

74/167z
v. 1

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between the Regents of the University of California and George B. Hartzog, dated 16 November 1967. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Library, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. The legal agreement with George B. Hartzog requires that he be notified of the request and allowed thirty days in which to respond.

The Bancroft Library

University of California/Berkeley

Regional Oral History Office

George B. Hartzog

THE NATIONAL PARKS, 1965

An Interview Conducted by

Amelia R. Fry

Copy No. ____



George B. Hartzog
Director, National Park Service
1964-1972

George B. Hartzog
Director, National Park Service
1964-1972



TABLE OF CONTENTS -- George B. Hartzog

INTERVIEW HISTORY	i
I. EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE TO 1965	1
<u>Public Support through Communication</u>	3
<u>Importance of Urban Areas</u>	7
II. DIRECTORSHIP OF NATIONAL PARKS	9
<u>Conrad Wirth's Retirement</u>	9
<u>Relationship to Other Agencies</u>	13
III. PARK PROTECTION AND THE PUBLIC	20
IV. REORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS	33
V. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: REORGANIZATION AND POLICY REVISIONS	36
VI. CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS	45
<u>Procedures</u>	45
<u>Redwood Park Example</u>	49
<u>Committees and Congressmen</u>	51
VII. FINANCING THE PARKS	55
VIII. CONCESSIONS	60
APPENDIX A: <u>S.F. Sunday Examiner and Chronicle</u> clipping, dated October 15, 1967.	66
APPENDIX B: E. T. Scoyen to United States National Park Service, Conference of Challenges. An Address, October 18, 1963.	67

APPENDIX C: Statement of George B. Hartzog, made before Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, January 18, 1968.	72
APPENDIX D: Listing of George B. Hartzog in <u>Who's Who in America</u> , 1967-1968.	87
APPENDIX E: Letter from George B. Hartzog to Amelia Fry, December 15, 1972.	88
APPENDIX F: Memorandum from Horace M. Albright on the Directorship of the National Park Service, December 26, 1972.	89
INDEX	90

INTERVIEW HISTORY

National Park Director George B. Hartzog was interviewed as a part of the Regional Oral History Office's series on parks and conservation. After the interviews with former Directors Newton B. Drury and Horace Albright, an up-dating of the directions of national park policy and management was needed. Director Hartzog, as one who had most recently been guiding the parks, was in a unique position to comment.

Interviewer: Amelia R. Fry.

Time and Place: April 4, 1965, during Director Hartzog's visit to California for the Sierra Club's wilderness conference. The interview was held in Muir Woods National Monument, where the superintendent made his office available for the tape recording.

The Interview: Grateful acknowledgement belongs to Newton Drury, who was still working on parts of his oral history at the time, for helping arrange Mr. Hartzog's willing consent to record the interview after a speech in Muir Woods.

Seated in the desk chair in the redwood office with the staccato palaver of tourists outside punctuating his remarks, Mr. Hartzog answered the questions with the easy articulation of one who had been over them many times in his own mind during the past year, his first year as director.

Although his busy schedule demanded an arbitrary cut-off time for the interview, the pace of the conversation was unrelenting but unhurried. His answers are thorough and thoughtful within the time frame available, and his dedication to park preservation and, simultaneously, the sometimes conflicting public availability of the lands, is fully evident. In fact, the theme of the interview can be his statement, "There is nothing easy about this. I don't think it should ever get real easy; if it does, I don't think the American public will appreciate their parks. I think we always have to be on the leading edge of concern"

After Mr. Hartzog returned to Washington, a proposal was sent to him from the Regional Oral History Office to continue the taping, once each year, for as long as he would be in office. The transcript was held in limbo status while various plans were outlined and negotiations

pursued with Cornelius Heine (then a National Park officer charged with planning an agency effort to preserve documentation of National Park Service history), with the Forest History Society, and with Director Hartzog. The correspondence file shows that in 1967 additional sessions were still being considered, and in 1969 at the Ladybird Grove dedication of the National Redwood Park Mr. Heine felt there was still a chance to allow a year-by-year current record to be recorded.

In the meantime, the transcript was edited in 1967 (very little, but some) by the interviewer and sent to Mr. Hartzog, who made a few light emendations, mainly changes in a word here and there, and who also apparently had one or two close aides read it. He returned it January of 1968 with an agreement for open use, but further processing was postponed on the possibility of additional sessions. Also in early 1968, Robert Cahn, a staff correspondent of Christian Science Monitor, received permission from Mr. Hartzog to use a copy of the transcript as part of the source material for a series of 15 articles on the national parks which appeared in that newspaper the spring and summer of 1968. Copies of three of the series are in the Hartzog file in The Bancroft Library.

Even though the idea of an annual interview had bogged down, Mr. Hartzog's interest continued and he had corroborating material sent for the appendix--such as the 1963 speeches of Eivind Scoyen and Conrad Wirth. More bulky supplemental documents are filed separately with the interview at The Bancroft Library.

The Regional Oral History Office has also included in the appendix two letters pertaining to Hartzog's resignation after the re-election of President Nixon in 1972: one is a letter to the interviewer from the Director; the other is a letter sent to the interviewer at about the same time from former Director Horace M. Albright, who consented to its inclusion in the manuscript. At this time the manuscript was final-typed and sent through the process of proofing, indexing, and binding. The National Park Service Regional Office in San Francisco is to be thanked for furnishing the photograph of its recent Director.

Amelia R. Fry
Interviewer
Regional Oral History Office

20 October 1973
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California
Berkeley, California

INTERVIEWS ON FORESTRY, PARKS, AND CONSERVATION

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

- Albright, Horace M. and Drury, Newton B. Comments on Conservation, 1900-1960. 1962. vi, 53 p.
- Black, Rexford Private and State Forestry in California, 1917-1960. 1968. 159 p.
- Bryant, Harold C. and Drury, Newton B. Development of the Naturalist Program in the National Park Service. 1964. vi, 49 p.
- Chaney, Ralph Works Ralph Works Chaney, Ph.D., Paleobotanist, Conservationist. 1960. x, 277 p.
- Clepper, Henry The Society of American Foresters. 1968. 36 p. (Bound with Hornaday and Pomeroy.)
- Coffman, John D. Forest Protection in the National Parks. 1973. ix, 126 p.
- Colby, William E. Reminiscences. 1954. vi, 145 p.
- Colgan, Richard Forestry in the California Pine Region. 1968. 50 p. (Bound with Krueger.)
- Dana, Samuel T. The Development of Forestry in Government and Education. 1967. 98 p.
- Drury, Newton B. Parks and Redwoods. 2 vols. 1972. xxii, 772 p.
- Dunshee, Bertram K. Land Planning in Marin County. 1965. v, 53 p.
- Evison, Herbert and Drury, Newton B. The National Park Service and Civilian Conservation Corps. 1963. vii, 143 p.
- Farquhar, Francis P. Francis P. Farquhar on Accountancy, Mountaineering, and the National Parks. 1960. xv, 376 p.
- French, Enoch Percy and Drury, Newton B. Cruising and Protecting the Redwoods of Humboldt. 1963. vi, 86 p.

- Fritz, Emanuel Emanuel Fritz: Teacher, Editor, and Forestry Consultant. 1972. xiii, 336 p.
- Gill, Tom The Summary of the Career of Tom Gill, International Forester. 1969. vi, 75 p.
- Granger, Christopher Forest Management in the United States Forest Service. 1965. xiv, 131 p.
- Hall, Ansel F. A conversation between Ansel F. Hall and Francis P. Farquhar, appended to Francis P. Farquhar volume. 1958. 34 p.
- Hall, R. Clifford Forest Taxation Study 1926-1935. 1967. vii, 113 p. (Bound with Shepard.)
- Hartzog, George B. The National Parks, 1965. 1973. 90 p.
- Hornaday, Fred E. The American Forestry Association: 1928-1964. 1968. 20 p. (Bound with Clepper and Pomeroy.)
- Isaac, Leo Douglas Fir Research in the Pacific Northwest. 1967. 152 p.
- Knowland, Joseph R. and Drury, Newton B. Conservation and Politics. 1965. ix, 120 p.
- Krueger, Myron E. Forestry and Technology in Northern California. 1968. 27 p. (Bound with Colgan.)
- Lowdermilk, Walter C. Soil, Forest, and Water Conservation in China, Israel, Africa, and the United States. 2 vols. 1969. xxxix, 704 p.
- Lund, Walter Timber Management in the Pacific Northwest, 1927-1965. 1967. vi, 83 p.
- McCulloch, Walter Forestry and Education in Oregon, 1937-1966. 1968. viii, 216 p.
- Metcalf, Woodbridge Extension Forester, 1926-1956. 1969. vii, 138 p.
- Miller, Loye H. The Interpretive Naturalist. 1970. ix, 61 p.
- Muiriana Four interviews on John Muir by personal acquaintances John Briones, William Colby, Dr. Herbert Evans, and Frank Swett. 1971. 106 p.

- Munger, Thornton T. Forest Research in the Northwest. 1967. x, 245 p.
- Packard, Walter E. Land and Power Development in California, Greece, and Latin America. 1970. xiv, 603 p.
- Peirce, Earl S. Salvage Programs Following the 1938 Hurricane. 1968. viii, 52 p.
- Pomeroy, Kenneth B. The American Forestry Association: Operations. 1968. 21 p. (Bound with Clepper and Hornaday.)
- Ringland, Arthur C. Conserving Human and Natural Resources. 1970. xvi, 538 p.
- Schofield, William R. Lobbying in California. 1968. 159 p.
- Shepard, Harold B. The Forest Insurance Study, a written memoir. 1967. 6 p. (Bound with R. Clifford Hall.)
- Show, Stuart Bevier National Forests in California. 1965. xvi, 215 p.
- Sieker, John H. Recreation Policy and Administration in the United States Forest Service. 1968. xi, 49 p. (Bound with Swift.)
- Swift, Lloyd Wildlife Policy and Administration in the United States Forest Service. 1968. 29 p. (Bound with Sieker.)

IN PROCESS:

Eddy Tree Breeding Station

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Gladys Austin
Jack Carpender
W.C. Cumming
A. R. Liddicoet
Nicholas Mirov
R. I. Righter</p> | <p>A six-part volume of individual interviews with men and women who participated in the establishment and early work of the Eddy Tree Breeding Station near Placerville, California.</p> |
| <p>Kneipp, Leon F.</p> | <p>Assistant Chief of the U.S. Forest Service in charge of lands and acquisition.</p> |
| <p>Kotok, E.I.</p> | <p>Assistant Chief of the U.S. Forest Service in charge of research, of state and private forestry.</p> |

Marsh, Raymond E.

Assistant Chief of the U.S. Forest
Service in charge of economic re-
search.

Nelson, DeWitt

State natural resources administrator.

Roberts, Paul

Forest Service administrator.

October 1973

(Interview: April 4, 1965)

EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE TO 1965

Fry: First I'd like to ask about your background, where you were born and what kind of schooling you had.

Hartzog: Well, I was born in 1920 on a farm in South Carolina in the lower part of the state in Colleton County. I went to public school. The school that I graduated from was a military preparatory school in the town of Bamberg, South Carolina, Carlisle Military School. After graduating from there in 1937 I went to Wofford College in Spartanburg, South Carolina for one semester until I had to stop school and go to work because of family difficulties.

I went to work as a stenographer, from there went into a law office as a stenographer and studied law at night in the law office. I passed the bar examination and was admitted to practice law in 1942. In the meantime, I had gone into the Service in 1940 with the National Guard when it was inducted, and I got out in 1941 just before Pearl Harbor. I went back into the Service for the second time in 1943.

After the war I went to work for the Department of Interior as an attorney in the Bureau of Land

Hartzog: Management. After six months there, I left the bureau and went to work for a law firm in Washington and was there only a matter of a few weeks when the National Park Service offered me a job as an attorney -- the National Park Service office was then in Chicago. So I went to Chicago for the National Park Service as an attorney, and a year later the office was transferred back to Washington, and I stayed there a few weeks and was then transferred down to Lake Texoma, at Denison, Texas.

It was an area which we administered under a cooperative agreement with the Corps of Engineers. There I served as regional attorney for the Southwest Region of National Park Service. I was out there about ten months, and then I went back to Washington as a lawyer.

In 1950 I was detailed - and then later transferred - to the concessions management work of the National Park Service. I stayed in that office until 1955, when I went to Rocky Mountain National Park as assistant superintendent. In 1957 I went to the Great Smoky Mountains as assistant superintendent.

In 1959 I went to St. Louis as superintendent of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, which was

Hartzog: a big project just then beginning to be developed on the river front, telling the story of westward expansion. I stayed there until the bulk of the money had been obligated and the majority of the work had been put under contract; and then a private organization offered me a job as executive director of Downtown St. Louis Incorporated, which I accepted in 1962, resigning from the National Park Service in July. Shortly after I left the Service, Connie Wirth and Secretary Udall offered me the job of Associate Director of the Park Service, and I went back with the Service in February of 1963. And then I took over as Director in January 1964.

Public Support Through Communication

Fry: Would you like to say anything concerning this path you have just laid out for us here, of experiences you've had which you think have a bearing on your role now as director of the National Parks? For instance, I noticed you said your concessions management work in 1950 took up a lot of your time. Do you find that this is valuable to you now?

Hartzog: Well, I do. As a matter of fact, during the time that I was in Washington, the period beginning in

Hartzog: 1948 when I went back to Washington from Lake Texoma - that seven years - I went to night school at the American University and got a degree in business administration. And I also came within three hours of being able to finish the Master's Degree in business administration. This was a period during which I was also working in concessions.

I find it to be very beneficial; I think that more and more big government and big business have a great deal in common. I found this to be true when I left the government and went with a private organization. While it was an association of business people, I had an opportunity to observe some of their own operations and procedures. So I think that all this has been a great help to me.

I think there is another thing that I learned, in St. Louis particularly: the need for a great deal of communication with a great many people when you are involved in a big project. Particularly when you are involved in a project that has a lot of controversy, which this particular project did have in St. Louis. For example, the first contract that we awarded in St. Louis, we had to have it agreed to

Hartzog: by sixteen different cooperating organizations in order to get it out. But this we were able to do. This experience also impressed upon me the need for waiting until you get all your facts before you make up your mind. The need to go talk to the other person and to find out what is on his mind, because sometimes lack of communications is really at the root of the problem. Rather than there being a problem in itself, it's just the fact that people aren't talking, and what they don't understand they are generally against.

Fry: So that this also has a bearing on being sure where your support lies before you make a decision.

Hartzog: Well, not necessarily where your support lies (but certainly you want to know what your support is; you want to know where your emphasis should be); even more important than this, you want to be sure that when you have finished with a subject, and are ready to make a decision on it, you've got a better case against yourself than the other fellow has. This is, I suppose, not only from my training with the Park Service and government, but my legal background as well. When you start doing your brief,

Hartzog: you want to make sure you research the cases for the opposition as well as for your own, so that you understand what the issue is.

Fry: I think that we should mention here some of your major projects when you were a solicitor for the National Parks.

Hartzog: No, I was just an attorney in the Chief Counsel's office; I was in charge of the regulations and contracts activity in the Chief Counsel's office. And it was because of this experience that I got involved in the concessions work, which involved at the time the difficulties - which I'm sure Mr. Drury and Mr. Albright have talked with you about - involving concession policies, contract language, and negotiation of these contracts.*

Fry: Was this where you crossed over the line from strict legal work into more general park service work?

Hartzog: Yes, that is right.

Fry: Well, then for our purposes I think I'd like to skip over the Jefferson Expansion Memorial part, and

*cf. Drury, Newton Bishop and Albright, Horace Marden, "Comments on Conservation, 1900 to 1960," typed transcript of tape-recorded interview conducted by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California General Library Regional Oral History Office, (Berkeley, 1962). In Bancroft Library.

Fry: I gather that you've just distilled out for us the experience there that you thought was important.

Importance of Urban Areas

Hartzog: I think so. I think that there is another aspect of this which has made a great impression on me, and that is the part that parks play for people in urban environments, the fact that the federal government has a very important part in this total picture of dealing with parks and open space in urban environment. This is where our country was born, as a matter of fact, in towns and communities.

The National Park Service is deeply involved in city parks. A lot of people are under the misapprehension that we don't know too much about city parks, when as a matter of fact, the National Park Service probably runs more city parks than any other particular instrumentality of government in existence. Starting with St. Augustine and all the way to Boston, Massachusetts, and following the flow of civilization westward, we run city parks. There are some 750 odd of them in the District of Columbia, and that is some 40,000 acres right there alone. There is a 91 acre park right on the river front in St. Louis, you see.

Hartzog: So we have a tremendous city park program, which I don't think we've ever really related to the total broad picture of park administration and wilderness preservation.

This is one of the things I was trying to say to the Wilderness Conference here this week, that all these things are tied together. You can't protect wilderness by drawing a boundary line around it and saying this is "wilderness" and we are going to protect this, without some understanding and some relating of these things all the way back to where people are in the cities, because this is why you are protecting the lands and this is why you want to preserve them, so that they can be of value and benefit to people. If you are going to do this, then I think you have to relate all of this. I think you start relating it right where people are, and that is in town.

DIRECTORSHIP OF NATIONAL PARKS

Conrad Wirth's Retirement

Fry: I ran across an article in the New York Times when Conrad Wirth first announced his decision to resign. It said that some in the Park Service had felt that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's activities should have been handled by the National Park Service, and in turn administration officials regard the Park Service as being "inbred and so professional that it has lost sight of its obligation to the public."* Can you give us some light on the context in which this occurred?

Hartzog: Well, as a matter of fact, what I could give you is probably no different than what you can get by reading Connie's own statement at the conference in Yosemite in 1963.** The word resign was used, and I think that it was an unfortunate word; because, as a matter of fact, he retired. I think that this whole thing to be understood, has to be related to what Eivind Scoyen said at the conference at Yosemite and also a letter which Eivind Scoyen sent to many people throughout the United States following this. When he resigned (There again one uses this word

*New York Times, October 17, 1963, p. 25, column 1.
**cf. appendix.

Hartzog: "resign" when one is really talking about retiring.

Nobody could say that Eivind Scoyen resigned; he served some 50-odd years in the Park Service.)--when Eivind Scoyen was ready to retire, as he relates the story, he told the Director, who was at that time Connie Wirth, and Connie Wirth asked him and several other people to sit as a committee to select a list of nominees for associate director. One of the committee was John Preston, the superintendent at Yosemite; another was Ronnie Lee, who was Regional Director of the Northeast Region; Tom Vint, who was at that time the chief of the design and construction organization; and Eivind Scoyen and himself, Connie Wirth. They selected five names, and I was one of the five.

Eivind Scoyen tells the story that I was the number one nominee of the five; John Preston tells the same story. I know that there was such a list, because before I resigned from the Park Service in 1962, I went to Washington and talked to Connie Wirth and asked him what the future was for me in the National Park Service. And at that time I told him I knew that this job was open. I told him that the people in St. Louis had made me a very attractive

Hartzog: proposition, much better than what I then had, but that my whole life had been in the Park Service. I said that if there was something in the offing for me in the Park Service that was different from what I had then as superintendent I wanted to evaluate it in that context, rather than in the context of superintendent of the Memorial. (The grade structure of the National Park Service at that time was such that a Civil Service rank of GS 15 was as high as you could go, unless you became an assistant director or regional director of the National Capitol Region, or associate director or director - these are the only higher grades in the Park Service. So I was as far as I could go in the context of the field service.) At that time Connie Wirth told me that there was a list of people under consideration for the job of associate director, and that my name was on that list. He didn't tell me that I was going to get the job, or that I was going to be offered the job.

So, therefore, the only thing I had to consider was my position as superintendent at St. Louis in relation to what the people in St. Louis were offering

Hartzog: me. So I resigned and accepted their offer. It was only after I did that the nominations for associate director were finally sent to the Secretary, and on the basis of these nominations the job was offered to me. So you see, insofar as the filling of the associate director's job was concerned, this was a well-thought-out process.

Now, at the time that I came back into the Service, Connie Wirth told me, as he had told a lot of other people (he had made no public announcement on this, but he had certainly told us this, and he said as much at Yosemite when this whole thing developed) that he was going to retire because he was going to be sixty-four years old in 1964. He felt that people should retire in their early sixties. And I know that he believed this, because at one time he actually moved in the direction of trying to encourage the same kind of practice with respect to retirement from the Park Service that the Forest Service encourages, and that is, retirement at sixty-two. Connie was then sixty-four years old, so for a full year or more in advance of his retirement, I knew he was going to retire. Several other

Hartzog: people were aware of the fact that he was going to retire. So that the context of the news publicity that this was a precipitous act on his part is certainly not supported by the facts as I know them to be. All of this is a matter of record in those talks that were made down at Yosemite. What was the other part of the question?

Relationship to Other Agencies

Fry: I didn't so much get the idea that his retirement was precipitous, but that it was a kind of slow evolutionary result of the change of administration from Eisenhower to Kennedy, and also in the New Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, set up in the Department of the Interior but intended to include recreation aspects of other departments too.*

Hartzog: Well, now let's talk about that. I know, of course, and I think a lot of people are aware of the fact that the National Park Service was not elated about the prospect of this recommendation of the commission for a separate bureau, because they felt they had the authority to do what the Outdoor

* cf. New York Times, re: Departments of Agriculture and Interior settle disputes over recreation areas. Freeman and Udall: "We have closed the books on these disputes." President Kennedy lauds agreement. February 2, 1963, p. 4, column 6.

Hartzog: Recreation and Resources Review Commission was suggesting be done; they had just never been financed to do it. And actually the National Park Service did have much of the authority under the 1936 Park, Parkway and Recreation Area Study Act. The nation-wide recreation planning that had been done up to the time of the ORRRC had in fact been done by the National Park Service. This new publication, Parks for America, is part of this whole planning program. There has been no secret about the opposition of the Park Service, either during the formulation of this recommendation by ORRRC or after it was made, because they felt they could do it. And I think an acknowledgment of the fact that the authority existed, is the fact that when the Secretary established the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, he established it on the basis of the authority that then existed in the Department of Interior to carry on these activities.

It's true that the organic act of the Bureau greatly expanded the authority which had previously existed, you see; and this is the organic act now of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. But that came later - oh, a year, a year and a half after the

Hartzog: Bureau was in existence. This is something that I also think careful research can develop and fill out the details on.

Fry: Well, before you leave this, the question has been raised in previous interviews about whether ORRRC was dominated more by the Forest Service, which was not to the interest of the Park Service.

Hartzog: Well, during this whole time, I was in the field, and as I mentioned to you walking up here, this is one of the reasons why for the first year I have been in Washington I have spent most of my time in the field trying to get reacquainted with the broad programs of the Service, because when you're in these field areas you hear a lot of stuff, but you don't know what is going on in any precise factual manner; you get what we in the Park Service call the grapevine, you know. I've heard this same rumor, but I have no basis for forming a judgment one way or the other. And as a matter of fact, when I arrived on the scene in Washington, the whole issue had been resolved. And I spent my time trying to establish a rapport and working relationship with the new Bureau, which I felt to be in the interest of just good government management of the people's

Hartzog: business. So I have very frankly never made any effort to ascertain whether the Forest Service influence on ORRRC is true or false, because it's history; it either is a fact or isn't a fact. I don't think that it is germane to my relationship with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and therefore, I had a lot of other things I have been busier trying to get done.

Fry: You had a job handed to you with that as past history.

Hartzog: That's right, so I think that within the past two and one-half years, we've succeeded in establishing a very favorable working climate with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and with the Forest Service. It has contributed to moving the program of the Park Service; this is my area of responsibility, and this is what I'm primarily interested in, but I likewise am sensitive to what is good management. I think that for the good of all of our programs, in particular for the good of my own, that it's important that you have a working rapport with these bureaus; and this is what I've devoted my efforts to, rather than trying to verify whether this or that piece of scuttlebutt is a fact.

Fry: Is this a rapport between the top level directors?

Hartzog: It is.

Fry: And what role does Secretary Udall play in this? Or is he above it all? - - no I don't think he's above it all.

Hartzog: Well, he, of course, is actually the creator; I think he is the moving spirit, really, in the improvement of the relationship between the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture. It involves things beyond just my area of programming; in answering your question I was talking particularly about our own program in the Park Service. But he is very sensitive to the need to work with people in the cooperative context.

It was this initiative between him and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman which I think laid the basis, and was certainly the motivating factor in my own efforts to try to improve the climate of our working relationship. For example at one time I understand that there were very fine working relationships between the Park Service and the Forest Service. This involved getting the top level people in the bureaus together. We have reinstated this practice. We have dinner sessions with the top

Hartzog: management of the Forest Service; we have joint regional directors meetings with them, and we have also had a joint regional directors meeting with the Urban Renewal Administration, because of my belief that parks are a catalyst for the enhancement of people's own daily lives in these metropolitan areas. The Secretary believes this very deeply as his own speeches indicate; the President believes this; this is an administration program. So I think the rapport not only exists at the top between BOR Director Ed Crafts and Forest Service Chief Ed Cliff and myself, I think it exists at the lower echelons of our organizations.

Certainly you have disappointments, I mean you have misunderstandings which arise down in the working levels of the organization. You wonder how they happen, but they happen. This is working with people again; that is really what it boils down to.

Fry: You have all the support--maybe I should even use the word "pressure"--that you need from the top, including the President, to bring the two together at this point?

Hartzog: Yes, that's right. And the Secretary is thoroughly committed to this, so this is no fragmentary effort

Hartzog: on my part. It is a concerted departmental effort, I think. And I think, really, it is a movement of government generally to arrive at improvement in management. This is a stated objective of our President right now.

PARK PROTECTION AND THE PUBLIC

Fry: Do you think that the parks are more secure in being the agency for protection of areas than they have been?

Hartzog: Oh, I definitely think so. I think that every day that passes, the parks are more secure than they were the day before; because I think there is an increasing awareness, an appreciation on the part of the people today for parks, such that the battles that the early directors of the Park Service went through no longer face me. Then it was a question of wanting to, in effect, raid the parks of their natural resources. This is not the question now. The big argument that we are having today is, "Now, how much of this are you going to let people use?" You read Steve Mather's works for example; he was going around trying to get railroads to advertise parks and taking tours out of his own money just to get people to go, to know that parks existed, you see. Today the real crux of the fight is not people who want to take parks away, but people who want to use parks more. I think the concept of parks is more secure today than it has ever been.

Fry: What do you see then, as the major threats to parks now? The population increase, I guess, is one. Newton Drury has mentioned the hydroelectric power interests, and the mining interests, and loggers have always been a part of it. Is this changing now?

Hartzog: Well, they always have been a part of it, certainly, and there is mining still authorized in some few parks. But I think that the dramatic evidence of what I am saying to you is the fact that while the Executive Department endorsed the Canyonlands National Park last year with a phase-out of mining, the Congress struck it down completely. So that for the very first time that I can recall offhand, they just chopped it right off at the pockets.

Fry: Congress had mining stopped immediately, you mean?

Hartzog: Absolutely. And this was done by the Congress itself. So I think this has laid to rest the person who wants to raid a park for mining. But we still have on the books, mining for some of these parks--Death Valley, Glacier Bay, and Mount McKinley. We are going to have to face up to those, and I am sure that when we do, we are going to have a fight. I mean - don't misunderstand me - the matter of getting rid of these adverse uses that

Hartzog: are now authorized always involves a fight. There is nothing easy about this. I don't think it should ever get real easy; if it does, I don't think the American public will appreciate their parks. I think we always have to be on the leading edge of concern, in order to really have a sense of appreciation. If you're not alert to it and aware of it, you are not very often appreciative of it.

Fry: As Congress is constituted in this year, it seems to me that you might have more luck in getting legislation like this through now than at any other time.

Hartzog: There is no question about it.

Fry: So is this a part of your job too?

Hartzog: That's right, and I think that as we study the parks from the standpoint of the Wilderness Act, that these will be questions that will be resolved. Because you see, under the Wilderness Act, we have to examine these areas in the parks and prepare reports to the Secretary, and he, in turn, reports to the President and the Congress on areas that ought to be included in the Wilderness Preservation System. When these things come up, I'm sure that

Hartzog: these questions of mining are going to be involved, and they are going to be resolved. Either the Congress is going to say it's all right to continue, or they are going to say stop it. I'm optimistic that with the tremendous surge of interest in parks, Congress is going to say, "Stop it," insofar as the parks are concerned. I think there is a real promise and hope for this.

Fry: This brings up the question of how the national parks operate in relation to the Hill and getting legislation through. Maybe a good way to describe this, would be to take one example and tell us of your efforts, how you operate both in gathering public support and in working directly with the Congress. Would the wilderness bill be a good example?

Hartzog: No, I didn't have too much experience with the Wilderness Act. I think that it would probably be more relevant for your purposes to talk about a piece of park legislation. But I'd like to talk just another moment, if I may, about the import of of the question you asked earlier as to what is the impact of the adverse influences so to speak, that threatens parks today. Is it people, or is it miners and dams?

Hartzog: You are always going to have this issue of dams, as long as you have free-flowing streams, you know; somebody wants to get hydroelectric power or some other thing out of it. I think the Secretary really put this in perspective, and the President has too, from the standpoint that this really involves a challenge of a balance in all these things, and I think the balance has been pretty well established now that they are not going to have these things in the parks. Now I am aware of the Bridge Canyon decision of the Secretary, and this may impinge on the Grand Canyon National Park.

 But I think that one of the things that we really have to think about in terms of park management, is something which historically the Park Service and the conservationists have shied away from, and that is this question of funiculars and tramways and railroads and other modes of transportation for the movement of people in parks. Historically, we have been bound to roads and trails. If you want the visiting public to go someplace, you build a road, if you want them to drive there; and if you want them to walk there you build a trail. We find now in many places, that you've got to build two trails. You've

Hartzog: got to build one for those that want to ride on a horse and another for those who want to walk, because if you get too many horses and too many people, then it is just like cows and people in picnic areas-- they just don't go together.

Well, there are many places it seems to me that we have gotten confused in our thinking about what these mechanical devices really do. They can be used for entertainment that is irrelevant to the purpose of the park, and for this reason we have said, "No, we don't want them." You know, there has been proposal after proposal for a tramway from the rim to the bottom of Grand Canyon, "purely a thrill ride." But these also serve a very utilitarian purpose of moving large quantities of people. In Europe and in other places they have done a marvelous job of developing the utilitarian aspects of these devices and saving their landscapes. It seems to me that we are going to have to face up to this question, and I mentioned this at the Wilderness Conference yesterday. I think it is not too early that we do some thinking about this traditional opposition to mechanical lifts and funiculars and railroads in the National Parks because I think that

Hartzog: these, perhaps, in many instances can be the greatest conservation devices that we have in national parks. I do not believe that you are going to be able to lock the gates on national parks. You can close the campground when it is full, but just to tell the American public, who own these parks, that they can't come in -- I don't think that this is something that is in the realm of possibility at this time.

Fry: You are a lawyer. Would locking the gates be acting against the original Antiquities Act, maybe?

Hartzog: Oh, yes. I feel this way about it, I don't think that we ought to seriously consider any such things as this.

I think that there are areas which ought to be developed, and there are areas which ought not to be developed. I think that there are areas which have a capacity; and when that capacity is reached, then you ought not to have any greater capacity there, because you endanger the very values that merit the development or the protection of this area in the first place. But this you can do through mass movements of people a lot easier, and a lot more effectively and efficiently, it seems to me, than you can by horseback or by automobiles or by roads,

Hartzog: which has been the historical way of doing it.

Fry: Because it is more highly controlled when the transportation is handled by the Park.

Hartzog: That's right; I mean, for example, you've got high mountain chalets, let's assume. You know what the capacity is; you know what the trail heads accommodate; you know how many campgrounds you've got up there. So if you have a tramway, and that is the way that you get people up there, you've got a funicular and that is the way you get people up there; then when you have got the limit in the capacity up there, you cut off the power and go home, and that is all that you've got up there. But if you are going to build a road up there, you haven't got as much control. They are going to get there; and when they get there, they are going to spend the night. We have this happen at place after place in the parks. People will be using it to two or three or four times its capacity; it's because they got there and they are just not going to leave, that's all. I've been out in the field, and I know what these boys are up against. You get a person who has driven five or six hundred miles to get there, his wife is tired, his children are hungry, and you tell him to pull out. You are

Hartzog: going to get a lot of conversation.

Fry: This could come up in Congressional hearings.

Hartzog: Yes, it sure could.

Fry: Do you think that this might be used in a place like Yosemite to move campers to higher campgrounds, so that you can put your campgrounds in less scenic places?

Hartzog: Well, I think this is something that we have to study very carefully; this is the kind of thing that it seems to me that we have to talk about. One of the places that I do know, because I was stationed there, is the Smokies. In several places in the Great Smoky Mountains, for example, there are old log beds where the railroad trains--you know, logging trains--used to go up to haul their timber out. You could lay down tracks on those today without any serious damage to the landscape and move quantities of people. Now, we've got to move people around in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park because the visitation there has reached the point where you are going to have to face up to this issue. We have had a master plan team in there, and they have been studying it, and they have made some recommendations that we have got

Hartzog: to face up to how we are going to move people in the Great Smokies, because traffic backs up seven miles on that one road through the park. You just can't continue to protect the park with that kind of a situation.

Fry: Apparently the population from all the Eastern seaboard cities funnels into that park on that one road on weekends.

Hartzog: Why sure it does. I don't think that this is a lot different than what the President has been talking about, that is, that he wants a 100-mile-per-hour railroad train between Washington and Boston. This is where you have got great concentrations of people, and you are going to have to move them.

Highway engineers are projecting statistics today, that if they really told you how wide they would have to build that road to accommodate the expected numbers of automobiles, it would literally shock people out of their chairs. I mean, there are some of these statistics and projections which indicate that roads which we are building right now that are eight lanes, on the very day that they are finished they will be inadequate. Well, now how much wider are you going to build these, and how many more

Hartzog: of these are you going to build? You can't build these up to a National Park and all the way around it, and then say, "We are just going to have one road through the park." Still everybody has to come in an automobile.

So this is why I think that all of us have to do some constructive thinking about how we are going to cope with this problem of taking care of people in a park because everybody isn't going to walk in. Particularly in an area the size of Yellowstone, for example, two million acres.

Fry: The parks at present are not used by an across-the-board sampling of the public I understand. They are used by people usually in the higher incomes and in the higher education levels too, I think. I wondered if you knew of any change in the park-use profile.

Hartzog: Well, I was very much interested in the observation that was made at the Wilderness Conference yesterday on this point. But again, I think that we get confused about parks and about what are parks, and what kind of areas does the National Park Service manage? The natural parks of the West are largely used by people who can afford an automobile to drive there. And there are lots of people in this country

Hartzog: who still don't have automobiles who can drive there. If you are talking about the parks we manage in metropolitan Washington and Philadelphia, they are used by people who don't have automobiles to drive to Yellowstone. So if you count all of them and compare them with those in Yellowstone, I am not sure that we don't have a pretty well-rounded profile now of people using the parks, you see?

But this is how people look at the Park Service as being in the business of managing the large areas of western parks, and then they overlook the eastern parks and particularly the metropolitan parks which do get very heavy use from a large and wide range of economical and educational levels. It is a different kind of use; it is purely and simply a desire to get outside and get on some green grass and relax and play ball and that kind of thing -- as opposed to taking a hike through the mountains.

Fry: Well, another change that I was thinking about in park use was that there has been a rise in the problem of vandalism, so that perhaps the duties of the ranger on the ground are changing somewhat.* Do you find that this is true?

*cf. New York Times, William M. Blair series on national parks: Rise in crime and park ranger's policing task, March 26, 1964, p. 24, col. 3.

Hartzog: Yes, I think that this is true. I think that our rangers are facing more and more the responsibilities of a law enforcement officer. And for the first time, this summer we are going to employ seasonally some actual policemen. Of course all of our rangers in uniform are policemen, and they have law enforcement authority. I mean people who are trained in police work--to put in some of the larger parks.

An interesting thing happens, I think, when we think of Yosemite, for example, as a great wilderness park, which it is, but Yosemite Valley is a great metropolitan area in the summertime. So you have got all of the problems that you have in a metropolitan environment anywhere else in the United States in Yosemite Valley in the summertime. This then involves someone who understands and knows the profession of police. We don't train our rangers in this kind of depth in law enforcement, so we are going to get professionally trained police officers in some of these situations.

REORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS

Fry: You mentioned that you have your planning staff working on the Great Smoky Mountains problem, and I wanted to ask you if there has been any difference in your research arm since you took over?*

Hartzog: Yes, we are reorganized. Well, following the Yosemite Conference of 1963 Connie Wirth was still there, but we were reorganizing it on the basis of the plan that had been agreed to. The research activity was pulled out of the operating divisions of history, natural history, and ranger activities, and it was centered in an assistant director for resource studies.

It has not gotten off to as good a start as I had hoped it would. There have been some organizational problems. But I think this is the preferable solution to handling research. This does not mean that we're not going to have some of our operating people doing research, but if they do it, from now on they are going to do it under a coordinated, organized plan of research where you know you are getting your money's worth. You get a report, you get some recommendations,

*cf. New York Times, re: charges by National Academy of Sciences that the National Park Service has not developed a research program to meet its operational needs, October 19, 1963, p. 6.

Hartzog: and you can apply it to a problem. Furthermore, we are going to have the problems identified as to which we are going to select for research, rather than just letting some person research because he likes to do it.

Fry: You'll arrive at this from a definition of problems?

Hartzog: Right.

Fry: What about reorganization of the whole service?

Hartzog: Well, there were several things that we tried to do in the reorganization, and it is still under-going adjustment. This was one of them, getting this research out. Secondly, was to strengthen the whole interpretive program. I think our interpretation had slipped in many places; we had kind of gotten stereotyped in our presentation of visuals and this kind of thing. So we have reoriented and reorganized our interpretative staff at the Washington level, including our museum laboratories.

Fry: I wanted to ask you if in your reorganization you have a special department to look at this problem of parks and recreation in urban environments.

Hartzog: No, we don't, and this is one thing that we have been talking about very seriously, as to whether or not we shouldn't have some strong executive leadership at the Washington level for our urban park program. So far we have felt that so much has been done in the last year and a half, that maybe we ought to let the organization set awhile, you know. It's

Hartzog: getting to be a big outfit, and communications are getting difficult because from the time you make a decision and the people start hearing about it, until they are finally able to read about it, is a long lag in a big organization. The result is, you are always confronted with rumors, and these are disquieting things to the morale of an organization. So we have decided that we are just going to leave this one alone for awhile. But this is something that we've got to face up to, in my judgment, and strengthen very definitely.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: REORGANIZATION AND POLICY REVISIONS

Hartzog: The other thing is that the Secretary's Advisory Board on Wildlife Management,* which was chaired by Starker Leopold, made some very keen insights into the wildlife management problems of the Service; and then over and above this, made some suggestions with respect to the broader aspects of management, pointing out, for example, that many of the problems that we have in a park cannot be solved in the park. In other words, parks are not in a vacuum. Everything that happens outside affects what happens inside, and what happens inside has a relationship to what goes on outside. So we have reorganized the resources management program of the Park Service to try to recognize this and develop some real management programs for resources that are in the system.

This involves also a recognition of the fact that all areas in the park system are not alike. Historically, we have just had one set of policies for everything, whether it was a park or recreation area or historical area. I think one of the classic examples is a policy which said that in the National Parks there will be no grazing, and yet in historical areas, we encourage pasturage.

This kind of dichotomy left a lot of confusion about

*cf. New York Times, re: Secretary Udall presenting award to National Park Advisory Board on Wildlife Management for its study of controversial wildlife policies, April 16, 1964, p. 61, col. 4.

Hartzog: just where we were and what our policies were. When you review the legislative history of the National Park System, it is very clear--and the Secretary recognized this in his memorandum of July 10, 1964 on the management of the National Park System--that the Congress has very clearly placed in this system three kinds of areas: there are natural areas, which are preserves for the natural values that are there, scenic, scientific, whatever; and there are historical areas, areas which are devoted primarily to the preservation of some great moment or event of history; and then there are areas which are set aside for recreation, for pursuits of the people--this is what it says they are for. These things require that they be managed differently, if you are going to protect the resources that are there and if you are really going to do a creative management job. This is what we are now trying to do in our resources management. We have a revised statement of policies now for each of these categories, which is undergoing review. We are revising the regulations, and we are going to have three sets of regulations for each of these categories or areas.

Fry: Can you define what change has taken place in wildlife management?

Hartzog: Yes. I'm very happy you brought me back to that, because there is some very significant thinking here. In the context of the natural areas, it is the clear intent of the

Hartzog: Congress that the wildlife should be protected as much as the trees or the vegetation that's there. Therefore, it's not available for public sport hunting. Such control of wildlife population as is necessary we are working out through special hunting seasons with the states outside park boundaries; and where this doesn't work, we allow trapping inside the parks; and shipping; and where this doesn't work, we have direct reduction by ranger personnel.

But these are not the same guide lines that need to be followed in recreation areas, where hunting is a completely compatible recreational pursuit. Public hunting is recreation. It's recreation to those who engage in it. It may not be for you or me, or somebody else who may be a non-hunter; but for a hunter, hunting is recreation. And recreation is what the area was set aside for, and therefore that's one of the activities that we are going to permit as compatible with all the others, you see.

We are also working with the states in the context that the state will establish the bag limits and the seasons and cooperate with us in the encouragement of habitat and so forth to propagate the species.

Fry: Now it is not clear to me whether you are talking about the new national recreation areas.

Hartzog: Right, the national recreation areas. These are the lake shores, the riverways, the reservoir areas. . . .

Fry: Not the Yosemite Valley. [laughter]

Hartzog: Not Yosemite Valley; that is a natural area. One thing that is going to clear up a lot of things for a lot of people, is that we are getting a publication out now in which all of the areas of the system are going to be rearranged in the three categories. The policies are going to be rearranged in three categories; the regulations are going to be rearranged. So that when you say, "What is your policy?" we are going to have to ask you, "Our policy for what?" you see. It is just not going to be, "This is our policy, and we have three or four exceptions to it down here because these are different kinds of areas." There is going to be our policy for natural areas, and our policy for historical areas, and our policy for recreational areas.

Fry: Who else will be administering recreation areas? [laughter]
I've heard horrendous references to as many as twenty government agencies.

Hartzog: Well, I've heard this; I've never counted them. I don't really know precisely, but I know there are a great many of them. The Corps of Engineers manages recreation areas; the Forest Service manages them; the Fish and Wildlife Service manages them; the Park Service manages them. So far, we are managing the recreation for the Bureau of Reclamation on their projects. We are working with the Bureau of Land Management now on trying to develop a program of cooperation by which

Hartzog: we will manage the recreation on the public domain lands which they manage. They in turn, will assist us in various aspects of our program, such as forestry and game management in which they are proficient. This is still evolving. It hasn't evolved yet.

Fry: Are you able to comment on any difference in acquisition policy?

Hartzog: The acquisition policy is different too. In national recreation areas, we have recognized that it is an accepted practice that you do not have to own all the land in an area in order to provide optimum recreation, providing that the private land that is left there is utilized compatibly with the recreation objectives of the area. This is to say that it is perfectly all right for a person to have a summer home in a recreation area and own it, so long as he keeps it a summer home. But we don't want it turned into a honky tonk, you see. So that, where the local municipality or county will zone the land compatible with the recreation objectives, our policy in recreation areas is that we don't have to own all the land in fee. We will buy scenic easements; we will accept zoning. For those lands which we have to develop, of course, legally we have to own the fee, so we have to acquire the fee.

Our objective in national parks--that is, national parks now--still remains trying to acquire all of the land

Hartzog: in the park, because this is for the preservation of an ecological environment. When you have unplanned interference with this ecological environment, you jeopardize the maintenance of the environment throughout the whole area. Therefore, we have not changed the policy with respect to trying to acquire all the in-holdings in the national parks. In the historical areas, we are now evaluating this policy, and I think that we are going to propose to the Secretary a change in the policy in the historical areas, to the end that we are not going to have to buy all the land in historical areas, on the same premises that I outlined for recreation areas.

Fry: I guess there has been more acceptance, too, of private preservation agencies sometimes handling part of your historical monuments.

Hartzog: Well, this has always been a part of the program. We haven't done too much in pushing it, but the Historic Sites Act of 1935 has always authorized the Secretary to cooperate with private and quasi-public organizations in historic preservation.

Fry: Has there been much change in the responsibility delegated to the field as opposed to that held in the Washington office?

Hartzog: That is another thing we tried to do: clarify our own thinking about the kind of organization we have. We have a field superintendent; we have a regional office, and we have a

Hartzog: Washington office. Frequently, we get mixed up as to where policy is made and what procedures are applied, and a matter goes all the way from the field to Washington that could have just as easily been answered in the field, if Washington had established a policy to guide the field. So we have tried to clarify the roles of these three echelons of management.

In doing so, we say that the Washington office is the policy-making arm of the Service, which it is. It's responsible for procedures, responsible for leadership and programming and budgeting, which get to the essence of how this program is going to operate; it's responsible for legislation and for the relationships with the Department and its other bureaus at a policy level in Washington.

The regional office is the core of our management, and it is the regional director and his staff to whom we look for improvement in the quality of management and the quality of improvement of public service to the visitors who come to these areas.

Fry: Is this an increase in the delegation of duties to the regional office?

Hartzog: Not actually. They had the duties; it's a clarification of them, this is really what it boils down to. They have always had this responsibility. This is what they're supposed to have been doing, but there has been confusion about whether they have been doing it or not.

Fry: Before this, then, there was more centralization than was necessary?

Hartzog: I think so. The superintendent on the grounds is responsible for running the program. We want to give him as much flexibility as we can, so that he can be as creative as possible, rather than putting him in a straight jacket, though we have to establish some broad guide lines out here, so that he knows when he is getting out of the ball park. And as long as he stays in the ball park, then we can recognize the individual ability of a person to improve in the quality of his performance through his own creativity and that of his staff. This makes for a harder job and it makes for a greater challenge for the person, because nobody is holding his hand and telling him every day what he has to do. It is giving him an opportunity to use his head. I think that it is going to work; we are encouraged by the response that we have had so far. Now we have a study underway in the regional offices to determine what kind of regional organization we should have in the Park Service. This study has not been finished yet.

Fry: I was talking about this with Mr. Charles Stoddard, head of the Bureau of Land Management yesterday, and he said that they were reorganizing with more emphasis on program; he thought this was rather typical of a lot of reorganization going on these days. Would you say that some of your

Fry: reorganization also puts more emphasis on programs up and down the administrative line so that the horizontal echelon becomes a little less important? Is that accurate?

Hartzog: Yes. Right.

CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

Procedures

Fry: Well, now I would like to take you back to what we started to talk about in relation to Congress.

Hartzog: O.K. Well, normally what happens is that we have a National Park System planning organization, whose job is to think about what the National Park System should be in the future.

Fry: This is within your office?

Hartzog: This is within our office and in the regional offices. They go out now and take a look at "X" area, and their preliminary reconnaissance indicates that it is of park quality and worthy of acquisition. So they put it on a study list. This study list comes to me, and if I agree I approve it. This constitutes a study project. They then go out and make what we call a professional study report.

Now heretofore it has been our practice that when this professional study report was made, it went to the Secretary's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites and Buildings. If they agreed with it, it went to the Secretary with a recommendation. He issued that as a departmental report, and that became the report, you see.

We've changed that; we now issue that professional study report as a professional study report. We analyze the resource, what its potentialities are, what the alternatives

Hartzog: might be for its preservation. Then we make that public and invite the public to comment on it. If the interest is sufficient, we go into the community and meet with the people and talk with them about it.

On the basis of all these comments, we then prepare a final report, which goes to the Advisory Board, and from the Advisory Board, with its recommendation, to the Secretary. If he agrees, he approves it. This then becomes the final study report.

Usually at this point, or maybe a little before--depending on how much public acceptance there may be for it--a bill or several bills are introduced into Congress. If you've got an area with wide public acceptance, you are just that much ahead, because then the local Congressman and the local delegation are usually pushing it.

If you have a bill for which there is a lot of local opposition, then the people who are interested have to take the burden of trying to work out these problems with the local people to the point where you do get the local Congressman interested. Seldom, if ever, do you succeed in any legislation which the local Congressman opposes. If he is opposed, you are not going very far with a piece of legislation as a general rule. So the beginning of the legislative process is to try to get the local Congressman a proposition which he can support. And also your two Senators--if your

Hartzog: two Senators are opposed, conversely, you are not going anywhere.

Of course, you can understand--and this is inherent in our system of government, it was intended to be this way--the local Congressman has a smaller constituency than the two Senators, so that people from all over the state are writing to the Senators. You may have intense opposition in a little pocket down here in this district, but in their total picture, it may not be too meaningful. However, to the Congressman it may be quite sensitive, and therefore you sometimes have a bill move for you in the Senate when it doesn't move for you in the House because you still have a local problem in this district that you have to work out.

We find that it is very helpful if the people who are interested in the proposal form a local organization and use this as a forum for providing information and working with the people informing them of what is in it. Now a great deal has been accomplished, I think, in this change of procedure alone.

This grew out of my own experience when I was in Missouri, because when I was there--in addition to my job in St. Louis--I was the coordinator for all Park Service activities in the state of Missouri. One of my jobs was the proposed Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and we had issued a report which said, "This is going to be it, and it is going to be a National Monument." Well, we ran

Hartzog: into a real storm of opposition. It took a couple of years to get this thing smoothed out, cleared away, and the local Congressman really interested. One of the Congressmen we never did persuade, and therefore, when the area was finally established, we had to leave out the counties that were in his district in order to get it established.

I was convinced from that experience that many people could have been persuaded to have gone along with this proposal, had they understood what it was about in the first place and had had an opportunity to participate in the making of the proposal. So this is why we have changed this procedure with the approval of the Secretary to issue a preliminary report, and it is working very well.

Fry: Quite frankly, there is one resource agency that has developed a very complicated and effective system, through its regional offices, of developing a great deal of public support when it needs it for a measure going through Congress. Is this what the parks can do under the new system?

Hartzog: Well, one of the advantages, I think, of this preliminary report is that before a hard position is taken by the opposition, as well as by the proponents, they have an opportunity to sit down and explore what the values are and what the alternatives are for dealing with it.

Redwood Park Example

Hartzog: I think that the redwoods, for example, are a perfect illustration of what I am talking about. This was the first professional report that we issued on this basis, and when we issued it, as you know, there was an immediate storm of reaction. There were an awful lot of people, including some of the major groups, who said no national park was needed.

Fry: You mean the major lumber groups?

Hartzog: Yes. And, well, not only that, but some of the Chambers of Commerce and others were against it.

Fry: You had the Save the Redwoods League as an example of one of these local groups to work through, in the community?

Hartzog: No, there was no local group up there in that country at that particular time that I was aware of. The Redwoods League had somebody up there, but he was an individual and not a group.

I think the Sierra Club had some people up there or an individual up there; at least, that is what I have heard. I don't know it for a fact. But, so far as I know, there was no park support organization up there. In addition to which, as I understand, there were several of the Chambers of Commerce who were opposed to a national park.

The point is that there was no consensus that there was a need for a national park when that report came out. Now, we gave them I think ninety days to make comments,

Hartzog: and that time has long since expired. But in the meantime, we have been continuing to receive comments and evaluate them. So far as I know now, the industry has finally said a national park is a desirable thing. The American Forestry Association has said a national park is a desirable thing. Every responsible organization that I am aware of--maybe I've left out some that I don't know about--but all of them that I know of that reacted violently contrary to it at the outset have now accepted the fact that a national park is a desirable thing. So this is what I am talking about as the benefit of this professional report being out, and giving the people an opportunity to talk about it, and to contribute to the thought process in making a final report.

Now, I will admit that there are an awful lot of differences over the details of what this national park ought to be, but the interesting thing is that the central issue is whether there should be a national park, and on this now, as far as I know, now there is unanimity. Now you can proceed to fill out the details, and I am sure that you are going to fight over the details. You are never going to have anything that goes through with everybody in support of it. I don't believe that you can achieve this, but I do think that this professional report has achieved remarkable success, that is, that all of the organizations are now in agreement that there should be a national park.

Committees and Congressmen

Fry: Yes.

In your work with Congress, do you work primarily just with the House Interior and Insular Committee, and the Senate Interior and Insular Committee and subcommittees?

Hartzog: Right. And then of course, two appropriation committees for the implementation of the program. This involves briefing, of course, talking with the local delegations. It involves visiting with the members of the subcommittee; it involves testifying and having your maps there.

I think the central thing that I learned--and believe me, I am still a novice in this business of legislative process--is the fact that if you do your homework, when you get to the hearing you're usually in pretty good shape. If you haven't done your homework, you are oftentimes in trouble.

Fry: How do you have your staff organized for this?

Hartzog: Well, this is one of the activities that we have totally reorganized in the Park Service, our legislative organization. So today when a legislative proposal goes to the Hill, and we go up to testify, we generally have the homework done. We have the professional man who made the study; we have the land man who set the values, and either I am there, or I have an assistant director who is there, who can resolve and answer the policy questions that are involved on it.

Fry: Would you like to mention now some of the main Congressmen who are receptive in helping park legislation?

Hartzog: Well, I think we have a wide range of Congressmen and Senators who are interested and effective in park legislation. I don't think it was any—I think that it was an absolute fact when the President remarked that the 88th Congress would go down in history as the "conservation Congress." As we talked about it earlier, the question of parks has become highly popular. I was very much amused yesterday at the Wilderness Conference of the Sierra Club—I don't know whether you heard it or not--when one of these speakers said that he thought that the pork barrel was going to become now the park barrel. That is, everybody wants a park in his district. I think that this has a lot more truth to it than we are really aware of at the moment, because there is a tremendous amount of support for parks in the Congress.

Of course, the people who are most directly involved are the Congressmen and the two Senators who have a particular park under consideration at the moment, and then also your subcommittee. And our subcommittee is chaired by Ralph Rivers of Alaska, and the ranking majority member on it is Wayne Aspinall, ex-officio member of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee. The ranking minority member is John Saylor of Pennsylvania. You can just go right down the aisle on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, and every one

Hartzog: of them are for parks.

Fry: They are.

Hartzog: Yes, they really are. I don't know any of them that you can't say is a real friend of the parks on that subcommittee.

Now in our subcommittee in the Senate, the chairman is Senator A. H. Bible. The chairman of the full committee is Senator H. M. Jackson. We have tremendous support out of this committee. There are times of course, when Senator M. L. Simpson raises some questions about some of our policies. Senator B. E. Jordan of Idaho has raised some questions about some of them. I think the questions that they have raised have considerable merit, and I think that we have met some of the questions that have been in their minds. I know that Senator Simpson has had a long history of opposition to the program in the Grand Teton National Park and to some of the practices and policies in Yellowstone National Park. But I have found him to be extremely helpful in our park program, extremely helpful. And deeply interested. I have indeed, and he has taken some very strong positions on some of our areas, particularly in the East, in pushing and supporting them.

Fry: Are you saying that this is a change in him?

Hartzog: I don't know whether it is a change in him, because I never knew him before; I am just telling you what the facts are as I find them. As a matter of fact, the Great Falls

Hartzog: area there in Washington is an area in which any number of times he has told me he is deeply interested in. I think that he is becoming convinced, as are a great many people, of the tremendous need for parks in the East. I think this is really about where you may find the cleavage. The only experience that I had with him that was different than this was involving the hearing on the Oregon Dunes. You see, this is a Western area, and he was a little bit sharp in his comments about us there, so this could be maybe an explanation for it. I don't know what the explanation is, but this is the way we find him.

Fry: Tell us about Senator Clinton Anderson of New Mexico.

Hartzog: Well, he is the great statesman, and the great stalwart of all of this conservation, a great man in the Congress on our committee. Sure, you can't overlook him. This is the hazard of naming names in any of this business. You can't name them all, and you overlook somebody and then the question arises, "Well, why did you overlook him?" Well, you overlooked him because you forgot him at the moment. But Senator H. M. Jackson, Senator C. P. Anderson, Lee Metcalf, Senator F. F. Church, Ted Moss of Utah, you name any of them, they are there.

Fry: Am I keeping you past your deadline? It's twenty 'til five.

Hartzog: No.

FINANCING THE PARKS

Fry: I want to ask you about the financial picture of the parks. You have just started the automobile admissions sticker for the Land and Water Fund.* Perhaps you can start right at the beginning of your career in Washington and bring us up to date on appropriations.

Hartzog: Well, I think parks are, of course, better financed now than they have ever been. I think this, that a great deal of the credit for this is due to Connie Wirth and the Mission 66 Program, the long range plan of the National Parks in which he dramatized the lack of maintenance and so forth. But I think with the tremendous increase in visitation too, that we are faced with the continuing problem that you are always going to have, the gap between what would be ideally available and what we have. For instance, right here in Muir Woods this trail ought to be paved all the way down, particularly through those wet soggy portions as we were walking down there, you see? I can imagine that they are wet and soggy right now and that they're a dust pile in the summertime. So you are always going to have that gap.

On the other hand, I think that the land acquisition facet of our program is now in much better shape, with the

*cf. New York Times, re: Senate passage of \$2 billion, 10-year Land and Water Conservation Fund, September 4, 1964, p. 31, col. 1. Also re: Presidential order expected to set fees, auto stickers, January 24, 1965, p. 64, col. 1.

Hartzog: Land and Water Conservation Fund, than it has ever been.

This has been the hardest money that we have ever tried to get from the Congress: funds for land acquisition. Now with the Land and Water Conservation Fund there is a regular systemized funding for the purchase of land, and the Congress at its will can appropriate from it. So I think our land acquisition picture looks much better than it has in years.

I think that our physical development program is still going to be in good shape. I don't think it's ever going to reach the utopian state that I'd like to see it, in order to provide everything that I would like to have when I want it. But I am encouraged by what's happening. Our budget that was passed by the House this year was about \$140,000,000, which represents a rather significant increase over last year.

Fry: Do you think that maintenance is the most difficult area to get appropriations for now?

Hartzog: I think maintenance and management are the most difficult. You can dramatize a construction need for a camp ground, but it is awfully hard to dramatize the fact that you need somebody to pick up the trash that is in the campground, until it gets real dirty. But when it gets real dirty, then you have other kinds of problems besides just the problem of trying to get the money to pick up the trash. Then you have all the public relations implications of the dissatisfied camper because his wife went in the bathhouse and it was

Hartzog: dirty or he went in and it was dirty or the children got dirty and this kind of stuff. So the maintenance side of it and the management side, the funding of these seasonal people, is tough money to get. Yes, it is.

Fry: The parks really have a very broad constituency.

Hartzog: Yes, they do.

Fry: This shows up in some of the Congressional hearings, and I wonder if you could just evaluate for me the feedback that you get in congressional hearings on park management and so forth.

Hartzog: Well, the interesting thing to me is that you have great constituency and you have a great deal of interesting support, but it usually reflects itself in getting the new area. It generally doesn't reflect itself in spilling over to the Appropriations Committee to follow through in getting the money for the management of the area, unless you have a real problem, such as you had there at Point Reyes with no entrance road. When these people descended all over the private land owners, then we really got some support, you see? But until you get a dramatic situation like that, they just kind of forget it after they get the park.

But that is just when the real hard work actually begins. That was what the Undersecretary of Interior was talking about yesterday with the Wilderness Act: the getting of the legislation is the main tent; the implementing of it is the

Hartzog: kitchen tent, and this is where the real hot and dirty work is. And the getting of this money to run these programs from the Appropriations Committee is real tough work.

Fry: How do you use the conservation organizations in this or in any kind of legislation? Is it easy to send out a call for help?

Hartzog: No, it isn't, because you see by law we are prohibited from lobbying for money, for programs and this kind of thing. But the conservationists are certainly not prohibited from supporting us. And I think that a great deal could be done by them which they are not now doing in this area of improving the quality of the management and maintenance of these parks. They are dissatisfied with some of the trails; well, the best way that I know to remedy that is in the emphasis in their own organization and their own support of our budget requests.

Fry: I have the mental picture of ex-park officials and people who have been very close to parks being in high positions within these organizations, so that communication shouldn't be too difficult.

Hartzog: No. It's not. It is not too difficult getting it out; the problem that you have is in getting them to go personally and testify before the congressional committee. A lot of them are content to write a letter, and writing a letter is fine--it makes a record--but I still believe that there is nothing that beats personal contact, because as you sit there

Hartzog: in front of that committee and they have an opportunity to ask you questions and evaluate what you are saying to them, they can get a feel for whether this is really something or whether you are just writing a letter because some person said for you to write a letter. Therefore, I don't think that just pounding out a letter is any substitute for asking the committee for an opportunity to go sit down and talk with them about it.

Fry: I guess there are problems with finances there too that come up, transportation from the West to Washington, for instance.

Hartzog: Yes, I think this is part of it. Conservationists normally don't have the same kind of money to keep people in Washington for this purpose as trade organizations do.

Fry: Because this is going to be deposited as a manuscript in Bancroft Library, I would like to ask you if you have any observations to make particularly relevant to the management of California national parks.

Hartzog: No, I don't. I am going to try and spend some time out here in these parks this summer just for that same purpose. I haven't spent any time in them yet. I just went to Sequoia National Park and stayed two days, and I was a week in Yosemite. We have a master plan coming up on Sequoia, and this is what I want to get into.

CONCESSIONS

Fry: My question on concessions is my last--because I don't want to detain you and talk about this all night. What have you seen in changes in the relation between the concessioners and the federal government, and what changes in their role in park management?

Hartzog: Well, of course, the changes have been dramatic. The concessions started off primarily catering to a clientele that was very small, that arrived by railroad and wanted a very deluxe type of service, and stayed many days and then left.

Today it's a highly mobile population, it wants one night's lodging and it wants a very inexpensive meal; it probably will be satisfied with a soda fountain, with sandwiches--youngsters want hamburgers. It's a wholly different kind of travel. Some of the concessioners have not responded to this change as rapidly as I believe the need for it exists. As a result, some of them have sold their properties, such as the Great Northern in Glacier.

Congress is very much concerned about the way we are managing concessions. As you know, they've had hearings on this. We have now put the concessions on a percentage of gross receipts. I think there's a keener appreciation of the necessity of good management on the side of both the concessioners and us--the government, I mean--

Hartzog: so that our management is being scrutinized more closely and therefore it's got to be better management.

The concessioners are an extremely vital part of a successful park operation. I've said to them that they're dynamic and creative partners in providing the proper service for the visitors to the visitors' parks--because these are the taxpayers' parks. I believe that we have a very good relationship with the concessioners. I think the informal relationships that have existed in the past have tended to become more formalized. I think there's a greater emphasis on what the contract says and what the contract requires. This can be good and it can be bad. If it's allowed to become petty and acrimonious, it can be bad. It's good if it helps both us and the concession to have a better understanding of what is needed and who's going to do it, in terms of what service and what quality of service.

Fry: What's happened in the dilemma of the concessioner who can operate only part of the year, and yet has to make his margin of profit?

Hartzog: This is very difficult. It's unlike a public utility in which you can say to the public, "You've got to use this one because this is the only one." In the national parks, you may still say, "This is the only concession." But they don't have to go there. And furthermore if the weather's bad they usually won't go there.

Hartzog: So it puts him in a highly speculative kind of business, so he has some very special kinds of problems. I think that we're getting some better understanding of what these problems are. And I think that when the Interior Committee starts hearings on this concession bill that this picture is going to become a great deal clearer than it is right now. Because right now, it's been confused by the General Accounting Office and by the Appropriations Committee and by the Government Operations Committee. We just really are in a confused policy state right now. This is why the bill has been introduced: to put into statutory form the existing concession policies.

Fry: I'm not current on this. Has there been more of a trend toward participation by the federal government? This could take the form of more instances of federal ownership of the physical plant of a concession, or outright. . . .

Hartzog: No, no, I wouldn't say there's been any trend. We've had to go in in some places, such as Isle Royale, and build the buildings because there's just no way for private enterprise to do it. But we remain very firmly fixed to the policy that these facilities should be provided and operated by private capital. I think this is the most effective way of getting it done.

Fry: What about subsidies then, when there are difficulties?

Hartzog: One of the things that's going to be involved, it seems to

Hartzog: me (and this is one of the bills that's pending in the Congress) is we're going to have to provide some kind of financial guarantee of the concession loans, just as FHA had to finally step in and do this in house financing because it just got to the point where a property owner couldn't buy a house. So FHA moved in and said, "We'll guarantee X per cent of this loan." This therefore gave the prospective homeowner a greater equity, down-payment, so to speak. Because he not only had his own money, but in addition the government is guaranteeing that much more. So then the lender could lend him that much more. I think that we're headed in this direction in concessions. We've got to, it seems to me, if you're going to insure the concessioner an adequate supply of risk capital as well as a reasonable rate of interest at which he can get this risk capital. Because it is a speculative business--there just isn't that much profit in it. It's profitable; I'm not saying they are not profitable--some of these concessions make very good money. But it also has a highly risky factor involved too. And operating under the restrictions of a national park, not being able to go to the extremes that they could go to if they were outside in order to maximize the profit within the short range, I think we've got to move in some other directions to ease this financial strain.

Fry: Has there been any change in length of contract?

Hartzog: Yes. The Congress recently authorized up to thirty years instead of the traditional twenty years. But we only have, I think, two of these thirty-year contracts. The term is not the important thing. The thing the banker wants back is his money, you see. He isn't interested in how long you keep it; he's interested in whether he gets it back. So if he isn't satisfied that he's going to get his money back, it doesn't make any difference if he's got a fifty-year contract. What he wants is his money back with interest. He's in the banking business.

Fry: I was thinking a longer-term contract might allow them to invest their own capital with a little more feeling of security.

Hartzog: My gosh, it does. But if they don't have it in the first place--and I don't know any of them that have enough capital to take it right out of their pockets and invest it--they usually have to borrow it.

Fry: When you were working on concessions way back in 1950, were you involved in that study that went on under Secretary Krug?

Hartzog: Yes.

Fry: But then you didn't have anything to do with the instituting of any results of that study.

Hartzog: No. I was just working there.

Fry: Could you just off-the-cuff give me some of the major differences of problems about concessions then and now?

Hartzog: Then of course, the question was whether the concessioner actually even had a possessory interest or any right to

Hartzog: be compensated for the improvements which he'd made on government property. This is really the thing that precipitated the whole dialogue. Then we got involved in the question of how much return should a concessioner get, should he be on a percentage of net profit? Should there be some limitation on the amount of profits that he should make? Well, this is a whole other day. [laughter]

Fry: It is getting late for you, and while I'd like to talk to you about the Secretaries of Interior, I guess we really couldn't do them justice. Thank you for giving your afternoon for an interview.

Hartzog: This has been a pleasure, and I appreciate the opportunity to sit down and discuss these things with you. Thank you.

This Land

'Parks Are for People To Have Fun In'

By Harold Gilliam

THE MAN with the most powerful grip in Washington, D.C., is muscular, cigar-chomping George B. Hartzog Jr., seventh director of the National Park Service and proponent of a controversial new national park policy.

His hearty handclasp, steely enough to make a professional wrestler wince, is a natural concomitant of a personality that radiates energy as a Yellowstone geyser gives off steam.

Hartzog bears not the slightest resemblance to the stereotype of the uniformed park ranger whose chief interest is rocks and wildlife. This is no John Muir of the mountains but a gregarious extrovert who is more often to be found in offices and committee rooms than in the wilderness — although he knows his way around in the woods and is an inveterate fisherman.

If Hartzog's park philosophy is different from that of some of his predecessors, right or wrong, the reasons are understandable. These are different times with different park problems, and he is a different breed of man.

Late Camper

Hartzog still speaks with a trace of the inflections of South Carolina, where he was born. He never saw a national park until he was in the Army in World War II, stationed at Fort Lewis, Washington, and visited Mount Rainier on a weekend pass.

There he enjoyed watching and joining families playing in the snow.

"I fell then and I feel now," he said on a recent visit to San Francisco, "that this is what parks are for — people having themselves a lot of fun in the outdoors.

"I'm not afraid that people will ruin the parks, if we make proper provision for them. We have to disperse the facilities and encourage visitors to spread out. We're trying to provide more campgrounds and minimum facilities, like youth hostels, where young people can throw a sleeping bag on the floor."

Reservations

It probably will be necessary, he added, to limit attendance in many areas

and require reservations not only for housing but for admittance through the park gates.

"The real enemies of the national parks are not people but automobiles," Hartzog said. "Cars foul up the environment in the parks just like they do anywhere else. They take over too many acres of natural areas for parking, and they're even creating a smog problem in Yosemite.

"That's why we're looking for ways of limiting the impact of cars. There's a lot of pressure to widen roads in the parks and build more of them, but instead we're thinking about having one-way roads, getting people on through while they're having a recreational driving experience."

The road in the Great Smokies might be one such route, he suggested, or possibly the Tioga road through Yosemite.

"And we're looking into other ways of getting people in and out of the parks — monorail, funiculars, other kinds of trains."

Land Costs

Hartzog is an attorney by profession and began his park career in the National Park Service solicitor's office. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall appointed him to the top job in 1963, on the retirement of Director Conrad L. Wirth.

One of Hartzog's major headaches is the escalation of land costs in areas



GEORGE HARTZOG JR.

where parks are proposed. At Point Reyes National Seashore, for example, prices have skyrocketed to incredible heights. The \$19 million authorized to purchase the land has bought less than half of the designated area, and prices for the rest have gone up so far that another \$40 million or so would be required to complete the purchase — an amount that a hudget-minded Congress has so far been unwilling to appropriate.

As an alternative, Hartzog proposed that the remaining acreage be purchased and part of the purchase price be recovered by leasing some of the lands to private owners who would contract to put in controlled developments — golf courses, recreation facilities, and limited residential buildings.

The proposal raised the hackles of conservationists who oppose such drastic departure from traditional national park principles, but so far no working alternative has emerged.

If Hartzog sometimes seems to place less emphasis on preservation of scenery and more emphasis on recreation and development than some conservationists would wish, he may claim ample precedent.

Of the six previous National Park Service Directors, Hartzog in some respects most closely resembles the first — the legendary Steven T. Mather, a native Californian and energetic businessman who inaugurated the job in 1917 and led his associates a gruelling pace day and night. Mather was full of ideas for recreation facilities in the parks, including swimming pools and golf courses. However, he was too busy establishing the park service and acquiring major park lands to put most of these ideas to work.

Like his illustrious predecessor, Hartzog is on the move continually, full of nervous energy, and by shortly after five o'clock on most mornings is out hiking around a golf course near his home in Arlington, Virginia, mulling over the ideas that may become part of his over-all program, entitled, ambitiously, "Parkscape USA."



SNOW-CAPPED MOUNT RAINIER DOMINATES ITS NATIONAL PARK

APPENDIX B

REMARKS BY
E. T. SCOYEN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, RETIRED
U. S. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
CONFERENCE OF CHALLENGES
YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK
October 18, 1963

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Director, Mr. New Director, Mr. New Associate Director and friends.

I didn't expect to make a speech, so I only have some notes. I think I had a little part in getting George [Hartzog] where he is and I would like to tell you a story about a "Shangri-La" that was held after I gave Director Wirth a year's notice of my retirement plans.

These changes are of greatest importance to conservationists and no doubt many wonder about the process of selection which fills such critical positions and the conditions surrounding the job. In view of the very unfortunate circumstances which developed the day prior to the announcement of Director Wirth's retirement, I think that these facts should be made known.

The highest Civil Service job classification is Grade 15. Above this are what are known as Supergrades 16, 17 and 18. These are also known as Excepted Positions - in other words, appointments to them can be made without Civil Service status and tenure is subject to the will and perhaps even the whim of the appointing officer. By and large the jobs are considered as just rewards for the politically faithful. Even when long-time career employees are selected for these supergrades, it can be assumed that their political attitudes have been checked and found at least not objectionable.

In my own case when I had been told, in 1955, that I had been selected for promotion to Associate Director (Grade 17), and warned to keep the matter completely secret, I was startled a few days later to get a call

from the Republican County Chairman notifying me that he had been informed of the proposed appointment and instructed to send in a report of my political affiliations. As I had been in Civil Service for some 40 years and had always registered as an Independent, I do not know what the report contained, but at least the appointment indicated I was acceptable.

In these circumstances, it should be kept in mind that there are some things to which the Secretary of the Interior must give consideration when he makes his appointments to these top positions in the Park Service. I doubt if he could afford to ignore entirely the political aspects of the situation, no matter how devoted he was to keeping career personnel in control of the Bureau. In this case, we can all be deeply thankful that he gave the jobs to two National Park Service employees judged by a jury of their peers to be capable of handling the jobs.

Let me explain this last sentence. In January 1961, I informed Mr. Wirth that it was my intention to retire the following January. This left him with the problem of finding a qualified successor in whom he could have complete confidence and who would be acceptable to the Secretary. A short time later he conferred on the matter with people in the Secretary's Office. He was told that the Secretary was fully inclined to go along with a career appointment. However, it was emphasized that the new Associate Director should be selected with the end in view that he would most likely be the next Director and should be young enough to have up to 20 years of active service ahead of him.

In order to get a list of names which could be sent to the Secretary, the Director selected a Committee of Park Service veterans to meet with him and study the situation. The members of the Committee were Thomas C. Vint,

Chief Design and Construction, and whose retirement had already been approved after 40 years of service; R. F. Lee, Regional Director in Philadelphia; John Preston, Superintendent of Yosemite National Park and myself. In order to enable us to work undisturbed and away from telephones, we held a two-day session with Mr. Wirth in Annapolis, Maryland. If I remember correctly, this was in May 1961.

Keeping in mind the specification set by the Secretary and other guide lines we felt were necessary and appropriate, and after checking personnel records again and again, we agreed on a list of 7 names. A number of highly qualified people in the Service were passed over because they had reached an age where they could not succeed the present Director and still have a number of active years ahead of them.

The consensus of the Committee was that Mr. Hartzog should be #1 on the list. Mr. Stratton was also well up near the top. Of course, we did not consider the names of anyone outside the Service. I feel very strongly that this should never be done.

Shortly before I retired, Dr. Wirth asked me to go over the list again and let him have my latest thoughts on the subject. I reported that I still thought the recommendations were sound; that I was firmly convinced that Mr. Hartzog should be number one.

There would be no particular point to this story were it not for the announcement in the New York Times of October 17th of Director Wirth's retirement and the appointment of Mr. George Hartzog to the resulting vacancy. The official announcement of these changes was to have been made by Secretary Udall at the National Park Service Conference in Yosemite National Park on Friday, the 18th.

The story, quoted in considerable detail from a supposedly within the family speech given by Assistant Secretary John Carver at the opening session

of the Conference, led the reader to believe Dr. Wirth was being precipitously forced out and that Mr. Hartzog was being given the job because he would be more cooperative with the Secretary's Office. This was the most demoralizing thing that has happened to the National Park Service since it was established in 1916. Only a very few of the conferees knew of the retirement and suddenly they were confronted with a tale which indicated their beloved and highly respected Director was being forced out under rather discreditable circumstances. Further, that his successor, judged by conditions as stated in the report, could be suspected of being a conniving party to a deal behind the Director's back to get the job for himself.

Mr. Udall has emphatically denied all the implications of the story and confirmed that Dr. Wirth had given him 9 months advance notice of his retirement. I hope that all will realize that Mr. George Hartzog fully earned his try at the Directorship and that, as I said before, he was judged by a jury of experienced and informed associates in the Service and found worthy and qualified for that position. That both he and Mr. Stratton, the new Associate Director, are, I have reasons to believe, good Democrats, is beside the point. Personally, I am sure that both will demonstrate they are fully capable to meet the crushing responsibilities of leading the National Park Service, but they can use a lot of help and cooperation.

So George--and Clark--I'm going to watch your careers with great interest, because I think you have what it takes.

I think the Secretary has done a wonderful thing in making these appointments and I believe what has happened here today is a tremendous compliment to the National Park Service. I don't think any Secretary ever will have too much trouble with such appointments if the Park Service continues to produce men of the quality necessary to the duty.

That is the responsibility of all of you fellows--I'm over the hump now-- but you be sure that you do your work so that when vacancies occur the Secretary will have career employees that he can put into these positions.

Now, Mr. Secretary, after I retired after 46 years, 7 months with the Department of the Interior, something of which I am exceedingly proud, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for the appointments you have made here today. I certainly congratulate you in overriding perhaps some pressures that have been upon you otherwise to make these appointments.

As I leave this stand--let's get up and let the Secretary know--really know--how we feel! Thank you.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE B. HARTZOG, JR., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND RECREATION OF THE HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 18, 1968

Thank you very much for this opportunity to report to you today on the management of the National Park Service. It is always an honor and a privilege to appear before you. We in the National Park Service know how tirelessly this Committee has worked to advance the conservation of our natural and cultural heritage and to meet the increasing and perplexing challenges of this Nation's park and recreation needs. We know how dedicated you are as individual members, and we are deeply grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to each member of the Committee, for your interest, counsel, and assistance.

We all look forward with pleasure to working with each of you in this second session of the 90th Congress. We stand ready to serve you in every way we can.

For the past four years, it has been a great personal satisfaction to report on the progress we have made in carrying out the growing responsibilities you have given to us. It has also been a great source of strength to me, and to all of my colleagues, to know that we could share with you the burden of our problems and to know that when we did so we would have your careful attention and thoughtful understanding.

It is my belief that the National Park Service has reached a time in its history which requires thoughtful decisions on enormously complex park problems, and bold innovation in the implementation of these decisions.

PARKSCAPE

In my statement to this Committee last year, Mr. Chairman, I presented our program designed to take a long and searching look at the quality of the environment of our National Park System and to develop feasible objectives for the National Park Service to contribute to a new conservation ethic in this country.

We call this program PARKSCAPE U.S.A., because it identifies our concern with the landscapes, seascapes, and cityscapes which make up our natural and cultural inheritance.

All of us are acutely aware of the unrelenting pressures of civilization whose all-pervasive influence seems likely to render all of our resources into "useful" objects for a materialistic world.

The National Parks are increasingly popular as places of escape, which provide an inspirational alternative to the urban sprawl. The astounding mobility of our citizens has brought the most remote corners of this continent within reach of millions.

The major destination points for this migration--usually in the summer--are the well-known National Parks, which are now asked to serve a volume of visitors beyond our comprehension as recently as the years immediately following World War II, and to withstand modern recreational activities of many kinds.

It may well be that the general public has lost sight of, or perhaps never fully understood, that a significant difference exists between National Parks and other public lands offering outdoor recreational opportunities.

With explosive increases in visitation, it is imperative that park use be tempered by genuine understanding and appreciation of park resources, if their real values are to be conserved. And more important still, that sense of values--that ecological conscience that is at the heart of what we call PARKSCAPE--is essential to the achievement and maintenance of a truly livable environment for mankind itself.

We feel that we must play a significant role in developing in the public a sense of oneness with the environment, if the PARKSCAPE program is to be of genuine service to the nation and its parklands. We have expanded and intensified our efforts in that direction in several key ways.

One of our most important actions last year was the appointment of Dr. A. Starker Leopold as Chief Scientist of the National Park Service. Dr. Leopold, who will continue in his position as Assistant to the Chancellor and Director of the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, is a world famous ecologist who has recently served as Chairman of Secretary Udall's Advisory Committee on Wildlife Management in the National Parks.

Under Dr. Leopold's leadership, our Office of Natural Science Studies will provide much of the basic knowledge necessary to maintain or restore the ecological integrity of our National Parks.

A national understanding of the values of our natural and historic heritage is essential to the successful conservation of the National Park System. We have pledged to communicate these values, and to this end, during 1967, we consolidated our interpretive and information programs under an Assistant Director for Interpretation.

Within the parks, an improved interpretive program will be accomplished by a reorientation in our approach to interpretation. The temptation is to interpret--to communicate with the visitor--only in terms of the colorful and exciting parts of each park's story; or, at best, in terms of the park story alone. In doing so, we sometimes fail to bring to the visitor a sense of the broader picture--the complex and vulnerable world of living and inanimate things of which man is so influential a part.

Through training and through publications, exhibits, and audiovisual productions that constitute an integral part of park interpretation, the new office will play a key role in presenting the message of environmental unity.

By allied efforts with schools, conservation organizations and others we will help make available to school children across the Nation, through the existing educational structure, a fully integrated program to foster environmental perception. The initial force of these efforts will be directed at the Nation's congested urban areas; and this is just one of many ways in which we hope to enlarge the horizons of the millions of city dwellers who now have so pitifully few opportunities to savor the expansion of the mind and spirit that comes, not from LSD, but from the fresh breath of woodlands and tangible reminders of the people and events that shaped America.

JOINT PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENTS

Millions of Americans who never have--and perhaps never will--set foot in wilderness, nor thrill at the sight of true wildness, take genuine pleasure and receive a spiritual lift from knowledge

of the existence of unspoiled wildlands. More millions can-- and shall--know that pleasure. And their children, and their children's children, deserve the assurance that the National Parks remain the gold standard on which the currency of such pleasures is based.

There is a very real danger, however, that we may destroy the wildness by trying to take every visitor to its heart. But if parks are for people--and, indeed, they are--what are the alternatives to the steady extension of visitor use facilities in the parks?

Last fall, I appointed a blue-ribbon committee, composed of conservation leaders, as well as key National Park Service staff members, to define the purposes, the standards, and the alternatives to park roads. In these times, the matter of roads--of transportation through the parks--is very much at the heart of nearly every aspect of park management. The committee soon will have ready its recommendations on these matters. The committee's preliminary report reaffirms the necessity for restraint in road building; the principle that park roads are for leisurely travel; and the urgency of the need for functional alternatives to automobile travel in the parks. In this regard, recent technology is our ally in providing us with the prospect of less intrusive and more effective forms of transportation.

The Service is assessing the capabilities, cost, location, criteria, and ecological effects of a number of methods of transporting visitors--buses, monorails, funiculars and rail conveyors. These forms of access might well prove adaptable to our use, with considerably less environmental intrusion which inevitably accompanies road construction and automobile traffic.

In my judgment, we must soon impose more stringent controls over vehicles. It has been demonstrated beyond any question that transportation systems other than privately-operated automobiles can be highly successful, and we intend to vigorously continue our investigation of such systems for use in National Parks.

National parklands exert increasingly salutary influences on the environment of our Nation. Through cooperative planning with local, State and Federal organizations--and the private sector--we are acting on our legitimate concern for the environment in which the National Parks--and their owners, the people of America--exist.

We intend to continue to encourage development of alternate facilities outside parks, and to promote, where feasible, some more equitable distribution of present use patterns.

While every reasonable indirect way will be sought to ease the burden, increasing use, ultimately, will force us to impose some form of direct control over the volume and duration of park visits, especially in the older, more fragile areas.

We have become increasingly concerned with our responsibilities in urban matters as they relate to historic preservation, city parks and recreation, sites and structures, visitor contact, transportation, beautification, planning, zoning, and other activities requiring close cooperation with many interests at many levels.

A number of newly authorized areas, as well as some of the proposed areas, are in or near urban complexes. We have for many years been intimately associated with urban affairs, not only here in Washington, D. C., but also in such major cities as New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Boston. Most of America's population resides in metropolitan areas, and here the National Park concepts and philosophies can be employed to help cities achieve more handsome, more livable environments, and the values of conservation can be more effectively communicated.

For this reason, last year I reorganized my immediate staff to establish an Office of Urban Affairs, headed by a Deputy Associate Director to coordinate our urban programs. Although this office has been in operation only a few months, it has been extremely effective in carrying out and coordinating a large number of highly complex activities.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM PLAN AND NATURAL LANDMARKS

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is at work on the Nationwide Recreation Plan as prescribed by the Congress. A part of this plan is the National Park System Plan. During 1967, a special effort was made to move ahead on the National Park System Plan to provide information to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for the Nationwide Recreation Plan.

In addition to studies of areas proposed for addition to the National Park System as Federal properties, the National Park System Plan involves the Natural Landmarks Program.

During calendar 1967, 203 sites were studied by the Service for eligibility as Natural Landmarks. One hundred and twenty-five site evaluations were completed and, of these, 45 were approved as eligible. Twenty-three eligible sites were included in the register at the request of their owners, and seven presentation ceremonies were held.

In 1968, the Service plans to study 150 additional sites to determine their qualification for Natural Landmark status.

To clarify the objectives and status of Service programs involving natural areas, publication of a brochure is planned for 1968 covering natural areas--parks, monuments and landmarks--as a companion volume to the National Register of Historic Places.

Through the Service's National Registries of Natural and Historic Landmarks, our endorsement and counsel is offered to those outside the Service who are preserving outstanding natural and historical resources without the expenditure of any Federal funds for acquisition. In many cases, this recognition of excellence can spell the difference between continued protection or irredeemable loss of significant resources.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

In October 1966, the Congress enacted the National Historic Preservation Act (P.L. 89-665), a legislative milestone that vastly broadens and strengthens the national preservation policy laid down by the Congress in the Historic Sites Act of 1935. To carry out the new responsibilities charged to the National Park Service, we have regrouped our existing professional units in this field and added two new ones to form the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation.

In addition to conducting previously existing programs of archeological salvage, Historic Sites Survey, Historic American Buildings Survey, and others, the new office has made considerable progress in launching the Nationwide Historic Preservation Program authorized by P.L. 89-665.

For this fiscal year the Congress appropriated \$300,000 for matching grants-in-aid to the National Trust for Historic Preservation. These funds are now being granted to the Trust on a regular schedule for acquisition and development of Trust properties and for educational and technical programs throughout the Nation. Although no funds were appropriated for grants-in-aid to the States, we have developed detailed guidelines for the State programs once funds are made available. We are now holding a series of regional meetings with the State Liaison Officers appointed by the Governors to carry out the State programs.

The first published edition of the National Register of Historic Places is now nearing completion. Federal agencies have predicted a need to make 10,000 consultations of the Register per year. We are intensively studying the application of computer technology to the storage and retrieval of National Register data so as to make this use of the Register more efficient.

The ten citizen members of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, appointed by the President in March 1967, have held two working meetings. The Council has shown an enthusiasm and dedication that promises to make it an immensely effective body.

The national historic preservation program united the resources of Federal, State, and local government, private societies, and individuals throughout the Nation in a major new effort to save the best of the past as an element around which to build for the future.

CRIME IN RURAL NATIONAL PARKS

I am sorry to have to report that the growing national crime problem is now an increasingly serious matter in some of our great National Parks. There is a marked increase in almost every category of offense, according to our preliminary data, but principally in "car clouting" (stripping automobiles of their valuable contents or parts), narcotics, vandalism, poaching, and traffic violations.

Law enforcement has always been part of our responsibility, but with limited funds and manpower shortages, we have been hard pressed in some areas to cope with these increasing problems. I am proud to say that our park personnel very keenly feel their obligation for the protection of visitors and property. They have contributed much uncompensated time and effort, beyond their normal duty, to help meet this need.

We have, of course, stepped up our law enforcement training effort. Some 75 men who have day-to-day law enforcement duties will benefit from practical and technical training sessions now under way. We are working with a number of other Federal agencies to provide our personnel with specialized training in narcotics control. Our personnel have also received training in law enforcement courses conducted by official agencies in several states. We are extremely grateful for this cooperation.

From present indications, law enforcement and crowd control will be an increasing problem, for which there are no short range solutions. This is a matter we must meet head on with adequate numbers of well-trained personnel.

WILDERNESS STUDIES

The Wilderness Act, Public Law 88-577, approved September 3, 1964, established mandatory requirements for the study of all roadless areas of 5,000 contiguous acres, or more, in units of the National Park System to determine their suitability or nonsuitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and set time limits for its implementation.

One-third of the wilderness study areas of the National Park System (19) were scheduled for study during 1964-67. It should be noted that the Wilderness Act allocated only three years (1964-67) for the completion of reviews on the first one-third of the study areas as compared with four years allocated for completion of the second review period which ends September 3, 1971.

Because of the great amount of detailed staff work required to develop instructions, procedures and guidelines, as well as train personnel, prepare maps and master plans, schedule and hold hearings, and evaluate the hearing testimony in order to comply with the legislation, we have not been able to meet the scheduled completion date for the first one-third of our areas.

Through 1967, however, reviews of 15 of the 19 areas scheduled for study in the first three-year period have been completed through the stages of study and public hearings. The remaining four areas needed to complete the quota of 19 are scheduled for public hearings between now and May 1968. We are confident that this program will be on schedule before the end of this year.

Wilderness studies by the Service are carried out as a part of the master plan program. For the information of the Committee, there is attached to my report a copy of the administrative policies (guidelines and procedures) of the Service for the conduct of this program. We would be pleased to supplement this information in any way the Committee wishes.

The crucial far-reaching effects of this act upon the future management, visitor use, and development of the units of the National Park System are yet to be fully realized. For example, since enactment of the wilderness legislation in 1964, there appears to be a belief on the part of some that the providing of facilities within National Parks for the accommodation of visitors is now contrary to the purpose of National Parks and the Congressional policies laid down for their management and use. In our opinion, the wilderness act provides no support for such a view, since Section 4 of the Act provides that:

"The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be * * * supplemental to the purposes for which * * * units of the national park system are established and administered * * *" (Emphasis supplied).

Thus, we have proceeded in our wilderness studies on the basis that the Congress by enacting the wilderness legislation has not changed its long established policy for the management and use of the National Parks.

We have also proceeded in our studies on the basis that the Congress could only have intended by making the Wilderness Act applicable to the National Park System that lands within National Parks designated by the Congress as wilderness should, if anything, result in a higher, rather than a lower, standard of unimpaired preservation. Accordingly, in our studies we have excluded from wilderness proposals lands within the National Parks which are subject to stock driveways, grazing, mineral and other reservations which constitute adverse uses of parklands. Additional details involving our wilderness use and management criteria are set forth in the statement attached to my report.

LAND ACQUISITION

Substantial progress has been made in our land acquisition program. Emphasis for the last several years has been on purchasing lands in the newly authorized areas of the National Park System which will serve primarily the crowded metropolitan areas nearby.

For fiscal year 1968, Congress appropriated \$32,269,000 for acquisitions in various areas of the National Park System. The bulk of this money is earmarked for new areas. Of this appropriation, \$3,326,800 is for inholdings in the older National Parks and Monuments. Total acreage acquired during the first half of fiscal year 1968 is 47,967 acres at a cost of \$16,136,947.

Although it was not concluded in 1967, one of the most significant achievements of our 1968 fiscal year land acquisition program has been the acquisition of sufficient lands, and interests therein, to insure the establishment of Piscataway Park, first authorized by the Congress on October 4, 1961. This park, which insures the protection of the overview from Mount Vernon, is a conservation milestone in cooperative effort by private individuals, organizations and their government.

As encouraging as our progress has been, there remains an especially difficult problem to which I invite your attention.

Privately owned lands within our older National Parks and Monuments (usually those established prior to 1960) constitute a serious and growing threat to the integrity of our National Park System.

The problem is particularly acute in the Natural Areas of the System where nearly one-third of a million acres remains in private ownership. Ranging in size from 0.2 of an acre in Mount McKinley National Park to more than 69,000 acres of land and semi-submerged land in the Everglades, these pockets of private property are found in 44 of the 66 National Parks and Monuments designated as Natural Areas.

Compared with the total size of the Natural Areas--more than 22,000,000 acres--the amount of privately owned land may seem statistically insignificant. But like the worm in the apple, these "inholdings" as we call them, often have a devastating effect upon the natural integrity of a park.

This is due, in part, to their strategic location. Private inholdings tend to cluster around the prime scenic attractions of the parks, or along natural access routes, where they are seen by millions of visitors.

Another factor is that the harmful uses to which these pockets of private property are put have impact far beyond their immediate locale.

As the Izaak Walton League once described them, they often are "festering sores in an otherwise unspoiled area belonging to the whole public."

There are, I believe, three overriding reasons why private inholdings are incompatible with the basic purpose and function of a National Park and should, therefore, be eliminated.

First, the wide variety of adverse uses that take place on these private parcels of property are destructive of park values--scenery, wildlife, forest and flowers--in short, the very features that made the area worthy of being a National Park in the first place.

For example, the owner of an ocean front property in Virgin Islands National Park brought in a bulldozer and began to strip the sand from his beautiful beach to sell it commercially. Another landowner on scenic Lake McDonald in Glacier National Park chopped down the stately pines on his lakeside lot to clear the way for a mobile hot-dog stand.

On other inholdings in National Parks and Monuments you will find sawmills and lumber yards; shoddy trailer courts and garish souvenir shops; gravel pits and logging operations.

You also will find power plants and mining operations; gas stations and auto junkyards; garbage dumps and private airports, and last, but not least, proliferating residential subdivisions--an increasingly serious problem.

The second basic reason why inholdings are undesirable is the bad impact they have on the park visitor. They spoil his view of the natural scene and demean his esthetic experience with intrusions

of a blatantly commercial nature. They deny him access to choice areas of the park, and block the development of new public facilities for his enjoyment and protection.

For example, the visitor who enters Olympic National Park via the Elwha River Road will be greeted by large signs announcing a trailer campsite development on one side of the road, and by an abandoned gas station adjoining a fenced cattle pasture on the other.

At Lake McDonald in Glacier National Park, a privately owned sliver of lakefront property blocks the development of a badly needed public boat-launching ramp, while elsewhere on the lake 12-foot cyclone fences bar visitors from privately owned sections of beach.

At Yosemite National Park, a gaping gravel pit on the bank of the Merced River preempts a desirable public campground site.

In the Taylor Slough of Everglades National Park--a biological resource of enormous significance--quick-buck operators moved in with bulldozers to create primitive roads so they can peddle "waterfront" lots. Farther north, in the labyrinth country of the park, similar real estate promotions threaten the proposed Inland Wilderness Waterway from Flamingo to the Ten Thousand Islands area. The potential damage from these activities to the fragile ecology of the Everglades is incalculable.

A third urgent reason for eliminating private inholdings from the parks is that money and manpower, needed for the basic job of protecting and preserving the parks and serving the visitors, must be diverted to deal with the administrative problems created by the adverse uses of the property.

This is especially acute where large residential subdivisions exist within parks, as at Kings Canyon, Glacier, and Yosemite.

Park superintendents suddenly find themselves confronted with most of the problems facing a professional municipal executive-- law enforcement, fire protection, zoning and construction, sewage and garbage disposal, traffic control, inspection of food handlers and regulation of a variety of commercial activities.

Wawona Village in Yosemite National Park is a striking example of this problem. Private ownership in this 640-acre section of land dates back to the 1890's when it was acquired under the Homestead Act.

Down through the years, Wawona Village, like Topsy, "just grewed" without controls on zoning, lot sizes, street widths, construction, or any organized planning for water supply or sewage disposal. During the past three years, growth has been explosive.

Today, Wawona Village is a booming subdivision of private inholdings, criss-crossed by roads and utility lines, and bristling with "NO TRESPASSING" signs. It is a hodge-podge community of rental cabins, dilapidated cottages, expensive new year-around homes in the \$20,000 to \$60,000 bracket, motels and trailer courts, a lumber yard, stores and restaurants.

Wawona is a community beset with perplexing problems of sewage and garbage disposal, fire protection and law enforcement, traffic control and public sanitation. Since most property owners draw their water from individual wells and dispose of their sewage through septic tanks and leaching fields, there also is a very real threat of water pollution in the future even though the water is now potable.

The ever-increasing adverse uses of private lands, coupled with the increasing popularity of the parks, is intensified by the growth of population and the economic development of the country. This makes the inholdings problem one of the most serious facing the National Park Service today.

And the situation can only get worse with time because the cost of acquiring these properties continues to escalate as the demand for desirable recreational land grows ever more fierce.

The estimated cost of acquiring all the private inholdings in the Natural Areas of the Park System is now \$114,000,000 compared with \$59,000,000 in 1961--an increase of 93 percent in six years. And this is a conservative estimate.

On the average, the price of private properties inside our National Parks is escalating at a rate of 12 to 24 percent per year. In some cases, it is a great deal more.

In Grand Teton National Park, for example, the value of privately owned land has increased from an average \$1,000 per acre in 1957 to \$4,500 per acre in 1965--a 350 percent increase in eight years.

In Yosemite National Park, for example, a land company bought a 160-acre tract in 1961 for \$25,000. Four years later, the Department of the Interior filed a notice of taking (condemnation) and deposited in court \$175,000 as the estimated fair market value--a 600 percent increase over the original purchase price. And the court has not yet made a final determination.

Last year, the National Park Service bought the Sol Duc property--in Olympic National Park--a 320-acre health resort featuring hot springs, for \$880,000, more than three and one-half times the official appraisal price set just five years earlier.

In 1962, the National Park Service purchased the 530-acre Steads Ranch in Rocky Mountain National Park for \$750,000--up 50 percent from the asking price of \$500,000 in 1958.

In 1954, the 543-acre McFarland Ranch in Glacier National Park was appraised at \$60,000, but when we filed condemnation proceedings last year, the appraised value had risen to \$181,570--an increase of 300 percent in 12 years. Had we been able to buy this property in 1941, the price would have been an estimated \$3,389, appraised value.

These and other examples I could cite point to one inescapable conclusion: We must take action now on an orderly, sustained basis to acquire these private inholdings that are causing an alarming erosion of natural values in our National Parks.

However, I wish to make it clear that it is not our objective to proceed precipitously to disrupt the lives of our citizens who have spent years developing and operating homesteads and similar properties, many of which existed long before the establishment of some of our National Parks and Monuments, the continuance of which remain largely compatible with the purpose of the park. To insure full understanding on this matter we have developed administrative policies and procedures to guide the acquisition of land and water rights within the natural areas provided the Congress supports our program. A copy of this statement is attached to my report.

In my judgment, the objectives of acquiring inholdings in our older National Parks and Monuments can best be achieved by the annual appropriation of a realistic amount of Land and Water Act monies in a manner that would give the Service the flexibility needed to meet the rapidly changing conditions of the real estate market.

This would enable the Service to acquire lands at the lowest possible cost to the taxpaying public because we could purchase them on an "opportunity" basis, as they become available, or are about to be put on the market.

It would also permit us to react quickly to block commercial or industrial development that might cause irreparable damage to National Park values when historical uses are about to be changed and it is not possible to prevent such developments through a negotiated purchase.

Finally, it would enable us to move forward with an orderly, efficient program of eliminating a blight that threatens one of the most cherished natural resources of the American people--their superlative system of National Parks and Monuments.

CONCLUSION

Few will deny that the quality of the home directly affects the quality of the life of its occupants. The home of man doesn't end at the doorstep, or yard's edge. Home is the world we live in. Its furnishings are the soil and water, the air, the sunlight, the growing things, and the reminders of man's past, whose finest combinations are epitomized in the National Park System and the PARKSCAPE of which they are the key part. If man's destiny is to be the good life, we must make the home of man a place worth living in.

HARTZOG, George Benjamin, Jr., govt. ofcl.; b. Colleton County, S.C., Mar. 17, 1920; s. George Benjamin and Mazell (Steadly) H.; student Wofford Coll., Spartanburg, S.C., 1937; B.S. in Bus. Adminstrn., Am. U., 1953; m. Helen Carlson, June 28, 1947; children—George, Nancy, Edward. With Bur. Land Mgmt. and Nat. Park Service, Dept. Interior, 1946-62; exec. dir. Downtown St. Louise, Inc., 1962-63; asso. dir. Nat. Park Service, 1963-64, dir., 1964—; trustee John F. Kennedy Center Performing Arts, 1964—; admitted to S.C. bar, 1942, Mo. bar, 1963, also Supreme Ct. U.S. Home: 4818 Old Dominion Dr., Arlington, Va. 22207. Office: Interior Bldg., Washington 20240.

APPENDIX E



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:

December 15, 1972

Mrs. Amelia R. Fry
Regional Cultural History
Room 486 Library
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Mrs. Fry:

Before leaving my post on December 31, I want you to know how much I appreciate all your support and assistance during the time it has been my privilege to serve as Director of the National Park Service. It has been a genuine pleasure and a high honor to have had the opportunity to work with you.

With warmest personal regards and every good wish,
I am

Sincerely yours,



George E. Hartzog, Jr.
Director

1643 Chain Bridge Road
McLean, Virginia 22101



National Parks Centennial 1872-1972

HORACE HARDEN ALBRIGHT
14144 DICKENS STREET
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA 91403

(213) 769-8292

MEMORANDUM RE THE DIRECTORSHIP OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE:

This memorandum is written to set forth my views on the resignation of Director George B. Hartzog, Jr. of the National Park Service and the appointment of Ronald H. Walker as his successor. I hope it will answer most of the questions coming to me by letter and telephone from persons in the Park Service as well as from people in private life.

I deplore the departure of Director Hartzog for he is a career man, and I thought he has managed the National Park Service well in the nearly nine years of his leadership of it. I regret the decision not to seek a successor from the ranks of the National Park Service personnel and the appointment of Mr. Walker who has had no part in the national park administration. Not knowing Mr. Walker, I make no comment on his capabilities as an administrator to direct the affairs of the service. No doubt he is a very capable man. I hope he will be a very successful administrator of the National Park Service.

Fifty-six years ago when legislation to create the National Park Service division was being framed, Interior Department officials and members of the Congress deliberately planned a bureau along the lines of the U. S. Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior and the U. S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, career bureaus of professional men and women. The law establishing the National Park Service provided for an agency with all career officers. Of the seven directors heading the Service since 1916, six have been national park administrators. The one exception, that of Newton B. Drury, was involved in the Save-the-Redwoods League and closely associated with the National Park Service. Mr. Drury had been executive secretary of the former for twenty years and was a dedicated conservationist thoroughly familiar with national park affairs.

My apprehensions are that a departure from the appointment policies of 56 years in selecting a National Park Service director may mean that the bureau's employees may no longer feel the aspiration to head their agency.

As I see it, the National Park Service is one of the largest and most important conservation agencies and has been very successful in managing a huge segment of our American heritage. It has about 6,000 employees and supervises the management and protection of nearly 30,000,000 acres of public land. Always closely in contact with the public, the Park Service is a sensitive agency making professional administration essential.

When the newly appointed director begins his service, he can count on my advice and support if he feels the need of it. On June 2, 1973, it will have been 60 years since I joined the Department of the Interior. My loyalty to it and its National Park Service has never faltered and is still as strong as ever. Furthermore I still firmly favor the plan to build around it the Department of Natural Resources.

Horace M. Albright

December 26, 1972

INDEX -- George B. Hartzog

- Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites and Buildings, 45, 46
 Agriculture, U.S. Department of, 17
 Albright, Horace, 6
 American Forestry Association, 50
 Anderson, Clinton, 54
 Antiquities Act, 26
 Aspinall, Wayne, 52
- Bible, A. H., 53
 Bridge Canyon, 24
- Canyonlands National Park, 21
 Church, F. F., 54
 city parks program (of National Park Service), 7-8
 Cliff, Ed, 18
 concessions management (see National Park Service, park management policy)
 Congress, U.S.
 appropriations for parks, 55-58
 Interior and Insular Committees, 51
 conservation organizations, 58-59
 Crafts, Ed, 18
- dam construction, 21, 24
 Death Valley, 21
 Drury, Newton, 6, 21
- Forest Service, U.S.
 relations with Outdoor Recreation and Resources Review Commission
 (ORRRC), 15-16
 retirement policy, 12
 Freeman, Orville, 17
- Glacier Bay National Park, 21
 Grand Canyon National Park, 24, 25
 Grand Teton National Park, 53
 grazing in national parks, 36
 Great Smoky Mountains National Park, 28-29, 33
- Hartzog, George B.
 education and experience to 1965, 1-7
 attorney for National Park Service, 2, 6
 career with National Park Service, 2-3, 6-7, 10, passim
 Historic Sites Act of 1935, 41
 hunting in national parks, 38

- Interior, U.S. Department of, 1, 13, 17
 Bureau of Land Management, 39, 43
 Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR), 9, 13-16, 18
 Isle Royale National Park, 62
- Jackson, H. M., 53, 54
 Jordan, B. E., 53
 Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, 2-3, 6-7
- Krug, Julius, 64
- Land and Water Conservation Fund, 55-56
 Lee, Ronnie, 10
 Legislation
 concession bill, 62-63
 favoring park preservation, 21-23, 52-54
 Leopold, Starker, 36
- Mather, Steve, 20
 Metcalf, Lee, 54
 mining in national parks, 20-23
 Mission 66 Program, 55
 Moss, Ted, 54
 Mount McKinley National Park, 21
 Muir woods, 55
- National Park Advisory Board on Wildlife Management, 36
 National Park Service
 acquisition policy, 40-41
 park management policy, 36-42
 concessions management, 2, 3-4, 60-65
 relations to other agencies, 13-19
 relations with Congress, 45-48, 51, 60
 research program of, 33-34
 resources management program, 36-37
 structure and reorganization, 33-35, 41-44, 51
- Oregon Dunes, the, 54
 Outdoor Recreation and Resources Review Commission (ORRRC), 13-16
 Ozark National Scenic Riverways, 47-48
- Park, Parkway and Recreation Area Study Act (1936), 14
 park rangers, responsibilities of, 31-32
 parks
 profile of usage, 30-31
 public attitude toward, 20-22, 46-49
- Parks for America, 14
 Point Reyes, 57
 Preston, John, 10

Rivers, Ralph, 52

Save the Redwoods League, 49

Saylor, John, 52

Scoyen, Eivind, 9-10

Senate, U.S.

 Appropriations Committee, 57, 58

Sequoia National Park, 59

Sierra Club, 49, 52

Simpson, M. L., 53-54

Stoddard, Charles, 43

transportation in national parks, 24-30

Udall, Stewart, 3, 17-19, 22, 24, 41, 45, 46, 48

urban parks, 7-8, 34

Urban Renewal Administration, 18

vandalism in parks, 31-32

Vint, Thomas, 10

Wilderness Act, 22-23, 57

Wilderness Conference, 25, 52

wilderness preservation, 8, 22

wildlife management in national parks, 36, 37-38

Wirth, Conrad, 3, 9-13, 33, 55

Yellowstone National Park, 53

Yosemite Valley, 32, 39

Amelia R. Fry

Graduated from the University of Oklahoma in 1947 with a B.A. in psychology, wrote for campus magazine; Master of Arts in educational psychology from the University of Illinois in 1952, with heavy minors in English for both degrees.

Taught freshman English at the University of Illinois 1947-48, and Hiram College (Ohio) 1954-55. Also taught English as a foreign language in Chicago 1950-53.

Writes feature articles for various newspapers, was reporter for a suburban daily 1966-67. Writes professional articles for journals and historical magazines.

Joined the staff of Regional Oral History Office in February, 1959.

Conducted interview series on University history, woman suffrage, the history of conservation and forestry, and public administration and politics.

Director, Earl Warren Oral History Project

Secretary, Oral History Association; oral history editor, Journal of Library History, Philosophy, and Comparative Librarianship.

