

INTERVIEWEE: GEORGE HARTZOG, JR.

INTERVIEWER: JOE B. FRANTZ

December 20, 1968

F: This is an interview with Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr., in his office in the Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., on the afternoon of December 20, 1968, and I am Joe B. Frantz.

Mr. Hartzog, you are from South Carolina, I know. Tell us a little bit about how you came your circuitous route to Washington.

H: Well, Joe, when I got out of the service in 1946, I had had a friend whom I had met in the Army who was a lawyer in the Department of the Interior. I stopped by Washington to visit with him. In the process of my visit, [I] met the chief counsel of the Bureau of Land Management who offered me a job and I took it. I came into the Bureau of Land Management in March of 1946.

F: Were you a lawyer then?

H: Yes. Shortly after that, I left the Department to go with a private law firm in Washington. I was out only a matter of a few weeks when the National Park Service offered me a job as a lawyer in Chicago where their headquarters were at that time. So I came back and went to work with the Park Service in October of '46. I have been with them ever since, except for a short break in '62 and '63.

F: What did you do in '62 and '63?

H: I left the Service to become the executive director of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., in St. Louis.

F: What was that?

H: It was a group of local businessmen who were interested primarily in the redevelopment and promotion of downtown St. Louis.

F: Was that Gateway Project tied in with that?

H: Many of the people who were directors of Downtown St. Louis were also directors of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, which was a cooperating association on that project. That's how I got to meet them.

F: And then you rejoined the Park Service?

H: In '63 as the Associate Director.

F: Who named you actually? I guess it was--.

H: The Secretary.

F: The Secretary named you.

H: Mine was a Secretarial appointment.

F: And you've been then Director of the Service since 1964.

H: January of 1964.

F: Right. You have, according to general consensus, presided over the greatest change of any one director in the Park Service except, of course, for the pioneering days.

H: Well, I appreciate that, Joe. I think it has been pretty exciting, and I do think that rather fundamental changes have come about, not only in the makeup of the National Park System, but also in some of the policies and guidelines.

F: Before we get on to your career as Director, you are on the board of the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts.

H: Yes.

F: What does that involve?

H: Well, I am not only on that board but also on the Building Committee.

F: Yes.

H: I have not been as active in that board as I probably should have because I had, at the time I took over as Director, an alternate who was serving for the previous Director--a very capable engineer who was then Associate Regional Director of the National Capital Region.

F: Who was that?

H: Robert C. Horn. He is now one of my special assistants, and I let him represent me in most of that activity.

F: Who named you to that board?

H: The state. This is an ex-officio relationship.

F: Have you reached that stage now where almost anything of any sizeable nature that goes into the District of Columbia at least involves consultation with the National Park Service for aesthetic and other values?

H: I would say most of it does, Joe, because our holdings are so widespread that almost anything that is proposed now in terms of development impinges at some point on a historic property or on park land, all of which we manage here in the National Capital Region. This puts quite a burden on your time.

F: So you have become inescapable?

H: Right.

F: You are involved in just about anything concerned with the District. You are on also the National Capital Planning Commission.

H: Yes.

F: What does that involve?

H: This Commission is charged with planning for the District of Columbia and then planning for all government activities in this metropolitan region. The Commission meets once a month. Usually the meetings are preceded by

committee meetings which may run for one or two days, and then the Commission meeting generally is a day and seldom could go more than two days each month.

F: That cuts into your time rather heavily too.

H: Pretty severely, yes. Because I have tried to be pretty active on that.

F: What kinds of people serve on that Commission?

H: The Commission is now evenly divided with ex-officio officers, of which I am one. The Director of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Director of the Public Buildings Service, the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Mayor-Commissioner of Washington, D.C., and five public members who are appointed by the President for terms of six years; and the Chairman of the Commission, of course, serves at the pleasure of the President.

F: You have also membership on this committee or commission for the Preservation of the White House.

H: Yes.

F: What are you up to there?

H: This committee came into being, of course, as the result of an Executive Order issued by the President.

F: Which President?

H: President Johnson, naming me as Chairman of the Preservation Committee, and providing for the appointment of seven public members who would serve at the pleasure of the President, and also certain ex-officio officers: one is the Secretary of the Smithsonian; the Director of the National Gallery of Art; the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission; and the Curator of the White House.

F: Does this mean then that both the National Capital Planning Commission and, for that matter, the White House are looked upon somewhat in the same

light as national parks and other national treasures as something to be preserved and planned?

H: Of course, as you know, there is a statute which recognizes the White House as one of our great historic properties and charges the National Park Service with a very special responsibility there--to maintain the historical character of the mansion and also to take care of its grounds. This is a shared responsibility with GSA because GSA, you know, takes care of the office space in the White House. We handle the rest of the White House including the living quarters of the First Family.

F: Are the tours under your direction?

H: Yes, sir.

F: Haven't you changed policy on the tours?

H: We have, with Mrs. Johnson's approval, experimented in an effort to try to make it a more pleasant and enjoyable visit to the public. Last summer we experimented with the system of pre-timed tickets so that a family could come even on the day prior to visiting the White House and get a ticket which would reserve a spot for them in the line. They could then go and visit other memorials here and utilize that time rather than just standing on the sidewalk for one or two or three hours as they had been doing previously.

F: Did that work?

H: Well, it worked very well. Unfortunately, the visitor had been so thoroughly ingrained with the idea of standing in line until we found that, even with the pre-timed ticket, still about half of them wanted to stand in line. But we were encouraged by it, because at least half of them did leave and go utilize their time in other sight-seeing activities. So with the permission of the new First Lady, we will continue to experiment

next summer, even including perhaps more extensive closing off of some of the streets--East Executive Avenue, for example, which gives the visitor a kind of a mall setting in which to wait, not burdened with the automobile traffic.

F: During the period in which you have been Director, more particularly during the Kennedy-Johnson period, you have had a fairly significant change in your general acquisition and land area policy.

H: Yes.

F: Could you describe this?

H: Well, Joe, you know, of course, from your service on the Advisory Board--the Secretary's Advisory Board--this issue came up here just shortly after I was named Director, in which we just sort of reached an impasse on some land acquisition in these older national parks. For example, in the Grand Teton National Park, our ability to condemn private property was actually eliminated. Congress prohibited it because the objective had been without regard to the purpose of the property, just simply to acquire all privately-owned.

Well, after studying this for some time we concluded that this really was not what our objective was. Our objective was to prevent the speculator from developing the private property in a manner that negated the federal investment there--or adversely affected the prime resources in the area. Many of these historical uses, such as dude ranches, small homesteads, and small restaurants, were really things that served the visitor, in some cases equally well with the federal investment that had been put there. So there was no great urgency to purchase the property and dispossess a family who had spent a lifetime on this land. Our objective was to insure that when they no longer wanted that property for such a compatible use that

the federal government got the first opportunity to purchase it and, in any event, that the federal government was in a position to prevent its adverse development.

So we developed a proposed policy expressing this viewpoint which we submitted to the Secretary--he agreed with it--and which we then took up with our legislative committees and with our appropriations subcommittees. They too approved of it, and as a result of that we have changed the fundamental land acquisition policy in connection with the acquisition of national parks from one of immediately trying to eliminate all "in- holdings" to one that took a longer view, that our objective was to insure the preservation of the basic values there consistent with a sense of understanding of the private rights and the private individual that had homesteaded, in many cases, his property.

On recreation areas, of course, we took the lead from the Congress which innovated this policy at Cape Cod--that with the creative, cooperative effort of local government and private individuals it was not necessary for the federal government to buy all lands within recreation areas. We just simply took that and built on it, with the Secretary's and the Congress' approval. A policy which now recognizes that certain recreation areas where the land area is sufficiently large that there can be indeed whole private developments, because the objective in a national recreational area is to provide optimum recreational opportunities in a natural environment as contrasted with a national park, the objective of which is to preserve a vignette of early America.

On the one hand you do this best by getting private, local, and federal government working together as a partnership and taking care of this whole spectrum of outdoor recreation. On the other hand, in the

national parks the long-term ownership of private property over many, many decades is incompatible with preserving a vignette of early America. This is why the basically two different kinds of policies.

So we then had a look at the historical areas, and here again we discovered that there were perhaps more similarities than differences in the kinds of ownerships that we needed in historical areas and those which we needed in recreational areas. We have revised that land acquisition policy, too, with the approval of the Secretary and the Congress.

And, interestingly, in the amendments to the 1968 Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Congress has gone one step further on the recommendation of the Administration. They have now given me the authority, where we in the past have purchased fee-simple title in recreation areas and historical areas and we no longer need that much control, that we can sell back a compatible private development right and realize the proceeds then for the Land and Water Conservation Fund which will enable us to buy other lands. So I do look on this as a real significant change and one which I think in the long run is going to be of material benefit to the System.

F: Historically, your national parks were pretty well taken out of public lands, weren't they?

H: That's right.

F: Has this been changed?

H: Not entirely. We got Canyonlands largely, of course, out of public lands. But you have to remember in connection with the public lands and the fact that it contributed the basic land mass within these national parks, that there were many private rights there, because they had been open to homesteading. In some cases they had been open to mineral leasing and development

and to mining claims and to these kinds of things which went to patents. Even in Yellowstone National Park which was established in 1872 before Idaho, Montana, or Wyoming became states, there is still privately-owned land in Yellowstone National Park.

F: But you have, to a great extent, moved the focus of your parks eastward in this decade.

H: Oh, very definitely, and especially is that true in terms of recreation areas.

F: What is your philosophy there?

H: I was asked this question some time ago by a legislative committee in the House as to what I foresaw as the dimension of the National Park System. As we have looked at the situation, it seems to us that you have about now identified all of the superlative scenic and scientific areas on the land mass of the United States. And these are already in the National Park System, or proposals are underway for including them in the National Park System. So I can foresee where we may be phasing out the addition of new scenic and scientific areas as national parks in the System.

But with our society moving as rapidly as it is toward an urban situation, I think that the need for national recreation areas--well, let me say for outdoor recreation areas--is going to continue to accelerate, and the question of when the national recreation area category of the system will be complete really is a basic fundamental policy decision for an Administration and a Congress to make in relationship to how much support they are going to give to state and local government in providing these recreational opportunities.

This, of course, is one of the fundamental purposes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act--to create a more viable partnership between

federal, state, and local governments in taking care of this burgeoning recreation problem. I think there are a number of opportunities yet for the federal government to be involved with national recreation areas. I have believed for some time now that there is a real opportunity for the federal government, or maybe jointly with the States, to develop recreation demonstration areas in urban environments.

F: What do you mean, "demonstration"?

H: I mean to take a land area such as we have down here at St. Elizabeth's Farm and just simply go in there with the avowed purpose of experimenting on recreation programs that might relate to our cultural heritage, such as the living farm--which we have down there now--such as trying to relate the environment to the urban youngster which we really are not now doing. You know what I mean. We just assume that everybody that goes to a park wants to walk on a trail. Well, I don't accept that as valid, and we are having quite a dialogue in the Service over there.

I don't think you can say to the visitor who goes out to one of the national parks, "Well, now, let's park your car and go for a walk," when for fifty weeks out of the year we have said to him in town, "Don't go out alone. Somebody is likely to hit you over the head." But all of a sudden we transform him out into a wilderness which he knows nothing about because his understanding is a bunch of asphalt and concrete in the middle of town. He has never seen a tree other than maybe a replica that he might have run into in a dime store some place. We put him in acres and acres of them and say, "Now, go for a walk." It just doesn't work. It seems to me that somehow we've got to bring this outdoor environment and understanding of it in terms of environmental education closer to home.

In terms of these environmental study areas, one of the things that

11

we are calling them, or recreation demonstration areas--whatever you want to call them--it seems to me that one of the great needs today that is not now being met. That's why I think this is a dimension of the system that has a real thrust to it in the future. Of course, as to our historical areas--and this is your special field and you know this even better than I do--we are making history every day. So in my judgment we are never going to be out of the expansion of the system in preserving those great moments.

F: May make some more tomorrow down at Canaveral.

H: That's right.

F: Traditionally the Secretaries of the Interior have come from the West, and then you get a President from the East like Kennedy who has a great deal--at least his Administration had a great deal to do with this sort of movement eastward in park interest. Has there been any shift in emphasis since you moved again to a Westerner as President?

H: No. As a matter of fact, President Johnson, if anything, has accentuated this movement to the East. I think this is supported also by many of the trips which the First Lady has made in pursuing her interests in which they have emphasized the importance of preserving our cultural heritage, providing for these outdoor recreational opportunities. When you look at the face of a map since 1964, the first area that was authorized after I became Director was the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri, and that was just slightly west of the Mississippi. And then we just simply have moved to the East. Interestingly, I was just checking the statistics the other day, 61-percent of our visitors to the National Park System are to areas east of the Mississippi, and 62-percent of our staff in the National Park System are assigned east of the Mississippi.

F: So you are getting a somewhat eastern operation?

H: That's right.

F: You came in just after the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation had been created.

H: That's right.

F: How has this been meshed with the general National Park procedure and concept?

H: Well, I think very well. I know there is a lot of background controversy on whether it should or should not have been done. As you mentioned, when I came here it was a reality. Therefore, I determined to make it work if it were humanly possible for it to work. My first order of business was to establish a rapport with Ed Crafts, its Director, which I believe I have established, and I think the record supports this. Ed Crafts works very closely and was extremely instrumental, as you well know, in getting the legislation on the North Cascades and the Redwoods National Park which just passed this year. Without Ed Crafts' help, we couldn't have gotten that legislation, in my judgment.

It has created some problems. There is some duplication, notwithstanding what I think were the best efforts of Ed Crafts and certainly a great effort on our part to avoid it in connection with planning, because this is one area that has never been clarified as to where their planning stops and ours starts. Therefore every once in awhile one of these things surfaces, and we find either his people or our people out of line and encroaching on what we have agreed was the other's responsibilities. In order to try to clarify this, one of the first things that Ed Crafts and I did was to sign a cooperative agreement between our two bureaus on this issue, but it is subject to interpretation. Men of good will sometimes don't always read the language the same way, so when you have a shift of

people you sometimes have this grating. That's really the only sore spot that has constantly bothered both of us as far as I'm aware of.

I think the land acquisition program that BOR has been running has done very well. I can't complain about the apportionments that we got. They are not as much as I would like to have. I have never found an occasion when Ed Crafts wasn't sympathetic to my arguments. Generally, I must say that he has gone along with me. It can be done differently in terms of bureau structure. Between that bureau and our bureau, I think it's a good thing the way it is.

F: You have several groups outside the Department that have some overlap, even conflict. One of them I am thinking of is the Army Corps of Engineers. Can you give me some rundown on what the fundamental problem is, and then some examples of either conflict and resolution or conflicts and lack of resolution.

H: This has been a very interesting experience for me because, of course, when I was Superintendent of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, it was my first introduction to the reality of trying to accomplish a management job in the context of almost a committee arrangement, in that we had sixteen different organizations that had to clear our construction plans at one point in St. Louis.

F: I would think that could hold you up forever.

H: Well, it was an interesting experience in human nature and negotiation, I will tell you that, to finally get them cleared. And because many times our interests ran really counter to theirs. Trying to get these points resolved was an interesting operation.

I think you have somewhat the same thing with the Army Corps of Engineers. At many points, just like with the Bureau of Reclamation, their

program results in an absolute conflict with our objectives. I mean there is no point in trying to evade the issue, they are just contradictory. As I said to Floyd Dominy one time, "Let's just recognize that you will never convince me that the most beautiful river in the world has got a dam in it, and I will never convince you that you ought to let beautiful clean water run down a stream without a dam in it. And now get on with the rest of the things that we can agree on." This is what we have tried to do with the Army Corps of Engineers. It has worked. It has been a difficult problem, but over four years, we have finally resolved our problems at the Everglades.

F: What has been the problem with the Everglades?

H: Well, of course, they built that Central Southern Florida Flood Control Project in such a way that it simply cut off the overland flows of water that went into the park which were crucial to the survival of the park. When I came in as Director, we were at the point where the two bureaus were hardly speaking on the issues. Our people were trying to tell them how to build dams, and theirs were trying to tell us how to run a park and what the ecological impact of drought was. Jackson Graham, who was then the chief of civil works, and I agreed after the very first meeting that we had in which we discovered this kind of dialogue going on among our staffs that I would get my people out of the dam-building business and the business of advising his people and he would get his people out of the park operation and advising our people on the ecological impacts of water or lack of water, and start talking in our specialties. And that's what we did. As I say, we finally got the agreement signed this year.

F: Exactly what has been happening in the Everglades?

H: They just totally dried it up. As a matter of fact, as you remember in 1964, the water was totally cut off. It didn't get a drop of water except what fell on it from rain.

F: And what did that do?

H: It just destroyed a great part of the fisheries and vegetation in the Everglades to the point that some of our ecologists say that at this moment they can't really give us any assurance that this imbalance will ever correct itself. In order to try to get on top of it, during the period when we could get no water and get no agreement on water releases, we actually went into the park and blew out so-called "gator holes" because, of course, with the water having been cut off, vegetation moved in on these traditional watering holes that the alligators had kept open, you know, during the seasons of drought, because the water is just under the surface there. And the alligators are the important part of that ecology for when the drought period comes he gets into these little swales and he wallows out a hole. Then as the water dries up, the fish retreat into those holes and in this hole he survives by eating the fish and the bird life survives by eating the fish. Then when a flood comes again, it fills up the area and there is enough of that brood stock left that he gets out and the fish repopulate the area. Then the cycle starts over again. These cycles have always persisted. But what was really devastating down there was the fact that there was not this cycle, because with the water having been cut off, flooding was no longer possible, you see.

Well, now, of course, they have agreed, and the authorization has already been passed to permit them to modify the works that had been built north of the park so as to guarantee to the park 315,000 acre feet of water a year, which is what our ecologists tell us in their judgment is the minimum. In addition to the maximum capacity of the system, they will give us all of the surplus flood waters instead of spilling them out of the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie canals as they were doing previously.

So I think it's a good agreement.

F: Was this agreement worked out face-to-face or did you have Congressional action?

H: You had a little of everything. You know, there are people who were supporting their point of view and putting the heat on us. I suppose you have to say it was an agreement that was worked out face-to-face with a great many people, including the State of Florida, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget importantly and significantly got involved. Of course, this is one thing which I said very candidly to the Bureau of the Budget people--that at the very outset I felt all along this problem should never have been allowed to happen, if the Bureau of the Budget had really brought about the kinds of coordination, it seemed to me, the Bureau of the Budget ought to be bringing about. Because the examiner who had heard our program and the examiner who had heard the Corps of Engineers' program were neither informed as to what the other was doing with respect to funds that were being given and the construction that was taking place.

F: The two examiners worked independently of each other.

H: Yes. So that until the issue blew up you just never got this kind of coordination that was essential to resolve the matter.

F: Do you think you can avoid that in the future?

H: Well, I think it can be avoided. I'm not sure that it will be avoided, of course, because it is a very complex process apparently in putting the budget together.

F: After you took over as Director of the National Park Service, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was passed. How has that worked out in practice?

H: Well, I think it has worked very well. I think the credit for this has to go to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and Ed Crafts--which Bureau was primarily responsible for the legislation.

F: Do you feel you benefit?

H: Oh greatly. This is where all of our land acquisition money comes from. Yes.

F: When you open up new areas, do you have certain in-built problems from the mere fact of their being new?

H: Right.

F: For instance?

H: Well, to start with, of course, a new area is a much different thing today than it was previously in which, as we mentioned previously, the new area was generally carved out of the public domain and the privately owned lands were minimal. Today the new area is carved almost entirely out of privately owned lands so that great dislocation in one of these new areas comes into being. This creates human problems in terms of adjustment in the local economy that requires a great deal of patience on the part of our negotiators.

F: Do you feel you have a responsibility within the Service for the reasonably satisfactory relocation?

H: We don't have a responsibility as such. We feel, however, that the program interests of the federal government are served best when we try to work with the local people in these adjustment situations. Furthermore, I feel that it is the kind of thing that human beings just ought to do for each other. Therefore, we try to work it with a great deal of human sensitivity.

F: You have certain threats to the Park System. You mentioned the little

problem of the Everglades. Do you continue to have threats from, say, mineral rights? I'm thinking now particularly of the oil shale controversy that is in the news right now. I can think of mining rights in Alaska and the Cascades, and so on.

H: Yes, Joe, we constantly have those, but there has developed in this country a great body of support for the national parks that in my judgment perhaps makes my job easier in dealing with these threats than was the job of some of my predecessors. I think one of the most serious problems that we have faced has not been the exploitative type of use such as seeking a mineral or seeking some other resource for development in a national park contrary to its preservation. As the problem arose, state highway departments and--

F: Federal highways.

H: Federal highway aid programs impinging on the parks.

F: For instance? Is ~~that~~ geographical, or is it anywhere?

H: It's anywhere. I mean, you know, there seems to be a philosophy that grew up in this country that if it's green and it's in public ownership, it's for free. Therefore if you're going to have to build a public improvement such as a street or a highway, then that's the place to aim for because it cuts down your cost. So far as I am personally concerned, I think this has been one thing which I am proudest of: that we have actually had it written into the law in the District of Columbia that if they need parks and they have to have parks for highways, they have to pay for them. Even before we got it into the statute, we had this agreement in the District of Columbia, in writing, with the District and with Virginia, where during the previous ten years they had taken out of the National Park System in this metropolitan area, without compensation,

several hundred acres of park land. And, of course, you just can't lose resources like that and not hurt the environment of a great metropolitan area.

F: What has been your problem as far as highways are concerned down in the Great Smokies?

H: Of course, there is a fantastic traffic problem that keeps plaguing us primarily because that trans-mountain road, as you know, is designated as a U.S. highway and will stay that way until Interstate 40 around the park has been completed, which I hope now will be some time in the next couple or three years. But, in addition to that, the issue is further complicated by reason of the fact that back in 1943 the Department acquired 44,000 acres on the south side of the park that TVA had purchased as a part of the Lake Fontana complex. Part of this contractual arrangement was that the Department of the Interior would build a road on the north side of Lake Fontana within this 44,000 acres to connect up Bryson City and Fontana Village to replace a road which TVA had flooded. This was an obligation which TVA had. This was an obligation which Interior assumed in consideration of getting the 44,000 acres. The contract was signed by TVA and Swain County in the State of North Carolina and by the Secretary of the Interior. It was a good deal because by getting that 44,000 acres into public ownership, we have been able to protect the great panoramic view on the north shore of Lake Fontana. The only problem with the contract was that the Interior Department never performed. In twenty-five years they still haven't performed.

So, about two or three years ago, I've forgotten just when it started, we had two problems in North Carolina--the Grandfather Mountain section of the Blue Ridge Parkway, which we were never able to resolve,

and this Bryson City-Fontana road. The Secretary and I talked about it. We concluded that the thing to do was try to settle these two issues. Part of what we proposed was take the road on the north shore of Lake Fontana down to the vicinity of Noland Creek (?) and then go across the mountain with a trans-mountain highway tunneling under the ridge and connect it up with Highway 73 in the vicinity of Tremont. Well, of course, as you know, the roof fell in, and the Secretary finally concluded that he wouldn't approve the contract amendment. So the matter still remains unresolved.

F: Why did the roof fall in?

H: Several of the conservation organizations claimed that we were violating the wilderness in the Smokies by building such a road. The facts of the matter are that the road at no point impinged on the wilderness values in the Great Smoky Mountains. The entire area had been cut over when that park had been extensively logged. Actually the only road that violated the virgin wilderness of the Smokies was [Highway] 441 which had been rebuilt by the Service during the previous ten years.

F: Do you find the conservation groups as intransigent on their side as some of the exploitative groups are on theirs?

H: I wouldn't want to generalize with respect to groups. I would rather personalize it with respect to individuals. I find that there are unreasonable individuals on both sides. I find that there are people who are willing to sit down and talk and to try to find the solution on both sides. I think it is hard to generalize. You have dogmatic people in every walk of life, including some in the bureaucracy. Maybe I shouldn't even excuse myself from that charge sometimes.

F: Have you effected any particular shift in the attitude toward providing

lodging within the parks areas?

H: I think so, Joe. I think that one of the things that has been done is that we have at least pulled this issue out and put it on the table and talked about it. I wouldn't want to go so far as to say that we have found the solution to it because I think basically the solution is going to have to be area by area, situation by situation.

F: When you say you put it out and talked about it, what are you talking about?

H: This question of how much accommodation in terms of campground and overnight accommodations you can have in a park and not ruin the park. Of course, as you know, there are two extreme views on this. One view takes the attitude, "Well, the parks are there and therefore you just ought to build until there is no more demand for anything." The other one says, you know, "Get all that stuff out of the parks and have nothing in there for people; just let them drive in in a bus or an automobile during the day and then they have to go out of the park some place at night."

I think the answer is probably somewhere in between. I think there are some areas in which certainly there is no need to have overnight facilities, either campgrounds or concession buildings. I think there are other areas in which it's just totally unrealistic to think that anybody can absorb and understand the values of a park in the course of just running into it during the day and going back out of it at night. So, as I say, we have gotten it up on the table and we have been talking about it. And we talk about it in terms of each one of these master plans. As you know, even in the Advisory Board meetings we have had some very interesting dialogues.

F: Are you experimenting in this matter of transportation with new means of

getting people in and out besides the highway and the private vehicular traffic?

H: Yes, and that too has been highly controversial. But I am very much encouraged that in the last two years there has been a recognition that it is a very serious problem--automobiles in the parks. Therefore, whether we like it or not, we've got to look at some alternative means. In Yosemite this last summer we experimented not only with the commuter-type bus, like the city transportation here, that went around the valley floor, but we experimented with an interpretive shuttle bus like the one we have on the mall.

F: You mean, let people move on into the park but stop them at the edge?

H: Right. Let them park their cars, and this year we didn't put any restrictions on the automobile. We just made these services available, so that they could use them as an option to their car. I was delighted when I was out there in Yosemite a couple of months ago to learn that the concessionaire made \$25,000 off this interpretive shuttle bus operation this past summer which shows that if you do provide an attractive alternative to the automobile in a great monumental area such as Yosemite Valley is, that the public will use it. But it has got to be attractive, and it has got to be reasonably priced. But they used it in numbers that startled our own people as well as the concessionaire. Now he is willing to expand it, and next summer we are going to have an interpretive shuttle service in the Mariposa Big Grove which has been one of the things that has plagued us for years because it has been jammed up with cars. But as a result of the great success we had in the Valley, he is taking the initiative and saying, "Let me put it up at Mariposa."

Now, the most controversial thing that we have run into--and I was

delighted that Congress considered this--it was argued by many representatives of the citizens conservation organizations and it was argued by us before the legislative committees and the legislative committees agreed with us, that in the North Cascades we should have tramways, mechanical lifts, and not build roads to take care of automobiles. So I think we are beginning to move. It's hard.

F: What are the advantage of tramways and helicopters?

H: It has a number of advantages, of course. With your mechanical lift, and I don't think we ought to get built into a situation with just these tramways, because I think there are many technological improvements today that give promise of being effective in the next three, four, or half a dozen years or so, that will startle us in terms of moving great numbers of people. But one of the great advantages, for example, of the tram is you can helicopter and airlift in your materials to build them. You just have one spot where the support is and on up the hill a ways you have another one. If they are attractively located, they can be screened so that they are not intrusive. They give you the great advantage of being able to control your visitation and limit your capacity in a way that is acceptable to the public because you don't then have to put a ranger on the gate and say to this automobilist, "You can't come in. We've got too many automobiles." This is quite a conversation, even though we have had that conversation.

F: Yes. "I just drove two thousand miles from Cincinnati."

H: Yes, and we've had that in Yellowstone this year, in which we said, "You know, when that campground is full, it's full, and nobody else comes in." We've turned away over 300,000 cars in Yellowstone this past summer, and the correspondence has been pretty heated about some of this.

Over the tram we won't have this problem because everybody accepts the fact that when a facility is full that they can't use it. But somehow the automobilist has not recognized the fact that when they are bumper to bumper the thing is full, and therefore he shouldn't be allowed to go in or to use it. You know, he still thinks he has the same right as everybody else to sit in line with his bumper right up to the next guy's bumper.

F: Do you have differences in your management principles and approaches according to the type of National Park Service area? In other words, is your management different in a national seashore over a national park and so on?

H: Yes, very decidedly so. As I say, our objective in the national seashore, which is one of the types of areas in the recreation area category, is to provide a variety of recreational opportunities and to provide the optimum recreational opportunities for an outdoor environment consistent with the kind of resources of the areas--water activities or land use activities; whereas in a national park the overriding mandate is to assure appropriate use consistent with preserving the basic resource unimpaired. Now, then, this means that you cannot in every instance optimize or maximize even your recreational use because to do so would impair the very values that you are charged by statute at protecting. Likewise, we have taken the view that the recreational opportunities should have a relationship to the values in that park, and therefore we simply don't just provide ballfields to play ball in a national park whereas we do do that in a recreation area.

F: Have you moved into a new phase with certain, sort of self-conscious areas for scientific study?

H: Yes.

F: How are you going to select who gets in there?

H: This is a little bit rugged. We have developed with the approval of the Advisory Board and the Secretary some criteria for evaluating these proposals. We have not had to test them out yet because we have not gotten any proposal far enough along that we've come right up to the rock-and-the-hard-spot on, whether it does fit or doesn't fit. But I believe very deeply that the programs of the Service have to be more intimately related to the academic community than they have been in the past. Therefore this is a program that I have been pushing, consistent with the funds that I have available, to relate us not only in terms of historical areas but archeological areas and natural areas in the hopes that eventually we would have university-sponsored research stations in the park and that we could have on the campus National Park Service-related research facilities. We have three of these proposals underway now, trying to develop an actual agreement.

F: Moving forward, just this week you indicated that you were going to permit buses on the George Washington Parkway.

H: Well, I was out of town. When I got back here this morning I saw that news article and it is at variance with what the Secretary and I have discussed, so I haven't had a chance to talk with him about it. But what we have been talking about, of course, is the subject of a lawsuit. That lawsuit is still pending before the courts, because even though we have won this case in the Circuit Court of Appeals, the D.C. Transit and the Metropolitan Area Transit Commission have filed an application for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. The Court has not acted on the application. So I had a meeting today with the attorney for Capital Transit, the Chairman of WMATA, and our own folks. We really

don't have anything resolved at this point.

F: I guess this question was premature then.

H: I think so. And even though I saw the Secretary as having been quoted there, I have not received any word from him that he has changed his mind over what he and I discussed before I went away on this trip about ten days or so ago; and that was that when the litigation had been adjudicated and the rights of the parties were known, we would then explore the regulation. This is the basis on which I am still proceeding.

F: Do you anticipate more such parkways around other metropolitan areas?

H: I think so. You know, this Joint Departmental Study of Scenic Roads and Parkways was made about three years ago by the President's Recreation Advisory Council and has not materialized in any legislative proposals by the Administration. I think this is primarily because of budgetary considerations at this particular time, because it is going to be pretty expensive. But I certainly think it's a dimension of the recreation picture that we would look forward to.

F: Now then, under your directorship, there has also been another shift, and that is to absorbing into the Park Service non-continental areas. I'm thinking of the Virgin Islands and Guam. I'm thinking even of offshore islands. You want to tell us a little bit about your thinking in this?

H: Of course, there are great opportunities there, and I think that it's important that we get them now. One of the ones we are deeply interested in is the Golden Isles off the coast of Georgia, for example--Cumberland, Ossabaw,?? and the rest of them there--because these have fabulous potential, not only for scientists but for absorbing tremendous recreational use. Most of them involve great expanses of beach, you know, and you can have tens of thousands of people using that beach, and the next tide it's

all virgin again. So they have great potential from this standpoint. So we have been pursuing it.

Of course, in Guam there is a great heritage there to be saved, it seems to me, and tremendous cultural resources as well as the great seashore opportunity--all of this based on my reading the report, you know, because the Advisory Board made its trip to the Pacific the year before I got back to Washington, so I haven't been there yet.

F: You have also accelerated your Scenic Riverways Program.

H: Right.

F: What do you have in mind there? What are your limits?

H: Well, the Congress has approved both of these bills, and this is an area, you know, in which the Secretary and President Johnson both have been vitally interested in the last few years of trying to establish a basic framework of important scenic rivers that still have not been violated with extensive and intensive commercial development while they still exist. The Congress approved some, which it incorporated in the System this year, and then designated others for study. This is a program that will be going on for several years. And the same thing with trails. They designated and established, in effect, two trails, the Appalachian Trail and the Cascade Crest Trail on the Pacific, and then designated other trails for study as to feasibility and suitability and so forth.

Here again this is a thrust in a conservation effort which the President at one point in one of his speeches termed "a new conservation, a viable partnership with federal and state and local government working with private citizens to preserve the best of our natural and cultural heritage." And certainly the scenic rivers and the trail bills are built around that framework.

There will continue to be private ownerships in there; there will continue to be state involvement, local government involvement, and federal government involvement even in terms of providing money for land acquisition and development through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, or actually federal management where the land happens to be federally owned.

F: You mentioned the President. Has he shown a considerable, continuing interest in your general parks program?

H: Very definitely. I suppose the greatest interest that I should say at my level that I have observed has been in this area of scenic rivers and trails, and then in the Redwoods, which very early in the proposals he took a very personal interest in.

F: Has he been involved in some of the programs?

H: Yes, but I am not aware of all of his involvement, of course, because this is handled by the Secretary. But at my level these are the three that I am aware of that he got very much involved in--especially the Redwoods. This has been one of his real personal projects, you might say.

F: Can you guess why?

H: I wouldn't want to speculate on why. I know that he has been--from what Mel Grosvenor, the chairman of the board of Geographic, has told me, a life-long friend of Mel Grosvenor's and the Grosvenor family, and the National Geographic--and Mel Grosvenor and the Geographic, you know, put up the money for the initial Redwood study. And I know that at the press conference the President had when he announced the results of the study that he received Mel Grosvenor with a great deal of warmth. So I wouldn't want to speculate, but I do know that this particular side exists simply because Mel told me about it.

- F: Have you seen much of the President in your activities?
- H: No. I have however been with Mrs. Johnson a great deal of the time on the preservation of the White House.
- F: You have taken several trips with Mrs. Johnson.
- H: Yes.
- F: How did these come about? Do they initiate here, or with her, or mutually?
- H: Most of them were initiated by her. The first that we would generally know about it would be a call either out of the Secretary's office or from some member of her staff saying that she wanted to make a trip to such-and-such an area. Would we make suggestions of places that she might visit? We therefore have worked up a number of itineraries for her consideration.
- F: You would find her fairly easy to advise on this?
- H: Oh, yes. Gosh, she is a perfectly gracious human being.
- F: Is she knowledgeable in the field?
- H: Extremely so. She is articulate, she does her homework, and she is a great pleasure to travel with and be with.
- F: Good outdoors woman?
- H: Yes, indeed. I have never seen the situation too rough for her to participate.
- F: Have you had any particular experiences that are vivid in your memory, either right or wrong?
- H: I suppose the most exciting trip and perhaps the most rugged trip--We were on the boat trip on the Rio Grande in Big Bend on which, you know, we dunked a few people, but fortunately she was not one of them. There were a few wet people by the end of the trip. But all of them have been exciting in their way. I think one of the greatest trips I have had the pleasure of going on with her was the one to the Redwoods the other day when she

dedicated the Redwoods, because it was perfectly obvious in her remarks and in remarking on the President's interest in this that she did it with a great deal of feeling and a great deal of sincerity. It was likewise perfectly obvious throughout the day that this was a great personal and inspirational experience for her.

F: Now I gather on that particular day that the setting was idyllic or even sepulchral.

H: Yes, we were very fortunate. It had been raining terribly before we arrived. We hit a little front on the way in and all of our people there and our hosts were very much concerned, as is usual there at that time of the year, that we would have more of the same the next day. I remarked to them that I had no concern about it because I had never been on a trip with Mrs. Johnson in which the weather was anything but perfect. And I had great confidence that it would be. The next morning the weather broke. It was one of the most beautiful days I have experienced in northern California. They tell me that the sun likewise came out until about ten o'clock the day after we left, and then it started raining. So everything was perfect. It couldn't have been nicer.

F: Has the presence of either President Johnson or Mrs. Johnson at the center of things made any difference, or given you any undue pressure as far as Texas projects are concerned?

H: No.

F: They have not shown more than normal interest in places like Guadalupe or Big Thicket?

H: No, they have not. In all of my visits with Mrs. Johnson it has never been brought up as an issue. She has expressed her interest, but she has likewise expressed her interest in a number of other things. This has not

been singled out; and Guadalupe, as you well know from the past three years, has not fared any better or any worse as a result of the budget reductions than any of our other new areas. I have not ever been admonished at all about it.

F: You want to talk a little bit about the Washington bridge and freeway problem?

H: Yes, I don't mind talking about it. I think you have to understand somewhat the perspective of how I got involved in the Washington freeway controversy. When I became Director, we had something in excess of twenty arguments going with the D.C. Highway Department. The Three Sisters Bridge was only one of them. They were proposing to tunnel under the Lincoln Memorial and then come out on the surface across the mall and then hook up at Fourteenth Street down there with a great interstate highway connection. I began by getting a new team, in effect, including an outside consultant, to come in and look at all of these controversies and come up with a proposal as to how they thought I should respond, because I took the position that it was basically a D.C. government problem to develop the freeway system. My responsibility was to see that in the execution of that program that it was done with sensitivity insofar as the park lands were concerned and that any lands taken from parks were replaced.

This has been the posture that I have taken when I was in St. Louis and the Missouri Highway Department wanted to go through the Memorial out there. Fortunately, the Director of the Bureau of Public Roads, as you know, is Rex Whitten, who had been the Commissioner of Highways in Missouri at the time that I was Superintendent there. So I had known him there.

For almost two-and-a-half years we studied these issues and debated back and forth with the District, Virginia, and the Bureau of Public Roads. Finally on May 25, 1966, I signed an agreement with the Virginia and the D.C. highway departments resolving all of these issues. Rex Whitten of the Bureau of Public Roads was present during the negotiation of the agreement. He suggested it would be inappropriate for him to sign the agreement inasmuch as he was not a party in the context of having a program responsibility. His was simply to provide matching money. But no item in that agreement was in that agreement contrary to his acquiescence in it.

What we got out of the agreement I thought were two extremely important things: one is that they agreed to tunnel entirely under the mall so as not to violate this great historic piece of property, and we got in writing a commitment out of Virginia and the District that they would replace all park lands utilized in the highway program, which as I mentioned earlier was the first time this had ever been done. Prior to that, the park system here had lost several hundred acres to them for free. In exchange, we accepted the Three Sisters Bridge.

It was a compromise. In compromises, you get some things and you give some things. It was not the perfect solution. I am not sure that there is any perfect solution. In addition to this, what the people of the District of Columbia got out of it was a minimum of dislocation of families as opposed to all other plans which were then on the boards at that particular time. So I thought it was a good agreement, and I still think it is a good agreement. As I said to the Deputy Mayor when the issue came up before the Planning Commission, I was not going to change my position on the '66 agreement until the City of Washington indicated to me that they

repudiated the '66 agreement.

Well, they did that at the Planning Commission meeting by voting for a different proposal. Again, with my same belief that the basic responsibility for the highway program is the City of Washington's and mine is to insure that it is compatible with the preservation of the parks in the District of Columbia, I also voted for it because again I had the same agreement--that the park lands would be replaced and that the south leg would be tunneled. Therefore my interests in the matter were fully protected.

Subsequently Mr. Boyd, while I was out of the city, issued a press release in which he said he too concurred in it except for the tunneling of the south leg. Well, now, I haven't had a chance to talk with Mr. Boyd, and I haven't had a chance to talk with our Secretary, so I don't know what the Secretary's view on that might be. But my view is that the tunneling of that south leg is an integral part of this agreement. And you can't have the sweet without a little of the bitter. And if Mr. Boyd wants that highway program, Mr. Boyd is going to have to tunnel the south leg because to the extent of my ability and to the extent of my authority I don't intend to acquiesce in a highway built through the greatest, most historic piece of property in this capital city, to violate the great monumental structures of the Capitol, of the White House, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial; so I don't know where we are now. It seems that maybe we are back to the beginning again.

F: You are not anti-bridge or freeway. You just want to preserve certain values in it. You think there is a solution that can do it?

H: I do think there is a solution. And I think the solution has to be found, however, within the context of a livable environment in a great metropolitan

area. I think part of that livable environment is a great parks system and a proper setting and a proper sensitivity to the great monuments in this capitol city. This city has values in terms of presenting the great moments in our nation's history, which no other city has. This is why I have been so insistent that these cultural and natural values be respected in the highway program because I think that we can afford to preserve our history. And I think we ought to begin with the highway program, because that has got more earmarked money than any other federal program. If you are not going to preserve it in terms of the highway program, which is the best financed program of the federal government, then how are you going to say to the States and the private entrepreneurs, "You ought to preserve it"?

F: Have you been involved in this matter of the act which has passed Congress that causes in effect two looks to be taken by citizens before any highway route is prescribed?

H: Not directly, no.

F: Has the fact that the President is such an advocate of public power and public power projects had any effect on your activities, or have you run athwart that at all?

H: No, sir, I have not. It started a little bit that way down at Grand Canyon, but that has been resolved now.

F: Two other questions that I want your advice on. One is the matter of the April riots and the subsequent Resurrection City. I am rather of the opinion that Nash Castro is the man I want to talk to about that rather than you, but if you think you are the one, I would like for you to take off.

H: Of course I know about them, but I think Nash is the man that you ought to

talk with about it, because he was the man on the spot. And both of them were very difficult situations for us. I approve of what he did and the way he handled the matters. He was very creative in dealing with the situation, and I expressed my confidence in him by telling him that I was here when he needed help.

F: You gave him pretty much of a free hand to work it out?

H: That's right.

F: The other question is this of beautification of the District itself which, of course, Mrs. Johnson is very heavily involved in. I can talk to you, I can talk with Nash.

H: Again, Nash was given the special designation of an assistant regional director for White House liaison when I took over as Director so that he could devote full time to these duties. He has been intimately involved, and here again I have great confidence in him. I gave him his head to handle the problems as he saw fit. He has kept me fully informed, and I have a complete report of everything that he did out there in the file. Again, I would like you to talk with him because I think he has a special contribution to make on this thing.

F: Finally, there is the matter of the LBJ State Park in Texas, which your office is providing some consultation on.

H: Right. And that's just what it is, and it's no different than the consultation which we provide any other state when they ask us for it. This is a part of our regular program of state cooperation which has been carried on since 1936 under the Park, Parkway, and Recreation Area Study Act which authorized us to cooperate with states and local governments in planning and development of state and local parks. We don't put any money into financing any part of the construction. That comes from Land

and Water Conservation Fund allocations to the States on a matching grant-in-aid basis, but we do provide museum interpretative advice, landscape architect advice, and this kind of thing. And that's what we have been doing down there.

F: Am I correct in believing that your thinking is moving toward a sort of exportation of your National Park Service principles to countries which do not have a well developed park system?

H: Very definitely, Joe. You know, the national park idea is a unique contribution of this country to world culture. The inspiration of this idea is such that more than eighty nations have now established national parks or similar preserve, and the requests for help and consultation are just simply staggering. We have never responded adequately in my judgment to this need. With the Secretary's approval, I invited a committee to sit down and have a look at this problem about six months ago. They are now in the process of finalizing their report. As a result of it, we hope to formulate some kind of recommendations for the Administration and hopefully also for the Congress.

F: Is your work hampered to some extent by perhaps needed reforms within the holdings of the Department of the Interior generally? I am thinking of things particularly like the Forest Service which is outside the Department.

H: Well, yes, we have some long-standing problems involving land ownerships between us and the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. I suggested some time ago that perhaps the Secretary may want to consider approaching the Secretary of Agriculture with the idea of a joint task force made up of the Chief of the Bureau of Land Management; the Forest Service; Sports Fish, and Wildlife, the National Park Service with the

chairman being Dr. Crafts of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to try to bring all of these problems out on the table and arrive at some solutions to them. I think they can be sorted out, but I don't think they can be sorted out except with all of us sitting down and talking about them, because I want some property the Forest Service has. Forest Service wants some property BLM has. Fish and Wildlife wants property which I have, and BLM has. It all involves sorting these issues out in trade-offs.

F: There is agreement that there is a problem.

H: I don't think any one of the people that I mentioned would deny that there is a problem. They don't agree with my proposal for a solution to it. I think this is why the Secretary hasn't done anything on it.

F: It hasn't moved beyond the Secretarial recommendation?

H: That's right. But very interestingly, historically, you know, President Coolidge appointed such a commission to resolve the issues that then existed between the Forest Service and the National Park Service, and some of that commission--

F: It has only been nearly a half century.

H: Yes. Some of those recommendations have been carried out. Some of them still have not been implemented. I think it's time we got them sorted out.

F: Did the Hoover Commission look at this?

H: Not to my knowledge, no.

F: Can you think of anything else we ought to cover?

H: No, it has been a great pleasure to visit with you. I think you are a tremendous interrogator, and exhaustive in your interview.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

By George B. Hartzog, Jr.

to the

Lyndon Baines Johnson Library

In accordance with Sec. 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U.S.C. 397) and regulations issued thereunder (41 CFR 101-10), I, _____, hereinafter referred to as the donor, hereby give, donate, and convey to the United States of America for eventual deposit in the proposed Lyndon Baines Johnson Library, and for administration therein by the authorities thereof, a tape and transcript of a personal statement approved by me and prepared for the purpose of deposit in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library. The gift of this material is made subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Title to the material transferred hereunder, and all literary property rights, will pass to the United States as of the date of the delivery of this material into the physical custody of the Archivist of the United States.

2. It is the donor's wish to make the material donated to the United States of America by terms of this instrument available for research as soon as it has been deposited in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

3. A revision of this stipulation governing access to the material for research may be entered into between the donor and the Archivist of the United States, or his designee, if it appears desirable.

4. The material donated to the United States pursuant to the foregoing shall be kept intact permanently in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

Signed

Date

July 23, 1974

Accepted

Archivist of the United States

Date

July 23, 1974