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Introduction:
People and their environments are inexorably linked to one another. Human activity and land use is the result of external environmental forcing and internal interpretation and application of ideals and experience to create perceptions (Amadeo and Golledge 135–36). Such perceptions dictate the activities and interactions occurring at the interface between humans and environment, the landscape. Humans are intensely complex and their actions are hard to predict and often irrational; however, the study of perceptual geography can lend insight into the reasoning behind choices of land use. Evidence for the pattern of land use over time can be extracted from a landscape after employing the concept of sequent occupancy, which involves analyzing the successive occupation of an area by different peoples and cultures and assessing this influence on the landscape (Holt-Jensen, 1999). Once a timeline is established and sources of evidence secured, it is important to delve into the cultural and societal perceptions of the landscape to address the questions of why the landscape was manipulated or utilized in a certain manner. The perceptions of a culture towards a landscape provide proper context, specific insight, and act as a guide when reconstructing the past landscapes of Mount Hood.

**Methodology and Source Material:**

The landscape surrounding Mount Hood was reconstructed and analyzed based on a classification of prevailing perceptions to determine how decisions of land use practices, influenced by perceptions, have produced the landscape. Two methods were used in an attempt to discern various perceptions of the landscape through time. First, primary sources and commentary on these sources were used to gain an understanding of general attitude, which could be verified through an examination of land use at that time. Secondly, perceptions were inferred through land use activities. Attempts were made to establish the perceptions of the general population that were relevant to physical
use and alteration of the landscape occurring on Mount Hood. The
categorized perceptions sometimes overlap or occur concurrently, but are
all included and analyzed separately in the analysis, as they are each
major contributors in the shaping of the landscape. Over time, these
perceptions may also fade in intensity and pervasiveness, fluctuating
between popular beliefs of the masses to more restricted ideas of a
local population. The analysis of land use attempted to focus on the
introduction of each general perception and the landscape influence at
the height of popularity.

A variety of source material was used to approach the task of
reconstructing past landscapes, each with their respective advantages
and drawbacks. Period source material for pre-European influence Oregon
often takes the form of archaeologically recovered artifacts or
transcribed oral histories. These oral histories often incorporate both
myth and fact into their testimony as Balch observes in Bridge of the
Gods: "Among a superstitious race, every fact becomes mingled more or
less with fable; every occurrence, charged with fantastic meanings."
When evaluating such sources, one is charged with the task of sifting
through the material and maintaining an open mind during interpretation,
analyzing all details closely in an attempt to draw out evidence of past
landscapes and the influence of human activity. Oral histories could be
influenced by cultural changes over time and it is important to attempt
to preserve the attitudes of the culture within the testimony to better
appreciate the symbolism of a landscape (Leffler and Brent, 1992 and
Meinig, 1979). Some of the material used in this analysis are second
hand sources, and have already gone through prior interpretation, which
must be considered and appreciated when conducting further analysis.
Records of this type can be biased by egocentric and ethno-ecological
ideas and so it is wise to compare material from a variety of sources to
uncover and provide a fair representation of the processes and parties
responsible for historical landscape change (Cronon, 1983). The written
record extending from the time of European contact may be considered more reliable in terms of its authenticity and accuracy, but additional measures should be referenced as an evaluation of bias. A vivid reconstruction displaying transitions over time can also be established by combining photographs with other sources of data. Analysis through comprehensive acceptance and integration of various source materials is necessary for a complete reconstruction of a landscape, since “all evidence needs to be corroborated before it can be more than a tantalizing suggestion of conditions in the past” (Russell, 1997).

Geographic setting

As the external agent influencing perceptions and defining land use options and potential resources, it is necessary to provide a proper description and background of the environmental features associated with Mount Hood. This stratovolcano is located approximately 160 km from the Pacific Ocean within the Cascade Range in northern Oregon, 45°22’24.3” latitude and 121°42’49.6” longitude (Lillquist and Walker, 2006). The local topography allows an unobstructed view of the mountain from all directions, an unusual feature that accentuates the strength and majesty cast by the mountain (Atkeson, 1977). The high visibility and solitary setting create a visual illusion, exaggerating the mountain’s height, which led to supposed overestimation in mountain elevation of several thousand feet by early settlers (Atkenson, 1977). More accurate early measurement techniques, such as barometer use, were applied in the late 19th century to obtain more accurate figures (Gannett, 1896).

The basal area at a 4000-foot elevation is approximately 80 miles (American Guide Series, 1940). Mount Hood is situated on the border of Oregon and Washington along the Columbia River Gorge, the major transportation route of the area into the 20th century. The Pliocene epoch was the major period of mountain building, while subsequent
outpourings of lava and erosion and weathering have continued to shape the mountain (American Guide Series, 1940). The volcano is currently considered dormant, though small-scale fumaroles and gas vent activity occurred into the mid 19th century (Topinka, 2008). This activity can also impact the landscape, for example, a portion of forest known as Ghost Forest was reduced by such volcanic activity in the beginning of the 19th century leaving behind deposits of ash (Lawrence, 1945). Tree ring analysis was conducted to determine the year of the event (Lawrence, 1945). In addition to volcanism, the landscape has been shaped by glacial activity. Currently eleven glaciers cover the mountain (Lillquist and Walker, 2006), while six rivers and two score creeks divert melt water from the glacier (American Guide Series, 1940).

**Reverence**

Although heavily reliant upon oral tradition, some aspects of Native American society were recorded to preserve the culture and belief systems. Much of the initial literature focuses on myths and creationist stories of the mountain and surrounding landscape. Various local tribes in the area, such as Clackamas, Klickitat, Tygh, Mollala, Wasco, and Paiute Indians, produced different myths as mechanisms to provide meaning to the environment before them (Atkeson, 1977). Similar details often arise in the analysis of these legends; a love story involving the personification of multiple mountain peaks, with a great warrior god, referred to as Wy’east, Sal-leks, or De-aubs, entombed within Mount Hood after death (Atkeson, 1977). The volcanic nature of the mountain is thus explained by the fierce warrior within. These myths describe a land viewed with awe and reverence, with a spiritual and sacred perception projected onto the mountains.

Land use on the mountain during the period of pre-European contact was restricted to small-scale burnings to improve the productive capabilities and secure food from the natural bounty. Mount Hood was
used as a landmark for gatherings and local populations established trails along the foothills of the mountain during the treks of various tribes to gathering sites along the Columbia River (Balch, 1940). The Columbia Gorge offered transportation, ample supply of local goods, and a central location for trade opportunities. Other direct influences on the mountain were negligible, allowing natural disturbance cycles to dominate the landscape. This respect and admiration for the mountain continued into the period of initial European contact.

**Respect**

The first recorded European sighting of Mount Hood is attributed to Lieutenant William Broughton of the Vancouver Expedition in 1792 (Grauer, 1975). An exploratory party lead by Broughton, referencing maps of the inlet produced by Captain Robert Gray, proceeded up the Columbia River with the goal of producing a more detailed description of the inlet and surrounding landscape (Mockford, 2003). Landforms and prominent features were named and general descriptions recorded. Broughton named the mountain in honor of famed British naval officer Lord Samuel Hood (1762-1814) (Mockford, 2003). Lewis and Clark noted in 1805 that the mountain had been referred to as Falls Mountain or Timm Mountain, where Timm was a Native American name referring “to the falls area in the river just above the site of the Dalles” (Grauer, 1975). William Clark also noted that this feature was “the mountain was the Mount Hood of Vancouver” (Grauer, 1975). The name quickly gained acceptance and has subsequently been referred to as Mount Hood. The mountain captivated early 19th century visitors to Fort Vancouver, established by the Hudson’s Bay Company, who shared the admiration and respect of the mountain attributed by Native Americans. These sentiments are borne out of journal entries, such those by botanist David Douglas in 1825, describing the mountain as “insurmountable” and Captain Nathaniel J. Wyeth in 1832, referencing the “large, snowy
mountain…a more stupendous pile than any of the Rocky Mountains” (Grauer, 1975).

Mount Hood continued to be dominated by natural factors, as direct contact with the mountain under this perceptional classification was quite limited. The mountain was observed from afar, since no monetary value was ascribed to the mountain. Interest during this period was focused on the Columbia River and its development, with Mount Hood relatively ignored aside from its aesthetic appeal. The perception in this era of appreciation for the spectacle of nature’s majesty was transformed into an attitude in which the mountain was regarded as a barrier to westward movement to an increasing population.

Obstacle

As manifest destiny gripped the nation, an ever-increasing number of eager settlers sought new land and a new beginning in the untamed wilderness. Routes of travel followed major river systems and where navigable, the Columbia River became heavily utilized. Rapids in the river required portaging and the rough terrain associated with the gorge necessitated the development of alternative routes and networks for safe travel. The prospect of a new route was further complicated by the presence of the Cascade mountain range, which proved to be a substantial obstacle to westward migration. The challenge of establishing a new path was met by a convoy including the Barlow and Palmer parties. The two families met at the Dalles in 1845 and quickly united under the common need for a way across the Cascades (Grauer, 1975). While exploring potential pathways, William Barlow recorded observations potentially described a volcanically induced event where a “Torrent of water carrying sand down from the mountain, the glacial area and the cliffs near the summit of Mt. Hood. Very significantly he mentioned the
grove of dead trees in the bottom that had been killed by water-carried sand being deposited around them” (Grauer, 1975). Sightings providing evidence of the raw power and ability of the mountain to alter landscapes, combined with a few near mishaps amid glacier fields, generated a renewed sense of appreciation for the dangers produced by the mountain (Grauer, 1975). The team decided to form a southern route around Mount Hood, along what is presently Highway 26. Although another trail, established by cattle drovers, led out of Hood River and followed the Lolo Pass northwest of the mountain, the Barlow Road became popular enough to be taken advantage of as a toll road (Grauer, 1975). The exact route as well as the ownership and location of the gate have changed over time, but the toll road remained in operation for approximately 70 years (Grauer, 1975). A few small settlements developed along the toll road, most notably Government Camp, whose name arose from the remains of an overburdened wagon train left behind during the passage under Lieutenant William Frost in 1849 (Rogers). The town was also referred to as Pompeii, visible on Metzger’s Atlases into the 1950’s, however the name Government Camp gained favor and primary usage when describing the town (Metzger’s Atlas Clackamas County 1937, 1951, 1966).

Over the decades following the establishment of the Barlow Toll Road, the mountain had been summited by a few daring individuals, however, the public perception of the mountain retained a wariness and awe of its raw nature and towering presence. The transportation network may have slightly reduced the intimidation factor of the mountain, granting a slight feeling of control over the mountain. The consequence of increased attention and population influx to the area was a larger human influence on the natural landscape. Humans began clearing vegetation for trail and road construction, though on a much smaller scale than subsequent development (Figure 1). The potential for invasive species introduction was also increased as a result of rising populations.
Manipulating the landscape by humans was increased, yet the use of land specific to the mountain was still limited in scale as few homesteaders selected alpine plots.

Figure 1: Mount Hood Loop (Grauer, 1975)

Exploration

Mount Hood with constant vigilance over the now developing city of Portland acted to arouse curiosity, attention, interest and a sense of adventure within certain citizens to tread into unknown territory. Groups of outdoor activists came together, surrounding their desire to explore their stoic neighbor in greater depth. One of the initial groups in this movement was the Oregon Alpine Club, which held its first meeting in 1887 (Grauer, 1975). Group interest seemed to wane in 1891, however, and the group soon dissolved. Three years later, some past
members of the club met and began what was to become the most influential mountaineering organization on Mount Hood. The Mazamas club was founded in 1894 with membership based on a successful scaling of Mount Hood, or display of equal ability by the achieving a climb to the summit of a comparable peak (Constitution of the Mazamas, 1896). During the first year over 100 members were initiated, composed of both men and women (List of Members, 1896). This group had a major impact on alpine culture and with other early mountaineering groups and was responsible for an attitude of conquest over the mountain, while still maintaining respect to the forces responsible for its existence. One of the original 1894 bylaws of the Mazamas stated their purpose was: “...to explore mountains, to disseminate authoritative and scientific information concerning them, and to encourage the preservation of forests and others features of mountains in their natural beauty.” However, by revealing more details about the mountain and in response to their mere presence and activity on the mountain, the prowess and capabilities of humans to utilize this landscape were displayed, which would lead to much different attitudes towards the mountain and result in a change in landscape (Mazamas Grants). Between the Mazamas group and others such as the Wiyeast Group and Crag Rats, a search and rescue club, a much larger proportion of the mountain was mapped and research committees were founded for the purpose of better understanding the mountain (Mazama Research Committee, 1925). Government agencies, such as the United States Geologic Survey, General Land Office, and National Forest Service, also created more accurate maps utilizing land surveys and techniques of mapping from photographs (Wernstedt, 1922). The mountain was also exposed to a wider audience through the movie “The Crystal Ascension” (1923), set on Mount Hood (Grauer, 1975).

With focused attention on the mountain, this period and exploration perception acted as a transition point for land use in the area. Small-scale use had dominated the landscape but with increasing
access through trails and improved mapping, the mountain was in effect
demystified, leaving it vulnerable to more permanent settlement as well
as development and increased tourism. These new land uses would
influence the landscape to an extent not yet experienced, both in terms
of the intensity of change as well as the scale.

Livelihood

The first stage in the progression from an environmental
determinist perception to a possibilist ideology occurred as a result of
human needs dictating land use. In order to survive and thrive in an
environment under a capitalistic doctrine, a source of revenue is
required to secure food, shelter and other basic needs. One of the
first sources of income for this area was through grazing. Evidence of
this activity is recorded in journals and publications, where it is
mentioned that sheep were often encountered on various parts of the
mountain by climbers (Lee, 1921).
Evidence for this land use can also be seen in the agricultural reports for Clackamas and Hood River Counties, where interest and participation in 4-H activities and annual county fairs indicates proportionately high activity surrounding animal husbandry (Oregon College of Agriculture Clackamas Extension Reports 1929, 1930). In addition to livestock, other forms of agriculture were carried out by settlers and by 1950 approximately 1,030 farms existed in Hood River County (Oregon College of Agriculture Hood River Extension Reports 1954). The most salient of the crops was fruit production in orchards. The two dominant crops for Hood River County by the 1960’s were apples and pears, making up over 80% of the agricultural income (Oregon College of Agriculture Hood River Extension Reports 1968). The Hood River Metzger’s Atlas of 1931 indicates plot ownership under multiple McIntosh names, a possible connection to, and introduction of, the McIntosh variety of apples grown in Oregon. Another resource that could be exploited for profit was timber. Lumber companies such as the Jones Lumber Company purchased large tracts of land in the area surrounding Mount Hood (Metzger’s Atlas Clackamas County 1951, 1966). Companies such as Publishers Papers Company, requiring timber for activities such as publishing and book production also increased their claim on land plots (Metzger’s Atlas Clackamas County 1951, 1966). The loss of initial forest cover and the restoration and planting of manicured forests has a large influence on native floral and faunal species distributions. Traditional old growth forests were replaced by rows of same aged tree stands creating a much different landscape. The tourist industry also began to develop in response to increasing visitation to the mountain.

Under the Livelihood perception, land use practices had a much greater influence on the landscape. Grazing and livestock operations require vast tracts of land, impacting the meadows around Mount Hood in addition to forests where land was cleared. Orchards restructured the
landscape as well, through forest clearing, soil agitation, and water system alteration by irrigation. Attempts were soon made to optimize profits from agriculture and other sources of livelihood discussed above, once a sufficient baseline income was established. Agriculture and lumber farms spread across the landscape and while these activities had a much greater impact spatially surrounding the mountain, it was the tourism industry, which would more intensely change the landscape of Mount Hood itself. The tourist industry relied on the development of towns and accommodations that would attract and provide ease of access for tourists. Houses and lodges were constructed beginning with the Cloud Cap Inn in 1889 (Grauer, 1975). In addition to accommodations, roads were required and sight seeing opportunities and activities needed to be developed.

**Economic Development**

The land use trends under the perception of livelihood continued as the question of how humans could use what was provided by the landscape for their needs was transformed into how humans could shape the landscape to suit their wants. Along the transportation networks, towns and villages began as stopovers for long trips or as final destinations for weary pioneers. The development of an improved road network surrounding Mount Hood connected early towns such as Rhododendron, Government Camp, and Hood River to one another and facilitated growth. This network included the Mount Hood Highway from Portland to Hood River that opened in 1915, a paved road joining road Government Camp to Portland completed in 1919, and a road from Hood River over Bennett and Barlow Passes to Government Camp, which completed the Loop Highway around the base of Mount Hood in 1925 (Figure 3) (Atkeson, 1977). The Lolo Pass Route opened in 1954 among other ancillary links in the network (Grauer, 1975). Other major roadways
providing access to the Loop Highway include The Columbia River Highway, built along the Columbia River between 1913 and 1922 (Columbia River Highway), and the Mount Hood Scenic Byway connecting Troutdale with Hood River (Mount Hood Scenic Byway).

Attraction to the mountain was influenced by the accessibility and altering perceptions of the landscape. Mount Hood was viewed as a valuable resource not only aesthetically, where one could engage in intimate contact with more or less unspoiled nature in its basest essence or form, but also from a strictly economic sense where the resources provided revenue. Developers eventually realized the potential of the area from the interest in outdoor activities and numbers of tourists presently visiting the mountain. O.C. Yokum of Government Camp initiated hotel construction in 1899 with the Mountain View House (Grauer, 1975). The 1920’s saw increased construction with such hotels as Timberline Hotel (1924) and the Battle Axe Inn (1925)
(Grauer, 1975). Unfortunately, the Mountain View House and Battle Axe Inn were destroyed by fires in the 1950’s (The Magic of Mount Hood). Hood River also saw a chance for development as ski facilities arose that continued into the 1970’s; discussed in the Hood River Agricultural Report 1970:

The ski development at Mt. Hood Meadows and the improvement of Highway 35 has brought an influx of ski enthusiasts to the area. Hood River County is expanding and improving county park facilities to accommodate a greater number of tourists. Tourism is expected to be a major contributor to the economy of the county in the years ahead.

Winter recreational activities, especially skiing, were major draws to the region. The first ski facilities, including the still operational Summit (1927), developed on Mount Hood with an interest in ski jumping (Grauer, 1975). Ski jumping required few runs and had less of an impact on the landscape when compared with modern ski hills. Multorpor and Ski Bowl, now a single ski area, developed in the years following the establishment of Summit, with continued interest in jump hills. Ski clubs soon arose, such as Mount Hood Ski Club, Cascade Ski Club, Viking Ski Club, and the Cascadians, who began holding competitions (Grauer, 1975). The activity at the ski areas attracted tourists, and the ski areas began adding ski runs and chairlifts along with lodges to accommodate the influx. The potential for economic development was not only locally acknowledged, but also at the national scale. As part of the national economic relief programs established by Franklin Delano Roosevelt during the Great Depression, the construction of Timberline Lodge became a project for the Works Progress Administration (WPA), as it was known at the time. The lodge, constructed in a unique Cascadian Architectural Style, was dedicated by Roosevelt on September 28, 1937 (Grauer, 1975). The construction of Mount Hood Meadows on the eastern slope and Cooper Spur on the north
The face of the mountain greatly opened up the mountain. The ski industry on Mount Hood became very successful and continues to thrive today.

Under the economic development perception, road construction vastly altered the native landscape, both in terms of its physical construction and the influence it had of attracting additional development. The construction of hotels, ski facilities, parking lots, chair lifts, and manicured runs changed the face of the mountain leaving indelible marks of human influence. The totality of exploitation, however, was partially impeded by the creation of Mount Hood National Forest.

**Preservation**

Although locally acknowledged by some, the movement utilizing the perception of preservation towards natural landscape was imposed upon the local landscape from a distant but powerful source, the National Government. The first parcel of land divvied up and set aside for preservation was the Bull Run Timberland Reserve in 1892 by President Harrison, allocating a pristine water source for the growing city of Portland, which fervently protected its water source (Grauer, 1975). In 1893 President Grover Cleveland established the Cascade Range Forest Reserve, including most of the Cascade Range (Grauer, 1975). The reserve was divided into north and south sections and operated under the General Land Office. In 1907 the Cascade Range Forest Reserve name was shortened to the Cascade Forest Reserve and in 1908 it was broken into several national forests where Mount Hood was included into the Oregon National Forest (Grauer, 1975). An executive order resulted in a renaming of the forest to the Mount Hood National Forest. In 1940 regional forester Lyle F. Watts announced a change in designation from primitive area to a wild area for 14,800 acres around Mount Hood (Figure 4) (Grauer, 1975). In these areas no roads, timber cutting or business was allowed, only recreation such as hunting, fishing, or skiing, with a
small area excluded for road to Cloud Cap Inn. In 1964 the wilderness act was passed establishing the national wilderness preservation system to manage wilderness areas, and defined the term wilderness in such a manner: "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the Earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain" (USDA Mount Hood Wilderness Map, 1983).
An old supervisor of the Mount Hood National Forest, Thomas Sherrard, discussing potential recreation area development in 1928 with Everett Sickler commented that "There are only two functions for this forest...One is to provide watershed area. The other is for grazing land" (Grauer, 1975). In addition to agricultural value, grazing of sheep during the early 20th century served the purpose of fire control, where
it was believed that sheep would have the influence of keeping fires from starting, keeping fires from spreading, and rendering fires less destructive (Rachford, 1923). The preservation perception extended to fire management as well. A fire lookout station was created in 1915 on the summit as part of the firefinder system for fire observation and in 1916, Timberline Cabin was built for the U.S. Forest Service (Grauer, 1975).

The perception of preservation limited development and human influence on the landscape of Mount Hood. Activities were only allowed in specific areas giving the landscape a somewhat parceled appearance. The wilderness area secured sections of forest that would be protected and kept in as natural a state as possible. The system of fire management altered natural processes and forest stand evolution, producing a landscape managed and controlled by humans.

Research

A cultural transition towards education about environmental trends and the influence of anthropogenic activities then occurred. The discipline of glacial studies gained attention for the capacity of glaciers to reflect climatic conditions. Mount Hood proved to be an important site for such studies due to the long period of measurements, initially begun by the Mazamas research group in 1925, and historical photographs enabling measurements through rephotography (Mazamas Research Committee, 1925 and Lillquist and Walker, 2006). Efforts to determine the influence and relationship between climate and snow pack have also been conducted on Mount Hood, while Mazama research has compared data between weather stations in an attempt to produce better spatial resolution for research (Heller 1963). Research on Mount Hood extends well beyond cryosphere, reflecting interests to all landscape components impacted by humans, such as meadow invasion by trees (Franklin et. al 1971), impact of ski slopes of vegetation (Titus and
Tsuyuzaki, 1999), and forest management (Dane, Meador, and White, 1977). The Mazamas organization has continued to make research a high priority, offering scholarships to relevant studies in addition to their own research.

The perception associated with research focused attention towards the mountain. In addition to specialized publications, general trends and results from research were sometimes conveyed in newspaper articles, attempting to draw awareness to changing landscape in hopes for action to stabilize and protect the landscape. The research methods themselves had little impact on the landscape; however, the potential change in land use resulting from the research may be very considerable in the future.

**Conclusion**

Perceptions are a product of the belief systems and cultural attitudes of a modern society and are therefore subject to change as time progresses. A variety of source material can be used to reconstruct historical landscapes and trace such land use evolution over time. The general land use trends surrounding Mount Hood can be classified based on the following perceptions: Reverence, Respect, Obstacle, Exploration, Livelihood, Economic Development, Preservation, and Research. Multiple perceptions and attitudes can occur during the same time period or overlap in their transitions, impacting the landscape to different degrees. Specific activities and their associated land use practices are a direct result of the general perceptions of Mount Hood and dictated how the landscape is viewed. The scale of human impact depends not only on the land use practice but also on the popularity and number of people ascribing to a perception. Popular movements, attitudes of the time, wants, and needs will shape public perception and it is the adoption or dismissal of these general public perceptions that in turn influences the trends of land use. Local perception has a dramatic
influence and has been a dominant forcing mechanism, while outside influence such as the National Government can mandate specific uses, imposing a specific perception. The variations in perception of Mount Hood have resulted in drastic changes to the landscape surrounding the mountain over the period of recorded history, the impact of which can only be fully appreciated after a complete reconstruction of the historic landscape.
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