- hotel unheated (May-Oct)
- teak in pote, up, Xmas trees on top
- high, 7 feet
- 76 1/2 ft
- Named in various directions
- 500 ton phylite place
- llev-cavilleri: dim lobby
- roof line foot wall

Marcelle: Jim McDonald, rest restaurant area
- barrels: like dry clay's faces
- solid-based chemicals to hide behind
White haunted forest
- 2nd level window seat
- lateral shot to red deck

Ash & mud eruption:
- surroundings: lodgepole pines, above clay-colored mountains
- H & D had to find some place below maze to watch
- steam puffing like train engine
- mist white; fall out of sight, then throwing higher, streams
- sound: "wall of water"
- column continues, recede; continue to throw & "rear" after original fall column
- steamMemo to ground & away as water goes down
- they heard of watches
Yakima
- geyser basins steaming till red
- Gf: columns seen

dye - galax. galax, 
woozy, peeling, brown as gingerbread

True arrival: steaming basin. soap colored surf

176 bus pref 1/-1/2 mid mi

- bridge cutting support of porch
- Azi. Dawn: fantastic timber, controlled forest

Entry: clock to 1 - stairs beyond - lower levels above lobby

Total upper electric candles

Old Home

$145,000 $2,7 m2 hotel cation
"They call it regional, this relevance--
the deepest place we have: in this pool forms
the model of our land, a lonely one,
responsive to the wind. Everything we own
has brought us here: from here we speak."

("Lake Chelan," by William Stafford)
Danny V A - not be smelling anywhere
-I (got @ Old #)
---time in the Inn, for my descriptive scene
    ---take phone pics and send to our email?
    ---see if my balcony corner material makes sense

---exterior: deck overlooking Old Faithful, or not?
    ---watch the geyser, for sound and atmosphere, a time or two

---will camp?
    ---chairs? (Spares)
    ---Ron & Claire’s far names?

---Sarah Callan

---lodge - older models

---start earlier from Jackson or Telluride
    ---colder, Matrix all-season tires
    ---sand
Old Faithful Inn

Old Faithful Inn is open from mid May - mid October.

The Old Faithful Inn is one of the most popular lodging facilities at Yellowstone National Park. Ideally located within view of the world-famous Old Faithful Geyser, this lodge offers many services and amenities you won't find anywhere else. The inn has more than 300 rooms available, including newly renovated suites and premium rooms that combine old-fashioned and modern characteristics indicative of Yellowstone's history.

The grand lobby, known as the "Old House," is one of the largest log structures in the world. It was completed in 1904, and has unique decorative features including etched glass panels, a large stone fireplace, and balcony porches overlooking the Old Faithful Geyser Basin. Timber columns, hickory furniture, and an antique, handcrafted clock add to the classic appeal of the Old Faithful Inn.

Old Faithful Inn Information

Highlights
- 329 Rooms / 3 Floors
- Historic lodge (more than a century old)
- ATM (For Guests)
- Fax (For Guests)
- Common/Public Areas Accessible to Wheelchairs
- Gift Shop
- Multi-lingual Staff
- Restaurant
- Espresso Service
- No Pets Allowed
- Non-Smoking

Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Faithful Inn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>$539.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Suite</td>
<td>$433.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wing Geyserside</td>
<td>$263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wing Standard</td>
<td>$231.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wing Frontside</td>
<td>$234.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wing Standard</td>
<td>$174.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old House, Room</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Custom wood framing outside the lodge can also be found throughout the building. Log stairs and pine railings add to the Old Faithful Inn's rustic charm. Recently renovated suites here include refrigerators and private bathrooms. You can choose from smaller semi-suites, premium rooms, and high-range or mid-range rooms with a choice of amenities. Basic rooms without private baths are also available, and guests may utilize bathrooms with private showers down the hall.

Lodging rates are per night, for up to 2 adults and do not include tax and utility fees. Most rooms available online allow 2 to 4 people per room. Larger room sizes may be available.

Rates and dates subject to change without notice.

*ADA rooms are available.

Room Amenities

Suites
- Recently Remodeled
- Sitting Room
- Refrigerator
- Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

Semi-Suites
- Sitting Room
- Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

East Wing Geyser side, West Wing Frontside
- One or Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

East Wing Standard, West Wing Standard
- One or Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower or Shower Only
- Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

Old House Room
- Located in the Old House
- One or Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

Rooms with Shared Bathrooms
- Located in the Old House
- Queen Bed(s)
- Sink with Hot/Cold Water
- Shared Bathrooms
The Old Faithful Inn has a dining room, deli, espresso service, and a gift shop. Sightseeing tours are available through the lodge's activity desk.

The Old Faithful Inn is a non-smoking establishment. It is open every summer season, but closed for the winter. Radio, television, and Internet hook-ups are not available in order to accentuate the natural essence of Yellowstone.

For easy online reservations for Old Faithful Inn log on to our Online Reservations or call us toll free 866.256.9046 for friendly assistance on all your lodging needs.

- Private Showers Down The Hall
- Smoke Alarm

**Accessible Rooms**
- Located on the First Floor
- Queen Bed
- Private Bathroom
- Bathtub has Handrails
- Portable Shower-Hose Attachment
- Toilet and Sink are Designed for Accessibility
- Smoke Alarm

**Reservations Policy**
- **Tax:** 13.94%
- **Cancellation:** 48 Hours
- **Deposit:** 1 Night
- **Credit Cards:** All

**Cancellation Policy:**
Cancellations must be made at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled arrival date in order to receive a full refund of the deposit.

**Area Map**

**To Make Reservations:**

**Call Toll Free:**

866.256.9046

Outside the USA Call:
406.552.1657

To Book Reservations Online
Click Here

Old Faithful Inn
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

The Old Faithful Inn is a hotel located in Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, United States, with a clear view of the renowned Old Faithful Geyser. The Inn features a multi-story log lobby, flanked by long frame wings containing guest rooms.

With its spectacular log and limb lobby and massive (500-ton, 85-foot) stone fireplace, the inn is a prime example of the "Golden Age" of rustic resort architecture, a style which is also known as National Park Service Rustic. It is also unique in that it is one of the few log hotels still standing in the United States. It was the first of the great park lodges of the American west.

Initial construction was carried out over the winter of 1903-1904, largely using locally-obtained materials including lodgepole pine and rhyolite stone. When the Old Faithful Inn first opened in the spring of 1904, it boasted electric lights and steam heat.

The structure is the largest log hotel in the world; possibly even the largest log building in the world. In 2007 the American Institute of Architects conducted a survey to determine the 150 favorite buildings in America; the Old Faithful Inn ranked 36. The Inn, which was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1987, is itself part of the Old Faithful Historic District. Old Faithful Inn is a member of Historic Hotels of America, the official program of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.[3]
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Design

The inn's architect was 29-year-old Robert Reamer, an architect for the Yellowstone Park Company, which was affiliated with the Great Northern Railway. Reamer was hired by Harry W. Child, the president of the Yellowstone Park Company, who had met Reamer in San Diego through mutual acquaintances.[4] Reamer designed the lobby and the initial phase of guest rooms, known as the Old House, which was built in 1903-1904, much of it in the long winter. The east wing was extended in 1913-14, and the west wing in 1927, creating a single structure almost 700 feet (210 m) long. The Old House is rotated 90 degrees with respect to Old Faithful so that a view of the geyser is framed by the entrance porch for arriving visitors. The porch roof provides a viewing platform for viewing eruptions of Old Faithful and other geysers, while the main facade faces Geyser Hill across the Firehole River, where the old Circuit Road once ran through the geyser basin.[5]

The central feature of the Old House is a tall gabled log structure housing the lobby, dominated by a deep, steeply-pitching shingled roof. The Old House uses load-bearing log lower exterior walls with a log pole interior framework supporting seven stories, six of which are the roof structure. The upper gable walls are of milled lumber framing with shingle sheathing. The front slope of the shingled roof is accented by shed and gabled dormers, some of which are purely decorative. Both interior and exterior framing is supported by twisted or curved branches, giving the entire structure a strongly rustic air. There are two levels of balconies, the lower encircling the lobby and the upper on two sides. Stairs climb from the second balcony to a platform in the framing known as the "Crow's Nest" which once was used by musicians to entertain guests, then on to the crown of the gable 92 feet (28 m) above the lobby floor. The entire structure is crowned by a roof walk that once held searchlights to illuminate Old Faithful Geyser at night. The original guest wings are 3-1/2 stories tall on either side of the lobby.[5] It is anchored to the ground by a rhyolite foundation that extends to the first floor window sills.[6]

Offset to the southeast corner, the stone fireplace measures 16 feet (4.9 m) square at the base. It features four main hearths, one on each face, with smaller hearths, each with a flue, at the corners. The stone extends to the roof, and until it was damaged by earthquake, a brick flue extended above the roof, covered in log cribbing. An ironwork clock decorates the north face of the upper chimney in the lobby.[5] The fireplace is centered in a shallow depression in the lobby floor that sets the area around its hearths apart from the rest of the lobby.[7] Custom ironwork, most notable in the main entrance door and the clock, was forged at the site by an ironmonger named Colpitts.

The dining room extends to the south of the lobby, with log scissors trusses supporting a more shallowly-pitched roof at right angles to the lobby roof. The dining room has its own stone fireplace, less massive than the lobby's, but still large. The Old House guest rooms retain much of their original character.[5]
Old Faithful
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Old Faithful is a cone geyser located in Wyoming, in Yellowstone National Park in the United States. Old Faithful was named in 1870 during the Washburn-Langford-Doane Expedition and was the first geyser in the park to receive a name.[3][4] It is also known as one of the most predictable (as indicated by its name) geographical features on Earth, erupting almost every 91 minutes. The geyser, as well as the nearby Old Faithful Inn, is part of the Old Faithful Historic District.
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History

On the afternoon of September 18, 1870, the members of the Washburn-Langford-Doane Expedition traveled down the Firehole River from the Kepler Cascades and entered the Upper Geyser Basin. The first geyser they saw was Old Faithful. In his 1871 Scribner's account of the expedition, Nathaniel P. Langford wrote:

"Judge, then, what must have been our astonishment, as we entered the basin at mid-afternoon of our second day's travel, to see in the clear sunlight, at no great distance, an immense volume of clear, sparkling water projected into the air to the height of one hundred and twenty-five feet. "Geysers! geysers!" exclaimed one of our company, and, spurring our jaded horses, we soon gathered around this wonderful phenomenon. It was

[Dataset]

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Old_Faithful#Eruptions
Old Faithful Inn

Old Faithful Inn is open from mid May - mid October.

The Old Faithful Inn is one of the most popular lodging facilities at Yellowstone National Park. Ideally located within view of the world-famous Old Faithful Geyser, this lodge offers many services and amenities you won't find anywhere else. The inn has more than 300 rooms available, including newly renovated suites and premium rooms that combine old-fashioned and modern characteristics indicative of Yellowstone's history.

The grand lobby, known as the "Old House," is one of the largest log structures in the world. It was completed in 1904, and has unique decorative features including etched glass panels, a large stone fireplace, and balcony porches overlooking the Old Faithful Geyser Basin. Timber columns, hickory furniture, and an antique, handcrafted clock add to the classic appeal of the Old Faithful Inn.
Indeed a perfect geyser. The aperture through which the jet was projected was an irregular oval, three feet by seven in diameter. The margin of sinter was curiously piled up, and the exterior crust was filled with little hollows full of water, in which were small globules of sediment, some having gathered around bits of wood and other nuclei. This geyser is elevated thirty feet above the level of the surrounding plain, and the crater rises five or six feet above the mound. It spouted at regular intervals nine times during our stay, the columns of boiling water being thrown from ninety to one hundred and twenty-five feet at each discharge, which lasted from fifteen to twenty minutes. We gave it the name of "Old Faithful."

In the early days of the park, Old Faithful was often used as a laundry:

Old Faithful is sometimes degraded by being made a laundry. Garments placed in the crater during quiescence are ejected thoroughly washed when the eruption takes place. Gen. Sheridan's men, in 1882, found that linen and cotton fabrics were uninjured by the action of the water, but woolen clothes were torn to shreds.[6]

**Eruptions**

Eruptions can shoot 3,700 to 8,400 US gallons (14,000 to 32,000 L) of boiling water to a height of 106 to 185 feet (32 to 56 m) lasting from 1.5 to 5 minutes. The average height of an eruption is 145 feet (44 m).[7] Intervals between eruptions can range from 45 to 125 minutes, averaging 66.5 minutes in 1939,[8] slowly increasing to an average of 90 minutes apart today.[9] The time between eruptions has a bimodal distribution.

More than 137,000 eruptions have been recorded. Harry Woodward first described a mathematical relationship between the duration and intervals of the eruptions (1938).[8][10] Old Faithful is not the tallest or largest geyser in the park; that title belongs to the less predictable Steamboat Geyser.[4] Its popularity is more likely due to the small eruption window and high frequency.
Custom wood framing outside the lodge can also be found throughout the building. Log stairs and pine railings add to the Old Faithful Inn's rustic charm. Recently renovated suites here include refrigerators and private bathrooms. You can choose from smaller semi-suites, premium rooms, and high-range or mid-range rooms with a choice of amenities. Basic rooms without private baths are also available, and guests may utilize bathrooms with private showers down the hall.

Old House Room
- Located in the Old House
- One or Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

Old House Room with Shared Bath
- Located in the Old House
- Queen Bed(s)
- Sink with Hot/Cold Water
- Shared Bathrooms

Old House 2 Room Unit
- Located in the Old House
- One or Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

Old House 2 Room Unit with Shared Bath
- Located in the Old House
- Queen Bed(s)
- Sink with Hot/Cold Water
- Shared Bathrooms

Lodging rates are per night, for up to 2 adults and do not include tax and utility fees. Most rooms available online allow 2 to 4 people per room. Larger room sizes may be available.

Rates and dates subject to change without notice.

*ADA rooms are available.

Room Amenities

Suites
- Recently Remodeled
- Sitting Room
- Refrigerator
- Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

Semi-Suites
- Sitting Room
- Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

East Wing Geyser Side, West Wing Front Side
- One or Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

East Wing Standard, West Wing Standard
- One or Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower or Shower Only
- Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

Old House Room
- Located in the Old House
- One or Two Queen Beds
- Private Bathroom
- Tub/Shower, Toilet and Sink
- Smoke Alarm

Rooms with Shared Bathrooms
- Located in the Old House
- Queen Bed(s)
- Sink with Hot/Cold Water
- Shared Bathrooms
Good evening, all.

We've enjoyed two incredibly warm and lovely November days--after a weekend that included some ice and snow. I went to Bozeman on Friday to visit Ron and Claire. On Saturday morning we got up early, drove to Billings, and attended the Northern Plains Resource Council annual meeting—a first for me, a choice on Ron and Claire's part because they'd been so impressed two years previous. So was I this time. The old guard (Wally McRae) isn't so involved now—but there's a new old crop of seasoned ranchers working with young community organizers. The group still battles open pit coal mining and coal trains—but now address GMOs, solutions for wolves that suit everyone—sort of, federal agricultural policy, etc. The keynote speaker was Winona LaDuke—one-time Ralph Nader running mate. So a grand day until we hit a seriously icy patch in the dark coming back to Bozeman.

But, time for more homework. Let me know if you'd like more of this subject!! In the second image, the relationship between the Geyser and the Inn is correct.

Old Faithful Inn:
So - I may already have lost the idea of what might help most here - but for starters. The iconic images seems to have both a broad column of water and that iconic drift—the direction of which is wind dependent. In the map, it's important to remember that the building for which I just send photos is Old Faithful INN—NOT the Lodge.
Hi Carol and Ivan,

I'm soon off to Bozeman for the weekend. I may give those old all-seasons still a great trial run on Sunday coming home!

But - to keep Donny and Herman on the road:

The heyday of White Model 706 (that's a brand not a color) buses in Yellowstone was 1930-1960s. In 1940, Yellowstone had 98 such buses. You would remember the lore about "jammers" - drivers - because they had to double clutch to get the vehicles in gear.

This funky web page appears to have the best quick history. By the time, Donny and Herman are riding, the bus world is already starting to wane--AS the train links into the park wane. [http://www.geyserbob.org/Buses-White.html](http://www.geyserbob.org/Buses-White.html)

I'll include photos below. They were yellow. Glacier used the same models--but wanted theirs red.

So - a smattering for today.

Love,

Marcella
For many decades Yellowstone National Park was the place where visitors came to feed the bears. People got hurt and bears got killed, but in the early years of the National Park Service (NPS) and Horace Albright's Yellowstone superintendency, park managers tended to believe that the negative results of feeding were far outweighed by the pleasure that visitors derived from it. People fed bears on roadside dump sites, and the NPS fed bears at the park's major hotels. Sanctioned by the National Park Service management. As a devotee of what has been called “aesthetic conservation,” Albright believed the park's primary purpose was to serve as a pleasing setting for the benefit and enjoyment of the people. To this end, Albright built aesthetic conservation into the Yellowstone landscape by establishing several wildlife viewing areas where visitors could easily get a close-up view of the park's charismatic megafauna. In addition to a buffalo corral and a short-lived zoo (home to a pair of bears named Juno and Pardy), these included the formalization of Yellowstone's famed “bear feeding grounds,” a series of dumps located in close proximity to the park’s major hotels, where visitors had been gathering to watch grizzlies feed since before the turn of the century. Under Albright, the dumps were equipped with seating, and the entire happening became a bona fide show, complete with ursine actors who entered and exited as if through theater wings each night. The NPS also tacitly encouraged visitors to feed bears themselves along the roadside, even featuring a photograph of them doing so on the cover of the park’s 1922 Rules and Regulations pamphlet; visitors reading the brochure might have been surprised to learn that to do so was against park rules.

Albright helped set in motion a pattern of behavior between Yellowstone's bears and visitors that would take decades to undo; a steady stream of injury reports and property damage claims led later managers to bemoan the park’s “bear problem” as one of their most vexing dilemmas. However, even after Albright left Yellowstone to become NPS director in 1930, Yellowstone’s managers were slow to remediate the situation, at least in part because they were loathe to change the ideal tourist experience as Albright conceived it. Suggestions that the park reduce the number of bear shows, move the shows farther from human habitation, eliminate artificial feeding in order to reduce the artificially inflated population, actively prohibit tourists from feeding bears, tell them that bears were dangerous, and change the system of bear feeding so that visitors would have to expend effort to see bears fell on deaf ears. As Albright told biologist Joseph Dixon in 1931, “Yellowstone has always been the ‘bear park.’ I would rather see bears not appear at all in other parts of the [national park] system than see any material change in the bears shows at Yellowstone.” Instead, Albright supported the practice of removing individual bears after they caused trouble.

For several years, both as superintendent and NPS director, Albright insisted that the NPS tell visitors that the act of feeding bears could be dangerous, instead of telling them that bears were dangerous, lest their enjoyment be lessened by fear. In this, Albright purposefully chose to tell the public one story over another, and in so doing, he helped to create a narrative of the bear in Yellowstone—a story told to visitors about the nature of bears and how people should interact with them. Over the past hundred years or so, this narrative has undergone many changes, as bear-related interpretation, signage, and other official communications such as brochures and even enforcement or non-enforcement of bear-feeding regulations have changed. In the end, the story told by the NPS about the Yellowstone bear has been the result of collaboration by NPS managers from the level of Yellowstone superintendent up to regional director to NPS director (and sometimes including the Office of the Secretary of the Interior) and visitors’ response to it. That story, and the process by which it was created from the 1930s to the 1950s, is the focus of this article.

Since before the turn of the twentieth century, visitors to Yellowstone National Park watched bears feed at a series of dumps located near the park’s major hotels. Sanctioned by the National Park Service (NPS), the entertainment value of bear feeding was too great to ignore. However, after Albright left the park in 1930, the practice continued under all subsequent superintendents. Park photographer F. Jay Haynes documented the decades-old practice, picturing the bears at the Canyon-area dump with an unconcerned-looking audience (left), probably transported there by a concessioner.
"Everyone upon reaching the park wants to feed a bear sooner or later, members of the Presidential party and visitors from our Washington office not excluded," noted Superintendent Rogers in a 1937 letter. As left President Warren G. Harding feeds a bear in 1923.

Changing ideals and personnel and the relative lack of park tourism in the 1930s and 1940s, however, provided an opportunity to experiment with different ways of attacking the so-called "bear problem." Helpful citizens wrote to suggest that "excess" and dangerous bears could be killed and utilized in the war effort for their fat and edible flesh. Technology was suggested as a possible fix by W. E. Sanderson of the Audubon Society, who visited the park in summer 1943 to test the effectiveness of an electric cattle prod as a bear deterrent. Olaus Murie and Vic Cahn, biologists from the NPS’s Wildlife Division agreed, however, that technology in this form was probably not the solution. (The primary mission of the Wildlife Division, a group of biologists organized under the leadership of George Wright in 1929 and based in Berkeley, California, was to survey and contribute to scientific knowledge about national park wildlife. Throughout the division’s approximately ten years of influence in the NPS, improving Yellowstone’s bear problem remained on its list of priorities.) The solutions that proved appealing, however, were controlling media imagery, dividing territory between people and bears, and, after the war, demolishing landscapes of memory.

Along with Newton Drury, a former executive secretary of the Save-the-Redwoods League who succeeded Walter opción to close the feeding grounds and slashed the budget for research such as that which helped foster the desire to eliminate the bear shows. At the end of the 1941 summer season, neither the NPS nor its visitors knew that Yellowstone had staged its final formal bear show.

The attack of December 7, however, changed everything in the United States, and in Yellowstone it resulted in a personnel shortage, closure of some of the park’s visitor facilities, and an expectation of slight visitation in summer 1942. It was the perfect time to end the feeding shows for good.

The park’s announcement in spring 1943 that it would post recipes Otter Creek feeding ground was attract­ from fifty to seventy grizzly bears each evening.

In its conception and concretion, the Otter Creek feeding facility was a monument to Horace Albright’s philosophy of aesthetic conservation. But since the late 1930s NPS officials had wanted to close Otter Creek. By summer 1940 managers in other national parks were complaining that the continued operations at Otter Creek were generating complaints from visitors to parks such as Sequoia that had already eliminated their bear shows. The problem was that the Otter Creek shows were still wildly popular with the park’s visitors and its main concessioner (which transported visitors to and from the shows). Ironically, World War II both provided the practical circumstances to allow the park to close the feeding grounds and slashed the NPS’s budget for research. The Japanese attack of December 7, however, changed everything in the United States, and in Yellowstone it resulted in a personnel shortage, closure of some of the park’s visitor facilities, and an expectation of slight visitation in summer 1942.

The last remaining bear-feeding ground at Otter Creek near Canyon was closed in 1945. Built in 1932, it had a concrete feeding platform and seating for 250 tourists on the hillside overlooking the feast.
on a nightly basis. With a push from the NPS’s Washington office, however, Nichol’s spirit of patriotism ultimately prevailed over his spirit of profit. At a meeting between Nichol, NPS officials, and the director of the Office of Defense Transportation, it was agreed that all eight sight-seeing trips in the national parks, including Nichol’s trips to the feeding grounds, would be eliminated for that summer due to gasoline rationing. With Nichol on board, the closure became a reality. Caretakers who would have been deposited at Otter Creek were either incapacitated or dumped at several areas out of public view.16

Having had the benefits of the insights of the Wildlife Division for several years, park officials were not so naive as to believe that they could expect the grizzlies that frequented the dump to simply understand that they were no longer wanted there; even at that time, it was well known that bears became habituated to human foods very quickly, and that once habituation occurred, it was exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to correct. Instead, park officials anticipated that they might seek food in the campgrounds and other developed areas. Drury asked Rogers to keep him apprised of such incidents and to monitor the bears’ dispersal as well as any adverse effects of the sudden cessation of feeding. He also counseled on the superintendent to “use ingenuity whenever possible to avoid shooting troublesome bears.”17

Per Drury’s instructions, Rogers submitted a preliminary report of bear incidents for the 1942 season on August 20. According to his final report for that year, submitted after the season’s end a couple of months later, visitation to the dump had increased from 1941 to 1942, representing an increase of 72 percent when placed in the context of a 68 percent drop in attendance in 1944 when President Franklin Roosevelt signed the “controlled slaughter” act. WithNichols on board, the closure was to become an experiment in caring for the dying sister. Visitors had been filing reimbursement claims for decades, always unsuccessfully, for bear-related medical costs and property damage, and NPS Regionial Director Lawrence Merriam responded to Ellen Hansen with a standard letter indicating that he was sorry about her sister but that “all funds appropriated by Congress are made available for specific purposes, and the funds that have been allotted to the National Park Service cannot be used for that claim.”18 Merriam’s lesson in civics, however, failed to convince Ellen Hansen, and she eventually succeeded in obtaining reimbursement in 1944 when President Franklin Roosevelt signed a bill whose attached rider granted the family $1,894.95 from common ground while on a common diet if people only behaved themselves (as had long been the claim) and was traumatic enough to require action.19

In 1944 park personnel lacked the technology that today is used to identify problem bears nor was there such a thing as an Endangered Species list to remind them of the import of prudence. According to the bear death toll suggests they responded to the Hansen attack by essentially declaring war—twenty bears were shot dead between August 20, when Rogers had submitted his preliminary report, and the end of the 1942 tourist season one month later, for a seasonal total of eighty-three—the highest total in park history to that date.20

In addition to engendering a violent campaign against local bears, Martha Hansen’s death also served as the catalyst for a series of revivallations of the park’s bear management policies. There was little consensus, though, about what exactly should be done. In a confidential memo to Superintendent Rogers, Regional Director Merriam disapproved of “controlling” killing bears.21 Merriam’s idea was that making the older generation of bears suffer for their offenses would deter the younger generation from following in their footsteps. He was aware, however, that such wanton killing would be unpopular with the public and so advocated secrecy: “In the spring of the year . . . before the general public arrives, a ‘scare campaign’ . . . should be initiated in an endeavor to cause bears to fear human beings. Torture methods are not advocated but anything short of that should be tried. The incriminable should then be trapped and disposed off as quietly as possible, the object being to instill a fear of human beings . . . as well as reduce the bear population which is probably the major contributing factor to the current bear problem.”22

Merriam’s recommendations demonstrate adherence to long-established policies that identified the bear itself as the primary problem rather than the set of connected human behaviors and institutions that had grown up in response to the bear’s “inoffensive” nature. The 1939s' and 1940s' efforts to contain the bears “rigidly controlled” bears, a term which has been used to describe any bear situations where human beings fear the animal and act to reduce it to the status of a pest.23


Other proposed nonlethal methods of dealing with bears included fencing them out of campgrounds, trapping them in dry-mead (diagramed 56), and adverse conditioning, but Superintendent Rogers preferred to change visitors' attitudes toward bears by emphasizing their wildness and unpredictability.

[26] in preference to the visitors you invite to the park you had better plug up the grays & make a feature of them. . . . . . It would seem to me that your board could . . . fence in the tourist camp. A year later Superintendent Toll received a petition signed by eighty-seven campers at the Fish­ ing Bridge campground asking that Toll either dispose of the bears raiding the campground, "reserving a few for exhibition purposes," or fence the campground. The idea had been consistently rejected, however, on the grounds that such an enclosure would be expensive, unsightly, unnatural, confining, and frightening by implication to visitors who might think that they were unsafe when outside it. Just as the administration had been hesitant to worry people that the bears were dangerous, so was it reluctant to establish the appearance of safe and unsafe zones within the park. The Wildlife Division was opposed to the idea in principle but periodically acknowledged the fence as a possible solution to campground problems.22 Despite this apparent lack of enthusiasm, an employee of the NPS's Branch of Plans and Design apparently drew a map of the Fishing Bridge area, dated January 1, 1939, upon which the outline of a proposed fence was sketched in red pencil.23 This enclosure would surround not just the campground but the entire developed area at Fishing Bridge. With Pelican Creek forming a natural border on the south, the fence would extend approximately a thousand feet to the east of the Fishing Bridge developed area. The design included four road gates and three hand gates that could be opened to provide human passage in and out of these areas. In theory these gates could be used as outlets for errant bears who might somehow breach the barrier and find themselves stuck on the inside rather than the outside of the fence. The specter of a breach the barrier and find themselves stuck on the inside proved of the idea.24

24. National Park Service Branch of Plans and Design map, 1939, box 1759, entry 87, RG 79, NPS.
26. Carnes to Committee on Bear Fences, April 19, 1945; Victor Cahalane to Director, National Park Service, June 6, 1945, Yellowstone: Mammals: Bears, 1944-1949, NA, College Park.
27. A. W. Burney to Director, National Park Service, June 8, 1945, Yellowstone: Mammals: Bears, 1944-1949, NA, College Park.
28. Lawrence Merriam to Edmund Rogers, November 12, 1948, Bears vol 1: 1939-1947, NA, YNP; Lawrence Merriam to Newton

Murie was not the bear but the human conception of the bear that was the root of the "bear problem" in Yellowstone. In his 1948 book _Oh, Ranger!, Horse Albright had pointed out the power of nursery tale imagery such as that of "Goldilocks and the Three Bears" in conjunction with the NPS's mission of preserving natural conditions. Albright did so, writing that he suspected Murie would "enjoy sinking [his] teeth into the 'inevitable right' of every park visitor to see all of the larger species of wildlife." 29

In an eloquent missive Murie responded that "it is a question of whether we are justified in sacrificing some of the main purpose of a park, and endangering lives and property, in order to maintain a special display, furnish cute bear antics, however stimulating this may be to the public." Murie wrote that he had observed visitors who seemed to have become bored with the bear on account of its omnipresence and concluded that "I think the quality of a national park experience can be improved if we do not try to lead the visitor on by recreation on a platter, but let him make at least a little exertion to find it ... and the resulting deeper satisfaction that comes from some form of personal achievement."

If Murie's thoughts evoke Edward Abbey's contention that "a man on foot, on horseback, or on a bicycle will see more, feel more, enjoy more in one mile than the motorized tourists can in a hundred miles," it may be because Murie and Abbey were not all that far apart when it came to their beliefs about recreation and wilderness (if not in Murie's views about wilderness were relatively purist was the tactics they believed necessary to preserve our wilderness and having these areas reduced to the commonplace"

Drury likely knew, then, what Murie would produce: a treatise that supported the NPS's recent policy changes and disavowed it of any obligation to guarantee the public an animal sideshow. Murie's response accomplished this goal and also echoed Arno Cammerer's suggestion that the NPS try to convince the public that a bear encounter that required some effort was more valuable than one supplied on demand. In combination with efforts to change its image from that of playing to predation, requiring people to seek out the bear would increase its status as a subject to be dealt with rather than a symbol to be consumed. As such, the success of the new message would necessitate a reformulation of people's ideas about nature—a shift from human-oriented conservation thinking to the "nature-oriented" preservation thinking that posited that wildlife had the right to live separate from human domination. This introduction of the values espoused by the emerging modern wilderness movement (and recommended for bear management purposes as early as 1930) represented a pivotal moment in modern NPS history—a philosophical and narrative shift from making nature accessible to the people to encouraging the people to seek reward from effort.

Feeding grounds in Yellowstone quickly habituated bears to eating garbage and handouts and caused unnatural behavior in grizzlies—they would rarely gather in numbers or share food in the wild. Below, grizzlies feed and spar with each other at Otter Creek in 1937. Beginning in the 1940s the NPS strove to undo decades of animal and visitor behavior perpetuated by entertaining park-goers with these feedings.

AlICE K. WONDRAK earned her Ph.D. in geography from the University of Colorado at Boulder in 2002. She is currently a writer-editor for the National Park Service at the Yellowstone Center for Resources. Research for this article was funded by the Canon National Parks Science Scholars Program.
As Part I of this article, which appeared in Autumn 2002, explained, Yellowstone National Park was for many decades a place where visitors expected to have close encounters with bears. Under the superintendency of Horace Albright, the “bear-feeding grounds,” a series of dumps located near the park’s major hotels, became headliner entertainment. The hundreds of incidents and injuries that resulted each year from interactions between bears and visitors came to be known as the “bear problem” to the park personnel who succeeded Albright after he left the park to become National Park Service (NPS) director in 1929.

The severe mauling and death of Martha Hansen in late summer 1942 ratcheted the “bear problem” up to an unprecedented level of urgency. In response, NPS officials began to fashion a new bear-management message emphasizing that close encounters between visitors and bears was bad for both. This new policy represented a pivotal moment in Yellowstone history—a philosophical and narrative shift away from making wildlife easily accessible to visitors to encouraging people to seek reward through effort. It was a shift not achieved without great difficulty.

For decades visitors to Yellowstone National Park expected to encounter bears panhandling along park roads and providing evening entertainment at the feeding grounds, including Otter Creek pictured here. But the 1940s brought changes to bear-management policies. The new message: Bears are dangerous wild animals that should not be in close contact with people.
A champion of the public's desire to see bears, former superintendent Horace Albright (below, 1905) fervently defended the feeding of bears, but Superintendent Edmund Rogers and National Park Service Director Newton Drury envisioned the park as a place to see nature in operation, not a forum to view the "immunized" antics of animals.

In the mid-1940s Horace Albright, despite his retirement from the NPS, remained influential in the agency and in the conservation movement. In April 1945 he came out with guns blazing to oppose the NPS's closure of the Over Creek bear-feeding grounds and the suggestion that visitors should be prohibited from feeding bears marshmallows and other human foodstuffs along roadways with a rather alarmist essay published in The Backlog, the journal of the Camp Fire Club. 1

In "New Order for National Park Bears" Albright pled the case for a democratic conservation in the face of what he saw as an exclusionary turn in NPS thinking. In part, Albright fought the changes because he felt the NPS had been built on the principle of "aesthetic conservation," a brand of conservation that fell somewhere between the traditional utilitarian conservation of Gifford Pinchot and the kind of preservation philosophy that had been espoused by John Muir and was being revitalized by his modern counterparts. Like other forms of conservation, aesthetic conservation had a "problem-oriented" goal, primarily to preserve species that humans valued. It departed from utilitarian conservation by advocating nonconsumptive resource use that elevated the human spirit instead of human industry. To Albright, prohibiting bear feeding violated the principles of aesthetic conservation in two fundamental ways: by killing bears and by dispersing them. Albright was convinced that the only ways tourists and bears would ever be kept apart was if roadside bears were either killed or hauled into the park's backcountry, which would lead to a reduction in the number of bears that tourists could see.

Wildlife biologist Olaus Murie's 1944 report that argued against tourists' "palatable right" to see bears in Yellowstone may have sparked Albright's article. In an eloquent missive solicited by NPS Director Newton Drury, who had made his decision to end roadside feeding, Murie wrote that "it is a question of whether we are justified in sacrificing some of the main purpose of a park, and endangering lives and property, in order to maintain a special display, furnish cute bear antics, however stimulating this may be to the public. Albright did not take kindly to Murie's comments, and in two letters to Director Drury, he made it clear that what irked him about Murie and his ideas was the absence of any concern for the desires of "the public who like the bears . . . much more than the geysers." Murie knew mighty little about the traveling public," Albright wrote, "and apparently is not particularly concerned about whether the public enjoys the parks or not. He could not understand why the public cannot have access to one or two big feeding grounds where they can see both black bears and grizzlies, photograph them, and enjoy their funny antics and be safe." During his superintendency, be remembered, bears annually bit an average of two hundred people to "no significant negative effect." 2

It should be noted, of course, that Albright was not opposed to wilderness, just to the idea of the national parks being reserved and managed for it. In his view, the NPS's wedding of ecology, wilderness ethic, and policy would ultimately sacrifice the needs and desires of the public for the sake of what the ecologists defined as a "purer" nature. He argued that "Not all park visitors can see bears along the roads. This does not disturb the scientific group. They think that if a person wants to see a bear he should go out into the wilds and find one, and then he would see a bear as a child of Nature and be vastly more thrilled and inspired by such a spectacle than to observe one near a highway." 3

1. Donald Swain, Wilderness Defender: Horace M. Albright and Conservation (Chicago, 1979), 258-59. Albright retired from the NPS in 1939 to join the United States Park Company; he became the company's president and general manager in 1946.

2. Horace M. Albright, "New Orders for National Park Bears," The Backlog: A Bulletin of the Camp Fire Club of America, 22 (April 1945), 1-11, copy in Albright, Horace M., New Orders for National Park Bears (Missoula, Montana: Haynes Foundation Library, 1996). The Camp Fire Club was a conservation group that shared Albright's conviction that wildlife visibility was key to wildlife conservation. When NPS officials proposed to cease operations at Yellowstone's Lamar Buffalo Ranch in 1944, the Camp Fire Club strongly opposed the idea out of concern that an unbridled, free-roaming bear herd would not survive and that even if it could, the animals would no longer be visible to visitors.


7. Horace M. Albright to Newton Drury, April 15, 1944, file 715.02 pt. 5, Yellowstone: Mammoth Bears, January 1941 to December 1943 (hereafter Yellowstone: Mammoth Bears, 1941-1943), box 1749, entry 67, Record Group 79 (National Archives). Records of the National Park Service, National Archives, College Park, Maryland (hereafter N.A. Coll. Parks); Horace M. Albright to Newton Drury, March 25, 1944, ibid.

8. Whether the "scientific group" to whom Albright referred included the entirety of the wildlife division, a group of biologists whose task was to survey and contribute to scientific knowledge about national park wildlife, or Olaus Murie alone is unclear. But Murie was certainly a specific target, as his exclusivist beliefs about wilderness were anathema to principles of conservation—aesthetic or utilitarian—that advocated the more democratic "greatest good for the greatest number for the greatest amount of time," opposed to an experience of carefully defined quality for those who were refined enough to be able to appreciate it.
To Albright's thinking, the evening entertainment at the bear-feeding grounds—a compressed interaction that showed how nature worked to as many visitors as possible in the shortest amount of time—was a far more efficient use of resources. At the bear feedings, the park observed the interactions and behaviors of no fewer than four species at different hierarchical levels in the food chain (black and grizzly bears, coyotes, and sea gulls), all accompanied by educational interpretation given by park personnel. This was ecology as spectacle, served up to a crowd in a manageable amount of time and in an accessible space. People enjoyed themselves and learned something; bears got fed and (according to Albright) stayed away from the campgrounds, garbage went away, and all it took was a big pile of bear bait. Why throw away one of the park's most valuable resources (the pleasure and experience afforded by the bears) and provoke public anger for the sake of the natu­ral world was a series of interconnections that might work in the absence of active human intervention. A

Various activities in preparation for the postwar renewal of rail service. The cover of the circular showed a panel of happy bears greeting the first train to West Yellowstone with shouts of "Welcome Back!"

The UP bears certainly were not the "dangerous wild animals" that Rogers wanted to show visitors, so there was little room for them in a postwar framework of bear and visitor management. As such, NPS Acting Director Hilary Tolson requested that Regional Director Lawrence Merriam urge the UP to modify its message: "We hope that special attention may be devoted by the Yellowstone Park staff to correcting the unfortunate impression which has been given by the Union Pacific Railroad publicity that the tourists should expect to renew convivial relations with the 'friendly' Yellowstone bears, which relationship was interrupted by the war." The UP produced Oehrle circulars until 1960 but never again depicted tourists and bears in close association.

NPS management also decided that simply stopping the bear-feeding shows was not enough—the landscape of the feeding grounds needed to be turned back to nature. The demolition of the Otter Creek bear-feeding grounds was recommended to Drury September 26, 1945, by Regional Director Merriam, who deemed the task of such import that he wanted it completed before the 1946 season, in spite of funding and staffing shortages. Drury and Rogers hoped that visitors would have forgotten about bear feeding, and it is no surprise that Drury immediately supported of this suggestion to erase evidence of NPS-sanctioned feeding from the park landscape. On October 4 he responded that Merriam should arrange with Superintendents Rogers to "obliterate, so far as possible, all develop­ments pertaining to the feeding of bears at the

Canyon feeding area at the earliest possible date" and informed Assistant Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman of the decision. Park officials agreed not to issue a press release notifying the public of these plans nor of concur­rent plans to remove all signs relating to the Antelope Creek buffalo pasture, whose previous inhabitants now freely roamed the park. If anyone inquired about the absence of these landmarks, he or she should simply be informed that the areas were no longer being used. In late May 1946, with the feeding grounds already in a dilapidated state from five years' disuse, park person­nel removed fencing, guard rails, signs, stairways and log seats, a retaining wall, two pit toilets, and the small building used to heat the water with which the concrete feeding pad had been hosed down each night. Removal of the pad itself was postponed until drier weather permitted build­darker operations.

The razing of the Otter Creek feeding grounds placed a palpable strain on what had historically been a congenial relationship between Director Drury and former director Albright. In October 1945 Drury notified Albright of the plans to demolish the facility. A month later, in response to Albright's apparently negative and advisory reply, Drury demonstrated that his tolerance for Albright's public and private criticism of the park's new wildlife policies had reached its limit: "Maybe we are wrong, and should have temporized longer, but I have to 'call 'em as I see them,' and take the consequences. (Your) references to 'screwy'

As vacationers returned to the park in greater numbers after a decline in recreation caused by World War II, park officials hoped to convince them that the elimination of bear feeding was a positive change. They tried various media, including, presumably, this Leon Schillinghen cartoon printed for park use in 1944.

his philosophical legacy must have hurt him personally and deeply, a fact perhaps demonstrated by his allusions to "secrecy" and "bureaucracy." In a sense, the razing physically destroyed Albright's guiding philosophy. With the elaborate Omer Creek feeding and viewing accommodations, aesthetic conservation had been built into the park landscape. The facility's destruction represented more than a desire for the new picnic ground that replaced it. It signified the NPS's resolve not to return to the old ways of thinking about itself and its duties to the public.

In order to reassure itself that the agency had done the right thing, the NPS in December 1945 solicited comments from scholars and environmental leaders from around the nation about whether they agreed with the closure of the feeding grounds (they did). A year later Drury wrote to one A. T. Wilcox of Michigan State College that "throughout

We want to warn you that certain humans in this park have been passing the biscuits and soda pop to some of your brothers. Keep your self-respect—avoid them. Don't be pauperized like your uncles. They'll come too close, read this notice to them.

We're reporting this to the National Park Service.

The Committee.

In the 1950s the NPS even tried harder to convince vacationers to stop feeding bears, though at least some failed to understand the point of this poster.

16. Victor Cahalane to Chic Young, November 21, 1951, Bears, vol 2 January 1, 1948—, NA, YNP.
Chief Ranger Frank Sylvester's negative reply to Lange's collector's impulse.\(^{18}\)

That at least some people failed to understand the point of "Notice to Bears" (if they, in fact, saw it) was reflected by the number of visitors who wrote to suggest that instead of warning people that they endangered themselves by feeding the bears, the park should explain the ways in which they endangered the bears by feeding them (which is exactly what "Notice to Bears" did). Several respondents to a 1952 survey and numerous individual visitors to Yellowstone between 1952 and 1953 proposed this suggestion as well.\(^{26}\)

Although some rangers chose to verbally communi- cate the "feeding is bad for bears" message to people stalled in bear jams—traffic congestion created by people stopping to watch bears—the idea was apparently not yet widespread among visitors in the early 1950s. Josef and Elizabeth Lynch of Germany, for example, offered a Euro- sophisticate perspective with a relativist remonstrance that to eat garbage was consistent with the "nature" of Yellow- stone's bears: "It would be as unnatural for a very intel- ligent animal as the wild bear is to look for food—hardly accessible food in the forest—as it is natural to expect food—easily attainable food—from visitors. . . . We can't consider millions of human visitors of the Yellowstone National Park feeding bears as unnatural. The bears are simply drawing natural consequences from the natural behavior of their fellow beings—visitors to the Yellowstone and other National Parks.\(^{20}\)

Though not the most cogent explanation, the Lynchs' point, that humans are part of the natural world and that it was natural for the bear, as an omnivore engaging in evolutionary struggle, to conserve energy by feeding on easily available garbage and handouts, would prove a pop- ular argument for proponents of feeding in the years to come. It appeared to provide scientific and philosophical grounding for the act of supplemental feeding after the closure of the park's garbage dumps.\(^{21}\)

Others just wanted to feed the bears without being hassle- ed by the marshallpolice. Visitor happiness was the issue for Joseph Paul Bitzer of Davenport, Iowa, who was incensed to arrive at the park in summer 1952 only to discover bear feeding illegal and that bears that injured people or repeatedly raided campground garbage cans were shot. Bitzer's arguments in favor of feeding recalled Albright's when he pointed out that bears injured only a very tiny percentage of visitors and that it was usually the visitor's own fault. Also like Albright, whose designa- tion of Yellowstone as "the bear park" reflected the inseparability of the place and the animal in his mind, Bitzer proclaimed that "Yellowstone wouldn't be Yellowstone without the bears and the ability to be near them and feed them, etc." He offered some suggestions on proper feed- ing methods and concluded with the suggestion that if the NPS was concerned about the health of the bears, it should provide people with a list of what was and was not good for bears to eat.\(^{22}\)

The park's managers disagreed and continued to experiment with different ways of telling people to stop feeding the bears.\(^{23}\) Unfortunately, there is little evidence that educational efforts encouraged people. The number of bear-related personal injuries rose from 38 in 1951 to 109 in 1956. There also seemed to be more begging bears than ever. In 1956 visitor Jack Frost Andrews wrote to ask what was going on; he saw eight bears during a 1955 visit but returned with his children in 1956 to see an aston- ishing seventy-one.\(^{24}\)

In light of continuing misunderstandings, a social science researcher attempted in 1953 to ascertain just what Yellowstone's visitors knew about bear feeding. That summer Donald Bock of the Colorado A&M School of Forestry administered "A Survey of Public Opinion Concerning the Yellowstone Bear Feeding Problem," the first study of the subject conducted by an outside entity and probably the first since park biologist Walter Kittams interviewed visitors whom he encountered in the act of feeding the bears a few years previously. Like Kittams, Bock found that the majority of visitors knew that feeding violated park rules but did not really know why, though most who had an idea believed that danger to visitors was the only reason for prohibiting feeding. In a statistic that might call into question the truth-in-reporting practiced by Bock's respondents, 72 percent claimed that neither they nor anyone in their party fed the bears, but 92 per- cent said that they saw others doing it. Sixty-four percent believed that feeding violated national park principles, but several of those who disagreed were emphatic in their responses. Perhaps most interesting for what it suggests about visitors' desire for a certain kind of visual experi- ence is the statistic that 39 percent of respondents said they would rather have seen fewer bears in a wild state than more bears along the roadside. Seventeen percent preferred to see them at the roadside receiving handouts, 20 percent were indifferent, and 9 percent stated that they did not care about seeing bears at all.\(^{25}\)

In spite of its creative messaging, by the early 1950s the NPS still did not in any meaningful way back up its educational efforts with law enforcement, and if any- gency of Rogers, who so wanted to convince visitors that bears were dangerous. In that sense, "Notice to Bears" may suggest a willingness to try just about anything to change visitors' attitudes toward bear feeding. (In the same year the NPS introduced a very different flyer called "Dan- gerous" that featured what would come to be known as a "horror bear," an enraged bear roaring, waving its front legs in the air, and displaying an enormous set of pointy teeth and intimidating claws.\(^{17}\)

Another problem with the use of humor in bear warn- ings was that such signs tended to backfire, when, more inspired to own the signs than to obey them, tourists ignored the fact that the public should not feed the bears. That at least some people failed to understand the point of "Notice to Bears" (if they, in fact, saw it) was reflected by the number of visitors who wrote to suggest that instead of warning people that they endangered themselves by feeding the bears, the park should explain the ways in which they endangered the bears by feeding them (which is exactly what "Notice to Bears" did). Several respondents to a 1952 survey and numerous individual visitors to Yellowstone between 1952 and 1953 proposed this suggestion as well.\(^{26}\)

Although some rangers chose to verbally communi- cate the "feeding is bad for bears" message to people stalled in bear jams—traffic congestion created by people stopping to watch bears—the idea was apparently not yet widespread among visitors in the early 1950s. Josef and Elizabeth Lynch of Germany, for example, offered a Euro- sophisticate perspective with a relativist remonstrance that to eat garbage was consistent with the "nature" of Yellow- stone's bears: "It would be as unnatural for a very intel- ligent animal as the wild bear is to look for food—hardly accessible food in the forest—as it is natural to expect food—easily attainable food—from visitors. . . . We can't consider millions of human visitors of the Yellowstone National Park feeding bears as unnatural. The bears are simply drawing natural consequences from the natural behavior of their fellow beings—visitors to the Yellowstone and other National Parks.\(^{20}\)

Though not the most cogent explanation, the Lynchs' point, that humans are part of the natural world and that it was natural for the bear, as an omnivore engaging in evolutionary struggle, to conserve energy by feeding on easily available garbage and handouts, would prove a pop- ular argument for proponents of feeding in the years to come. It appeared to provide scientific and philosophical grounding for the act of supplemental feeding after the closure of the park's garbage dumps.\(^{21}\)

Others just wanted to feed the bears without being hassle- ed by the marshallpolice. Visitor happiness was the issue for Joseph Paul Bitzer of Davenport, Iowa, who was incensed to arrive at the park in summer 1952 only to discover bear feeding illegal and that bears that injured people or repeatedly raided campground garbage cans were shot. Bitzer's arguments in favor of feeding recalled Albright's when he pointed out that bears injured only a very tiny percentage of visitors and that it was usually the visitor's own fault. Also like Albright, whose designa- tion of Yellowstone as "the bear park" reflected the inseparability of the place and the animal in his mind, Bitzer proclaimed that "Yellowstone wouldn't be Yellowstone without the bears and the ability to be near them and feed them, etc." He offered some suggestions on proper feed- ing methods and concluded with the suggestion that if the NPS was concerned about the health of the bears, it should provide people with a list of what was and was not good for bears to eat.\(^{22}\)

The park's managers disagreed and continued to experiment with different ways of telling people to stop feeding the bears.\(^{23}\) Unfortunately, there is little evidence that educational efforts encouraged people. The number of bear-related personal injuries rose from 38 in 1951 to 109 in 1956. There also seemed to be more begging bears than ever. In 1956 visitor Jack Frost Andrews wrote to ask what was going on; he saw eight bears during a 1955 visit but returned with his children in 1956 to see an aston- ishing seventy-one.\(^{24}\)

In light of continuing misunderstandings, a social science researcher attempted in 1953 to ascertain just what Yellowstone's visitors knew about bear feeding. That summer Donald Bock of the Colorado A&M School of Forestry administered "A Survey of Public Opinion Concerning the Yellowstone Bear Feeding Problem," the first study of the subject conducted by an outside entity and probably the first since park biologist Walter Kittams interviewed visitors whom he encountered in the act of feeding the bears a few years previously. Like Kittams, Bock found that the majority of visitors knew that feeding violated park rules but did not really know why, though most who had an idea believed that danger to visitors was the only reason for prohibiting feeding. In a statistic that might call into question the truth-in-reporting practiced by Bock's respondents, 72 percent claimed that neither they nor anyone in their party fed the bears, but 92 per- cent said that they saw others doing it. Sixty-four percent believed that feeding violated national park principles, but several of those who disagreed were emphatic in their responses. Perhaps most interesting for what it suggests about visitors' desire for a certain kind of visual experi- ence is the statistic that 39 percent of respondents said they would rather have seen fewer bears in a wild state than more bears along the roadside. Seventeen percent preferred to see them at the roadside receiving handouts, 20 percent were indifferent, and 9 percent stated that they did not care about seeing bears at all.\(^{25}\)

In spite of its creative messaging, by the early 1950s the NPS still did not in any meaningful way back up its educational efforts with law enforcement, and if any-
thing, feeding seemed to be on the rise, concomitant with the postwar surge in visitations brought on by the return of the family vacation and the advent of 1950s car culture, and including the introduction of the mass-produced motor home. 23

In a 1951 memo the park's acting superintendent informed the NPS director that so many people fed the bears that only the most flagrant offenders—for example, the four people who actually left their cars to hand-feed—could be prosecuted. Rangers got traffic moving and talked with people about why they should not feed the bears, but punishing them for feeding was neither required nor encouraged. 24 Although 93 percent of Bock's 1952 subjects reported knowing that feeding was illegal, visitors would continue feeding even in the presence of a ranger, and one seasonal ranger remembered that in three summers of patrolling bear jams between 1951 and 1953, he never wrote a single ticket for bear feeding nor was he ever reprimanded for failing to do so, despite regular inspections of his ticket book by his supervisor who knew that his seasonal staff de­ veloped a substantial amount of time getting traffic moving. 25

This lack of punishment did not extend to bears that broke the rules. In the absence of a formal management plan, district rangers dealt with bears on a case-by-case basis. A seasonal ranger stationed at Lake, an area whose jurisdiction included the Fishing Bridge camp­ground, explained that the campground's unruly visi­ tors would be trapped and relocated three times and then were dispatched. As had been the case for decades, rangers kept track of strikes by marking offend­ing bears with paint. "We had the three paint colors . . . and bruises got three chances at Fishing Bridge Campground. First time we trapped him, one color . . . next incident . . . the second color. Take him back into a remote area again. Same procedure the third time. If he came back the fourth time, he was trapped, and that was his last move. A bear trapped in the camp­ground that had been previ­ously painted three times was then disposed of. I guess if there was a bear management policy, that was it." 26

Most of the problem bears at Fishing Bridge in those days were black bears. Grizzlies, thought to be a more serious threat to human safety, rangers handled somewhat differently. "We had a grizzly on occasion as well. That was sometimes handled in a more direct way, depending upon history of incidents and all. . . . [We] had some night incidents in which I held the flashlight, and the dis­trict ranger settled the grizzly bear problem in the camp­ground on the spot [by shooting it]. Another description of bear-management methods during the 1950s also indi­cates a lack of messing around: "If [bears] that could not be

Superintendent Edmund Rogers, who retired in 1952, overwrought extraordinary change during the twenty years he spent at Yellowstone's helm. Among his accomplishments was laying the groundwork for fixing the park's "bear problem." Pictured in 1957 at Petrified Specimen Ridge, he is accompanied by Jack Fauntleroy (center) and Frank Ochsenshulz (left).

When people broke the rules, bears suffered. Rangers trapped and relocated some to remote territory (up to three times if necessary). Others were dispatched.

Superintendent Edmund Rogers, who retired in 1952, overwrought extraordinary change during the twenty years he spent at Yellowstone's helm. Among his accomplishments was laying the groundwork for fixing the park's "bear problem." Pictured in 1957 at Petrified Specimen Ridge, he is accompanied by Jack Fauntleroy (center) and Frank Ochsenshulz (left).

...
The controversy surrounding the northern Yellowstone elk herd and the application of changing ecological principles to the park's northern range can be further investigated in Pritchard, "Ecological Dynamics on Yellowstone's Northern Range," a 2002 report by the National Research Council.

31. Pritchard, Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions, 199, 235. The controversy surrounding the northern Yellowstone elk herd and the application of changing ecological principles to the park's northern range can be further investigated in Pritchard, Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions, as well as in innumerable scientific papers and National Academy of Science reports from the past few decades, including "Ecological Dynamics on Yellowstone's Northern Range," a 2002 report by the National Research Council.


Edmund Rogers retired in 1956 after spending twenty years at Yellowstone's helm, more time than any other superintendent in the park's history. Under his tenure, the park experienced extraordinary changes. The NPS closed the bear-feeding grounds, moved strides toward demythologizing the relationship between bears and people in Yellowstone, and essentially abandoned aesthetic conservation in favor of a brand of preservation shaped by the early wilderness movement. The Great Depression and war years had offered opportunity for change, and Edmund Rogers seized it. Yellowstone's "bear problem" was far from fixed, but the groundwork had been laid.

Just three years after Rogers's retirement, scientists arrived in Yellowstone whose presence would forever change what had been, up to then, the relatively insular world of bear management in the park. When twin brothers John and Frank Craighead began their revolutionary grizzly bear studies in 1959, no one could have predicted the acrimony, controversy, and change that would ultimately result from their research. We have the Craigheads to thank for developing radio telemetry; for popularizing the idea of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem—a more effective framework for thinking about and managing Yellowstone's resources than existed previously; and, for both better and worse, for shining a critical spotlight on wildlife management that in the coming years would occasionally inspire unprecedented public outcry about public-land management and the NPS.

Although Yellowstone's grizzlies get most of the attention, the descendants of this black bear still roam the park, though you won't find them begging for marshmallows along the roadsides.

Yellowstone's black bears are still around, of course. But you will not see them begging for marshmallows at the roadsides, due in part to the vision of Edmund Rogers and his colleagues more than half a century ago.
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