance from Carroll, Montana Territory, on the Upper Missouri to the Yellowstone National Park, and Return, Made in the Summer of 1875* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1876), 26, as cited in Haines, vol. 1, 200.

19. Langford, *Annual Report for 1872*, 4.

20. He visited the park only twice, once during the summer of 1872, and once to evict squatters in 1874. Haines, vol. 1, 212.

21. Haines wrote that the two visits by Langford and “perhaps a visit by David Folsom to the Park following his appointment as assistant superintendent in 1873, was the extent of ‘on site’ management” (Ibid.).

22. Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone National Park*, 39.

23. Ibid., 40.

24. Ludlow, *Report of a Reconnaissance*, 26.

25. Ibid., 38.

26. *Bozeman Avant Courier* (Bozeman, Mont.), Aug. 20, 1875, as quoted in Haines, vol. 1, 204–205.

27. Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 108; Haines, vol. 1, 214; Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 108.

28. Langford, *Annual Report for 1872*, 3.

29. Haines, vol. 1, 214.

30. Ibid.

31. Langford, *Annual Report for 1872*, 3.

32. Haines, vol. 2, 450.

33. Ibid.

34. Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 109.

35. Ibid.; Lee H. Whittlesey, *Yellowstone Place Names* (Helena, Mont.: Montana Historical Society Press, 1988), 113.

36. See Norris’s *Annual Report for 1880*, 51–52, and his *Annual Report for 1881*, 75.

37. Norris, *Annual Report for 1877*, 844.

38. Mary Shivers Culpin, personal communication to editor, August 10, 2005.

39. Norris, *Annual Report for 1878*, 992.

40. Haines, vol. 2, 450.

41. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 9.

42. Haines, vol. 1 (1977 ed.), 242.

43. Yellowstone National Park, *The State of the Park* (Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyo.: National Park Service, 1999), 1–4.

44. Norris, *Annual Report for 1877*, 841.

45. Norris, *Annual Report for 1878*, 985.

46. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 13.

47. Ibid., 20.

48. Ibid., 13.

49. See Norris, *Annual Report for 1878*, 993, and *Annual Report for 1880*, 51–52.

50. Norris, *Annual Report for 1878*, 992.

51. Norris, *Annual Report for 1877*, 837.

52. Ibid., 843.

53. See the Rules and Regulations in Norris, *Annual Report for 1878*, 993.

54. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 21; Norris laid out

his plan in his *Annual Report for 1877*, 843.

55. Norris, *Annual Report for 1877*, 843.

56. Norris, *Annual Report for 1878*, 896–897.

57. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 20.

58. Ibid., 21.

59. Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 26.

60. Norris, *Annual Report for 1877*, 843, and *Annual Report for 1880*, 15.

61. Park appropriations were increased to \$15,000 in 1880 (Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 34).

62. Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 50.

63. Ibid.

64. Norris, *Annual Report for 1881*, 27, 62–63.

65. Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 20, 18–19, 7.

66. Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 35.

67. Ibid., 35.

68. Norris, *Annual Report for 1877*, 840.

69. Ibid., 842.

70. Norris, *Annual Report for 1878*, 981–983.

71. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 10.

72. Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 7, 36.

73. Norris, *Annual Report for 1881*, 7.

74. Norris found utensils, weapons, and other implements near the Indian-built game driveways leading into the canyons of the Clark’s Fork of the Yellowstone River and Crandall Creek. One stone vessel found in the upper Madison Canyon was eleven inches in diameter and ten inches in height; others were found in a burned area at the upper end of Pleasant Valley, at the head of Soda Butte Creek, and in an apparent ancient campsite on the eroded banks of Blacktail Deer Creek. Implements and arrowheads were found in various areas of the park. Norris found the recently constructed fortified camp (from 1877) of the Nez Perce to be of interest, as well as a corral just to the east of Mary’s Lake, another corral and breastworks between Mud Volcano and the Yellowstone River, and others near Pelican and Cache creeks (Norris, *Annual Report for 1881*, 36–38).

75. Norris, *Annual Report for 1881*, 32–47.

76. Ibid., 31.

77. Norris, *Annual Report for 1877*, 844.

78. Ibid., 845.

79. For a complete study of the road building projects undertaken by Norris and subsequent superintendents, see Mary Shivers Culpin, *The History of the Construction of the Road System in Yellowstone National Park, 1872–1966*, vol. 1 of *Historic Resource Study* (Selections for the Division of Cultural Resources, Rocky Mountain Region, National Park Service, 1994).

80. Norris, *Annual Report for 1878*, 986–987.

81. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 3–4. Philetus W. Norris to the Secretary of Interior Carl Schurz, October 1, 1879, microcopies of records of the National Archives, no. 62, roll 1, Yellowstone National Park Archives [hereafter YNPA].

82. Ibid., 4. Norris described the fence as having “posts sustained at an angle of some 60 degrees by smaller posts or legs through holes near the top, surmounted and faced by poles pinned or spiked horizontally upon them.”

83. Ibid., 5.

84. Ibid.; Norris to Schurz, Oct. 1, 1879, microcopies of records of the National Archives, no. 62, roll 1, YNPA.

85. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 4, 6, 9.

86. Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 4, 36–37.

87. Ibid.

88. Haines, vol. 1, 249.

89. Aubrey L. Haines, *Yellowstone Place Names: Mirrors of History* (Niwot, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1996), 138.

90. Norris, *Annual Report for 1881*, 69.

91. Norris, *The Calumet of the Coteau*, 252.

92. Lon Johnson, “Queen’s Laundry Bathhouse,” National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, February 1, 2001, Yellowstone Center for Resources [hereafter YCR], 5; W.W. Wylie, *The Yellowstone National Park, or the Great American Wonderland* (Kansas City, Mo.: Ramsey, Millett & Hudson, 1882), 26.

93. Johnson, “Queen’s Laundry Bathhouse.”

94. Johnson, “Queen’s Laundry Bathhouse,” 4.

95. Aubrey Haines to Chief Park Naturalist, Memorandum, March 17, 1964, in Queen’s Bathhouse Laundry, vertical files, YNPL.

96. Norris, *Annual Report for 1877*, 840.

97. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 7, 16.

98. Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 14–15.

99. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 7, 16.

100. Norris, *Annual Report for 1881*, 12, 68–70.

101. Norris, *Annual Report for 1879*, 30.

102. Norris, *Annual Report for 1880*, 14–15.

103. Ibid., 20.

104. Ibid., 20.

105. Ibid., 24.

106. Norris, *Annual Report for 1881*, 25–26.

107. Ibid., 74.

108. Haines, vol. 2, 449.

CHAPTER 2

1. Mary Shivers Culpin, “*For the Benefit and Enjoyment*

of the People.” *A History of Concession Development in Yellowstone National Park, 1872–1966* (Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: National Park Service/Yellowstone Center for Resources, YCR-CR-2003-01), 9.

2. Richard A. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1985), 235.

3. Ibid.

4. Hiram M. Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 5th ed. (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1905), 109.

5. Aubrey L. Haines, *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*, revised ed. (Niwot, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1996), vol. 2, 450–451, [hereafter Haines, vol. 1 or 2].

6. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 235–236.

7. Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 109.

8. Patrick H. Conger, *Report of the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park to the Secretary of the Interior 1882*, 9, hereafter *Annual Report for [year]*.

9. Conger, *Annual Report for 1882*, 8; “Congress Proposes to Check the Yellowstone National Park Grab,” *The American Field*, January 20, 1883. These reports by Generals Sheridan and Sackett were also directed at the 1882 lease of large areas in the park to the Yellowstone National Park Improvement Company.

10. Louis Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone National Park and Its Relation to National Park Policies* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1932), 60.

11. Haines, vol. 1, 268.

12. Ibid.

13. “Mr. Vest’s Victory,” *Forest and Stream* (March 8, 1883). Sundry Civil Bill for March 3, 1883, U.S. Stat. at Large, Vol. 22, 626.

14. Haines, vol. 1, 292.

15. As quoted in Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 242.

16. Haines, vol. 1, 293.

17. H. M. Teller to Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park [Robert E. Carpenter], September 29, 1884, document #1, letter box 1, item 1, Yellowstone National Park Archives [hereafter YNPA]; Secretary H. M. Teller to Mr. P. H. Conger, July 14, 1883, document #85, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

18. Haines, vol. 1, 299–300.

19. Acting Secretary M. L. Joslyn to the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park [Robert E. Carpenter], October 12, 1884, document #7, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

20. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 238;

Joslyn to Superintendent, October 12, 1884.

21. William Chambers, Jr., to Mr. Patrick H. Conger, March 20, 1884, document #1340, letter box 5, item 9, YNPA.

22. Lee H. Whittlesey, "The First National Park Interpreter: G. L. Henderson in Yellowstone, 1882–1902," *Montana the Magazine of Western History* 46(1) (Spring 1996): 26–41.

23. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 240. For more information on Henderson, see Whittlesey, "The First National Park Interpreter."

24. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 240.

25. Ibid., 241–242.

26. Ibid., 238; Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 113.

27. Conger, *Annual Report for 1883*, 5.

28. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 237–238.

29. Haines, vol. 1, 294.

30. James H. Dean to Maj. P. H. Conger, Supt., July 31, 1883, document #1368, letter box 5, item 9, YNPA.

31. E. I. Fish to Major Conger, May 12 [1884? See Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 252, note 17], document #1420, letter box 5, item 9, YNPA.

32. James H. Dean to Maj. P. H. Conger, Supt. Park, August 26, 1884, document #1355, letter box 5, item 9, YNPA.

33. Conger, *Annual Report for 1883*, 7.

34. James H. Dean to Maj. P. H. Conger, July 31, 1883.

35. Acting Secretary M. L. Joslyn to P. H. Conger, August 3, 1883, document #153, letter box 1, item 1, and Acting Secretary M. L. Joslyn to P. H. Conger, March 24, 1884, document #160, letter box 1, item 1, both in YNPA.

36. Secretary of the Interior Henry M. Teller to the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park [Patrick H. Conger], January 15, 1883, document #162, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

37. Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 112.

38. Conger, *Annual Report for 1883*, 3.

39. William Chambers to Maj. P. H. Conger, November 22, 1883, document #1345, letter box 5, item 9, YNPA.

40. E. I. Fish to Major Conger, May 12, [1884?].

41. Haines, vol. 1, 264. For a full account of all issues and events related to the history of concessions in Yellowstone, see Culpin, "For the Benefit and Enjoyment of the People."

42. General Philip H. Sheridan, as quoted in Haines, vol. 1, 263.

43. Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone*, 42.

44. Patrick H. Conger to Secretary of the Interior [Henry M. Teller], March 7, 1883, document #164, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

45. Conger, *Annual Report for 1883*, 3–4, 6.

46. Haines, vol. 1, 291.

47. Ibid.

48. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 243.

49. Haines, vol. 1, 305.

50. P. H. Conger to the Secretary of the Interior, January 5, 1884, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 2, YNPA.

51. Haines, vol. 1, 314.

52. Conger, *Annual Report for 1882*, 4, 5, 6. For more details on road work during this period and for all other periods, see Mary Shivers Culpin, *The History of the Construction of the Road System in Yellowstone National Park, 1872–1966*, vol. 1 of *Historic Resource Study* (Selections for the Division of Cultural Resources, Rocky Mountain Region, National Park Service, 1994).

53. Haines, vol. 1, 262–263.

54. Conger, *Annual Report for 1882*, 3.

55. Ibid., 6–7.

56. Ibid., 7.

57. Ibid.

58. Conger, *Annual Report for 1883*, 3.

59. Ibid., 5, 6.

60. Conger, *Annual Report for 1882*, 8.

61. Secretary of the Interior Henry M. Teller to Mr. P. H. Conger, July 14, 1883, document #85, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

62. Conger, *Annual Report for 1883*, 5.

63. M. L. Joslyn, Acting Secretary of the Interior, to Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park [Robert E. Carpenter], October 30, 1884, document #30, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

64. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 238.

65. Haines, vol. 1, 300.

66. Conger, as quoted in Aubrey L. Haines, Charles S. Pope, and Erwin N. Thompson, "Norris Soldier Station, Yellowstone National Park: Historic Structures Report," Sept. 1969, 8, vertical files, YNPL.

67. Haines, vol. 1, 300, and M. L. Joslyn to Superintendent, October 30, 1884.

68. *Livingston Enterprise*, July 5, 1884, as quoted in Haines et al., "Norris Soldier Station," 8.

69. Apparently Robert Carpenter, Conger's replacement, wrote to the Interior Department asking for permission and funding to build three cabins for "the comfort of the Assistant Superintendents": "one at the Upper Geyser Basin, one

near Marshall's Hotel and the third at Soda Butte." In a return letter to Carpenter, Joslyn wrote: "A letter was addressed to the Superintendent [Conger] April 18, 1884, approving the plan [Conger's plan to build "a sufficient number of cabins, at such points as they might be required for the use of the assistants"]. The Department has not since been advised whether any of the buildings contemplated in the correspondence referred to were ever erected" (Joslyn to Superintendent, October 30, 1884).

70. P. H. Conger to Lt. Dan Kingman, November 7, 1883, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 2, YNPA.

71. Lt. Dan Kingman to P. H. Conger, November 19, 1883, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 2, YNPA.

72. P. H. Conger to Secretary of the Interior, December 2, 1883, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 2, YNPA.

73. Secretary of the Interior Henry M. Teller to P. H. Conger, April 18, 1884, document #26, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

74. Secretary of the Interior [Henry M. Teller] to P. H. Conger, Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park, April 29, 1882, document #112, letter box 1, item 1, and H. L. Muldrow, First Assistant Secretary of the Interior to the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park [David W. Wear], February 18, 1886, document #110, letter box 1, item 1, both in YNPA.

75. Conger, *Annual Report for 1882*, 6.

76. "Report on the National Park," February 4, 1884, *Livingston Daily Enterprise*, 1.

77. M. L. Joslyn, Acting Secretary of the Interior to P. H. Conger, Superintendent National Park, August 3, 1883, document #153, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

78. "Major Conger strenuously denies. . .," February 4, 1884, *Daily Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), 2.

79. Haines, vol. 2, 451.

80. M. L. Joslyn to Superintendent, October 30, 1884.

81. Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park*, 113.

82. See Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 243–244, and Haines, vol. 1, 315–318.

83. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 243.

84. Acting Secretary M. L. Joslyn to Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park [Robert Carpenter], November 6, 1884, document #156, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

85. Haines, vol. 2, 452.

86. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 244; Senator George Vest to Secretary of the Interior Lucius Lamar, April 14, 1885, as quoted in Bartlett, 244.

87. Arnold Hague to Senator George Vest, December 28, 1883, folder "Records Relating to Yellowstone National Park," box 63, entry 4[?], record group 57, National Archives. Copy in folder "History—Boundaries," Marcy Culpin's files, Historian's Office, Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center, Yellowstone National Park, Montana.

88. John W. Powell to the Secretary of the Interior, May 9, 1885, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 5, YNPA.

89. Powell to the Secretary, May 9, 1885.

90. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 244.

91. David W. Wear, *Annual Report for 1885*, 3.

92. *Weekly* (Livingston) *Enterprise*, Livingston, Mont., June 1885, as quoted in Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 244.

93. From *Laws Appertaining to the Yellowstone National Park* as quoted in Haines, vol. 1, 312.

94. J. W. Weimer to the Hon. Supt. N. Park [P. H. Conger], August 29, 1884, document #1585, letter box 5, item 9, YNPA.

95. Haines, vol. 1, 313.

96. "The New Park Superintendent," *Livingston Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), June 6, 1885, 3.

97. [Editorial], *Livingston Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), May 30, 1885, 2.

98. From a series of letters by David Wear to Secretary of the Interior Lucius Lamar, in July and September 1885, as quoted in Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 244 and 254 (note 37).

99. Wear, *Annual Report for 1885*, 3.

100. L. Q. C. Lamar to D. W. Wear, August 26, 1885, document #3, letter box 1, item 1, YNPA.

101. Haines, vol. 1, 320.

102. *Ibid.*

103. *Livingston Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), November 7, 1885, as quoted in Haines, vol. 1, 321.

104. Wear, *Annual Report for 1885*, 3, 4.

105. *Ibid.*, 4.

106. Henry Page to Secretary of the Interior, August 30, 1885; D. W. Wear to the Secretary of the Interior, December 10, 1885, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 63, roll 3, YNPA.

107. R. E. Carpenter to Secretary of the Interior, January 15, 1885, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 4, YNPA.

108. Wear, *Annual Report for 1885*, 3, 4.

109. *Ibid.*, 4.

110. *Ibid.*, 5.

111. W. Hallett Phillips to Secretary of the Interior,

December 12, 1885, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 63, roll 3, YNPA.

112. *Livingston Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), August 29, 1885, as quoted in Haines, vol. 1, 322.

113. Haines, vol. 1, 323; also see Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 247–248.

114. “An unextinguished campfire,” *Livingston Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), August 29, 1885, 3; Haines, vol. 1, 321.

115. “An unextinguished campfire,” *Livingston Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), August 29, 1885, 3.

116. “Noticed in the Park,” *Livingston Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), September 19, 1885, 1.

117. Ibid.

118. Haines, vol. 2, 4.

119. Haines, vol. 1, 324–325.

120. “Delegate Toole Returns,” *Livingston Enterprise* (Livingston, Mont.), August 14, 1885, 2.

121. A. B. Freeze to Secretary of the Interior L. Lamar, March 29, 1886, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 5, YNPA; Haines, vol. 2, 58.

122. Wear, *Annual Report for 1885*, 5.

123. “Mr. Hague on the Park,” *Forest and Stream* (February 25, 1896). More information regarding efforts toward the park’s enlargement can be found in Mary Shivers Culpin, “Yellowstone and Its Borders: A Significant Influence Toward the Creation of the First Forest Reserve,” *The Origins of the National Forests* (Durham, North Carolina: Forest History Society, 1992), 276–287.

124. Haines, vol. 1, 323.

125. Many historians have speculated about this connection between the protection of Yellowstone and the degradation of Niagara Falls. Landscape architect Ethan Carr, for example, refers to Niagara Falls’s “descent into a commercialized attraction.” Ethan Carr, *Wilderness By Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 42.

126. House Report 1076, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, as quoted in Cramton, *Early History of Yellowstone*, 44.

127. First Assistant Secretary of the Interior to Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, March 6, 1886; Acting Secretary of the Interior to Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, June 8, 1886, both microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 6, YNPA.

CHAPTER 3

1. Arnold Hague, “The Yellowstone National Park,”

Scribner’s Magazine 35 (May 1904): 527.

2. Secretary of the Interior to Secretary of War, August 6, 1886, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 6; Lt. Gen. P. H. Sheridan to Secretary of War, August 9, 1886, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 3, both in Yellowstone National Park Archives [hereafter YNPA]. For good accounts of this period, see H. Duane Hampton, *How the U.S. Cavalry Saved Our National Parks* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1971); Aubrey L. Haines, *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*, revised ed. (Niwot, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1996), vol. 2, chapter 12 [hereafter Haines, vol. 1 or 2]; and Richard A. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1985), chapter 9.

3. Captain Moses Harris, *Report of the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park to the Secretary of the Interior, 1889*, 11, hereafter *Annual Report for [year]*.

4. Haines, vol. 2, 4.

5. Ibid., 453.

6. Hampton, *How the U.S. Cavalry Saved Our National Parks*, 94. Harris, *Annual Report for 1888*, 3.

7. As quoted in Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 259.

8. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 14.

9. Haines, vol. 2, 454. For a detailed discussion of these issues, see Haines, vol. 2, chapter 1, 19–21.

10. Ibid., 454–455.

11. Ibid., 455.

12. David G. Battle and Erwin N. Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone: Historic Structures Report* (Denver: National Park Service, 1972), 14.

13. Ibid.

14. Haines, vol. 2, 457.

15. Arnold Hague to H. Muldrow, September 21, 1886, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 3, YNPA.

16. H. Muldrow to Captain Moses Harris, September 30, 1886, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 3, YNPA.

17. Captain Moses Harris to Acting Secretary of the Interior H. Muldrow, October 8, 1886, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 3, YNPA.

18. Lee Whittlesey, personal communication, November 18, 2003.

19. Haines, vol. 2, 6. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 11, 12. Captain Moses Harris to Adjutant General, [?] 3, 1886, consolidated file “Fort Sheridan–Camp Sheridan,” box 1026, Record Group [hereafter RG] 92, National Archives; Capt. Moses Harris, “Inspection Report of Camp Sheridan made the

- 5th day of August, 1887, by Captain Moses Harris, 1st Cavalry," box 117, entry 464, RG 94, National Archives. Copies of both in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1892–1900," Marcy Culpin's files [hereafter Culpin's files], Historian's Office, Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center, Yellowstone National Park, Montana [hereafter HRC].
20. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 5.
 21. Memorandum from Moses Harris, May 18, 1887, box 117, entry 464, RG 94, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1892–1900," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 22. Edwin C. Mason, Acting Inspector General, to the Adjutant General, September 8, 1887, box 117, entry 464, RG 94, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1892–1900," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 23. Harris, "Inspection Report of Camp Sheridan," August, 5, 1887.
 24. Mason to the Adjutant General, September 8, 1887.
 25. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 4.
 26. Harris, *Annual Report for 1886*, 11.
 27. *Ibid.*, 13.
 28. Harris, *Annual Report for 1889*, 11.
 29. *Ibid.*, 11–12.
 30. G. Chandler, Acting Secretary of the Department of the Interior, to Captain F. A. Boutelle, Acting Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, October 23, 1890, document # 217, letter box 1, item 2, YNPA.
 31. Quartermaster, U.S.A., Chief Quartermaster to Quartermaster General, U.S. Army, February 25, 1890, consolidated file "Fort Sheridan—Camp Sheridan," box 1026, RG 92, National Archives. Copy in folder "Camp Sheridan—General Correspondence, 1883–1891," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 32. Thomas H. Ruger, Brigadier General, Commanding to the Adjutant General, U. S. Army, January 16, 1891, document #301, letter box 1, item 2, YNPA.
 33. *Ibid.*
 34. *Ibid.*
 35. John W. Noble to Secretary of War, February 27, 1891, consolidated file "Fort Sheridan—Camp Sheridan," box 1026, RG 92, National Archives. Copy in folder "Camp Sheridan—General Correspondence, 1883–1891," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 36. Haines, vol. 2, 454.
 37. *Ibid.*, 162.
 38. G. H. Sands, 1st Lieutenant, to the Secretary of the Interior, February 16, 1891, as quoted in Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 9.
 39. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 9.
 40. R. Laurie Simmons and Thomas H. Simmons, National Historic Landmark Nomination: Fort Yellowstone, Draft, May 10, 2000, 5.
 41. Simmons and Simmons, National Historic Landmark Nomination, 5.
 42. George Anderson, *Annual Report for 1892*, 5, and Captain George Anderson to Adjutant General, August 13, 1892, box 117, entry 464, RG 94, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1892–1900," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC. *See also* Assistant Adjutant General to Captain George Anderson, June 16, 1892; Captain George Anderson to Adjutant General, August 13, 1892; and Assistant Adjutant General Indorsement, September 16 1892; all in box 117, entry 464, RG 94, National Archives. Copies in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1892–1900," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 43. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 11.
 44. Simmons and Simmons, National Historic Landmark Nomination, 5.
 45. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 13.
 46. Captain George Anderson to Adjutant General, U.S. Army, April 10, 1894, and Adjutant General to Commanding Officer, Department of Dakota, May 2, 1894, both in box 117, entry 464, RG 94, National Archives. Copies in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1892–1900," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 47. Simmons and Simmons, National Historic Landmark Nomination, 6.
 48. Oscar J. Brown, *Annual Report for 1899*, 9.
 49. *Ibid.*
 50. John Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1901*, 7.
 51. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 34.
 52. *Ibid.*, 15. For a thorough discussion of the engineer officer's involvement in the construction of the roads and bridges in Yellowstone National Park, *see* Mary Shivers Culpin, *The History of the Construction of the Road System in Yellowstone National Park, 1872–1966, Historic Resource Study* volume 1 (Denver: National Park Service, 1994).
 53. Hiram Martin Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park: Historical and Descriptive*, 5th ed. (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1905), 278.
 54. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1901*, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 11.
 55. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 36. Chittenden served two tours of duty in the park. The first ran from 1891 to 1892; the second from 1899 to 1906 (Haines,

vol. 2, 465).

56. Linda Flint McClelland, *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 47.

57. Haines, vol. 2, 165.

58. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 16.

59. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1902*, 13.

60. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 35.

61. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1902*, 12, 13.

62. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1903*, 3, 4, 8.

63. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1904*, 11.

64. Haines, vol. 2, 165.

65. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1902*, 4, 13.

66. Simmons and Simmons, National Historic Landmark Nomination, 7.

67. Battle and Thompson (*Fort Yellowstone*, 7) wrote, "Unfortunately, despite an intensive search of written documents and maps, it has not been possible to prove by historical methods that the house he planned is the building standing."

68. Hiram Martin Chittenden, "Improvement of Yellowstone National Park." Appendix GGG of the *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army Upon the Construction, Repair, and Maintenance of Roads and Bridges in the Yellowstone National Park* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903), 2889.

69. Chittenden, "Improvement," 2889.

70. This excerpt was taken from Roosevelt's complete speech as it appeared in Lee H. Whittlesey and Paul Schullery, "The Roosevelt Arch: A Centennial History of an American Icon," *Yellowstone Science* 11(3) (Summer 2003): 2–24.

71. Acting Superintendent Pitcher referred to the arch as Roosevelt Arch in his *Annual Report for 1905*, page 3.

72. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1903*, 7.

73. Chittenden, "Improvement," 2890.

74. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1904*, 3, 11. Major Hiram Chittenden to Major John Pitcher, June 1, 1904, document #7988, letter box 15, item 29, YNPA.

75. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1905*, 3.

76. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 61.

77. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1906*, 5.

78. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1902*, 5; Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1903*, 4.

79. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1904*, 9–10.

80. Ibid.

81. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1905*, 10. Pitcher used the statistic of 4,000 visitors in 1892, but Aubrey Haines listed the visitation number for 1892 at 7,290 (Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1906*, 9; Haines, vol. 2, 478).

82. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1903*, 4.

83. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 19.

84. Ibid., 15, 19–20.

85. Major W. E. Wieden [?], Assistant Adjutant General, to the Commanding Officer, Fort Yellowstone, October 13, 1904, box 1, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1904–1907," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

86. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District, *Context Study of the United States Quartermaster General Standardized Plans, 1866–1942*. November 1972 [hereafter *Context Study*].

87. Ibid., 31.

88. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 231.

89. Ibid., 15.

90. Captain Moses Harris to H. Muldrow, September 1, 1886, microcopies of records in the National Archives, no. 62, roll 3, YNPA.

91. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 3, 28; Haines, vol. 2, 6, 11.

92. Harris, *Annual Report for 1886*, 6.

93. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 15. For information on Wilson, see Haines, vol. 2, 448.

94. Haines, vol. 2, 448. Harris's men went on daily patrols from each station, usually under the direction of the park scout. Even with the help of these guides, Harris felt the available force was inadequate for protecting the park, and hoped to supplement his one troop of cavalry with the addition of a company of infantry and two more scouts (Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 12).

95. According to Robert Flather, retired park ranger and authority on snowshoe cabins in the park, six cabins were authorized, but only five were built under contract to Lawrence Link of Gardiner, Montana. Robert Flather, personal interview, October 2003.

96. John Noble, Secretary of the Interior, to Capt. F. A. Boutelle, Acting Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park, September 25, 1890, document #236, letter box 1, item 2, YNPA.

97. George Smith Anderson, *Annual Report for 1891*, 4, 5.

98. Ibid., and Anderson, *Annual Report for 1892*, 5. See also Captain George Anderson to Adjutant General, August 13, 1892, box 117, entry 464, RG 94, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1892–1900," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

99. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1893*, 7.

100. Haines, vol. 2, 191.

101. Lieutenant Colonel 6th Cavalry, Acting Inspector

General, to Inspector General, U.S. Army, August 30, 1899, 2, file "Fort Yellowstone," box 1269, RG 92, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1892–1900," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

102. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1894*, 6.

103. Ibid., 6.

104. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1895*, 7.

105. Ibid.

106. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1894*, 8–9.

107. Samuel B. M. Young, *Annual Report for 1897*, 7.

108. Col. S. B. M. Young to Secretary of the Interior, July 10, 1897, Item 218, Letters Sent, July 24, 1896–October 1, 1897, YNPA.

109. Station logs are still kept, but rangers are no longer required to submit monthly reports.

110. Young to Secretary of the Interior, July 10, 1897.

111. James B. Erwin, *Annual Report for 1898*, 6.

112. Oscar J. Brown, *Annual Report for 1899*, 3.

113. Ibid., 9.

114. It is unclear if Brown used the snowshoe cabin at Hellroaring Creek as his "new station." He could have adjusted the number of men at the cabin and decided to keep it manned year round (Brown, *Annual Report for 1899*, 4, 13).

115. Oscar J. Brown, *Annual Report for 1899*, 4.

116. Ibid.

117. Brown listed the routes soldiers were to take from the various stations in Brown, *Annual Report for 1899*, 12–13. According to a Yellowstone National Park and Forest Reserve map by the U.S. Geological Survey for 1900, there were twenty-one snowshoe cabins in 1900. A copy of the map can be found in the original bound copies of *Annual Reports* vol. 5, 1895–1900, YNPL.

118. George W. Goode, *Annual Report for 1900*, 4, 8.

119. Ibid.

120. John Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1901*, 10.

121. Chittenden, "Improvement Yellowstone National Park," in Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1901*, 11.

122. Chittenden, "Improvement Yellowstone National Park," in Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1902*, 14.

123. Chittenden, "Statement of Work Done During Year 1903, Improvement of Yellowstone National Park," in Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1903*, 9.

124. Captain Hiram Chittenden to Major John Pitcher, September 28, 1903, document #6049, letter box 12, item 24, YNPA.

125. Robert Flather, written correspondence with author, June 9, 2003.

126. Chittenden, "Improvement of Yellowstone Na-

tional Park," in Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1905*, 13; Chittenden, "Improvement Yellowstone National Park," in Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1904*, 13; Major Hiram Chittenden to Major John Pitcher, June 1, 1904, document #7988, letter box 15, item 29, YNPA.

127. Wieden [?] to Commanding Officer, October 13, 1904.

128. Albert [?], Military Secretary, to Commanding Officer, Fort Yellowstone, September 13, 1905, box 1, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1904–1907," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

129. John H. Dean, Assistant Superintendent, to Maj. P. H. Conger, Superintendent, July 31, 1883, document #1368, letter box 5, item 9, YNPA.

130. Harris, *Annual Report for 1886*, 6.

131. Ibid., 8.

132. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 14.

133. Harris, *Annual Report for 1886*, 6.

134. Harris, *Annual Report for 1889*, 10.

135. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 12.

136. Harris, *Annual Report for 1889*, 7.

137. Ibid.

138. Harris, *Annual Report for 1888*, 13.

139. Haines, vol. 2, 54. For an excellent discussion of the wildlife policies of this period, see Haines, *The Yellowstone Story*, vol. 2, chapter 14, and Paul Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone: Ecology and Wonder in the Last Wilderness* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997), chapter 7.

140. Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone*, 113.

141. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 12, 13.

142. Harris, *Annual Report for 1888*, 6.

143. As quoted in Hampton, *How the U.S. Cavalry Saved Our National Parks*, 91.

144. Ibid.

145. Frazier A. Boutelle, *Supplemental Report of the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1889), 21, 22.

146. Frazier A. Boutelle, *Annual Report for 1890*, 5.

147. Ibid., 6.

148. Boutelle, *Supplemental Report*, 22.

149. Boutelle, *Annual Report for 1890*, 7.

150. Boutelle, *Supplemental Report*, 22.

151. Boutelle, *Annual Report for 1890*, 6.

152. John W. Noble, Secretary of the Interior, to Capt. F. A. Boutelle, Acting Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, August 25, 1890, document #271, letter box 1, item 2, YNPA.

153. John W. Noble, Secretary of the Interior, to Capt.

F. A. Boutelle, Acting Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park, December 12, 1890, document #265, letter box 1, item 2, YNPA.

154. James A. Pritchard, *Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions: Science and the Perception of Nature* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 24.

155. Haines, vol. 2, 89.

156. Boutelle, *Annual Report for 1889*, 22, 23.

157. See Paul Schullery, *Searching For Yellowstone*; John D. Varley and Paul Schullery, *Freshwater Wilderness* (Yellowstone Park: Yellowstone Library and Museum Association, 1983).

158. Boutelle, *Annual Report for 1890*, 7, 8.

159. Boutelle, *Supplemental Report*, 23.

160. Boutelle, *Annual Report for 1890*, 11.

161. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1891*, 8.

162. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1892*, 7, 9.

163. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1894*, 9–10.

164. From the Lacey Act and the “Rules and Regulations of the Yellowstone Park” by Secretary of the Interior Michael Hoke Smith, as printed in Anderson, *Annual Report for 1894*, 12–15.

165. Anderson was also pleased by the entertainment value of the park's bears. While he found bears troublesome, they “are not in the least dangerous,” he noted in 1892, and again in 1895. In fact, he found their presence near the hotels to be “a source of great amusement.” Anderson, *Annual Report for 1892*, 10, and *Annual Report for 1895*, 13.

166. John W. Noble, Secretary of the Interior, to Captain George Anderson, June 13, 1892, document #371, letter box 1, item 2, YNPA.

167. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1893*, 14, and *Annual Report for 1894*, 11.

168. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1892*, 10.

169. Ibid.

170. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1895*, 13.

171. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1896*, 13.

172. Ibid., 12.

173. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1894*, 8.

174. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1895*, 11.

175. “Instructions to Persons Traveling Through Yellowstone National Park,” in Young, *Annual Report for 1897*, 17.

176. Haines, vol. 2, 91.

177. Schullery, *Searching For Yellowstone*, 166.

178. Ibid., 253.

179. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1895*, 6–7.

180. Young, “Supplemental Report,” *Annual Report for 1897*, 23.

181. Young, *Annual Report for 1897*, 9.

182. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1904*, 7.

183. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1905*, 9.

184. Young, “Supplemental Report,” *Annual Report for 1897*, 25.

185. James B. Erwin, *Annual Report for 1898*, 13.

186. Haines, vol. 2, 92.

187. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1903*, 4.

188. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1906*, 9–10.

189. Young, *Annual Report for 1897*, 8.

190. Elmer Lindsley [“report regarding the fishes, birds, and animals in the park”], in Young, *Annual Report for 1897*, 27.

191. Erwin, *Annual Report for 1898*, 11.

192. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1901*, 6.

193. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1902*, 9.

194. Haines, vol. 2, 72–74. For more information on Buffalo Jones, see Paul Schullery, “Buffalo Jones and the Bison Herd in Yellowstone,” *Montana the Magazine of Western History* 26(3) (July 1976): 40–51.

195. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1902*, 10.

196. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1906*, 8–9.

197. Ibid., 5.

198. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1905*, 6.

199. Ibid.

200. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1902*, 7.

201. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 14–15.

202. Harris, *Annual Report for 1888*, 14–15.

203. George W. Goode, Second Lieutenant First Cavalry, Post Adjutant, Orders No. 37 as given in Section E of Harris's *Annual Report for 1887*, 28.

204. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 8.

205. Harris, *Annual Report for 1889*, 12.

206. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1895*, 4, and Anderson, *Annual Report for 1896*, 5.

207. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1894*, 12.

208. Director, U.S. Geological Survey to Secretary of the Interior, September 3, 1897, box 54, entry 1, RG 57[?], National Archives. Copy of cover letter in folder “History—Boundaries,” Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

209. Erwin, *Annual Report for 1898*, 4–6.

210. Noble to Anderson, June 13, 1892.

211. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1894*, 4.

212. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1895*, 4.

213. Anderson, *Annual Report for 1896*, 3–4.

214. Young, *Annual Report for 1897*, 4–5, 17.

215. Young, “Supplemental Report,” in *Annual Report for 1897*, 23.

216. Erwin, *Annual Report for 1898*, 6.

217. Ibid., 6–8.

218. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1906*, 12.
219. Young, "Supplemental Report," in *Annual Report for 1897*, 24.
220. Director, U.S. Geological Survey to Secretary of the Interior, September 3, 1897.
221. Goode, *Annual Report for 1900*, 10–11.
222. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1904*, 13.
223. Ibid.
224. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1906*, 14, 15.
225. Ibid.
226. Ibid., 14.
227. Ibid., 12.
228. Ibid., 14.
229. Noble to Anderson, June 13, 1892.
230. Pitcher, *Annual Report for 1906*, 12.
231. Harris, *Annual Report for 1887*, 24.

CHAPTER 4

1. Hiram M. Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park: Historical and Descriptive*, 5th ed. (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1905), 115.
2. Samuel B. M. Young, *Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park to the Secretary of the Interior, 1907*, 24–26, hereafter *Annual Report for [year]*.
3. Aubrey L. Haines, *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*, revised ed. (Niwot, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1996), vol. 2, 457 [hereafter Haines, vol. 1 or 2].
4. Haines, vol. 2, 458.
5. See Haines, vol. 2, chapter 9, "Enter the Rangers," and H. Duane Hampton, *How the U.S. Cavalry Saved Our National Parks* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), chapter 9, "The Culmination of an Idea."
6. See chapter 3 of this document.
7. Young, *Annual Report for 1907*, 25.
8. Ibid.
9. Horace M. Albright, Acting Director of the National Park Service, memorandum to Secretary of the Interior, September 24, 1917, folder "Troops in Park," box 253, entry 6, record group [hereafter RG] 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "History—Military—1917–1921," Marcy Culpin's files [hereafter Culpin's files], Historian's Office, Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center, Yellowstone National Park, Montana [hereafter HRC].
10. Hampton, *How the U.S. Cavalry Saved Our National Parks*, 176.
11. Young, *Annual Report for 1907*, 25.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., 26.
14. Ibid.
15. Hampton, *How the U.S. Cavalry Saved Our National Parks*, 175–176.
16. [Major General J. F.] Bell, Chief of Staff, to General S. B. M. Young, January 18, 1908, folder "Fort Yellowstone," box 218, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1908–1910," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
17. S. B. M. Young to Maj. Gen. J. F. Bell, U.S. Army, Chief of Staff, January 31, 1908, folder "Fort Yellowstone," box 218, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1908–1910," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
18. Lieut. Gen. U.S. Army, retired, S. B. M. Young, to James Rudolph Garfield, Secretary of the Interior, February 1, 1908, folder "Fort Yellowstone," box 218, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1908–1910," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
19. Alexander Lambert to Theodore Roosevelt, September 9, 1908, folder "Troops," box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.
20. Young, *Annual Report for 1908*, 14.
21. Alexander Lambert to Secretary of the Interior James Garfield, September 29, 1908, box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.
22. James Garfield, *Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1909* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909), 42.
23. Haines, vol. 2, 457.
24. Robert Shaw [?], Acting Secretary of War, to Secretary of the Interior, December 6, 1909, folder "Fort Yellowstone Military Post," box 218, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1908–1910," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
25. Congressman Harry Coudrey to Secretary of the Interior Richard Ballinger, April 11, 1910, and Secretary of the Interior Richard Ballinger to Congressman Harry Coudrey, April 13, 1910, both in box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.
26. Secretary of the Interior to Secretary of War, April 13, 1910, box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives; Secretary of War to Secretary of the Interior, April 28, 1910, file "Troops: Required in Park and Use of," box A-7, Yellowstone National Park Archives [hereafter YNPA].
27. Acting Secretary of the Interior to Secretary of the Interior, August 12, 1910; Secretary of the Interior to R. B. Marshall, August 31, 1910; Telegram from Richard Ballinger

to Frank Pierce, August 25, 1910, all in folder "Troops," box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.

28. Ibid.

29. M. J. V. to George Ward, April 4, 1911, and George Ward to Comptroller of the Treasury, June 21, 1911, both in folder "Troops," box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.

30. Linda Flint McClelland, *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 8, and Haines, vol. 2, 284.

31. Haines, vol. 2, 284; Ethan Carr, *Wilderness By Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 70.

32. "Introduction," *Proceedings of the National Park Conference Held at Yellowstone National Park September 11 and 12, 1911* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1912), 1.

33. "Remarks by Lieutenant Colonel L. M. Brett, Acting Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park," *Proceedings of the National Park Conference Held at Yellowstone National Park September 11 and 12, 1911* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1912), 154–155.

34. As quoted in Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 72.

35. Haines, vol. 2, 284.

36. *Proceedings of the National Park Conference Held at the Yellowstone National Park, September 11 and 12, 1911* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912); Lt. Col. L. M. Brett, *Annual Report for 1912*, 15.

37. Brett, *Annual Report for 1912*, 15.

38. Brett, *Annual Report for 1915*, 30.

39. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 72–73.

40. By 1913, there were eleven national parks: Yosemite (1890), Sequoia (1890), General Grant (1890), Mount Rainier (1899), Crater Lake (1902), and Wind Cave, Sully's Hill, Platt, Mesa Verde, and Glacier (1910).

41. Department of the Interior, 1913 Annual Reports, as quoted in Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 73 and note 66, 323.

42. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 73.

43. Col. L. M. Brett to Adolph Miller, Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, October 21, 1913; Telegram from Adolph Miller, Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, October 25, 1913; Adolph Miller to Col. L. M. Brett, October 28, 1913, all in box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.

44. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 73.

45. Ibid., 74.

46. Adolph Miller, Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to Secretary of War, March 21, 1914, file "Troops: Required in Park and Use of," box A-7, YNPA.

47. Secretary of War Lindley Garrison to Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane, May 1, 1914, file "Troops: Required in Park and Use of," box A-7, YNPA.

48. Secretary of War Lindley Garrison to Hon. J. J. Fitzgerald, January 30, 1915, file "Troops: Required in Park and Use of," box A-7, YNPA.

49. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 74.

50. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 124.

51. Stephen Mather to Col. L. M. Brett, May 20, 1915, and Col. L. M. Brett to Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane, May 26, 1915, both in file "1913–1915," letter box 41, item 87, YNPA. H. M. Albright to Col. L. M. Brett, June 4, 1915, file "Employees, Assistants Secretary of the Interior," letter box 60, item 102A, Employees, Assistants Secretary of the Interior, YNPA.

52. Stephen Mather to Col. L. M. Brett, December 28, 1915, file "1913–1915," letter box 41, item 87, YNPA.

53. Haines, vol. 2, 287.

54. As quoted in *ibid.*, 289.

55. Ibid., 286.

56. Ibid., 287.

57. Ibid., 286.

58. Hampton, *How the U.S. Cavalry Saved Our National Parks*, 178–179.

59. *Annual Report of the Superintendent of National Parks to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1916* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1916), 13–14, hereafter *Director's Report for [year]*.

60. Memorandum from J. Cotter to Stephen Mather, April 14, 1916, folder "Troops," box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.

61. Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane to Secretary of War Newton Baker, July 18, 1916, and Secretary of War Newton Baker to Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane, July 20, 1916, both in file "Troops: Required in Park and Use of," box A-7, YNPA.

62. Memorandum from Adjutant General W. M. Wright to Commanding General, Western Department, August 1, 1916, folder "Inspections & Investigations," box 218, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives; Franklin Lane to Newton Baker, June 15, 1917, folder "Troops in Park," box 253, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "History Military—1917–1921," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC; and Robert Marshall to Stephen Mather, September 7, 1916, file "Troops Required and Use of," box A-7, YNPA.

63. Acting Secretary of the Interior to Secretary of War, September 11, 1916, folder "Inspections & Investigations," box 218, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.

64. David G. Battle and Erwin N. Thompson, *Fort*

Yellowstone: Historic Structures Report (Denver: National Park Service, 1972), 23.

65. *Ibid.*, 239.

66. *Context Study of the United States Quartermaster General Standardized Plans, 1866–1942* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District, 1997), 40.

67. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 82.

68. *Context Study*, 227.

69. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 81; *Context Study*, 227.

70. *Context Study*, 227.

71. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 81.

72. As quoted in *ibid.*, 93–94.

73. *Ibid.*, 94.

74. *Context Study*, 39.

75. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 94.

76. *Ibid.*, 88.

77. *Ibid.*, 223–224.

78. *Ibid.*, 245–246.

79. *Ibid.*, 27, 151–152.

80. *Context Study*, 39.

81. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 140.

82. Aubrey L. Haines, *A History of the Yellowstone National Park Chapel* (Yellowstone National Park, 1963), 3–7.

83. Clement Ucker, “Report of the Chief Clerk of the Department on the Yellowstone National Park, September 22, 1910,” folder “Inspections and Investigations,” box 218, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.

84. *Context Study*, 204–205.

85. Haines, *A History of the Yellowstone National Park Chapel*, 7–8.

86. Battle and Thompson, *Fort Yellowstone*, 159.

87. Major W. H. Gordon, Inspector General, to Commanding Officer, May 19, 1911, folder “Inspection of Post,” box 15, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder “Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

88. L. M. Brett to [Inspector General?], [May 1911?], folder “Inspection of Post,” box 15, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder “Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

89. Robert L. Louwburg [?], 2nd Lieutenant, 1st Cavalry, Adjutant, “Re new bakery and riding hall,” folder “Buildings new, #942,” box 15, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder “Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

90. Robert L. Louwburg [?], 2nd Lieutenant, 1st Cavalry, Adjutant, “Report of irregularities and deficiencies noted by Major Alonzo Gray, I.G., during recent inspection

of post,” September 16, 1912, III Quartermaster’s Department: #62, folder 1156, box 16, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder “Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

91. Ucker, “Report of the Chief Clerk, September 22, 1910.”

92. Colonel L. M. Brett to Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane, November 4, 1913, folder “Accommodations at Hotel and Camps, 1901–1917,” box 20, item 39, YNPA.

93. Superintendent Young to the Secretary of the Interior, December 14, 1908, document #8249, letter box 15, item 29, YNPA.

94. R. Laurie Simmons and Thomas H. Simmons, Draft “National Historic Landmark Nomination Fort Yellowstone,” May 10, 2000, 21. Copy available in YNPA and YCR.

95. According to retired park service ranger Robert Flather, the cabin at Buffalo Lake was built earlier than 1912, but the exact date is not known. The cabin, he writes, was in existence by August 1911, according to the Bechler Station Log. Flather claims that the Buffalo Lake cabin is the “oldest existing snowshoe cabin still serving its original purpose.” “The oldest cabin is what is now the Hellroaring barn built in Oct. 1898.” Quotes are from Flather’s unpublished comments, dated June 9, 2003, located in folder “Slough Creek,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

96. Aubrey L. Haines, Charles S. Pope and Erwin N. Thompson, *Norris Soldier Station, Yellowstone National Park: Historic Structures Report* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1969), 30.

97. See chapter 2 of this document.

98. Haines et al., *Norris Soldier Station*, 20.

99. *Ibid.*, 26.

100. Simmons and Simmons, Draft “National Historic Landmark Nomination Fort Yellowstone,” 19.

101. Haines et al., *Norris Soldier Station*, 31.

102. Simmons and Simmons, Draft “National Historic Landmark Nomination Fort Yellowstone,” 19, note 29.

103. As quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 434.

104. *Ibid.*, 103.

105. Simmons and Simmons, Draft “National Historic Landmark Nomination Fort Yellowstone,” 19–20.

106. *Ibid.*, 20.

107. *Ibid.*, 20–21.

108. Young, *Annual Report for 1907*, 8.

109. This according to Robert Flather, retired park ranger, who has studied the park’s soldier stations and snowshoe cabins extensively, from a personal interview with Flather in October 2003.

110. Brett, *Annual Report for 1911*, 12.

111. "List of Buildings Owned by Interior Department," January 21, 1918, "Dates of Construction or Improvements Made to Structures in YNP, List of Buildings, Memoranda, 1918, 1920," vertical files, History—YNP—Structures, YNPL.

112. Robert Flather, "Gallatin Station," [no date], unpublished report, according to a copy acquired from the author in October 2003.

113. Brett, *Annual Report for 1912*, 14–15.

114. Brett, *Annual Report for 1914*, 17.

115. Haines, vol. 2, 183; Culpin, "Ranger Stations/Patrol Cabins," note 18.

116. Acting Adjutant General to Commanding Officer, Telegram, June 21, 1910, and H. C. Benson to Quartermaster General, rough draft of letter, box 13, RG 393, National Archives, as cited in Mary Shivers Culpin, "Ranger Stations/Patrol Cabins, Yellowstone NP, April 23, 1997," unpublished paper, Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

117. Culpin, "Ranger Stations/Patrol Cabins," 4.

118. "Report of irregularities and deficiencies noted by Major Alonzo Gray, I.G., during recent inspection of post," September 16, 1912, IV sub Stations need repair as follows: #85, folder "Inspections and Investigations," box 16, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

119. Inspector General to the Commanding Officer [L. M. Brett], Fort Yellowstone, Wyoming, October 6, 1911, Quartermaster's Department: #22, 4, folder 859, box 15, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

120. Ucker, "Report of the Chief Clerk, September 22, 1910."

121. Culpin, "Ranger Stations/Patrol Cabins," note 18.

122. Brigadier General Marion Maus to the Adjutant General of the Army, October 14, 1911, folder 880, box 15, RG 393, National Archives, as quoted in Culpin, "Ranger Stations/Patrol Cabins," 5.

123. Inspector General to the Commanding Officer [L. M. Brett], Fort Yellowstone, Wyoming, October 6, 1911, Quartermaster's Department: #22, 3, folder 859, box 15, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

124. L. M. Brett, Lieutenant Colonel, 1st Cavalry, to the Adjutant General, Department of the Columbia, October

12, 1911, 2, folder 859, box 15, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

125. Marion P. Maus, Commanding General, to Adjutant General of the Army, October 24, 1912, #20, 5, folder "Inspections Post and Park Stations," box 16, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

126. Colonel J. L. Chamberlain, Inspector General, to Commanding Officer, Fort Yellowstone, Wyoming, September 15, 1913, Soldier Stations: #36, 4, folder "Inspection Annual," box 17, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

127. Brett, *Annual Report for 1913*, 9–10.

128. Assistant Secretary of the Interior to Secretary of Commerce, August 6, 1913, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives.

129. Brett, *Annual Report for 1913*, 7, 6.

130. Brett, *Annual Report for 1914*, 13.

131. Brett, *Annual Report for 1915*, 25.

132. *Ibid.*, 16–24.

133. Young, *Annual Report for 1907*, 8.

134. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 73–74 and note 69, page 323.

135. From the *Proceedings of the National Park Conference Held at Berkeley, California, 1915*, as quoted in Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 75, and note 74, page 323.

136. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 74.

137. From the *Proceedings of the National Park Conference Held at Berkeley, California, 1915*, as quoted in Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 75, and note 74, page 323.

138. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 124.

139. Frederick Law Olmsted, "The Distinction Between National Parks and National Forests," *Landscape Architecture* VI(3) (April 1916): 114–115.

140. W. H. Gordon, Inspector General, to Commanding Officer [L. M. Brett], May 19, 1911, Commanding Officer: #9, 2, folder "Inspection of Post," box 15, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

141. Alonzo Gray, Major, Inspector General, to the Adjutant General, Western Division, August 30, 1912, 3, 6, folder 1156, box 16, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

142. Chamberlain to Commanding Officer, September

- 15, 1913.
143. Gray to Adjutant General, Western Division, August 30, 1912.
144. Chamberlain to Commanding Officer, September 15, 1913.
145. Maus to Adjutant General of the Army, October 24, 1912.
146. Colonel J. L. Chamberlain, Inspector General, to Commanding Officer [L. M. Brett], Fort Yellowstone, Wyoming, August 24, 1914, #1, 1, folder 1956, box 18, RG 393, National Archives. Copy in folder "Fort Yellowstone—General Correspondence, 1911–1914," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
147. Maus to Adjutant General of the Army, October 24, 1912.
148. Brett, *Annual Report for 1911*.
149. Ibid., 11.
150. Young, *Annual Report for 1908*, 9.
151. *Report of the General Superintendent of Parks to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1916*, 30–36.
152. Young, *Annual Report for 1908*, 8.
153. Brett, *Annual Report for 1914*, 17.
154. Brett, *Annual Report for 1916*, 34.
155. Benson, *Annual Report for 1909*, 11.
156. Ibid.
157. Young, *Annual Report for 1907*, 14, and *Annual Report for 1908*, 11.
158. Brett, *Annual Report for 1915*, 19.
159. Brett, *Annual Report for 1912*, 13, and *Annual Report for 1916*, 38.
160. Benson, *Annual Report for 1910*, 10.
161. Ibid.
162. Brett, *Annual Report for 1911*, 11.
163. Brett, *Annual Report for 1913*, 13, and *Annual Report for 1916*, 36.
164. Mark Daniels to Secretary of the Interior, October 23, 1914, folder "Inspections and Investigations," box 218, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.
165. T. M. Koel, J. L. Arnold, P. E. Bigelow, P. D. Doepke, B. D. Ertel, and D. L. Mahony, *Yellowstone Fisheries and Aquatic Science: Annual Report, 2003* (Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: National Park Service, Yellowstone Center for Resources, YCR-NR-2004-03, 2004), 2.
166. Brett, *Annual Report for 1916*, 28–29.
167. James Rudolph Garfield, Secretary of the Interior, to Major John Pitcher, Acting Superintendent, April 2, 1907, document #8079, letter box 15, YNPA.
168. Young, *Annual Report for 1907*, 12–13.
169. Though not purposely introduced, mountain goats have been extant in Yellowstone National Park since the 1980s, when herds introduced to surrounding areas by the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks in the 1940s and 1950s, and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game in 1969–1971, were found to have colonized in the park. Yellowstone National Park, *Yellowstone's Northern Range: Complexity and Change in a Wildland Ecosystem* (Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyo.: National Park Service, 1997), 93.
170. Paul Schullery and Lee Whittlesey, "Mountain Goats in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: A Prehistoric and Historical Context," *Western North American Naturalist* 61(3) (July 2001), 298.
171. Brett, *Annual Report for 1913*, 13–14.
172. Young, *Annual Report for 1907*, 11, and Benson, *Annual Report for 1910*, 11.
173. Ibid.
174. Benson, *Annual Report for 1910*, 11.
175. Ucker, "Report of the Chief Clerk, September 22, 1910."
176. Brett, *Annual Report for 1911*, 12.
177. Brett, *Annual Report for 1912*, 14.
178. Brett, *Annual Report for 1913*, 13–14.
179. Brett, *Annual Report for 1914*, 17.
180. Ibid., 19.
181. Brett, *Annual Report for 1915*, 25.
182. Ibid.
183. Brett, *Annual Report for 1914*, 20.
184. Young, "Instructions of July 2, 1908," *Annual Report for 1908*, 16–17.
185. Young, *Annual Report for 1907*, 8.
186. Ibid.
187. Ucker, "Report of the Chief Clerk, September 22, 1910."
188. Major Wallace DeWitt to Captain H.C. Benson, October 26, 1910, folder "Repairs/Improvements," box 240, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.
189. Brett, *Annual Report for 1914*, 18–19.
190. Brett, *Annual Report for 1912*, 5.
191. Ibid., 14–15.
192. Brett, *Annual Report for 1913*, 5.
193. Ibid., 14.
194. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 63.
195. Brett, *Annual Report for 1913*, 14, and Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 73.
196. Brett, *Annual Report for 1914*, 7.
197. Ibid., 18–19.
198. Brett, *Annual Report for 1915*, 24–25.
199. Colonel L. M. Brett to Secretary of the Interior,

January 20, 1910; Bo Sweeney to R. B. Marshall, January 29, 1916; Ashland Commercial Club to Colonel L. M. Brett, April 14, 1916; R. B. Marshall to Colonel L. M. Brett, June 27, 1916, all in folder "Repairs/Improvements," box 246, entry 6, RG 79, National Archives.

200. Brett, *Annual Report for 1916*, 42, 44.

201. As quoted in Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 79.

CHAPTER 5

1. *Annual Report of the Director of the National Park Service to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1917* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917), 32, cited hereafter as *Director's Report for [year]*.

2. Aubrey Haines, *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*, revised ed. (Niwot, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 1996), vol. 2, 458, [hereafter Haines, vol. 1 or 2].

3. Haines, vol. 2, 458–459.

4. See papers regarding the exchange in folder "History—Military—1917–1921," Marcy Culpin's files [hereafter Culpin's files], Historian's Office, Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center, Yellowstone National Park, Montana [hereafter HRC].

5. *Director's Report for 1918*, 38.

6. *Ibid.*

7. As reprinted by Tom Stout in *Montana, Its Story and Biography* (Chicago: American Historical Society, 1921), vol. 1, 480, as quoted in Haines, vol. 2, 290.

8. *Director's Report for 1917*, 32–33.

9. Chester A. Lindsley to Horace M. Albright, Assistant Director of National Parks, February 1, 1918, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Mammoth, 1 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

10. Chester A. Lindsley to Commanding Officer, Fort Yellowstone, January 28, 1918, National Archives, RG 79, entry 7, CCF Yellowstone National Park, box 620.01-630. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Mammoth, 1 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

11. Stephen M. Mather, Director of the National Park Service, to Mr. Lindsley, Acting Superintendent, February 20, 1918, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Mammoth, 1 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

12. Mather to H. M. Albright, telegram, February 23, 1918, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Mammoth, 1 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

13. Alexander Vogelsang, First Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, to the Secretary of War, March 2, 1918, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Mammoth, 1 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

14. Haines, vol. 2, 289–290.

15. *Director's Report for 1917*, 33.

16. Haines, vol. 2, 289–290. In a memorandum to the secretary of the interior, acting NPS director Horace Albright noted that tourists had been complaining about the troops in the park and inquiring "as to why troops were patrolling the park when their sons and brothers were being drafted for service in the Army." See Horace M. Albright, Acting Director of the National Park Service, to Secretary of the Interior, memorandum, September 24, 1917, folder "Troops in Park," box 253, entry 6, record group [hereafter RG] 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "History—Military—1917–1921," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

17. *Director's Report for 1918*, 39–40.

18. Haines, vol. 2, 290.

19. *Director's Report for 1918*, 39.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Haines, vol. 2, 293.

22. Horace M. Albright, *Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park to the Secretary of the Interior, 1920*, 4–6, hereafter *Annual Report for [year]*.

23. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921–1922*, 2.

24. Haines, vol. 2, 293–294.

25. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921–1922*, 2.

26. See Superintendent's Annual Reports for the years 1920 through 1929.

27. From an undated form letter signed by Superintendent Roger Toll (who became superintendent in 1929) as quoted by Haines, vol. 2, 296.

28. Haines, vol. 2, 299. Haines described the "routines of rangering" in chapter 19, "Enter the Rangers."

29. Hiram Martin Chittenden, *The Yellowstone National Park: Historical and Descriptive* (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1905), 120.

30. As quoted in Linda Flint McClelland, *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 12.

31. *Director's Report for 1918*, 10.

32. As quoted by Ethan Carr in *Wilderness by Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 81.

33. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 11.

34. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 78.

35. As quoted in McClelland, *Building the National*

- Parks*, 10.
36. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 135–136.
 37. *Ibid.*, 136.
 38. *Director's Report for 1919*, 25.
 39. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 88.
 40. Charles P. Punchard, Jr., "Landscape Design in the National Park Service," *Landscape Architecture* 10(3) (1920): 144–145, as quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 137.
 41. Charles P. Punchard, Jr., to Superintendent [Horace M. Albright], August 28, 1919, 1, folder 1, box D-38, Yellowstone National Park Archives [hereafter YNPA].
 42. *Ibid.*, 1–2.
 43. *Director's Report for 1919*, 26.
 44. Punchard to Superintendent, August 28, 1919, 2.
 45. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 150.
 46. Punchard to Superintendent, August 28, 1919, 3–4.
 47. *Ibid.*, 6.
 48. *Ibid.*, 4 and 6, Punchard's emphasis.
 49. Charles P. Punchard, Jr., to Horace M. Albright, July 21, 1920, 1, folder 1, box D-38, YNPA.
 50. Charles P. Punchard, Jr., to Horace M. Albright, Supt., September 20, 1919, folder 1, box D-38, YNPA.
 51. Punchard to Albright, July 21, 1920, 3.
 52. *Ibid.*
 53. Punchard to Albright, September 20, 1919.
 54. *Director's Report for 1920*, 96.
 55. *Director's Report for 1921*, 169–171.
 56. Punchard to Albright, July 21, 1920, 3.
 57. *Ibid.*, 1–2.
 58. *Director's Report for 1919*, 52.
 59. Punchard to Superintendent, August 28, 1919, 9–10.
 60. *Director's Report for 1919*, 52.
 61. Albright, *Annual Report for 1920*, 53–54.
 62. *Ibid.*, 54.
 63. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 149–150.
 64. *Ibid.*, 149.
 65. Albright, *Annual Report for 1920*, 53.
 66. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 149.
 67. *Director's Report for 1919*, 26.
 68. Stephen T. Mather to Mr. Horace M. Albright, January 10, 1922, folder 2, box D-38, YNPA.
 69. Horace M. Albright to Director, January 30, 1922, folder 2, box D-38, YNPA.
 70. *Director's Report for 1917*, 31.
 71. *Ibid.*, 39.
 72. *Ibid.*
 73. See Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 85–88, and note 109, 325–326, for an illuminating discussion of Mather's contention that the entrance fees automobilists paid were an essential part of the effort to have the parks pay for themselves.
 74. Stephen T. Mather, "The Ideals and Policy of the National Park Service Particularly in Relation to Yosemite National Park," in Ansel F. Hall, ed., *Handbook of Yosemite National Park* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921), 77–86, as quoted in Carr, 86.
 75. *Director's Report for 1919*, 46.
 76. *Ibid.*
 77. Albright, *Annual Report for 1919*, 100.
 78. "Memorandum for the press," November 1, 1919, 2, as part of Albright's Annual Report for 1919. See also *Director's Report for 1919*, 46, in which Mather claimed that "nearly half of the [more than 62,000] tourists [visiting the park that season] camped out."
 79. *Director's Report for 1919*, 26; Albright, *Annual Report for 1920*, 54–57.
 80. Albright, *Annual Report for 1920*, 54–57.
 81. Punchard to Albright, July 21, 1920, 4.
 82. *Ibid.*, 5.
 83. *Director's Report for 1921*, 56.
 84. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 159–160; notes 1 and 2, 542–543.
 85. Albright, *Annual Report for 1919*, 101.
 86. *Director's Report for 1920*, 105.
 87. Haines, vol. 2, 303–304.
 88. D. R. Hull, Acting Landscape Engineer, to Director of the National Park Service, April 6, 1921, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous buildings—Old Faithful, 2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 89. Stephen T. Mather, Director, to Mr. Albright, April 13, 1921, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous buildings—Old Faithful, 2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 90. D. R. Hull, Landscape Engineer, to Director, April 26, 1921, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous buildings—Old Faithful, 2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 91. Horace Albright to Daniel Hull, May 25, 1921. Copy in folder "Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture, 1921," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
 92. Horace M. Albright to Director, June 24, 1921, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Old Faithful, 2 of 2,"

Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

93. "Construction Contract Bond—Individual," July 30, 1921, box 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Old Faithful, 2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

94. Albright to Director Mather, Telegram, July 27, 1921, box 620.31-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Old Faithful, 2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

95. Albright to D. R. Hull, Telegram, July 26, 1921, box 620.31-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Miscellaneous Buildings—Old Faithful, 2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

96. Stephen T. Mather to Mr. Albright, January 10, 1922, folder 2, box D-38, YNPA.

97. Horace M. Albright, Field Assistant to the Director, to Director, National Park Service, Attention of Mr. Cammerer, July 26, 1922, folder 2, box D-38, YNPA.

98. Horace M. Albright to Mr. D. R. Hull, October 27, 1922, file "Report of Construction to Mr. D. R. Hull, (Landscape Engineering Division), from Horace M. Albright (Superintendent), October 27, 1922," box L-56, YNPA.

99. Horace M. Albright to Paul P. Kiessig, Assistant Landscape Engineer, October 25, 1921, box 610-620, #470, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Ranger Stations—Canyon," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

100. *Director's Report for 1921*, 58.

101. Horace M. Albright to Mr. D. R. Hull, October 27, 1922.

102. Horace M. Albright to Hull, Memorandum, May 24, 1922, folder 2, box D-38, YNPA.

103. *Director's Report for 1922*, 37–38.

104. Horace M. Albright to Hull, August 9, 1922, folder 2, box D-38, YNPA.

105. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921–1922*, 19.

106. D. R. Hull to Horace M. Albright, July 31, 1922, folder 1, box D-26, YNPA.

107. D. R. Hull to Horace M. Albright, August 12, 1922, folder 1, box D-26, YNPA.

108. Haines, vol. 2, 414, note 46.

109. The authors are indebted to retired Yellowstone Park ranger Robert Flather and his unpublished report "Slough Creek History" (October 10, 2002) for information on the Lower and Upper Slough Creek developments. Flather's report is located in folder "History and Archeology," box H-40, YNPA.

110. Horace Albright to Daniel Hull, May 25, 1921. Copy in folder "Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture, 1921," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

111. Ibid.

112. Albright, "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," June 1921, 15.

113. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921*, 177, in *Director's Report for 1921*, 170.

114. Ibid.

115. National Park Service, "Hellroaring Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE892, LCS #50930, 6.

116. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921*, in *Director's Report for 1921*, 170.

117. National Park Service, "Fox Creek Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE933, LCS #51026, 6.

118. National Park Service, "Assistant Buffalo Herder's Cabin at Slough Creek Hay Ranch," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE939, LCS #50932, 8.

119. Albright, "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," August 1921, 11, and July 1921; National Park Service, "Crevice Mountain Ranger Station," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #24YE35, LCS #50980, 4–6.

120. Albright, "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," August 1921, 9; *Director's Report for 1921*, 171–72.

121. *Director's Report for 1921*, 170, 189.

122. Ibid., 169.

123. Ibid., 171, 176, 189.

124. "From Hull, [Trip Report] Yellowstone National Park," July 12, 1921, 2, in folder "Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture—1921," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

125. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 98.

126. Yellowstone National Park historian Lee Whitlessey, November 2003.

127. Stephen Mather to Horace Albright, January 10, 1922, folder 2, box D-38, YNPA.

128. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921–1922*, 19–20.

129. Ibid., 34–36.

130. Ibid., 23–24; *Director's Report for 1922*, 37; and Horace Albright to Daniel Hull, October 27, 1922, box 470, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture—1922," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

131. Horace M. Albright to Hull, February 10, 1923, folder 3, box D-38, YNPA, and Horace M. Albright to Hull, August 9, 1922, folder 2, box D-38, YNPA.

132. Albright, *Annual Report for 1923*, 29.

133. Albright, "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," September 1924," 10.

134. Albright, *Annual Report for 1923*, 28.

135. Ibid., 31.
136. Albright, *Annual Report for 1924*, in *Director's Report for 1924*, 96–97.
137. Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, to Mr. Albright, June 27, 1924, folder 3, box D-26, YNPA.
138. Albright, *Annual Report for 1924*, 9.
139. Albright, *Annual Report for 1924*, in *Director's Report for 1924*, 96, and *Annual Report for 1924*, 9.
140. National Park Service, "Heart Lake Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE896, LCS #51007, 3–6.
141. Albright, *Annual Report for 1924*, in *Director's Report for 1924*, 96.
142. National Park Service, "Heart Lake Snowshoe Cabin," 6.
143. National Park Service, "Cache Creek Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE928, LCS #50000, 6.
144. Albright, "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," August 1924, 18.
145. *Director's Report for 1925*, 23.
146. Ibid., and Daniel R. Hull to Mr. Albright, March 17, 1925, folder 4, box D-38, YNPA.
147. National Park Service, "Ranger Station/HS-0201 [West Thumb Area]," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE998.
148. Albright, *Annual Report for 1925*, in *Director's Report for 1925*, 79.
149. National Park Service, "Blacktail Deer Creek Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #24YE37, LCS #50915, 6.
150. *Director's Report for 1925*, 23. For a more in-depth study of the Apollinaris Spring area, see Lee H. Whittlesey, "The Changing Face of Apollinaris Spring," *Yellowstone Science* 11(1) (Winter 2003):2–8.
151. Hull to Albright, March 17, 1925; Daniel R. Hull to Superintendent Albright, Memorandum, June 17, 1925, folder 4, box D-38, YNPA.
152. Albright, "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," June 1925, 20.
153. Horace M. Albright to Daniel R. Hull, June 27, 1925, folder 4, box D-38, YNPA.
154. Horace M. Albright to Daniel R. Hull, July 21, 1925, folder 5, box D-38, YNPA.
155. Albright to Hull, July 21, 1925.
156. Albright to Hull, June 27, 1925.
157. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 171–174.
158. Gilbert Stanley Underwood to Horace Albright, August 4, 1926, folder 5, box D-38, YNPA.
159. Paul Kiessig, "Landscape Engineering in the National Parks," 1, draft of manuscript in folder 3, box D-38, YNPA.
160. Ronald A. Foresta, *America's National Parks and Their Keepers* (Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future, 1984), 43.
161. Paul Kiessig to Horace M. Albright, December 2, 1922, folder 3, box D-38, YNPA.
162. Horace M. Albright to Paul Kiessig, January 6, 1923, folder 3, box D-38, YNPA.
163. Lee H. Whittlesey, "Handkerchief Pool," *Yellowstone Place Names* (Helena, Mont.: Montana Historical Society Press, 1988), 70.
164. Kiessig, "Landscape Engineering in the National Parks," 11.
165. Horace M. Albright to Paul Kiessig, January 6, 1923, folder 3, box D-38, YNPA.
166. Horace M. Albright to Mr. Hull, Memorandum, June 3, 1925, folder 4, box D-38, YNPA.
167. See, for example, letters Albright wrote to the director of the National Park Service in Hull's defense on July 26, 1922, and July 11, 1926, in folders 2 and 3 respectively, box D-38, YNPA.
168. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 163.
169. Ibid., 195–196.
170. Ibid., 196–197.
171. Ibid., 197.
172. Ibid., 198.
173. Vint, "Job Analysis, Assistant Landscape Architect," ca. June 1928, as quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 199.
174. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 200.
175. Ibid.
176. Horace M. Albright to Mr. Hull, March 9, 1926, and Sam T. Woodring, "Memorandum to Mr. Albright," n.d. ca. March 1926, both in folder 5, box D-38, YNPA.
177. Albright, *Annual Report for 1926*, in *Report of Director of National Park Service for 1926*, 86.
178. National Park Service, "Equipment Storehouse/Bunkhouse at Slough Creek Hay Ranch," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE939, LCS #50933, 4.
179. Sam T. Woodring, "Memorandum to Mr. Albright," n.d. ca. March 1926.
180. National Park Service, "Equipment Storehouse/Bunkhouse at Slough Creek Hay Ranch," 4.
181. T. C. Vint, memorandum to Mr. Hull, June 2, 1926, folder 5, box D-38, YNPA. See also Albright, *Annual*

Report for 1926, in *Report of Director of National Park Service for 1926*, 86, 88.

182. Albright, *Annual Report for 1927*, 12.

183. National Park Service, "Lamar Buffalo Ranch Barn," Single Entry Report-LCS, HS-0109, 2, [August 17, 2000]. Copy available in Yellowstone Center for Resources, Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyo.

184. Albright, *Annual Report for 1927*, 9; National Park Service, "Fawn Pass Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE931, LCS #51016, 6; and National Park Service, "Mary Lake Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE935, LCS #50941, 6.

185. Albright, *Annual Report for 1927*, 9.

186. *Ibid.*, 8–9.

187. A. H. Abbott, Forest Supervisor, Gallatin National Forest, to Superintendent Toll, October 13, 1930, as part of the National Park Historic Structure Survey information for Dailey Creek Snowshoe Cabin, YCR.

188. *Director's Report for 1925*, 8; see Mary Shivers Culpin, *The History of the Construction of the Road System in Yellowstone* (Denver: National Park Service, 1994) for a discussion of the roadside cleanup project funded by the John D. Rockefeller family.

189. Albright, *Annual Report for 1927*, 9.

190. See, for example, Albright, *Annual Report for 1927*, 10, and *Annual Report for 1926*, 5, for number of campers.

191. Horace Albright to Director, National Park Service, November 1, 1926, 4, at end of "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," July 1926.

192. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 234.

193. *Ibid.*, 234–236.

194. *Ibid.*, 244.

195. *Ibid.*

196. National Park Service, "Messhouse/Quarters/HS-0112," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE78, LCS #50935, 2.

197. National Park Service, "Norris Road Camp Bunkhouse/HS-0113," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE87, LCS #50936, 2. Leroy Hill, Acting Superintendent, advocated a particular floor plan for bunkhouses. He promoted sketches that were "a departure from the standard plans . . . especially in the case of the separate sleeping rooms planned for the bunkhouses instead of the usual 'bull-pen,' and a separate room and office of the foreman" (Leroy Hill, Acting Superintendent, to Mr. Vint, March 24, 1927, folder 6, box D-38, YNPA).

198. Albright, *Annual Report for 1928*, 7.

199. National Park Service, "Fishing Bridge Ranger

Station," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE675, LCS #50495, 2,3.

200. Albright, *Annual Report for 1928*, 7–8.

201. Other mess- and bunkhouses were built in 1929: one of each at Norris Junction, a bunkhouse each at Lewis River and at Madison Junction, and a messhouse at Tower Junction. The ranger station at the South Entrance was completed, and a three-lane checking station was built at the East Entrance (Roger Toll, *Annual Report for 1929*, in *Report of Director of National Park Service for 1929*, 134).

202. National Park Service, "Lamar Buffalo Ranch bunkhouse/HS-0107," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE675, LCS #10627, 2.

203. *Director's Report for 1917*, 32.

204. *Director's Report for 1918*, 10.

205. *Ibid.*, 10.

206. *Director's Report for 1919*, 29–31.

207. Denise S. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., 1986, 60.

208. Albright, *Annual Report for 1919*, 28–29.

209. Haines, vol. 2, 307–308, and note 52, 414; Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 59.

210. Albright, *Annual Report for 1920*, 39.

211. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921*, in *Director's Report for 1921*, 169.

212. *Ibid.*

213. Haines, vol. 2, 308.

214. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921–1922*, 33.

215. *Director's Report for 1921*, 35–36.

216. *Ibid.*, 36–37.

217. Albright, *Annual Report for 1920*, 41.

218. Haines, vol. 2, 304.

219. From Lemuel Garrison to Chief, Division of Interpretation, Memorandum, October 25, 1961, in Aubrey L. Haines, "Memorandum of the History of Women in Uniform (National Park Service) in Yellowstone National Park, October 1961," vertical files, YNPL.

220. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 58.

221. Albright, *Annual Report for 1920*, 41. Vick asserted that there is some uncertainty as to where Albright first heard Bassett lecture (Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 256, note 8).

222. *Director's Report for 1919*, 30.

223. *Director's Report for 1921*, 34.

224. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921*, in *Director's Report for 1921*, 163.

225. Horace Albright to Isabel Wasson, October 8,

1921, as quoted in a memorandum from Lemuel Garrison to Chief, Division of Interpretation, October 25, 1961, in Haines, "Memorandum of the History of Women in Uniform."

226. Ibid.

227. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921*, in *Director's Report for 1921*, 163.

228. Albright, "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," June 1921, 11.

229. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921*, in *Director's Report for 1921*, 163.

230. *Director's Report for 1921*, 162–163.

231. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921–1922*, 34.

232. Ibid.

233. Haines, vol. 2, 303–304.

234. From the National Park Service's "General Plan of Administration for the Educational Division," June 4, 1929, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 70.

235. Haines, vol. 2, 308.

236. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 39; Haines, vol. 2, 308.

237. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 38.

238. Haines, vol. 2, 308.

239. *Director's Report for 1926*, 6–7, 28.

240. From the address by a committee of the American Association of Museums to the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial on June 18, 1924, as quoted in *Director's Report for 1924*, 8.

241. *Director's Report for 1924*, 9.

242. *Director's Report for 1925*, 12.

243. *Director's Report for 1925*, 13. Ansel Hall mentioned the opening of a branch museum in Yellowstone, "Report of the Educational Division, Ansel F. Hall, Chief Naturalist," in Albright, *Annual Report for 1926*, 41.

244. "Report of the Educational Division, Ansel F. Hall, Chief Naturalist," in Albright, *Annual Report for 1926*, 40–42.

245. Albright, "Monthly Report of the Superintendent," July 1927, 17.

246. Horace M. Albright, Assistant Director (Field), Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, to the Secretary of the Interior, January 27, 1928, folder 620.046, box 620.10-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Museums—2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

247. Ibid.

248. Secretary of the Interior to Chauncey J. Hamlin, President, American Association of Museums, n.d. ca. January

1928, folder 620.046, box 620.10-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Museums—2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

249. Hubert Work to The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, February 9, 1928, folder 620.046, box 620.10-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Museums—2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

250. Ibid.; Ansel F. Hall and F. R. Oastler, "Organization Plan for the Educational Division of the National Park Service," typescript, Interpretation Correspondence, 1922–1928, YNPA, as cited by Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 40.

251. Frank Oastler, "Report on Educational Survey National Park Service, Summer 1928," folder 43, box 79, subseries 2E, series 3, Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, New York. Copy in folder "Education/Interpretation," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

252. *Director's Report for 1924*, 8. The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial also provided funds for the construction of at least two other trailside museums: one for the rim of the Grand Canyon in Grand Canyon National Park and the other near Bear Mountain in the Interstate Palisades Park in New York. H. C. Bumpus, as chairman of the Committee on Museums in National Parks of the American Association of Museums, hoped that similar structures would be used by other agencies ("Trailside Museum - Interstate Park" William Carr, "Blazing Nature's Trail," File 743, Box 79, subseries 2E, series 3, Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, New York). The illustration of the Bear Mountain Trailside Museum was similar in design to the museums built in Yellowstone; Beard-sley Ruml to Hubert Work, March 2, 1928, folder 620.046, box 620.10-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder "Museums—2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

253. Ibid.

254. "A History of the Educational Department in National Parks," undated typescript, ca. 1930, vertical files, YNPL, 7, as quoted in Haines, vol. 2, 310.

255. *Director's Report for 1925*, 13.

256. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 124.

257. Albright, *Annual Report for 1928*, 8.

258. Horace M. Albright to Director, National Park Service, October 25, 1928. Copy in folder "Museums—2 of 2," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC, and in "Report on Yellowstone Park Museum Development and New Fish Hatchery at Lake Yellowstone," folder 1, box D-17, YNPA.

259. K. McCarter, "Weekly Report of Week Ending Sept. 22, 1928." Copy in folder "Construction Projects/Land-

scape Architecture—1928–1929,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

260. Toll, *Annual Report for 1929*, 40.

261. National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form, “Norris, Madison, and Fishing Bridge Museums,” in Laura Soulliere Harrison, *Architecture in the Parks: National Historic Landmark Theme Study* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, Nov. 1986), 312. For a clear discussion of the campsite legend, see Paul Schullery and Lee Whittlesey’s *Myth and History in the Creation of Yellowstone National Park* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003).

262. Albert H. Good, *Park and Recreation Structures* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999; reprint of 1938 edition published by National Park Service), 178.

263. National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form, “Norris, Madison, and Fishing Bridge Museums,” in Harrison, *Architecture in the Parks*, 313.

264. *Ibid.*, 317.

265. *Ibid.*, 318.

266. *Ibid.*

267. Herbert Maier, “The Purpose of the Museum in the National Parks,” *Yosemite Nature Notes* (May 1926): 37, as quoted in National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form, “Norris, Madison, and Fishing Bridge Museums,” in Harrison, *Architecture in the Parks*, 320.

268. National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form, “Norris, Madison, and Fishing Bridge Museums,” in Harrison, *Architecture in the Parks*, 320.

269. Albright to Director, October 25, 1928.

270. Albright, *Annual Report for 1928*, 8.

271. Horace M. Albright to Director, National Park Service, August 30, 1928, folder 601.01, box 503-601.13, #462, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Architectural History,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

272. Horace M. Albright to the Director, National Park Service, September 27, 1928, folder 601.01, box 503-601.13, #462, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Architectural History,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

273. Albright to Director, August 30, 1928.

274. Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, to Horace M. Albright, Assistant Director (Field), National Park Service, September 20, 1928, folder 601.01, box 503-601.13, #462, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Architectural History,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

275. Horace M. Albright to Kenneth Chorley, October 13, 1928, folder 620.046, box 620.10-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Museums—2 of 2,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

276. Albright to Director, October 25, 1928.

277. *Director’s Report for 1924*, 35. The total number of visitors to the park in 1924 was 138,352, thus slightly more than half used the lecture service at Mammoth.

278. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 65, 84–85.

279. *Ibid.*, 103.

280. Horace Albright, Preface, *Ranger Naturalists’ Manual of Yellowstone National Park* (Yellowstone National Park: National Park Service, 1927), ii, as quoted in Paul Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone: Ecology and Wonder in the Last Wilderness* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 139.

281. Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone*, 140.

282. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 116.

283. *Ibid.*

284. Newell F. Joyner, “An Outline of the History of Educational Activities in Yellowstone Park,” *Ranger Naturalists’ Manual* (Yellowstone National Park: Educational Department, 1929), 173–174, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 116.

285. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 44 and Haines, vol. 2, 310.

286. H. C. Bumpus to Horace M. Albright, September 20, 1929, folder 620.046, box 620.10-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Museums—2 of 2,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

287. Albright to Director, October 25, 1928.

288. Oastler’s mention of the stagecoach actually caused a bit of a brouhaha, leading to a Congressional inquiry questioning the park’s preservation of the stagecoach. Park officials assured Congress that the stagecoach was only outside during the summer season, and would be exhibited indoors and given preservation treatment if a large museum was built at Mammoth (Roger Toll to Horace Albright, August 23, 1929, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives).

289. Oastler, “Report on Educational Survey National Park Service, Summer 1928.”

290. Toll, *Annual Report for 1929*, 41.

291. *Ibid.*

292. *Ibid.*

293. *Director’s Report for 1917*, 34.

294. *Ibid.*, emphasis added.

295. *Director’s Report for 1918*, 44; Albright, *Annual Report for 1918*, 39.

296. Albright, *Annual Report for 1918*, 39.

297. *Ibid.*, 41.

298. See James A. Pritchard, *Preserving Yellowstone’s Natural Conditions: Science and the Perception of Nature* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).

299. Thomas R. Dunlap, "Wildlife, Science, and the National Parks, 1920–1940," *Pacific Historical Review* 59(2) (May 1990), 189.

300. *Ibid.*, 187–202.

301. *Director's Report for 1926*, 14.

302. *Director's Report for 1929*, 25–26.

303. Pritchard, *Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions*, 134–136.

304. Yellowstone National Park, *Yellowstone's Northern Range: Complexity and Change in a Wildland Ecosystem* (Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyo.: National Park Service), 7. According to Pritchard (*Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions*, 138), 67,440 elk were removed between 1934 and 1967 by means of live-shipping, direct reductions, and high hunter quotas outside the park boundary.

305. *Director's Report for 1922*, 23, and *Director's Report for 1924*, 35.

306. *Director's Report for 1924*, 97–98.

307. Thomas Cochran to Arthur Wood, December 14, 1925, folder 772, box 83, subseries 2E, series 3, Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, New York. Copy in folder "History—Boundaries," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

308. *Director's Report for 1926*, 29.

309. *Director's Report for 1929*, 4.

310. *Ibid.*, 4–5.

311. Oastler, "Report on Educational Survey National Park Service, Summer 1928."

312. Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone*, 144.

313. Albright, *Annual Report for 1918*, 41–42.

314. Albright, *Annual Report for 1922*, 40.

315. Albright, *Annual Report for 1925*, as part of *Director's Report for 1925*, 79.

316. Albright, *Annual Report for 1921*, as part of *Director's Report for 1921*, 179.

317. For excellent studies of the park's policies regarding bears see Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone*, and Paul Schullery, *The Bears of Yellowstone* (Worland, Wyo.: High Plains Publishing Co., 1992).

CHAPTER 6

1. Roger W. Toll, *Annual Report for Yellowstone National Park, 1930*, 1, Yellowstone National Park Library (hereafter *Annual Report for [year]*).

2. *Annual Report of the Director of the National Park Service to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1931* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1931), 2, cited hereafter as *Director's Report for [year]*.

3. *Director's Report for 1932*, 1.

4. *Director's Report for 1931*, 1–2.

5. William C. Tweed, *Parkitecture: A History of Rustic Building Design in the National Park System, 1916–1942*, 78, unpublished manuscript, vertical file "History—YNP—Structures," Yellowstone National Park Library [hereafter YNPL].

6. *Ibid.*, 1–2.

7. *Director's Report for 1932*, 1.

8. James A. Pritchard, *Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions: Science and the Perception of Nature* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 96.

9. Alice K. Wondrak, *(Do Not) Feed the Bears: Policy, Culture and the Historical Narrative of the Yellowstone Bear*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., 2002, 137. Copy in YNPL.

10. Aubrey L. Haines, *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*, revised ed. (Niwt, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 1996), vol. 2, 460, [hereafter Haines, vol. 1 or 2].

11. *Ibid.*, 460–461.

12. Toll, *Annual Report for 1930*, 2; Toll, *Annual Report for 1931*, 1.

13. Toll, *Annual Report for 1932*, 2; Toll, *Annual Report for 1933*, 2.

14. Guy Edwards to Roger Toll, August 31, 1933, folder 5, box D-26, Yellowstone National Park Archives (hereafter YNPA).

15. "Public Number 5 and Executive Order 6101 Affecting the Civilian Conservation Corps," as found in Matthew A. Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps as a Tool of the National Park Service: The Development of Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks, 1933–1942*, (M.A. thesis, University of Montana, 1988), 125–126.

16. Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, 103.

17. Edmund B. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1936*, 31.

18. Linda Flint McClelland, *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 328.

19. Timothy Mann's study is cited and discussed in Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*.

20. Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, 60–61.

21. Toll, *Annual Report for 1936*, 31.

22. Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, 58–59.

23. *Ibid.*, 62–66.

24. *Ibid.*, 61–62, 67–71.

25. *Ibid.*, 79.

26. Stephen J. Pyne, *Fire in America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 360, as quoted Redinger, *The*

Civilian Conservation Corps, 82.

27. Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, 85.

28. *Ibid.*, 71–72.

29. *Ibid.*, 75–76.

30. *Ibid.*, 54.

31. In October 1932, approximately 7,600 acres were added to the park by presidential executive order in an area extending 3.5 miles from Gardiner toward the north and west. President Hoover signed the proclamation for inclusion of the land on October 20, 1932. The land, set aside under a Congressional Act of May 26, 1926, was to provide additional winter grazing for the antelope and elk. The addition covered all of the land except a 38.2-acre parcel owned and operated as a slaughterhouse ranch by Albert Hoppe (Section 14, T9S, R7E, Montana Principal Meridian), which the government and the Game Preservation Company finally bought in September 1933 (Toll, *Annual Report for 1933*, 4). For a complete discussion of the newly acquired land, see Haines, vol. 2, 332, and Toll, *Annual Report for 1933*, 4. See Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, 53–54 for a discussion of the nursery. According to Redinger, the 18-acre nursery produced 500,000 seedlings a year from a variety of species: “lodgepole pines, Douglas firs, birches, willows, aspens, and poplars.” The nursery closed in May 1941.

32. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 345.

33. Toll, “Monthly Report of the Superintendent,” July 1933, as quoted in Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, 55.

34. Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, 55.

35. Robert Fechner, “Objectives,” 15, as quoted in Redinger, *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, 56.

36. *Ibid.*

37. Fred T. Johnston, “Plans for the Restoration and Regulation of Camp Grounds in Yellowstone National Park,” January 19, 1933, 3. Copy in folder “Campgrounds,” Marcy Culpin’s files [hereafter Culpin’s files], Historian’s Office, Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center, Yellowstone National Park, Montana [hereafter HRC].

38. E. P. Meinecke, “Camp Planning and Camp Reconstruction,” [1934?], 4–5, vertical file “Recreation,” YNPL.

39. *Ibid.*, 4.

40. *Ibid.*, 6.

41. *Ibid.*, 16–18.

42. E. P. Meinecke, “A Camp Ground Policy,” [1932?], 15, vertical file “Recreation,” YNPL.

43. Johnston, “Plans for the Restoration and Regulation of Camp Grounds in Yellowstone National Park,” 4–5.

44. *Ibid.*, 5.

45. *Ibid.*, 8.

46. *Ibid.*, 10–12, 14–15, 17, 18.

47. Guy D. Edwards, Acting Superintendent, to Mr. Baggley, Chief Ranger, March 11, 1933, folder “Campsites and Campgrounds,” box D-156, YNPA.

48. Frank Mattson, “Report to the Chief Architect Through the Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, Period July 26 to August 29, 1934,” folder “1934 Reports,” box D-37, YNPA.

49. George F. Baggley to John D. Coffman, September 4, 1934, folder 5, box D-26, YNPA.

50. Roger W. Toll to The Director, June 26, 1935, folder 4, box D-29, YNPA.

51. Frank E. Mattson and Robert G. Hall, Assistant Landscape Architect, “Report to the Chief Architect, Period May 26 to June 25, 1935,” folder “1935 Reports (2),” box D-37, YNPA.

52. Anonymous letter to Yellowstone National Park officials, n.d., ca. 1930s, copy in folder “Campgrounds,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

53. Mrs. Miriam C. England to Charles West, Under Secretary of the Interior, ca. July 12, 1937, folder 600.03, box 1731 600.02-601.18, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Campgrounds,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

54. Mattson and Hall, “Report to the Chief Architect, Period May 26 to June 25, 1935.”

55. Mary Shivers Culpin, “Campgrounds,” 5. Copy in folder “Campgrounds,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

56. *Ibid.*

57. Tweed, *Parkitecture*, 79.

58. *Ibid.*, 80.

59. *Ibid.*, 55, 58.

60. Toll, *Annual Report for 1930*, 15.

61. Tweed, *Parkitecture*, 55, 90; McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 330.

62. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 292.

63. *Ibid.*, 293.

64. “General Planning,” Tentative Outline, February 1929, RG 79, National Archives, as quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 293–4.

65. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 301–302.

66. Ethan Carr, *Wilderness by Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 239.

67. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 294.

68. Thomas Vint, “National Park Service: Master Plans,” *Planning and Civic Comment* (April/June 1946), as

quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 304.

69. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 304.

70. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 241–242.

71. Memorandum for the Director [Horace M. Albright], February 16, 1932, transmitted with a letter from Roger W. Toll to Director Albright, March 14, 1932, filed “Yellowstone General file No. 169, Trees-Insect Control-Surveys-Etc., F.Y. 1932,” as quoted in the narrative “Developed and Special Areas,” of the master plan, 1939, YNPA.

72. Ibid.

73. Because there was some confusion as to the process of formally designating special areas, the areas Toll designated in 1932 were indicated as “proposed” on the revised master plan of 1939 (except for the Old Faithful and Canyon–Tower Fall sacred areas, which were indicated as “existing”). The revised 1939 master plan also recommended including seven special areas as wilderness, four research areas, and seventeen sacred areas. The seven special areas as wilderness were 1) Upper Yellowstone–Snake River, 2) Lamar River–Mirror Plateau, 3) Bechler River–Pitchstone and Madison Plateaus, 4) Central Plateau, 5) Washburn Range, 6) Gallatin Range, and 7) Northern. Recommended research areas included 1) White–Tern–Fern–Wapiti lakes, 2) Specimen Ridge Fossil Forest, 3) Specimen Creek–Big Horn Peak Fossil Forest. Number 4, the Electric Peak area, should be omitted, the narrative of the revised master plan argued. Sacred areas were 1) Mammoth Hot Springs, 2) Norris Geyser Basin, 3) Midway and Lower Geyser Basins, 4) Upper, or Old Faithful, Geyser Basin, 5) West Thumb Hot Springs, 6) Yellowstone Canyon–Tower Fall, 7) National Park Mountain, 8) Petrified Tree, 9) Obsidian Cliff, 10) Roaring Mountain, 11) Frying Pan Spring, 12) Monument Geyser Basin–Beryl Spring–Artist Paintpots, 13) Terrace Spring, 14) Shoshone Geyser Basin, 15) Heart Lake Geyser Basin, 16) Mud Volcano–Dragons Mouth, and 17) Lone Star Geyser (“Recommendations,” narrative to the master plan, 1939, YNPA).

74. David A. Jay, “The History of Masterplanning in Yellowstone,” unpublished paper, December 22, 1986, 2, copy in folder “Master Plans,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

75. U.S. Department of the Interior Office of National Parks, Buildings & Reservations, *The Master Plan for Yellowstone National Park, Coordinated by Branch of Plans & Design, 1933*, YNPL. Tweed (*Parkitecture*, 55) discusses Carpenter’s background.

76. This is one of four things David A. Jay notes in “The History of Masterplanning in Yellowstone,” 3.

77. U.S. Department of the Interior Office of National Parks, Buildings & Reservations, *Master Plan for Yellowstone*,

13.

78. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 300.

79. Gilmore D. Clarke, “Report to Accompany Plan of Mammoth Hot Springs Area, Yellowstone National Park, June 1930,” 7, box L-56, YNPA.

80. See page 7 of the 1933 master plan for Clarke’s vision of the Mammoth Hot Springs area.

81. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 300–01.

82. A. C. Stinson, Chief Engr. Insp. Supt., “Report of Reconnaissance Survey of Mammoth Entrance Roads,” January 31, 1930, as quoted in Clarke, “Report to Accompany Plan of Mammoth Hot Springs Area,” 4.

83. Copies were sent to “Yellowstone Park Lodge and Camps Company; Yellowstone Park Hotel and Transportation Companies; Park Curio Shop; George Whittaker; J. E. Haynes, President of Haynes Picture Shops, Inc.; American Association of Museums (via Dr. Bumpus); Mr. C. A. Lindsley, Postmaster; Mr. Robert Lathrop, Weather Bureau; Mr. C. F. Capes, Bureau of Public Roads; Mr. Herbert Maier, Architect for the American Association of Museums; Mr. John Nolen, Harvard Square, Cambridge, Mass.” (“Memo to Files,” August 28, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA).

84. Kenneth C. McCarter, Assistant Landscape Architect, to John Nolen, August 28, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

85. Vernon Goodwin, Yellowstone Park Lodge and Camps Company, to Roger W. Toll, September 3, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

86. W. M. Nichols, Assistant to the President, to Roger W. Toll, August 28, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

87. Ibid.

88. Ibid.

89. George Whittaker, Manager, to Mr. Kenneth McCarter, September 1, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

90. Anna K. Pryor, Manager, to Mr. Toll, September 30, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

91. J. E. Haynes to Mr. Toll, August 21, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

92. Kenneth McCarter, Memorandum to Mr. Toll, August 28, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

93. Tweed, *Parkitecture*, 57.

94. Thomas C. Vint to Mr. Director, September 24,

1930, file 329, folder "FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division," box D-66, YNPA.

95. H. C. Bumpus to Roger W. Toll, September 9, 1930, file 329, folder "FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division," box D-66, YNPA.

96. The only parts of the plan to be built, according to Jay, were "[t]he esplanade and a French Provincial style post office" (Jay, "The History of Masterplanning in Yellowstone," 3). Jay's assessment, although technically incorrect—the apartment house for park employees was built in 1935—is not far from the mark. The phrase "a satisfactory plan toward which to work" is from Toll's letter to Director Albright, March 26, 1931, file 329, folder "FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division," box D-66, YNPA.

97. Thomas C. Vint to Roger W. Toll, March 18, 1931, file 329, folder "FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division," box D-66, YNPA.

98. Roger W. Toll to Director Albright, March 26, 1931, file 329, folder "FY 1931, FY 1932, Landscape Division," box D-66, YNPA.

99. Vint to Toll, March 18, 1931.

100. These modifications may also show up in the master plan of 1935. The Yellowstone National Park Archives does not have a copy of that master plan.

101. U.S. Department of the Interior Office of National Parks, Buildings & Reservations, *Master Plan for Yellowstone*.

102. See the master plan for 1939 and 1940 for Yellowstone National Park. The master plan for 1940 had a description for the "North Entrance Area" on page 14. The map is called "North Entrance Part of the Master Plan for Yellowstone National Park, 1940."

103. U.S. Department of the Interior Office of National Parks, Buildings & Reservations, *Master Plan for Yellowstone*, "Bridge Bay."

104. U.S. Department of the Interior Office of National Parks, Buildings & Reservations, *Master Plan for Yellowstone*, "Canyon Area Proposed Development."

105. Tweed, *Parkitecture*, 56.

106. Laura Soulliere Harrison, *Architecture in the Parks: National Historic Landmark Theme Study* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1986), 6.

107. Ibid.

108. Ibid.

109. Ibid., 7.

110. Randall J. Biallas, "Foreword," in *Park and Recreation Structures*, by Albert H. Good (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999; reprint of 1938 edition published by National Park Service), i.

111. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 429, 432.

112. Ibid., 335, 433–441.

113. Good, *Park and Recreation Structures*, 5.

114. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 394.

115. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 398.

116. Carr, *Wilderness by Design*, 145.

117. See, for example, Roger W. Toll to Mr. Jacob M. Hoffman, June 18, 1931, file 329, folder "FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division," box D-66, YNPA.

118. "Yellowstone National Park, Construction Report on Two Snowshoe Cabins—Lamar & N. Bdry. Project F.P. 140," October 30, 1936, folder 4, box D-25, YNPA.

119. "Construction of Physical Improvements—Outline of Work. Yellowstone National Park, 1929, 1930, and 1932," file "Landscape Division," entry 7, RG 79, National Archives, as quoted in Mary Shivers Culpin's "Ranger Stations/Patrol Cabins, Yellowstone NP," April 23, 1997, unpublished document, Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

120. Leroy Hill to Mr. Vint, March 24, 1927, folder 6, box D-38, YNPA.

121. Yellowstone Plan No. 328, microfiche, YNP Maintenance Division, as cited in Lon Johnson and Christine Whitacre, "Snowshoe Cabins Yellowstone National Park," [no date, 2000?], 4, unpublished document, Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

122. Johnson and Whitacre, "Snowshoe Cabins Yellowstone National Park," 4.

123. Yellowstone Plan No. 3037, microfiche, YNP Maintenance Division, as cited in Johnson and Whitacre, "Snowshoe Cabins Yellowstone National Park," 4.

124. National Park Service, "Miller Creek Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE936, LCS #51028, 6.

125. Ibid., 4.

126. Ibid., 6.

127. Ibid., 6–7.

128. Guy Edwards to Horace Albright, June 11, 1931, and Guy Edwards to Horace Albright, August 13, 1931, file 620-008, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives, as quoted in National Park Service, "Fern Lake Snowshoe Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE932, LCS #51021, 6.

129. National Park Service, "Fern Lake Snowshoe Cabin," 6.

130. National Park Service, "Upper Miller Creek Buffalo Herder's Cabin," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE942, LCS #51018, 5, 6.

131. "Yellowstone National Park Construction Report

on Two Snowshoe Cabins,” October 30, 1936.

132. National Park Service, “Buffalo Plateau Snowshoe Cabin,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #24YE34, LCS #51017, 6.

133. National Park Service, “Cold Creek Snowshoe Cabin,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE929, LCS #51020, 6.

134. National Park Service, “Blacktail Deer Creek Snowshoe Cabin and Barn,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #24YE37, LCS #50915 and #50914, 6–7. In 1935, a snowshoe cabin at Cougar Creek northwest of Madison Junction was built, as was a cabin at Pelican Creek in 1937. Both cabins followed standard designs and are extant (National Park Service “Cougar Creek Snowshoe Cabin,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE930, LCS #51004).

135. “Lake Fish Hatchery Historic District,” National Register of Historic Places Nomination Sheet, Draft 1/19/01, 2–6, Historian’s Office, HRC.

136. Guy D. Edwards to Mr. Toll, August 9 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

137. Roger Toll to Thomas Vint, August 23, 1930, and Thomas Vint to Roger Toll, September 8, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA. Copy in folder “Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1930,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

138. Good as quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 439–440.

139. Thomas Vint to Guy Edwards, April 27, 1931, file 329, folder “FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA; K.C. McCarter and Howard Baker, “Report to the Chief Landscape Architect Through the Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, May 9–16, 1931,” copy in folder “Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1930,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

140. Sanford Hill, Resident Landscape Architect, “Narrative Report on Yellowstone National Park,” July 1939, box L-56, YNPA.

141. F. Mattson to Mr. Toll, Memo, July 3, 1934, folder 6, box D-26, YNPA.

142. Roger W. Toll, “Memorandum to Operators,” July 9, 1934, folder 6, box D-26, YNPA.

143. Toll, *Annual Report for 1932*, 18; National Park Service, “West Yellowstone Ranger Station/HS-0133,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE, LCS #10650, 1, 2; Toll, *Annual Report for 1935*, 17; National Park Service, “Cooke Ranger Station/Residence/HS-0251,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE,

LCS #10624, 2; National Park Service, “Northeast Entrance Station/HS-0254,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE, LCS #10625, 2

144. The Bureau of Fisheries was alerted to the new policy in regard to its planned fish hatchery buildings at Lake. The other design decision involved the switch from the “dull brown stain” to using a grey-green color on most of the buildings to be built in the future. The Bureau of Fisheries’ Regional Director was directed to paint all of the new buildings at Lake grey-green, and within a short time he would be expected to paint the existing fish hatchery buildings grey-green (Paul Brown to Fred Foster, January 17, 1940, file “Fish Hatchery Part 2, January 1, 1940 to December 31, 1943,” box D-157, YNPA.

145. C. A. Lord, Engineer, “Final Report Reconstruction Checking Station and Equipment Gardiner Checking Station, Project No. F.F. 601,” folder 6, box D-25, YNPA.

146. Ibid.

147. “Lookout—Mount Holmes, Project #832,” Report of Progress of Approved Construction Projects of Fiscal Years 1931 and 1932 Built During Season of 1931, and K. C. McCarter and H. W. Baker, “Report to the Chief Landscape Architect Through The Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, June 1, 1931, 5, both in folder “Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1931–1934,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC. The information regarding Mt. Sheridan’s lookout tower is from Toll, *Annual Report for 1930*, 14. The annual report establishes that a tower was built but it does not mention where; that information can be found in Toll, “Monthly Report of the Superintendent,” August 1930, 6.

148. Toll, *Annual Report for 1931*, 14; Rogers, *Annual Report for 1938*, 33.

149. Sanford Hill, “Monthly Narrative Report to the Chief Architect,” August 26–September 30, 1937, 17, folder “Landscaping and Landscape Architects,” box L-56, YNPA.

150. Sanford Hill, “Special Report to the Chief Architect,” March 3 to March 15, 1938, 5–6, folder “Landscaping and Landscape Architects,” box L-56, YNPA.

151. “Final Report, One Primary and Three Secondary Fire Lookouts, Project O.P. 267,” December 30, 1942, folder 6, box D-35, YNPA.

152. Sanford Hill, “Narrative Report on Yellowstone National Park,” June 1939, 10, folder “Landscaping and Landscape Architects,” box L-56, YNPA.

153. “Final Report, One Primary and Three Secondary Fire Lookouts, December 30, 1942.

154. “Apollinaris Spring Comfort Station,” Classified Structure Field Inventory Report, copy in folder “94 Comfort

Station Apollinaris Springs,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC; Thomas Vint to Joseph Joffe, Assistant to the Superintendent, July 18, 1931, file 329, folder “FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

155. “Comfort Station/HS-0201,” National Park Service—Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE998, LCS #50560, 2; the hand-written note on the top of page 1 of the survey form indicates that the structure was moved to the Mammoth campground in 2000. This is the only extant structure of the original four.

156. Roger W. Toll to Thomas C. Vint, July 17, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

157. Kenneth C. McCarter to Roger W. Toll, Memorandum, July 22, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

158. Guy D. Edwards, Acting Superintendent, to Thomas C. Vint, April 2, 1931, file 329, folder “FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA. Copy in folder “Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture—1930–1934,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

159. Toll, *Annual Report for 1933*, 10.

160. Kenneth McCarter to Thomas Vint, May 21, 1933, folder 5, box D-26, YNPA.

161. Guy D. Edwards to W.G. Carnes, March 16, 1934, folder 5, box D-26, YNPA.

162. Frank E. Mattson, “Report to the Chief Architect,” June 26–July 20, 1935, box L-56, YNPA. By 1937, Gebhardt had taken over supervision of the EWC architectural work and became Associate Architect.

163. R. Laurie Simmons and Thomas H. Simmons, National Register of Historic Places Nomination: Mammoth Hot Springs, Draft, July 6, 2000, 27–28.

164. Edmund Rogers, “Annual Report of Roads and Trails Construction Activities for the Fiscal Year June 30, 1936,” file “631 Construction Under Road Budget Program Part 1, Jan. 1, 1936 to December 31, 1939,” box D-13, YNPA.

165. Sanford Hill, “Monthly Narrative Report to Chief Architect,” May 3–May 20, 1937, box L-56, YNPA.

166. Howard W. Baker, Assistant Landscape Architect, “Report to the Chief Architect on Yellowstone National Park,” June 5–June 22, 1937, box L-56, YNPA.

167. Simmons and Simmons, National Register Nomination, Mammoth Hot Springs, Draft, 27–28.

168. Ibid., 29–30. By September 1938, the Mammoth road project was nearly complete. Superintendent Rogers found a “much improved appearance at park headquarters.” Landscape Architect Sanford Hill was not pleased with the size

of the chips used in the sidewalk, however; he believed they lent a “rough appearance” to the surface. He also thought the top dressing should have been a finer aggregate, and he believed additional sidewalks should have been built for pedestrian travel. (Sanford Hill, “Report on Yellowstone National Park, September, 1938,” Box D-38, YNPA.) The road project, combined with the development of the cottages behind the Mammoth Hotel and the improvements and extension of the Mammoth Auto Campground, made for a busy construction period. (Rogers, *Annual Report for 1939*, 2.)

169. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1935*, 17; Edmund B. Rogers to the Director, June 28, 1939, copy in folder “Lamar Buffalo Ranch,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

170. “Lamar Buffalo Ranch Asst. Buffalo Keeper’s House,” Single Entry Report—LCS, HS-0108, [August 17, 2000], 3, copy available in YCR.

171. Rogers to Director, June 28, 1939.

172. Ibid.

173. National Park Service, “Lamar Buffalo Ranch Generator House/HS-0273,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE, LCS #10630, 1–3; National Park Service, “Lamar Buffalo Ranch Fire Hose Houses #1 and #2/HS-0996, HS-0997,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE, LCS #101347 and #101346, 1, 2.

174. National Park Service, “Stephens Creek Administration Area Residence/HS-0102,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #24 YE, LCS #51012, 2–4; Guy D. Edwards, Acting Superintendent, to Mr. T. C. Vint, January 4, 1934, folder 5, box D-26, YNPA.

175. Roger W. Toll to Dr. H. C. Bumpus, July 16, 1930, file “Museums,” box 471, 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Museums, 2 of 2,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

176. Bumpus to Horace M. Albright, telegram, July 15, 1930, file “Museums,” box 471, 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Museums, 2 of 2,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

177. Albright to Roger W. Toll, telegram, July 16, 1930, and Roger W. Toll to Dr. H. C. Bumpus, July 16, 1930, both in file “Museums,” box 471, 620.01-630, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives. Copy in folder “Museums, 2 of 2,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

178. National Park Service, “Fishing Bridge Museum,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE675, LCS #50573, 3.

179. Ibid, 2.

180. Good, *Park and Recreation Structures*, 177.

181. R. W. T. [Roger Toll] to [Kenneth] McCarter, Memorandum, August 31, 1933, folder 5, box D-26,

YNPA.

182. National Park Service, "Naturalist's Residence," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE675, LCS #50574, 2.

183. National Park Service, "Comfort Station/HS-0116," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE, LCS #10622, 2; National Park Service, "Norris Barn/HS-0118," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE820, LCS #10621, 2.

184. Joseph Joffe to Director, July 14, 1931, box 1737, entry 7, RG 79, National Archives, as cited in National Park Service, "Lake Comfort Station/HS-0197," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE852, LCS #50601, 2.)

185. National Park Service, "Lake Ranger Station/HS-0191," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE852, LCS #10636, 3. The octagonal room's integrity—spoiled at some point in the history of the building—was restored in a major restoration effort in the mid-1980s.

186. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 400.

187. Ibid., 252, and note 7, 547.

188. Ibid., 254.

189. Good, *Park and Recreation Structures*, Part 2, 210.

190. National Park Service, "Fishing Bridge Amphitheater," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE675, 2.

191. Ibid., 1.

192. Toll, *Annual Report for 1934*, 8.

193. Toll, *Annual Report for 1935*, 7.

194. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1936*, 12; Rogers, *Annual Report for 1937*, 16; Rogers, *Annual Report for 1938*, 15.

195. Toll, *Annual Report for 1935*, 7. Concessioner employees in those days were commonly known as "savages"—a self-moniker referring to their location in the "wilderness" of the national parks.

196. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 254.

197. Ibid., 249–250.

198. Ibid., 364.

199. Ibid.

200. Good, *Park and Recreation Structures*, Part 2, 169.

201. Ibid., 169–170.

202. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 250.

203. Ibid., 252.

204. Ibid., 251.

205. Good, *Park and Recreation Structures*, Part 2, 176.

206. National Park Service, "Obsidian Cliff Nature

Shrine/HS-0983," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE, LCS #10649, 2.

207. Toll, *Annual Report for 1933*, 10; McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 409; Lee Whittlesey, *Wonderland Nomenclature*, (unpublished manuscript, 1988), 588, copy available in YNPL.

208. National Park Service, "Natural Bridge Sign and Kiosk," Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE, LCS #[], 2.

209. Good, *Park and Recreation Structures*, Part 2, 175.

210. H. C. Bumpus, *Trailside Notes for the Motorist and Hiker: Mammoth to Norris Geyser Basin, Number One*, [Yellowstone Park, Wyoming]: National Park Service, 1930, in Bumpus, H. C., Rare Separates, YNPA. *Trailside Notes* were added for Mammoth-to-Old Faithful in 1933, Fishing Bridge Museum-to-Mammoth Hot Springs in 1936, and Old Faithful-to-Yellowstone Lake and Fishing Bridge Museum in 1939.

211. R. M. Taylor to H. C. Bumpus, postal card, September 1929, card found in *Trailside Notes for the Motorist*, Yellowstone Education Department, 1929, in Bumpus, H. C., "Trailside Notes for the Motorist and Hiker, 10 booklets dated from 1929–1939," Rare Separates, YNPA.

212. Edward N. Jones, "Report on Yellowstone Park Educational Activities," as quoted in Denise S. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., 1986, 119.

213. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 119.

214. Jones, "Report on Yellowstone Park Educational Activities," 9, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 119.

215. Hermon C. Bumpus, "Outdoor Education: The Part Played By Our National Parks," *Hobbies* 10(10), June 1930, 326, Bumpus, Hermon C., "Outdoor Education," vertical files, YNPL.

216. *Director's Report for 1931*, 17.

217. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 120.

218. Fred J. Foster, "Report of Fish-Cultural Activities," in *Director's Report for 1930*, 146.

219. Toll, *Annual Report for 1931*, 13.

220. Ibid.

221. Christine Whitacre, "Otter Creek Bear-Feeding Station," no date, archeological report, 3, copy in folder "Bear Feeding Grounds–Otter Creek," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

222. C. A. Lord, Park Engineer, "Final Report, Loop

Betterment-Project #525.6, Otter Creek Road and Bear Feeding Ground,” January 26, 1932, 2, as quoted in Whitacre, “Otter Creek Bear-Feeding Station,” 3.

223. Roger W. Toll to Mr. McCarter, Memorandum, August 23, 1930, file 329, folder “FY 1932, FY 1932 Landscape Division,” box D-66, YNPA.

224. Toll, *Annual Report for 1932*, 3.

225. Toll, *Annual Report for 1933*, 3–4.

226. Toll, *Annual Report for 1935*, 13.

227. Bears Playground was located near a small pond “just west of the bridge that crosses the Firehole River on the Grand Loop Road downstream from Kepler Cascades (1.5 miles from Old Faithful)” [Lee H. Whittlesey, *Yellowstone Place Names* (Helena, Mont: The Montana Historical Society Press, 1988), 21].

228. Mattson, “Report to the Chief Architect, Period July 26–August 29, 1934.”

229. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1936*, 20.

230. Ibid.

231. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1937*, 26.

232. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1938*, 15.

233. <www.nps.gov/yell/nature/animals/bear/infopaper/inf01.html>; Kerry Gunther and Mark Biel, eds., *Yellowstone National Park Bear Information Book* (Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: Yellowstone Center for Resources Bear Management Office, 1994), 40.

234. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1937*, 26.

235. Ibid, 14–16.

236. In 1933, the park’s educational department (which replaced the information department in 1928) became the Naturalist Department. This change took place in all national parks after park superintendents meeting in Washington, D.C., in 1932 decided that “naturalist” was more “distinctive and accurate” than “educational” (see Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 136). As early as 1930, park superintendents had decided that the term “education” seemed “open to misinterpretation, as perhaps implying the formal type of education dispensed in institutions of learning.” Park superintendents expressed concern that visitors would not understand that education in the parks meant “imparting to the visitor something which is a blending of the recreational, intellectual, and spiritual.” They sought a term that would “define the educational functions [of the parks’ various services] in terms of use and enjoyment of the national parks” (*Director’s Report for 1930*, 19).

237. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1938*, 15.

238. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1937*, 16.

239. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1938*, 22.

240. Pritchard, *Preserving Yellowstone’s Natural Condi-*

tions, 143.

241. <www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/fauna.htm>.

242. Pritchard, *Preserving Yellowstone’s Natural Conditions*, 87.

243. George M. Wright, Joseph S. Dixon, and Ben H. Thompson, *Fauna of the National Parks of the United States, Fauna Series No. 1*, May 1932 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933), iv.

244. Ibid., 3–4.

245. Ibid., 82–84.

246. Ibid., 84.

247. See “An Act to Establish a National Park Service, and for Other Purposes,” 64th Cong., 1st Sess., H.R. 15522. For a good discussion of the issues surrounding the dichotomous message, see Paul Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone: Ecology and Wonder in the Last Wilderness* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997), chapter 8.

248. George M. Wright and Ben H. Thompson, *Fauna of the National Parks of the United States: Wildlife Management in the National Parks. Fauna Series No. 2*, July 1934 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), 23.

249. Mattson, “Report to the Chief Architect, Period July 26–August 29, 1934,” and Wright and Thompson, *Fauna Series No. 2*, 23.

250. Wright and Thompson, *Fauna Series No. 2*, 23.

251. “Outlying Areas,” [Narrative Description of Existing and Proposed Facilities in Outlying Areas], Master Plan, 1939.

252. Roger Toll to Horace Albright, May 12, 1930, copy in folder “Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1930,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

CHAPTER 7

1. Park officials recorded a new high of 814,907 visitors to the park in 1946 (<www.nps.gov/yell/stats/historical.htm>).

2. Aubrey L. Haines, *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*, revised ed. (Niwt, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1996), vol. 2, [hereafter Haines, vol. 1 or 2], 462.

3. Ibid.

4. Edmund B. Rogers, *Annual Report for Yellowstone National Park, 1942*, Yellowstone National Park Library, 11, hereafter *Annual Report for [year]*; Rogers, *Annual Report for 1943*, 1; Rogers, *Annual Report for 1944*, 1.

5. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1942*, 12.

6. Newton Drury, “Statement Concerning Facilities

Available to the Public in National Park Areas During the 1943 Season,” folder “Accommodations in Park, 1943–45,” Yellowstone Park Company Papers, box 5, Yellowstone National Park Archives [hereafter YNPA].

7. Linda Flint McClelland, *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 460.

8. For further reading on the campfire discussion, see Paul Schullery, *Searching For Yellowstone: Ecology and Wonder in the Last Wilderness* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997), chapter 4 and 51–67, and Paul Schullery and Lee Wittlesey, *Myth and History in the Creation of Yellowstone National Park* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003).

9. Robin Smith, “The History of Grant Village,” unpublished study, April 24, 1988, 13, Yellowstone National Park Library [hereafter YNPL].

10. Hillory A. Tolson to Regional Director, August 20, 1945; Lawrence Merriam to Edmund Rogers, September 27, 1945, copies of both in folder “Administration Buildings–Mammoth Hot Springs,” Marcy Culpin’s files [hereafter Culpin’s files], Historian’s Office, Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center, Yellowstone National Park, Montana [hereafter HRC].

11. “Park Office Move Advances,” March 3, 1960, copy of clipping, folder D3415 “Buildings (General) 1959–60,” box D-158, YNPA. Copy in folder “Administration Buildings–Mammoth Hot Springs,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

12. Roger Ernst to Senator Mike Mansfield, March 29, 1960; Senator Mike Mansfield to Conrad Wirth, March 8, 1960; Conrad Wirth to Senator G. W. McGee, April 5, 1960, copies of all in folder “Administration Buildings–Mammoth Hot Springs,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

13. Edmund Rogers, “Monthly Report of the Superintendent,” September 1944, 5, YNPL; National Park Service, “Nez Perce Snowshoe Cabin,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE937, LCS #51000, 1–7.

14. Newton Drury, *Annual Report of the Director of the National Park Service to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1946*, 307–308, hereafter *Director’s Report for [year]*.

15. Frank Mattson, “Resident Landscape Architect’s Monthly Report, July 10, 1946”; Frank Mattson to Edmund Rogers, November 1, 1946, both in file “207-02.7 Monthly Narrative Landscape Report,” box D-157, YNPA.

16. Warren Hamilton to Regional Director, January 31, 1957, file “D22, Book #2, January 1957–January 1959,” box D-223, YNPA.

17. George Baggeley to Lemuel Garrison, June 11, 1959;

“Memorandum for the Press for Immediate Release, June 30, 1959,” book 5 “November 1958–July 1959,” box D3415, record group [hereafter RG] 79, National Archives and Record Center, Kansas City, Missouri [hereafter NAKC]. Copies of both in folder “Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1959,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

18. Denise S. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., 1986, 156–157.

19. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1942*, 6.

20. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1944*, 16. Rogers wrote, “Every effort has been made to provide for prompt removal and disposal of garbage, which during the 1943 season was burned in pits well removed from the utility areas, since incinerators were not operated, and the same practice was followed in 1944.”

21. Ibid.

22. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1946*, 20.

23. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1944*, 13.

24. Ibid.

25. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1947*, 8, 10–11. The park biologist position was established on November 26, 1946.

26. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1949*, 12–13.

27. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 159.

28. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1949*, 12–13.

29. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 159.

30. C. Max Bauer, “Report of the Naturalist Division for August 1946,” *Reports of the Naturalist Division, Yellowstone National Park*, YNPA, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 159.

31. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 85, 462–63.

32. William Nichols to Conrad Wirth, December 17, 1953, folder “Lake,” box YPC-125, YNPA.

33. Conrad Wirth to William Nichols, June 16, 1955, folder “Lake,” box YPC-125, YNPA.

34. National Park Service, *Mission 66 in Action: Report on the First Year of Mission 66* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1957), 3, as quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 462.

35. Conrad Wirth, “The Basic Purpose of the National Park System,” in National Park Service, “Mission 66 for the National Park System,” 1956, 26–27, as quoted by McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 463.

36. National Park Service, “Mission 66 for the National Park System.” See Brian Kenner, *An Examination of National Park Service Decision Making: A Case Study of Grant Village*,

Yellowstone National Park, M.S. thesis, University of Montana, Missoula, Mont., 1984. Copy in YNPL.

37. See Kenner, *An Examination of National Park Service Decision Making*, for a discussion of anthropocentric versus biocentric ideologies of park management.

38. Kenner, *An Examination of National Park Service Decision Making*, 53.

39. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 464.

40. Conrad Wirth, "The Landscape Architect in National Park Work: His Projects, Opportunities, Problems, and Obligations," *Landscape Architecture* 46(1), 9, as quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 464.

41. *Ibid.*, 464–465.

42. Sarah Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2000), 11–13.

43. Ernest Mickel, *Architectural Record* 120 (2) (August 1956), 32, as quoted in Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 11–12.

44. Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 23–24.

45. *Ibid.*, 22, 13.

46. Edmund Rogers to Regional Director, Memorandum, May 21, 1954, binder "Museum Plans Madison, Mammoth, Norris, West Entrance," box D-66, YNPA.

47. *Ibid.*

48. Howard W. Baker to Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, Memorandum, May 28, 1954, folder [binder] "Museum Plans Madison, Mammoth, Norris, West Entrance," box D-66, YNPA.

49. Baker to Superintendent, May 28, 1954.

50. Warren Hamilton, Acting Superintendent, to Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park, Memorandum, October 15, 1954, binder "Museum Plans Madison, Mammoth, Norris, West Entrance," box D-66, YNPA.

51. *Ibid.*

52. Baker to Superintendent, May 28, 1954.

53. Rogers to Regional Director, May 21, 1954.

54. *Ibid.*

55. Hamilton to Superintendent, October 15, 1954.

56. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 470.

57. Conrad Wirth, "Mission 66 in the Headlines," *National Parks Magazine* 32(132) (1958): 8, as quoted in McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 470.

58. "Report of Working Committee, April 11–15, 1955, Statement of Current and Future Park Visitor Needs for Accommodations and Facilities in Yellowstone National Park," file 2, box 188, Ms. 1504, Haynes Papers, Montana State University, Bozeman, Mont.

59. National Park Service, "Mission 66 for Yellowstone

National Park," [n.d., ca. 1957], 3, "Mission 66," NPS–Development, USDI–NPS, vertical files, YNPL.

60. *Ibid.*, 5.

61. *Ibid.*, 3.

62. *Ibid.*, 6.

63. *Ibid.*, 9.

64. *Ibid.*, 7.

65. "Canyon Area Proposed Development," Master Plan for 1939, YNPA.

66. *Ibid.*

67. Mark Daniel Barringer, "Mission Impossible: National Park Development in the 1950s," *Journal of the West* 38(1) (January 1999), 23.

68. Kenner, *An Examination of National Park Service Decision Making*, 82.

69. See Barringer, "Mission Impossible," generally, and Haines, vol. 2, 369.

70. Barringer, "Mission Impossible," 23.

71. *Ibid.*, 24.

72. Superintendent Rogers had mentioned this "revolt" to Regional Director Baker (Rogers to Regional Director, May 21, 1954).

73. G. R. Brosius, M.D., to Mr. W. M. Nichols, May 17, 1956, and a note on a prescription form dated May 14, 1956, both in folder "D 3415, Book 2, Jan. 1955–Sept. 1956," box D-266, YNPA.

74. E. T. Scoyen, Acting Director, to Hon. Mike Mansfield June 8, 1956, folder "D 3415, Book 2, Jan. 1955–Sept. 1956," box D-266, YNPA.

75. *Ibid.*

76. Devereux Butcher, "Our National Parks in Jeopardy: Resorts or Wilderness?" *Atlantic Monthly* (February 1961): 45–51.

77. Smith, "The History of Grant Village," 18.

78. "Proposed Prospectus For Grant Village," as part of a memorandum from Lemuel Garrison to Regional Director, Region Two, regarding Pre-Planning conference for Grant Village, November 13, 1957, 2, folder "Development–Grant Village," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.

79. The Western Office of Design and Construction (WODC) was the successor in 1954, along with its eastern equivalent (EODC), to the Division of Design and Construction. According to Allaback's *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, the Division of Design and Construction was transformed into the two offices, east and west, in June 1954 (see endnote 15 on page 248). In 1971, the two offices were consolidated in the Denver Service Center, which, according to McClelland, "continues to provide the National Park Service with multidisciplinary expertise in planning and design," (see McClelland,

Building the National Parks, 483).

80. Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park to Chief, Western Office, Division of Design and Construction, Memorandum, March 26, 1957, 2–4, book 2, Jan. 1956–Jan. 1958, box D-18, YNPA. Copy in folder “Development–Grant Village,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

81. “Proposed Prospectus for Grant Village,” 3–4.

82. Lemuel Garrison to Regional Director, April 2, 1958, file “D18, Book #3, January 1958–January 1959,” box D-233, YNPA.

83. Ibid. According to Garrison, the project would not cause conflict or “destroy any primary values,” because the “forest scene [was] not a superior or unique characteristic of the site, and [was] duplicated in many places elsewhere in the Park.” Furthermore, the site warranted development for its “recreational and interpretive use.” Boating and fishing were high priorities for visitors, Garrison noted, and the area deserved “a full-scale interpretive plan” as well (“Proposed Prospectus For Grant Village,” 5). Contrarily, according to park archeologist Elaine Hale, the Grant Village development destroyed some of the park’s oldest archeological sites (personal communication to editor, August 9, 2005).

84. “Proposed Prospectus For Grant Village,” 7–8.

85. Ibid., 6.

86. “Grant Village: Dedication and Opening Ceremony,” Yellowstone National Park, June 23, 1963, photocopy of program in folder “Development–Grant Village,” Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC.

87. According to a post-1981 NPS Denver Service Center report on Grant Village, the National Park Service “completed its portion of the primary utility system, a 400-site campground, a visitor center and ranger station, and roads” in the village “in anticipation that the park’s principal concessioner would establish the necessary overnight accommodations and restaurant complex.” The NPS also built a marina and trails. But by 1976, General Host, the company responsible for operating concessions and constructing the facilities related to them, had built only a service station and camper service facility. General Host claimed that more detailed financial analyses had shown that the project would be fiscally unprofitable (John D. Amerman, President and General Manager of Yellowstone Park Company, to Andrew C. Wolfe, Chairman, Yellowstone Concessions Review Group, May 25, 1976, “Other Correspondence About Grant Village,” NPS–Development, vertical files, YNPL). Finally, because of General Host’s resultant failure to make progress on dining and lodging facilities, the NPS terminated the contract in 1979, and purchased the existing facilities (National Park Service (Denver Service Center), “Grant Village,” and National Park

Service, “Other Correspondence About Grant Village,” both in NPS–Development, vertical files, YNPL). In a 1976 letter to Andrew Wolfe, Group Leader of the Yellowstone Concessions Review Group, Trevor S. Povah, president of Hamilton Stores, Inc. (which had purchased the Haynes Picture Shops in 1968), and a member of the same group, claimed that the Grant Village project had been doomed from the start (Richard A. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged* [Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1985], 379). Grant Village, he complained, “is the first location to get snow in the fall and the last location that can be opened in the spring due to snow. Millions of dollars were spent on sewage, marina, roads, etc., and none of it has proved to be economically feasible or advantageous to the traveling public. There is a big mosquito problem in this area. The limited season makes it impossible to recover any investment.” Povah strongly recommended that no further building be done at Grant Village, and favored a trailer village for recreational vehicles to replace plans for a motel unit. John D. Amerman, President of the Yellowstone Park Company, also preferred a trailer park. However, he wanted the government to build the project and for the Yellowstone Park Company to operate it (Trevor S. Povah, President of Hamilton Stores, Inc., to Andrew C. Wolfe, May 27, 1976, “Other Correspondence About Grant Village,” NPS–Development, vertical files, YNPL). In his own letter to Wolfe, Amerman also argued that the campground at Grant Village and campgrounds elsewhere in the park should be concessioner-operated—a policy change in which he understood Secretary of the Interior Thomas Kleppe to be interested (John D. Amerman, President of Yellowstone Park Company, to Andrew C. Wolfe, May 26, 1976, 2, “Other Correspondence About Grant Village,” NPS–Development, vertical files, YNPL).

88. Haines, vol. 2, 378; Barringer, “Mission Impossible,” 22–24; Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, chapter 14.

89. McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, 465–466.

90. Ibid., 466.

91. U.S. Department of the Interior, *Our Heritage, A Plan for Its Protection and Use: “Mission 66”* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956), as quoted in Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 17.

92. Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 17.

93. Conrad Wirth to Washington Office and field offices, Memorandum “Visitor Centers; Park Roads,” February 10, 1956, as quoted in Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 18.

94. Western Office of Design and Construction,

“Summary of General Discussions of Visitor Center Design Problems,” February 4, 1958, 7, as quoted in Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 18.

95. Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 22–24.

96. *Ibid.*, 24–25.

97. Mission 66 visitor centers were also planned for Mammoth Hot Springs, Madison Junction, and the ill-fated Firehole Village. When the Firehole Village project was abandoned in 1971, a new visitor center was built at Old Faithful, instead.

98. National Park Service, “Canyon Village Visitor Center,” Historic Structure Survey Form, 1999, Smithsonian #48YE999, 3.

99. Jerry A. Riddall, Chief Architect, WODC, to Regional Director, Midwest Region, Memorandum, October 1, 1963, folder “D3415, #17 Oct. 1963–Jan. 1964,” box D-245, YNPA.

100. Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 16, 104.

101. *Ibid.*, 17.

102. Instead of planning to hire and then, once the program was completed in 1966, lay off the many architects needed to design the new Mission 66 visitor centers, the NPS opted to contract out work to different architectural firms (Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 25).

103. *Ibid.*

104. *Ibid.*, 261, and Riddall to Regional Director, October 1, 1963.

105. Warren F. Hamilton, Acting Superintendent, to Director, Region Two, Memorandum, January 5, 1956, folder “D3415, Book 2 Jan. 1955–Sept. 1956,” box D-226, YNPA.

106. Frank Mattson to Lemuel Garrison, September 19, 1957; Lemuel Garrison to Thomas Vint, October 11, 1957; Lyle Bennet to Cop Construction Company, August 28, 1957; and Earl Brown to Cop Construction Company, September 27, 1957, as quoted in Mary Shivers Culpin, draft “History of Administration,” chapter 9, page 15, Culpin’s files, Historian’s Office, HRC. The colors selected for the visitor center were Sanitas colors T520 and T510. The exterior colors for the camp manager’s residence were planned to be the same as those of the District Ranger’s residence. The selection for the asphalt tile for the visitor center was Matico - Exhibit Room Floor - CK 1005; all other asphalt tile floors were to be CK 1003.

107. M. E. Beatty, Regional Chief of Interpretation, to Superintendent, September 28, 1960, folder “D3415, Book #9, Aug. 1960–Jan. 1961,” box 243, YNPA.

108. *Ibid.*

109. For an excellent discussion of Doty’s association

with the National Park Service, see Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, chapter 6. See endnote 15 on page 248 for a discussion of Lyle Bennett and page 189, for example, for a discussion of Sanford Hill.

110. Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 221.

111. *Ibid.*, 265.

112. *Ibid.*, 34.

113. *Ibid.*, 34.

114. *Ibid.*, 31.

115. *Ibid.*, 26, 29.

116. For a brief discussion of this activity, see *ibid.*, 30.

117. *Ibid.*, 31.

118. *Ibid.*, 25.

119. *Ibid.*, 25.

120. *Ibid.*, 27.

121. For example, Roy Appelman and Ronald Lee, two historians with the NPS in the 1960s, favored “right-on-top” siting (*ibid.*).

122. From “A Report on Visitor Centers” (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, ca. January 1960), as quoted in Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 28.

123. From “A Survey of the Public Concerning the National Parks,” (Princeton: Audience Research, Inc., December 1955), as quoted in Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 4.

124. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 133–136.

125. *Ibid.*, 134–135.

126. Vick documented the interim names: Branch of Natural History (1943), Natural History Division (1948), and Research and Interpretation (1951) (*ibid.*, 139).

127. *Ibid.*

128. Tilden, *Interpreting Our Heritage*. Third ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977), 8, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 181.

129. Freeman Tilden, *The Fifth Essence* (Washington, D.C.: The National Park Trust Fund Board, n.d.), 60, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 179. Tilden wrote three books on national parks: *The National Parks: What They Mean to You and Me* (1951), *The Fifth Essence: An Invitation to Share Our Eternal Heritage* (circa 1953), and *Interpreting Our Heritage* (1957).

130. Paul E. Schulz, “Interpretation of Park Values,” *Park Practice Guidelines* (March 1962): 49, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 183.

131. Tilden, *Interpreting Our Heritage*, 9, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 181.

132. Ibid., 8, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 181.
133. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 179.
134. Tilden, *Interpreting Our Heritage*, 9, as quoted in Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 181.
135. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 183.
136. See Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, chapter 9 and page 234; Haines, vol. 2, 382.
137. From Lemuel A. Garrison, *The Making of a Ranger: Forty Years with the National Parks* (Salt Lake City: Howe Brothers, 1983), 279.
138. Lon Garrison, "Interview with Lon Garrison, with Alan Mebane, Chief Naturalist, Yellowstone National Park," February 22, 1973, transcribed by Cheryl Moore, February 1977, 12, vertical file "Biography," YNPL.
139. Haines, vol. 2, 379.
140. Lon Garrison, "Interview with Alan Mebane," February 22, 1973, 12.
141. Haines, vol. 2, 379.
142. Lon Garrison, "Interview with Alan Mebane," February 22, 1973, 12.
143. Vick, *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 200–201.
144. According to Vick (*Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*, 202–204), the *Manual of General Information* replaced the *Ranger Naturalists' Manual* (last updated in 1945), and park historian Aubrey Haines introduced *The Yellowstone Interpreter* to replace *Yellowstone Nature Notes*, which was discontinued in December 1958.
145. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1948*, 10.
146. Rogers, *Annual Report for 1949*, 18.
147. See Howard Baker to Mr. S. S. Kistler, September 10, 1953, and S. S. Kistler to Mr. Gerald [sic] L. Wirth, August 9, 1953, both in folder "601-03 Campsites and Campgrounds," box D-156, YNPA.
148. S. A. Mendenhall to Idaho Senator, August 10, 1957, Yellowstone National Park, book 1 "Yellowstone 1953–1964," box L3415, RG 79, NAKC. Copy in folder "Campgrounds—General," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
149. Assistant Superintendent to Superintendent, Memorandum, July 6, 1959, folder "D32, Grounds, Parking Areas, Campgrounds, General, 1958–60," box D-159, YNPA.
150. Lemuel A. Garrison, Superintendent to Mr. C. E. Stinson, September 1, 1961, folder "D32—Grounds—General (Parking Areas, Campgrounds) 1961–1962," box D-159, YNPA.
151. Park Engineer, Assistant Superintendent, Chief Ranger, Assistant Park Naturalist, Park Landscape Architect, and District Ranger to Superintendent, April 2, 1959, folder "D32, Grounds, Parking Areas, Campgrounds, General, 1958–60," box D-159, YNPA.
152. M. H. Harvey, Acting Regional Director, to Superintendent, Memorandum, August 21, 1959, book 1 "Yellowstone Jan. 1953–Jan. 1964," box L3415, RG 79, NAKC. Copy in folder "Campgrounds—General," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
153. Lemuel A. Garrison to Mr. E. W. Woodger [?], September 3, 1959, book 1 "Yellowstone National Park, Jan. 1953–Jan. 1964," box L3415, RG 79, NAKC. Copy in folder "Campgrounds–Pelican Creek," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
154. Lemuel A. Garrison to Regional Director, May 18, 1961, book 1 "Yellowstone National Park, Jan. 1953–Jan. 1964," box L3415, RG 79, NAKC. Copy in folder "Campgrounds–General," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
155. Lemuel A. Garrison to Regional Director, Region II, Memorandum, June 18, 1962, folder "D5039, book 17, Jan.–July 1962," box D-244, YNPA.
156. Yellowstone National Park, "Visitor Days in Yellowstone Breaks All-time Record," Memorandum of the press for immediate release, October 7, 1963, book 1 "Yellowstone National Park, Jan. 1953–Jan. 1964," box L3415, RG 79, NAKC. Copy in folder "Campgrounds–General," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
157. Roger W. Toll to Mr. Mattson, Memorandum, July 14, 1935, copy in folder "Campgrounds–Bridge Bay," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
158. Jerry A. Riddall, Chief Architect, WODC, to Regional Director, Region II, April 20, 1962, folder "D3415, book 16, Aug. 1961–May 1962," box D-243, YNPA; Luther T. Peterson, Jr., Regional Engineer, to Acting Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, Long Distance Telephone Call, June 21, 1960, folder "D46, book 3, Jan. 1960–Jan. 1961," box D-243, YNPA; Luther T. Peterson, Jr., to Chief, Western Office, Design and Construction, Memorandum, December 30, 1960, folder "D32, Grounds, Parking Areas, Campgrounds, 1958–1960," box D-159, YNPA.
159. M. H. Harvey to Superintendents, August 9, 1956, as quoted in Culpin, draft "History of Administration," 14.
160. Thomas Vint to Lemuel Garrison, May 10, 1957, as quoted in Culpin, draft "History of Administration," 14.
161. Lon Garrison, "Interview with Alan Mebane," February 22, 1973, 2.
162. Ibid.

163. For a more thorough analysis of the Leopold Report and a discussion of A. Starker Leopold's life and career, see Carol Rydell, *Aldo Starker Leopold: Wildlife Biologist and Public Policy Maker*, M.A. thesis, Montana State University, 1993.
164. Kenner, *An Examination of National Park Service Decision Making*, 59.
165. Alice K. Wondrak, *(Do Not) Feed the Bears: Policy, Culture and the Historical Narrative of the Yellowstone Bear*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., 2002, 275–276. Copy in YNPL.
166. Schullery, *Searching For Yellowstone*, 168.
167. Robert Barbee, in a personal interview with Brian C. Kenner, September 15, 1983. See Kenner, *An Examination of National Park Service Decision Making*, 59.
168. For an excellent discussion of this period in Yellowstone's wildlife management history, see *Yellowstone Science* 8(2) (Spring 2000), 2–22.
169. A. Starker Leopold, Stanley A. Cain, Clarence Cottam, Ira N. Gabrielson, and Thomas L. Kimball, "Wildlife Management in the National Parks," *Transactions of the North American Wildlife Conference* 28 (1963): 34, 35.
170. George Baggeley to Regional Director, August 14, 1957, copy in folder "Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1958," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
171. Leopold et al., "Wildlife Management in the National Parks," as quoted in Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone*, 169.
172. Baggeley to Regional Director, August 14, 1957.
173. Howard Baker to Lemuel Garrison, November 13, 1959, copy in folder "Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1959," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
174. Ray H. Mattison, "Report on Historical Structures at Yellowstone National Park," September 1960, 1, vertical files, YNPL.
175. Ibid., 3–7.
176. A. L. Haines to R. N. McIntyre, Memorandum, October 26, 1960, in Mattison, "Report on Historical Structures."
177. Mattison, "Report on Historical Structures," 6.
178. Horace Albright to Conrad Wirth, February 10, 1960, copy in folder "Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1960," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
179. Ibid.
180. Ibid.
181. Ibid.
182. Conrad Wirth to Horace Albright, January 9, 1961, copy in folder "Construction Projects/Landscape Architecture–1960," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, HRC.
183. Haines, vol. 2, 379.
184. Albright to Wirth, February 10, 1960.
185. Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone*, 186.
186. Ibid., 186–187.
187. Bartlett, *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*, 384.
188. Schullery, *Searching For Yellowstone*, 183.
189. Haines, vol. 2, 383.
190. Ibid.
191. Smith, "The History of Grant Village," 46.
192. Conrad Wirth, Director National Park Service, to Washington Office and All Field Offices, Memorandum, February 27, 1959, folder "#9, 1959: Memorandum Regarding Increased Public Relations Effort For Mission 66," box D-20, YNPA. As is often the case with requests that memo recipients destroy the document after reading it, some survived; the existence of this one is a case in point.
193. Haines, vol. 2, 383.
194. Schullery, *Searching for Yellowstone*, 192.
195. Smith, "The History of Grant Village," 28–29; see Garrison, *The Making of a Ranger*, as quoted in Smith, "The History of Grant Village," 47.
196. Kenner, *An Examination of National Park Service Decision Making*, 59.
197. Richard West Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 183; Smith, "The History of Grant Village," 47.

Bibliography

Sources Used

The Yellowstone National Park Archives and Research Library in the Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center (Yellowstone National Park, Montana) contains countless invaluable published and unpublished sources. First and foremost, the archives contain correspondence, official government documents, and unpublished reports concerning Yellowstone National Park. These holdings are extensive, and for the most part processed in a user-friendly way. Master plans for the park, although in fragile condition, are also accessible. The library contains most published and unpublished texts concerning the park. It also houses most of the park superintendents' annual and monthly reports, dating—in the case of annual reports—from 1872. Annual reports of the director of the National Park Service are also available. The photo archives contain countless wonderful photographic prints.

The Historian's Office at the Heritage and Research Center houses a collection of photocopied documents concerning Yellowstone National Park compiled from other National Archives depositories. Mary Shivers Culpin collected these photocopies for her research into the roads, concessions, and administration of the park. These documents are processed and referred to as the Marcy Culpin files. Many of these documents are also available in the archives. The center also contains the Historic Structure Survey forms for most of the structures in the park. Completed in 1999, these forms contain some useful information concerning park structures.

Bibliography

- Allaback, Sarah. *Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2000).
- Barringer, Mark Daniel. "Mission Impossible: National Park Development in the 1950s," *Journal of the West* 38(1) (January 1999): 22–26.
- Bartlett, Richard A. *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1985).
- Battle, David G., and Erwin N. Thompson. *Fort Yellowstone: Historic Structure Report* (Denver: National Park Service, 1972).
- Butcher, Devereux. "Our National Parks in Jeopardy: Resorts or Wilderness?" *Atlantic Monthly* 207(2) (1961): 45–51.
- Carr, Ethan. *Wilderness By Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998).
- Chittenden, Hiram Martin. "Improvement of Yellowstone National Park," Appendix GGG of the *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Upon the Construction, Repair, and Maintenance of Roads and Bridges in the Yellowstone National Park* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903).
- . *The Yellowstone National Park: Historical and Descriptive*. 5th ed. (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1905).
- Cramton, Louis. *Early History of Yellowstone National Park and Its Relation to National Park Policies* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932).
- Culpin, Mary Shivers. "For the Benefit and Enjoyment of the People": *A History of Concession Development in Yellowstone National Park, 1872–1966*. Historic Resource Study, vol. 2. (Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: National Park Service, Yellowstone Center for Resources, YCR-CR-2003-01, 2003).
- . *The History of the Construction of the Road System in Yellowstone National Park, 1872–1966*. Historic Resource Study, vol. 1. (Denver: Rocky Mountain Region, National Park Service, 1994).
- . "Yellowstone and Its Borders: A Significant Influence Toward the Creation of the First Forest Reserve," in Harold K. Steen, ed., *The Origins of the National Forests* (Durham, No. Carolina: Forest History Society, 1992): 276–287.
- Dunlap, Thomas R. "Wildlife, Science, and the National Parks, 1920–1940," *Pacific Historical Review* 59(2) (May 1990): 187–202.
- Foresta, Ronald A. *America's National Parks and Their Keepers* (Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future, 1984).
- Garrison, Lemuel A. *The Making of a Ranger: Forty Years with the National Parks* (Salt Lake City: Howe Brothers, 1983).
- Good, Albert H. *Park and Recreation Structures* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999). Reprint of 1938 edition published by National Park Service.

- Hague, Arnold. "The Yellowstone National Park," *Scribner's Magazine* 35 (May 1904).
- Haines, Aubrey L. *A History of The Yellowstone National Park Chapel* (Yellowstone National Park, 1963).
- . *Yellowstone National Park: Its Exploration and Establishment* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974).
- . *Yellowstone Place Names: Mirrors of History* (Niwot, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1996).
- . *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*. vol. 1. (Niwot, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1977).
- . *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*. vol. 2. revised ed. (Niwot, Colo.: University Press of Colorado, 1996).
- Haines, Aubrey L., Charles S. Pope, and Erwin N. Thompson. *Norris Soldier Station, Yellowstone National Park: Historic Structures Report* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1969).
- Hampton, H. Duane. *How the U.S. Cavalry Saved Our National Parks* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971).
- Harrison, Laura Soulliere. *Architecture in the Parks: National Historic Landmark Theme Study* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1986).
- Ise, John. *Our National Park Policy: A Critical History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961).
- Jay, David A. "The History of Masterplanning in Yellowstone," unpublished paper, December 22, 1986, 2, copy in folder "Master Plans," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center, Yellowstone National Park, Mont.
- Kenner, Brian C. *An Examination of National Park Service Decision Making: A Case Study of Grant Village, Yellowstone National Park*, M.S. thesis, University of Montana, Missoula, Mont., 1984. Copy in Yellowstone Research Library.
- Koel, T. M., J. L. Arnold, P. E. Bigelow, P. D. Doepke, B. D. Ertel, and D. L. Mahony. *Yellowstone Fisheries and Aquatic Science: Annual Report, 2003* (Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: National Park Service, Yellowstone Center for Resources, YCR-NR-2004-03, 2004).
- Leopold, A. Starker, Stanley A. Cain, Clarence Cottam, Ira N. Gabrielson, and Thomas L. Kimball. "Wildlife Management in the National Parks," *Transactions of the North American Wildlife Conference* 28 (1963).
- Ludlow, William. *Report of a Reconnaissance from Carroll, Montana Territory, on the Upper Missouri to the Yellowstone National Park, and Return, Made in the Summer of 1875* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1876).
- McClelland, Linda Flint. *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
- Meinecke, E. P. A. *A Camp Ground Policy* (Ogden, Utah: U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1932).
- . *Camp Planning and Camp Reconstruction* (N.p.: U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, n.d.).
- Norris, Philetus W. *The Calumet of the Coteau* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippencott & Co., 1883).
- . *The Calumet of the Coteau Together with a Guide-book of the Yellowstone Park* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1884).
- Olmsted, Frederick Law. "The Distinction Between National Parks and National Forests," *Landscape Architecture* VI(3) (April 1916): 114–115.
- Paige, John C. *The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933–1942: An Administrative History* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1985).
- Pritchard, James A. *Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions: Science and the Perception of Nature* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).
- Proceedings of the National Park Conference Held at the Yellowstone National Park, September 11 and 12, 1911* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912).
- Redinger, Matthew A. *The Civilian Conservation Corps as a Tool of the National Park Service: The Development of Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks, 1933–1942*, M.A. thesis, University of Montana, Missoula, Mont., 1988. Copy in Yellowstone Research Library.
- Runte, Alfred. *National Parks: The American Experience* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979).
- Rydell, Carol Henrietta Leigh. *Aldo Starker Leopold: Wildlife Biologist and Public Policy Maker*, M.A. thesis, Montana State University, Bozeman, Mont., 1993.
- Schullery, Paul. *The Bears of Yellowstone* (Worland, Wyo.: High Plains Publishing, Co., 1992).
- . "Buffalo Jones and the Bison Herd in Yellowstone," *Montana the Magazine of Western History* 26(3) (July 1976): 40–51.
- Schullery, Paul, and Lee Whittlesey. "Mountain Goats in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: A Prehistoric and Historical Context," *Western North American Naturalist* 61(3) (July 2001).
- Schullery, Paul. *Searching For Yellowstone: Ecology and Wonder in the Last Wilderness* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997).
- Schullery, Paul, and Lee Whittlesey. *Myth and History in the Creation of Yellowstone National Park* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003).
- . "Yellowstone's Creation Myth: Can We Live with Our Own Legends?" *Montana the Magazine of Western History* 53(1) (Spring 2003): 2–13.

- Sellars, Richard West. *Preserving Nature in the National Parks* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).
- Simmons, R. Laurie, and Thomas H. Simmons. National Historic Landmark Nomination: Fort Yellowstone, Draft, May 10, 2000. Copy available in Yellowstone National Park Archives (Yellowstone National Park, Mont.) and Yellowstone Center for Resources (Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyo.).
- . *National Register of Historic Places Nomination: Mammoth Hot Springs*, Draft, July 6, 2000. Copy available in Yellowstone National Park Archives (Yellowstone National Park, Mont.) and Yellowstone Center for Resources (Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyo.).
- Smith, Robin. "The History of Grant Village," unpublished study, April 24, 1988. Copy in Yellowstone Research Library.
- Strong, W. E. *A Trip to the Yellowstone National Park in July, August, and September, 1875* (Washington, D.C., 1876).
- Tweed, William C. *Parkitecture: A History of Rustic Building Design in the National Park System, 1916-1942*, unpublished manuscript in vertical files, "History—YNP—Structures," Yellowstone Research Library.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Seattle District). *Context Study of the United States Quartermaster General Standardized Plans, 1866–1942* (November 1972). Copy in Yellowstone Research Library.
- Varley, John D., and Paul Schullery. *Freshwater Wilderness* (Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: Yellowstone Library and Museum Association, 1983).
- Vick, Denise S., *Yellowstone National Park and the Education of Adults*. Ph.D. diss., University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., 1986. Copy in Yellowstone Research Library.
- Whitacre, Christine. "Otter Creek Bear-Feeding Station," no date, archeological report, 3, copy in folder "Bear Feeding Grounds—Otter Creek," Culpin's files, Historian's Office, Yellowstone Heritage and Research Center, Yellowstone National Park, Mont.
- Whittlesey, Lee. H. "The First National Park Interpreter: G. L. Henderson in Yellowstone, 1882–1902," *Montana the Magazine of Western History* 46(1) (Spring 1996): 26–41.
- . *Yellowstone Place Names* (Helena, Mont.: Montana Historical Society Press, 1988).
- Whittlesey, Lee H., and Paul Schullery. "The Roosevelt Arch: A Centennial History of an American Icon," *Yellowstone Science* 11(3) (Summer 2003): 2–24.
- Wondrak, Alice K. *(Do Not) Feed the Bears: Policy, Culture, and the Historical Narrative of the Yellowstone Bear*, Ph.D. diss., University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., 2002. Copy in Yellowstone Research Library.
- Worster, Donald. *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas*. 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Wright, George M., Joseph S. Dixon, and Ben H. Thompson. *Fauna of the National Parks of the United States*. Fauna Series No. 1, May 1932. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933).
- Wright, George M., and Ben H. Thompson. *Fauna of the National Parks of the United States: Wildlife Management in the National Parks*. Fauna Series No. 2, July 1934. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935).
- Wylie, W. W., *The Yellowstone National Park, or the Great American Wonderland* (Kansas City, Mo.: Ramsey, Millett & Hudson, 1882).
- Yellowstone National Park. *Yellowstone's Northern Range: Complexity and Change in a Wildland Ecosystem* (Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyo.: National Park Service). *Yellowstone Science*, "Ungulate Management in Yellowstone, Part II: Oral History Interviews with Former Staff," *Yellowstone Science* 8(2) (Spring 2000): 2–22.

Index

A

- Adirondack style 63
- Albright, Horace Marden, 90, 103
 - “three-headed monster” and, 52
 - as assistant to Adolph Miller in Department of Interior, 56
 - as superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, 76, 94, 96–101
 - bears and, 106, 108
 - biographical sketch, 76
 - camping and, 75, 84
 - disagreement with Daniel Hull, 84, 86, 87
 - military management of the park and, 57
 - organization of park operations into departments, 78
 - Paul Kiessig and, 87, 93, 94
 - ranger station/community center design and, 85–88, 91, 92, 98
 - snowshoe cabins and, 82, 83, 89, 91, 92, 95
- Allaback, Sarah 143, 148, 149, 151
- Allen, Major H.T.,
 - General S. B. M. Young and, 53, 54, 59
- American Association for Museums 101
- American Civic Association 55
- American Society of Landscape Architects 55, 67
- Amphitheaters,
 - bears and, 133
 - CCC and, 129
 - Charles Punchar and, 128
 - Herbert Maier and, 128, 129
- Anderson, Captain George Smith,
 - biographical sketch, 26
 - bison protection and, 44, 46
 - camping and, 48
 - construction of park facilities and, 50
 - fire protection and, 45
 - Fort Yellowstone and, 29–31
 - park outposts and, 36, 37
 - protection of the park and, 36, 37, 43, 44
- Apollinaris Spring, 49, 50, 72, 92, 94, 125
- Assistant superintendents, 14, 21, 40, 76, 78, 123, 138, 154

Auto caravans. *See* education.

Automobiles allowed in the park, 57, 66, 72–75, 77–81, 84, 89, 91, 96, 112, 113, 133

B

- Baggley, George F., 114, 156, 157
- Baker, Howard, 143, 144, 153, 154, 157
- Baker, Newton, 58
- Ballinger, Richard, 54, 55
- Baronett, Collins J. (Jack), 22, 36
- Barringer, Mark Daniel, 146, 148
- Bartlett, Richard A., 13, 15, 17, 20, 148, 159
- Battle, David G., 31, 32, 35, 59, 60
- Bauer, Carl. *See* park naturalist.
- Bears,
 - as amusement, 106, 108
 - as danger, 47, 108, 133, 134
- Bear feeding grounds,
 - biological thinking and, 134, 135, 140
 - closing of, 140
 - education and, 134
- Otter Creek, 70, 132, 133, 140
 - problems with bears and, 108, 132, 133
- Beaux Arts style, 59
- Bechler River Soldier Station, 38, 63
- Benson, Major Harry Coupland,
 - biographical sketch, 51, 52
- Bison,
 - protection of, 6, 7, 16, 37, 41, 42, 44–46, 50, 69, 71, 100, 106–108, 122, 127, 135
- Black Sand Basin, 94, 104, 133
- Boutelle, Captain Frazier Augustus,
 - biographical sketch, 26
 - campsites and, 48, 49
 - fire control and, 26, 41, 42
 - fish introduction and, 42, 43
 - Fort Yellowstone and, 28, 29
 - National Zoo and, 42
 - park outposts and, 36
 - wildlife and, 42
- Branch of Plans and Design. *See* Landscape

Architecture Division.
 Brett, Colonel Lloyd Milton,
 “special sanitary camps” and, 73, 74
 administration building and, 62
 biographical sketch, 52
 branch museums and, 62
 military management of park and, 51, 55,
 56–58, 65
 National Parks Conference (1911) and, 55
 riding hall and, 61
 sanitation and, 72, 73
 Bridge Bay development, 119, 145, 153, 155
 Brown, Captain Oscar James, 26, 31, 38, 39, 45
 Buffalo corral at Antelope Canyon, 135
 Buffalo Ranch in Lamar Valley. *See* Lamar Buffalo
 Ranch.
 Bumpus, Hermon C., 105, 119, 127, 132
 Burney, A. W., 95

C

Camp Sheridan, 27–30, 35, 36, 50, 157
 Campgrounds,
 automobile camps, 84, 89, 91
 CCC improvement of, 112, 114
 Mission 66 and, 145, 148, 154, 155
 public, 79, 90, 92, 99
 restrictions and regulations, 68
 Canyon area observation stations and platforms, 81,
 96, 130
 Canyon Village, 138, 142, 145–147, 149, 159
 Caparn, Harold, 96
 Capitol Hill, 9, 27, 29, 34, 105
 Carnes, William G., 115, 126, 143
 Carpenter, Robert E., 13, 20–22, 24
 Carpenter, Thomas E., 116, 125
 Carr, Ethan, 56, 79, 80, 121
 Chamberlain, Colonel J. L., 65, 68
 Chambers, William, 15, 16
 Checking stations, 89, 119, 124, 144
 Child, Harry,
 Child House, 82, 160
 Chittenden, Captain Hiram, 2–4, 13, 15, 16, 20,
 31–34, 39, 49, 51, 63, 77, 79
 Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), 109, 111, 138,
 139, 141, 143, 144, 150
 Civilian management of Yellowstone National Park,
 52, 55–57, 61, 74

Civilian ranger corps. *See* park rangers.
 Clarke, Gilmore D., 116–119, 126, 127
 Clean-up effort, 112
 Cleveland, President Grover, 21
 Colonial Revival style, 35, 59, 160
 Color of park structures, 50, 82, 88, 90, 123
 Comfort stations,
 controversy concerning location of, 125
 standardized plan for, 90, 91, 125
 Committee on Study of Educational Problems in
 National Parks, 105
 Community center/ranger stations. *See* ranger station/
 community rooms.
 Conger, Patrick Henry, 13–21, 23, 24, 36, 40, 63
 Coolidge, President Calvin, 107
 Cottage Style architecture, 29
 Coudrey, Harry, 54
 Cramton, Louis C., 2, 14
 Crow Indians, 5

D

Dana, E. S., 3
 Daniels, Mark Roy, 56, 57, 67, 70, 73
 Davidson, Ernest A., 95, 96
 Dean, James H., 14, 15
 Delano, Columbus, 2, 3, 6
 Department of the Interior,
 conflict with War Department, 19, 28, 43,
 51, 52, 54, 56, 57
 rules and regulations for Yellowstone National
 Park, 16, 36, 40, 72, 73
 Department of War. *See* War Department.
 Dixon, Joseph, 134, 140
 Doty, Cecil John, 150, 151
 Drury, Newton, 138, 139, 141
 “Duckwalks,” 141

E

East Entrance,
 Charles Punchar’s plan for, 81, 91
 Education,
 auto caravans and, 131, 132, 140
 Division of Interpretation, 148, 152, 160
 history of in Yellowstone, 12, 75, 79, 97, 99,
 100

Information Bureau, 97, 98, 118
 lectures and, 134
 museums as important part of, 100, 101
 Naturalist Department and, 105
 roadside exhibits and, 130
 self-guiding trails and, 104–106
 visitor centers and, 145, 148, 149–152
 Edwards, Guy D., 110, 113, 122, 123, 125, 126
 Eisenhower, President Dwight, 141, 142
 Emergency Conservation Work (ECW), 109, 111–114, 122, 124, 125, 155
 Emmert, John W.,
 biographical sketch, 110
 Employee housing, 126, 139, 145
 Erwin, James Brailsford, 26, 38, 45, 46, 48, 49, 72, 89

F

Fencing (along park's northern boundary), 31
 Fire,
 lookout stations, 89, 124, 125
 protection from, 40–42, 50, 59, 68, 71, 72, 77, 81, 94, 96, 111, 112, 116, 124, 126, 127, 156
 “Firehole Village,” 145, 146, 148
 Fish,
 egg collecting projects, 46
 hatchery, 40, 50, 66, 87, 104, 127, 132
 introduction of non-native species into park, 42, 44, 45, 71
 stocking of, 43, 50
 Fort Yellowstone,
 barracks, 30, 32, 58, 59, 159
 bachelor officers' quarters, 59, 98, 103, 118
 chapel, 60, 61
 duplexes of officers' quarters, 30, 58, 59
 field officers' quarters, 59, 60
 guard houses, 30, 60
 landscaping of, 32
 non-commissioned officers' quarters, 30, 58
 officers' row, 30, 90
 parade ground, 31, 32, 59, 60, 81
 post exchange, 30
 reservoir, 9, 31, 32
 U.S. Commissioner's house, 32

G

Gallatin Game Preservation Company (GGPC), 107, 112
 Garfield, James (Secretary of Interior), 51, 53, 54, 62, 71
 Garrison, Lemuel Alonzo (“Lon”),
 biographical sketch, 138
 campgrounds and, 154, 155
 Grant Village and, 147, 148, 153
 historic preservation and, 157
 management structure change and, 153
 Mission 66 and, 149, 150, 160
 Garrison, Lindley, 56, 57
 Good, Albert H., 63, 102, 120, 123, 124, 128, 129–131
 Goode, George William, 26, 39, 45
 Goodwin, George E., 80
 Goodwin, Vernon, 117, 118
 Grant Village,
 controversy surrounding, 147, 148, 159
 Grinnell, George Bird, 3

H

Hague, Arnold, 21, 23–25, 27
 Haines, Aubrey L.,
 park historian, 153, 157
 Queen's Laundry and, 10, 11
 Hale, William, 21
 Hall, Ansel F., 100, 101, 104, 134
 Hamlin, Chauncey J., 101
 Hampton, H. Duane,
 military management of the park and, 53
 “three-headed monster” and, 52
 Handkerchief Pool, 94
 Harris, Captain Moses, 25–28, 36, 40–43, 47, 48
 Harrison, Laura Soulliere, 102, 103, 120
 Harvey, M. H., 154
 Hay fields for wildlife, 69
 Hayden, Ferdinand V., 2
 Haynes, Jack E., 100, 104
 Henderson, George L., 15
 Hill, Leroy, 121
 Hill, Sanford, 126, 150
 Historic preservation,
 National Historic Preservation Act (1966), 157, 159

Hitchcock, F. A., 46
Horr, Henry, 3
Howard Eaton Trail, 90, 112
Howell, Ed, 44
Hubbard, Henry Vincent, 79
Hull, Daniel R.,
 ranger station/community center design and,
 85–88, 90, 92, 125

I

Information services. *See* education.

Interpretation,
 definition of, 152, 153
 difference from education, 99, 152
 Mission 66 and, 145, 148, 150, 152, 160
 terminology, 137, 152

J

Jones, Charles J. “Buffalo,” 46, 100, 131
Jones, Edward, 131
Johnston, Fred,
 reports on campgrounds, 113, 114

K

Kenner, Brian C., 142, 155, 160
Kiessig, Paul, 85, 87, 93, 94
Kingman, First Lieutenant Dan C., 18, 19

L

Lacey Act, 30, 40, 44, 50
Lamar, Lucius Q. C., 21–25
Lamar Buffalo Ranch, 66, 69, 90, 95, 96, 107, 111,
 127, 140, 157
Lambert, Alexander, 53, 54
Landscape architects,
 Charles Punchard. *See* Punchard, Charles.
 Daniel Hull. *See* Hull, Daniel.
 National Park structures and, 58, 67, 68, 79,
 83, 94, 95, 111, 115, 120, 122, 143, 146
 Thomas Vint. *See* Vint, Thomas.
Landscape architecture,

 idea of harmony between park structures and
 natural environment and, 32, 79, 80
Landscape Architecture Division,
 Branch of Plans and Design, 115, 120, 124
 Landscape Engineering Division, 50, 93, 94
 Western Office of Design and Construction
 (WODC), 147, 149, 150, 151
Landscape Engineering Division. *See* Landscape
 Architecture Division.
Lane, Franklin, 56–58, 62, 73, 74, 79
Langford, Nathaniel Pitt, 1–4
Langley, Samuel P., 42
Larkin, George, 122–124
Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 100, 101, 125
Leopold, A. Starker, 155–157
Leopold Report, 155, 156
Lindsley, Chester Allinson, 75–77
Lindsley, Elmer, 46
Lower Slough Creek Horse (or Hay) Ranch, 88, 89,
 95, 112
Ludlow, Captain William, 3, 14, 24

M

Maginnis, Martin, 3
Maier, Herbert,
 amphitheaters, 128, 129
 architectural philosophy, 103, 120
 museums and, 101, 102, 127
 nature shrines or roadside exhibits, 130, 131
Mammoth Hot Springs,
 Gilmore D. Clarke’s plan to revamp, 116–
 119, 126
Manning, Warren H., 32
Mason, Edwin C., 27
Master plans,
 development of, 109, 115, 116
 Yellowstone National Park’s of 1933, 116,
 117, 130
 Yellowstone National Park’s of 1939, 119,
 135, 146
 Yellowstone National Park’s of 1941, 139,
 140
Mather, Stephen Tyng,
 as assistant to Secretary Lane, 57
 as director of National Park Service, 77,
 82–84, 106–108
 on education, 97, 98, 100

ranger station/community center design and, 85–88

Mattes, Merrill J., 157

Mattison, Ray H., 157, 158

Mattson, Frank, 114, 115, 124, 127, 139, 146, 150, 155

Maus, Brigadier General Marion, 65, 68

McCarter, Kenneth, 95, 101, 115, 117–119, 122, 125, 127, 128, 130, 132

McCartney, J. C., 3, 6, 157

McClelland, Linda Flint, 32, 57, 63, 67, 79–81, 85, 90, 94–96, 111, 112, 117, 120, 121, 129, 130, 142, 148

McDonald, Colonel Marshall, 42, 43

McFarland, J. Horace, 55

McLaughlin, John S.,
biographical sketch, 138

Meagher, Mary, 153

Meinecke, Emilio P.,
campground planning and reconstruction, 113, 114

Meldrum, John W., 30, 61

Merriam, John C., 105

Miller, Adolph C., 56

Mission 66 program,
architectural style. *See* Park Service Modern.
conceptualization of, 142, 143
Conrad Wirth and, 138, 141, 144
legacy of, 137, 148, 152, 159, 160

Mission 66 in Yellowstone National Park,
at Bridge Bay, 145, 153, 155
campgrounds, 154, 155
at Canyon Village, 146, 149–151
“Firehole Village”, 145, 146, 148
at Grant Village, 147, 153
pamphlet, “Mission 66 in Yellowstone National Park,” 145

Mosquito control efforts, 90

Muldrow, H. L., 27

Murie, Olaus J., 140

Museums,
as part of education of park visitors, 75, 97, 98, 100, 101
branch (also called “trailside”), 101, 103, 105, 120
Buffalo Jones, 100
Colonel Lloyd Brett and, 62
Fishing Bridge, 101, 102, 127–129, 141
headquarters information office, 98, 99

idea for first, 51, 58, 62

Madison Junction, 101, 102, 129, 139, 145

Mammoth Hot Springs, 98, 100, 104, 116, 118, 119, 126, 140

national parks as museums, 100

Norris Geyser Basin, 101–103, 128

Old Faithful, 97, 105, 128

N

National Park Service,
creation of, 57, 68, 74–76

National Park Service Act of 1916, 74, 76, 142, 156

National Parks Conference of 1911, 55

Native American tribes,
Bannock, 8, 9, 140
Crow, 5, 8
Sheepeater, 6, 8
Shoshone, 8

Nichols, William Morse, 117, 118, 142, 146

Noble, John W., 29, 36, 42, 44, 48

Nolen, John, 117, 125

Norris blockhouse headquarters, 18, 157

Norris, Philetus Walter,
accomplishments of superintendency, 4, 12
biographical sketch, 1–2
construction of park facilities and, 9, 10
exploration of park, 5
gamekeeper and, 7
Native Americans and, 5, 8
protection of park and, 6
Queen’s Laundry bathhouse, 10
scientific study and, 7, 9
signs and, 11

Norris Soldier Station, 62, 63, 157

North Entrance Arch. *See* Roosevelt Arch.

Northern Pacific Railroad, 12, 13, 32, 61

Nursery, 112, 138

O

Oastler, Frank R., 100, 101, 105, 107

Obsidian Cliff interpretive wayside or nature shrine, 130, 131

“Officers’ dog house,” 39, 63

Olmsted, Jr., Frederick Law, 67, 74, 90, 116

Otter Creek bear feeding ground. *See* bear feeding

grounds.
Outhouses. *See* comfort stations.

P

“Pagoda”. *See* U.S. Engineers’ Office.

Park biologist,

position created, 140

Park naturalist,

Clyde Max Bauer, 141, 152

David deLancy Condon, 152, 153

John Good, 153

Robert McIntyre, 153, 157

Park rangers,

activities and routine of, 72, 78, 99, 106

creation of position in Yellowstone National
Park, 57, 58, 67

need for a civilian corps of, 52, 56, 57, 69,
77

in other national parks, 52, 100

seasonal positions, 99

Park Service Modern, 143, 146, 148, 150–151, 159

Pitcher, Colonel John,

biographical sketch, 27

bison and, 46

construction of park facilities and, 31, 33, 34,
39

fish hatchery and, 46

Lamar Buffalo Ranch and, 46, 47

landscaping and, 32, 34

visitor facilities and, 49, 50

Poaching, 6, 7, 14, 16, 20, 36, 37, 39, 42–44, 46, 74

Powell, John Wesley, 21, 24

Predator control policy, 41, 45, 106, 107, 136

Pryor, Anna K., 118

Public Works Administration (PWA), 109, 115, 123,
139, 143

Punchard, Jr., Charles P.,

amphitheaters and, 128

“Landscape Design in the National Park
Service” article, 80

ranger station/community center design and,
82, 85

recommendations for improvement of YNP,
80, 81, 84

Q

Queen’s Laundry bathhouse, 4, 10

Queen Anne style, 29

R

Ranger station/community centers,

at Canyon, 120, 129, 146, 150, 151

concept of, 85, 86, 89, 90, 148

design of, 124

at Lake, 87, 88, 128

at Old Faithful, 86

Rangers. *See* park rangers.

Reamer, Robert, 61, 63

Redinger, Matthew A., 111, 112

Rockefeller, Jr., John D., 96, 101

Rogers, Edmund Burrell,

bear feeding grounds, 133, 134, 140

biographical sketch, 138

campgrounds and, 154

Modern design of park structures and, 143,
144

moving headquarters and, 139

Rolfe, Mary, 98, 99

Roosevelt Arch, 31–34, 69, 89, 119, 124

Roosevelt, President Franklin D., 111, 114

Roosevelt, President Theodore, 33, 53, 54

Ruger, Brigadier General Thomas, 29

Russell, Carl P., 105, 130, 131, 134

Rustic style architecture, 63, 88, 139, 143

S

Sargent, Charles, 41

Sawyer, Daniel E., 14, 22

Sawyer, Edmund J., 99, 105

Schullery, Paul, 41, 45, 71, 104, 108, 156, 159, 160

Schurz, Carl, 4, 7, 9, 11

Science in the park, 5, 9, 21, 43, 97, 125

Scott, Major General Hugh L., 57

Scouts, 37–39, 45, 52–54, 57, 62, 71, 76

Scoyen, E. T., 146

Senate bill 392, 1

Shaw & Powell Camping Company, 73, 84

Sheridan, General Philip H., 14, 16, 24, 25, 27

Signs, 11, 15, 22, 40, 49, 50, 67, 72, 82, 104,

123–125, 130
 Simmons, R. Laurie and Thomas H., 29, 30, 63
 Skinner, Milton P., 98
 Snowshoe cabins,
 construction of, 62, 64, 79, 82, 88, 89, 91,
 92, 95, 96
 idea behind, 35–38
 list of in 1900, 19
 oldest existing example, 122
 rustic design of, 121
 standardized plan for, 122
 Soda Butte Cabin, 127
 Soda Butte Creek, 5, 7
 Soldier stations,
 Bechler River, 63, 64
 Crevice Mountain, 64
 East Entrance, 64
 Gallatin, 64, 72
 Lake, 64
 Lower Geyser Basin, 64
 Norris Geyser Basin, 62–64, 157
 Riverside, 64
 Snake River, 39, 64
 Soda Butte, 64
 Thumb (West), 63, 64
 Tower Fall, 64
 Upper Geyser Basin, 64
 Stephens Creek Administrative Area, 107, 112, 127
 Stinson, A. C., 117
 Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill of 1883, 14

T

“Three-headed monster”, 52
 Taft, President William Howard, 55
 Teller, Henry M., 13, 15–20
 Thompson, Ben H., 134, 135, 140
 Tilden, Freeman, 152, 153
 Toll, Roger Wolcott,
 bear feeding grounds and, 110, 132, 133
 biographical sketch, 110
 campgrounds and, 114, 129, 155
 construction of park museums and, 127, 128
 master plans and, 116, 117, 119
 park service green and, 123
 Toole, Joseph K., 24
 Tourist management, 25, 40, 50
 Trails,

creation of, 4, 11, 12
 nature. *See* education/self-guiding trails.

Trailside Notes, 131
 Tuttle, Merritt I., 86
 Tweed, William C., 109, 114, 120

U

U.S. Army,
 management of Yellowstone National Park,
 24, 25, 27, 51, 52, 55–58, 68, 76, 77
 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 18, 31, 67, 77
 U.S. Engineer’s Office (the “Pagoda”), 32, 34, 60, 77,
 80
 U.S. Fish Commission,
 construction of fish hatchery, 34, 45
 U.S. Geological Survey, 21, 24, 29, 49, 58, 66, 97
 U.S. Weather Bureau,
 closing of in Yellowstone, 138
 construction of weather station, 34
 Ucker, Clement C.,
 report of, 55, 61
 Underwood, Gilbert Stanley, 93, 94
 Upper Slough Creek Ranch, 88
 Utah Northern Railroad, 12

V

Vandalism, 9, 13, 20, 24–27, 41, 43, 44
 Vest, Senator George Graham, 14, 16, 17, 21, 24, 26
 Vick, Denise, 97, 141, 152, 153
 Vint, Thomas Chalmers,
 master plans and, 115–119
 Mission 66 and, 146, 149, 151, 155
 rusticity and, 95, 109, 120, 121, 123, 124
 Visitor Centers,
 Albright (at Mammoth Hot Springs), 98
 at Canyon, 149, 150
 Cecil John Doty and, 150, 151
 at Grant Village, 149, 153
 Visitor observation facilities,
 platforms, 63, 81, 108
 Vitale, Ferruccio, 101, 103, 116
 Vogelsang, Alexander, 77

W

War Department,
 conflict with Department of Interior, 28,
 51–58
Wasson, Isabel Bassett, 98, 99
Waugh, Frank Albert, 80, 128, 141
Wear, David W.,
 biographical sketch, 20
 protection of park and, 20–22
 Wyoming law and, 21, 23, 24
West Thumb development,
 abandonment of, 147
West Thumb fish eyeing facility, 34
Western Office of Design and Construction
(WODC), 147, 149–151
Whittaker, George, 118
Wilder, Wilber Elliot, 26, 31, 38, 45
Wildlife, 3, 5–7, 12, 14, 25, 36, 40–43, 50, 68, 69,
 71, 79, 105–107, 110, 127, 133–135, 137, 138,
 140, 144, 155, 156, 160
Wilson, Edward, 22, 36
Wilson, President Woodrow, 56
Wirth, Conrad,
 Fort Yellowstone and, 139, 158, 159
 Mission 66 and, 138, 141, 144
Woodring, Chief Ranger Samuel T., 78, 87, 91, 95,
 121
Work, Hubert, 82, 84, 91, 100, 101
World War II, 138–141
Wright, George M., 110, 134, 135, 140
Wylie Permanent Camping Company, 48, 49, 73, 84

“Wyoming law” of 1884, 17, 21–24

Y

Yeager, Dorr G., 105, 106
Yellowstone National Park Organic Act of 1872, 1, 2,
 5, 156
Yellowstone Nature Notes, 98, 140
Yellowstone Park Improvement Company (YPIC),
 13, 16, 17, 20
Yellowstone Park Transportation Company, 34, 49
Yellowstone Timber Land Reserve, 36
Young, Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Baldwin Marks
(S. B. M.),
 biographical sketch, 26
 camping and, 48, 49, 72
 civil guard and, 53, 54
 construction of park facilities and, 30, 32,
 62, 67
 logbooks at park outposts and, 38
 military management of park and, 51, 52
 predator control and, 45, 70
Yount, Harry, 7, 12

Z

Zoo,
 at Buffalo Jones museum, 100
 wildlife sent to Washington, D.C., 44