

The Le Conte Memorial Lectures and Park Interpretation—A Historical Account

Karen Merritt

The Yosemite is not only a paradise for the lover of nature, but it contains materials of extraordinary scientific interest which may be interpreted for the public more satisfactorily by lectures given in the valley itself than by any other means.

—*University of California Extension overview of Le Conte Memorial Lectures*

THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION PROGRAMMING IN AMERICA'S NATIONAL PARKS is well-documented.¹ One contributor to this history has, however, been mentioned only in passing: the Le Conte Memorial Lectures offered in Yosemite Valley between 1919 and 1924 by the University of California (UC) Extension, the university's continuing and adult education division. This article will take a closer look at the role of the series in the context of creation of the Free Nature Guide Service in Yosemite in 1920. The Le Conte Memorial Lectures story is doubly revealing in considering how interpretation became a formal feature of national parks. First, it sheds light on how the Sierra Club's fostering of guided nature walks and informative campfire lectures during its annual outings connected via the Le Conte Lectures with park interpretation. Second, it serves as an early case study of the difficulties in sustaining a program dependent on partners with divergent interests. These difficulties would come in two forms: fiscal and educational.

UC faculty, alumni, and friends constituted the leadership of the Sierra Club from its 1892 founding through its first decades. When the National Park Service (NPS) was created in 1916, the university served as the old school tie between Sierra Club and Park Service leadership. Stephen Mather and Horace Albright shared the experience of undergraduate education at UC, as well as Sierra Club membership, with club leaders William Colby and Joseph N. Le Conte, both of whom stood ready to advise Mather and Albright on NPS issues. Goals in these early years were fundamentally the same, in that each organization sought to expand public knowledge of America's scenic treasures and, through that knowledge, build public advocacy for protection and expansion. The old school tie proved an informal link that brought to bear club activism on behalf of the NPS agenda.

The Le Conte Memorial Lectures briefly formalized the connections among the UC, NPS, and Sierra Club in the interest of public education. UC Extension developed the pro-

The George Wright Forum, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 303–322 (2010).

© 2010 The George Wright Society. All rights reserved.

(No copyright is claimed for previously published material reprinted herein.)

ISSN 0732-4715. Please direct all permission requests to info@georgewright.org.

gram, engaged distinguished scientists as speakers, arranged honoraria, and provided an on-site staffer to oversee logistics. The Sierra Club provided a venue—its Yosemite Valley visitor information headquarters, the Le Conte Memorial Lodge, which it finished rebuilding in time for the commencement of the lectures, then improved with the addition of an amphitheater. NPS provided a second venue and increasingly engaged in soliciting direct support of lecturer expenses from the concessionaires and transportation companies. Yet this orderly listing of how responsibilities were divided does not begin to reveal the intricate interactions among the partners.

Concurrent with the Le Conte Lectures, a UC circle, centered on the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology and well-connected with UC Extension, developed the Free Nature Guide Service, the first officially constituted national park educational program. As the Guide Service proved its strong appeal to valley visitors, the Le Conte lectures were treated as a valued contribution to attracting the public. Both ventures grew out of a shared premise that, metaphorically, Yosemite represented a natural outdoor school that could both teach and inspire, by educating visitors to read “the sermons in stone, books in the running brooks.”²² The shared UC connections among the Nature Guide organizers and Yosemite’s first park naturalist were evident as these individuals all contributed to solving unexpected problems faced by the Le Conte lecture staff. Yet these closely allied UC associates would part ways in defining how that public education should be carried out. As early as the beginning of 1918, when the Extension lectures committee proposed the Le Conte Memorial Lectures in Yosemite, the Extension Advisory Board initially resisted, doubting such a recreationally oriented setting was an appropriate one for a lecture series by prestigious scientists and other university faculty.

Inaugural plans for the Le Conte Memorial Lectures

In the spring of 1919, UC Extension introduced a plan for twelve Le Conte Memorial Lectures to be offered free of charge during June and July, primarily in front of the Sierra Club’s Le Conte Memorial Lodge. According to the widely circulated brochure, “The lectures deal with the geology, botany, folk-lore and history of the Yosemite, and all will be illustrated by the magnificent scenic features which have gained world-fame for the giant gorge of the High Sierra. Surely, America can offer no finer ‘outdoor school’ than Yosemite. . . . While dealing in an authoritative way with scientific subjects, the lectures will be popular and not highly technical in character—seeking to interest as well as to instruct. The speakers are all men of recognized standing in their various fields.” Lecturers included U.S. Geological Survey geologist François Matthes, in the midst of his ground-breaking research on the formation of Yosemite Valley and the High Sierra; Willis Linn Jepson, UC’s distinguished botanist, whose *A Flora of California* and *The Trees of California* were definitive; William F. Badè, literary executor of the John Muir estate, professor of theology at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, and, at that time, president of the Sierra Club; and Alfred L. Kroeber, UC’s celebrated anthropologist. Each gave three lectures, respectively, on Yosemite geology, Sierra flowers and trees, John Muir’s ideas and contributions, and Yosemite Indians. As will be seen, the Sierra Club provided much more than just a venue for these speakers.

Early Sierra Club contributions to public education in Yosemite

Three of the first four Le Conte Memorial lecturers—Matthes, Jepson, and Badè—had honed their considerable experience as public educators during the Sierra Club’s annual backcountry outings. In the May 1900 *Sierra Club Bulletin*, Secretary William E. Colby made the first outing proposal, citing the success of the Mazamas and Appalachian Clubs in organizing member treks, but also setting apart the Sierra Club plan by suggesting educational aims. Colby encouraged prospective participants to read John Muir’s *Mountains of California* and Joseph Le Conte’s *Journal of Ramblings Through the High Sierras*,³ and noted that both men would likely participate in the outing. Le Conte’s *Ramblings* foreshadowed what Sierra Club members might expect. Written by UC’s most celebrated scientist and beloved founding faculty member, *Ramblings* described an 1870 trip to Yosemite Valley and the Sierra high country in the company of a fellow faculty member, eight of the university’s first 38 students, and, for part of the trip, John Muir. *Ramblings* included summaries of Le Conte’s campfire lectures on the scientific phenomena that the party had seen during the day. Typically, he appealed to his listeners’ sensory memory of what they had experienced during the day, then explained the science behind the natural phenomena. For the proposed 1901 outing, Colby solicited the participation of scientists from UC, Stanford University, and other institutions to offer campfire talks on the scientific phases of the trip. As Colby remarked, “This feature alone will make the trip an extremely desirable one.”

The annual outings proved immensely popular, with parties of 200 or more members joining in each year. The educational focus continued. The 1915 outing announcement, for example, noted that a special feature of the trip would be campfires with lectures, stories, talks, music, and singing, drawing on the talents of outing participants. The announcement could confidently state that “interesting and instructive talks will be given by men of science familiar with the trees, flowers, birds, animals and geology of the region.” Matthes, Jepson and Badè, an amateur natural scientist, had all been among those “men of science,” not only giving guided walks and campfire talks, but publishing accounts of their discoveries in the *Sierra Club Bulletin*. In a word, what was fundamentally a social event designed to bind together the club membership in the interest of advocacy for Sierra preservation continued to have an educational purpose that set it apart from trekking in other American alpine clubs. Beginning in 1905, Stephen Mather was a drop-in participant during numerous Sierra Club outings. As early as 1912, at an outing during which Jepson guided walks and lectured at campfires, Mather gave his own campfire talk on national parks (Farquhar 1973, 177)—an auspicious choice of topic, given his subsequent career.

The Le Conte Memorial Lodge in front of which most of the inaugural Le Conte lectures were given had also made early contributions to public education. While Yosemite Valley was still under the jurisdiction of the state of California, the state oversight commission contracted with the Sierra Club to establish in 1898 a visitor information headquarters in an existing valley cottage. In 1903, the club raised funds to build a new headquarters adjacent to Camp Curry as a memorial to Joseph Le Conte, who had been a charter member and officer. Over succeeding years, custodians of the Le Conte Memorial Lodge would provide visitor information, host lectures and wildflower shows, and themselves give informative talks and guided walks. The lodge housed a herbarium and other museum-like displays, plus a

library. While other national parks hosted various and largely unofficial examples of guided walks, talks, museums, general information services, and publications, the Sierra Club was notable in pioneering the full suite of educational activities that would be formally piloted in Yosemite for NPS during the 1920s at Mather's instigation.

1919: A watershed year

The year in which the Le Conte Memorial Lectures were launched was seminal in the development of Park Service programming that started with the Free Nature Guide Service in Yosemite. Central to this effort was Stephen Mather. Recovered from a recent bout of illness and back at work as NPS director, Mather both lent his support to the Le Conte Memorial Lectures and spent the early summer personally recruiting the men who would pilot public education for NPS, all while preparing to resume his Sierra high country camping trips for influential men from politics, business and the media—a reprise of the Mather Mountain Party of 1915.

Meantime, the Sierra Club expressed support for Mather's plans for educational development in the parks by publishing in the January 1919 issue of the *Sierra Club Bulletin* the May 13, 1918 letter from Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane to Mather, which included the following admonition:

The educational, as well as recreational, use of the national parks should be encouraged in every practicable way. University and high-school classes in science will find special facilities for their vacation-period studies. Museums containing specimens of wild flowers, shrubs, and trees, and mounted animals, birds, and fish native to the parks, and other exhibits of this character will be established as authorized.

As Barry Mackintosh has chronicled, Congress was not prepared to fund such activities. The Park Service would depend heavily on external support, with a substantial element of volunteerism, to get education in the parks started. What NPS leadership could give was encouragement—and helping hands. Thus, UC Extension Assistant Director F.F. Nalder assured François Matthes that Mather “expressed his hearty sympathy with the Le Conte Memorial course and offered to make the assistance of the NPS available for it in every possible way.”⁴ Nalder also commented that the Sierra Club would provide special assistance in the form of publicizing the lectures.

Mather's promise was fully realized in 1919 and the years thereafter. In a subsequent letter (dated May 27, 1919) to Matthes, Nalder described Yosemite Superintendent W.B. Lewis's personal help in locating suitable venues, including making arrangements for lighting and seating facilities at the Le Conte Memorial Lodge and providing equipment for the illustration of lectures with slides. Further, Lewis gave assistance in publicity and saw to it that the road by the Lodge was clear of traffic while the lectures were in progress.⁵ Horace Albright, working cooperatively with Nalder, arranged for NPS to help with transportation from El Portal to Yosemite Valley and living expenses in the valley for the lecturers and an on-site UC Extension coordinator.⁶ By the end of the series, Nalder declared that “I think it may be said that the course was a pronounced success.”⁷ Lecture attendance usually ranged

from 200 to 425, with Badè's July 4 lecture on John Muir's service to the nation attracting 1,500.⁸ Mather attended the July 12 Kroeber lecture, next to last of the Le Conte series, "and expressed a most cordial interest in the course."⁹

While the backcountry camping trip with men of influence was Mather's principal focus, his attendance at the Kroeber lecture and verbal support of the Le Conte "course" represented only the first phase in spearheading public education in Yosemite. Between two visits to the Sierra Club outing at Soda Springs in Tuolumne Meadows, Mather drove to Lake Tahoe where he had arranged to meet his distinguished camping trip recruits on July 20—and not incidentally, where he would act as recruiter of his own educators to initiate interpretive services in Yosemite.

He had as background for these activities correspondence from Joseph Grinnell, director of UC's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology; from Grinnell's enthusiastic friend of many years, Sacramento businessman C.M. Goethe, lately founder and promoter of the California Nature Study League; and at the National Research Council in Washington, D.C., the reinforcing advocacy of UC paleontology professor John C. Merriam, a long-time Grinnell colleague, beginning what would be a fifteen-year advisory role to promote educational programming in the parks. In a letter to Mather dated June 6, 1919, Grinnell posed the idea of a resident naturalist, a position that he had first suggested toward the end of a 1916 *Science* article (Grinnell and Storer 1916, 379). To launch such a position, he recommended his colleague Harold C. Bryant and Loye Holmes Miller of the State Normal School in Los Angeles, both of whom he and Merriam had supervised during their doctoral degree work. On June 12, 1919, Merriam wrote to Grinnell that he had received a copy of the June 6 letter to Mather, noting that it had come "at a good time as I know that Mr. Mather and Mr. Albright are greatly interested in the development of scientific and education work" in the parks. With plans to see the two shortly, Merriam promised to speak to them about Grinnell's idea.

The UC careers of Grinnell and Merriam had been intertwined by research circumstances and a shared outlook on public education. Both were dedicated field scientists befitting the university's strong tradition of description and systematics. Grinnell was an ornithologist and mammalogist whose work included wildlife studies, among which was the first comprehensive Sierra wildlife assessment in a transect that included Yosemite National Park. Merriam was a paleontologist, the first to bring that field of study to bear on a variety of sites in the American West. Both searched for the overarching interconnectedness of living things, present and past. Both were animated by the well-established image of nature as a book to be read and understood through the tools of field science. Reflecting the strong preference of Grinnell and Merriam for learning directly from nature, Bryant, Miller, and Ansel F. Hall, Yosemite's first ranger-naturalist, would build programs that favored field-based over institutional learning and that encouraged visitors to appreciate the interconnections among the phenomena that they were seeing. In their subsequent positions in the NPS hierarchy, Bryant and Hall would carry this approach to interpretation into the entire national park system.

Merriam's research patron, Annie M. Alexander, recruited Grinnell to found the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, which she underwrote, in 1908. In 1909, Grinnell established a

lecture series, open to the public, to showcase the museum's research results; and Merriam was instrumental in establishing a universitywide distinguished researcher lecture series for the general public. In recruiting future UC president W.W. Campbell as a lecturer, Merriam offered his view of what constituted an appropriate lecture for the general public: the lecturer should present results of his recent original research in the simplest possible form consistent with a satisfactory statement of evidence.¹⁰ In Merriam's view, the national parks presented "an extraordinary venue for adult education." (Mark 2005, 23) The Le Conte Memorial Lectures mirrored a philosophy of taking research to the public that Grinnell and Merriam had fostered in earlier years, and it is not surprising that both were recruited for stints as Le Conte lecturers.

Another shared philosophy centered on the role of museums in public education. For both, public lectures conveying up-to-date scientific knowledge should be backed up by well-designed museums, though it should be noted that the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology was designed for researchers rather than the general public. In the public realm, Grinnell and Merriam were variously involved in the affairs of the California Academy of Sciences and the Oakland Museum. During that watershed year of 1919, they worked together to promote Albright's and Mather's interest in national park museum development. Grinnell conducted Albright through the California Academy of Sciences exhibits, expounding his philosophy of what national park museums should be and do.¹¹ Merriam promised to urge Mather to take a similar tour with Grinnell.¹² Museums were a central feature of the interrelated suite of public education services that Bryant, Miller, and Hall would pilot in Yosemite and elsewhere in the park system. Under the mentorship of Grinnell and Merriam, Bryant, Miller, and Hall brought scientific and research expertise that expanded the scope and raised the professionalism of these services. The Yosemite museum would serve as a headquarters for the growing public education programming in Yosemite, and Grinnell and Merriam would continue to give material assistance to this effort in other national parks as well as Yosemite.

On June 27, 1919, Mather sent a warm response to Grinnell's proposal for a resident naturalist, finding it a splendid idea to have scientific information disseminated among visitors to replace the current haphazard communications. Mather promised to consult with Assistant Director Albright on the red tape, observing that civil service approval might be required. It was, and by the time Mather met Bryant, the position had been approved.¹³

Between July 19 and 21, Mather made contact with both Bryant and Miller. Mather had been urged by Goethe to meet Bryant at Lake Tahoe, where he was experimenting with a program of evening talks and guided daytime walks at several area resorts under the joint auspices of the California Fish and Game department and the California Nature Study League, repeating a program that he had tried out in Yosemite the year before. Mather asked Bryant to go at once to Yosemite and start something like the Tahoe program (Bryant and Drury 1964, 7ff.). Initially, Bryant refused and referred Mather to Loye Miller, who was camping with his family near the lodge at Fallen Leaf Lake. The lodge owner invited campers to give impromptu talks during evenings and Miller recollected that Mather overheard him there doing a talk which featured imitation of bird calls. Mather followed up with a telephone call and meeting, asking Miller to go to Yosemite for the rest of the summer as a naturalist guide. (In 1917, Miller, like Bryant, had used Yosemite Valley as an educational setting, offering a

course in ornithology for school teachers.) Miller told Mather that he needed proper preparation, which meant not starting the guide service until the summer of 1920. (Miller 1970, 15ff.). By early 1920, responding to active recruitment by both Goethe and Grinnell, Bryant and Miller had agreed to begin a nature guide service together.

1920: Public education from three angles

Beginning in June, 1920, visitors to Yosemite had three ways in which to enrich their vacation experience with a better understanding of the natural phenomena around them. The brochure for the 1920 Le Conte Memorial Lectures now described them as an annual event and announced that Joseph Grinnell and John C. Merriam would be among the four lecturers that year. Bryant launched the Free Nature Guide Service, still under the auspices of California Fish and Game and the California Nature Study League. Loye Miller joined him for a month, starting in mid-June. The two men variously offered three evening lectures per week at the resorts and Government Pavilion, shorter campfire talks, guided nature walks for adults and children, and information desk services for visitors.

A third and key initiator of public education programming was Ansel F. Hall, beginning in June his assignment as Yosemite's first park naturalist. A 1917 UC forestry graduate, where he had also studied with Grinnell, Hall had served as a ranger in Sequoia National Park and had done military service during World War I. Hall would establish park publications, including the 1921 *Handbook of Yosemite National Park*, to which Le Conte Memorial lecturers and Mather contributed; guidebooks on Sequoia and Yosemite; and, beginning in 1922, the periodical *Yosemite Nature Notes*. He also oversaw creation of a new, professionally designed, museum, with assistance from the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology and support from the university in the form of a campus office and workshop. Beginning in 1920, the UC old school tie would engage Hall, Bryant, and Miller in helping to solve problems that arose from the second-year Le Conte Memorial Lectures.

The lectures indeed needed help. While the matter of venue had been improved with completion of a new amphitheater at the Le Conte Memorial Lodge, a joint project of the Sierra Club and Yosemite park staff, the second year did not run as smoothly as the first. While Bryant took pains to support the Le Conte series through publicizing them widely and postponing Nature Guide lectures that might present competition, attendance, which ranged from 50 to 200, disappointed UC Extension.¹⁴ The seating capacity at the Government Pavilion partly accounted for the limitation on numbers.¹⁵ However, with the great post-World War I increase in automobile tourism in Yosemite, Extension's expectations might not have been that unrealistic. A wreck on the Yosemite railroad line prevented Merriam from delivering his first scheduled lecture. Miller stepped in with a substitute lecture on birds and Merriam condensed his two lectures into one to compensate.¹⁶

1921–1924: Difficulties accumulate

At the beginning of 1921, UC Extension made a unilateral decision to discontinue the Le Conte lectures, citing expense and a shortage of funds. As Lectures Department Secretary Ethel Strohmeier would later write to Superintendent Lewis, the lectures cost a lot. To be worth the expenditure, each should attract an attendance of at least 500 to 600.¹⁷ Extension's action brought a quick and pained response from the NPS. As a February 16, 1921, memo

to the file records, Mather “earnestly” requested that the series be continued. Strohmeier suggested that the lectures might continue if Mather would supply the funds necessary from a combination of Park Service resources and contributions raised from the railroad companies, concessionaires and the public.¹⁸

There was considerable irony in Strohmeier’s proposal. At the beginning of 1919, when the Extension Committee on Lectures proposed the Le Conte Memorial Lecture series, there was a negative initial response from the Extension Advisory Board. Some members evidently worried that the lectures would be misattributed to the concessionaires and thus lack suitable university gravitas. Perhaps anticipating such a roadblock, the Extension’s assistant director had conferred in advance with board member Merriam, who was, not surprisingly, enthusiastic about the Le Conte idea. Merriam not only steered the board toward approving the lectures, he also followed up with his “very close friends” Mather and Albright to secure NPS support, as well as approaching the Sierra Club for their cooperation.¹⁹ The assistant director could shortly report that Merriam had secured Albright’s promise that NPS would “give our lecture course enormous publicity and, what will doubtless most win the approval of the Advisory Board here . . . control the interest of the concessionaires . . . so as to avoid any offensive effort . . . to use them for purposes of their own.”²⁰

Be that as it may, Ansel Hall was ready to help drum up financial support from the concessionaires, and in March began what for the next four years would be an arduous fundraising campaign on behalf of the lectures. He arranged a meeting between T.E. Farrow, the manager of the Yosemite National Park Company, and Extension Director Leon Richardson, who explained that if transportation and accommodations could be covered, the lectures could continue.²¹ On March 9, 1921, Yosemite’s Acting Superintendent E.P. Leavitt wrote to Farrow, thanking him for picking up requested expenses and commenting, “We feel that the Le Conte Memorial Lectures will be the means of making Yosemite Park more popular each year and any help from these lectures or publicity through them will redound to the benefit of the Concessioners in the Park as well as to the Government.”

The 1921 lecture series went forward, drawing audiences that ranged from 200 to 300, total attendance increasing by more than 1,000 in comparison with 1920. Bryant and Miller returned to continue the Free Nature Guide Service, co-sponsored by California Fish and Game and Yosemite National Park, and helped out with the lectures as needed. As Strohmeier wrote to Helen Spalding in the Southern California UC Extension office, “[Loye Miller and Harold Bryant] have been splendid in promoting our work and we greatly appreciate this. . . .”²² Mather’s *Annual Report* commented, “It is to be hoped that [the Le Conte Memorial Lectures] will be continued, forming as they do a most important part of the park educational program.”²³

So they did, with 1922 representing a high-water mark for Le Conte Memorial Lecture attendance as well as expansion of other educational initiatives in the national parks. As visitation in Yosemite reached 100,000,²⁴ attendance at the Le Conte lectures ranged between 250 and 600 and totaled 4,600, the series’ best year. Bryant took sole charge of the Nature Guide Service, still on the California Fish and Game payroll, and he and his guides reached nearly 40,000 visitors. Hall’s new museum was now open to the public, though it would require a grant from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation to build an adequate facili-

ty. All educational activities were now consolidated under Hall's supervision.²⁵ Similar services had been initiated in parks beyond Yosemite and Yellowstone.²⁶ In Sequoia National Park, Judge Walter Fry created a volunteer nature guide service and wrote nature notes, with a wildflower show pointing the way to museum development.²⁷ In Glacier National Park, Montana State University initiated a free nature guide service, and one was begun in Rainier National Park as well.²⁸

However, the cost-sharing arrangements with the concessionaires and transportation companies that had allowed the Le Conte lectures to continue had caused numerous headaches in both 1921 and 1922. W.L. White, general manager of the Yosemite Valley Railroad, at first balked at the donation requested of his company, citing legal prohibitions.²⁹ Farrow replied with a summary of Curry Company and Horseshoe Line agreements, observing, "I am not sure if you appreciate the caliber of men participating in these lectures; and the influence they would have in directing business." Lodging arrangements hit snags, too. Camp Curry and Yosemite Lodge had agreed to split the four lecturers between them for room and board. However, three of the four wanted to stay at the Lodge and Extension had to resolve the matter with the lecturers.³⁰

Lewis's attempt to find a venue at which attendance could be increased foundered. As he wrote to Strohmeier on April 29, 1921, both the Yosemite National Park Company and Curry Company had made their own plans for entertainment. As Curry Company president Mrs. David A. Curry would point out, Camp Curry's evening entertainment programs were a popular draw for guests.

That Camp Curry evening campfire programs were the best organized, eclipsing those of competing commercial camps in Yosemite, is well documented (see, for example, Sargent 1975; Greene 1987; De Mars 1991). When Indiana schoolteachers David and Jessie Curry launched Camp Curry in 1899, David used evening campfires to pass along what he was learning about Yosemite natural history and called on guests with expert knowledge or talents to share them with the other guests (Sargent 1975, 29). In 1912, for example, Curry asked guests John Muir and Stanford's entomologist Vernon L. Kellogg—both of whom were regulars on Sierra Club annual outings—to give campfire talks on Yosemite topics (Sargent 1975, 41) With institution of the Free Nature Guide Service, Bryant and Miller gave interpretive talks at no charge several nights a week at Camp Curry and other Yosemite resorts.

By the advent of the Le Conte lectures, Camp Curry's evening programs included paid entertainers such as a widow who did monologues in Irish, Negro, Yankee and Indiana farmer dialects; a "popular lecturer" who also personally guided daily hikes to points of interest; a pianist who played melodies by request; a baritone who sang ballads; and, in addition, the Glacier Point firefall and dances accompanied by a jazz band. It is likely that the miscellaneous—and largely non-expert—character of these entertainments was the source of the UC Extension Advisory Board's worries that the Le Conte lectures would be misappropriated by the concessionaires and seen as entertainment rather than serious university work.

Given this history, the Curry Company offered to give up one hour in an evening for a Le Conte lecturer, but no more. Strohmeier replied that this would not be satisfactory³¹ and the lectures continued to alternate between the Le Conte Memorial Lodge and Government Pavilion. Between the lines, one reads UC Extension's refusal to subordinate their distin-

guished speakers to popular entertainers.

Planning for the 1922 Le Conte Memorial Lectures hit a curious, perhaps revealing, bump. With his return to summer school teaching in Berkeley, Miller volunteered to do a set of Le Conte lectures on his area of research expertise, California fossil animals, with the endorsement of UC Extension's Helen Spalding.³² On January 18, 1922, Strohmeier replied that "while I think very highly of him, I believe it would be a mistake for us to schedule him for one of the groups of the Le Conte Lectures. He and Dr. Bryant are both lecturing in the Valley all summer and it does not seem advisable to ask them to speak for us." Strohmeier was in error about Miller's participation in nature guiding; and that summer, his Le Conte lectures attracted robust audience numbers. However, Strohmeier's resistance to blurring the line between the Le Conte lectures and Nature Guide Service echoed Extension Advisory Board doubts and would be a foregrounded issue during the attempt to revive the lectures in the late 1920s.

Hall paid a visit to Strohmeier in early 1922 to discuss subjects of potential interest to valley visitors, evidence of his attention to all phases of educational programming in Yosemite.³³ However, the solicitation of concessionaire contributions was running into increasing problems, as the rather testy exchange of correspondence in 1922 demonstrated. Mrs. Curry complained about the demand for long-term bungalow housing by Extension's on-site coordinator during the height of the tourist season: she assumed—incorrectly—that the Nature Guide Service was responsible for Le Conte lecture logistics. She added, "I feel that considering what both you and we do in the way of entertainment for our guests, that while these lectures are an additional attraction, they are hardly patronized sufficiently to put upon us the burden of their expense, since I believe it is much more largely the private camping element that attends these than it is those who are stopping either at the Lodge or at Camp Curry. It is only a matter of patriotism to the general cause of what is good for Yosemite that I feel we should be called upon to handle the expenses in this way."³⁴ (Note Mrs. Curry's characterization of the Le Conte lectures as an entertainment and an attraction.) However, the Curry Company continued to cover, if reluctantly, 32% of on-site costs. The Yosemite Valley Railroad and the Horseshoe Route refused to cover the requested 10% per company of total expenses, though both were willing to refund lecturer fares. The Yosemite National Park Company continued to pay the balance, including remaining transportation costs.³⁵

Problems continued, fraying nerves all around. By the end of the summer, Strohmeier was insisting on a new business model. Each contributing concessionaire should be prepared to pay a lump sum to cover a portion of the costs estimated by Extension, using Superintendent Lewis's office as intermediary; lecturer reimbursements would be made through Extension.³⁶ This arrangement appeared to be acceptable, and on May 28, 1923, Superintendent Lewis forwarded checks totaling \$500 to Strohmeier.

The lectures appeared to run more smoothly in 1923. Strohmeier called the on-site coordinator's attention to the help available from Superintendent Lewis—"...he is an extremely busy man, yet pleasant and courteous at all times"—from Bryant, particularly with publicity, and at the Le Conte Memorial Lodge, "Be sure and call on [Lodge Custodian] Ansel Adams . . . as he can give you considerable assistance on the evenings that lectures are held [there]. For the past few years he has been there representing the Sierra Club which

owns the Lodge and keeps it open all summer for the convenience of guests in the Valley.”³⁷ The coordinator noted Hall’s help in projecting slides and Bryant’s help in meeting a lecturer’s train and introducing him to the lecture audience.³⁸ One senses a note of pride in Strohmeier’s letter to a Le Conte lecturer when she wrote, “Dr. Bryant’s nature guide work and the LeConte Memorial Lectures constitute the educational work being done in the Park. The Government has not only strived to increase this work in Yosemite National Park but to extend the same type of educational service to the other National Parks throughout the United States.”³⁹

Nevertheless, the overall attendance had fallen back to the 1921 level and clearly the question of the cost to Extension had again come to the fore. On February 28, 1923, Richardson sent an inquiry to a range of people with an interest in the Le Conte lectures—former Le Conte lecturers and C.M. Goethe among them—asking whether cost justified their continuation. Goethe’s enthusiastic “Yes!” was likely typical of the response. Joseph Grinnell’s response was even more pointed: though the audience may be small, “it is a *select* attendance, by people of intellectual discrimination far above what I suppose to be the average of those attending the usual Extension lectures.”⁴⁰

Strohmeier’s 1923–24 Lectures Department annual report to Richardson noted that the planned 1924 Le Conte lectures represented “somewhat a departure from those given in previous years.” She continued, “There is wide diversification of opinion as to what the lectures should include. Those with direct interests in the Valley a part of whom are developing the nature guide work, feel quite strongly that the lectures should always deal with natural history . . . while still another group, which seems to represent the majority, believe attendance would be materially increased if timely subjects of more general interest were presented.” Accordingly, a reduced program of nine lectures would be given on the topics “Literature of the Sierra,” “America’s Place in the World,” and “Psychology and Human Living”—only the first topic having any connection with Yosemite. The “outdoor school” idea that had animated the first years of the lectures and bound them philosophically to the public education efforts promoted by Grinnell and Merriam and their students was lost through UC Extension’s decision.

Attendance at the 1924 lectures plunged. The Extension site coordinator, Boyd B. Rakestraw, sounded the warning that the new direction in lecture topics had been a serious misstep: “It is difficult to work up interest in outside subjects when one is so close to nature. While Dr. Lehman’s lectures [on Sierra literature] do appeal, the interest in the others is particularly difficult to develop here. With the exception of a few who live here . . . the people here are interested in the valley and the Sierra and lectures along those lines would have more appeal.”⁴¹ Competing entertainment at the camps did not help. For example, though the Nature Guide Service was working hard to publicize the lectures, one Le Conte lecturer had to compete with Camp Curry’s evening of “high class entertainment,” a trio of musicians from the Los Angeles Philharmonic.⁴²

On July 1, Strohmeier wrote to Superintendent Lewis, asking his opinion on general versus natural science topics. He, in turn, solicited the views of the valley concessionaires, replying to Strohmeier on July 7 that there was “an adversity of opinion” on general topics. The Yosemite National Park Company’s traffic manager, H.H. Hunkins, was blunt: the com-

pany would support future Le Conte Memorial Lectures only if they were on subjects related to Yosemite National Park. On a more conciliatory note, he added that for such a program, his company would eliminate competing entertainment on nights of the lectures.⁴³ Harold Bryant spoke to company manager T.E. Farrow and found that he, too, was in a conciliatory mood: the Yosemite National Park Company and Curry Company should cooperate more than they had in the past to support the lectures, both venues should host lectures, and competing entertainment should be suspended. However, Bryant added, “Sentiment thus far seems to have been less favorable to the present series than in the past apparently on account of the subject material.”⁴⁴ While Mrs. Curry wrote that she had heard good things about the year’s lectures, “people, while in the valley, are especially interested in valley subjects in a way that they would not be perhaps at any other time, and it is therefore the psychological moment to impress them with the importance of the work here.”⁴⁵

The lectures come to an end

On April 24, 1925, Strohmeier informed Lewis that UC Extension was discontinuing the Le Conte Memorial Lectures, given funding reductions: “After offering these lectures for the past six years we feel that we have had a real part in promoting education in the Valley and we sincerely hope that you will find it possible to substitute something to take their place. Doctor Bryant’s excellent work has . . . become so well established that the Leconte lectures will probably be less missed than they would have been a few years ago when educational work in the Valley was in its infancy.” She added that Lewis’s extensive support had made it possible to keep the series going for six years. Lewis’s disappointment was palpable in subsequent correspondence, Ansel Hall conferred with both Extension and the park, and Extension Director Richardson conferred with Merriam, now president of the Carnegie Institute in Washington, D.C., and sent him a report on the lectures, including statistics on attendance.⁴⁶ However, the lectures were not revived.

In 1928, a final appeal to resume the lectures came directly from Merriam—who in that year was appointed chair of the Committee on Study of Educational Problems in National Parks, of which Bryant was a member—to UC President W.W. Campbell. Citing his own recent discussions with Campbell, as well as a letter from Hall, Merriam asserted, “I have been making a careful study of possibilities of education of the highest type through utilization of the National Parks and have the feeling that the Le Conte memorial lectures represent in many respects one of the most important and distinguished constructive efforts for utilization of the National Parks for educational purposes.” Merriam added that he had been corresponding with Stephen Mather regarding “a study of Yosemite Valley with special reference to utilization of this great feature primarily for its highest purpose. Mr. Mather is in full sympathy with the proposal. . . . The Le Conte memorial lectures would help somewhat in leading the way.”⁴⁷ Campbell looked for outside funding, writing on February 20 to Charles A. Thompson, president of the Native Sons of the Golden West, to see whether the organization would provide financial help to restart the lectures. The new NPS director, Horace Albright, continued in 1929 to urge Campbell to resume them.

In letters directed to President Campbell, Extension Assistant Director Rakestraw and Ansel Hall, from his position as Chief Naturalist for the NPS, offered a point-counterpoint

insight into what had made the university–Yosemite partnership fiscally difficult to sustain. Rakestraw complained that it was hard to find lecturers with pertinent research backgrounds; because they offered most of their research in their first lecture, it was not desirable to invite them again. Concessionaire entertainment and jazz programs competed with the lectures, and encouragement of patrons to attend the lectures was half-hearted. The bottom-line issue was that relative to cost, attendance did not compare with that at other Extension lecture series. However, if costs would be handled by others, such as NPS, the lectures could resume “as a contribution to the study of nature and to the general enlightenment on scientific subjects.”⁴⁸ In rebuttal, Hall wrote that he had solicited funding from the concessionaires at great personal effort, not an ideal way to support the lectures. Echoing Grinnell, he noted that the lectures had been attended by a “select audience,” that returning visitors cited the lectures as a reason for their return, and that the increase in park visitation in recent years would assure greater attendance at the lectures. Further, while the “jazz element” had been a problem in the past, NPS was trying to eliminate it. Donald Tresidder, currently president of the merged Curry and Yosemite National Park Company concessions, would likely eliminate competition with the lectures and, with the Park Service, would cooperate in every way. Hall concluded, “During the past five years, the educational activities of the NPS in Yosemite National Park have gained enormous impetus so that now almost every visitor to Yosemite is served by Government ranger naturalists at the museum, on Government field trips, and popular commercialized lectures, etc. We find that the public is now demanding such service and are sure that the reestablishment of the LeConte Memorial Lectures would again be the finest feature of the educational program during the entire season.”⁴⁹

Another confounding factor lay behind the difficulty in reviving the Le Conte lectures. The original circle centered in the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology had come to an unacknowledged but decisive split in how they viewed what was the most effective approach to delivering public education in the parks. That split would be reflected by Grinnell himself during the final discussion of whether to revive the Le Conte lectures, as discussed below. Merriam, too, came to part company with NPS over the issue of public education. As president of the Carnegie Institute, he had directed funding toward both research and museum development in the parks during the 1920s. At the height of his influence on park leadership, he persuaded Mather to advance Merriam’s contention that the primary purpose of national parks was to serve as America’s “super-universities.” In his view, educational programs in each park should be guided by a chief naturalist with university research and faculty experience. But by the 1930s, as park leadership changed and Merriam’s influence waned, he bitterly identified the Park Service’s primary goal as becoming, not the steward of America’s super-universities, but the “Super-Department of Recreation” (Mark 2005, 106–107, 113, 121).

For his part, Bryant increasingly found standard university science training inadequate for the kind of public education in development across the national parks. By 1925, he had come to the conclusion that formal university training was insufficient background for effective nature guides. Carrying on the early and animating metaphor of Yosemite as an outdoor school, Ansel Hall’s *Yosemite Nature Notes* had asserted that “The [Nature Guide] Service probably forms the largest trail school in the world, and trail school it is for people who are

led to study nature, not out of books or in a laboratory, but first hand.” The next issue added that school teachers vacationing in Yosemite were turning the Park Service “into a regular summer school,” looking to the guides for resources to take what they were learning into their own schools. The Museum of Vertebrate Zoology helped out by creating a list of books on natural history of the West. The nature guide’s motto, adapted from Goethe’s California Nature Study League, was to teach visitors “to read nature as a book.”⁵⁰

In February 1925, Bryant announced establishment of the School of Field Natural History to train teachers of nature study and nature guides, with “stress . . . upon first-hand information from the living thing itself rather than upon printed or spoken words, although these also play a part.”⁵¹ Bryant defined how public education in Yosemite should be focused in the following way: “Every summer vacationist wants to be able to identify interesting forms of life encountered. . . . Biology as taught in the average high school and college does not emphasize field study; and as a consequence there are few persons who are able to recognize, name and properly study living things along a trailside.”⁵² With Bryant in charge of the school, faculty in the early years included such nature guides as Enid Michael, a Loye Miller student and former school teacher; university faculty such as UC entomologist E.O. Essig, who also taught a university summer class in Yosemite (the school was planned to coincide with UC’s summer session); current schoolteachers such as M.B. Nichols of Oakland Technical High School; and researchers such as the Carnegie Institute’s paleontologist Ralph Works Chaney. When Grinnell student George Melendez Wright joined Yosemite as a ranger naturalist, he too would teach for the school.⁵³ Yet, as will be seen, even the involvement of Grinnell’s students failed to impress him that nature guides were other than science popularizers, an irony given his own advice in 1919 to Mather that the proposed resident naturalist should take out bird classes in the afternoon and give evening talks on local natural history, including birds, mammals, reptiles, fish, forests and flowers,⁵⁴ an echo of what the Sierra Club promised in announcements of its annual outings.

The lectures are not revived

The final chapter on the Le Conte Memorial Lectures was written by a committee appointed by President Campbell. Among its members were Joseph Grinnell and Willis Linn Jepson, with Rakestraw acting as chair and likely as drafter of the committee’s report. The committee concluded their business in a single meeting on August 16, 1929. Rakestraw’s odd notion that lecturers should not be asked twice was rejected by the committee. However, a sensitivity—or arrogance—about the Le Conte lectures vis-à-vis the Nature Guide Service was inescapably evident in the language of the draft report. The committee asserted that the lectures should be real contributions based on first-hand scientific investigation, “delivered in a dignified manner [to] raise the standards of the current popular type of ‘nature’ lecture,” and not just a supplement to the Nature Guide Service. While resumption of the lectures “would not be undesirable,” the growth of the Nature Guide Service may have lessened “the need for lectures of the type of the LeConte Memorial Lectures.” If continued, a 50% contribution to costs by NPS would prove that the lectures were really wanted.

These recommendations show the hand of Joseph Grinnell, whose edits softened even more truculent language in the draft.⁵⁵ Yet in the notes he wrote for himself in preparing for

the committee meeting, he was direct in his slighting comparison of a university-based lecture series versus the park's own program: "...University gives certain backing which is authoritative and dignified—apart from lecture bureaus or the nat. park nature guide service itself: representative of latter not original 'researchers,' but 'retailers.'" The distinction he drew harked back to his 1923 letter urging Richardson to continue the lectures, and even to the initial debate within the Extension Advisory Board on whether to launch the Le Conte lectures. Grinnell reiterated in 1929 that the lectures were of value to relatively few, but those few were of the upper intellectual class. The nature guide service fully met popular needs, in Grinnell's view. The Le Conte lectures should be viewed as an addition to this service, informational and instructional rather than entertaining and amusing—two sets of aims that Grinnell considered to be at odds.

Rakestraw sent President Campbell a somewhat modified account of the committee's recommendations on September 2, concluding that the lectures should resume on a 50/50 division of costs between the university and NPS. However, revival of the lectures was not to be. Two months after the committee's recommendations were submitted, Black Tuesday marked the beginning of the Great Depression and an end to any hope of special funding.

Conclusion

The history of the Le Conte lectures reveals early fissures in both the cobbling together of multiple partners to support this academically oriented form of public education and in the growing separation between the UC's faculty views of public education and those developed by the founders of interpretive programming in Yosemite and NPS. National park leadership clearly valued the prestige of noted professors lecturing to the public in Yosemite and worked very hard to hold the funding partners together. To the concessionaires, they argued that distinguished Le Conte lecturers could exert a good influence on business. While the concessionaires gave lip service to the value of the lectures, they were not convinced, finding their own entertainment programs more effective in bringing in customers.

The university itself was unable to pledge a stable and secure funding base for its share of lecture costs. While President Campbell made a last-ditch effort to locate donor funding from at least one organization, there does not appear to be a record of approaching the Sierra Club or other potentially sympathetic groups. While one has to take the expression of fiscal difficulty at face value, Rakestraw's letter to Campbell also echoes the "hassle factor"—the list of annoyances recorded over the Le Conte years by UC Extension staff in both Berkeley and Yosemite. It is not clear that Extension staff fully understood the need or developed effective strategies to publicize the lectures steadily to a potential audience that changed literally day by day. Bryant and Hall did what they could to help here, doubtless more appreciative of the nature of the Yosemite visitors, but from Extension's point of view, these efforts evidently fell short. Even more glaring in misreading the potential audience for the Le Conte lectures was the unilateral redirection of lecture topics in 1924 from Yosemite-oriented presentations to "general interest" topics. Though Extension staff were clearly given ample warning that this approach was misguided, they persisted, with rather dramatic results in terms of reduced attendance at the lectures.

The question of what constituted effective public education for park visitors proved

even more vexed. The UC cadre that promoted and began formal programming in Yosemite was interconnected. Grinnell and Merriam trained Miller and Bryant as graduate students and, once their doctoral degrees had been conferred, the latter two continued their Berkeley connections through Extension and the summer school, respectively. Both were steady contributors to the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology. Ansel Hall shared their educational connection with Grinnell. The Museum of Vertebrate Zoology assisted Hall in Yosemite and national park museum development, to which inaugural Le Conte lecturers Alfred L. Kroeber and François Matthes also contributed. Grinnell, Merriam, and Hall were or had been Sierra Club members and had numerous colleagues on the faculty who guided trail walks and gave campfire lectures as part of the club's annual outing. As the university's purveyor of continuing education for the public, UC Extension represented another bond, with many Le Conte lecturers—Kroeber was just one example—also delivering education through Extension. At the outset of Yosemite's Nature Guide Service and Hall's assumption of the park naturalist position in Yosemite, Bryant and Hall clearly saw their work and the Le Conte lectures as part of an educational continuum, a view echoed in Mather's annual NPS reports to the secretary of the interior.

Yet the continuum would fray and split apart by the end of the 1920s. Extension personnel at first looked to the Nature Guide Service and Hall for their indefatigable assistance, and accepted it gratefully over the years of the lectures, when problem after problem was solved by their erstwhile UC colleagues. But Extension representatives had an underlying resistance to any blurring of lines between their offerings and those made under the Yosemite National Park aegis. By the end of the 1920s, a UC committee that included Grinnell and Jepson endorsed a definition of the university's contribution as men of science who would present results of their own research "in a dignified manner," calculated to "raise the standards of the current popular type of 'nature' lecture." The committee stressed that the lectures should be clearly separate from the Nature Guide Service. Implicit in committee language was an arch academic view of the popular education in the parks.

Thus, the initial continuum of academic and popular, represented by the strong connections among Sierra Club outing education, the Le Conte Memorial Lectures, and the Free Nature Guide Service, fell victim to the tensions well-known inside university walls between academic and popular work, between the original researcher who presents scientific results in a way that the general public can understand versus education that popularizes scientific subjects and puts a premium on education as a form of recreation. A bit of this tension existed even between the two originators of the Free Nature Guide Service, Bryant and Miller. Miller had needed some persuasion to take on the founder's role. He had written to Grinnell on January 22, 1920, that he was "greatly interested in seeing the National Parks movement succeed" and though inclined to return to the Fallen Leaf Lake lodge at the request of the proprietor, was willing to go to Yosemite as a matter of patriotic duty for a good cause. On February 17, 1921, Miller expressed to Grinnell his disappointment at not coming to Berkeley for his usual summer teaching appointment, "but the Yosemite work seems to need a wet nurse for some time yet." This hint of reluctance points to the difference between Bryant's and Miller's careers, with Bryant teaching outdoor education regularly for the continuing education-oriented Extension, while Miller's career was traditionally academic, as he com-

piled an impressive research record and would serve as the first chair of UCLA's biology department when the University of California created its "Southern Branch" out of the Los Angeles Normal School. In 1926, Miller would answer the national park call once again, going with his son Alden—a Grinnell doctoral student and future director of the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology—to Crater Lake at Hall's request to start the summer public education program there. But Miller's gently expressed arm's-length attitude hinted at an academic's stand-offishness toward the popularizing needs of a program intended to educate people as an extension of their recreational experience in the parks.

In the end, NPS would choose a popular approach to scientific subjects that put a premium on education as a form of recreation, in preference to the ideal of the researcher and academic who presented original scientific results in a way that the general public could understand. In the 1930s, Bryant and his colleagues in NPS would standardize the use of the term "interpretation" to describe the parks' core program of recreational public education. Yet the popular value of naming phenomena and introducing a park's natural history to visitors out in the field, a value well recognized in earlier years by the Sierra Club, Grinnell, and Merriam, would be amplified by combining identification with the ideal of seeing the interconnections among natural phenomena, modeled by Grinnell's and Merriam's academic work and the training that they gave their students.

A note on sources

The history of the Le Conte Memorial Lectures has been gleaned from archival sources held by the University of California's Bancroft Library and the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology. Records of the Sierra Club annual outings were also consulted at the Sierra Club's Colby Library in San Francisco. Bancroft Library holdings consulted:

- Records of University Extension, University of California, 1913–1957, CU-18
- University of California Extension Division, Lectures Department, Annual Report, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924
- Le Conte Memorial Lectures, Box 3, Folders 55, 56; Box 4, Folders 1–6
- Lectures Department Annual Reports for 1919–1924, Box 3, Folders 4–9
- Administration, Leon Richardson Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 10
- General, William F. Bade Correspondence, Box 8, Folder 13
- General, W.W. Campbell Correspondence, Box 10, Folder 69
- Francis P. Farquhar Papers, 1912–1968, C-B 517, Carton 4
- Papers of Joseph Nisbet Le Conte, C-B, Carton 1, Volume 35
- John Campbell Merriam Papers, C-B 970, Box 2
- Regional Oral History Collection (see histories cited in bibliography)
- Sierra Club Records, 71/103c

Museum of Vertebrate Zoology holdings consulted:

- Correspondence files of Joseph Grinnell, Horace Albright, Harold C. Bryant, C. M. Goethe, Stephen Mather, John C. Merriam, Loye Miller, Boyd B. Rakestraw, Leon Richardson

Other archival sources:

- *Sierra Club Bulletin*, 1893–: Annual articles on outings, Le Conte Memorial Lodge custodian and Lodges Committee reports
- National Park Service, *Report of the Director to the Secretary of the Interior*, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office
- *Yosemite Nature Notes*. Yosemite National Park, California. I: 1; II: 7; IV: 4; XXXIX: 7 (Nature Guide Service issue).

Endnotes

1. For example, see Brockman (1978, pp. 24-43), and Mackintosh (1986).
2. Ella M. Sexton, commenting on John Muir's trailside lectures during the first Sierra Club outing in 1901, in the *Sierra Club Bulletin* (IV:1), p. 17.
3. *Ramblings* had been reprinted in its entirety in the January 1900 issue of the *Sierra Club Bulletin*.
4. Nalder to Matthes, May 21, 1919. Nalder also sent a letter on May 20 to Superintendent Lewis, conveying Mather's expression of support.
5. Nalder to Merriam, July 18, 1919.
6. Nalder to Lewis, May 20, 1919.
7. Nalder to Merriam, July 18, 1919.
8. Lecture attendance figures have been gathered from the *Annual Reports* of the UC Extension Lectures Department.
9. Nalder to Merriam, July 18, 1919.
10. Merriam to Campbell, February 28, 1913.
11. Grinnell to Merriam, March 3, 1919.
12. Merriam to Grinnell, April 3, 1919
13. Bryant to Grinnell, June 19, 1919.
14. *Annual Report*, 1920, p. 255.
15. Tapscott to Strohmeier, June 22, 1920.
16. Tapscott to Strohmeier, July 7, 1920.
17. Strohmeier to Lewis, April 6, 1921.
18. Strohmeier to Richardson, February 26, 1921.
19. Nalder to Richardson, January 18, 1919.
20. Nalder to Richardson, January 24, 1919.
21. Farrow to White and Huffman, March 4, 1921.
22. Strohmeier to Spalding, January 18, 1922.
23. *Annual Report*, 1921, p. 72.
24. *Annual Report*, 1922, p. 45.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 46, 115.
26. In 1920, as superintendent of Yellowstone, Horace Albright had appointed ranger Milton P. Skinner as park naturalist, supported by two seasonal rangers (Brockman 1978, pp. 30-31).

27. *Annual Report*, 1922, pp. 46, 120.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
29. White to Farrow, March 8, 1921.
30. Van Wyck to Strohmeier, June 11, 1921.
31. Strohmeier to Lewis, May 2, 1921.
32. Spalding to Strohmeier, January 16, 1922.
33. Strohmeier to Hunkins, February 17, 1922.
34. Curry to Hunkins, March 23, 1922.
35. Hunkins to Strohmeier, April 25, 1922.
36. Strohmeier to Farrow, July 25, 1922; Strohmeier to Hunkins, August 21, 1922.
37. Strohmeier to Smith, June 8, 1923.
38. Smith to Strohmeier, July 2, 1923.
39. Strohmeier to Snyder, July 10, 1923.
40. Grinnell to Richardson, March 8, 1923.
41. Rakestraw to Strohmeier, June 18, 1924.
42. Rakestraw to Strohmeier, June 20, 1924.
43. Hunkins, July 7, 1924.
44. Bryant to Strohmeier, July 1, 1924.
45. Curry, July 9, 1924.
46. Strohmeier to Lewis, May 8, 1925; Richardson to Strohmeier, May 7, 1925.
47. Merriam to Campbell, February 13, 1928.
48. Rakestraw to Campbell, June 26, 1929.
49. Hall to Campbell, July 30, 1929.
50. *Yosemite Nature Notes*, II:8, p. 1; II:9, p. 3; V:III:10, p. 2.
51. *Ibid.*, V:IV:2, p. 9.
52. *Ibid.*, pp. 9–10.
53. Attracting a substantial number of school teachers and establishing itself as the National Park Service's basic training program for interpretive staff, the school would continue until after World War II, with a hiatus during the war years.
54. Grinnell to Mather, June 6, 1919.
55. The UC Extension files on the Le Conte Memorial Lectures include the unedited draft report, approval by some committee members, and Grinnell's edited copy.

References

- Albright, Horace, Russell E. Dickenson, and William Penn Mott, Jr. 1987. *National Park Service—The Story behind the Scenery*. Las Vegas, Nev.: KC Publications.
- Brockman, C. Frank. 1978. Park naturalists and the evolution of National Park Service interpretation through World War II. *Journal of Forest History* 22, 24–43.
- Bryant, Harold C., and Newton B. Drury. 1964. *Development of the Naturalist Program in the National Park Service*. Berkeley: Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office, University of California.
- Bryant, Harold C., and Wallace W. Atwood, Jr. 1932. *Research and Education in the National Parks*. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Casamajor, Paul, ed. 1965. *Forestry Education at the University of California: The First Fifty Years*. Berkeley: California Alumni Foresters.
- Cohen, Michael. 1988. *The History of the Sierra Club, 1892–1970*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Demars, Stanford E. 1991. *The Tourist in Yosemite, 1855–1965*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Farquhar, Francis, 1963. *Francis P. Farquhar on Accountancy, Mountaineering, and the National Parks*, Berkeley: Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office, University of California.
- Greene, Linda Wedel. 1987. *Yosemite: The Park and Its Resources*, 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service.
- Grinnell, Hilda Wood. 1940. Joseph Grinnell: 1877–1939. *The Condor* XLII:1 (January–February), 2–34.
- Grinnell, Joseph, and Tracy I. Storer. 1916. Animal life as an asset of national parks. *Science* (n.s.) 44:1133, 375–380.
- Jones, Holway R. 1965. *John Muir and the Sierra Club: The Battle for Yosemite*. San Francisco: Sierra Club.
- Le Conte, Joseph N. 1919. *Journal of 1919 High Sierra Trip*. Berkeley: Joseph N. Le Conte Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California.
- Mackintosh, Barry. 1986. *Interpretation in the National Park Service: A Historical Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service. Online at www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/mackintosh2.
- Mark, Stephen R. 2005. *Preserving the Living Past—John C. Merriam’s Legacy in the State and National Parks*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Miller, Loye Holmes. 1970. *The Interpretive Naturalist*. Berkeley: Bancroft Library, Regional Oral History Office, University of California.
- Runte, Alfred. 1990. *Yosemite: The Embattled Wilderness*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Sargent, Shirley. 1975. *Yosemite & Its Innkeepers*. Yosemite, Calif.: Flying Spur Press.
- Shankland, Robert. 1970. *Steve Mather of the National Parks*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sierra Club. 2009. Le Conte Memorial Lodge. Online at www.sierraclub.org/education/leconte (accessed October 21).
- Stock, Chester. 1951. *John Merriam Campbell, 1869–1945: Biographical Memoir*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Karen Merritt, Office of the President, University of California, 1111 Franklin Street, Room 11205, Oakland, California 94607; kmerritt@ucmerced.edu