

A CRITIQUE OF THE PORTRAYAL OF GRIZZLY BEARS IN
CONTEMPORARY NATURAL HISTORY FILMS

by

John Walter Shier

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Fine Arts

in

Science and Natural History Filmmaking

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

November 2005

©COPYRIGHT

by

John Walter Shier

2005

All Rights Reserved

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

John Walter Shier

This thesis essay has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

Ronald Tobias

Approved for the Department of Media and Theater Arts:

Joel Jahnke

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies:

Dr. Joseph J. Fedock

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a masters degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under the rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with “fair use” as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this essay should be referred to ProQuest Information and Learning, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted “the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my essay in and from microform along with the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my abstract in any format in whole or in part.”

John Walter Shier

November3, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF TERMS	v
ABSTRACT.....	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. HUMANITY AND WILDERNESS.....	3
3. HOW NATURAL HISTORY FILMS PORTRAY THE GRIZZLY	13
4. A NEW GRIZZLY ARCHETYPE.....	26
REFERENCE MATERIALS	34
Cited Literature	34
Bibliography	34
Cited Films.....	37
Reference Films	37

GLOSSARY

Blue Chip Films- Natural history documentaries that typically have high production values, strong animal characters, an off-screen narrator, and usually an intentionally limited or non-existent on-screen human presence.

Civilization - Areas with high densities of human settlement, such as cities and towns. Civilization is the antipode of wilderness, a place where the presence of humans is the rule, not the exception.

Conservationism – Also known as *wise use*. Gifford Pinchot, who served from 1905 to 1910 as the United States Forest Service's first chief, is often considered the father of modern conservationism. Conservationists are against the rampant, unchecked development and harvest of natural resources. They rely on scientific methods to manage resources, ensuring that all harvest and development is sustainable. While conservationism is easier on ecosystems than pure resourceism, it is still primarily concerned with maximizing the natural resources available for use in human projects.

Ecocentrism - Ecocentrism is based on the belief that *all* of nature possesses intrinsic value and that humanity is a part of nature, not the reason for its existence. Ecocentrism differs from biocentrism in that it considers natural systems to be the 'most significant fact of existence' whereas biocentrists consider life to be the dominant truth and judge everything according to its relationship with life. Ecocentrists believe that life is part of a larger system that includes both the organic and inorganic and value a species much more than an individual. Simply put, ecocentrism takes a more holistic and ecosystemic approach than biocentrism, which is more concerned with individual life forms.

Imperialistic Nostalgia - Imperialistic nostalgia defines a sense of nostalgia that is felt for a culture, species or environment that has been destroyed. Renato Rosaldo, the Lucie Stern Professor in the Social Sciences at New York University, named this concept. Imperialistic nostalgia is often felt by those who were responsible for the destruction, or by their descendents, and they come to reminisce about an earlier time, missing what was destroyed, working to restore it (if possible) and making efforts to experience or connect with what was lost. This nostalgia may also be indicative of a dislike, resentment or unease with the current civilization. In this thesis, the term Imperialistic Nostalgia will be used in reference both to the loss of wilderness and to the near-extinction of the grizzly bear, two events that earlier generations of Americans caused. The demise of the grizzly engenders a sense of imperialistic nostalgia in most modern day Americans. This nostalgia inspires a wide array of actions, ranging from people who simply believe that the bears should be allowed to exist in several wilderness areas to people who completely invest themselves in efforts to re-establish the grizzly throughout its prior range.

Preservationism – A philosophy that views nature as a living whole rather than merely as a collection of parts. Believes that natural systems are self-creating, evolutionary wholes with synergetic characteristics that preclude complete reduction and analysis. Preservationists also understand that human actions can impair the ability of natural systems to maintain themselves or evolve further. In spite of its departure from resourcism, preservationism remains anthropocentric, since human interests are the ultimate arbiters of value. According to Roderick Nash, some view preservationism as little more than an instrument to sustain the economic development of Western cultures while forestalling environmental disasters.

Pure Nature – Many people perceive pure nature as the type (or level) of nature that exists in wilderness areas, where humans have little or no impact on or interaction with animals or with the ecosystem/wilderness area. People who perceive nature in this manner often believe that a human presence sullies or corrupts nature. Examples of ecosystems containing what is commonly perceived as pure nature include Yellowstone NP, Denali NP and the Serengeti. Most blue-chip films concentrate on pure nature and actively minimize an on-screen human presence to ensure that audiences perceive their subject matter as ‘pure’.

Resourcism - Resourcism can be described as a purely humanistic perspective of nature. It considers all of nature to simply be resources or commodities for use in the development and maintenance of civilization. Resourcism defined the United States’ interaction with nature until the early 1900s, when imperialistic nostalgia inspired more ecocentric perceptions of the world.

Romanticism - Romanticism was initially a rebuttal to modernism that rejected a mechanistic view of nature. Romantic writers, artists and philosophers rejected modernism, industrialization and the devastation of the environment. They perceived nature to be a living, evolving whole whose value to humanity extended beyond resources. Romanticism supported the belief that nature is known not through science, but through immediate contact and exploration. Romanticism, which originated in Europe and spread into America via Thoreau and Emerson, served as an initial rebuttal to the industrial/scientific revolution but ultimately couldn’t stop it, instead serving as a voice of dissent.

Rural - Areas where there is a substantial, yet not overwhelming human presence. Rural defines a middle ground between civilization and wilderness where the density of human settlement is low.

Wild Frame – A motion picture image that is devoid of humans or of human artifacts.

Wilderness - A region that is largely devoid of people and of their trappings. A wilderness area is a region where the presence of humans is the exception, not the norm.

ABSTRACT

Natural History films and television programs are based on the perception that the grizzly bear is an animal that only lives, that only belongs in wilderness. These films and programs spread and strengthen this perception among audiences, compelling them to relegate grizzlies to the few parcels of land that still meet our society's definition of wilderness. The perception ensures that the grizzly's long-term survival in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem is threatened; the regions wilderness areas simply don't provide enough habitat for the bears and many people are unwilling to tolerate the presence of grizzlies anywhere except wilderness. Natural history films require a new *grizzly archetype* if they are to have a positive impact on behalf of the grizzly. This archetype, which perceives the grizzly as an appropriate species for both wilderness and rural landscapes, must be based less on an *anthrocentric* perception of the grizzly and more on an *ecocentric* perspective.

INTRODUCTION

Today just less than five percent¹ of the United States remains undeveloped and is legally classified as wilderness²; developed areas³ constitute an equal⁴ amount.⁵ The majority of these wild areas are in the West⁶ and their existence drives an ongoing cultural and physical battle between civilization and wilderness, between anthropocentrism⁷ and ecocentrism.⁸ This battle impacts not only the land but also many species of wildlife, including the grizzly bear.

I've spent the past four years working with grizzlies in Yellowstone as a filmmaker, striving to understand them, their environment, and the political and cultural storm surrounding their existence. What I've learned makes me question the core perceptions that natural history filmmakers rely on to portray the grizzly. I believe that natural history films play a powerful role in shaping society's perceptions of nature and that they are the public's primary source of information about grizzly bears. In an age when most people will never encounter a wild grizzly, a single program can define a person's lifelong perception of grizzlies. I've watched many natural history programs, armed with academic, theoretical and real-world knowledge of both filmmaking and of grizzlies, and I'm troubled by what I've seen. Filmmakers errantly perceive the grizzly as only living, only belonging, in landscapes that our society defines as wilderness. They view the grizzly and nature through an anthropocentric (rather than an ecocentric) lens and their films encourage audiences to believe that the grizzly is justly relegated only to wilderness, away from people.⁹

If Yellowstone's grizzlies are to survive, society as a whole must abandon these perceptions and allow grizzlies to exist in rural, non-wilderness areas,¹⁰ as deer, elk and cougars do. Natural history films play a role in creating this problem and they must play a role in solving it. To do so they will require a new, ecocentric, grizzly archetype in order to subvert the status quo by challenging audiences' ingrained perceptions of the grizzly.

Before creating this archetype, however, it is necessary to explore how humans have historically perceived wilderness, to explore the history and effects of wilderness preservation, to establish the biological and societal truths regarding grizzly bears and to analytically investigate several natural history films.

HUMANITY AND WILDERNESS

The rise of agricultural societies and permanent settlements prompted the concept of wilderness to enter the human psyche, causing people to perceive divisions between civilization (settlements) and wilderness, between nature and culture, for the first time.¹¹ These divisions have only become greater over the millennia. Whereas hunter-gathers had previously been at home anywhere in nature, agricultural societies, whose settlements were islands of civilization in oceans of wilderness, likely perceived wilderness as a dark, ungodly place where fearsome, sometimes man-eating, animals lurked.¹²

Judeo-Christianity's domination over pagan, nature-based religions strengthened the divisions between civilization and wilderness by installing a divine figure that wasn't part of nature; he created it for humans. As Carolyn Merchant puts it, "Monotheism represented an irrevocable break with the natural world."¹³ Western societies viewed wilderness as the antipode of Eden and associated it, and some animals,¹⁴ with Satan. The biblical story of man's fall from Eden and resulting struggle for recovery became the primary narrative (though it would mutate over time) shaping and legitimizing Western cultures' relationships with nature and wilderness, compelling them to convert the 'savage' into the 'civilized' with an ultimate goal of transforming Earth into a restored Eden.¹⁵

The Enlightenment and the industrial revolution remade the recovery narrative in the nineteenth century, combining the traditional biblical mandate to tame the wilds and

utilize nature with a capitalist/industrialist mandate to make profits and improve humanity's living conditions by dominating nature.

This biblical/capitalistic/industrialist narrative of recovery directed the development of North America. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries wilderness and natural grandeur defined the United States and served as an answer to Europe's castles and cathedrals. It gave the young country a sense of pride and served as a point of distinction because Europe's domesticated mountains and pastoral fields paled in comparison to a wild continent.¹⁶ But this pride didn't compel early Americans to value wilderness enough to protect it. The recovery narrative, along with the enlightenment's theory of dominion, compelled them to march into the frontier, axes and plows in hand. Europeans who journeyed to the U.S. in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, such as Alexis De Tocqueville found great value in the wilderness and decried its loss.¹⁷ These Europeans perceived nature through a more romantic lens and saw wilderness as an important source of inspiration and natural beauty but their perceptions struck a hollow cord on America's frontiers. As is still somewhat the case today,¹⁸ most of those living on the frontier were too close to wilderness and too engrossed in their daily work to perceive any inherent value or worth in it, outside of its usefulness as a collection of raw resources. They were concerned with more utilitarian purposes, with the domination of nature and the establishment of civilization. And even the romantics who valued the wilderness and the frontier often viewed civilization as both logical and inevitable. Author James Fennimore Cooper and his main protagonist character in the Leatherstocking novels were undoubtedly Romantics. But whereas Leatherstocking was

so wholly invested in the wild that its demise haunted him at his death, Cooper, though he appreciated wilderness, seemed to realize that it must necessarily disappear in favor of civilization, which he believed is the greater good.¹⁹ A contemporary of Cooper, artist Thomas Cole was also an early American romantic and celebrant of wilderness. While Cole, like Cooper, could not completely affirm wilderness, he ultimately idealized a combination of the wild and the civilized, believing, as Henry David Thoreau soon would, that a human's optimum environment is a amalgam of wilderness and civilization.²⁰

By the early nineteenth century the United States had largely diverged from the religious narrative of recovery and embraced a purely capitalistic/industrialist narrative, heralding the heyday of resourcism. Most Americans perceived all of nature as mere resources, as fuel for a growing economy. The conservationism/wise use movement, led by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot,²¹ helped to temper resourcism by calling for an end to unchecked and reckless exploitation. But their goal was not the protection of wilderness or of the environment but merely the 'scientific management' of it. The U.S. Forest Service adopted this philosophy of wise use, using science, regulated harvest and careful management to ensure that natural resources²² are harvested at a level that not only satisfies our immediate needs but that also ensures ample resources for the endeavors of future Americans. While conservation is an improvement over pure resourcism in that it ensures that ecosystems aren't completely devastated, it still perceives and manages wilderness in a way that is more concerned with utilizing wilderness for human needs rather than preserving wilderness for its own needs.²³

This perception began to change towards the end of the nineteenth century as imperialistic nostalgia and romanticism took root and inspired Americans to perceive wilderness as having values that went beyond mere resources. Many became disgusted with the increasing destruction of the environment and came to miss and value the very wilderness that their parents and grandparents had destroyed, an attitude reflected in the writings of Thoreau and John Muir. As Merchant says, “It was the pioneer’s children and grandchildren, removed from a wilderness condition, who began to sense the ethical and aesthetic values of wilderness.”²⁴ Growing numbers of Americans began to consider wilderness *as* Eden and believed that humans were threatening it and all of nature by destroying the environment. They felt compelled to save some of what wilderness remained because they perceived it as a place where humans could find solace from the civilized world and some, such as Muir, came to perceive it as a natural cathedral where one might come to know God.²⁵ Thus the stage was set in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries for the emergence of a wilderness preservation movement and also of an alternative recovery narrative, a narrative of decline.

Whereas the traditional recovery narrative is based on the belief that God entrusted mankind with the task of restoring earth into Eden (transforming wilderness into garden), the declensionist narrative of recovery holds that mankind’s actions over the centuries have spoiled and continue to spoil what earth once was: Eden. Both narratives acknowledge the past existence of Eden; the traditional narrative believes it was a biblical garden, the declensionist narrative perceives it as being unspoiled wilderness. But whereas the traditional recovery narrative views the history of humanity as a series of

positive steps towards the restoration of Eden, the declensionist narrative views it as a constant movement away from Eden.

The wilderness preservation movement adopted the declensionist recovery narrative and integrated it into its efforts to protect what wilderness remained, gradually gaining momentum over the last 150 years. The movement truly gained power and publicity during the dam wars (1906-1913). The movement's first big battle was over Hetch-Hetchy, a Californian valley similar to Yosemite. While the movement lost this battle (the O'Shaughnessy Dam, completed in 1923, submerged Hetch-Hetchy), the highly publicized fight to save the valley, which spilled into the U.S. Congress and onto the front pages of papers throughout the nation, brought the movement into the American mainstream and made it a cause that the public largely supported. This support was evident when the movement won the next 'dam battle,' preventing the Grand Canyon from being damned, an event that was wilderness's first big victory against resourcism. The movement arguably climaxed with the passage of the Wilderness Act in 1964, which made it possible for areas to be legally defined as wilderness and created legal protections required to protect and maintain wilderness. The declensionist narrative mandated that wilderness be protected from civilization (i.e. people), a mandate that the U.S. federal government eventually met with the creation of National Parks and the Wilderness Act.

All forms of the recovery narrative (biblical, capitalist/industrialist/dominionist, declensionist) had the ultimate effect of distancing Western cultures from wilderness, and from nature.

The capitalist/industrialist/dominionist narrative had the largest impact on the grizzly – humans eradicated the bears from 95% of their range because they perceived them as a threat to both life, and perhaps more importantly, to the livestock industry. The declensionist narrative of recovery, which is a primary force behind wilderness preservation, has had a more complicated impact. From about 1850 until 2000 the narrative saved the grizzly by providing it with key refuges in Yellowstone National Park and Glacier National Park.²⁶ But today the legacy of the declensionist narrative, via wilderness preservation, is having a limiting, negative impact on grizzlies.

By fighting to protect and preserve wilderness, the wilderness preservation movement has placed boundaries and restrictions on wilderness by physically and legally separating it from civilization. Wilderness, previously a concept, is now a discretely labeled region on maps and is surrounded with signs proclaiming: “Entering a Wilderness Area”. The demarcation of tangible wilderness areas is the fundamental flaw of wilderness preservation – it creates an *appropriate space* for wilderness. Another fundamental flaw is its anti-human bias. Wilderness preservationists viewed people as a destructive opponent of nature that must be restrained. They saved a few areas of wilderness, but in the process strengthened people’s alienation from wilderness because they insisted that humans could be little more than interlopers in it. This attitude created a dualistic perception in which humans were completely outside of and alien from wilderness. This way of perceiving the world created another, more dangerous perception: if wilderness consists of pure nature and if people don’t belong in

wilderness,²⁷ then people must be separate from nature. Thus, where they live isn't part of nature and may be inappropriate for wildlife.

William Cronon²⁸ succinctly defines this perception: "The place we are is the place where nature is not." This perception makes it possible for people to perceive a grizzly as 'out of place' once it leaves a wilderness area.

Today the American public perceives and defines wilderness in a multitude of ways. As Roderick Nash states, "wilderness is truly in the eye of the beholder and is transient to their subjective elements."²⁹ The federal government has created several levels of wilderness including national forests, wilderness areas and national parks and has applied varying levels of restrictions and protections to each. This approach both reflects and allows for a wide range of definitions of wilderness. Some perceive it as a place for recreation and relaxation, others perceive it as a last preserve of wildlife where a human presence should be minimized or eliminated and others perceive it as merely a collection of resources that should be harvested. Though these disparate opinions incite the conflict between anthropocentrism and ecocentrism, they share one basic tenet: wilderness is an area where humans and human artifacts are assumed to be the exception, not the standard.

Many perceive wilderness areas as places where there are no signs of humans. But modern wilderness is never free from human influences, at least not in the Greater Yellowstone Region. The Wilderness Preservation Act of 1964 declared that people may not permanently reside in wilderness areas and the National Park Service also prevents people from permanently residing in backcountry areas. It is important to note that in

order to meet these requirements, the federal government at times had to remove native Americans from regions so that these regions might meet their definition of what wilderness was.³⁰ While specific individuals don't permanently reside in wilderness today, the human *species* does. Humans and human artifacts, ranging from bear jams and gift shops in the front country to trails, cabins, and hikers in the backcountry, are a permeating part of Yellowstone.

Wilderness areas were protected during a time period roughly spanning from 1850 to 1970, coinciding with the demise of the grizzly. Over one hundred years of extermination at the hands of ranchers, hunters and the state and federal governments ensured that grizzly bears survived only in Colorado,³¹ Wyoming, Idaho, Montana and Washington by 1950. The small surviving populations have existed solely in wilderness areas for the past fifty-five years, a fact that shapes how filmmakers (and society) perceive the grizzly. Instead of realizing that these are the only places where society allowed the grizzly to survive, filmmakers perceive them to be the only places where grizzlies *can* live, believing they cannot live outside of wilderness, in rural areas because either they are incapable of being around people on a permanent basis without becoming a threat, or, they can't live in non-wilderness areas because such areas aren't ecologically sound enough to support them. This perception vastly differs from what has been the reality in North America for thousands of years. Native Americans lived in close proximity to grizzlies ever since the first peoples arrived on the continent and their technical capabilities meant that there was little they could do other than to accept grizzlies as an everyday part of life and an everyday part of most of the American West.

This perception has changed drastically over the past two hundred years until Americans today only perceive the grizzly as belonging in a few scattered wilderness fragments.

The often used phrase “*the grizzly bear is a symbol of wilderness*” encapsulates the problem: filmmakers (and society) are unable to separate the grizzly from wilderness. So in addition to defining an appropriate space for wilderness, wilderness preservation has also inadvertently defined appropriate spaces for grizzlies. Filmmakers subscribe to this idea of appropriate spaces and add to the misperception by only constructing ‘wilderness sets’ for their portrayals of the grizzly.

The perception that grizzlies belong only in wilderness threatens the grizzly’s future survival in Yellowstone because nearly all wilderness areas (‘appropriate spaces’) in the Yellowstone ecosystem are ‘filling up’ with grizzlies, a fact evidenced by the increasing expansion of grizzlies out of their core habitat in Yellowstone.³² Unless people allow grizzlies to expand into neighboring wilderness areas or into rural landscapes, the grizzly has run out of places to go. Without additional habitat, bears that wander out of wilderness will be ‘managed’³³ and the population will grow no larger than 500-600 individuals.³⁴ However, a population of this size can only be expected, with any certainty, to survive for a few decades; a population must contain at least 2000 individuals to ensure its long-term survival.³⁵ Thus the future of Yellowstone’s grizzlies depends on whether society is willing to share non-wilderness areas with them.

Natural history films provide the bulk of the American public with information on and perspectives of the grizzlies. As a result, these films have played a role in shaping

society's current acceptance of the grizzly. Hence, a detailed analysis of their perspectives of the grizzly follows.

HOW NATURAL HISTORY FILMS PORTRAY THE GRIZZLY

Filmmakers go to considerable lengths to portray grizzlies as existing in a ‘wilderness fortresses’³⁶ by actively manufacturing wild, humanless sets for the grizzly. Two key cinematic motivations shape how filmmakers portray the grizzly. First, so-called blue chip natural history films historically embrace a romantic³⁷ view of nature that draws a clear boundary between primeval nature (wilderness) and civilization.³⁸ This romantic gaze typically perceives a human presence as corrupting or negating wilderness and compels filmmakers portraying nature to keep humans off of the screen. Audiences expect a romanticized presentation and often interpret it as a hallmark of ‘pure nature’. Doug Bertran, the producer and cinematographer of Showdown at Grizzly River,³⁹ does exactly this in his pursuit of a romanticized and sentimentalized narrative. Showdown at Grizzly River takes place almost entirely at McNeil River – an Alaskan State Preserve that is world-renowned for its fishing grizzlies. Dozens of bears come to the river every summer, as do hundreds of people. Up to a dozen visitors enter the preserve every day to watch the bears and are required to stay within manmade viewing areas. The bears pay little attention to the tourists who are only yards away and some females even leave their cubs within feet of human ‘babysitters’ knowing that the adult males won’t bother the cubs as long as they are near people.

But Bertran portrays McNeil as a human-free landscape,⁴⁰ creating a wild frame for his film even though he filmed much of it from ‘authorized viewing islands’ where he positioned the camera in the midst of other visitors. If he had not wanted a host or active

human involvement he could have only portrayed humans as another animal in the frame, as another part of the ecosystem.

The absence of a human component evidences a concerted and continuous effort⁴¹ to create and maintain a humanless landscape. Predators of the Wild⁴² also visits McNeil River but producer Malcolm Penny chose to present a contrasting portrayal that does acknowledge a human presence. One shot that is particularly effective is a pullout from a wild frame of bears fishing to reveal human visitors, only yards away from the bears. Predators of the Wild's narrative acknowledges a profound fact: the bears have not injured a single human in over seventeen years, in spite of their extremely close proximity to people. The greatest fault of Showdown at Grizzly River is that it ignores the reserve's history of peaceful human-grizzly interaction in order to maintain a wild frame. An accurate portrayal of McNeil that includes the ever-present human component would show audiences an example of grizzlies and humans peacefully sharing the same landscape and would increase society's acceptance of the grizzly. Both The Grizzlies,⁴³ produced and written by Theodore Thomas, and Predators of the Wild portray humans as sharing landscapes with grizzlies. In addition to documenting McNeil, both films also visit Brooks Camp, a settlement in Katmai National Park where there they show humans and grizzlies fishing for salmon from the same stream. This inclusion is important because it shows people and bears co-existing in a situation where the people are not present *because* of the bears (they aren't there to observe, take pictures, etc.). The people shown in the frame simply want to catch fish, just as the bears do and they both work to avoid conflict. These visual narratives encourage audiences to perceive humans and

bears as capable of sharing the *same* part of nature and leads to greater acceptance of grizzlies in non-wilderness areas.

I often filmed wildlife from Yellowstone's roads while working as the cinematographer for The Grizzly's Return.⁴⁴ My desire for a blue-chip production, for a romantic feel, compelled me to frame images in a way that excluded the road and surrounding people. I didn't always do this because the story required *some* sequences of human-wildlife interaction but when confronted with a truly dramatic wildlife situation, I did everything I could to maintain a wild frame. This impulse arises from a societal perception that a wild frame is more romantic and authentic, and is a more legitimate portrayal of nature.

This perception of scientific legitimacy is the basis for the second cinematic force that compels filmmakers to create a wild frame for the grizzly. Blue-chip natural history programs strive to maintain a scientific approach by presenting a naturalist's view. But Neil Evernden claims that:

“(naturalists) in the place of a natural world redolent with human analogy and symbolic meaning, and sensitive to man's behavior, construct a detached natural scene to be viewed and studied by an observer from the outside, as if peering through a window, in the secure knowledge that the objects of contemplation inhabit a separate realm, offering no omens or signs, without human meaning or significance.”⁴⁵

One of a naturalist's primary unspoken rules is that the presence of humans invalidates, or de-legitimizes natural events. Filmmakers adopt the same detached way of viewing nature in an attempt to bring the perceptions of scientific rigor, authenticity and accuracy to their films. They try to position the camera so it serves as a window into a separate realm they create for their wildlife characters, keeping human artifacts out of sight. It can

be as simple as adjusting a frame to exclude a road, or as involved as keeping a crowd of people watching a bear near a road in Yellowstone off-screen and using audio editing to remove the event's actual sounds (cars, people etc.) to create a wild audioscape to go along with the wild frame.

This practice goes beyond cinematic license; it fosters inaccurate perceptions and expectations among audiences. The practice has created a paradox: a wild frame meets audiences' expectations of what authentic nature is, but nature itself fails to meet these same expectations because it rarely lives up to the cinematic, wild frame. Visitors to Yellowstone have an experience that fails to live up to its cinematic version.

There is another inherent danger in this practice: it affects people's perception of and appreciation for the natural world they encounter on a daily basis. One's own natural settings may no longer be appreciated or valued as 'true nature'⁴⁶ after witnessing the exotic animals and dramatic behaviors that occur in the wilderness landscapes that natural history films present. As a result, audiences may come to perceive the environment they live in (say on the edge of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem) as unsuitable for the wildlife that they've only seen portrayed in wilderness areas. Because filming often takes place in the midst of human artifacts (i.e. roads, viewing platforms, bear jams) filmmakers do grizzlies (and all of nature) a disservice by choosing not to show audiences that 'pure nature' does occur in the presence of humans and human artifacts.

So far I have highlighted flaws that result from filmmakers' creation of a wild frame. But some filmmakers make conscious decisions to portray human involvement with grizzlies in only one of two archetypes, both of which strengthen the perception that

grizzlies only belong in wilderness and thus decrease society's acceptance for them. One portrays humans exclusively as characters whose interactions with grizzlies are motivated by imperialistic nostalgia. The other engenders the perception that once grizzlies leave wilderness they embark upon an inevitable path to conflict with humans.

In the first archetype, the human characters' imperialistic nostalgia results from the regret they feel over the historic extermination of grizzlies that earlier generations of Americans carried out. Those portrayed as working to save or protect bears are typically scientists learning more about bear behavior and wildlife managers working to minimize human-grizzly conflict. The nostalgia they feel over the demise of the grizzly compels them to protect (and rehabilitate) the remaining grizzly populations. The archetype portrays other visitors traveling into wilderness areas to seek out the last of the West's grizzlies for a variety of reasons, ranging from a simple desire to view the bears (i.e. tourists in Yellowstone), to an urge or need for a deep, almost spiritual experience⁴⁷ (i.e. Timothy Treadwell) with grizzlies.

The second harmful archetype portrays a grizzly bear getting into trouble for being in non-wilderness areas and labels it as a 'problem bear'⁴⁸. The bear inevitably must be hazed⁴⁹, relocated to an area far from people, or killed. The story, at its most basic, is that once a grizzly leaves the wilderness it becomes habituated to human food/garbage/livestock feed and must be "managed".

These portrayals combine to give the impression that grizzlies and humans can safely interact only on human-dictated terms, terms that require that humans willingly 'visit' grizzlies in 'their' habitat. This fosters the perception that grizzlies and humans

cannot coexist outside of this situation, or in other words outside of wilderness and without imperialistic nostalgia serving as a primary motivation.

The portrayal of grizzlies as ‘problem bears’ isn’t inaccurate; grizzlies do in fact become habituated and management can be required, but filmmakers too often concentrate on this more sensationalistic scenario while ignoring more common and benign scenarios, such as grizzlies unobtrusively⁵⁰ existing in areas of low human density. This portrayal also fails to consider human culpability.

Grizzly & Man – Uneasy Truce⁵¹ begins with a bear jam in Yellowstone where dozens of tourists gather to watch a grizzly family near the road. The program casts people as visitors to the grizzly’s home/refuge in Yellowstone. The program describes bear watching as *a wilderness experience*, an innocuous phrase that illustrates just how inseparable producers Franz Cemnzind and David Clark perceive grizzlies and wilderness to be. This phrase creates the perception that encounter a grizzly means you *must* be in a wilderness area if they see a grizzly. While it implies that the presence of wilderness makes it possible, or acceptable, to encounter a grizzly, it doesn’t imply that the presence of a grizzly makes an area wilderness; only the actions of people can do this. The very definition of wilderness makes it impossible for an area with a permanent human presence to be considered as wilderness. Hence this phrase and phrases such as ‘*the grizzly is a symbol of wilderness*’ engender the perception that a grizzly encountered outside of wilderness is out of place and doesn’t belong there.

Even more disturbing is the title of Grizzly & Man – Uneasy Truce. Considering that Cemnzind and Clark chose to include the phrase *Uneasy Truce* in the title of their

film, they unquestionably perceive the grizzly as an opponent to humanity. The title also implies that grizzlies and humanity once engaged in a form of war. It could be argued that humans, who exterminated grizzlies in over 98% of their former range, did in fact wage war against the grizzly. But it is foolish at best, and unethical at worst, to imply that any species other than humans engages in war. This program's title leads audiences to perceive that conflict between grizzlies and humans is common and perhaps even natural before they even see the first minute of this program.

The Grizzlies is guilty of both misperceptions. Producer/writer Theodore Thomas sets up humans as stewards who travel into "the fortress of the bears" to study and help the grizzly. The film creates the perception that people don't permanently share habitat with bears, but rather are interlopers who visit from time to time. The program then introduces a prehistoric view of the grizzly – referencing Native American mythology that considers the grizzly to be an elder brother who teaches humans how to survive off the land. This concept is powerful because the idea of sharing landscapes with the grizzly and learning from it could help foster acceptance for it. The Grizzlies, instead of exploring this concept, quickly moves on to a 'bear attacks' segment that reinforces society's worst fears of grizzlies. While bears do maul people, The Grizzlies places too much prominence and importance on what is in reality a rare occurrence.⁵² The program decreases social acceptance of the grizzly by sensationalizing bear maulings and should at the very least devote as much time and effort to establishing the benefits and importance of living and traveling responsibly⁵³ in grizzly country.

The Good, The Bad, And The Grizzly,⁵⁴ produced and written by Janet Hess, is unique because it portrays grizzlies as existing outside of wilderness areas. But the film's ultimate message is that after twenty-five years of recovery, there are too many grizzlies and they have expanded into unacceptable regions – non-wilderness regions, where they get into trouble.

The program features several people who have been physically or financially 'bothered'⁵⁵ by too many bears and shows grizzlies consuming dead cattle and getting into garbage. But the film fails to sufficiently address the roles people play in each of these situations. For example, the film shows a grizzly eating garbage (used as an example of a bear causing problems) – but the garbage is not in a bear-proof container and is not fenced, a clear example of improper (and possibly illegal) garbage storage, a fact the film fails to mention. And it never tells the audience whether grizzlies killed the livestock or merely scavenged from a carcass that ranchers left on the range⁵⁶. Instead of investigating, the program doesn't make a definitive statement and passively leaves viewers with the impression that grizzlies killed it. The program's vague portrayal doesn't explicitly cast *all* grizzlies as cattle-killers but it implies that it is an expected and unsurprising result of grizzlies straying from wilderness. In reality, grizzlies kill an insignificant amount of cattle - out of the total of 5.2 million cattle grazed in Wyoming and Montana in 2000, bears (grizzly and black) killed 200 and other predators, management errors and natural causes⁵⁷ killed 134,000. In other words bears accounted for .15% of all cattle fatalities⁵⁸ and it could be reasonably estimated that grizzlies accounted for, at most .1%.⁵⁹ Blizzards, dogs, diseases, lightening, wolves, improper

fencing, improper herding and insufficient veterinary care all kill far more cattle than grizzlies.

The program fails to assess human culpability; there are numerous steps ranchers can take to minimize *or* maximize grizzly conflict.⁶⁰ Perhaps most troubling is the testimonial given by a rancher at a county hearing in The Good, The Bad And The Grizzly. He claims that grizzlies are running rampant, killing large numbers of cattle in one relatively small area and devastating his livelihood. Producer/writer Hess allows this unverified testimony to stand unquestioned, in effect allowing it to be presented as fact even though quantitative data proves that grizzlies have a negligible economic impact⁶¹ on livestock industries and in spite of the fact that official statistics⁶² make it very unlikely that grizzlies have such an impact.

Of all the films critiqued in this essay, I believe that The Good, The Bad, And The Grizzly does the most damage to society's acceptance of grizzlies by concentrating on negative examples and by marketing the perception that grizzlies can't 'behave' around people. It dwells on human-grizzly interaction along the Eastern edge of Yellowstone, where a strong resentment, fear and hatred of grizzlies still exists.⁶³ This resentment often extends beyond grizzlies and is directed towards laws and regulations whose intent is to minimize human-grizzly conflict.⁶⁴ Many people in this region *choose*⁶⁵ to behave irresponsibly, in a manner that invites conflict with grizzlies. The Good, The Bad, And The Grizzly at times sensationalizes conflict, even going so far as to suggest that grizzlies *forced* an elementary school in Wapiti, Wyoming, to put fences around a playground to protect students. In the summer of 2004 managers relocated or killed dozens of bears in

this region, while not a single grizzly got into enough trouble to justify removal in Big Sky, Montana, a community located in the middle of what is generally considered some of the best bear habitat in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. And I haven't seen a single school in or around Big Sky that has a fenced defensive perimeter. The difference seems to be that the citizens of Big Sky make a conscientious effort to live responsibly in bear country and generally possess a more tolerant attitude towards grizzlies. It may be that the people of Big Sky are more willing to accommodate grizzlies because many of them recently moved to the West and in fact came to the West to live near wilderness and wildlife. This attitude is in stark contrast to what is commonly found in areas of Wyoming, where the families of many of the biggest grizzly-opponents have lived for generations and where the grizzly has been viewed as a annoyance, as a financial burden for generations.

The Good, The Bad, And The Grizzly intends to document the status of the grizzly in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem but falters because it fails to sufficiently address human culpability (and responsibility), and fails to chronicle the less contentious grizzly-human relationship that exists in over half of the ecosystem. The program ultimately greatly strengthens the perception that grizzlies are incapable of living anywhere but in wilderness.

Ironically, the natural history filmmaking community has awarded The Good, The Bad, And The Grizzly with multiple awards at wildlife film festivals.⁶⁶ This fact makes it painfully clear that a majority of this community continues to possess and propagate a flawed perception of the grizzly.

I portray human-grizzly interactions in a manner that contradicts this perception in my second year film, Saving the Grizzly, One Hair at a Time.⁶⁷ I wanted to establish the fact that both humans⁶⁸ and grizzlies reside in Glacier National Park's backcountry. I include hiking trails in the frame and show bears using them to make their way from one huckleberry patch to the next. I also included two sequences of hikers sharing the frame with grizzlies. These people are not photographers or researchers; they have not set out to interact with grizzlies and in one case the hikers aren't even aware the bears are present; they are merely *sharing* the landscape.

I believe that grizzly bears and people can peacefully coexist in rural areas. The greatest obstacle standing in the way of greater societal acceptance of grizzlies is the habituation of bears to human food/garbage/animal feed. Grizzlies become a serious and aggressive threat once they learn to associate humans with food – justifying the label of 'problem bear'. But the fact is that humans typically create problem bears by failing to properly store potential grizzly foods, thus providing bears with a tantalizing first taste that compels them to seek it out in the future.

In the early nineties, a bear called 'Digger', or 'The Dairy Queen Bear'⁶⁹, periodically spent time in and around the town of Bigfork, Montana.⁷⁰ Montana Fish and Game had previously fitted Digger with a radio collar,⁷¹ which meant that bear managers were able to monitor his movements. Few Bigfork residents knew that Digger was around and even fewer saw him because he was "shy and retiring, doing everything a grizzly must do to survive amid expanding humans."⁷² When Fish & Game finally made his presence public⁷³ some residents expressed excitement and others expressed unease,

but the general sentiment was not anti-grizzly.⁷⁴ In spite of the fact that he did find and eat human garbage on at least two occasions,⁷⁵ Digger eventually moved back into wilderness.⁷⁶ As of 1997, Digger still existed around people, though not in a town. He regularly left scat on the driveways of a rural neighborhood, whose residents had never seen him.⁷⁷ Author Roland Cheek wonders if Digger is “a possible bear of the future...(who has) exhibited exactly the type of behavior all grizzlies must adopt to survive amid a mushrooming human population that is predicted to double within the next sixty years.”⁷⁸

Natural History films portray grizzly bear behaviors in a manner that allows them to be broken into two categories: behaviors that occur in wilderness/grizzly regions and behaviors that occur in human regions. Filmmakers typically only use wilderness regions to portray ‘natural’⁷⁹ behaviors and utilize non-wilderness/rural regions only to portray problem⁸⁰ behaviors. So while some films present a responsible portrayal that encourages the perception that grizzlies and humans can coexist in wilderness, audiences are rarely, if ever, presented with a portrayal that supports the perception that grizzlies and people can coexist outside of wilderness. These films instead propagate the perception that when grizzlies leave wilderness they abandon their natural, wild behaviors and enter onto a path that inevitably brings them into conflict with people.

Filmmakers perceive rural areas as places they go only when they need to obtain a sequence of grizzly bears exhibiting problem behaviors or a sequence of grizzly bear management. But grizzlies living outside of wilderness exhibit the same ‘natural’ behaviors that grizzlies living in wilderness exhibit. It is true that grizzlies are more

likely to come into conflict with humans if they live in rural regions but, as evidence by the Dairy Queen Bear, it isn't at all a certainty. Natural history films have a responsibility to make audiences aware of these facts.

A NEW GRIZZLY ARCHETYPE

If future natural history films are to benefit the grizzly, they will require a new, ecocentric archetype:

The grizzly bear has an intrinsic right to exist and humans have an ethical⁸¹ responsibility to honor this right. The fact that some grizzlies occasionally maul hikers or kill livestock does not negate it. The grizzly requires more habitat than wilderness areas alone can provide and, with the exception of heavily settled areas, it's capable of surviving in nearly all areas of the American west; human actions and opinions have relegated them to wilderness areas. Grizzlies can share a non-wilderness/rural landscape with humans, provided that people take a few responsible steps to ensure that the bears don't come to associate humans with food. The grizzly was, and can again be, an important component of all Western ecosystems, from the Mississippi to the Pacific.

Filmmakers currently perceive the grizzly, its actions and role in the world through an anthropocentric lens, basing their understanding of the grizzly on *humanity's* relationship with the landscape. This new archetype requires filmmakers to remove human boundaries and divisions from their perception of the grizzly, to mentally and cinematically separate it from wilderness and embrace the idea that the *entire* landscape is part of nature. Civilization simply marks a variation in habitat, like a wetland or forest. This archetype values parks and wilderness areas and acknowledges that they are the heart of the grizzly's habitat, but recognizes that the grizzly is not bound to such places; we have relegated it to them. Edward Abbey⁸² and Henry David Thoreau⁸³ believed that

wilderness areas are an important part of civilization. Likewise, they are an essential *part* of grizzly habitat.

This new archetype also requires filmmakers to perceive the grizzly's actions through a more egalitarian lens. Filmmakers too often place the majority of responsibility for conflict on grizzlies by simply portraying them as 'problem bears.' But humans are often more to blame than the bears and filmmakers need to take the bold, possibly unpopular, step of identifying 'problem people' as well as 'problem bears'. The Good, The Bad, And The Grizzly's greatest flaw is that it fails to take this step. Filmmakers must equitably distribute the responsibility for conflict and must accurately portray the grizzly's behavior around people. They must go beyond simply blaming bears if society is to ever accept the grizzly in rural areas.

This archetype isn't entirely new – traces of it appear in past films. Grizzly and Man – Uneasy Truce redeems itself in the closing sequence by introducing Millie, an elderly lady who lives alone in grizzly country. She recounts an encounter she had with a grizzly family and shows pictures she took. She expresses a belief that the bears have a right to exist and be around her house – though perhaps not so close. Audiences come away with a new perception – if a little old lady is willing to share her landscape with grizzlies, why can't we all?

Predators of the Wild possesses a similar sequence in which the late Stan Price, an elderly Alaskan who lives on Admiralty Island's Pack Creek, talks about a lifetime of coexisting with bears. He portrays the grizzly/brown bear⁸⁴ simply as another animal that he's lived alongside for years, dispelling the notion that it is a fearsome, intimidating

beast and in the process essentially nullifying the attitudes and perceptions of the grizzly hunters that the filmmakers featured in an earlier sequence.⁸⁵ Malcolm Penny, the program's producer, chose to end the program with a sentence that encapsulates the new archetype: "In Alaska, people and bears can live together". While Predators of the Wild did have flaws, it succeeded in leaving audiences with a hopeful, inspiring message that isn't strident.

Predators of the Wild and The Grizzlies both present sequences that show humans fishing alongside bears. These portrayals are particularly important because they portray humans interacting with the grizzlies for a utilitarian purpose: they hope to catch salmon to eat, just as the bears do. This sequence illustrates that grizzlies and humans can share a region peaceably, even when imperialistic nostalgia isn't the human's motivation for being present or for allowing the grizzlies to be present. But while this is definitely a positive step, it still doesn't go far enough. The new archetype requires sequences that portray grizzlies peacefully existing in regions that are defined by anthropocentric purposes (ranching, farming, recreation, etc.). Films must not only show bears coexisting in grizzly regions (i.e. wilderness areas), but also in rural, human regions (i.e. the Dairy Queen Bear). The new archetype requires the filmmakers cease perceiving rural areas as simply epicenters of human-grizzly conflict. They must perceive rural areas (and portray them) as places where grizzlies lead lives that are nearly identical to the lives of those bears living in wilderness. They can and should acknowledge the fact that grizzlies living in rural areas stand a higher chance of coming into conflict with people, but must do so as *part* of balanced portrayal and should do so in a manner that stresses the

importance and ease of food storage rather than encouraging the perception of grizzlies as a menace or inconvenient.

These examples serve as past evidence of the archetype but it needs to become the norm in naturally history films, not the exception.

For the vast majority of humanity, natural history films are the primary, and often only, source of information on exotic and rare wildlife species such as Yellowstone's grizzlies. The portrayal of this population as being strictly 'wilderness creatures' has been scientifically questionable and even misleading for years. But now, with a grizzly population nearing recovery, the portrayal is unethical because it reinforces misperceptions⁸⁶ that could prevent the population from ever fully recovering.

Natural history films often serve as a feedback loop between society and its perceptions of nature. This is problematic because they increase our society's alienation from nature. Documentaries historically questioned societal beliefs, but natural history films seem to have abandoned this tradition; they strengthen, rather than confront the status quo.⁸⁷ Natural history filmmakers must become more subversive by utilizing the new, ecocentric grizzly archetype if they are to positively affect audiences' perceptions of the grizzly and their relationships with it.

The grizzly bear is in some ways a harbinger; other animals are already, or will soon experience a similar situation: namely, that they no longer have enough wilderness areas to support their existence. For this reason all filmmakers, not just those working with grizzly bears, must realize that while they may now choose to *create* wilderness sets for their films, they will soon have no choice in the matter: current perceptions and

attitudes towards most wildlife, and towards nature in general, are ensuring the likelihood that no large predators will exist one hundred years from now. It seems that the world's mega-fauna's only hope for survival lies not solely in the preservation of wilderness but also in humanity's acceptance of their existence and in humanity's realization that if these animals are to survive, they will need to exist in non-wilderness habitat.

In 1958 the American naturalist Earl Fleming said, "It would be appropriate, if among the last man-made footprints found on Earth were the huge tracks of the great brown bear." At first glance this quote attests to Fleming's desire that grizzlies not go extinct, but the quote's deeper meaning reveals how the grizzly's long-term survival can be ensured. If grizzlies are to survive, they must be allowed to walk and live among us. It is possible that humanity could come to perceive the grizzly in this manner without the help or input of natural history films utilizing new wildlife archetypes, but it is more likely that filmmakers will have to play a prominent and active role in the transformation. This role will require filmmakers to adopt the new archetype (or similar archetypes for non-grizzly subjects) and adopt two new basic perceptions of nature, and more accurately of the world. Both perceptions must be integrated into the foundations of natural history films. The first is all too familiar: grizzlies require more habitat than solely wilderness if they are to survive. The second is more profound and possibly more difficult to accept; humans are as valid a part of nature as any other life form on Earth and our presence doesn't spoil or invalidate nature.

FOOTNOTES

¹ 4.6%, or 106 million acres.

² U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Resources. “U.S. Land Statistics and Environmental Progress.”

http://resourcescommittee.house.gov/issues/more/land_envstatistics.htm

³ The U.S. Bureau of Land Statistics considers developed areas to consist of roads, suburban sprawl, airports, etc.

⁴ Developed areas constitute 5%, or 115 million acres, of the U.S.

⁵ U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Resources. “U.S. Land Statistics and Environmental Progress.”

http://resourcescommittee.house.gov/issues/more/land_envstatistics.htm

⁶ The majority of the United States’ wilderness areas are in California, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado and New Mexico (excluding Alaska).

⁷ Anthropocentrism arose in classical Europe and spawned three philosophies that have shaped the American landscape as much as any glacier: modernism, capitalism and resourcism. Conservationism and preservationism, two offshoots (or watered-down versions) of resourcism, are the dominant paradigms used to manage our forests, parks and wilderness areas.

⁸ I’m grouping conservationism and preservationism under anthropocentrism because the both are heavily influenced by an anthropocentric bias. Likewise, I’m grouping more radical environmental philosophies under ecocentrism for simplicity’s sake.

⁹ Though imperialistic nostalgia motivates us to *visit* the grizzly’s ‘wild sanctuary’.

¹⁰ Biologists currently estimate that there are 500-600 grizzly bears in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. This is more than when the grizzly was first listed on the endangered species act, but still not enough to ensure long-term genetic stability and survival. That will require a larger population and connections to other populations of bears.

¹¹ Oelschlaeger, Max, The Idea of Wilderness. New Haven: Yale University, 1991: 28.

¹² Nash, 27-29, 33.

¹³ Carolyn Merchant, Reinventing Eden. New York: Routledge, 2003: 28.

¹⁴ The wolf is likely the best example of an ‘evil’ animal whose extermination was called for by both religion and government.

¹⁵ Merchant, 13-20.

¹⁶ Nash, 69.

¹⁷ Nash, 23.

¹⁸ Today Easterners (NY, Washington DC) call for increased protection of wild lands and wildlife in the West while Westerners bristle at they’re ‘meddling’ and respond by calling for the reintroduction of wolves into Central Park.

¹⁹ Nash, 75-77.

²⁰ Nash, 78 –82. Cole’s painting, “The Oxbow”, is an example of this idealized combination of wilderness and civilization. The picture’s left half is wilderness,

consisting of a rugged cliff, shattered trees and dark clouds. The right half is a vista of 'rural bliss', including neat farm fields, groves and homesteads.

²¹ Pinchot is generally considered to be America's first professionally trained forester and was the first chief of the US Forest Service.

²² Both mineral resources and timber resources.

²³ Theodore Roosevelt's attitudes about wilderness are emblematic of this. Roosevelt is generally perceived as one of the first U.S. politicians to value wilderness, but he valued it for how it made him feel – it served as an area to prove his masculinity and vitality. One could argue that this famous hunter found no intrinsic value in the big game he hunted – the animals were simply a means by which he could prove himself.

²⁴ Nash, 43.

²⁵ Nash, 125.

²⁶ Both regions were made national parks not because of wildlife, but because of their scenic beauty. The protection of wildlife was a subsidiary goal until recent years.

²⁷ One of the Wilderness Protection Act's (1964) main tenets is that humans may only be *visitors* to wilderness areas, they may not be permanent residents and permanent structures are strictly regulated and often banned.

²⁸ William Cronon, Uncommon Ground. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995: 81.

²⁹ Nash, 1-7.

³⁰ Cronon, 79.

³¹ Though not commonly acknowledged, grizzlies definitely lived in Colorado's San Juan Mountains until the 1970's and there is evidence that they still do.

³² Chuck Schwartz (Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team Leader), personal conversation, 2004.

³³ Relocated back into wilderness areas or killed, either at the hands of managers or the public.

³⁴ Chuck Neal, Grizzlies In The Mist. Moose, WY & San Francisco: Homestead Publishing, 2003: 129. Biologists estimate that 500-600 grizzlies currently reside in the greater Yellowstone ecosystem. This number can be expected to hold steady if no additional habitat is made available, or denied to grizzlies.

³⁵ Neal, 128. A minimum viable population of grizzly bears needs a connected population of at least 2,000 animals in order to have a 95% probability of survival over three hundred or more years.

³⁶ The Grizzlies. Thomas Skinner, Producer. National Geographic / WQED Pittsburgh, 1987

³⁷ Romanticism initially was a rebuttal to modernism (represented by the industrial/scientific revolution) that rejected a mechanistic view of nature and perceived nature to be a living, evolving whole. Modernism has become a subset of humanism over the past century as civilizations have advanced. As a result, romanticism is a voice of dissent against humanism as well. An idealized, romantic portrayal of nature rebuts humanity by excluding it.

³⁸ Greg Mitman, Reel Nature, Harvard University Press, 1999: 108. Mitman also points out that a new genre of nature films that capitalized on a romantic desire for pure nature arose in the 1940's, with Walt Disney leading the charge.

³⁹ Showdown at Grizzly River. Doug Bertran, Producer. Bertran Productions / Thirteen WNET New York, 2000.

⁴⁰ There is a short (two - three minute) opening sequence that acknowledges the human presence but this may well have been added for the home video version and not included in broadcast.

⁴¹ Considering the filming restrictions at McNeil, it is obvious that the filmmakers made such a concerted effort.

⁴² Predators of the Wild: Grizzly Bear. Malcolm Penny, Producer. Survival Anglia Ltd., 1992.

⁴³ The Grizzlies. Thomas Skinner & Debbus B, Kane, Executive Producers. Theodore Thomas, Writer/Producer. National Geographic / WQED Pittsburgh, 1987.

⁴⁴ The Grizzly's Return, Sara Shier, Producer, Matjijn Films, 2005.

⁴⁵ Neil Evernden, The Social Creation of Nature. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992: 107.

⁴⁶ People may perceive the nature they encounter on an everyday basis to be damaged or marginalized because it doesn't live up to the romantic, Eden - like portrayal of nature natural history films present. This idealized portrayal is 'true nature'.

⁴⁷ For the person, not the bear.

⁴⁸ State and Federal agencies as well as the media commonly use the term 'problem bear'.

⁴⁹ Managers use aversive conditioning (rubber bullets, explosives, trained dogs) to 'teach' bears to stay away from people.

⁵⁰ By unobtrusively, I mean without being in conflict with people.

⁵¹ Grizzly & Man, Uneasy Truce. Chris Palmer, Executive Producer. National Audubon Society / WETA Washington D.C., 1988.

⁵² Stephen Herrero. "Human Injury Inflicted by Grizzly Bears." *Science*, (6 November, 1970). Herrero calculated the probability of being mauled by a grizzly to be about .00007 percent in 1970. The number of grizzly-caused injuries has declined since he made this calculation due to more responsible food storage practices, in spite of a significant increase in the number of bears.

⁵³ What I mean by 'living responsibly' is taking steps to ensure that grizzlies don't obtain food from humans or human structures. By 'traveling responsibly' I mean bringing defensive measures such as pepper spray and making noise while hiking/walking/running/etc.

⁵⁴ The Good, The Bad, And The Grizzly. Fred Kaufman, Executive Producer. Thirteen WNET New York, 2004.

⁵⁵ Three ranchers discuss problems they have had with an 'expanding grizzly population'. One woman recounts a frightening encounter on her front porch but the majority of concern seems to be centered of the supposed financial impact grizzlies have on ranching.

⁵⁶ This is an important distinction because while grizzlies do kill livestock they often scavenge from animals that have been killed by other predators, died due to management errors or died naturally.

⁵⁷ Horejsi, Brian, Ph.D., “Ranching in Bear Country – Conflict and Conservation,” Welfare Ranching: The Subsidized Destruction of the American West. Wuerthner, George, ed. Washington D.C.: Island Press, 2002: 221-226.

⁵⁸ Fatalities mean cattle that died on the range – never making it to slaughter.

⁵⁹ Black bears (which were grouped with grizzlies in the statistics) are far more widespread than grizzlies, though not as predatory (or as capable of killing an adult cow). Therefore, I would estimate grizzlies accounted for 2/3 of all predation.

⁶⁰ Many ranchers still maintain a ‘bone-yard’ – a specific location where they dump cattle that have died of natural causes. These bone-yards attract grizzlies and some biologists and managers claim they cause grizzlies to consider cattle as prey, in effect creating ‘cattle-killers’. Carcasses should be taken to rendering facilities as soon as possible (private groups will pay for costs) or bone-yards should be made bear-proof by installing electric fences (Horejsi). Additional measures, such as electric fences, can often reduce grizzly conflict with little or no cost to ranchers (public and private organizations provide grants to minimize carnivore conflict).

⁶¹ Defenders of Wildlife, “Grizzly Compensation Trust.” www.defenders.org/wildlife/grizzly/facts.html. (Defenders of Wildlife provides ranchers with financial reimbursement for predator losses in the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem – an environment with more grizzlies than Yellowstone and with an equivalent amount of ranching.) In an average year grizzlies kill 15 cows and five sheep in the NCDE. Losses have been less than \$14,000 per year over the past five years, a minute amount for a million-dollar industry.

⁶² Horejsi, 221-226.

⁶³ Fremont county commissioners (other Wyoming county politicians soon followed suit) passed a law banning grizzly bears and wolves from entering their county (which is part of the grizzly bear recovery zone).

⁶⁴ Wyoming residents and politicians have made frequent complaints about National Forest food-storage regulations. These regulations require people to store their foods in trees, out of the reach of grizzlies, and are designed to minimize conflict and prevent bears from becoming habituated. But some Wyomingites have submitted public comments (to the state government) claiming that this is an infringement on their rights and enjoyment.

⁶⁵ Several communities in the region have threatened legal action to block food storage restrictions intended to keep grizzlies from becoming habituated to human food; they also refused federal grants and private funds intended to purchase bear-resistant garbage containers. And bear managers continue to find unsecured food, garbage and livestock feeds, in spite of repeated suggestions, cautions and warnings.

⁶⁶ The film was named a finalist at the 2005 International Wildlife Film Festival and was named a finalist for multiple awards at the 2005 Jackson Hole Wildlife Film Festival.

⁶⁷ Saving the Grizzly, One Hair at a Time. John Shier, Producer. Matjijn Films, 2002.

⁶⁸ While *individuals* don't permanently reside in Glacier, the human *species* does.

⁶⁹ Residents christened Digger with this name because he was known to graze on vegetation within a couple hundred yards of a Dairy Queen restaurant.

⁷⁰ Cheek, Roland, Learning to Talk Bear. Columbia Falls, MT: Skyline Publishing, 1997: 142.

⁷¹ Digger wasn't a problem bear – he had been trapped and collared as part of a grizzly research project in the NCDE.

⁷² Cheek: 146.

⁷³ Montana Fish & Game officials felt compelled to alert residents of his presence because they feared it could, in a reasonably populated town, result in unexpected encounters.

⁷⁴ Cheek: 146.

⁷⁵ Cheek. 145. According to Cheek, Digger did not become habituated as a result; as of 1997 he had not pursued any additional human foods.

⁷⁶ Fish & Game 'helped out' by trapping Digger and relocating him 150 miles from Bigfork.

⁷⁷ Cheek, 152.

⁷⁸ Cheek, 152.

⁷⁹ I'm referring to behaviors that most people would perceive as actions that wild grizzlies, uncompromised by human involvement, would exhibit

⁸⁰ I'm referring to behaviors such as eating garbage, breaking into homes, killing cattle, etc.

⁸¹ According to Oelschlaeger (pg. 292 -301) ecocentrism mandates ethical human actions that preserve such intrinsic values as diversity, stability and beauty. This promotes and benefits all life on Earth, including humankind.

⁸² Edward Abbey, Desert Solitaire. New York: Ballantine Books, 1968: 58.

⁸³ Nash, 93.

⁸⁴ Grizzly bears are a sub species of brown bear (*Ursus Arctos*) and their full scientific name is *Ursus Arctos Horribilis*. They are technically 'brown bears', but bears living inland (whether it be on the Alaskan tundra, the Canadian Rockies or in Yellowstone) are called 'grizzlies'. Brown bears living along the coasts of Alaska and British Columbia are commonly referred to simply as 'brown bears'.

⁸⁵ The hunters play the role of the archetypical 'rugged individualists', ala Roosevelt, out to courageously track and kill the ferocious beast.

⁸⁶ I am referring to the belief that grizzlies can't or shouldn't exist in non-wilderness regions. This belief instigates and perpetuates society's un-acceptance of the grizzly.

⁸⁷ I believe that this can be attributed to the fact that natural history films almost solely exist on television, a medium that seems to largely embrace programming that doesn't question or challenge the values and beliefs of audiences.

REFERENCE MATTER

LITERATURE CITED

- Abbey, Edward. Desert Solitaire. New York: Ballantine Books, 1968.
- Cronon, William. "The Trouble with Wilderness," Uncommon Ground. Cronon, William, ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995
- Defenders of Wildlife. "Grizzly Compensation Trust,"
www.defenders.org/wildlife/grizzly/facts.html.
- Herrero, Stephen. "Human Injury Inflicted by Grizzly Bears." Science 6 November 1970.
- Horejsi, Brian, Ph.D. "Ranching in Bear Country – Conflict and Conservation," Welfare Ranching: The Subsidized Destruction of the American West. Ed. George Wuerthner. Washington D.C. : Island Press, 2002.
- Merchant, Carolyn. Reinventing Eden. New York: Routledge Press, 2003.
- Mitman, Greg. Reel Nature. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Nash, Roderick. Wilderness and the American Mind. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Neal, Chuck. Grizzlies In The Mist. Moose, WY & San Francisco: Homestead Publishing, 2003.
- Oelschlager, Max. The Idea of Wilderness. New Haven: Yale University, 1991.
- Rosaldo, Renato. Culture & Truth – The Remaking of Social Analysis. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.
- U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Resources. "U.S. Land Statistics and Environmental Progress."
http://resourcescommittee.house.gov/issues/more/land_envstatistics.htm

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bass, Rick. The Lost Grizzlies – A Search for Survivors in the Wilderness of Colorado. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1995.
- Bixler, Patricia E. Gifford Pinchot, Historic Pennsylvania Leaflet No. 39. Ed. Harold L. Myers. Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Harrisbur, 1976.
- Bouse, Derek. Wildlife Films. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Brown, David, The Grizzly in the Southwest. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985.
- Butler, Tom, ed. Wild Earth. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 1992.
- Chadwick, Douglas. True Griz. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 2003.
- Cheek, Roland. Chocolate Legs – Sweet Mother, Savage Killer?. Columbus Falls, MT: Skyline Publishing, 2001.
- Craighead, Frank. Track of the Grizzly. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1979.
- Dillehay, Thomas. The Settlement of the Americas. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Evernden, Neil. The Social Creation of Nature. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Fagan, Brian. The Long Summer. New York: Basic Books, 2004.
- Freemont, Wyoming, County Commission. Grizzly Bear Deemed Unacceptable Species. Resolution 2002-04. March 12, 2002.
- Hayles, Katherine. “Simulated Nature and Natural Simulations: Rethinking the Relation between the Beholder and the World,” Uncommon Ground. Cronon, William, ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995.
- Heuer, Karsten. Walking the Big Wild – From Yellowstone to the Yukon on the Grizzly Bear’s Trail. Seattle: The Mountaineers Books, 2004.
- Jans, Nick. The Grizzly Maze. New York: Dutton, 2005.
- Kellert, Stephen R., et al. “Human Culture and Large Carnivore Conservation in North America.” Conservation Biology 10 (1996) 977-990.

- Lowenthal, David. The Past is a Foreign Country. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Mattson, David J, et al. "Science and Management of Rocky Mountain Grizzly Bears." Conservation Biology 10 (1996) 921-1305.
- McMillion, Scott. Mark of the Grizzly. Helena, MT: Falcon Press, 1998.
- McNamee, Thomas. The Grizzly Bear. New York: Knopf, 1982.
- Noss, Reed, et al. "Conservation Biology and Carnivore Conservation in the Rocky Mountains." Conservation Biology 10 (1996) 921-1305.
- Olsen, Jack. Night of the Grizzlies. Moose, WY: Homestead Publishing, 1969.
- Olwig, Kenneth. "Reinventing Common Nature: Yosemite and Mount Rushmore – A meandering Tale of a Double Nature," Uncommon Ground. Ed. William Cronon. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995
- Pollan, Michael. Second Nature: A Gardener's Education. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1991.
- Primm, Steven A.. "A Pragmatic Approach to Grizzly Bear Conservation." Conservation Biology 10 (1996) 921-1305.
- Proctor, James. "Whose Nature? The Contested Moral Terrain of Ancient Forests," Uncommon Ground. Ed. William Cronon. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995.
- Quammen, David. Monster of God. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003.
- Russell, Andy. Grizzly Country. New York: Nick Lyons Books, 1967.
- Russell, Charlie & Enns, Maureen. Grizzly Heart. Toronto: Random House Canada, 2002.
- Schoch, Russell. "A Conversation with Carolyn Merchant." California Monthly June 2002: V.112, N.6.
- Schneider, Bill. Where the Grizzly Walks – The Future of the Great Bear. Guilford, CT: Falcon, 2004.

- Schullery, Paul. Lewis and Clark Among the Grizzlies. Helena, MT: Falcon Press: 2002.
- Schullery, Paul. Yellowstone Bear Tales. Boulder, CO: Roberts Rhinehart Publishers, 1991.
- Shelton, James. Bear Attacks II – Myth and Reality. Hagensborg, B.C., Canada: Pallister Publishing, 2001.
- Shepard, Paul, & Sanders, Barry. The Sacred Paw. New York: Penguin Books, 1985.
- Slater, Candace. “Amazonia as Edenic Narrative,” Uncommon Ground. Ed. William Cronon. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995
- Thoreau, Henry David. Walden. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1854.
- The United States Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Forest Service. Grizzly Bear Conservation for the Greater Yellowstone Area National Forests – Draft Environmental Impact Statement. July 2004.

FILMS CITED

- Grizzly & Man, Uneasy Truce. Chris Palmer, Executive Producer. Franz Cemnzind & David Clark, Producers. National Audubon Society / WETA Washington D.C., 1988.
- Predators of the Wild: Grizzly Bear. Malcolm Penny, Producer/Writer. Survival Anglia Ltd., 1992.
- Saving the Grizzly, One Hair at a Time. John Shier, Producer. Matjijn Films, 2002.
- Showdown at Grizzly River. Fred Kaufman, Executive Producer. Doug Bertran, Producer. Bertran Productions / Thirteen WNET New York, 2000.
- The Good, The Bad, And The Grizzly. Fred Kaufman, Executive Producer. Janet Hess Producer/Writer. Shane Moore Producer/Cinematographer. Thirteen WNET New York, 2004.
- The Grizzlies. Thomas Skinner & Debbus B, Kane, Executive Producers. Theodore Thomas, Writer/Producer. National Geographic / WQED Pittsburgh, 1987.
- The Grizzly’s Return, Sara Shier, Producer. Fulgens Productions, 2005.

FILMOGRAPHY

King of the Grizzlies. Winston Hibler, Producer. Walt Disney Productions, 1969.

Grizzly, Monarch of the Wilderness. Albert Karvonen, Executive Producer. Karvonen Films LTD, 1999.

Save the Endangered Species: The Grizzly Bear. Glen Hartford, Producer. Cinamour Entertainment.

The Bear. Jean-Jacques Annaud, Producer. Columbia Tri-Star, 1989.

Wild Discovery: The Great Siberian Grizzly. Kim Macquarrie & Drew Hunt, Producers. Discovery Channel Pictures / Superflow Corporation, 1997.