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INTRODUCTION

While establishing the National Park Service in 1916, Congressional lawmakers directed the park administrators to "promote and regulate the use....of national parks," but also cautioned Park Service officials to do so in a manner that would "leave them [the parks] unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."¹ The directives to provide for use and to leave the parks unimpaired were admirable in theory but proved to be incompatible or conflicting when actually applied. Experience has shown that even regulated use usually impairs, in some form, the natural phenomena within the parks. The total utilization of natural resources within these areas was unquestionably incongruous with national park objectives, and similarly the absolute preservation or non-use of the parks was also unrealistic. Congress did not realize the obscure nature of the two objectives and failed to further define the two dichotomous concepts. Thus, it became necessary for the Park Service officials to apply the vague Congressional objectives and to attempt a balance between the concepts of use and preservation in the national parks.

In an attempt to clarify national park policy in 1918, Interior Secretary Franklin K. Lane wrote to Stephen Mather, Director of the National Park Service, that "the national parks must be

maintained in absolutely unimpaired form." Lane added, however, that the parks "are set apart for the use, observation, health and pleasure of the people." Thus, Mather, as the first National Park Service director, had no more success than Congress, in defining "use" and "preservation." So, to Lane, Mather, and others, the two objectives of use and preservation remained contradictory: keeping national parks preserved or "in absolutely unimpaired form" was impossible, when simultaneously "use" through tourism, recreation, and development was advocated.

Lane recommended plans for concessions, cattle grazing, limited timber production, and various construction projects. Neither Lane nor Mather saw any threat of destruction in building highways or encouraging unlimited visitation to areas which were virtual wilderness. Because park officials advocated new roads, hotels, and other tourist facilities, unimpaired wilderness areas designated as parks were gradually changed into accessible tourist attractions. And improvement or development has continued to the present time, because officials still emphasize recreational use and tourist satisfaction as the parks' basic function, secondary to preserving the parks unaltered for the future.

The concept of use in national park policy has been ambiguous since the formation of Yellowstone as the first national park in 1872. During the latter part of the 19th century, Americans feverishly exploited their natural resources: trees were to be cut,

minerals were to be found and unearthed, rivers were to be harnessed for energy and irrigation. In that era of resource consumption, only a few individuals realized that natural resources were not inexhaustible in quantity. George Perkins Marsh wrote in 1864, that "man has too long forgotten that the earth was given to him for usufruct alone, not for consumption, still less for profligate waste." Persons interested in protecting resources from waste or destruction, later to be known as conservationists, realized that natural resources and the virgin or wild characteristics of the land could pass gradually out of existence; and they suggested that the Federal government become active in the care and protection of the nation's natural resources. Because of a concern over the possible destruction of unique natural areas by private interests, conservationists such as John Muir, Frederick Law Olmstead, and George Bird Grinnell, urged Congress to form additional national parks. Thus, following Yellowstone, Congress established Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant in 1890, Mt. Rainier in 1899, and Crater Lake National Park in 1902. By 1910, the year of Glacier National Park's formation, thirteen monuments or parks had been set aside.

Conservationists disagreed among themselves, however, about the purpose of the Federal areas—whether the parks were to be used or to be preserved. To conservationists like Gifford Pinchot, who was one of the original advocates of national forests, and to

James Garfield, who as Secretary of the Interior permitted Hetch Hetchy dam to be built in Yosemite National Park, the anticipated development of the parks included Federally regulated timber production, livestock grazing, and use of water resources.

Other conservationists, known as "preservationists," promoted a more stringent interpretation of protection of natural resources. Even the preservationists, however, were not totally categorical in their beliefs and demands. Some preservationists would maintain that the only method to preserve natural phenomena consisted of the complete exclusion of man from a given area under all circumstances. The mere knowledge of the existence of a preserve would provide a source of satisfaction to citizens. George Perkins Marsh remarked: "But man is everywhere a disturbing agent. Wherever he plants his foot, the harmonies of nature are turned to discordes." However, a less idealistic preservationist, Dr. Morton J. Elrod of the University of Montana, felt that these extremists were over-reacting against America's past consumption of natural resources, when he wrote: "The over-rapid exploitation of new regions in the past has brought a reaction which is reflected in the strong sentiment for parks and in an often times vague desire to preserve everything, regardless of legitimate needs."

Most park advocates and conservationists realized that absolute preservation of "unimpaired" parks was unrealistic.

4. Ibid., p. 33
Therefore, to insure that some natural areas would be preserved, most moderate preservationists developed an attitude of expediency. More practical preservationists, ecologists, and natural scientists were willing to use public interest to insure preservation, and in turn allow some development in the parks to attract the public interest. In 1922, ecologist G. W. Goldsmith wrote: "The chief public interest in preserves is, and will continue to be, a recreational interest." Preservationists suggested, however, that necessary development be limited in order not to distract visitors from the appreciation or enjoyment of nature. Dr. Elrod remarked: "National Parks should be protected completely from any and all utilitarian and commercial enterprises, save those necessary for and subservient to legitimate park uses."

Though most American conservationists accepted the development of national parks for public recreational use, the preservationists continued to oppose those conservationists and economic interest groups who advocated limited consumption of park resources or use of the parks for personal gain. While the preservationists concerned themselves about the dangers to the parks from outside forces, recreation advocates encouraged extensive resource use through recreational development and tourism. Only recently have preservationists become aware of overdevelopment for recreation and the pressure upon the parks from increasing visitation. The

7. Elrod, "Relations of People to Glacier Park," p. 4.
older use-preservation problem concerning the exploitation of the parks' natural resources, however, worried preservationists from the formation of Yellowstone throughout the history of the parks.

Administrators in almost every park created by Congress prior to the National Park Service's formation in 1916 experienced similar use-preservation difficulties, basically because of a lack of co-ordinated control and the ill-defined concepts and goals of the various organic acts. The Secretary of the Interior managed all of the national parks as a part of the miscellaneous activities of his department, and the result was haphazard planning, a lack of funds, and little public interest. Congress formulated each of the national park organic acts with a similarity of vague goals and imprecise wording which, in turn, contributed to administrative confusion during their application or enforcement.

The general lack of funds and the constant incongruous demands for resource use plagued park administrators continually during the early years. Most parks did not receive any appropriation from Congress until several years after their formation, because of the belief that they were to be self-supporting. The lack of appropriations led to inadequate staffing in the parks and, hence, to insufficient enforcement of regulations. Use, in the form of recreation, did not conflict with preservation during this period, since only a small number of tourists visited the parks. Only limited numbers who could afford the time and money to travel to the relatively inaccessible parks and stay long enough to tour them enjoyed the recreational activities. However,
proposed irrigation projects, dam building, timber production, and mining constituted an overt danger to the primitivism of the parks. After some development and use had taken place, park officials recognized the policy of allowing a park's resources to be used for private financial gain as a threat to the parks' existence and purpose, and, thus, the more recent park administrators discouraged or rejected most of the schemes for resource use.

In these early parks, officials interpreted preservation to mean protection from outside forces attempting to poach wildlife, graze cattle or sheep, prospect and mine, or engage in practices which they interpreted as destructive to the parks. Administrators in Yellowstone had difficulties with poachers, concessionaires, and vandals. Park officials in Yosemite experienced problems with sheep and cattle grazing, poaching, concessionaires, as well as the Hetch Hetchy dam construction. The officials of Sequoia and General Grant parks encountered hostility from numerous private land owners, and especially from the lumbermen among them who wanted to cut the giant trees. Private land was also a problem in Mt. Rainier National Park. There, the Northern Pacific Railroad owned considerable land, and since a clause in the Park's organic act allowed prospecting, claims and mines were established within the reserve. Thus, true to the pattern, administrators in Glacier National Park also dealt with private land problems, lumbering and mining interests and
poaching.  

After the formation of the National Park Service in 1916, the struggle continued between those interested in consumptive use of national park resources and those seeking their preservation or protection from outside commercial interests. Water and power interest groups continued demanding the utilization of park resources and land. Park lands also attracted timber and grazing interests, especially during the World Wars and during periods of economic depression and drought. Poaching, private land, and some concessionaire problems remained in many parks.

As these older, more obvious conflicts continued, a new version of the use and preservation problem developed. In 1916 and for years after, national park officials and allied organizations encouraged Americans to travel to and vacation in the national parks. As a result of such mottos as "See America First" and "Parks are for People," as well as periodical literature and brochures and publicity campaigns, Americans began to take notice of the recreation areas. Construction of access roads and overnight accommodations--and publicity campaigns by concessionaires, railroads, and the Park Service--attracted tourists in increasing numbers. As affluence, greater leisure time, and increased mobility became commonplace, the national parks became more accessible as recreation areas. Visitor statistics reflected increasing national park popularity: in 1916 approximately 356,000 persons visited

the thirteen existing parks, while in 1967 about forty million
individuals visited the thirty-two national parks. Because numbers
of tourists increased, traffic congestion and shortage of accom­
modations intensified and park administrators found it increasingly
difficult to balance development for visitation or recreation
with preservation.

National park administrators have almost always regarded
development of the parks as a necessity. Administrators believed
that development of hotels, roads, campgrounds, and other facil­
ities in scenic areas would attract tourists, increase travel to
the parks, and establish the parks' popularity. Further, park
officials, using the increasing visitation figures to justify their
actions, asked for and received enlarged Congressional appropri­
ations for additional construction.

Recently, the issue of greater development versus more
preservation in the national parks has become a predominant
concern of policy makers in the National Park Service, and a
primary focal point for critics of park officials. Members of
the National Parks Association, the Wilderness Society, the Sierra
Club, and other organizations allied with the basic national park
ideals, have increasingly criticized Park Service policy, and they
have displayed a constant awareness of external dangers to the
various parks. These critics have promoted the old ideal of
wilderness or preservation, rather than development. Park

9. Robert Cahn, "Will Success Spoil the National Parks," Part
administrators, however, were concerned with practical application of policy and with public relations, as well as with idealism; hence, the Park Service's efforts to satisfy both preservationists and use advocates probably seemed inadequate to both.

Several studies of national parks within the past decade have exposed the use-preservation problem and suggested that the Park Service design alternatives to its present policies. In 1963, the Leopold Committee and the Robbins Committee (sponsored by the Department of the Interior and the National Academy of Sciences respectively) dealt with park wildlife policy and general research recommendations. The committees recommended that the Park Service increase its research programs in all phases of activity and improve its resource management. Among the most recent critics of park policy are F. Fraser Darling and Noel D. Eichhorn in their book, *Man and Nature in the National Parks*. They conclude that dangers to national parks from increasing numbers of people, and subsequent development to meet tourists' actual or projected demands, out-weigh all former park problems. Darling and Eichhorn stress the earlier Leopold Committee recommendation that "the enormous complexity of ecological communities and the diversity of management procedures required to preserve them" be recognized by the Park Service. Man--his "traumatic action" and his "metabolic activities"--represents a major element in the ecological balance of national parks, and Darling and Eichhorn recommend
that man be recognized for his disruptive tendencies. In addition, their study provides specific recommendations for policy changes: more cautious development of roads, buildings, and trails; biologically informed policy; flexibility in procedure rather than expedience; and an emphasis on research and ecology. Finally, Darling and Eichhorn contend that the "national park policies of the 20's and 30's were not adequate in the 50's and 60's, and the National Park Service has not adapted quickly enough to the new situation."

In order to refute or substantiate statements concerning the inability of the Park Service to adapt to new situations, the increasing stress placed upon parks by man, the rigid or expedient Park Service procedures, and the Park Service's insufficient biological and ecological awareness, one must examine a specific national park in considerable detail. By studying the application of policies and Park Service activities to a given park, one may properly evaluate the various statements or criticisms and, because of the general similarity of problems, draw conclusions that may be relevant to other national parks.

Further, most national parks are affected by other interacting forces aside from the Park Service: concessionaires, the general and local public, and in many cases, private land owners. The activities of these four groups—Park Service, concessionaires, the public, and private land owners—each affecting the nature of

11. Ibid., p. 73
a national park, must be evaluated with historical perspective before conclusions concerning the responsibility for or existence of a use and preservation conflict can be reached. The object of the following study is to show that these four interacting forces, operating either singly or in concert, have been responsible historically for promoting either use or preservation or a balance of both in Glacier National Park.

Glacier's problems are similar to those which existed or are existing in other national parks—mining, cattle grazing, poaching, concessionaires, and private land. Also, the four interacting forces—Park Service, concessionaires, the public, and private land owners—all affected Glacier. In addition, historical perspective can be gained from a study of Glacier's administration before the formation of the National Park Service, as well as during the 1920's and 1930's, and in the 1950's and 1960's, when trends of administration changed. Access to the Glacier area was almost entirely by railroad until the 1930's; hence, limited recreational use of the pre-World War II era can be compared to the mass recreational use of the last two decades. All development and preservation policies affected in Glacier by the Park Service were part of a national policy and were generally instituted in all national parks. With respect to tourism, Glacier is not yet inundated with tourists as are Yellowstone or Yosemite, yet it is not so inaccessible or unvisited as Mt. McKinley National Park. Finally, a reevaluation of administrative policies or plans in Glacier is still possible since policies affecting the preservation or use of Glacier are still subject to change.
CHAPTER I — GLACIER NATIONAL PARK—1910-1917

In 1965, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall stated: "All park managers face the dilemma of striking a balance between preservation and use. Within our park concept there can be no question of locking up the wilderness. The wilderness proper serves all park visitors." He also stated that some individuals derive pleasure from penetrating wilderness while for others wilderness provides a "setting and background." ¹ The National Park Service in Glacier National Park never attempted to "lock up" the wilderness. On the contrary, the administrative policies in Glacier since its establishment in 1910 led to increasing the accessibility to wilderness areas, providing more tourist accommodations, and promoting recreational use of the area. In addition to development for recreation, Park officials allowed some limited resource exploitation. Trends initiated by the first Park officials help explain the Park Service emphasis on development and use throughout Glacier's existence.

Congress passed Glacier's organic act at the time conservationists were divided between resource management or development and resource preservation. The Forest Service's Gifford Pinchot suggested that parks can be opened for "unified resource management" which meant general resource utilization, including "sustained yield from forest lands," allowing grazing on payment of a fee,² and the leasing of power sites." Interior Secretary James

Garfield also advocated that dead and decaying timber be cut in the parks. Thus, Glacier's organic act not only allowed the cutting of "matured or dead or down timber," but provided land for railroad construction, and granted water and land for use in reclamation projects. Although "preservation of the Park in a state of nature" was a specified goal, the organic act allowed Park superintendents to lease acreages within the Park to private individuals, to allow building of private summer cabins on leased land, and to insure private land owners, previously established within the Park's boundaries, of their right to remain. The organic act provided for preservation by withdrawing the area from "settlement occupancy, or sale" and instituting rules and regulations for its protection; but the act also stated that Glacier was a "pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the public." The imprecise objectives of the organic act made absolute preservation impossible at the outset and Glacier's early administrators further interpreted the act in favor of development for recreational use.

When the Park's first administrator, William R. Logan, arrived in Glacier on August 8, 1910, his title explained his purpose: Superintendent of Road and Trail Construction. Although his title was changed to "Superintendent" on April 1, 1911, Logan's emphasis and activities toward construction continued. Logan, during two seasons as superintendent, began the road, trail,

telephone line, and building construction which was to lead to his
desired goal, increased public utilization of the Park. He intended
to prepare the Park for its future, and the future, as Logan inter-
preted it, meant increased tourism. As Superintendent, Logan hoped:

To develop the Park as rapidly as possible consistent with facilities now obtainable, keeping in mind the future day....when the American traveling public will at last realize that the beauties of their own country are unsurpassed anywhere in the world and our national parks will come into their own.5

Logan did not ignore Secretary of the Interior Walter L. Fisher's instructions regarding protection of the area from poachers, grazing interests, illegal timber cutting, or other "depredations" which concerned the Park's ultimate preservation. Preservation to Logan meant protection from outside influences, not necessarily keeping the Park in an unimpaired, natural state. His construction plans for "comprehensive roads and trails," if fully carried out, would have opened almost every drainage in Glacier to automobile travel. His basic suggestion, however, that a road be built through a mountain pass from the east to the west side, was later realized as the Going-to-the-Sun highway. Logan also hoped that the government would construct tourist accommodations. He wrote:

"I also desire to build a number of Swiss chalets, which could

5. William R. Logan, "A National Park in its Formative Stages," Glacier National Park Historical Collection, File 114, p. 11. The Glacier National Park Historical Collection, consisting of various files, correspondence, maps, reports, and other administrative material, is located in the National Park Service headquarters building, Glacier National Park, West Glacier, Montana, and for the purposes of this paper it will be abbreviated "GNPHC."
be rented to tourists who prefer to run their own cuisine."^6
For Logan, extensive development meant increased public use, and he directed the Park toward expanded public use and enjoyment rather than preservation of the unique natural phenomena.

Although Logan initiated development for visitation in Glacier, he was not its principle advocate. The National Parks Conference at Yellowstone in 1911 provided park officials, as well as use and development advocates, an opportunity to discuss park policy and plans. Assistant Secretary of the Interior C. A. Thompson echoed Logan's desires when he mentioned that "an automobile road leading from both entrances would be advisable" but he felt it would be impossible to build because of the terrain.^7

R. B. Marshall, Chief Geographer of the United States Geographical Survey, while discussing park administration, wondered how the number of visitors to the parks could be increased. He stated that in 1910, the national parks had only 200,000 visitors, less than one quarter of one percent of the ninety million Americans. His plan for increasing visitation to the parks contained three suggestions: obtain greater government appropriations for improvements in the parks, set up a better organization to administer the parks allowing that organization to formulate plans, and increase the publicity about the parks with free literature and through close co-operation with concessionaires.^8 The park officials

8. Ibid., p. 109.
agreed that the success of national parks was dependent upon increased visitation with development and publicity the keys to that success. As a result of the 1911 conference, Interior Secretary Walter L. Fisher pledged his full support to national parks by increasing appropriations for construction and general improvements.⁹

Henry W. Hutchings, R. H. Chapman, James Galen, and Samuel F. Ralston, successors to Logan in Glacier from 1912 to 1917, continued the trend of construction for increased visitation. By 1915, the Park road construction Logan had supervised between Belton (West Glacier) and Apgar had been completed and extended three miles along the north side of Lake McDonald. In addition, the superintendents began construction of a new road parallel with the North Fork of the Flathead River toward Canada. The Park officials also suggested four additional major road construction projects: a road from Lake McDonald over Flattop Pass to Waterton Lake, a road from Avalanche Creek Crossing to St. Mary Lake through Trapper Creek Pass (later called Logan Pass), a road to connect the McDonald-Waterton road with the projected North Fork road via Browns Pass. The Park superintendents made plans for this network of roads with the co-operation of T. Warren Allen of the Office of Public Roads. Allen enthusiastically presented these plans at the National Park Conference in 1915.¹⁰ All of the road plans subsequently gained the approval of the national park planners attending the Conference, and the next year the Park Service allocated money for preliminary surveys.

⁹. Daily Inter Lake (Kalispell, Montana), 15 September 1911
In addition to construction of roads and buildings by Park crews and of tourist accommodations by crews of the Great Northern Railway, some consumptive use of Park resources occurred between 1910 and 1917. Superintendent Logan managed Glacier more like a national forest than as an area set aside for preservation. Logan used the matured, dead, or insect infested Park timber for various construction projects. He felt that using Park timber for building construction or for sale was entirely in keeping with Park preservation, when he remarked: "In a short time it is believed that lumber will rank first among the sources of revenue." Further, Logan extended the lumbering rights of several individuals who originally obtained their permits from the Forest Service. D. D. La Breche and John Thompson, both of Midvale (East Glacier), Montana, operated relatively small sawmills on the Park's east side while the Waterton Oil, Land and Power Company of Butte, Montana, cut mature spruce and fir in the Kintla Lakes region. After surveying fire killed timber in 1911, Forest Service advisor Eugene S. Bruce made several recommendations concerning timber usage in Glacier. He suggested that damaged timber be "cut and manufactured into lumber"; that along the Middle Fork of the Flathead River there was "considerable mature timber not fire killed which could be sold in connection with the dead timber"; and that "a general policy of utilizing the merchantable mature, dead standing, and blowdown timber...should be

---
applied to all national parks wherever possible." Logan and his successors only partially accepted his recommendations by issuing a limited number of lumbering permits and by disregarding Bruce's suggestion to harvest mature or burned timber.

In addition to allowing some timber production, Logan issued several grazing permits to private landowners in the region. Also, Glacier's superintendents allowed the reclamation projects on the east side (begun by the Bureau of Reclamation at Sherburne and Two Medicine Lakes before the Park's formation and protected by the organic act) to become more fully developed with the resultant destruction of trees and scenic values due to the varying water level of the lakes which had been turned into reservoirs. When Reclamation Service officials decided to build a hydroelectric power plant within the Park near Many Glacier Hotel, Logan was not only enthusiastic but intended to use the Park's water resources to gain revenue for the new administration. He urged the Reclamation Service to build the dam but he insisted that the Park administrators, rather than the Reclamation Service officials or the Great Northern Railway personnel, reap the benefits. He stated:

When the Reclamation Service installs the plant, we could have it made sufficiently large not only for their needs but our needs, giving us the opportunity to sell considerable power to the hotels, etc., within a radius of twenty-five or thirty miles of McDermott Falls.¹³

He also suggested that power lines be constructed over a mountain pass to provide the headquarters area near Lake McDonald with electrical power, and concluded: "I want it to be revert in its entirety to the park as one of its assets."  \[14\]

Subsequently, Park officials allowed the dam building and provided logs from the Upper St. Mary Lake region to be used in its construction.

Logan also leased cottage sites to individuals who desired to build summer cabins on Lake McDonald, St. Mary Lake, or numerous other less accessible lakes. In 1913, Superintendent James Galen recommended that five year, rather than annual permits, be issued to "encourage the construction of more permanent buildings" and after five years "longer leases, from ten to twenty years, be issued."  \[15\] Along with encouraging private cottage construction, several other recommendations were made to use Park resources. For example, in 1912, Acting Superintendent Hutchings suggested that McGee's Meadow, a vast natural meadow northwest of Lake McDonald, be harrowed, seeded, fenced, and turned into a hay field to supply hay for government stock. He further recommended that a "regular farmer could be employed to have charge of farming operations."  \[16\] Although his suggestion was not adopted, it illustrated the attitude which superintendents of Glacier followed during this early period in suggesting liberal use and development.

---

14. Ibid.
15. Letter, J. L. Galen to Interior Secretary (unnamed), 25 November 1913, Privileges and Permits, File 891, pp. 6-7. GNPHC.
16. Letter, H. Hutchings to Interior Secretary (unnamed), 1 March 1912, Wildlife Survey, File 720-04, GNPHC.
of the Park's natural resources.

The reaction of Glacier's early administrators toward development and resource use reflected the influence of a wilderness environment over the idealism of preservation. Although preservation was a stated purpose or goal, administrators dealt with an inaccessible, undeveloped, primitive area. They assumed that preservation meant only protection from outside forces and encouraged development so the recreation goal, which was completely nonexistent at the time, could be fulfilled. Roads were of primary importance. However, roads, as noted in a policy statement by Hiram M. Chittenden of the Army Corps of Engineers, were to be "restricted to actual necessities," "limited in extent," and "built as perfect examples of their class."17 Glacier's superintendents found many "necessities" and their plans for future development certainly were not "limited" but were instead comprehensive.

Other than the influence of an undeveloped area, the prevalent attitude that parks were to be self-supporting affected Glacier's officials. Before 1917, a penurious Congress reluctantly appropriated money to support national parks and sometimes neglected to do so for several years after a park's formation. Glacier's officials, although not desperately in need of money, saw natural resources as an obvious source of revenue. The sale of timber, stone, and hides of predatory animals gave the Park administration

a source of income. Glacier's officials also used grazing and hay cutting permits to add to Park earnings.\textsuperscript{18} Thus, the administrators took advantage of Glacier's wilderness character to support their bureaucratic organization.

In 1915, four years after the first National Park Conference, Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane appointed Steven T. Mather to administer all of the national parks. Mather hoped to encourage Congress to make vast increases in park appropriations and to "authorize a bureau of national parks."\textsuperscript{19} Subsequently, Congress formed the National Park Service in 1916. Through the new organization, Mather intended to popularize the parks with the public. To accomplish this goal, he hoped to "make park travel easier by promoting whole-sale improvements in hotels, camps, and other concessions and in roads and other transportation facilities both inside the national parks and outside."\textsuperscript{20} Mather's emphasis on construction and hope for greater visitation was identical to that already instituted by William R. Logan and his successors in Glacier.

Officials realized that a strong public demand could insure sufficient Congressional appropriations for Park maintenance and protection. Glacier's superintendents, as well as Director Mather, believed that after some money was spent on improvements and publicity, the public interest or enthusiasm toward parks would be stimulated. Mark Daniels, General Superintendent and Landscape


\textsuperscript{19} Shankland, \textit{Steve Mather of the National Parks}, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 56.
Engineer of the National Parks, when asked in 1915 if Park development was not about completed, answered:

The parks are not developed. Our work has just begun. There are roads to be built, and there are bridges to be built, and there are hotels to be built, and sanitation must be taken care of. Insect pests must be removed.  

Daniels hoped to further his belief that "every national park.... in the United States is primarily for recreation in its character" and that the "prime purpose of development of the (national parks) is commercial." Development for recreational use was instituted as the rule rather than the exception in Glacier and other parks.

While concentrating on development, the early park administrators also devoted some attention to preservation. Late in October 1910, Superintendent Logan formed the first ranger force to guard the Park against poachers during the winter months. When Logan left for the east that winter, the chief ranger, Henry Vaught, and his five assistants began to patrol the Park's boundaries. One of the assistant rangers, Dan Doody, exemplified the contemporary attitude toward preservation. Doody owned a homestead within the Park and used it as a base for his patrol. It was not uncommon for him, in his isolated situation on the Middle Fork of the Flathead River, to utilize Park wildlife for his food supply. The Park administrators soon recognized Doody's attributes as a skilled hunter, and they gave him the responsibility of killing the undesirable wildlife within the Park. These

22. Ibid., p. 147.
23. Interview, Mrs. George Henderson, West Glacier, Montana, 3 November 1968.
"undesirable" predatory animals included wolves, coyotes, and mountain lions. Ranger Doody, using dogs, poison, and his skill as a hunter, began to "protect" or "preserve" the more esteemed Park wildlife such as deer, elk, and the various wild birds. In 1912, the Park officials expanded the control program and appointed a temporary ranger, Ora Reeves, to hunt predatory animals.  

The administrative policy of preservation, as exemplified first by Doody and later by Reeves and others, centered not only on protection from poachers but also was directed toward the elimination of certain natural elements which humans disliked. The destruction of predatory animals continued throughout this early period as a major preservation policy. In 1911, Logan issued about ten permits to homesteaders within the Park and to several private parties to hunt predators in the Park. His successor, Henry Hutchings, cancelled the permits in order to allow a more orderly control program using Park rangers as hunters. By 1914, Supervisor S. F. Ralston reported that the rangers successfully used strychnine to reduce the coyote population and hunted with hounds to eliminate mountain lions. He further recommended: "Weasels, mink, and marten abound in large numbers throughout the Park. These animals are very destructive of wild fowl and bird life, and at some future time some provisions should be made to deplete their numbers."  

Almost all Park administrators used the predatory animal control program as part of their

preservation activity throughout this period and the process continued for the two succeeding decades.

Protection and restoration of the desirable wildlife also took other forms in the Park preservation program. After the severe winter of 1911-1912 killed many deer and elk within Glacier, Superintendent R. H. Chapman hoped to restore the depleted herds to their original size; he obtained a carload of elk from Yellowstone and turned them loose in the Park at Belton. Chapman was one of the first superintendents to recognize that the winter range on the Park's east side was insufficient for the elk herds. During severe winters, the elk ranged onto the Blackfeet Reservation where they were killed by Indian hunters. Chapman recommended that the Park's eastern boundary be extended to include more natural range to insure greater elk protection. Almost every succeeding superintendent echoed Chapman's desire, but the Interior Department neglected their recommendations. 26

Although attention toward wildlife dominated most preservation activity during this period, several incidents reflected the Park officials' concern for preservation as well as resource use. In 1910, the Great Northern Railway engaged in building roads, hotels, and additional tourist facilities within the Park, and railway officials requested the use of Park timber for construction of some of their buildings. Superintendent Logan authorized the Great Northern crews to use dead, fallen, or

matured timber which had been selected and marked by a Park ranger. The Great Northern officials did not care to wait for the rangers to mark the various trees and began to take unmarked trees. Logan, however, opposed their arbitrary logging within the Park. The railway officials in turn referred Logan's intransigence concerning their activity to his superior in Washington, Chief Clerk C. S. Ucker. Ucker, an advocate of development, agreed with the Great Northern and instructed the superintendent "to permit the representatives of the Great Northern Railway to cut timber sufficient to enable them to complete their buildings at the various permanent campsites." Park officials then adopted the policy of selling timber to the Great Northern and by 1914 the railway was cutting about one million board feet of timber annually for construction purposes.27

Logan also opposed another Great Northern project which would have changed the water level and natural surroundings of Lake McDermott (Swiftcurrent Lake). The Great Northern wanted to construct a dam at the lower end of the lake to back the water over the falls and connect Lake McDermott with Lake Josephine in order to make a "longer boating lake" for the hotel patrons. Logan answered their proposal, when he stated:

This is not right and should not be permitted, as it would have a tendency through the hand of man of spoiling the scenic beauty as created by the hand of God, and I would never recommend that the Great Northern or any of the concessionaires be

allowed to tamper in any way, shape or form, with the natural beauties of the park.  

However, the Great Northern officials gained the support of later superintendents when they proposed a similar project to connect the two lakes. Logan, while emphasizing development in many other situations, in this instance revealed a concern for preservation rather than change.

Generally encouraged by Interior Department officials, however, the Great Northern and its subsidiary, the Glacier Park Hotel Company, became the major developers in Glacier during this period. The national park philosophy of James J. Hill, President of the Great Northern Railway, coincided with the early park administrators' attitudes. He remarked: "Conservation does not mean forbidding access to resources that could be made available for present use. It means the forests and largest development of them consistent with the public interest and without waste."  

The Park administrators decided that: "Scenery is a hollow enjoyment if the tourist starts out after an indigestible breakfast and a fitful sleep on an impossible bed." Thus, the Park officials encouraged the Great Northern to invest in and build tourist facilities in Glacier as the Santa Fe Railway had done in Grand Canyon National Park and as the Northern Pacific had done in Yellowstone. Speaking of hotel construction in Glacier, Louis W.

29. Quoted in Daily Inter Lake, 8 September 1910.
Hill, J. J. Hill's son and successor as President of the Great Northern, stated:

We do not wish to go into the hotel business; we wish to get out of it and confine ourselves strictly to the business of getting people there just as soon as we can. But it is difficult to get capital interested in this kind of pioneer work. With the cooperation and assistance of the government, we hope within two or three years to get financial people interested in the park and then we can get out and attend to railroading.  

However, the hope for financial reimbursement and innumerable construction projects kept the Great Northern in Glacier for about forty years.

The construction activity of the railroad centered primarily on Glacier's east side. In 1910, the Great Northern officials began building a road from Midvale (East Glacier) northward, parallel with the Park's eastern boundary. Major hotel construction began on June 25, 1910, less than two months after Glacier's formation. Great Northern crews completed the first chalets just outside the Park at Belton by July, 1910. By the time construction was completed on the Glacier Park Hotel at Midvale in 1912, a series of chalets were being built adjacent to the newly constructed road, including developments at Two Medicine, Cut Bank, St. Mary, Sun Point, and Many Glacier. In 1915, the Great Northern officials announced the opening of the "Mammoth Mountain Hotel" later called Many Glacier Hotel at McDermott Lake.

The Glacier Park Hotel Company crews also erected small "tepee camps" at St. Mary Lake, Barring Creek, and near Many Glacier

Hotel. Several other chalets at Sperry Glacier, Granite Park, and Gunsight Lake further developed the Park's interior and were advertised as "veritable mountain villages." All of this construction resulted from the slow means of travel of the day, which was either by horse-drawn coaches, saddle horses, or by a few motorized vehicles. Touring the Park required several days of travel, thus making accommodations near points of interest within the Park necessary. As a result, centers of development began to appear.

All of the hotel, road, and other tourist facilities developed by the Great Northern crews received the approval of the Park officials. Interior Secretary Walter L. Fisher commented in 1912:

We thoroughly appreciate the expenditures which the railroads have made in many instances for the development of the parks; I mean expenditures made in the furnishing of increased facilities in getting to the parks, and particularly the work of publicity they are carrying on.

The Great Northern promoters adopted new slogans such as "See American First," advertised their railroad as the "National Park Line," and published annual Glacier Park travel brochures in order to attract tourists. The desire to increase tourism led the Park officials to cater to the interests of the railroad promoters. The Interior Department's Chief Clerk, C. S. Ucker, remarked: "The way I look at it is that the Great Northern has

33. Great Northern Railway Company. New Hotels and Tours: Glacier National Park (1915) Travel Brochure.
34. Proceedings of the National Park Conference, 1912, p. 34.
gone in here and erected these chalets and it is up to us to accommodate the travel to them." He then advised that the key to better travel meant additional Park trails and roads, and that they be built as rapidly as possible to facilitate tourists' movement to the chalets. By 1915, Director Stephen Mather indicated that increased tourism meant concessionaire prosperity, when he stated: "The Government must do its part to make the national parks as cheap and as attractive as possible to the people, in order that the people, by coming yearly in great numbers, may make business profitable for the concessionaires." Thus, the Park and railroad officials managed to combine the newly constructed facilities with effective advertising--and visitation to Glacier steadily increased, from about four thousand in 1910 to over fifteen thousand by 1917.

Although the Great Northern was the major developer and advertiser, many other concessionaires operated within the Park. Independent stage lines, carrying both passengers and freight, operated on both sides of the Park. Several individuals operated boats on Lake McDonald, St. Mary Lake, and later on McDermott Lake. A number of men received permits to operate pack trains and saddle horse concessions. On the west side of the Park, John Lewis, a private land owner at the head of Lake McDonald, built the sixty-five room "Lake McDonald Hotel" on his land during 1913 and 1914. A few other private land owners at the foot of Lake

35. Memorandum, C. S. Ucker, (No date), Glacier Park Company, File 900-05, GNPHC.
McDonald also erected some cabins for tourist use. These early concessionaires on the west side generally competed among themselves for tourists during the short three-month season. The Great Northern held a virtual monopoly on the Park's east side.

Of all the concessionaires established within the Park, those who operated transportation concessions faced the most competition. On the Park's east side the horse-drawn stage lines of the Brewster Brothers handled all Great Northern passengers between Midvale and Many Glacier. However, complaints from dissatisfied tourists and competition from motorized vehicles operated by the Glacier Park Transportation Company, another subsidiary of the Great Northern, forced the Brewster Brothers out of business.\(^{37}\)

John Weightman, a liveryman on the Park's west side, feared the growing competition from motorized vehicles and requested a monopoly in the Belton-Lake McDonald area. Hoping to protect his business, he stated: "I have an investment there of over $14,000. If there is too much competition there the tourists will grow dissatisfied."\(^{38}\)

He also criticized the "poor condition" of the roads. Generally, the transportation concessions hoped to provide better service to tourists in order to insure their own prosperity; hence, they demanded improved road conditions within the Park and expected the Park officials to reconstruct older roads and build new ones.

The superintendents received many complaints concerning road conditions and annually recommended road improvement on both sides.

---
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of the Park to facilitate motorized vehicles.

The touring public also favored improved roads and facilities within Glacier. East-west automobile travel within or near the Park was impossible because roads were non-existent. The railroad officials offered to transport tourists' cars between East Glacier and Belton for a ten dollar fee, but many tourists felt that the "Transcontinental Auto Tour" suggested by the Great Northern promoters should be made entirely by auto, not partly by railroad or horseback.\textsuperscript{39} Thus, many tourists avoided the area entirely. At the same time Montana residents supported the construction of a Park-to-Park "Yellowstone-to-Glacier" highway to attract tourists. One Montanan remarked:

\begin{quote}
It is to be remembered that every friend now gained for the park will be a strong booster toward the making this wonderful region as equally a great mecca for tourists as any of the present famous scenic resorts.\textsuperscript{40}
\end{quote}

Thus, public pressure for roads to and within Glacier influenced the administrators' plans to increase Park road mileage.

The least vocal of all the interest groups affecting Glacier were the private land owners. The organic act assured the land owners that if their claims were valid they would not be affected by the Park's establishment. The Interior Secretary instructed Superintendent Logan that:

\begin{quote}
All people entering the park and especially those owning or leasing lands therein, should be handled in a tactful manner, in order that their co-operation
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{39}. Great Northern, New Hotels and Tours, 1915.
\textsuperscript{40}. Daily Inter Lake, 8 August 1911.
in the management of the park may be secured rather than their enmity. 41

Dan Doody, who served as a ranger while operating his homestead within the Park, and John Lewis, who provided tourist accommodations acceptable to Park officials, both exemplified "co-operation." However, many other homesteads dotted the western, southern, and eastern boundaries of the Park, and, according to Logan, each presented some potential for administrative problems of control.

Some of the private land existed in the form of mining claims. In 1910 and 1911, General Land Office representatives investigated over two hundred mining claims in Glacier. Valid mineral and oil claims numbered less than fifty and centered in the Lake Sherburne and Lake McDermott area. The government officials validated oil claims in the Kintla Lakes region as well as some copper, quartz, and oil claims on the east side. A majority of the mines, however, remained dormant and the claimants worked their mines only enough to keep their patents valid. For uniformity in administration, Logan stressed the desirability of the government "purchasing and gaining control of the patented lands within the confines of the Park." 42 Logan's successors adopted the first superintendent's attitude and hoped eventually to return all of the 16,580 acres of private land existing in 1911 to government control. During this period many of the private land owners developed their homesteads,

41. Letter, Interior Secretary W. L. Fisher to W. R. Logan, April 1911, Historical File, GNPHC.
obtained permits before they grazed their cattle or cut hay and timber on government land, and generally co-operated with Park administrators.

During the first eight years following Glacier's formation, from 1910 through 1917, the Park officials established precedents for succeeding decades. Glacier's local administrators and the national park planners became the advocates of development and construction to encourage visitation. The development of tourist accommodations within the Park created numerous "high density" areas near scenic attractions where tourists congregated. These areas supplied necessary facilities at a time when travel conditions made alternatives to the series of hotels, chalets, or established campsites unrealistic. Visionaries in Park administration, promoters with the concessionaires, and an expedient public encouraged road construction to facilitate tourist mobility. Directing his work toward greater development and popularization of the parks, Director Mather remarked: "Our national parks are practically lying fallow, and only await proper development to bring them into their own." Mather used the term "fallow" to describe the primitive or natural park conditions as if the parks were fields ready for cultivation and eventual harvest. He intended to popularize the parks so more tourists would visit the areas and assumed that the natural phenomena would remain "unimpaired." Logan, as Glacier's first administrator, assumed that preservation of natural phenomena existed as soon as Congress designated the Park boundaries. The succeeding administrators felt that policies emphasizing development and construction which catered

to tourism were not only acceptable but adopted them as their purpose and goals. Administrators did not totally neglect preservation but it became obviously less important in Glacier than the development and construction activity during the first eight years.
CHAPTER II — GLACIER NATIONAL PARK—1917-1933

The years from 1917 through 1933 reflected a continuation of the earlier programs fostering the "development" of Glacier; but this era also produced an increasing awareness of preservation among Park Service personnel. World War I affected the national parks in several ways. Tourism, because it constituted a luxury in a time of national stress, dropped abruptly in almost every park; in Glacier, visitation decreased from about fifteen thousand in 1916 to only nine thousand in 1917. In addition, Congress curtailed almost all "improvement" programs suggested by park administrators when it allocated funds for war activity. By the time the war ended, the newly formed National Park Service, with Stephen Mather designated as director, began to consolidate all of the parks under a unified program and purpose. Thus, World War I separated most national parks, including Glacier, from a period of haphazard planning and construction, and introduced an era of more orderly administrative "development" programs and new preservation activities. Throughout the 1920's and early 1930's, development in the Park continued. By 1933, the construction of the Going-to-the-Sun highway as well as numerous other projects was completed marking the end of the initial phase of Glacier's development activity.

The National Park Service, under Director Mather, urged the continuation of construction to facilitate tourism. However, the process of construction became less feverish, more orderly or well planned, and involved the formulation of priorities. In
1917, Glacier's Acting Supervisor, George E. Goodwin, recommended an amalgam of construction projects: new administration buildings, bridges, ranger cabins, roads, trails, and campgrounds. World War I, however, interrupted his plans by forcing Congress to reduce budget allowances to the Park. By 1919, Superintendent W. W. Payne advocated a definite, orderly, five-year construction policy for a more economical and efficient development. The Park officials determined that highest priority be given to road construction. Every succeeding superintendent of Glacier, during this era, encouraged road construction as the key to increased visitation. Director Mather sanctified their recommendations with his belief that every park should have one road penetrating its wilderness area, and in Glacier the "Transmountain Road" fulfilled that requirement. Mather also believed that too many tourists ignored Glacier because it lacked an east-west automobile road; rather than pay the Great Northern Railway to transport their cars from Midvale to Belton and tour the Park on horseback, most tourists omitted Glacier from their itinerary. "Roads...had to be developed and expanded" Mather explained, because "cross-country motoring was just then developing and motorists were

3. Shankland, Steve Mather of the National Parks, pp. 157-158
urging that the parks be opened to automobiles."4 The construction of the Transmountain Road, later called the Going-to-the-Sun highway, dominated construction activities in Glacier until its completion in 1933.

In 1921, Park Service Director Mather announced triumphantly that construction had begun on the "first unit of the Transmountain Road, which will extend from the foot (to the head) of Lake McDonald, a total distance of about 10 miles."5 Throughout the 1920's, construction continued toward the Garden Wall and Trapper Creek (or Logan) Pass as funds became available and as weather conditions permitted work. The officials opened the road from Glacier's west entrance to Trapper Creek Pass in June, 1929, and visitation statistics showed an increase of seventeen thousand tourists over the previous year, the greatest increase in the Park's history. When the road was completed in 1933, statistics revealed the highest annual visitation in the history of the Park, even though most Americans were suffering financially from the depression. Mather's successor, Horace M. Albright justified the road (which caused an irrepairable scar) across the Garden Wall leading to Logan Pass, when he stated:

Although Glacier will always remain a trail park, the construction of this one highway to its inner wonders is meeting an obligation to the great mass

of people who because of age, physical condition, or other reason would never have an opportunity to enjoy, close at hand, this marvelous mountain park.\textsuperscript{6}

While the Park Service crews concentrated on the Going-to-the-Sun highway, the administrators also planned and built allied projects. From 1910 on, Park crews extended and improved trails into Glacier's wilderness. Logan mentioned that 199 miles of trail existed in 1911; by 1921, Superintendent J. R. Eakin reported over four hundred miles; and by 1930, Glacier's trails totaled about 850 miles.\textsuperscript{7} Administrative buildings, including ranger stations, garages, stables, barns, and sheds, accounted for other construction activity.

Because roads extended deep into Glacier for the first time, Mather noted a new demand by 1921, when he remarked: "The number of automobiles now visiting Glacier Park make it necessary to provide additional campgrounds."\textsuperscript{8} The old campgrounds at Many Glacier and Two Medicine were expanded and new areas were developed at Cut Bank, St. Mary, and Avalanche Creek Crossing. When the campgrounds received the tourists' attention and became more popular, Park crews installed toilet facilities, regulated water supplies, and built fireplaces.\textsuperscript{9} In 1923, Superintendent Eakin, showing concern for the campers' welfare, suggested building

\textsuperscript{8} Rept. Dir. of the N.P.S., 1921, p. 89.
\textsuperscript{9} Great Falls Tribune, 21 August 1925.
several stores "for the sale of provisions and supplies for automobile campers." By 1930, Park officials provided campers with shower and laundry buildings at Many Glacier, Avalanche, and Two Medicine. The officials, seeing increasing campground popularity and use, also considered constructing small house-keeping cabins at these sites similar to those suggested by Logan twenty years earlier.\(^1^1\)

During this construction period, Park Service officials either advocated or allowed several other activities which utilized Glacier's natural resources. World War I brought demands from local stockmen to open Glacier to cattle and sheep grazing. Because of drought, Montana wool growers insisted that if officials refused to open the Park to grazing, many sheep would die. Mather's assistant, Horace Albright, with the help of two sympathetic Butte (Montana) businessmen, Bruce Kremer and Walter Hansen, arranged for "only a token herd, a carload or two" of cattle to graze in the Park, and thus, allowed Glacier's officials to refer to the Park as already leased while denying grazing permits to all other applicants.\(^1^2\) Glacier's superintendents continued issuing grazing and hay cutting permits to the Park's homesteaders throughout the 1920's.

Almost all construction within Glacier utilized the Park's timber, stone, and water resources. Timber sales remained a source of Park revenue during this period. The Great Northern

\(^{10}\) Rept., Dir. of the N.P.S., 1923, p. 158.
\(^{11}\) Rept., Dir. of the N.P.S., 1930, p. 98.
\(^{12}\) Shankland, Stéve Mather of the National Parks, p. 204.
Railway Company's subsidiary, Glacier Park Hotel Company, desired a dam and set of locks between Josephine and McDermott (Swiftcurrent) lakes near Many Glacier Hotel to better facilitate the movement of boats between them. Director Mather and Glacier's superintendents agreed and advocated changing the natural watercourse between these lakes for the benefit of the hotel patrons. A lack of funds and more important priorities, however, prevented construction. In addition, Mather suggested that a ranch with a large herd of buffalo be established in Glacier for the pleasure of the tourists. The ranch however, was never built due to other construction. The cattle grazing, hay production, timber usage as well as general construction activity revealed a growing digression from any strict preservation objective.

During the early 1930's, the Park Service continued its departure from strict preservation. In 1930, the opening of the Roosevelt Highway between Midvale and Belton (U.S. Highway 2) attracted cross-country tourists to the area in increasing numbers. Going-to-the-Sun highway, further encouraging tourism, opened officially in 1933 allowing east-west travel through the Park. The number of visitors to Glacier tripled between 1929 and 1936, increasing from approximately seventy thousand to 210,000 tourists. Considering the remote position of Glacier in relation to general east-west travel routes in the United States and the effects of the depression, the increase in tourism to Glacier

14. Ibid., p. 72
was noteworthy. Glacier underwent additional changes because of this growing use, especially when the Park officials suggested plans for further development and construction.

The economic depression of the 1930's, however, affected most national parks, including Glacier, in several ways. The Director of the National Park Service, Arno B. Cammerer, wrote that the depression had had "something of a purging effect" on American society; people began to "turn away from the 'artificialities' of life" and found "less time for discontent over trifles." According to Cammerer, most national parks showed an increase in tourism because they served as a "stimulus" to the "physical, spiritual, and mental" needs of their visitors. The Park Service, Cammerer added, hoped to direct "avocational activities through park use" and develop "a plan to meet increased demands of tourists' leisure time."\(^{15}\) To accomplish his goal of development, Cammerer encouraged planned construction and development in the parks even though Congress severely cut national park appropriations.\(^{16}\)

While construction activity dominated most Park Service programs during the years 1917 through 1933, preservation became more significant in administrative policy. Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane instructed Director Mather in 1918, to insure that: "Every activity of the Service is subordinate to the

---

16. Direct appropriations to the National Park Service were cut by 50% in 1934: from $10,820,000 to $5,085,000. John Ise, Our National Park Policy (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961), p. 359.
duties imposed upon it to faithfully preserve the parks for posterity in essentially their natural state."17 These instructions technically gave Mather almost no prerogative to advocate programs other than those directed toward preservation. However, Mather continued to suggest ideas for expanding tourism, for increasing the number of accommodations built within the Park, and, in certain instances, for changing natural features to enhance recreation. Yet he stated: "The avowed purpose of Congress by setting aside this area as a preserve was that it never be touched by the hand of commercialism."18 Even though commercialism already dominated certain areas in Glacier, Director Mather and Glacier's administrators simultaneously displayed a greater concern for preservation in contrast to the pre-World War I period which had been dominated primarily by "improvement" programs.

During this period, preservation remained basically an ideal, since Park Service officials failed to institute standards to insure preservation. While advocating many park road building projects, Director Mather remarked: "It is not the plan to have the parks gridironed with roads." He explained that a good road system would be built, but also that: "Large sections of each park will be accessible only by trails by the horseback rider and the hiker."19 Realizing the destructiveness of road construction, he instructed the highway builders to disturb as little natural

18. Rept., Dir. of the N.P.S., 1923, p. 21
vegetation as possible in the areas through which roads were being built.

Mather seemed less concerned about using park resources for cattle grazing and timber production. Although cattle grazing was allowed in many parks, Mather felt that it should be restricted to "isolated regions not frequented by visitors and where no injury to the natural features of the parks may result." Similarly, Mather advocated timber cutting where the trees could "be removed without injury to the forests and where cutting of vistas would improve the scenic features of the parks." Mather, in formulating policy which directly affected Glacier, displayed a concern for preservation only when any evidence of destruction or resource utilization would be observed by tourists.

The Park Service centered its preservation program around protection. Wildlife protection meant the continuance of the predatory animal control program instituted in Glacier before World War I. Mather, rationalizing the destruction of certain species of wildlife, stated:

It is contrary to the policy of the service to exterminate any species native to a park area, 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 depredations.  

21. Ibid., p. 33
The policy of protection grew out of the awareness or fear, prevalent during the 1920's, that certain animals faced possible extinction. Conservationists realized that without protection certain animals would disappear: including the trumpeter swan, whooping crane, antelope, and big horn sheep. Thus, Park administrators favored some animals while destroying others.

In Glacier, deer and elk received more protection than any other animals. The officials began feeding deer during severe winters, but soon the Park Service established deer feeding grounds and annually purchased hay for distribution to the deer. By 1925, Assistant Superintendent Henry Hutchings estimated that about fifteen hundred deer were being fed at ten different feeding grounds around the Park and he reported that about five railroad car loads of alfalfa had been purchased for deer feeding. Simultaneously, the Park Service conducted an intensive program to eliminate predators which endangered the deer; for each season government authorized trappers assisted the Park rangers in ridding the Park of unwanted wildlife.23 The predatory control program combined with the feeding program proved effective, for each year the superintendents reported a deer population growth.

Park Service officials also attempted to protect the east side elk herd which occasionally wandered onto the Blackfeet Indian Reservation. Director Mather suggested that state or Congressional legislation be enacted to protect the elk from the

23. *Great Falls Tribune*, 1 December 1925.
"slaughter." Each year the Indian hunters killed a number of elk which migrated to their natural winter range, and Park personnel responded with demands to extend the Park boundaries eastward. Mather stated that "there will be but little increase among these animals" unless Congress moved the Park's boundaries and the "unauthorized killing" of elk halted. While the elk herd remained stable and in no danger of extinction, Park officials failed to gain any boundary changes.  

The Park Service also incorporated forest protection into its preservation program as Glacier's officials assisted other government agencies with forest disease and insect control within the Park. In 1919, the Park rangers, at the request of the Bureau of Plant Industry, conducted a survey for blister rust, a fungus disease which killed white pine trees. In addition, the Bureau of Entomology began a survey in 1922 for pine beetles in the Park's lodgepole pine, alpine fir and Engleman spruce. By 1923, the Park officials became aware of the presence of blister rust within Glacier and, in 1924, Park rangers reported beetle infestations in Douglas fir. Park officials hoped to control these diseases in order to preserve the Park "unimpaired." Blister rust, in particular, was a disease imported from Europe, and hence, unnatural to North American forests; thus, many American white pine stands easily became infected and their destruction followed.  

25. Insect Infestations, File 883-06, GNP HC.
Disease control work began in many national parks early in the 1930's. Park Service officials adopted the philosophy that actual manipulation of the natural ecology was at times necessary in order to maintain the areas' unaltered appearances or to prevent "unsightly" natural scars. Crews in Yellowstone, Crater Lake, and Yosemite worked to eradicate insects and diseases from affected trees. Similarly in Glacier, crews cut many trees containing bark beetles in an attempt to control the insect infestation. In 1929, Director Horace M. Albright remarked that "the most important tree disease threatening the forests of the national parks is the white pine blister rust." Glacier's rangers co-operated with the Bureau of Plant Industry by intensively surveying the disease and Glacier's officials hired crews which attempted to destroy an intermediate stage of the rust by removing a common currant and gooseberry bushes in order to control the rust. These efforts to protect the forests from destructive diseases and insects showed a growing emphasis on preservation.

The growth of an interpretive program also indicated an evolving awareness of the contemporary tourists and Park officials toward their natural surroundings. In 1921, Glacier's administrators granted a concession to M. P. Somes allowing him to conduct a "Nature Guide Service" including walking tours and lectures on a fee basis. Beginning in 1922, however, the Park superintendents supported another "nature guide" service; the new "nature guide"

service received support not only from the government but also from the Glacier Park Hotel Company personnel, who supplied publicity and lecture and display facilities, and the University of Montana, which designated qualified individuals to conduct the service. Dr. Morton J. Elrod, a University of Montana biology professor and long-time enthusiast for Glacier Park, organized walking tours and field trips, created exhibits to be displayed in the hotels and chalets, and began a series of lectures explaining topics concerning nature. Elrod also encouraged the translation of the scientific jargon explaining Glacier's natural features into a language which almost every tourist could understand.

Subsequently, Elrod's government supported service forced Somes' guide concession out of business. During the 1920's, the "nature guide" program flourished: publications explaining Glacier's natural features appeared, "nature guides" became known as "ranger naturalists" and were recognized as part of the Park Service organization, and in 1929, Superintendent J. Ross Eakin appointed the first permanent Park naturalist, Dr. George C. Ruhle. The popularity of this service among the tourists, the rapid acceptance of the "guide service" by Park officials, and the program's general expansion indicated an emphasis on preservation operating concurrently with development.

Officials of the Great Northern and the Glacier Park Hotel Company continued to be enthusiastic about increased construction

27. Rept., Dir. of the N.P.S., 1922, p. 136
during the 1920's and early 1930's, but their investments and efforts centered more on publicity. Aside from building the Prince of Wales Hotel in 1927, at Waterton Townside just north of Glacier in Alberta's Waterton Park, the Hotel Company constructed very few additional buildings. Park Service officials, however, continued to encourage the Great Northern and the Hotel Company to invest in more hotels and chalets and suggested sites for further development. Because Director Mather anticipated the completion of an east-west Park highway, he urged that the Great Northern build a chalet or small hotel on Logan Pass. In 1920, Mather also suggested that a large hotel be built by the Hotel Company in the primitive Belly River region, that smaller hotels be built on Bowman and Kintla Lakes in the Park's undeveloped North Fork region, and that the Going-to-the-Sun Chalet on St. Mary Lake be extensively expanded. 29

The Great Northern and Hotel Company officials responded by increasing publicity about Glacier to encourage tourism, and thus, insure that their previously constructed hotels and chalets would be filled and show a profit from the short, three-month season. Great Northern promoters emphasized the "See America First" slogan to encourage travel on their line. The promoters also adopted the symbol of "Rocky, the Great Northern Goat" as their railroad emblem in 1921; for Glacier Park contained the only habitat for Rocky Mountain goats along the Great Northern line. Similarly, the promoters labeled the Great Northern as "The

National Park Route' in order to emphasize that their railway ran adjacent to Glacier Park.30

Although Glacier's natural scenery was the Hotel Company's most valuable asset, several of the Company's activities during this period showed a growing commercial emphasis and expansion. Just before World War I and for several years after, the Hotel Company leased acreages adjacent to their hotels and chalets within the Park for grazing dairy cattle and gardening. Hotel managers hoped to insure their patrons of fresh dairy products and vegetables. Even though these plots were not more than ten acres apiece, the originally confined facilities began to spread over larger areas. In addition, Park officials allowed the Hotel Company personnel to seine whitefish from Upper St. Mary Lake, and the hotel and chalet managers used the native fish as a special item on their menu. Hotel officials at Many Glacier further encouraged the construction of a channel to join Josephine and McDermott Lakes, but remained unsuccessful. The construction of a bear feeding platform at Many Glacier in 1929 allowed tourists to observe bears at a close range, but also put the bears in the unnatural position of depending upon humans for their food. The Hotel Company officials attempted to bring a part of Glacier's wilderness to the tourists, but in doing so created an atmosphere more common to a city zoo.31 While engaging in a few activities toward 'development,' Glacier Park Hotel Company officials did not accept

30. Great Northern Railroad Company, Modern Railroads, May, 1956, pp. 32-34.
many of the proposals suggested by Park Service officials.

Glacier's other concessionaires also developed their facilities less extensively in comparison to their pre-World War I activity. By the 1920's, a horse concession, operated by G. W. Noffsinger as the "Park Saddle Horse Company," dominated its competitors. Noffsinger established several temporary tent camps in Glacier's backcountry, and the camps remained "temporary" or undeveloped since wilderness trips provided the objective for tourists who hired some of the Horse Company's one thousand horses and numerous employees. Several small concession operators built structures to accommodate tourists on private land. Probably the least compatible with the primitive ideal of a national park was the Transmountain Hotel Company's "Bungalow" or "Park Clubhouse." Located in Apgar, this combination restaurant, curio shop, and dance hall, with the help of its managers, provided crass, resort-time entertainment available in most contemporary amusement centers and enhanced a climate of commercialism instead of the atmosphere of wilderness.32 Park officials advocated most of this development within Glacier and seldom encouraged primitivism over development. In 1931, Director Horace Albright summarized the Park Service attitude toward allowing development, when he stated: "Our ideals contemplate a national park system of primitive lands free from all present and future commercial utilization, but like all ideals, they cannot be uniformly attained in this day and age."33

32. Great Falls Tribune, 4 July 1924.
Director Mather advocated that accommodations in Glacier be expanded. He felt that future visitation would overtax available tourist facilities and encouraged additional construction "before the park is overwelmed." When Mather realized that the Glacier Park Hotel Company officials were reluctant to increase their already heavy investment, he stated: "It may be necessary to secure new capital to undertake further extension of facilities in Glacier Park." Thus, when representatives of Culver Military Academy toured Glacier in 1921 searching for a site for a boy's summer camp, Glacier's officials encouraged them to locate the camp within the boundaries of the Park. Subsequently, Park officials granted sites for development near Bowman and Kintla Lakes, even though the promoters anticipated that future attendance of the "Skyland Camps" would annually reach nearly one thousand boys. The Park officials further provided that any development of the boy's camp must include the construction of some tourist facilities for the general public in order to develop this primitive section of Glacier. During the 1920's, promoters of the Skyland Camps constructed several buildings at Bowman Lake, conducted intensive publicity campaigns, and a seasonal boy's camp with adjacent tourist facilities flourished. Park officials, by encouraging a semi-permanent settlement, overlooked the potential destruction to the natural surroundings which could accompany the concentration of hundreds of seasonal residents in a wild section.

34. Rept., Dir. of the N.P.S., 1923, p. 63.
35. Ibid., p. 63
36. Skyland Camp, 1921-1940, Historical File, GNPHC.
of Glacier.

Most tourists, numerous Montana residents, and various conservation groups agreed with the Park Service and concessionaire construction programs. However, in 1921, when the International Joint Commission of Canada and the United States suggested a dam building project near Waterton Lake, various state and national organizations combined to oppose the project. Members of the National Parks Association, Sierra Club, the American Game Protective Association, the National Civic Association, various chambers of commerce in Montana, and many other groups successfully prevented any destruction to Glacier's natural features when they forced the International Joint Commission to withdraw its proposal. 37 State organizations, in particular, co-operated with the Park Service to increase accessibility to and within the Park. On Glacier's west side, the Flathead County Commissioners aided Park officials by furnishing trucks and necessary funds to repair and reconstruct the North Fork road. 38 Similarly, the Great Falls (Montana) Council of Boy Scouts annually furnished a number of boys to aid the Park crews in trail construction. 39

Displaying some self-interest, various regional organizations hoped to increase tourism to Glacier by improving area roads. Montana's State Highway Commission and various civic groups in Glacier's adjoining counties suggested several road

projects. Various chambers of commerce in Montana cities west of the Continental Divide promoted tourism and road improvement through the Park-to-Park (Yellowstone-to-Glacier) Highway Association. East of the Divide, other chambers of commerce suggested the Y-G (Yellowstone-Glacier) B-Line to encourage tourism through their cities. Adjacent county commissioners and local promoters worked through the Roosevelt Highway Association to provide an east-west road over Marias Pass, along the southern boundary of the Park. Even the promoters of Canadian tourism and improved transportation announced a new "Glacier-to-Gulf" Highway, from Calgary, Alberta, to Tampico, Mexico, with Glacier Park an important attraction along the proposed route. Most of the civic groups had the ulterior motive of economic prosperity for their own communities when they promoted tourism and recreation for Glacier; they greeted programs for improvement in transportation, accommodations, and accessibility as well as any publicity with enthusiasm.

Not everyone, however, welcomed the policies of development with enthusiasm. Several writers criticized the Park Service policy of "improvement" and especially the Great Northern's activity in Park construction programs. In an article in The New Republic, Enos A. Mills accused the Director of the National Park Service of "farming these parks out to monopolies" which in turn were "exploiting our national parks." Mills further criticized "our

40. Rept., Dir. of the N.P.S., 1924, p. 48
41. Great Falls Tribune, 4 October 1924.
national park policy (which) governs without the consent of the
governed." He insisted that the public lacked any opportunity
to control the "monopolies" in the parks and he alleged that the
monopolies charged "excessive tolls," used "propaganda" to draw
tourists, and generally provided "discriminatory service." Mills
concluded that a general lack of competition resulted from the
"playing of politics" in many parks.\textsuperscript{42} Another critic, W. C.
Whipps, writing in the \textit{Kalispell} (Montana) \textit{Times}, directed his
criticism toward the "grasping maws of the Great Northern Railway"
in Glacier Park. Whipps claimed that the Park Service turned
Glacier over to the Great Northern "for alleged development, but
really for exploitation" and the result was "The Great Northern
Wild Animal Preserve." He stated that:

\begin{quote}
The people have not yet learned that Uncle Sam in
his foolish generosity turned this magnificent resort,
which was theirs and always should have been theirs,
over to a selfish, heartless corporation and that now
only the very wealthy people, silkstockings and high
hats, the bears and other wild animals, the alleged
park service and perhaps a few prominent individuals,
likely officials or some very learned gentlemen, stoop-
shouldered with their weight of wisdom and knowledge,
are really welcome in the park.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

Whipps added that the "hotels and chalets are....too good for
the average traveler who goes into the animal preserve for outdoor
recreation and not for bridge or golf." He concluded by condemning
the Park Service officials for their conduct of fighting forest

\textsuperscript{42} Enos A. Mills, "Exploiting Our National Parks," \textit{New Republic},
10 November 1920, p. 272

\textsuperscript{43} W. C. Whipps, "The Great Northern Wild Animal Preserve,"
\textit{Kalispell Times}, 6 October 1932, \textit{Events in National Park
Service History}, File 101-03, GNPHC.
fires and their methods of protecting wild animals. Mills, Whipps, and others provided a dissenting opinion concerning activities within Glacier which, if it reached the ears of Park administrators, was disregarded.

George Snyder, a concessionaire and private land owner, provided an example of a critic whom Park officials could not disregard. Just after World War I, Snyder received a concession to operate a boat on Lake McDonald. While operating the boat, Snyder freely and openly criticized various Park officials, much to their consternation. When the officials did not renew his permit in 1919, Snyder began to operate his boat between private land on both ends of the lake. Superintendent W. W. Payne and several rangers, fearing that other people would attempt to operate concessions in Glacier without permits, confiscated Snyder's boat. Snyder, in turn, sued Payne on the basis of his rights as a private land owner and won. He then continued both his vehement criticism of the officials and the operation of his boat. By 1921, Snyder decided to defy further Park regulations since automobile travel parallel with the lake slaked his boat business. Snyder began to operate a passenger vehicle between Belton and the head of Lake McDonald without a permit in competition with authorized transportation concessions. To antagonize Park officials and to insure his own prosperity, Snyder secured a mail carrying position, thus preventing Park rangers from attempting any interference with his business. In 1922, however, Snyder provided his own downfall. While drunk from "moonshine liquor,"
Snyder collided with a government team and wagon; several Park rangers and prohibition agents quickly apprehended Snyder and took him to the Kalispell jail. As a result of the various charges against him, Snyder was sentenced to six months in prison and the prohibition agents later sold his passenger vehicle. Park officials terminated Snyder's association with the Park when they purchased his land and finally eliminated a defiant critic of their activities.\(^{44}\)

Most private land holders remained less defiant and certainly less outspoken than George Snyder. During this period, many land holders continued to co-operate with the Park officials. For example, in 1918, Superintendent Payne praised their actions, when he stated: "Private owners in the Park have greatly assisted in the prevention of forest fires and in several cases have extinguished small fires without help from the park forces." He added his appreciation for their "strict observance of the park regulations."\(^{45}\) Many of the land owners operated concessions and opened cabins to accommodate tourists with the approval of Park administrators; homesteaders also leased Park land for grazing, providing Glacier's officials with an added source of revenue. However, the attitude of co-operation became increasingly uncommon as Park Service planners adopted policies to eliminate private holdings within all national parks.

In Glacier, an undercurrent of antagonism between Park officials and private land owners occasionally became evident.

\(^{44}\) George Snyder Concessions, File 111, GNP HC
\(^{45}\) Rept., Dir of the N.P.S., 1918, p. 174.
In 1918, several private land owners began to cut timber along the Belton-Lake McDonald road and Director Mather immediately began negotiations to acquire the land in order to prevent further destruction of the natural scenery. As a result of the George Snyder affair, private owners siding with Snyder presented officials with a "defiant mood" when they repeatedly turned their stock loose to graze upon Park lands without permits. In addition, various mine owners in the vicinity of Many Glacier Hotel decided to work their mines. Park administrators conceded the owners legal rights to develop their claims and build access roads if necessary; but Director Mather became exceedingly anxious to return these claims to Government ownership. Glacier's administrators closely observed the actions of the owners to detect any possible violations of the law which could invalidate their claims.

Mather initiated the program of preserving timber—and hence, natural scenery—in privately owned, but highly visited, areas. By exchanging timber land in portions of the Park which remained "unfrequented by visitors" for land in heavily travelled areas, Director Mather acquired several tracts of land at "strategic points." While trying to eliminate certain sections of private land, however, Mather displayed an inconsistent policy toward all private holdings. In 1925, when reviewing the private land

46. Ibid., p. 72.
47. George Snyder Concessions, File 111, GNP HC.
48. Mining Claims, File 610-05, GNP HC.
49. Rept., Dir. of the N.P.S., 1924, p. 49.
situation in Glacier, he remarked that "numerous cabin accommodations" were furnished by private land owners; he noted that these accommodations were popular, that they "helped materially to care for the visitors," and that they "will have to be given serious consideration in the future development of hotel and camp accommodations."  

Mather later solidified his position against the private land owners; for when Congress adopted a policy and allocated funds allowing the direct acquisition of condemnation of private land in 1929, he termed their action, "the outstanding event of the year."  

The years from 1917 to 1933 reflected the activity and plans directed by Park Service officials to further "develop" Glacier; simultaneously, officials in Washington and in the Park initiated programs concerning preservation. Park administrators concentrated their development programs on increased accessibility by building roads and trails, but they also encouraged the investment of capital to enlarge the number of tourist accommodations. While most concessionaires reduced their construction programs, Glacier's officials continued to suggest that the concessionaires attempt additional construction. Park Service programs for preservation became more elaborate than the mere protection activities of the previous era; the administrators' co-operation with other government agencies especially enhanced forestry management within Glacier. Park officials concurrently worked to maintain the national park in its natural state and to open the area as a

tourist attraction or recreation area. The Park administrators, acting similarly to their predecessors, disregarded the mandate to keep the Park "unimpaired for the future" and promoted development, thus, leaving their successors the problem of striking a balance between use and preservation.
CHAPTER III -- GLACIER NATIONAL PARK--1934-1954

The twenty years from 1934 through 1954 constituted an era
of relative quiescence concerning construction activity in Glacier
Park when compared to the preceding decades. It was not adminis­
ttrative neglect, however, that caused a slackening in the "develop­
ment" effort; nor were visitation statistics a cause for slower
development. Tourism increased from about 120,000 individuals
in 1934 to just over 600,000 people by 1954, providing ample
justification for additional construction activity. Instead,
several factors combined to prohibit the Park officials from attempting
any concentrated building program in Glacier. The depression of
the 1930's originally contributed to frugality in many Park Service
programs. Similarly, World War II diverted both government revenue
and the attention of most Americans from the national parks. In
addition, a dam building threat in the post-War years distracted
the attention of Glacier's administrators from construction and
centered their interest on preservation. Park administrators,
however, continued to affect changes and emphasize greater "develop­
ment" in Glacier whenever it was possible; even when the depression
theoretically made additional construction impossible. In fact,
the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps signaled the
beginning of Glacier's only concentrated "development" program
during this period.

On March 31, 1933, Congress passed the Emergency Conser­
vation Work Act forming the Civilian Conservation Corps. President
Franklin D. Roosevelt suggested the formation of the CCC with a
two-fold objective: to combat the unemployment caused by the depression, and to provide manpower for construction and maintenance programs in all facets of American conservation.\footnote{1} Park Service Director Arno B. Cammerer capitalized on the availability of labor for projects in the national parks. The Park administrators started using the CCC work crews as soon as they were organized, were transported to the parks, and had constructed their camps. By July, 1933, eight camps and some sixteen hundred men were established and working in Glacier National Park. The number in Glacier increased to about two thousand by 1934, and the crews remained until 1941. Nationally, of the 300,000 men enrolled in the CCC program, about 75,000 of them worked for the National Park Service.\footnote{2} Cammerer, aided by President Roosevelt and the depression, supplied the manpower for the various work projects necessary to "develop" further such parks as Glacier.

In Glacier, Superintendent E. T. Scoyen and his staff formulated a series of projects they felt would enhance the Park. Scoyen's "improvement program" included the construction of about 250 miles of trail, several miles of road, and about a hundred miles of telephone line. In addition, Scoyen advocated that naturally fallen timber or "forest debris" be cleared along Going-to-the-Sun highway and that the dead or partially burned timber remaining from the 1929 Half-Moon Fire on Apgar flats be cut, cleared, and disposed of.

\footnote{2} Ibid., pp. 322-324.
Campground construction and improvement provided additional projects. 3

Civilian Conservation Corps projects were not limited, however, to those originally formulated by Scoyen. The Park Service readily adapted the CCC manpower to new projects or Park maintenance wherever possible. For example, the CCC volunteers served as part of the Park fire suppression force and assisted the administrative personnel within the headquarters offices. CCC crews also constructed nine bridges and about thirty buildings. Further, the crews accomplished some reforestation, including the planting of thousands of trees and shrubs in formerly burned areas. 4 These projects, and many others, exemplified the administrative attitude toward a national park: great emphasis on construction activities with less regard for the primitive or natural scene.

The two CCC projects that best illustrate the Park Service attitude and objectives during the 1930's were campground construction and the clearing of burned areas. During the 1930's, campers increased in numbers and their demands for improvements intensified. Responding to one critic, who complained of the lack of firewood, shelter cabins, and toilets, a Park ranger remarked: "The more the service does for a patron of a national park campground, the more critical the tourists become." 5 By the mid-1930's, the first camp trailers or towed vehicles began to appear in Glacier. Their appearance and the subsequent desires of their owners altered the

administrators' plans for the type and size of campsites; the sites had to be enlarged to drive-through type so trailers could be pulled completely off the campground roads. The trailers allowed many tourists to stay in the Park for longer periods, but also engendered demands for such "luxuries" as electricity and individual water supplies.⁶ One Park Service official wrote:

If the objectives of the National Park Service are to be realized, its activities in relation to campsites might properly include such projects as: erection of public shelters, building of fireplaces, construction of truck trails, bridle trails, thinning of woodlands--as reduction of fire hazard--the establishment of water supply lines and sanitary facilities--as provision against stream pollution and safeguarding of health, the creation of beach areas and building of canoe landings and platforms--as control against stream or bank erosion.⁷

The CCC crews in Glacier cleared about two hundred acres of woodland for campground development and, in 1936 alone, completed some fifty-one of the drive-through spaces for trailer camping. They also laid water and sewer systems, built fireplaces and picnic tables, and constructed numerous service buildings.⁸ Campgrounds soon became recognized as "developed" or "high density" areas.

The project of clearing burned-over areas did not reflect an attitude toward greater "development." Instead, the natural aesthetics of the Apgar flats area were in question. The area near Park headquarters had been burned during a 1929 fire and

---

⁶ Ibid., Miscellaneous Correspondence, 1933-1938.
⁸ N.P.S. Press Release, 1934, Newspaper Articles, III, File 501-03, GNPHC.
by 1933, young lodgepole pine already began to take the place of the burned cedar forest. The CCC project in the area consisted of "clearing and beautifying" the "ugly burned areas." Natural or not, the burned and fallen timber was sawed, loaded on railroad cars in Belton, and shipped to the Blackfeet Reservation east of the Park. The three thousand acres of burned timber were not left unimpaired for the future but made more pleasing for those then living in the area. Even if the area was not kept in its natural state, a few individuals derived some benefit from the sawed timber. The Superintendent of the Blackfeet Reservation, F. R. Stone, remarked that giving the Indians the logs and poles was "one of the finest things ever done for the Indians on the reservation."10

Many observers remarked that Glacier's "improvement program" of the 1930's, which Scoyen and his staff advocated and CCC volunteers accomplished, proved beneficial to both the Park and the people involved. President Roosevelt, in summarizing the vast number of construction projects, remarked: "We are definitely in an era of building, the best kind of building--the building of great public projects for the benefit of the public and with the definite objective of building human happiness."11 He might have added that human comfort, human demands, and human aesthetic values pre-empted the primitive or natural condition of Glacier Park.

9. Great Falls Tribune, 13 July 1933.
President Roosevelt referred to most of the CCC projects in Glacier as having a duel objective, when he stated: "We are helping these young men to help themselves and their families and at the same time we are making the parks more available and more useful for the average citizen."12 Certainly the trail construction, the small amount of road building, and the general maintenance work damaged neither human enjoyment of the Park nor the Park itself to any extent. The buildings which the CCC workers constructed were not obtrusive to the natural scene. Since much of their labor involved mere improvement of previously constructed roads, trails, and water or sewer systems, the preservationists had no quarrel. When the manipulation of natural conditions in the Park was involved, as in the expansion of campgrounds, clearing of natural debris, landscaping, and planting of trees, however, the government carefully linked development or change to the need for work on the part of the Nation's unemployed. The preservationists generally remained silent. Considering the number of men employed, of projects attempted, and of actual accomplishments, the eight years of CCC labor and the allied Works Progress Administration, marked one of the more concentrated efforts toward construction and development during this twenty year period.

World War II ended the extensive construction activity of the preceding decade. The shortage of manpower forced Superintendant Donald S. Libbey to curtail all construction plans and restrict administrative operations to maintenance. From September,

12. Ibid., p. 322.
1942, through September, 1946, however, a group of about 125 conscientious objectors under the Civilian Public Service organization were assigned to Glacier and assisted in general maintenance, especially in fire control. Park visitation during this period abruptly declined because of the War: in 1941 figures showed about 180,000 tourists, by 1943 only some 23,000 visitors came to the Park, and it was not until 1946 that visitation again reached the 1941 mark. Although all construction within the Park had been halted during the War, Park Service planners realized that future visitation would undoubtedly increase. Thomas C. Vint, the Park Service's Chief Landscape Architect, and his assistants formulated a new development program which promised to be as concentrated as the CCC activity. They felt that public transportation had to be made available in the parks, that the interpretive division—including naturalists programs, new museums, and visitor centers—needed expansion, and, finally, they recommended that additional overnight accommodations be built within the parks. Vint summarized his plans for the parks, when he stated: "The development program of the areas therefore is largely one that provides for the visitor." Vint neglected any discussion of preservation assuming nature could be enhanced by additional development. For the duration of the War, Glacier's officials failed to initiate new construction activity and they neglected Vint's plans until the mid-1950's and the beginning of "Mission 66."

From the end of World War II to about 1954, tourism in Glacier Park increased considerably; in this eight year period visitation more than tripled as it grew from about 200,000 in 1946 to nearly 600,000 in 1954. John W. Emmert, superintendent in Glacier from 1944 to 1958, originally responded to the increasing numbers with less construction activity than did his predecessors. One of Emmert's chief preoccupations during this period concerned the preservation of about twenty thousand acres of Park land which was endangered by the proposed Glacier View Dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River. Due to this threat, Emmert concentrated less on construction and more on maintenance, improvement, or completion of already existing projects. Even Emmert, however, advocated some new development. The expansion of Avalanche, Many Glacier, and Apgar campgrounds reflected Emmert's response to the increasing public demands, as well as his desire to complete the CCC activity in these areas. Emmert's "Lakeshore Vista Program," which provided for the removal of trees at "strategic places" along Lake McDonald, sacrificed the natural presence of trees to the tourists who desired "beautiful and outstanding views" along Going-to-the-Sun highway without having to step out of their automobiles. Responding to the Glacier View Dam threat, Emmert planned a "primary road through the North Fork area" and hoped to develop additional campground facilities and cabin accommodations in that region. By 1953, the Park Service began construction on new campgrounds in the Quartz and Logging Lakes area, both in the North Fork, avowedly "to avert pressure for the Glacier
Emmert hoped that the old pattern of development would lead to public use and interest and somehow insure preservation. Park Service attitudes toward preservation began to change during the 1930's. In 1935, Park Service planners recognized the existence of "high density" areas within the parks and adopted their policies and plans to conform to the development of previous decades. The new policy stated that "the National Park Service is interested in the preservation and development of those projects whose use is extensive in character, in which the protection of the more remote natural scenic areas is insured." As a result, some of Glacier's officials began to discourage development in certain areas. When the planners suggested the expansion of Two Medicine campground in 1940, a Park official remarked: "This Two Medicine area should never have been opened to camping in the first place. The precariousness of the vegetation surely has been amply demonstrated and the serious fire hazard that exists in this windy area is well known." Regardless of his suggestion, Park crews fulfilled the planners' desires and later expanded the campground. Superintendent Donald S. Libbey, when questioned in 1944 about the further development of campgrounds through the addition of electricity, stated: "It is not clear in our minds that it is in the best interest of a park such as Glacier

16. Letter, J. F. Cook, Chief of Forestry to Acting Superintendent R. R. Vincent, 9 April 1940, Campgrounds, File 857-02.1 GNP HC.
to yield to the demand for electrical installations for trailers and thereby further disturb natural values." Subsequently, Park officials did not allow electrical outlets in the campgrounds. These efforts toward less development reveal an awareness that additional construction would cause a general disturbance or some obliteration of the natural, primitive features.

Park Service policies regarding wildlife preservation also began to change. In Glacier, officials halted the deer feeding program by 1934 as a result of the policy that "every species should be left to carry on its struggle for existence unaided" and that "no animal shall be encouraged to become dependent upon man for its support." Subsequently, a Park ranger reported that "the improvement in the condition of all animals since the 'grub line' was eliminated has been startling." The rangers later discovered that the health of the deer improved because the number of animals congregating at feeding grounds had "facilitated the spread of disease." As a result of this growing interest toward Park wildlife, Glacier's administrators adopted a more definitive wildlife program including more accurate counting and observation.

The east side elk problem continued to plague Park administrators during the period. Superintendent E. T. Scoyen suggested
that the Blackfeet Indians limit their hunting season to several weeks during the fall or winter, and that they restrict the number of elk which individuals could kill. Superintendents D. S. Libbey and J. W. Emmert continued negotiations for an arrangement in order to protect the elk; but the Indians frustrated the officials' attempts to settle the dispute and continued to kill elk wandering onto the reservation.21

During the late 1930's, George M. Wright, a National Park Service wildlife specialist, suggested that reintroduction of buffalo on Glacier's east side in order to recreate part of the primitive ecology of the area. Again, cooperation with the Blackfeet was essential, for much of the buffalo herd's natural range would be on the reservation. Theoretically, the herd would be a joint project between the Indians and the Park Service. But similar to the elk situation, the Blackfeet rejected Wright's and Superintendent Scoyen's proposal; and the Park officials eventually dropped their plan to reintroduce the animal which once dominated the primitive scene of Glacier's east side.22

Glacier's officials also curtailed the predatory animal control programs after the mid-1930's. Park Service officials formulated the policy that: "No native predator may be destroyed merely because it is a meat-eater. Individuals may be removed, if, by scientific inquiry, it is determined that a prey species

22. Miscellaneous Correspondence, Buffalo, File 715-03, GNPHC.
is in danger of extermination."23 Park officials developed an enthusiasm for the preservation of all wildlife. After World War II, however, local citizens believed that predator control was still necessary. In 1951, Melvin Ruder, editor of the Hungry Horse News, denounced the destruction of deer in the Park by coyotes and criticized Glacier's officials for a lack of control programs. He claimed that Glacier had been "set aside by federal law to be a preserve where there shall not be destruction of wildlife."24 He assumed that neither man nor animal had the right to kill the "well loved deer" in Glacier. The Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service responded to Ruder's and other local resident's demands for control programs and placed "1080" or poison bait stations on Forest Service and private land near Glacier's boundaries to control predators and especially coyotes. Superintendent Emmert, reflecting a concern for the complete preservation of wildlife in Glacier, responded to the Fish and Wildlife Service's efforts. Emmert stated that the use of poison near Glacier:

would have an adverse effect on wildlife within the Park [and] we are bound by law to maintain the Park in as near a natural state as possible. The removal of coyotes or other predators from the park area would tend to upset the balance between predators and other animals.25

24. Hungry Horse News, (Columbia Falls, Montana), 13 April 1951.
25. Letter, Supt. J. W. Emmert to E. F. Grand, U.S.D.I., Fish and Wildlife Service, 4 January 1950, Control Measures, File 720-08, GNPHC. Chemical 1080 is a poison used with bait such as horse meat which is more effective and easier to handle than strychnine.
Emmert suggested that the poison stations be removed to a distance of at least three miles from Glacier's boundaries where they would have little effect on Park wildlife. As a result, Emmert obtained an effective compromise with the Fish and Wildlife personnel which resulted in the removal of many stations thus prevented the unauthorized destruction of Glacier's predators.

Programs to control forest diseases and insects continued throughout this period. Park crews, aided by Forest Service entomologists, treated Engelmann spruce bark beetle infestations by removing problem trees in the Starvation Ridge area. During the early 1950's, the Park administrators also suggested programs to control or eliminate exotic weeds or plants unnatural to the area. Subsequently, Park crews attempted a systematic elimination of goatweed (Common St. Johns Wart), a plant not native to Glacier and poisonous to certain animals, as well as thistles and nettles.26 The blister rust control program, formed late in the 1920's, developed into the most significant forestry disease control program in Glacier. In the 1930's, Park crews and Civilian Conservation Corps workers began ribes eradication in the Two Medicine and Lake McDonald areas. During World War II, the program continued as Park officials designated Civilian Public Service crews to work at rust control. During the early 1950's, the blister rust program continued to grow; with the guidance of Forest Service adviser, John C. Gynn, Park officials expanded

26. Miscellaneous Correspondence, Annual Forestry Report, File 207-01.9, GNPHC.
crews, surveyed new areas for the disease, and hoped to save Glacier's white pines from possible destruction.\(^{27}\)

Regardless of the varied contemporary preservation efforts, the foremost preservation issue of the period remained the controversial Glacier View Dam project. In 1943, planners for the Army Corps of Engineers suggested the construction of a dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River to complement the proposed Hungry Horse dam on the Flathead River's South Fork. By August, 1944, survey parties from the Army Corps of Engineers began preliminary surveys and test drilling to locate rock formations suitable for dam construction. The surveys verified several projected dam locations and the Army Corps of Engineers planners decided to promote the Glacier View site. The controversy over the dam began when the Engineers displayed their plans which included a reservoir with the potential to flood over twenty thousand acres of Glacier Park, completely altering the natural character of the primitive North Fork section.\(^{28}\) According to an extensive Interior Department survey, the projected destruction included: the drowning out of considerable meadowland, such as Lone Pine and Round Praries; the destruction of winter grazing areas for deer, elk, moose, and other wildlife; and the flooding of several ranches, numerous summer cabins, two ranger stations, and the site of Polebridge—a small settlement across the North Fork from Polebridge Ranger

\(^{27}\) Miscellaneous Correspondence, Blister Rust, File 207-01.9, GNPHC.

\(^{28}\) Miscellaneous Correspondence, Glacier View Dam I, File 0-44, GNPHC.
Station. In addition, the projected reservoir would have raised the level of Logging Lake more than fifty feet and would have obliterated the entire Camas Creek drainage.29

Park officials confronted the Army Corps of Engineers with an unalterable position opposed to the dam construction. At one of the first public hearings, Superintendent J. W. Emmert stated:

The National Park Service is convinced that Federally-owned lands within Glacier National Park are now being used for the highest possible benefits to the public and, therefore, it must object to any proposed extraneous development for purposes that would modify its primitive character.30

He added that the creation of a "fluctuating artificial body of water" would change the "wilderness character" of the area and be "detrimental to its cultural and inspirational values."31

Facing this potential destruction of a section of the Park, Park Service personnel continuously opposed the Army Corps of Engineers' plans, urged the area's preservation over its development, and encouraged the public to support the Park Service position.

The Park Service officials discovered, however, that numerous individuals and organizations, especially in the local area, supported the dam construction project. Montana's Senator Mike Mansfield encouraged the project because he felt that "Glacier View would be of much more immediate benefit and would not disturb the economy of the region but add to it."32 Economic benefits to

31. Ibid.
the immediate communities became the rationale for many local citizens groups supporting the project. Representatives of the local Montford-Eagen Flood Control District, the Montana Reclamation Association, and the Flathead Farmers Union argued that flood control and irrigation were more important than intangible aesthetic values. Members of the Flathead Electric Co-operative and the Kalispell Labor Council encouraged the project to insure employment in the area. Similarly, representatives of the Flathead Citizens Committee, the Kalispell and Columbia Falls Chambers of Commerce, and the Boomtown Builders Club (of Martin City, Montana), hoping for economic prosperity, supported the Army Corps of Engineers position.33 Unfortunately for the Engineers, however, these local interest groups lacked sufficient strength, influence, or numbers when compared to the opponents of the Glacier View dam site.

The Park officials received enthusiastic support in their stand for preservation and against the dam construction from numerous national conservation organizations as well as many local interest groups. Representatives of such organizations as the National Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, the Society of American Foresters, the New York Zoological Society, the Izaak Walton League, and many others presented their opposition to the dam at several public hearings. A representative of the Cosmos Club (Washington, D.C.) typified the opinions held by these organizations when he stated that his group remained "unalterably opposed to

the Glacier View Dam as an unwarranted invasion of Glacier National
Park."^34 One of Montana's former senators and a Park land owner,
Burton K. Wheeler, realized the potential danger to the area,
and remarked: "I hope that the Park Service and the Interior
Department will do everything they possibly can to prevent this
dam from being built."^35 Other Park land owners joined Wheeler
and the Park officials' effort by emphasizing the recreational
value of the area. About forty land owners wrote letters pro­
testing any dam construction near the Park. One of them stated:
"To seriously curtail one of the few great recreational areas
at a time when expansion, rather than decrease, is needed, seems
tragic."^36

Simultaneously, local Montana citizens and organizations
combined to fight the proposed construction. Members of the local
West Glacier Fire protective Association, the Glacier Park
Association, and the Glacier Conservation Society petitioned against
development. Officials of both the Glacier Park Transportation
Company and Hotel Company voiced allegiance to the Park Service
position. Chambers of commerce from the nearby communities of
Browning, Whitefish, and Missoula presented petitions against the
dam site. State organizations, including the Montana State Grange,

34. Letter, K. A. Reid (for the Cosmos Club, Washington, D.C.)
to District Engineer, Army Corps of Engineers, 24 May 1948,
Glacier View Dam I, File 0-44, GNPHC.
35. Letter, Senator B. K. Wheeler to Secretary of the Interior
O. L. Chapman, 5 May 1948, Glacier View Dam I, File 0-44, GNPHC.
36. Letter, B. P. Britz to Superintendent J. W. Emmert, 24 May
1948, Glacier View Dam II, File 0-44, GNPHC.
the Western Montana Fish and Game Association, and the State Fish and Game Commission, also joined the opponents of the dam. The united opposition presented by these numerous conservation groups and state and local organizations, combined with the preservation arguments of Superintendent J. W. Emmert and other Park Service officials, resulted in the defeat of the proposed Glacier View site. The Army Corps of Engineers temporarily yielded to the opposition against Glacier View but continued to consider other Nort Fork sites which would inundate less Park land.

The Glacier View dam proposal provided an opportunity for both the Park officials and the public to clarify their positions toward encouraging the greater use or "development" of Glacier in contrast to maintaining its "unimpaired" character. Superintendent Emmert led the struggle for preservation, but expediently encouraged recreational development near the wilderness lakes and urged road construction through the undeveloped areas. Public opinion toward Glacier, especially among the local interest groups, remained divided: some individuals felt water resource development remained the key to economic prosperity in the region, while others understood that the recreational value of Glacier could lead to prosperity just as easily.

During the 1930's, the Park officials fully recognized their responsibility toward recreation and toward developing a rapport with the public. Superintendent E. T. Scoyen realized

that contemporary attitudes toward recreation were changing and encouraged new activities. He knew, for example, that horseback riding had become less popular after Going-to-the-Sun highway opened a section of Glacier's back country. While encouraging tourists to leave their cars and the heavily travelled roads, Scoyen emphasized and expanded the program of organized trail hiking. Scoyen arranged for Dr. George C. Ruhle, the Park's naturalist, to assign seasonal naturalists to all of the major trails and the naturalists' subsequent availability expanded hiking as a recreational activity: the numbers of people hiking with naturalists increased from 4200 in 1929 to over 32,000 by 1935.
Park officials also encouraged boating, horseback riding, fishing, and many other activities to stimulate public interest.38

Glacier's officials, while catering to the public and to tourism in general, hoped to present as appealing an image as possible. The stigma remaining from W. C. Whipps' inference that the Park Service personnel were lackeys of the Great Northern Railroad bothered many officials. Superintendent D. S. Libbey developed a plan to overcome critics of the Park Service. He stated:

The most effective method, in conjunction with a fair and impartial administration of Park policy and regulations, is the spreading of good will through courteous treatment of our neighbors and dissemination of information by press, radio, and the lecture platform which will explain the purposes and objects of

38. Letter, Supt. E. T. Scoyen to Dir. of NPS, A. E. Demaray, (no date, 1936), Recreational Survey. File 830-02, GNPHC.
the National Park Service without directing further attention to its opposition.\(^{39}\)

Superintendent Libbey also felt that almost any public criticism could be answered, and he subsequently stated that Park Service activities "are in the public interest and are able to undergo public examination. Our public relations policy starts with that assumption and welcomes public examination because of the beneficial understanding and support which will result."\(^{40}\)

After World War II, Glacier's officials, being especially concerned about the Glacier View dam, hoped to impress critics, who had urged development and use of the Park's natural resources, by emphasizing the intrinsic value of recreation to the state's economy. In 1949, Superintendent Emmert co-operated with the Bureau of Business and Economic Research of the University of Montana "to determine the economic value of Glacier National Park."\(^{41}\) Park Service and University representatives subsequently interviewed over 3200 Park visitors. As a result of the tourist survey, Park officials announced that over seventy-five percent of all visitors stated that they came to Montana "primarily to see Glacier National Park."\(^{42}\) Results of the survey also elaborated upon the amount of time and money spent in the state, indicating

\(^{39}\) Letter, Supt. D. S. Libbey to Dir. of NPS, A. B. Cammerer, 24 July 1939, Events in National Park Service History, File 101-03, GNP HC.

\(^{40}\) Memorandum, Supt. D. S. Libbey, 16 November 1939, Publicity, File 501-0.3, GNP HC.


\(^{42}\) Ibid., pp. 335-336.
that in 1951 some 4800 Park tourists spent over twenty million dollars in the state. Park officials hoped to counter the advocates of Glacier View dam by showing that the tourism and recreation provided by Glacier Park were among Montana's most valuable assets.

A few critics of the Park Service, however, did not need Glacier's administrators to indicate the value of tourism. The interest groups demanding expanded tourism, especially individual motel, restaurant, and service station owners, wanted the Park officials to enlarge their programs for recreational development. Melvin Ruder, Hungry Horse News editor and vocal advocate of development for tourism, frequently enumerated Glacier's inadequate tourist facilities. He remarked: "Housing facilities both in and outside the park are inadequate. This also applies to campgrounds. Highway improvements have been too slow. Other park roads have been improved too little with resultant funnelling of visitors over the one 50-mile stretch of Sun highway."^3 He complained that "appropriations for park upkeep and administration including campground maintenance and improvement specifically just creep along."^4 One of Ruder's frequent criticisms revealed the inability of the Park crews to clear snow from Logan Pass early in the spring; the earlier Going-to-the-Sun highway became passible, the sooner businesses serving tourists in nearby communities would prosper. Ruder remarked: "With the pass

blocked, traffic to Glacier has been more than halved. The economic loss to Montana stores, cabin camps, service stations and restaurants runs into thousands of dollars."\(^{45}\) He later suggested that, due to Glacier's economic effect on the Flathead valley, local citizens should insure that "Sun highway has A-1 snow removal equipment," that skilled manpower be available for snow clearing work, and that Park officials consider constructing "snow sheds over Sun highway in certain slide areas."\(^{46}\)

Similarly, several national organizations began to criticize many of the national parks for a lack of development. Representatives of the American Automobile Association, in particular, voiced numerous complaints regarding "the inadequacy of present hotels, restaurants, parking areas, and other facilities in the parks." Members of the Association also urged that "the only real solution is a greater Department of the Interior expenditure on parks, enough to improve present park facilities and to prepare for even larger numbers of visitors to come."\(^{47}\) Conversely, members of the National Parks Association urged Park Service officials to consider additional "development" only if it was completely "compatible with....nature's reproductive and recuperative power." An editorial in the *National Parks Magazine* warned:

"The 'development' of park and wilderness reservations for intensive recreational use is urged by many who do not realize that such 'development' is incompatible with the preservation of the natural

\(^{45}\) *Hungry Horse News*, 19 June 1952.

\(^{46}\) *Hungry Horse News*, 26 June 1953.

conditions to which these areas have been dedicated."48 Thus, Glacier's administrators not only faced local demands for increased "development," but also had to placate various national organizations suggesting greater recreational use of the Park as well as those demanding its preservation.

During this period, Glacier's concessionaires did not suggest any additional development. The Glacier Park Hotel Company officials experienced financial problems because many tourists failed to use their facilities; the Company's officials realized that the hotels could only operate during the short, three-month season, that costs involved in maintaining their two million dollar investment in buildings exceeded their annual income, that tourists travelled far more by automobile than by railroad thus becoming less dependent on the Company for facilities, and that cheaper campgrounds and cabins were available. These factors, combined with the slack tourist seasons during the depression and World War II, forced the Hotel Company officials to curtail all development and reevaluate their position in the Park. In 1933, the officials closed Cut Bank and St. Mary chalets, and in succeeding years they closed other chalets including the extensive Going-to-the-Sun chalet complex. Many of the chalets eventually deteriorated beyond repair and were destroyed. In 1941, the Great Northern even proposed the destruction of the Lake McDonald Hotel, which it had owned less than a decade, and suggested the

removal of all tourist facilities to the foot of Lake McDonald. Park officials, however, refused to allow the destruction of this developed area. By the end of World War II, the Hotel Company officials felt that their success in Glacier was impossible and failed to renew their twenty year contract with the Park Service. Hotel Company officials began operating on an annual contract basis and started searching for another investor to relieve them of their unprofitable concession.49

Two other concessionaires, which had flourished during the previous decades, also yielded to financial difficulty. The Park Saddle Horse Company, operated by G. W. Noffsinger, stopped making pack trips in 1942, and terminated their contract in 1945. As a result of the combined effects of the depression, the growing popularity of hiking, and a subsequent decline in popularity of horse riding and pack trips, Noffsinger's Horse Company ceased its operation and removed its temporary camps.50 Similarly, the representatives of the Skyland Camp at Bowman Lake terminated their permit in 1940. The camp's administrator, L. R. Gignilliat, who once presented optimistic plans for development, admitted failure, but blamed the camp's lack of success as much on its primitive character as on the lack of a public demand.51 Both of these concessions earlier presented the potential for extensive development; both were forced to halt their development schemes

49. Miscellaneous Correspondence, Glacier Park Company, File 900-05, GNPHC.
50. Daily Inter Lake, 10 November 1945.
51. Miscellaneous Correspondence, Historical File, Skyland Camps, GNPHC.
with the realization that private enterprise could exist in the Park only when or where public demand would insure success.

Glacier's private land owners provided the administrators with contrasting attitudes toward development and preservation. A majority of land owners maintained their holdings in Glacier without incident. A few land owners, however, provoked conflicts with Park Service personnel causing exaggerated charges that all private land owners "seriously hamper administration." In 1935, officials co-operated with the Flathead County Commissioners when land owners in the North Fork region suggested that the old North Fork road be improved. Park crews reconstructed much of the road, but when they arrived at a section running through the private property of Charles H. Finton, they were forced to stop. Finton, aggravated at having been caught poaching and at having his deer rifle confiscated by Park rangers, constructed a fence across the road and demanded that the road crews remain off his land. Although a right of way had earlier been obtained from Finton's father, Superintendent E. T. Scoyen was forced to negotiate for the right of way again. Finton contended that his rights entitled him to close the road if he desired. He stated: "I know the law; and I also know my rights, As a property owner. I own this land here Mr. Scoyen, Not the County, State or Government. We paid cash for every inch of this land...." Finton also accused Scoyen of using the "same tactics as the Kaiser used the time of the war,

rule or ruin."\

After a month and a half of argument, Scoyen, with the help of the United States District Attorney, J. B. Tansil, obtained an agreement with Finton and the Park crews completed the road maintenance.

Conversely, when the Glacier View dam threatened Glacier, Dr. J. S. McFarland, a private landowner near Polebridge, became one of many landowners supporting the Park administrators and one of the dam site's outstanding and vocal opponents. Siding with the Park Service position, he presented arguments promoting conservation as well as his own self-interest. He stated: "We realized that once the government invades the natural resources in a National Park that all our National Parks are subject to similar invasion." He added that the destruction of fishing streams, virgin timber, wildlife habitat, private lands, and homes, and "the esthetic value for which we created the national parks" was intolerable. McFarland convinced his fellow members of the National Dude Ranchers Association to oppose the dam. As a representative of the Dude Ranchers and as a private landowner, McFarland attended the various public hearings and fought for the area's preservation rather than its development.54

Charles Finton and Dr. McFarland exemplified only a few private landowners. The actions of Finton, however, proved undoubtedly more detrimental to the Park Service-landowner

54. Letter, Dr. J. S. McFarland to C. C. Moore, President, Dude Ranchers Association, 28 April 1948, Glacier View Dam I, File 0-44, GNPHC.
relationship than McFarland's actions did to increase cordiality. In addition, several other incidents encouraged Park officials to obtain more private land. Owners of mining claims near Many Glacier continued to develop their mines during the 1930's and early 1940's. Although completely legal, their work aggravated Glacier's superintendents, who, in turn, unsuccessfully attempted to invalidate the claims. In 1951, Canadian oil companies discovered oil in British Columbia, a short distance north of Glacier's North Fork. Park officials feared that the Park's private land owners in that region would begin drilling for oil. Superintendent Emmert wrote: "The privately owned land in the park situated in the North Fork drainage may present a serious threat to the wilderness aspect of the park. It may be advisable to immediately obtain as many of these holdings as possible." In 1953, Glacier's officials managed to avert the threatened development of forest land owned by the State of Montana within the Park when, after several decades of negotiations, the Park Service acquired the ten thousand acres from Montana's legislature. Because of the mine owners, the private land owners like Finton, the oil drilling threat, and regardless of concerned individuals like Dr. McFarland, the Park Service emphasized their policy of land acquisition hoping to eliminate every parcel of private land within Glacier.

During the twenty years from 1934 to 1954, Glacier's officials, concessionaires, and private land owners engaged in

fewer "development" projects than those occurring in previous decades. Preservation programs, in fact, became increasingly more important to the officials than any construction activity. Changing Park Service policies as well as the effects of the Glacier View dam controversy compelled Glacier's officials to adopt stricter preservation principles. Less emphasis on development and construction, however, paralleled the increased promotion of tourism and especially of Glacier's recreational value. As a result, the tourist accommodations, which some 120,000 visitors used in 1934, remained unimproved or were even decreased in numbers for the five times as many Park tourists in 1954. While promoting both recreation and preservation, Park Service personnel failed to anticipate the post-War increase in tourism. Responding to a lack of contemporary "development" and to the rising visitation statistics, Park planners of the mid-1950's began to prepare Glacier for the mass tourism of its future.
CHAPTER IV -- GLACIER NATIONAL PARK--1955-1967

The most recent period in Glacier's history, from 1955 through 1967, presented Park officials with administrative problems in many respects similar to those which their predecessors encountered and failed to solve. The most significant problem of the period resulted from expanding tourism. Tourism in Glacier and other National parks increased steadily after World War II; in 1955, for example, over 674,000 tourists visited Glacier as compared to the 1946 figure of just over 200,000 people. By the mid 1950's, this increasing visitation resulted in public demands to improve roads, hotels, campgrounds, and many other facilities. Director of the National Park Service Conrad Wirth, realizing that many national park facilities were deteriorating, stated: "We actually get scared when we go into some of these areas. Some of the camps and areas are approaching the level of rural slums and need taking care of."¹ Director Wirth, considering the situation in the parks and responding to critics of the Park Service, explained: "Since 1941, appropriations for management, for protection, and for development have lagged seriously behind the need for them occasioned by greatly increased public use."² He presented a solution which depended upon increased Congressional appropriations, a solution which faced the realities and problems of mass visitation, and which subsequently required the Park Service personnel to "formulate

and carry out a sound overall program of improvements." Director Wirth advocated "Mission 66"—named after its projected date of completion, 1966—because he felt that "planning for today and the immediate future, and construction on that basis, can lead only to future embarrassment and to renewed demands for more of everything." Thus, Wirth encouraged Park Service personnel to formulate a "reliable plan" on the basis of a "10 year forecast", so that by 1966, when construction became complete and their plans were fulfilled, "travel, development for visitor needs, and park protection [will be] brought into proper harmony."³

According to Superintendent J. W. Emmert, Mission 66 in Glacier meant a "development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the resources of the national park system consistent with maximum protection."⁴ From 1955 through 1957, Glacier's officials formulated plans for new development as well as for the reconstruction of older facilities and submitted their plans to the regional office in Omaha, Nebraska, or to the Park Service offices in Washington, D.C., for approval. When Mission 66 development began in Glacier in 1958, it was called the "largest and most varied construction program" in the Park's history.⁵ The projected increase in tourism and the "inadequate and obsolete facilities" provided the Park Service with ample justification for the accelerated construction activity which continued for the following decade.

³. Ibid., p. 335.
⁴. Great Falls Tribune, 8 April 1957.
⁵. Great Falls Tribune, 15 September 1958.
The decade-long construction program proved to be extensive and varied. Representatives of both the Western Office of Design and Construction and the Bureau of Public Roads assisted the Park Service administrators in formulating plans and later in supervising construction. Expecting that 1.2 million tourists would be visiting Glacier by 1966, Park officials proposed a new St. Mary campground, several parking and picnicking areas adjacent to Going-to-the-Sun highway, visitor centers at St. Mary and Logan Pass, a new administration building, numerous residences for both permanent and seasonal employees, and a new road into Glacier's North Fork—called the Camas Creek Cutoff. In addition to the building of major facilities, Park officials promoted the construction of a myriad of smaller projects, such as comfort stations in campgrounds, new entrance stations, and numerous fireplaces and picnic tables in the campgrounds and picnic areas. Most of the new construction complemented older developed areas, such as the new picnic or parking areas along the older Going-to-the-Sun highway. But other projects, such as the Camas Creek Cutoff, represented the first stage in a comprehensive development plan.6

Park Service planners, however, directed the bulk of Mission '66 activity toward reconstruction and renovation. The Park officials, realizing that some facilities were "dilapidated"

6. Miscellaneous Reports, Annual Reports, Superintendent, 1951-1960, File A26, and Annual Reports, Superintendent, 1961-, File A2621, Central Files, Glacier National Park, West Glacier, Montana. All annual superintendent reports from the period 1955 through 1967 are contained within these two files and are hereafter cited: Supt. Report, Date, File Number, Page.
or inadequate, began resurfacing old roads, rebuilding or expanding highway approaches to already developed areas, and repairing old sewage and water systems. Park crews expanded the older campgrounds, such as Apgar, Avalanche, and Two Medicine, and made improvements in many other campgrounds to accommodate greater numbers of campers. The crews also improved and reconstructed many Park trails, increased the number of roadside exhibits and interpretive signs, and built several shelter cabins in the backcountry. Many of the smaller, less significant projects originally designated to the Mission 66 program were accomplished through the Accelerated Public Works Program of 1962 and 1963. The Public Works Program supplied additional funds to the Park and nearly one hundred men to complete the improvements on trails, roads, buildings, bridges, boat docks, and numerous other projects.

In many national parks the projected Mission 66 construction ended in 1966 as originally scheduled; in Glacier, however, in spite of the Accelerated Public Works Program, natural forces worked against Park crews and obliterated many of their accomplishments. In early June 1964, several days of heavy rainfall combined with late-thawing snow to produce a flood within the Park and adjacent areas. In Glacier, the flood destroyed various buildings, miles of roads and trails, water and sewage lines, many bridges, and several boat docks. Park officials began emergency

reconstruction of all flood-damaged facilities, and within two years Park crews completed much of the repair work. However, road construction became such an extensive project due to the flood damage that crews continued working long after most other Mission 66 construction was complete. Park Service activity also continued on such projects as the complete reconstruction of facilities at Waterton Ranger Station, expansion of St. Mary campground, additional residences for Park personnel, and other less extensive projects. Park officials then planned to continue further "development" and additional construction projects earlier formulated through Mission 66 planning as well as those incorporated into Glacier's Master Plan.9

While Mission 66 planners appeared to concentrate only on "development" for greater public use, they simultaneously considered the problems of interpretation, protection, and preservation. Lon Garrison, chairman of the Mission 66 steering committee, recommended that Park Service personnel define the intrinsic values in each area of the national park system, and remarked: "The protection and preservation of these values is paramount in all planning."10 Thus, when Glacier's administrative staff defined the Park's values and their objectives in the Master Plan of 1963, they intended, "to preserve all of the park as a natural wilderness except those relatively small portions designated for development of visitor and administrative

As a result, the Park officials confined most Mission 66 construction programs "generally to those areas where initial development already has occurred." Glacier's administrators felt a responsibility to provide "for access and other reasonable needs of visitors" but alleged that "most of the park is relatively undisturbed by man-made intrusions and should remain that way." Regardless of their objectives, the twenty-three million dollar construction program of Mission 66, even though it was primarily confined to already developed areas, tended to overshadow their preservation efforts.

Glacier's officials continued most of the preservation programs of the preceding era. Park wildlife policy, however, began to change as the Park Service personnel increased their research and observation of the wildlife and of the animals' environment. After years of controversy about protecting elk against hunting by the Blackfeet Indians, Park Service biologists and ecologists decided that the range capacity of the St. Mary area was limited to a herd numbering about two hundred. The elk herd, lacking any natural predators, flourished within the Park boundaries and consequently a lack of natural forage resulted. Thus, Park rangers began to reduce the herd in 1955 and 1956, and by a method of "constant harassment," forced the elk to "drift out" of the Park and onto the Reservation where the Indians harvested the surplus animals. Superintendent Emmert estimated

that in 1956 alone over one hundred elk "drifted out" of the Park. Similar elk reduction programs continued during the 1960's. Because of the harassment and the herds' natural movement to winter range outside the boundaries, management specialists prevented the elk herds at Belly River, St. Mary, and along the Middle Fork of the Flathead River from overpopulating, overgrazing, and possible starvation.  

In 1963, the Park officials, realizing the importance of wildlife ecology in Glacier, created a new ranger position devoted entirely to problems of wildlife and fisheries management. As a result, range studies, animal census reports, and intensified biological research aided Park administrators in determining the necessity of reduction programs or increased protection. Similarly, creel census reports, gill netting projects, and various aquatic research programs—combined with the co-operation of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Montana Fish and Game Department—aided Park Service fisheries research and management.

The blister rust control program of the previous two and a half decades continued and expanded during the late 1950's with Forest Service personnel providing supervision. Park crews worked not only at destroying the common currant and gooseberry bushes which provided the intermediate stage of the disease, but also began to treat individual white pine trees with chemical antibiotics.

to combat the rust. By the mid-1960's, Forest Service advisors conducting surveys and examining the effectiveness of the treatments concluded that complete control of the disease was impossible. Thus, in 1966 and 1967, Park officials decreased the blister rust crews, concentrated small control programs in areas along roadsides and in campgrounds where diseased trees were more obvious to Park visitors, and signaled the final stages of one of the more concentrated programs directed to preserve a part of Glacier's primitive ecology for posterity. Similar preservation efforts were more sporadic. One of the few programs of the period occurred in 1957 when Park rangers discovered black-headed budwords attacking Park hemlock stands and, as a result, Forest Service personnel assisted the rangers in surveying and spraying about 6500 acres of land along Going-to-the-Sun highway with DDT. Although no additional control programs were started, Forest Service specialists surveyed other Park areas for mountain pine beetle throughout the period. Park crews also continued destroying exotic plants, such as goatweed, but, in 1966, after several decades of effort, that control program finally ended.

One of the foremost steps toward preservation in Glacier and in almost every other national park occurred on September 3, 1964, when Congressional lawmakers established the National

Wilderness Preservation System. The Wilderness Act, which provided for the Wilderness System, outlined the program's objectives or goals when it stated:

> In order to assure that an increasing population accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions, leaving no lands designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition, is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness.\textsuperscript{19}

That act also defined "wilderness" as an area affected primarily by nature rather than by man, retaining its primeval influence and character, and without permanent improvements or habitation. Also, to achieve wilderness classification, an area needed at least five thousand contiguous acres of land or sufficiently large to make its preservation practicable. Congress added that criteria for an area's classification as "wilderness" include opportunities for primitive or unconfined recreation and "ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value."\textsuperscript{20}

As a result, Park Service personnel in Glacier and other parks began to delineate primitive, roadless areas under their control which would meet the requirements of the Wilderness Act. Glacier's officials hoped to designate two large areas as wilderness: one north and the other south of Going-to-the-Sun highway, and a smaller area, in the southwestern section of the

\textsuperscript{19} United States Statutes At Large, 88th Congress 2nd Session, (1964), 78, p. 890.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., pp. 891-896.
Park encompassing the Apgar range. The officials encountered several problems, however, because Granite Park and Sperry chalets represented "permanent improvements" or structures for "human habitation" within the proposed wilderness boundaries. Some of Glacier's officials felt that chalet areas could be designated as enclaves or islands of development, while other officials advocated a "corridor theory" by proposing imaginary boundaries linking the areas of development near Going-to-the-Sun highway with the isolated chalets. A proposal to build a third chalet in what would be wilderness area also bothered Glacier's administrators. The problems, however, remained unsolved for Glacier's officials because personnel from regional and Washington, D.C., offices failed to consider the wilderness designations by 1967 and no public hearings were held; hence, the wilderness areas in Glacier remained undefined.21 Regardless of departmental machinery, Glacier's officials continued to work for the classification of over sixty-five percent of the Park as primeval wilderness.

The Park Service preservation efforts during the 1960's concerning forestry or wildlife management and with the Wilderness Act, provided a contrast to the earlier "development" programs instituted through Mission 66. The "development" or construction activity of the mid-1950's represented a Park Service response to many public demands. Various critics, both local and outside the region, demanded that facilities in Glacier and in other national parks be improved and complained about the crowded or

unpleasant conditions. In one exposé of the period, critic Charles Stevenson observed many national parks and then derided various concession facilities for their overpriced and shabby conditions, revealed the lack of Park rangers, water and electrical systems, and comfort stations, and complained that revenue allocated to operate the Parks was generally insufficient. After observing the housing conditions for Park Service personnel in several of the parks, he stated: "The underpaid Rangers and their families have to live in shacks, old barns, barracks, and even a former slaughter house." Many individuals blamed Congress for its failure to supply funds for new facilities in the parks. Another critic wrote: "Congress has insisted that the bulk of funds appropriated for construction purposes for highways, many of them leading to the parks." Revealing that after World War II Congress spent nearly eighty percent of the park funds on road improvement and only twenty percent on the improvement of tourist accommodations, Representative (now senator) Lee Metcalf of Montana stated: "The result is that Americans have better, safer, speedier access to deteriorating facilities."  

Local spokesmen agreed that Glacier's tourist accommodations of the 1950's were insufficient. Melvin Ruder, Hungry Horse News editor, exemplified local attitudes when he complained of the old buildings and hotels in the Park and especially of the inadequate

24. Ibid., p. 78.
accommodations on Glacier's west side. Ruder also encouraged
campground improvement including more rest rooms, sewer and
electrical connections for trailer campers, the construction of
showers, and concluded: "More and better campground facilities
are realized as a 'must.'" When Glacier's Mission 66 program
was outlined, Ruder announced: "Finally we have a program for
improvement of Glacier and other national parks. It is a program
to keep pace with the visitor increase." When the Mission 66
program began, Ruder compared construction, appropriations, and
plans for Yellowstone National Park with those for Glacier and
remarked: "We are jealous of Yellowstone [and] of the $3,000,000
new Canyon Village planned to accommodate at least 500 guests and
be opened up in 1957." In 1958, Ruder commented:

There isn't a museum or decent visitor center as
such in the whole of Glacier National Park....
In this respect the federal government treats
Glacier like a second or third class park. The
Department of the Interior and the National Park
Service should be embarrassed."

Reflecting on Mission 66 and the potential improvement for Glacier
Park, Ruder concluded: "One might call Mission 66 a plan for
progress. The past certainly has been hit and miss."

Melvin Ruder merely illustrated the attitudes of various
local and state organizations which also encouraged development.

The advertising section of the Montana Highway Department, the

---

Flathead Boosters, the Montana Chamber of Commerce, and the various local chambers of commerce, all encouraged any Park development that would alleviate crowded tourist accommodations, replace older facilities with new ones, and prepare the Park to meet the expected onrush of tourism.\(^{30}\) Even as late as 1965, however, when most Mission 66 construction was being completed, some individuals continued to express their dissatisfaction with the lack of national park development. One critic, N. M. McKitterick, reviewing the condition of many Western national parks, complained of the lack of tourist accommodations, a lack of publicity about the parks, the inferior quality of food served by most concessionaires, and the poor quality of guides in national parks when compared to European guides. He remarked: "The rangers are much better naturalists, geologists, and historians than they are tourist guides. The Park Service isn't set up to promote tourism."\(^{31}\) Consequently, Park Service personnel in Glacier and many other parks reacted to the advocates of "development" or improvement by continuously reconstructing old buildings and roads and promoting new construction when funds were available.

Simultaneously, the increased preservation efforts of the mid-1960's, exemplified by the Park Service reaction to the Wilderness Act, represented a similar response to public demands; the preservation demands, however, came from the advocates of preservation or from the opponents of the Mission 66 development.

\(^{30}\) Hungry Horse News, 23 August 1960.
\(^{31}\) Nathaniel M. McKitterick, "Perking Up the Nation's Parks," The New Republic, 18 September 1965, pp. 15-16.
After several years of Mission 66 activity, some preservationists began to dispute the validity of more "improvement" programs. Questioning whether the parks were meant to be "resorts or wilderness," one preservationist presented a list of new visitor centers, concession developments, roads, skiing areas, and other "intrusions on the natural scene" resulting from Mission 66, and concluded:

Mission 66 in action shows the trend that is occurring throughout the whole national park and monument system and emphasized the extent to which the taxpayer unknowingly is taking part in the impairment of these masterpieces of nature's handiwork. To popularize and commercialize the national parks is to cheapen them and reduce them to the level of ordinary playgrounds.32

Another preservationist, Frank A. Tinker, writing in the American Mercury, blamed increased development in the National parks on the "newly-liberated citizen" who "comes to the woods not from any compulsion of love or interest, but from idleness or vapid curiosity; not for inspiration but for 'thrills.'"33 The "culprits" responsible for the "abuse" of America's outdoors, Tinker continued, were the "pampered, flattered 'normal' Americans who drive afield in their second mortgaged car to 'damn well get what's coming to them.'"34 He directly criticized Mission 66 programs when he stated: "Public demand today is for blasting roads into the pitifully few remaining wilderness areas, toward increased 'facilities' in present

34. Ibid., p. 97.
Most concerned individuals were not as vehement as Tinker, but many realized that Mission 66 would not solve the parks' problems.

While being disturbed about Mission 66 construction activity, some preservationists also became alarmed about increasing numbers of people visiting the parks. In 1957, David R. Brower, an avid preservationist and a member of the Sierra Club, warned of the potential danger to wilderness areas in both national parks and forests from the greater public use and the "expanding population." Brower felt that the "carrying capacity" of wilderness areas—or the amount of human use an area could withstand and recover naturally, or could withstand without destroying any esthetic value—had to be determined. After an area's "carrying capacity" was specified, Brower felt the pressure of increasing numbers would result in the access to most natural areas being limited or controlled when the "carrying capacity" was reached. Other preservationists also felt that increasing visitation resulted in increased "development" but believed that the American public had a right to recreation. Recreation to many Americans, however, meant being "entertained in comfort" or "to recreate in some exotic setting the situation from which [they have] just escaped." Conservationist Kirke Wilson remarked: "The flood of visitors forces the Park Service into projects which are incongruous with the setting and

35. Ibid., p. 98.
36. David R. Brower, "Wilderness—Conflict or Conscience?" Sierra Club Bulletin, June 1957, p. 10
incompatible with park purpose." The result, preservationist Weldon F. Heald claimed, was that Park officials and Mission 66 planners, being concerned about mass tourism, concentrated "almost wholly on the facility of circulation." In 1961, Heald charged that: "Mission 66 is, in many instances, bringing about the 'urbanization' of the national parks....[where] the visitor is being insulated from contact with the natural thing he has come to see." Heald concluded: "The national parks should be spared so far as possible, from the vandalism of improvement." Thus, Glacier's officials, as well as other Park Service personnel throughout the national park system, faced their own ideal of preservation, the realities of expanding park use, the encouragement to provide increased accommodations, and the demands of preservationists to maintain the parks "unimpaired."

Park officials and public interest groups were not alone in condoning "development" within the Park. Glacier's major concessionaire also encouraged "development" which continued throughout the period. During the late 1950's, however construction was restrained. In 1955, the Glacier Park Company, in accord with the Park Service Master plan, began a limited expansion program by building several cabins in the Swiftcurrent area. When plans for Mission 66 were announced, Park officials noted that the number of hotels was "adequate" but that more

38. Ibid., p. 392.
"lodge and cabin-type units and light housekeeping cabins" would be built. Officials remarked that any new units would be "confined to areas where such development already exists" and concluded that "the provision of such accommodations within the Park will be limited to a considerable extent on how adequately visitors can be served by accommodations supplied by private enterprise in areas immediately adjacent to the Park." Thus, Park officials intended to restrain concessionaire development within Glacier by relying on facilities outside Park boundaries.

In 1957, the Glacier Park Company, eager to be rid of its Park holdings, signed a contract enabling the Knutson Hotel Company to operate its concessions for three years. Officials of the Knutson Company announced plans for renovation and reconstruction of facilities within Many Glacier and Lake McDonald hotels, of older adjacent cabins, and of inadequate water and sewer systems. Very little new or additional construction, however, was attempted.

In 1961, Glacier Park Incorporated, represented by Don Hummel of Tucson, Arizona, purchased the Glacier Park Company holdings and signed a twenty-five year contract with the Park Service. As a result of Hummel's subsequent aggressive "development" policy, more new and improved concession facilities appeared in Glacier between 1962 and 1967 than in the previous three decades. Although the Park Service policy of limiting new accommodations

and relying upon "private enterprise in areas immediately adjacent to the Park" remained in effect, Hummel managed to build the first two complete service stations within Park boundaries, one near Rising Sun and the other in the Lake McDonald hotel area. In 1963, Glacier Park Incorporated began the "modernization" of forty-five cabins at Swiftcurrent near Many Glacier hotel. In 1965, two new coffee shops of similar design appeared near Lake McDonald hotel and at Rising Sun, one built by the Park Service and the other built by Glacier Park Incorporated, but both were operated by the concessionaire. As these construction projects were completed, an extensive program of renovation and repair work continued on the older facilities. Simultaneously, Park Service crews repaired approaches to the hotels, expanded parking facilities, and assisted the concessionaire with flood-damaged buildings in several areas. Glacier's officials, while ignoring their reliance upon "adjacent areas" for facilities, condoned and sustained Glacier Park Incorporated's activity to improve, repair, and expand tourist accommodations within the Park.  

Private land owners, however, received less co-operation from the Park officials. Each year during the period, the Park Service decreased the amount of private land within Glacier's boundaries. In 1956, Glacier's officials estimated that some "three-hundred privately owned residences, motels, stores, and undeveloped tracts" amounted to about four thousand acres of

Intensified acquisition of private land became the policy of the Park Service. Both the Mission 66 program and the Master Plan of 1963 included private land purchasing as an important priority. The Master Plan revealed the Park Service planners' reasoning behind their recommendations, when it stated:

Commercial and residential uses on private land constitute some of the most intrusive and destructive activities within the park. This land covers about 4000 acres of the park and much of it is situated in or near areas of high scenic value. Grazing, airstrips, neon lights, obstructive building groups, and visible utility lines are but a few of the factors which prohibit full enjoyment of the park by the visiting public.

Thus, throughout the period, Glacier's officials appraised, negotiated, purchased, and began some condemnation proceedings on as many inholdings as were available, necessitated immediate purchase to avert development, or were allowable through budgetary allowances. By 1967, the Park officials managed to acquire nearly half of the four thousand acres of private land existing only a decade before.

Some private land owners, however, responded with vehemence to the Park Service policy of land acquisition. Criticizing the Park administrators for occasionally using condemnation proceedings instead of allowing voluntary sale, R. V. Bottomly, a Great Falls (Montana) attorney and a Park land owner, stated:

Land owners in Glacier National Park are also real advocates of the Park and have without exception continued to improve their lands and are highly critical of others who are not as interested in preservation of the beauty and natural bounty of the Park. Sometimes this includes the Park Service.\footnote{Hungry Horse News, 17 November 1967}

Another land owner, James Bose, while building a motel on his property, explained his attitude toward the Park Service, when he stated:

> The private property owners within the park have been harassed by the Park Service which has fabricated a pack of lies. I told the Park Service that I own my property and I do as I damned well please. This place does not harm the scenic view of Glacier Park.\footnote{Great Falls Tribune, 9 May 1968}

Other land owners did not confine their criticism merely to the Park Service land acquisition policy. Charles K. Green, a land owner and realtor dealing in Glacier's private land, eagerly denounced Park officials when two girls were killed by grizzly bears in August, 1967. Green felt that the girls were "sacrificed to the stupid policy 'Let nature take its course' followed by the bureaucrats running our local Glacier Park."\footnote{Hungry Horse News, 18 August 1967.} Criticizing the Park officials for their hesitation before allowing the use of bulldozers to fight a 1967 forest fire, Green announced that they had been "handicapped by stupid regulations set up by the so called conservation groups" and he suggested that the fire itself "was the result of stupid bureaucratic regulations."\footnote{Hungry Horse News, 1 September 1967.}

Regardless of these few outspoken critics of the Park
Service, many land owners realized that their tenure in Glacier was limited. Some gave the Park officials options to purchase their land, while others, such as Burton K. Wheeler, obtained life-lease contracts which permitted the owner and sometimes the owner's children to maintain their acreage in the Park until their death—at which time the land would revert to the government. Thus, most landowners, whether outspoken or silent, realized that the Park Service's procurement of their land was simply a matter of time.

During the late 1950's and early 1960's, Glacier's officials began fully to understand the implications and the dichotomy of use and preservation. Tourism continued to increase; nearly a million visitors travelled through the Park in 1967. At first, Glacier's officials, along with other Park Service planners, encouraged development through Mission 66 to solve the problems of crowded roads, campgrounds, and other accommodations. Later, the Park administrators realized, through the efforts of preservationists and the Wilderness Act, that development had to be restricted and eventually terminated. Subsequently, they began to limit their construction programs and increased their preservation efforts. Critics of the Park Service, however, including both preservationists and the advocates of greater development, continued to promote their own ideals while failing to realize that Glacier's administrators tried to balance the ideals of both extremes and yet faced the realities of managing a national park. Thus, Glacier National Park, while being the end result of
controversy and the stage of conflict for different conservation philosophies, remained the object of visitation for many American and foreign tourists and continued to present them with the "spectacular" mountain scenery and primitive wilderness for which it was noted.
CONCLUSION

In retrospect, Glacier National Park represented the efforts of many individuals who encouraged the ideals or objectives of both national park use and preservation. Congress, however, gave representatives of the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service the primary responsibility for the parks and for the administrative activity within the areas; thus, the general nature or character of one national park reflected the prevalent objectives, policy, and programs applied in most other national parks.

According to Noel D. Eichhorn, the extent to which Glacier and other national parks have remained "unimpaired," is dependent "upon many factors" including "their history, size, location, local political pressures, the ways in which they have been managed, and the uses which have been permitted." Similarly, anyone attempting to compare Glacier with other national parks must examine and consider all of the variables Eichhorn mentioned. Theoretically, national parks reflect many similarities because of general National Park Service policies. Even with that supposed uniformity, however, individual superintendents in various parks have interpreted national park objectives and enforced the policies differently. Thus, the problems which Glacier's administrators faced

with mining, logging, or grazing interests, private land owners, concessionaires, and public demands, are comparable between the various parks only to a degree. Consequently, the study of Glacier's past provides numerous representative examples, situations, and administrative problems which are at best similar to those occurring in other national parks. Before any parallels can be drawn, the uniqueness of each individual national park must be considered.

Soon after the formation of the National Park Service, Director Stephen Mather decided that "safeguarding health and providing recreational facilities" were among the primary objectives of the national parks. Mather's representatives in Glacier adopted his plan to enhance recreational activity and hoped to facilitate tourism by encouraging the construction of hotels, chalets, and campgrounds for tourist accommodations, by providing horse, boating, and hotel concessionaires to cater to the visitors, by promoting better highways to and within the Park, and by later suggesting other "development" or construction to provide for the public.

The Park administrators' activity during the first two and a half decades after Glacier's designation as a national park reveals a concerted effort to popularize and "develop" the area and its recreational resources. Simultaneously, however, Glacier's administrators protected the area from outside interest groups seeking extensive timber, water, and mineral resource utilization.

guarded the Park against poachers and vandals, and began various programs for wildlife and forestry management. They placed greater emphasis, however, on projects directed toward stimulating public visitation; hence, the increased accessibility and the subsequent tourism expected from the construction of Going-to-the-Sun highway and the improvement of other roads and trails became the priority to which administrators devoted most of their energy and much of the annual Congressional appropriations.

After 1933, when most of the initial "development" projects were completed, Glacier's officials continued to emphasize recreation and tourism as essential to the Park's purpose. Construction and development were not stressed again, however, until the late 1950's when Park officials decided that deteriorating highways and tourist facilities could not withstand the anticipated tourism of the future. While the Park Service slackened its construction activity for several decades, preservation programs assumed a more significant role in administrative activity. Beginning in the 1930's, wildlife protection changed from simple control projects to more sophisticated management programs which utilized ecological and biological research and observation; thus Park officials ended the destruction of predators as well as the feeding of more esteemed animals. Park administrators also instigated preservation programs in forest disease and exotic plant control. Finally, Park Service personnel began to emphasize preservation efforts along with recreation when, responding to the Wilderness Act of 1964, they worked to designate over sixty-five percent of Glacier as
"wilderness" to prevent any future development in primitive sections of the Park.

Simultaneously, however, the officials recognized that highways, hotels, campgrounds, and other areas of "development" were necessary to satisfy the "recreation" or use aspect of dual national park objectives. Glacier's administrators, more than any other individual or group interested in the Park, faced the reality that absolute preservation could not co-exist on a practical level with extensive recreational development. Thus, Park Service personnel attempted to balance development or use with preservation as they catered to the vast majority of Glacier's visitors; but Park officials also found that their attempt at a "balance" and their practical management philosophy was at times unsatisfactory to both preservationists and advocates of greater "development."

The foremost shortcoming of Glacier's administrators, however, resulted from their inability to assert all Park Service policies with equal ferocity. After the initial development of the first two and a half decades, Park officials sporadically encouraged construction projects when funds or Federal programs provided the initiative rather than continuing development in an orderly, systematic manner. Similarly, some of Glacier's officials disregarded the general policy of eliminating private land holdings while others, observing general Park Service policies with more obeisance, initiated land acquisition whenever funds became available. Glacier's officials failed to initiate a fundamental standard for the Park to guide its development for recreation or tourism.
and to provide for extensive preservation until the final decade of the period—and then neglected the standards when they desired. Such standards, if formulated earlier in the Park's history, probably would not have satisfied either use advocates or preservationists and would have needed great flexibility to accommodate changing tastes and expectations. Thus, Glacier's administrators reflected the human weakness of inconsistency. Their lack of uniformity in enforcing policies, in providing limits for Park "development," or in demanding a strict preservation policy, led to some antagonism with private landowners, a growing disdain among the idealistic preservationists, and some criticism from individuals demanding more development.

In Glacier, most development projects, whether stimulated by the Park Service or by the concessionaires, reflected an attempt to meet future demands of tourism on the Park. The Great Northern officials, while constructing hotels and chalets in Glacier, expected that tourists would eventually use their facilities and anticipated financial success from their investment. When Park officials planned and constructed Going-to-the-Sun highway, they expected the road to provide access to the Park's interior for future travelers. Similarly, Mission 66 in Glacier represented another attempt to prepare the Park for the predicted mass tourism of the future. Thus, Glacier's officials continually anticipated future demands and responded more than adequately to satisfy the contemporary visitation.
Glacier's officials, however, differed from other national park administrators since Glacier was not inundated with tourists. The post-World War II increase in tourism to most national parks failed to overwhelm Glacier's existing facilities. Administrators in the more popular parks like Yellowstone and Yosemite faced severe problems from overcrowding, overuse, and from resultant damage to natural phenomena caused by sheer numbers of people. Some national park administrators responded to the demands of expanded tourism by utilizing Mission 66 to enlarge tourist facilities, build new highways, and initiate other construction fully to accommodate the vast numbers of tourists. In Glacier, the increase in tourism was slower than expected allowing Park administrators to adjust more easily to the pressures of greater visitation.

Most of Glacier's concessionaires regarded the Park as raw material for their economic prosperity and generally acquiesed to Park Service rules and regulations. The Great Northern Railroad's subsidiary, Glacier Park Hotel Company, provided necessary services and accommodations for Park visitors for over fifty years with practically no significant disputes with Park Service administrators. With only a few exceptions, operators of horse concessions readily complied with Park authorities. The "high density" areas created by the concessionaires were justified when inadequate transportation made alternatives to hotels and chalets

3. Park planners anticipated 1.2 million visitors by 1966 but during that year only 907,893 appeared.
within the Park unrealistic. The areas of development remained generally confined and resulted in a minimal detraction from the natural scene. Since recreation remained an integral part of the national park objective, Glacier's concessionaires provided the necessary accommodations and equipment to facilitate that objective.

Glacier's private landowners, because of the varying location and size of their holdings and because of their individual attitudes toward Park officials, presented a more complex problem for Park Service personnel. Whether a legal homestead, later encompassed by a national park, actually represented as much of an "intrusion" on the wilderness character of the Park as Park Service personnel suggested, remained a mystery. Certainly the government sanctioned hotels, service stations, or visitor centers were also "intrusions." To most Park officials the private land created obvious administrative problems including law enforcement, highway maintenance, and potential development. Park administrators, beginning with Superintendent Logan, decided that the holdings were "intrusive"--some more than others--and promoted land acquisition. Some private landowners resisted Park Service attempts to acquire their holdings but many inholders accepted the inevitability of government purchase and sold their land for as great a profit as possible. The general policy of eliminating inholdings in all national parks as well as the defiant and sometimes critical attitude of a few landowners provided Glacier's officials with ample justification to secure almost all of the private land in Glacier.
In 1967, Glacier National Park displayed the results of over a half century of both use and preservation activity. The actual conflict of use and preservation began when Superintendent Logan started his construction program in 1910 within an area which was to be "unimpaired" and the conflict continued throughout Glacier's history. Early Park officials emphasized development and construction programs and each successive superintendent encouraged additional projects to facilitate Park use. Efforts toward preservation, however, existed simultaneously with the continuous development. The first several administrators recognized preservation only as protection; later officials realized that only biological research and overt management would insure the maintenance of the Park's "wild" characteristics; and more recent officials hoped to curtail "development" and maintain a large portion of Glacier as complete "wilderness."

Obviously not all use of the Park proved detrimental to its natural phenomena. Many types of recreational activity, including sightseeing, hiking, horse riding, boating, swimming, and mountain climbing, required almost no facilities other than the natural features of the Park. Park Service preservation efforts, while easily criticized, could be interpreted as sufficient when the vast amount of "wilderness" still existing in Glacier is compared to the smaller enclaves of development. The fact that most of the Park retained its "wilderness" characteristics, however, was as much due to the very nature of its rugged mountain terrain and the reluctance of tourists to leave the developed areas as it
was a result of the Park Service preservation efforts. The developed areas, such as hotels, campgrounds, and highways, although possibly "intrusive" upon the natural scene, also served to confine the great number of tourists to a small portion of the Park and to protect much of the adjacent natural area. Use of the Park was certainly as much a part of the national park purpose as preservation; hence, Park administrators were undoubtedly justified in encouraging development, recreation, and tourism.

Glacier's administrators attempted to resolve the conflict between preservation and use by balancing the two dichotomous objectives and believed that the satisfaction of individual Park tourists would justify or vindicate their activity. In the past, Glacier's administrators generally maintained a fair balance between the two contradictory objectives. If the visitation trends of the 1960's continue and if the projected travel statistics for the future are realized, however, Glacier National Park will be increasingly difficult to preserve "unimpaired" for the future. Only if the public and the National Park Service considers the very real threats of "urbanization" and of overdevelopment, will greater efforts be made to insure the absolute preservation of Glacier's natural phenomena for posterity.
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