1872

PUBLIC USE OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

2000

1872

PUBLIC USE OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

2000

by

Ronald F. Lee
Special Assistant to the Director

with a foreword by
Director George B. Hartzog, Jr.

National Park Service
United States Department of the Interior
January 1, 1968

FOREWORD

As America's population grows and interest in its parklands burgeons, the directive to ".... conserve.... and provide for the enjoyment of ...." our scenic, scientific, historic, and recreational treasures presents an increasingly complex challenge.

Properly answered, that challenge can bring new meaning to the life of every American.

For more than 32 years, Ronald F. Lee has distinguished himself as a leader in the Service's efforts at meeting that challenge. Since his retirement in 1965, he has remained a most respected Service adviser.

In Public Use of the National Park System, 1872-2000, Mr. Lee has brought together the profound insight derived from those years of direct involvement; and a careful analysis of today's National Park System, its future, and the changing character of the needs of its users.

This is a thought-provoking contribution to the continuing discussion of the functions and policies of the Service, particularly as they relate to our most basic responsibility--providing the public, for all time, with park benefits of the highest order.

We of the National Park Service can, and shall, seek to encourage proper use of the parks by acquainting visitors with basic park values. We are exploring every reasonable means of regulating the manner in which park resources are used, to assure that those values be unimpaired. And we are redoubling our efforts to extend the influence of parkscapes to the many for whom direct use of the national parks is not always feasible.

Public Use of the National Park System, 1872-2000 is clearly a document that will be extraordinarily useful to all of us who strive--now and in the years ahead--to make the resources and ideals represented by the National Park System a part of every citizen's life.

George B. Hartzog, Jr.
Director

CONTENTS

1. Public Use, 1872-1966.

a. Rescuing Scenic Wonders from Exploitation 1872-1908.
b. Establishing a National Park Service 1908-1917.
c. Promoting Public Use 1917-1929.
d. Enlarging and Developing the System 1929-1941.
e. Surviving Two Wars 1941-1956.
f. Catching Up and Going Ahead through MISSION 66.

DIGEST

In the beginning (1872-1908), the big conservation problem was developing appreciation for and saving the superlative scenic and wilderness wonders of the west from private exploitation by timber, mining, grazing and other interests and making them public national parks. With establishment of the Service, it was essential, at least until 1929, to promote travel to the parks to prove the national usefulness of the national park idea. Once the idea was firmly established, the System was expanded (1929-1941) (a) into the east, (b) into the field of historic sites, and (c) into recreation at first via parkways and reservoirs. World War II and the Korean War posed major challenges which were overcome. By this time, physical facilities had deteriorated and travel was mounting rapidly. MISSION 66 was created to enable the whole System to catch up and go ahead. It was only now, 84 years after Yellowstone was authorized, that mounting public use became the central issue in managing the System.

1. Public Use, 1872-1966.

In recent years the perennial problem of balancing preservation and public use in the National Park System has taken on new urgency, caused by the tremendous growth in travel since World War II. In 1946, visits to the National Park System totaled less than 22,000,000, but 20 years later had multiplied over six times, to 133,000,000--growth at a rate many times greater than the increase in population, and accelerating to as yet unknown dimensions. Of all the conservation and management problems facing the National Park System in 1967, balancing the claims of rapidly mounting public use and the requirements of preservation is probably the most pervasive and difficult.

It was not always so. Viewed in the perspective of National Park Service history, other issues took the foreground in earlier periods. It is primarily in recent years that public use problems have come to dominate park management. The history of the National Park System needs deeper study than has yet been given it, which we may hope will be accomplished by historians before the centennial of Yellowstone in 1972. Meanwhile, the place of public use in Service history may be very briefly summarized as follows:

a. Rescuing Scenic Wonders from Exploitation 1872-1908. The pioneers in national park conservation--John Muir, Cornelius Hedges, Frederick Law Olmsted among others--sought to develop public appreciation for the superlative scenic and wilderness wonders of the west, rescue them from private exploitation for grazing, timber cutting, mining, and commercial resorts, and protect them in perpetuity as public parks and pleasuring grounds for the American people. The theme of the era was public parks vs. private exploitation. Knowledge of the areas destined to become famous was still limited, visitors were few, and the impact of public use was not, as yet, even a remote problem.

b. Establishing a National Park Service 1908-1917. As David Swain has pointed out in the Wisconsin Magazine of History (Autumn 1966), these years saw a conflict between the "utilitarian conservationists" like Gifford Pinchot who were interested in national forests and reclamation projects, and the "aesthetic conservationists" interested in national parks.[1] The "aesthetic conservationists," aided by public officials and See America Firsters, won the battle and the act establishing the Service was approved on August 25, 1916.

President Taft sent a special message to Congress in 1912 recommending a National Park Service which presents the case for preservation and public access in these words:

> "I earnestly recommend the establishment of a Bureau of National Parks. Such legislation is essential to the proper management of those wonderful manifestations of nature, so startling and so beautiful that everyone recognizes the obligations of the government to preserve them for the edification and recreation of the people. The Yellowstone Park, the Yosemite, the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, the Glacier National Park, and the Mount Rainier National Park and others furnish appropriate instances. In only one case have we made anything like adequate preparation for the use of a park by the public. That case is the Yellowstone National Park. Every consideration of patriotism and the love of nature and of beauty and of art requires us to expend money enough to bring all these natural wonders within easy reach of our people. The first step in that direction is the establishment of a responsible bureau, which shall take upon itself the burden of supervising the parks and of making recommendations as to the best method of improving their accessibility and usefulness."[2]

c. Promoting Public Use, 1917-1929. The greatest task that confronted Steve Mather and Horace Albright in 1917 was to marshal public support for the new bureau and promote public use of the embryonic National Park System. In the 1915 travel year, 335,299 people visited the national parks which were equally difficult to reach and to travel in after arrival. Appropriations both to Interior and War Departments for the national parks totaled $498,000. To arouse the nation to the need for greater support, Mather and Albright launched a major program of public education, through speeches, periodicals, the press, national park conferences, and special group and Congressional visits to the parks. But to secure public support also required better means to reach the parks and to get around within them afterwards. The first automobile entered Mount Rainier in 1908, General Grant in 1910, Crater Lake in 1911, Glacier in 1912, Yosemite and Sequoia in 1913, and Mesa Verde in 1914. Over some opposition from railroad officials, stagecoach concessioners, and wilderness preservationists, Mather also opened Yellowstone to automobiles in 1915. By this time,

much effort was being devoted to a proposed "park-to-park highway" and to seeking funds for park roads. These efforts culminated in a major road appropriation for the national parks in 1924. Close relationships were also developed with the leading western railroads. Concession policies were drastically revised so that better accommodations would be available when visitors reached the parks. By the time of Steve Mather's retirement in 1929, travel to the national parks had multiplied over seven times to 2,757,415 and the national monuments received an additional 490,845 visitors. Appropriations for the 1929 fiscal year were $4,754,015 for administration and maintenance or ten times greater than in 1915, and in addition, $4,000,000 was authorized for the construction of roads and trails. "In the last analysis," commented Mather in 1920, "travel is the deciding factor as to whether or not the parks are measuring up to the high standard that has been set for them and all that is being said about them as the great recreational grounds of the American people."[3]

The above paragraph should not leave the mistaken impression that Steve Mather and Horace Albright were not also very much concerned with preservation. Among many urgent preservation problems they tackled energetically were acquisition of park inholdings; strenuous resistance to new efforts by grazing, lumbering, and mining interests to invade the national parks during World War I; and successful opposition to mounting demands for new reclamation projects that threatened the integrity of the national parks. Important as were these problems, attracting public support was still the dominant theme of this period.

d. Enlarging and Developing the System 1929-1941. During this period under the leadership of Horace Albright, Arno B. Cammerer, and Arthur E. Demaray, the National Park Service which had already secured Congressional authorizations some years before, entered the east in a large way. In 1929 the National Park System contained only one reservation--Acadia National Park--east of the Mississippi River. The Great Smokies was established in 1930, Mammoth Cave in 1934, and Shenandoah in 1935 (all three had been authorized in 1926). Isle Royale was established in 1940. A program of national parkways was initiated in the east also, beginning with the George Washington Memorial Parkway in 1930, the Blue Ridge Parkway in 1933, and the Natchez Trace in 1934. The Service also entered the field of historic preservation with major new programs, centered largely in the east. George Washington's Birthplace and Colonial National Monuments were established in 1930, and Morristown three years later. On August 10, 1933, over 50 historic properties

previously administered by the War and Agriculture Departments were added to the National Park System at one stroke of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's pen, including such famous places as Gettysburg, Fort McHenry, the Castillo de San Marcos, and the Statue of Liberty. The Historic Sites Act of 1935 confirmed the central role of the Service in Federal historic preservation. By 1941, the National Park System combined a great array of historic and natural areas and was beginning to move toward a third category--recreation. Furthermore, park holdings were now widely distributed over the nation--a truly National Park System. The Park, Parkway and Recreation Area Study Act of 1936 provided the basis for broad resource planning and confirmed the great contribution the National Park Service made in this period to major strengthening of state park systems.

This was also the period of great public projects all over America. The National Park System and the state parks as well felt the benefits and impact of a wide range of emergency programs supported by the Civil Works Administration, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Public Works Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps. An immense amount of long-needed conservation work was accomplished in the National Park System and the state parks, from erosion control to trail building, from construction of signs to ranger stations.

With the rise of public construction programs in the 1930's, major park preservation controversies began to develop more often from the competition of other public projects, such as dams or highways, with park land use, and less often from the threat of private exploitation. Planning park developments to minimize intrusions became a major objective. Public use rose steadily, from about 3,000,000 in 1929 to 21,236,900 in 1941, but visitor impact on park resources did not yet constitute the major Service problem. One note, however, pointed to the future. A small group of conservationists meeting because of their concern over Congressional enthusiasm for sky-line drives, organized the Wilderness Society in 1934.

e. Surviving Two Wars 1941-1956. It is difficult now to realize the impact of World War II and the Korean War on the National Park Service and System. The large emergency programs of the 1930's came to an abrupt end. CCC camps were closed and new construction stopped. Travel fell sharply with war conditions and gas rationing. Appropriations were cut sharply. In effect the National Park System was put on a custodial basis from 1941 to 1946. During this period the

dominant problems were belt-tightening and resistance to war-inspired threats to park resources, particularly minerals and timber. Under the leadership of Newton B. Drury, the Service moved energetically to meet war-time public use needs and preserve the System intact for post-war generations. This proved a major responsibility.

By 1946, hopes rose that the National Park System would soon be back to normal. Progress was being made toward that objective when war broke out again in 1950--the Korean War. Appropriations again became hard to get and the resumption of normal park programs was postponed. For over a decade, national park operations had been at a custodial level, and deferred maintenance needs piled up alarmingly. Meanwhile, park travel, instead of slackening as it had during World War II, grew almost two and one-half times between 1946 and 1955, from nearly 22,000,000 to over 50,000,000 visits. By the mid-fifties, deterioration of the National Park System's physical facilities in the face of mounting use had become acute. Bernard de Voto wrote his famous article in Harper's Magazine, "Let's Close the National Parks."[4] At this moment, Director Conrad L. Wirth, with the full support of the Department, the President and the Congressional Committees on Appropriation and Interior and Insular Affairs, launched MISSION 66.

f. Catching Up and Going Ahead Through MISSION 66, 1956-1966. It is not necessary here to review the origin and achievements of MISSION 66. It is still fresh in the memories of all participants. It was a magnificent concept, timed with great skill, and conducted with energy, foresight and unusual professional talent. MISSION 66 met with extraordinary success and had far-reaching effects on the National Park System as well as several other government programs.

The eight objectives of MISSION 66, set forth in Our Heritage, A Plan for its Protection and Use: "MISSION 66,"[5] issued by the National Park Service in 1956, reveal the dominant themes of this period--bringing the neglected physical facilities of the National Park System fully abreast of the needs anticipated by 1966, preserving and protecting the parks, and making them more usable, enjoyable and meaningful for the American people. The problem of visitor impact was growing and great efforts were made to provide the physical plant and staff services needed to meet the visitor load anticipated for 1966. Six of the eight objectives dealt with this problem. It was pointed out that the National Park System of 1955 was developed to care for 21,000,000 visitors, whereas 80,000,000 were expected by 1966 and the parks should be ready.

A seventh objective was a coordinated nation-wide recreation plan for all levels of government. Last of all, the program sought to provide for the protection and preservation of the wilderness area within the National Park System and encourage their appreciation and enjoyment in ways that would leave them unimpaired. This objective sought to help realize the long standing objectives of wilderness organizations and others, going back many years, to insure the perpetuation of substantial wilderness on Federal lands

This period also saw important additions to the National Park System. Perhaps the most significant was a group of national recreation areas, including the new national seashores and lakeshores. For the first time, recreation areas began to take their place beside natural areas and historic areas as parallel segments of the National Park System. During this period, however, responsibility for making a national recreation survey and coordinating a government-wide park and open space acquisition program for the nation was transferred from the National Park Service to the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Conclusion

Eighty-four years after Yellowstone was authorized, mounting public use at last became the central problem of National Park System management during the 1956-1966 period. In these years the solution to growing visitor impact on park resources was sought through carefully planned physical development and enlarged staffing. It was hoped, however, that through nation-wide park planning part of the visitor load in natural areas could be diverted to recreation areas inside and outside the National Park System.

2. Entering a New Period in the 1960's.

a. Population Growth.
b. Travel.
c. Outdoor Recreation.
d. Wilderness Preservation.
e. The New Conservation.

DIGEST

The 1960's marked a turning point in conservation in the United States. New emphasis was given by new leadership to the significance of at least five forces that profoundly affect public use of the National Park System--population growth, travel, outdoor recreation, wilderness preservation and the new conservation. In this period the nation's needs for outdoor recreation, fully documented by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in 1962, and for wilderness, fully documented in hearings that led to the Wilderness Act of 1964, became more urgent than ever, against a background of mounting population, diminishing resources, increasing leisure time and income, growing mobility, and pyramiding travel.

2. Entering a New Period in the 1960's.

In the midst of MISSION 66, at least five forces began to make themselves more strongly felt on the national conservation scene than ever before. New emphasis was placed by new leadership on the significance of these forces and their convergence together for the future of conservation in the United States. These new developments were recognized as profoundly affecting public use of the National Park System.[6]

a. Population Growth. About this time the nation seemed almost suddenly to become conscious of the implications of rapid population growth, both at home and around the world. When the National Park Service was established in 1916, the population of the United States was approximately 100,000,000. By 1967 it reached 200,000,000 and within 35 years it was expected to reach 350,000,000. After the year 2000 the situation as foreseen by Secretary Udall was many times more disturbing. He suggested that by the middle of the next century "...for every person who now hopes to camp in the summertime on the floor of Yosemite Valley, there will be ... nine. For every present hiker down the John Muir Trail along the spine of the Sierra, there will be nine. For every tin can and bottle and carton that now litters park and wilderness trails, there will be nine. For every hundred people on the beach at Drakes Bay, there will be at least 900 and conceivably several times that many. Here we have, in dramatic and depressing terms, the geography of rising population."[7]

b. Travel. Travel in the United States continued to grow at a sharply accelerating rate, far faster than population. The number of automobiles increased from 5-1/2 million in 1918 to over 78 million in 1967. Eight and a half million new automobiles were being added to the motor pool each year. Two and even three-car families were common. The Congress of the United States appropriated over 13 billion dollars to build a massive new interstate highway system to link all parts of the nation by multiple lane, high-speed, nonstop expressways. These facilities, combined with increasing leisure time and growing affluence, caused travel to pyramid and visits to outdoor recreation areas to mushroom. From 1953 to 1959, for example, use of outdoor recreation areas increased 143 percent while population was growing only ten percent. The National Park System felt its share of the increase. Based on the size of the System in 1956, MISSION 66 estimated 80,000,000 visits by 1966, but the actual number to the growing System was 133,000,000 or 66 percent more. By 1959, Marion Clawson estimated that the 1950 demand for national park use might multiply 40 times by the year 2000,[8] to the fantastic possible total of 1,320,000,000.

c. Outdoor Recreation. These forces led to a new appraisal of the problems of outdoor recreation in the United States. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was established and made its report, Outdoor Recreation for America, to the President and Congress in 1962.[9] It introduced new concepts into the park and recreation field, and made comprehensive studies of public demands for outdoor recreation and available resources to meet the needs. Recommendations included a major proposal for land classification within Federal recreation areas, establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, creation of a Land and Water Conservation Fund, and preparation of a new National Recreation Plan. The ORRRC Report and its aftermath are having a major influence on management concepts for the National Park System and on proposals for its enlargement.

d. Wilderness Preservation. The pressures of mounting population, travel and outdoor recreation activities on the remaining wilderness led to the Wilderness Act of 1964. This legislation, a new assertion of the importance of wilderness preservation, has laid the foundation for formal designation of wilderness areas in many units of the National Park System. It has resulted in important new master plan studies for each national park and many national monuments; intensive investigation of projected wilderness areas by conservation and other groups throughout the country; and important public hearings on the proposed boundaries of wilderness areas in units of the National Park System.

e. The New Conservation. Embracing all these forces and others, was the vision of a "new conservation" concerned with the quality of our total environment. This concept, and all that it implies, is having a profound effect on the National Park Service and its relationship to other Federal, state and local conservation programs. Among aspects of the "new conservation" particularly relevant to the National Park Service are the Natural Beauty Program, and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which carries the historic preservation program far beyond the National Park System to protect history's place in our total environment, national, state and local.

3. The National Park Service Meets Changing Times.

a. Establishment of Three Categories within the National Park System.
b. Service Reorganization.
c. PARKSCAPE U.S.A.
d. Innovations in Management.

DIGEST

The National Park Service has responded to the challenge of changing times with a major program of new measures. Four measures are emphasized here because of their direct bearing on public use. These are the formal establishment of three segments within the National Park System; reorganization of the Service; promulgation of a broad plan of action for the Service entitled PARKSCAPE U.S.A.; and encouragement of innovations in management.

3. The National Park Service Meets Changing Times.

Under the leadership of Director George B. Hartzog, Jr., the National Park Service responded to the challenge of these five forces with a major program of new measures, including the following:

a. Establishment of Three Categories within the National Park System. On July 10, 1964, Secretary Udall sent an important directive to Director Hartzog renewing and up-dating the basic administrative policies for the National Park Service first set forth in 1918 by Secretary Lane. Included in this directive was a new principle of far-reaching importance. Secretary Udall requested that henceforth the National Park System be classified into three segments--the natural areas, the historical areas, and the recreational areas. Furthermore, he asked that new statements of management principle be developed for each segment to guide resource management, resource use, and physical development. A statement embodying general management principles for each of the three segments of the System was published by the Service in 1965. A detailed exposition of principles for the management and administration of natural areas was issued by Director Hartzog on September 13, 1967.[10] This is a very important document with long-range implications for the management of all natural areas in the National Park System, including a wide range of policies directly affecting public use. It will be followed shortly by parallel compilations of administrative policies for the historical areas and the recreational areas.

b. Service Reorganization. An important reorganization of the Service was put into effect in 1965 and 1966 and is continuing. This included establishment of three Planning and Service Centers in Washington, D. C., Philadelphia, and San Francisco, and the strengthening of responsibilities of six assistant directors supervising administration, operations, design and construction, cooperative activities, interpretation, and policy and program analysis. Special offices were created to improve coordination and direction of important professional work--the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, and the Office of Natural Science Studies. A field official was designated in each state to serve as keyman for Service programs, projects and official relations in that state.

c. PARKSCAPE U.S.A. In the 50th Anniversary year of 1966, Director Hartzog inaugurated PARKSCAPE U.S.A. This set forth a broad plan of action for the National Park Service to meet its growing responsibilities. PARKSCAPE U.S.A., described to some ten million readers in the July 1966 issue of the National Geographic Magazine, set forth five major goals:

"1. Completing the National Park System by 1972, a program of enormous scope--in effect, a Master Plan for the System--which has been endorsed by President Johnson.

"2. Utilizing the National Park concept as a vital means of helping American cities to achieve handsome, livable urban environments.

"3. Communicating the values of park conservation so that our citizens may better appreciate their heritage, to the end that all of us learn to live in better harmony with our environment.

"4. Developing cooperative programs with other organizations and, together, approaching the new problems of outdoor recreation on the broadest possible front.

"5. Extending assistance to--and exploring mutually helpful programs with--other nations through an international exchange of conservation knowledge with the goal of a second World Conference at Yellowstone and Grand Teton in 1972."

d. Innovations in Management. In this period it was discerned that many problems involved in managing the growing National Park System would not yield to old solutions. A spirit of innovation, within the framework of basic policies, was encouraged. Service employees were asked to propose new ways to meet old problems, particularly the problem of mounting public use. For example, a comprehensive study was made of new methods of transportation that might, in some locations, be introduced in place of the automobile. The "mini-bus" was introduced in Washington, D. C. A study was inaugurated to establish a rational basis for arriving at the carrying capacity of a park, using Rocky Mountain as a pilot example. Master plan teams were encouraged to propose innovations to help provide for public use. New and better methods of communication with the traveling public were energetically sought. Land classification, advisory commissions, regional planning and other helpful management concepts were explored, adopted or extended.

4. Bird's-eye View of the National Park System and Public Use in 1967.

a. Diversity of the National Park System.
b. Geographical Distribution.
c. Breadth of Public Use.
d. Changing Character of Public Use.
e. Extent of Overnight Use.

DIGEST

This section emphasizes the tremendous diversity of the National Park System in 1967. The System is no longer overwhelmingly western, but regional environments and traditions of every section of the nation are woven together in the System's fabric. It is a surprising fact that in 1966 over 81 million visits, or more than 61 percent of all visits, were made to units of the System east of the Mississippi River. It is also a surprising fact that 25.5 percent of all visits to the System (over 34 million) were made to units in or within the immediate influence of 15 major cities. We conclude that public use has not only increased greatly but has steadily broadened to include at least some visitors from every geographic region, from both urban and rural areas, from every ethnic, religious, and racial group, and from every social and economic class except the most deprived. The composition of this user audience is changing with changes in our society. Overnight visits constitute less than 11 percent of visits to the System. The predominant use is day-use.

4. Bird's-eye View of the National Park System and Public Use in 1967.

At this point, it seems desirable to take a bird's-eye view of the National Park System and some broad aspects of its public use in 1967.

a. Diversity of the National Park System and Consistency of Public Use. In any overall view, one is immediately struck by the diversity of the National Park System and the general consistency of its public use. The System is divided into three roughly equal segments--the natural, historical, and recreational areas. These three segments themselves represent considerable diversity, but there is also a further variety of areas within each category. Public uses cover a wide range, but one public use seems to predominate fairly consistently throughout all segments of the System. It is sightseeing.

The natural areas, oldest segment of the System, contain a tremendous range of superlative natural environments including mountains, rivers, canyons, lakes, caverns, deserts, glaciers, forests, volcanoes, and abundant fauna and flora. In 1966 these natural areas received 46,200,000 visits. Some of the national parks, for example, Yellowstone and Yosemite, contain a rich variety of natural features within a single reservation. In such areas, visitors engage in a wide range of outdoor activities, including sightseeing for scenic and nature appreciation, walking, camping, fishing, boating, hiking with pack, and mountain climbing. In many other national parks, such as Grand Canyon, Carlsbad Caverns, Bryce Canyon and Crater Lake, although they also contain a richly varied natural environment, public use is principally drawn by their single superlative natural feature--the canyon, the cave, the formations, or the crater. Sightseeing for scenic and nature appreciation, walking and camping therefore tend to dominate public use in such areas more than in other parks. Most, though not all, of the nature monuments, such as Devils Tower, Muir Woods, and Rainbow Bridge, also emphasize a single dramatic natural feature, and in these areas, too, scenic appreciation, walking and camping are the principal public use. This is not to say there are not many other--and perhaps "higher"--uses. But it is necessary to recognize that because sightseeing use predominates, it presents extremely important management obligations and problems.

The historical areas, the second oldest segment of the System, and numerically the largest, include two out of every three units.

These include a rich variety of cliff dwellings, mounds and caves; colonial houses and town-sites; historic churches, custom houses and capitol buildings; frontier trails, roads and forts; the birthplaces and homes of Presidents; and the great national memorials. These areas received 50,400,000 visits in 1966. Sightseeing for historical appreciation and walking was the predominant public use. There was some camping in archeological areas in the southwest, but it was incidental. Special events of all kinds from national holidays to special anniversaries were important activities in most historical areas. Taken as a whole, these areas present to the sightseeing public a vast panorama of the American historical heritage from prehistoric times to the site of the first airplane flight.

The recreational areas, the newest segment of the System, also include diverse units, ranging from major reservoir areas, like Lake Mead; national seashores and lakeshores, like Cape Cod and Indiana Dunes; to parkways such as the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace. Because of their recreational character, public use, which totaled 36,400,000 visits in 1966, was more diverse in these areas than in other segments of the System. Of the 24 types of outdoor recreation activity identified and measured by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, all were pursued in some degree in the recreational areas. Even here, however, it seems probable that sightseeing, walking and camping were numerically the most important activities in 1966, though this may change in some units as they are developed. Interesting special public uses in this group are parkway use, which involves both sightseeing and driving for pleasure, and the water-based recreation provided by seashores, lakeshores and reservoirs.

b. Geographical Distribution. In 1929 every unit of the National Park System except one was west of the Mississippi River. In 1967 there were 84 units east of the Mississippi. Furthermore, units of the System were to be found in every geographical region of the nation, in urban as well as rural areas, and in the Territories and Island Possessions as well as in the continental United States. Major units were located in historic New England, in the mid-Atlantic region, in the deep south, along the Appalachian Mountain chain, bordering the Great Lakes, along the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada, in the southwest, in Alaska, and in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Hawaii. Whether these units were natural, historic or recreational, each reflected the unique cultural and environmental characteristics of its region. The American West, although still highly important, is now only one among a growing number of major American regional environments and traditions whose

strands are woven together into the broad fabric of the National Park System.

c. Breadth of Public Use. The National Park System was established by the Congress for the benefit and enjoyment of the people as a whole and not for any one geographic, economic, social, ethnic, religious, racial, or other group within the population. In 1956 this point of view was expressed again in two of the guidelines of MISSION 66: "Substantial and appropriate use of the National Park System is the best means by which its basic purpose is realized and is the best guarantee of perpetuating the System ... All persons desiring to enter a park area may do so ..."[11]

The 133,000,000 visitors who came to the National Park System in 1966 are believed, in fact, to have included all segments of the American people, as well as many visitors from abroad. Visitation is almost as widespread as car ownership. It is a little-noticed but remarkable fact that in 1966 the National Park System areas east of the Mississippi River received over 81 million visits. This figure represents more than 61 percent of the total of 133 million visits to the entire System that year. Areas west of the Mississippi River received less than 39 percent of the visits in 1966. These figures are somewhat deceptive, however, since a short sightseeing visit to the Lincoln Memorial is not commensurate with a trip to Yosemite National Park. It helps to preserve a balanced understanding to know that 70.7 percent of overnight stays were in areas west of the Mississippi River. Furthermore, we are often reminded that intangible values cannot be measured by statistics, and we would all agree that the large western parks provide the "image" for the entire National Park System. Nevertheless, the figures are significant.

Times do persist in changing, moreover, in spite of our desires. It is another little-noticed but remarkable fact that in 1966 urban units of the National Park System received over 34 million visits or 25.5 percent of the total visits to the System. By urban unit, this study means areas within cities with over 100,000 population, or within their immediate area of influence. Units of the System are to be found in or near at least 15 such cities, including Boston, New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Richmond, Jacksonville, San Juan, New Orleans, St. Louis, Portland, and San Diego. Furthermore, over six million visits were made to units in 15 other smaller but sizable cities or towns, including Charleston, South Carolina; St. Augustine, Florida; Fort Smith and Hot Springs, Arkansas; Macon, Georgia; Chillicothe, Ohio; and Walla Walla, Washington. It has been

noted that some people like occasionally to vacation in the city. There may be a hard core of "city-lovers," just as there is a core of "wilderness-lovers" among the American people.

Because of heavy eastern as well as urban travel, it is probably safe to conclude that at least some visitors to the System come from every geographic region, every ethnic, religious, and racial group, and every social and economic class, except the most deprived. In the National Park System, these diverse social groups have a common meeting ground and a common heritage.

The "travel pool" from which visitors to the National Park System are drawn, has steadily widened over the years for many reasons, of which three are particularly important. As leisure, mobility, affluence, and education have spread through the population, there has been a corresponding widening of the socio-economic spectrum from which visitors come. With the increasing diversity of the areas included in the National Park System, and with their wider geographic distribution throughout the nation, potential visitors find more areas to choose among, including some nearer home. Last of all, the National Park System as a showcase for the United States, has also experienced growing impact from international travel which has multiplied five times since 1950. Visitors to the System from abroad come from almost every country in the world. It is believed these trends would have pleased Steve Mather, although their extent might have disturbed him. Mather wrote in 1921: "The parks are beginning to measure up to the great national use for which they were created. The people have learned to love these areas as their very own; national assets in which every individual of every State in the Union has an inalienable right of possession."[12]

d. Changing Character of Public Use. Although the above generalizations are believed sound, we need a much more accurate picture of present public use of the National Park System as a whole and of each individual park. Even superficial observation reveals considerable differences among the characteristics of travelers to the Adams House in Quincy, Massachusetts, the Statue of Liberty, George Washington's Birthplace, Yosemite, Arches, Fire Island, Mount McKinley, and Haleakala. Although visitation is large and diverse, and in total represents a broad cross-section of the American people, the composition of park users is evolving and changing with changes in our society. It changes, for example, with alterations in the age grouping of the population. In 1967 more older people and more young people were visiting the System than 20 years ago when their proportionate share of the total population was smaller. Similarly,

changes in patterns of work and leisure, amount of education, income and many other factors, are bound to affect the composition of park travel. It would be very desirable to develop a careful statistical base for present travel to the National Park System and then revise it periodically, perhaps every five years.

e. Extent of Overnight Use. Almost every discussion of the impact of mounting travel on the national parks, at some point, reaches a discussion of overnight use. Without at this point considering pros and cons, in our bird's-eye view, it may be useful to note some broad aspects of overnight use of the System as a whole.

(1) Natural Areas. As noted above, travel to the natural areas totaled 46,200,000 visits in 1966. Overnight accommodations, either lodges, cabins, or campgrounds, were available in 56 of these parks. In these accommodations, there were 11,562,000 overnight stays. Since a person may stay several nights on one visit, this figure represents a smaller number of visits. Even if every overnight stay represented one visit, it is clear that overnight stays make up no more than one-fourth of the visits to the natural areas of the System. Three-fourths of our visitors are day-users.

The proportion of overnight stays to total visits varies widely among the natural areas. Visits to the Great Smokies totaled 6,466,100 in 1966, while overnight stays numbered 678,200. Completely eliminating overnight stays in the Smokies would at the most reduce visits ten percent and might in fact increase visits if the individuals involved camped outside and returned to the park each day on a separate visit. In Yosemite, on the other hand, visits totaled 1,817,000 in 1966, but overnight stays numbered 2,230,400, indicating many visitors stayed more than one night. These figures, however, present a completely misleading picture of travel to Yosemite. We know from other statistics the astonishing fact that in 1966 over 54 percent of Yosemite visitors were day-users; over 26 percent more stayed three nights or less; and only 18 percent stayed longer than three nights.

(2) Historical Areas. In 1966, as we have noted, there were 50,400,000 visits to historical areas. Fifteen historical areas (principally archeological units in the Southwest) offer overnight accommodations which were used for 349,500 overnight stays in 1966. Overnight use in historical areas is an insignificant part of total use.

(3) Recreational Areas. In 1966 there were 36,400,000 visits to the recreational areas. Twelve recreational areas offered overnight accommodations, which were used for 2,382,100 overnight stays. In other words, day-use is the clearly predominant use in recreational areas.

Taking the System as a whole, there were 133,081,000 visits in 1966, and 14,540,000 overnight stays. Day-use is the predominant use of the System.

5. National Patterns of Outdoor Recreation and the National Park System.

   a. The Five Recreation Patterns and the 24 Activities.
   b. The Four Types of Occasions for Outdoor Recreation.
   c. ORRRC's Concepts and Public Use of the National Park System.
   d. Need for Public Use Studies of the National Park System.

DIGEST

This section reviews the outdoor recreation patterns and activities identified and measured by ORRRC, and considers their implications for the National Park System. Patterns and activities include passive outdoor pursuits like sightseeing and walking; backwoods recreation, including camping and hiking; water sports; winter sports; and physically active recreation of youth, including games and sports, horseback riding and bicycling. A study of ORRRC's survey of the four occasions for outdoor recreation activities also throws light on public use of the National Park System. These occasions are a vacation, a trip, a day's outing, and a short occasion of two or three hours' duration. This section presents a chart showing current views of the compatibility of 24 different outdoor recreation activities with the natural, historical, and recreational areas of the System.

5. National Patterns of Outdoor Recreation and the National Park System.

In 1962 ORRRC published the results of its comprehensive National Recreation Survey, as ORRRC Study Report 19.[13] In 1967 the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation published a subsequent study carrying the data through 1965.[14] These two documents constitute the most comprehensive study of outdoor recreation activities ever made in the United States, and contain concepts and data valuable for any study of public use of the National Park System.

a. The Five Recreation Patterns and the 24 Activities. The National Recreation Survey identified five broad patterns of outdoor recreation. Different groups of recreationists, in a very general sense, tended to follow each of these patterns. The five patterns ranged from "passive outdoor pursuits," such as driving and walking for pleasure, to "physically active recreation of youth," such as playing outdoor games and sports. Within each recreation pattern, the National Recreation Survey also identified, defined, and measured the principle recreation activities, which numbered 24. The following table shows the five recreation patterns, the recreation activities characteristic of each, the percentage of the population participating in each activity, and the number of days each activity was pursued per person in the United States during 1960-1961.[15]

	Annual Days Per Person	% of Population Participating 1960-61
Passive outdoor pursuits		
Driving for pleasure	20.73	52
Walking for pleasure	17.93	33
Sightseeing	5.91	42
Picnicking	3.53	53
Nature walks	2.07	14
Attending outdoor sports events	3.75	24
Attending outdoor concerts, drama	.39	9
Miscellaneous activities	.57	--
	54.88	
Backwoods recreation		
Camping	.86	8
Hiking	.42	6
Mountain climbing	.09	-
Hunting	1.86	13
	3.23	

Water sports		
Fishing	4.19	29
Swimming	6.47	45
Canoeing	.12	2
Sailing	.11	2
Other boating	1.95	22
Water skiing	.41	6
	13.28	
Winter sports		
Snow skiing	.07	2
Sledding and tobogganing	.51	9
Ice skating	.55	7
	1.13	
Physically active recreation of youth		
Horseback riding	1.25	6
Bicycling	5.17	9
Playing outdoor games and sports	12.71	30
	19.13	

We do not have a further breakdown of these statistics for recreation patterns and activities to reveal the precise nature of public use of the National Park System. Nevertheless, some general comments may be offered.

(1) Passive outdoor pursuits dominate outdoor recreation in the United States. These pursuits represent three-fifths of the total outdoor recreation in the nation. These pursuits also appear to dominate use of the National Park System. Until they are measured statistically, we cannot be certain; but it seems probable that the majority of the visitors alike to natural areas, historic areas, and recreation areas are sightseers. It is significant to note that among natural areas, this statement is clearly true of Yosemite National Park. In a perceptive article in National Parks Magazine for October 1967, based on a master's thesis at the University of Michigan, Warren A. Johnson makes some interesting observations.[16] In 1966, 54.9 percent of the visitors to Yosemite did not stay overnight, 26.3 percent stayed three days or less, and only 18.18 percent stayed longer. It seems clear that sightseeing is the major public use of Yosemite. Among historic areas, sightseeing is obviously the principal public use. This would be equally true of Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia, with 2,745,000 visits in 1966, of Castillo de San Marcos in Florida, with 488,500, and of

Cabrillo National Monument, across the country in California, with 1,085,000. Among recreation areas, there is also extensive sightseeing use. In 1966 the Blue Ridge Parkway--a recreational area--had 8,011,000 visits, almost all of them for sightseeing. A great many of the 2,830,000 visits to Cape Cod National Seashore in 1966 were probably sightseeing. It is more difficult to judge the 3,720,000 visits to Lake Mead and those to other reservoir areas. The proportion of sightseers to other users of the recreational areas of the System may diminish in future years as more facilities are developed in these areas.

(2) Backwoods recreation. Some lovers of the outdoors may quarrel with the term "backwoods recreation" as inadequately reflecting the intensity of superlative wilderness experience. There would be some justice in such criticism, but for this analysis we find it necessary to use the term. According to ORRRC, backwoods types of recreation constituted about three and a half percent of outdoor recreation in the United States in 1960-61. Three-fifths of this was hunting, which is forbidden in the national parks, monuments, and historical areas, although it is permitted and encouraged in appropriate national recreation areas. The remaining forms of backwoods recreation, namely, camping, hiking and mountain climbing, are widely pursued in the National Park System. Camping, however, is no longer as much a backwoods recreation activity as it used to be. Steady improvements in design of camping equipment, which make it easier and quicker to set up and take down and more comfortable to use, have made camping a different experience for many people from what it used to be. Oftentimes today, camping is simply an inexpensive form of family accommodation on what is basically a sightseeing trip. Out of 9 million camper days in established campgrounds in the National Park System in 1966, almost 4 million were in trailers and only a little over 5 million were in tents. Volume 20 of the ORRRC report offers this further observation on camping: "The large majority of American adults, as well as the large majority of vacationers, do not go camping. In some cases age is a deterrent and often lack of experience. The main reason, however, is that most Americans like comfort and service during their vacation. This is especially true of women who look forward to a change from housework; often it is true of men also."[17] It would appear likely that "hiking with pack" rather than "camping" is the best measure of the desire of the American people in 1960-61 for wilderness experience.

Many who are lovers of the national parks to whom the lonely grandeur of remote places is an invaluable experience may find it difficult to realize that apparently only some people like to be alone. Most people evidently prefer to be with others.

The distinguished anthropologist, Dr. Margaret Mead, writing on outdoor recreation in the context of emerging American cultural values, observed: "... for most people the point of a park--whether it is in a city or in the country or at the seaside--is that it is full of people, and a park where one is out of sight or hearing of others is--as it may be in fact--a dangerous place."[18] And the well-known sociologist, Professor William J. Goode of Columbia University, commented in the same volume: "Poets and philosophers of the outdoors (along with the author) have praised the aloneness of the outdoors, but most Americans enjoy nature best in groups and family units."[19] We may or may not agree with Professor Goode's conclusion and it should perhaps be further verified in regard to natural areas of the National Park System. If the conclusion is sound, as seems probable, it will have to be taken into account in managing public use of the System.

(3) Water sports. There is a very large public demand for water sports as a major and growing form of outdoor recreation activity in the United States. It represented over fourteen percent of outdoor recreation in 1960-61. The number of power boats has increased enormously in recent years. The National Park System offers facilities to meet a part of the demand for water-based recreation, but the facilities vary from segment to segment of the System, and in many areas there are definite limits to this type of recreation.

Fishing is an important visitor activity in many natural and recreational areas. The System's recreation areas are the principal locations for visitors to enjoy water sports. This makes a lot of sense, for most recreation areas are water-based either as reservoirs, seashores, or lakeshores. There has been a sharp rise in public demand for water sports since World War II and establishment of many of the national recreation areas represents, in part, a response to this demand.

(4) Winter sports represented a very small part of outdoor recreation in the United States in 1960-61--scarcely more than one percent. The most popular winter sport, ice skating, was pursued to a minor extent in the National Park System. Sledding, tobogganing and skiing were the predominant types of winter use in natural

areas of the System. Here the problem was how much intensive use to permit, supported by ski tows, and involving timber cutting to open ski slopes, which could become conspicuous in the summer season. Generally speaking, intensive developments are properly avoided in natural areas. There is no problem in permitting such developments in recreation areas. However, the present recreation areas in the System are principally seashores or reservoirs and offer little natural terrain for winter sports.

(5) Physically active recreation of youth. This is the second most important category of outdoor recreation in the United States, ranking next to passive outdoor pursuits. It comprised about 21 percent of all outdoor recreation activity in 1960-61. Most of this recreation, however, is not suitable in the natural and historic areas of the National Park System. In the survey year, two-thirds of this recreation was playing outdoor games and sports. While these activities are normally pursued on playing fields near home, they may also be pursued in national recreation areas and the National Capital Parks, Washington, D. C. There is plenty of room, however, in all three categories of the National Park System for the two other principal physically active recreation pursuits of youth, namely, horseback riding and bicycling. The problem with horseback riding is its growing cost which has already put it out of reach of most people, although it is theoretically available in many areas of the System. We may be on the brink of a growing demand for bicycle riding, however, which is likely to take initial hold in recreation areas like Cape Cod, where the terrain is suitable and the public use pattern compatible. One sees no objections at all to bicycle riding also in natural or historic areas, and many reasons to encourage it.

b. The Four Types of Occasions for Outdoor Recreation. In addition to identifying five outdoor recreation patterns and 24 activities, the National Recreation Survey also identified and analyzed four types of occasions for outdoor recreation activity. These are a vacation, a trip, a day's outing, and an occasion of only two or three hours' duration. Each of these types of occasion has special meaning not only for outdoor recreation generally, but also for understanding public use of the National Park System. Perhaps the most illuminating data is contained in a special report from the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, published as ORRRC Study Report 20, referred to above.

(1) A vacation. The survey defined a vacation as a trip of more than three days which the person surveyed regarded as a vacation.

During the survey period (1959-60), 43 percent of American families went on a vacation trip, over 80 percent in their own automobiles. Many vacationers reported they would have liked to travel even more. Nearly as many families took a vacation trip as bought a car or any major household appliance. Other studies by ORRRC show that during the year from June 1960 to May 1961, persons twelve years and over took nearly 80 million vacations, remaining away from home nearly 800 million person-days.

Vacation trips are often family trips which include children. Thirty-five percent of the vacation trips recorded in the University of Michigan survey involved husband, wife and children. Thirty-eight percent included one spouse and children, friends or relatives, or were made alone. Twenty-five percent included husband and wife and no children. While statistics of this kind are not available for travel to the National Park System, it seems probable that family travel predominates.

Vacation trips varied greatly in length and distance. The median length of vacation trips was 8-9 days. Two-fifths of the trips covered long distances and were made to another region of the country or abroad. One-third of the trips were out-of-state but within the general region. One-third of the trips were made within the vacationers' home state. Since units of the National Park System are found in every region and most states, travel to one or more of them is usually possible even on a short vacation in one's home state.

"Automobile riding for sightseeing and relaxation" was the most popular recreation activity on vacations. It was engaged in by 53 percent of vacationers. "Outdoor swimming or going to a beach" was second, with 38 percent participating, and "picnics" third, with 29 percent. Furthermore, among vacationers who visited Federal or state parks, 77 percent engaged in "automobile riding for sightseeing and relaxation." The survey concluded that people on vacation trips to parks pursue those activities they consider help them "see and enjoy the scenery and nature--pleasure driving, hiking, nature and bird walks, camping, and picnics ... Many of the visitors undoubtedly come to the parks for a short time en route to some other destination. They may make only a brief stop in the park, and they are interested primarily in activities which are part of seeing the sights. Other park visitors stay longer and have more time. Yet park visitors did most of their swimming, fishing, boating and canoeing, and hunting outside the parks."[20] (Underlining supplied.)

(2) A trip is an outdoor recreation occasion during which the participant is away from home at least overnight. According to the National Recreation Survey, from June 1960 through May 1961, there were 111 million outdoor recreation trips. Many of those occasions were weekend trips. Outdoor recreation activities on short trips tend to be different from those on vacation. Only 38 percent participated in "automobile riding for sightseeing and relaxation." Thirty-seven percent went fishing; 30 percent went swimming or to a beach; and 25 percent on picnics. (The percentage exceeds 100 percent because those surveyed could list more than one activity.)

A person on a short trip may sightsee in the National Park System but is more likely to do so when on vacation. People who take weekend or other short trips are seeking opportunities for fishing or swimming, camping or hunting, much more often than sightseeing. The recreation areas of the National Park System, because of their proximity to large centers of population and their water-based recreation activities, make a significant contribution toward meeting some of the outdoor recreation needs of people on "trips."

(3) A day's outing is an outdoor recreation occasion not involving an overnight stay away from home. Outings averaged eight hours each, and because they do not involve an overnight stay, are much less expensive and therefore more frequent. There were 810 million outdoor recreation outings during the year June 1960-May 1961. Picnicking is the most frequent reason for an outing; swimming second, fishing third, attending outdoor sports events fourth, and hunting fifth. Sightseeing and driving for pleasure run a rather poor sixth and seventh. While units of the National Park System may be visited by some people on outings, such visits are more likely to occur during vacations or overnight trips. Outings may become an important element in public use of such national recreation areas near urban populations as Cape Cod, Fire Island, and Point Reyes.

(4) Short occasion of two or three hours' duration. The ORRRC Report identifies this type of occasion, but gives much less data on it than on vacations, trips, and outings. It appears that a good deal of walking for recreation is done during short periods of two or three hours. Many city-dwellers find walking a pleasure and important for health. The growing interest of the National Park Service in urban parks, natural beauty, and historic preservation is potentially relevant here.

c. ORRRC's Concepts and Public Use of the National Park System. For many years the term "recreation" has been used differently by different people. The ORRRC report established an identifiable and measurable framework for the term "outdoor recreation." Within it is to be found the entire spectrum of recreation activities pursued in the National Park System from hiking with pack to water-skiing. Now that so much valuable data has been collected nationally on this framework--data periodically made current by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation--it would seem only common sense for everyone concerned to use it in discussing public use of the National Park System.

There are bound to be differences in viewpoint over the nature and extent of such public use. These differences are likely to be compounded if the term "recreation" is used in a general, subjective or derogatory sense, such as castigating park visitors as "crowd-recreationists." On the other hand, if a particular outdoor recreation activity is believed on the one hand to be desirable, or on the other hand objectionable, in a specific location in a particular park, the issue is pinpointed if the activity and location can be identified precisely. For this reason, the outdoor recreation activities and categories developed and measured by ORRRC provide a valuable tool for analyzing and discussing public use of the National Park System, and for managing that use.

In order to clarify our ideas about the proper framework for public use of the System, let us examine ORRRC's five patterns of outdoor recreation and their sub-activities, and set forth in chart form which activities the Service currently considers generally compatible with the preservation of the System and each of its segments for the benefit of the people of the United States. We are not dealing here with the quantity, but only with the kinds of recreation activity. In considering compatibility of use, we differentiate between natural, historical and recreation areas, but do not attempt to consider individual parks and exceptions.

Compatibility of Outdoor Recreation Activities with Segments of the National Park System

Activity	Natural Areas	Historical Areas	Recreation Areas
Passive Outdoor Pursuits			
Sightseeing	X	X	X
Walking for pleasure	X	X	X
Nature walks	X	X	X
Driving for pleasure(1)	Sightseeing only; see note	Sightseeing only; see note	X
Picnicking(2)	X	X	X
Attending outdoor sports events(3)	No	No	X
Attending outdoor concerts, dramas(4)	No	See note	X
Backwoods Recreation			
Camping(5)	X	See note	X
Hiking	X	X	X
Mountain climbing	X	Not applicable	X
Hunting(6)	No	No	See note
Water Sports			
Fishing	X	X	X
Swimming(7)	See note	X	X
Canoeing(8)	X	X	X
Sailing	X	X	X
Other boating(8)	See note	See note	X
Water skiing	No	No	X
Winter Sports			
Snow skiing(9)	See note	Not applicable	X
Sledding & tobogganing(9)	See note	Not applicable	X
Ice skating(9)	See note	Not applicable	X
Physically Active Recreation of Youth			
Horseback riding	X	X	X
Bicycling	X	X	X
Playing outdoor games and sports	No	No	X

Footnotes

(1) Driving in a park is classified here as sightseeing. It may give pleasure, but it is the pleasure of sightseeing. People do not pay a park entrance fee simply to drive for driving's sake on park roads.

(2) Picnicking is permitted only in approved locations.

(3) There are some water sports events in some national recreation areas, such as Lake Mead and in National Capital Parks. There are some baseball and football fields in National Capital Parks.

(4) There are many special events in historic areas, including commemorations and national holidays. Outdoor dramas are performed at Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and in National Capital Parks, and concerts are also performed in the latter area.

(5) In approved locations only. Generally prohibited in historical areas, with the exception of archeological areas in the Southwest where camping is common.

(6) Public hunting and fishing are resource uses which are considered desirable and compatible with most national recreation areas.

(7) In approved locations only. Intensive beach developments are contrary to policy in natural areas.

(8) Canoeing and sailing would usually be permitted in any area of the System where suitable waters are available. Power boats are prohibited on many waters in natural areas, and their use is regulated on permitted waters.

(9) In natural areas, only by special justification and plan. Trail or cross-country skiing is encouraged when safety factors permit.

Careful description of the use pattern for each type of area--natural, historic and recreational--is a proper subject for the statement of management principles for each segment of the System. The first of these detailed statements, the Compilation of Administrative Policies for Natural Areas, was issued by Director Hartzog on September 13, 1967.[21] This compilation represents a major step ahead in the thoughtful analysis and interpretation of basic public use and preservation policies for a major segment of the System.

Parallel compilations for the historic and recreational areas will doubtless be issued soon.

The above table confirms the pluralistic nature of public use of the National Park System. Different patterns of public use, such as passive outdoor pursuits and backwoods recreation, go on side by side in the same park. Different recreation activities characteristic of these patterns, such as sightseeing and hiking with pack, are pursued by different groups of people in different areas of the same park simultaneously. Recognizing and analyzing the pluralistic forms of public use in each park or, in other words, the different user groups, is important to the overall management of public use of the System.

d. Need for Public Use Studies of the National Park System. While its concepts, data and conclusions leave room for discussion, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's basic report to Congress and the 27 study reports that followed, laid a monumental foundation for a better understanding of the outdoor recreation habits and needs of the American people. In addition to the summary report, Outdoor Recreation for America, and Study Reports 19 and 20, we single out for special mention Study Report 22, Trends in American Living and Outdoor Recreation. This last volume contains the valuable comments and insights of 14 recognized scholars in the behavioral sciences. Among subjects discussed by these authorities in relation to outdoor recreation are technological changes in our society, attitudes toward work and leisure, population growth and change, urbanization, social mobility among classes, changing family relationships, ethnic groups, mass media, and the recreation needs of such special groups as the aged, adolescents, minorities, single adults and foreign visitors. Among authors of essays in this volume are Dr. Margaret Mead, distinguished anthropologist of the American Museum of Natural History, who writes on "Outdoor Recreation in the Context of Emerging American Cultural Values: Background Considerations;" Dr. Philip M. Hauser, Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago, on "Demographic and Ecological Changes as Factors in Outdoor Recreation;" Dr. William J. Goode, Professor of Sociology at Columbia University, on "Outdoor Recreation and the Family to the Year 2000;" and Dr. Herbert J. Gans, then at the University of Pennsylvania, on "Outdoor Recreation and Mental Health." These essays are cited because even a brief study of the approaches such behavioral scientists make to outdoor recreation will reveal how little the National Park Service really knows about its visitors and their needs.

This is not to say that the Service has not been aware for a long time of the importance of public use studies. It has been keenly aware of their value for management and has made a beginning within its very limited resources. The Service has long kept data on travel, but in recent years the collection and interpretation of this data has been critically reviewed and consistently improved. It is interesting to note that as long ago as 1955, the Service contracted with Audience Research, Inc., Princeton, New Jersey, for A Survey of the Public Concerning the National Parks.[22] This study provided helpful background data that contributed to better understanding of public attitudes toward the national parks. It is well to recall, also, that the MISSION 66 staff, under Director Wirth's leadership, achieved a broader understanding of the System and its public use than had been reached before. Nevertheless, there are still great gaps in our knowledge and some persistent differences of viewpoint.

Current research includes a study of the carrying capacity of Rocky Mountain National Park mentioned above. This is being conducted by a team organized by the Center for Research and Education at Estes Park, Colorado, including participants or consultants from the fields of ecology, sociology, statistics, anthropology, psychology, wildlife management and recreation from several universities. The Service has also embarked on a research program to examine the socio-economic relationship between certain parks, their visitors, and the surrounding communities. These studies are usually conducted by state universities in cooperation with the Service. Thus far, studies have been completed for Teton County, Wyoming (University of Wyoming), and Dare County, North Carolina (State University of North Carolina). Similar studies are in progress for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park (Memphis State University) and Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (University of Arizona).

It seems evident that continuing careful thought needs to be given to further developing the concepts and financial support for a program of public use studies for the System as a whole, and for many of its units. Management of the National Park System must inevitably be based on thorough knowledge of its natural, historical and recreational resources, and of the human beings who use it, as their behavior manifests itself in each park area. The concepts for a program of public use studies should be developed by an appropriate staff group, with advisors, representing or

consulting with representatives from the behavioral sciences, the natural sciences, the fields of archeology and historic preservation, and the statistical, economic, interpretive and planning elements of Service organization. This need not be as cumbersome as it sounds. Many circumstances, including diminishing resources, mounting use, and perhaps as a last straw, the current national concern over foreign versus domestic travel, conspire to make this study effort peculiarly timely now.

Needless to say, studies of public use will not be very helpful unless they are accompanied by informed consideration of the interrelationship of the visitor and the resources, tangible and intangible. It is to be hoped the Service can build on the foundations laid in the ORRRC report, but add refinements and subtleties in analysis of visitor behavior that were impossible in ORRRC's broad national survey.

6. Functions of the National Park System and Public Use.

a. Before 1916.
b. The 1916 Act.
c. Public Use of Historical Areas.
d. Public Use and Recreation.
e. Public Use and Wilderness.
f. National Heritage, the Unifying Theme.

DIGEST

This section reviews the evolution of concepts about public use of the National Park System from the Yellowstone Act of 1872 through the Wilderness Act of 1964. Public use is interpreted here to mean the actual physical activities of visitors in units of the System. Public use concepts embodied in legislation embrace a cumulative succession from "resort and recreation," through "park or pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people," through "enjoyment in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired," through the "inspiration and benefit" provided by historical areas, through various forms of public outdoor recreation in recreational areas, and concludes with "outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation" in wilderness areas. The unifying theme in this progress is that the natural, historical and recreational areas of the National Park System combine to present a superb expression of our national heritage. Public use of the System is an important unifying force for the people of the United States.

6. Functions of the National Park System.

This section will review the development of concepts about public use of the National Park System by which we mean the actual physical activities of visitors in units of the System. It will not attempt to review other important public functions of the System; for example, "the preservation in their natural condition of remnants of the fast disappearing primeval beauty of the continent;" or the use of the national parks for scientific research; or the educational or other values of the System to nonvisitors; or the contribution of the System to the national economy. Important as these and other functions are, they lie beyond the limited scope of the present study.

a. Before 1916--"Public Parks or Pleasuring Grounds." We begin with Frederick Law Olmsted and Yosemite at the time it was made a state park in 1864. After viewing the valley repeatedly in 1863 and 1864, Olmsted concluded Yosemite was "far the noblest park or pleasure ground in the world." Here he saw the "union of the deepest sublimity with the deepest beauty of nature:" which made Yosemite "the greatest glory of nature." In his perceptive book, Nature and the American, Dr. Hans Huth writes: "Having arrived at this conviction Olmsted started the movement to protect the unique valley of Yosemite and the country surrounding it. But this ... was not the only purpose of his drive ... These new public grounds, he felt, should be opened for 'the use of the body of the people' and for their 'free enjoyment;' he considered it the duty of the managers of Yosemite to make the park serve the people in their 'pursuit of happiness' ... He was the first to conceive the idea that 'great public parks' must be managed 'for the benefit and the free use of the people,' which has become a fundamental policy of the National Park Service."[23] The 1864 act granting Yosemite Valley to California stated it was to be held for "public use, resort, and recreation, inalienable for all time."

Eight years after Yosemite Valley was made a California state park, legislation was passed to establish Yellowstone as the first national park. No attempt will be made here to review the history of that legislation. The key point is that Yellowstone was "dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." This concept of public use was then adopted by Congress in legislation establishing other national parks. In 1890 Sequoia was set aside as a "public park, or pleasure ground, for the benefit and enjoyment of the

people." Laws for Mount Rainier in 1899 and Crater Lake in 1902 contained similar phraseology, which thus became the general principle guiding public use of the national parks until 1916.

a. The 1916 Act. We now come to the famous public use concept developed in part from these earlier laws and expressed in the enabling act as follows: "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." The principal author of this language was Frederick Law Olmsted, the son of the Olmsted who helped open Yosemite Valley for "free enjoyment" of the people.[24]

Without lengthy discussion, let us review a few connotations of this language sometimes overlooked. What is to be conserved? The first and key word is scenery, followed by natural and historic objects and wildlife.

The idea of "scenery" was well developed in the United States during the 18th and 19th centuries. Many American people knew the natural beauty of the Hudson Valley and the grandeur of Niagara Falls from first-hand observation. They were well prepared to hear of the "incomparable valley" of Yosemite, and the "wonders" and beauty of Yellowstone. Drawings, photographs and descriptions of the primeval beauty of the western mountains, canyons and lakes met a ready audience who foresaw the day when they could perhaps travel west and see these natural beauties and wonders for themselves. The whole idea was to save these places from commercial exploitation, and set them aside for public use as parks for every citizen. When President Taft sent his special message to Congress in 1912 recommending a Bureau of National Parks, he used the language of natural beauty. He said such a bureau was essential "to the proper management of those wonderful manifestations of nature, so startling and so beautiful that everyone recognizes the obligations of the Government to preserve them for the edification and recreation of the people ... Every consideration of patriotism and the love of nature and of beauty and of art requires us ... to bring all these natural wonders within easy reach of our people."

Although in some embryonic and general sense the idea of wilderness may also have been present in the minds of early national park supporters, generally speaking, "wilderness" was long thought of as somewhat different from natural beauty or scenery. Wilderness has usually had an awesome and forbidding quality not ordinarily

associated with natural beauty. According to Michael McCloskey in his excellent article, "The Wilderness Act of 1964: Its Background and Meaning," in the June 1966 issue of the Oregon Law Review, 18th century philosophers drew a distinction between the sublime and the beautiful in analyzing the subject matter of landscape p..inting. "Philosophers like Edmund Burke," he says, "described sublime scenes as those having characteristics such as vastness, massiveness, apparent disorder, profuse detail, roughness, immense energy, isolation, irregularity and obscurity--characteristics which are today associated with wilderness."[25] A somewhat parallel distinction between wilderness and natural beauty or scenery persists to this day, and affects ideas of public use.

The consequence of the idea of "scenery" in the enabling act is the idea that the public "enjoyment" which is to be provided will be, in a substantial degree, scenic enjoyment. This means access to the main points of interest and ample opportunities for "sightseeing." This, in fact, is what the new National Park Service immediately set about providing in 1917. During the next 12 years, as is pointed out elsewhere in this report, Steve Mather and Horace Albright energetically promoted travel to the national parks, and built roads and concessions so sightseers could enjoy the scenery. These were the years of the "See America First" movement and the "better roads" campaign.

Now let us turn to the word "unimpaired." What does the enabling act say shall be conserved unimpaired? The words are "the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein." "Scenery" even combined with "natural objects and wildlife," is not quite the same as "wilderness." It is possible to build properly located roads and properly designed and located lodges, cabins, and campgrounds to provide national park access and public use, without impairing the scenery, the natural objects or the wildlife in any serious way. This is evidently what the founders had in mind.

The 1916 Act itself authorizes several measures which were not considered impairments to scenery, natural or historic objects or wildlife. For example, the act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell or dispose of timber to control the attacks of insects or diseases or "otherwise conserve" the scenery or the natural or historic objects in any park. He may also destroy such animals and plant life as may be "detrimental" to park use. He may also grant privileges, leases and permits for the use of park land for the accommodation of visitors. He may also grant the privilege to graze livestock when such use is not "detrimental" to the primary

purpose of the park. Secretary Lane's famous memorandum to Mather in 1918 discussed several measures that were not considered impairments of the national parks, including leasing lands for the operation of hotels and camps, construction of roads and trails, the admission of automobiles, and outdoor sports consistent with law.

An enlarged road program was specifically authorized by the Act of April 9, 1924, which provides that the Secretary may "construct, reconstruct, and improve roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges" in the national parks and monuments. Evidently, Congress did not consider this legislation in conflict with the "unimpaired" provision of the enabling act. Furthermore, during these years from 1917-1929, some of the best known scenic roads in the United States were surveyed, approved and built in the western national parks, including the Going-to-the-Sun Highway in Glacier, the Trail Ridge Road in Rocky Mountain, and the Zion-Mount Carmel Highway originating in Zion National Park.[26]

While actively sponsoring these projects to facilitate public use of the System, Director Mather and his associates, as well as public supporters of the national parks generally, also considered that large sections of each park should be kept in a wilderness state. This viewpoint developed over the years and received its fullest expression in the Service's 1957 publication, prepared by Howard Stagner, entitled The National Park Wilderness.[27]

c. Public Use of Historical Areas. Many of the individual park laws for historical areas have provisions defining public use a little differently than the natural areas. It is common in historical area legislation to use the phrase "a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." This language was used, for example, in enabling legislation for Morristown National Historical Park in 1933. Fairly often, however, an alternate phrase is used: "for the benefit and inspiration of the people." This language was used, for example, in legislation for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park.

The most important public use statement for the historical areas of the National Park System is contained in the Congressional declaration in the Historic Sites Act of 1935: "that it is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."

The important point is that the word "inspiration" is now added to the word "enjoyment" which appears in the 1916 Act, and "benefit"

from other legislation as an objective of public use, applicable especially to the historical segment of the System.

d. Public Use and Recreation.

(1) In the national parks. In the early days, recreation, used in a very general sense, was considered a proper function of a national park, but by the 1920's an adverse reaction set in which has continued to the present day. Yosemite Valley was ceded as a state park in 1864 for "resort and recreation." Yellowstone was thought of as "a great breathing place for the national lungs." Congressman Taylor, in 1915, described Rocky Mountain as "a public recreation ground out of doors," which would prove "a Godsend to the public's health and shattered nerves." Theodore Roosevelt, in 1918, said Acadia would "give a healthy playground to multitudes of hardworking men and women ..."[28] In his annual report for 1920, Steve Mather spoke of the national parks as "the great recreational grounds of the American people."[29]

It has not been possible in preparing this report to trace the development in the 1920's and later of the adverse reaction to the concept of recreation in the national parks. Suffice it now to quote the distinguished Committee on Study of Educational Problems in National Parks, appointed by Secretary Wilbur in 1928, and headed by Dr. John C. Merriam, then President of the Carnegie Institution. In their published report of 1929, this Committee developed the basic principles that underlie the interpretive program of the National Park Service. Their second principle read: "The distinctive or essential characters of National Parks lie in the inspirational influence and educational value of the exceptional natural features which constitute the reason for the existence of these parks. Outdoor recreation is recognized as an important factor in National Park administration but it is not the primary purpose, and can also be enjoyed through abundant opportunities furnished elsewhere ..."[30] In the 1960's, with the benefit of ORRRC's report, we now realize that the term has specific analyzable content which can and should be applied to the study of all public use activities in the National Park System.

(2) In the recreational areas of the System. Outdoor recreation as a clearly recognized function of particular areas of the System, comes into view with the authorization of (a) national seashores and lakeshores; (b) national recreation areas (reservoirs); (c) national parkways; and (d) national riverways. Each type needs at least brief comment.

National Seashores and Lakeshores.

Cape Hatteras was the first national seashore authorized (1937) and the legislation specifically mentions recreation. After stating that the area is established "for the benefit and enjoyment of the people," it goes on to add some curious and interesting language. The act says that "except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, particularly swimming, boating, sailing, fishing and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed as needed," the area shall be reserved as a "primitive wilderness." Here we have recreation and wilderness side by side.

Twenty-four years later, somewhat similar concepts reappear in the Cape Cod National Seashore law. After stating that no development for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken "which would be incompatible" with preservation of the unique flora and fauna, physiographic conditions and historic sites and structures, the law goes on to provide for "public enjoyment and understanding" and "for camping, swimming, boating, sailing, hunting, fishing," and "the appreciation of historic sites and structures and natural features." This act influenced several other seashore and lakeshore acts, passed between 1962 and 1966.

The Point Reyes and Padre Island (1962) laws set forth their public use functions as "public recreation, benefit, and inspiration." The Fire Island Act (1964), on the other hand, turns out to be very strict, stating that the area is established "for the purpose of conserving and preserving for the use of future generations," the natural resources situated there. The Assateague legislation (1965) speaks of "public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment," and that for Cape Lookout (1966) says the area shall be administered "for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation." Pictured Rocks (1966) is established "for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use and enjoyment of the public"--a very broad coverage of public uses. The Indiana Dunes legislation calls "for the educational, inspirational and recreational use of the public." One may conclude that the public use functions of national seashores and lakeshores vary from area to area and that, as a category, these areas are still evolving.

National Recreation Areas (Reservoirs).

After many years of management by inter-bureau agreement, the first reservoir to be made a national recreation area by act of

Congress was Lake Mead (1964) to be administered "for general purposes of public recreation, benefit and use." The second was the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (1965), established "for public outdoor recreation, use and enjoyment." This law, however, contained an unusual feature calling for a land and water use management plan, "which shall include specific provision for, in order of priority--(1) public outdoor recreation benefits; (2) preservation of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; (3) such utilization of natural resources as ... does not significantly impair ..." the first two values. Here, for the first time in the 93-year-old history of ational Park System legislation, public use is given clear legislative priority over preservation as the function of a particular area. The legislative pattern was generally followed, but omitting the clear expression of priorities in the laws for the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity and the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Areas in 1965 and 1966.

National Parkways.

It is an odd fact that legislation for the Blue Ridge Parkway (1936) and the Natchez Trace Parkway (1938) does not describe their public use functions. However, it is well known that these two parkways served, with others, as the prototypes for the Proposed Program for Scenic Roads and Parkways prepared for the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty in 1966.[31] The Council had recognized the recreational value of parkways in a 1964 policy statement, which pointed out that driving for pleasure is one of America's most popular outdoor recreation pursuits and that tourism and sightseeing are made possible by attractive roads and parkways, which provide access to a wealth of scenic and natural beauty. We may take these statements as a fair evaluation of the public use functions of national parkways.

National Riverways.

A new type of national recreation areasis in the making--the national riverway. In 1964 Congress authorized the first reservation of this kind, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri. The legislation provided for the preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife and provision for the "use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States." Other wild rivers and free-flowing streams have been and are being studied, and Congress has under consideration further legislation in this significant field.

e. Public Use and Wilderness. The Wilderness Act of 1964 introduces the concept of a National Wilderness Preservation System into the legislative fabric which governs management of the National Park System, as well as many other Federal lands. It is, therefore, desirable to attempt a brief account of the origin and nature of this legislation.

The concept of wilderness has a long history, which is perhaps most effectively summarized by Michael McCloskey in the valuable article cited above.[32] After reviewing early and contemporary valuations of the wilderness, he points out that probably the first governmental efforts to protect wilderness are to be found in the origins of the National Park System. At this point, departing for a moment from McCloskey's guidance, we note that while the wilderness idea may well have been present in embryonic form in the minds of early advocates of national parks, when the Service was established in 1916, principal emphasis was on the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein, and in making them accessible for public enjoyment. Steve Mather spoke early of a good sensible road system for each park so that visitors would have a good chance to enjoy them. At the same time, he expected that large sections of each park would be kept in a natural wilderness state. In his day, however, no foreseeable growth in public use appeared likely to make this achievement difficult.

"Institutional wilderness" began in 1924, according to McCloskey, with designation of the Gila Wilderness in New Mexico, set aside by the Forest Service as a result of the work of Aldo Leopold. The first use of the term "wilderness" in legislation involving the National Park System appears in 1934 in the enabling act for Everglades National Park. Between 1931 and 1939, the Forest Service designated 73 different primitive areas throughout the west embracing about 13 million acres. World War II intervened to slow down this process; but after the war, interest revived and in 1951 Howard Zahniser, drawing on a report by C. Frank Keyser of the Library of Congress, publicly advocated statutory status of the Forest Service's administrative system of wilderness. In due course, the subject came before Congress and during a period of nine years, from 1956 through 1964, some 65 bills were introduced, 18 different hearings held, and eventually, after much deliberation, the Wilderness Act of 1964 became law.

For the purposes of our consideration of public use of the National Park System, we note certain features of this law. It establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed

of federally owned areas designated by Congress as "wilderness areas." These are to be administered "for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness." Wilderness is defined as an area "where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." Among further points of definition, wilderness areas are required to have "outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation." The legislation prohibits certain uses within wilderness areas, subject to existing rights, including commercial enterprises and permanent roads, and also states that, except for purposes of administration there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation. Among other provisions, the legislation establishes a procedure for the Secretary of the Interior to review within ten years every roadless area of five thousand contiguous acres or more in the National Park System and recommend to the President its suitability or nonsuitability as wilderness.

It is evident that this legislation defines a public use function within designated wilderness areas of the National Park System which is far more specific than the 1916 Act. The earlier legislation provided that the public shall enjoy the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife in the national parks only by such means as leave them unimpaired. Many uses, including permanent roads and accommodations, are permitted under the provisions of the 1916 Act that are prohibited in wilderness areas to be established under the 1964 law.

Wilderness area designations provide an important means for aiding management and further insuring meaningful wilderness preservation in the National Park System. Wilderness areas, by definition, provide a specialized opportunity for solitude and primitive recreation that can only be successfully pursued in designated areas by a limited number of people at one time. Wilderness area designations reaffirm that wilderness has a definite, resolute and permanent home in the National Park System. That home should be generous and rooted in ecological concepts, but it cannot be so large that it tends to deprive important numbers of traveling American families of the opportunity to identify themselves at firsthand, by a personal visit, even by automobile, with the great examples of their own national heritage preserved for them in their National Park System. The Wilderness Act adds to the original and

evolving functions of the National Park System but does not nullify or supersede what has gone before. This is made clear in Section 4(a), which states that "nothing in this Act shall modify the statutory authority under which units of the national park system are created." The public use provisions of the Wilderness Act do not take the place of those in the 1916 Act or the individual park acts, but rather supplement them in regard to those areas within each park designated by Congress as wilderness.

f. National Heritage the Unifying Theme. One concept, above all others, provides the unifying theme for the evolving functions of the National Park System. As one traces the growth of the System from "parks and pleasuring grounds," through the conservation of "scenery and natural and historic objects and wildlife therein," through historic sites, buildings and objects that provide "benefit and inspiration," through the national parkways, the reservoirs and the national seashores and lakeshores with "recreational" connotations, and through the "wilderness area" designations most recently added, the idea steadily grows that the natural, historical and recreational areas of the National Park System combine to present a superb expression of our national heritage. This heritage is to be used by the public for enjoyment, benefit and inspiration, with opportunities for solitude.

While, as far as this study is aware, the words "national heritage" do not appear in legislation, they are frequently used to characterize the System, and this has been true for at least half a century. Quite early, it was recognized that the National Park System has a favorable influence upon national citizenship by encouraging travel between different parts of the country and widening and deepening knowledge of the United States. Steve Mather wrote in his annual report for 1921 that visitors to the national parks "are impressed with the fact that there is no essential difference between the man from California and the man from Maine, the man from Florida and the man from Montana; that they are all Americans, each doing his share in the upbuilding of the Nation ..."[33]

Dr. Paul S. Buck, professor of history at Harvard University, as a young graduate student wrote his master's thesis in 1921 on The Evolution of the National Park System of the United States. It is an excellent history of the period from 1872 to 1921. Dr. Buck concluded his volume with the following interesting paragraph:

> "The influence of the national park in stimulating an intersectional travel that tends to broaden the point of view of the American people and to upbuild a national unity is possibly the greatest contribution made by the National Park System in the life of the nation. There is an attraction in thinking of the United States Government reserving and making accessible for its citizens the choicest places of beauty and grandeur in the country, of encouraging its people to visit them, and then in turn being strengthened by the better and broader spirit of Americanism which such a system engenders ..."[34]

There seems little need to alter or add to those words today.

7. Sightseeing and the National Park System.

a. Evolving Concepts of the Travel Movement.
b. Broad Aspects of the Travel Movement.
c. Abuses of Tourism.
d. Values of Well-Regulated Sightseeing in the National Park System.

DIGEST

This section points out that public use of the National Park System may be thought of as pluralistic, with different outdoor recreation activities pursued by different groups of people in different areas of the same park simultaneously. While much has been written about some of these activities, such as camping and fishing, little has been written about sightseeing, which is the principal process through which most Americans experience at first-hand their national heritage, conserved for them in their National Park System. Travel for sightseeing in the System is seen to be part of a world-wide social movement which in recent decades has brought the possibility of leisure travel within reach of many average men around the world. The broad aspects of this travel movement are outlined, as well as some of the abuses of tourism. An attempt is then made to describe the values of well-regulated sightseeing in the National Park System.

7. Sightseeing and the National Park System.

Public use of the National Park System may be thought of as pluralistic, with different outdoor recreation activities pursued by different groups of people in different areas of the same park simultaneously. Recognizing and analyzing these different activities and user groups is important to the overall management of the National Park System. Much that is helpful has been written about some of these activities such as camping, mountain climbing, back-packing, and fishing. Comparatively little has been written, however, about the predominant visitor activity in the National Park System--sightseeing. Accordingly, we will now attempt to analyze some aspects of this important activity.

Sightseeing is the principal process through which most Americans experience at firsthand their national heritage conserved for them in the National Park System. As Howard Stagner has observed, park recreation, including sightseeing, may be thought of as involving in part physical refreshment, in part mental stimulation, and in part aesthetic or historical appreciation.[35] Inadequate though the word sightseeing is to convey the full meaning of National Park System experience, this typical American activity must not be dismissed as inherently superficial and unimportant, but instead, deserves our serious study.

We begin by recognizing that sightseeing in the National Park System is to be thought of as part of a world-wide social movement which in recent decades has brought the possibility of leisure travel for the first time in history within reach of many average men around the world. We should not be misled by the fact that this movement of travel is often called tourism. Instead, let us take as our point of departure one of the conclusions of the Vatican Congress on Spiritual Values in Tourism held in Rome, Italy, April 18-21, 1967. According to Regional Director Lemuel A. Garrison who served as one of the delegates, this conference was attended by 250 representatives from 60 nations, including all the countries of western Europe, the United States, Poland, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Senegal, Sudan, Tunis, Chile and Japan. The first conclusion of the conference was that "tourism, an established fact in the consciousness of present-day man, constitutes one of the most powerful forces not only from the economic and social points of view, but also from the standpoint of the cultural and spiritual values of our time."[36]

a. Evolving Concepts of the Travel Movement.

It is perhaps worth noting that use of the word "tourist" as a synonym for "traveller" appears to go back to the early decades of the 19th century, when aristocrats and wealthy persons, who for centuries had a monopoly on travelling for pleasure, saw with distaste the rising middle class also begin to travel abroad when the railroad and steamship made it possible. Someone coined the word tourist to these middle class travellers. The somewhat condescending use of the word tourist has continued to the present day. There has also been a long-standing tendency to consider "tourism" the equivalent of "the tourist trade." This happened because the first people to promote "tourism" were those who hoped to benefit financially. The result is that writings on tourism are loaded with books and articles on travel promotion, hotels and restaurants, and other aspects of the travel business.

At least 30 years ago, however, derogatory use of the words tourist and tourism was recognized as shallow and out-of-date, when the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences published a significant article on "Tourist Traffic" by Dr. F. W. Ogilvie of England. He pointed out that the word tourist "is now used in the social sciences, without color (i.e., without prejudice), to describe any person whose movements fulfill two conditions: first, that absence from home is relatively short; and second, that money spent during absence is money derived from home and not earned in the places visited. Thus tourists may be sightseers, holiday makers, religious pilgrims, invalids in search of health, students--any travellers who, as distinct from emigrants or immigrants, intend to return home within, say, twelve months, and who, as distinct from migratory laborers, move in the capacity of consumers, not producers. Tourist traffic may be either internal, within any given country or district, or external, crossing political frontiers."

There has been notable progress in the social sciences since Dr. Ogilvie's article was written. Today tourism has become respectable as a subject for study and comment by sociologists, political scientists, anthropologists, theologians and others. Comments on it may be found in such volumes of the ORRRC report as Trends in American Living and Outdoor Recreation; in publications of the United Nations, including statements by Secretary General U Thant; in publications of learned organizations, such as the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences' book, Leisure in America: Blessing or Curse?;[38] and in the reports of religious

bodies, including the National Council of Churches,[39] and the Vatican Congress on Spiritual Values in Tourism mentioned above.

b. Broad Aspects of the Travel Movement.

One aspect of the broader travel movement has been the rapid growth of means of travel in modern industrial society. There has been some form of tourism since ancient times, but it was limited to the well-to-do or to special groups, such as pilgrims or students, until the invention of the railroad and the steamship in the 19th century made it possible for the middle class to travel and thus inaugurate modern touring. The travel explosion only came, however, with mass production of the automobile in the United States beginning about 50 years ago, and construction of a national network of excellent highways. After World War II, growing affluence in large classes of American society, including both white and blue collar workers, and a steady increase in leisure time, combined with greater mobility to produce by the 1960's a constant movement of people around the United States in a manner completely without parallel in human history. Travel in Europe and other countries of the Western World grew only a little less rapidly. Soon air transport supplemented other methods and travel between countries and continents mounted rapidly. Behind the iron curtain, Communist countries systematically organized tours for their citizens for political and social purposes, generally using public rather than private transport. Even in the Orient, travel also increased, and the recent phenomenon of millions of young Red Guards moving across the Chinese landscape to Peking and back, can be interpreted from one point of view, as in part a phenomenon of travel in Communist China. In brief, the people of the world are today vastly more mobile than at any time in human history.[40]

A second aspect of this broad travel movement is growing recognition of the right to travel. In the United States, freedom of travel has long been an accepted right. A strong case can be made that every human being within the framework of his nation's economic policies has an inherent right to travel. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1948, contains several references to travel. For example, Article 13 states that "(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state; (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country." Furthermore, Article 24 states that "everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay." Last of all,

Article 21 states that "Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country." These broad human rights, held up by the United Nations as an objective for all countries around the world, are pertinent when one begins to consider the flow and control of tourism, nationally and internationally.[41]

Thirdly, travel is widely recognized as potentially a valuable use of our growing leisure time often considered one of our major social problems in coming decades. As the Vatican Congress pointed out, tourism has the possibility of freeing the individual person for a while from the monotony of "wearing and dehumanized work," allowing him change and refreshment in new environments, where he can enjoy new experiences and at the same time come to terms with himself and with others. In the ORRRC report, Lawrence K. Frank, former Visiting Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, makes this similar observation: "Liberty in the 18th century was concerned with political freedom and escape from tyrannical governments. Today liberty is being recognized as required periodical release from the many restrictions and constraints, the continual strains and frustrations, and the severe demands imposed by the patterns of living and working according to rigid time schedules ... As one step toward the realization of liberty, we may find in outdoor recreation release from urban and industrial hazards and restrictions, with opportunities for individually selected activities carried on according to the personal needs and capacities of each one ..."[42] Travel is one of the outdoor recreation activities most frequently selected by individuals for their vacations.

Fourthly, travel may contribute toward improving understanding among diverse people and classes. Disraeli said "travelling teaches toleration." Travel tends to bring together in a common experience people of varied social and economic backgrounds, from widely separated geographical areas, and representing a broad range of nationality, racial and religious outlooks. In this sense, travel has the potential of widening peoples experiences, perhaps reducing prejudice, and contributing toward improving harmony among social groups. Applying this concept to all forms of outdoor recreation, Professor Lawrence K. Frank makes this comment: "Of especial significance today is that outdoor recreation permits and usually requires people to play together regardless of race, religion, political beliefs or other lines of demarcation. In the open, intent upon their chosen activity, people are less and less concerned about these distinctions and cleavages ... Thus the outdoors fosters associations based on common interests and shared

needs as the frontier, then all outdoors, did in our earlier history. For an urbanized, industrial civilization we face the difficult problem of developing the kind of personality-structure required for living and working close together, as participants in a social order to which each one must contribute and share responsibility."[43] It is Professor Frank's view that outdoor recreation (of which travel is an important part) may contribute toward the development of such suitable patterns for group living. Many years ago, Associate Justice Burton of the U. S. Supreme Court, after a long visit where he saw a broad cross-section of visitors, praised Yosemite National Park as a splendid example of democracy at work.

Fifthly, family travel is an important form of family experience, allowing its members "to spend together the hours of relaxation and rest and to develop the dialogue which is at the basis of family harmony." Family vacation experience includes the period of trip planning, the trip itself, and the period of trip recollection in which snapshots, mementoes and other souvenirs preserve common recollections. Family travel to visit relatives or friends is often combined with a visit to a National Park System unit. According to Dr. William Goode's "Outdoor Recreation and the Family to the Year 2000," in Volume 22 of the ORRRC report, family vacations are likely to benefit if family members can pursue different activities in a common environment. "What is particularly needed," he states, "are multipurpose outdoor facilities, which permit family members and extended kin with different tastes, ages, and goals to enjoy being together without essentially compromising their personal wishes--some will wish to be active in sports, while others may be content with studying wildflowers and watching birds."[44] This kind of diversity is found in many units of the National Park System.

Sixthly, travel may have important educational values. Each year more and more parents take their children on trips beginning at an early age believing it is good to widen their experiences. More and more schools regularly organize trips to places of historical or natural interest for their classes, in order to awaken curiosity and broaden knowledge. Adults travel to learn more about their state or their country or about other people and customs on other continents. They may seek to be stimulated by a different landscape, architecture, language or food; they may seek to discover natural beauty, view natural wonders, identify themselves with the nation's or world's history, or experience natural wilderness. Travel contributes toward education in all these and many other ways.

Lastly, travel produces important economic benefits to communities, states and the nation. The "tourist trade" is not the purpose of travel; it is a by-product. This by-product, however, possesses important economic value. No attempt will be made here to estimate the economic value of travel to the National Park System. It is perhaps sufficient here to recall economic studies of such parks as Great Smoky Mountains, Grand Teton, Yellowstone and Glacier, to establish the fact that such travel has major economic impact on the communities and states involved. It is also true that international travel has a significant effect on trade balances, so much so that one of the principal motives behind the "Discover America" program has been to keep more American travel dollars at home. It is also well known that travel can be a major factor in the economy of a developing country as the endless army of tourists seeks new sights and new experiences in countries thought of as "off the beaten track."

The remarkable growth of international travel can be seen in the following table, issued by the United Nations:[45]

Region	Tourist Arrivals (thousands)				Tourist Receipts (millions of $)			
	1950	1963	1965	1966*	1950	1963	1965	1966*
Europe	16,839	66,163	85,933	95,500	890	5,437	7,249	8,120
North America	6,180	16,449	19,394	20,750	668	1,483	1,903	2,130
Near and Middle East	197	2,090	2,835	3,290	26	164	297	340
Latin America and the Caribbean	1,305	3,247	3,579	4,150	392	1,253	1,365	1,502
Africa	523	1,299	2,083	2,250	88	225	296	325
Asia and Australia	237	1,616	1,829	2,050	36	-	524	580
Total	25,281	90,864	115,893	127,990	2,100	9,051	11,634	12,997

*IUOTO (International Union of Official Travel Organizations) estimates.

It will be seen that the volume of international travel has multiplied five times since 1950, and now numbers almost 128,000,000

tourist arrivals a year throughout the world. Measured either by rate of growth or total participation, travel has become a major international activity.

c. Abuses of Tourism. A long catalogue of articles deploring the evils of tourism could be prepared with little effort to offset this favorable view and would include Michael Frome's denunciation of commercialism at Gettysburg which appeared two or three years ago in Changing Times, and Walter Muir Whitehill's caustic remarks in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Tourist, Stay Home!"

We are all familiar through personal experience with many obvious objections to unregulated tourism. Some objections relate to the quantity of tourist travel, and involve mounting traffic volume with concomitant increase in parking problems, highway accidents, traffic snarls and jams, bent fenders, noxious exhaust gases, honking horns, crowded accommodations, waiting in long lines, and a hundred small and large irritations and frustrations associated with automobile touring, especially at peak periods. Some of these objections relate to the quality of the touring experience and may involve views that "many persons are not mentally prepared properly to appreciate parks and historic sites;" "tourists are anonymous mass travellers;" and that the experiences most tourists have are "superficial and routine." But, as Professor Bernard Lemann of Tulane University has written about New Orleans' Vieux Carré: "There will always be the shallow kind of historicism, the gaping, empty and bored kind of tourism, the cheap commercialized travesty of historic taste, and other false values or misguided intentions. Yet who is to judge between these and the first worthy impulse, the genuine response to some ephemeral impression, an idling glance or ruminating thought that seeks no deep penetration, nor specific historic data, yet avoids ... indifference?"[46]

Last of all, there is the commercial exploitation of genuine values. The offensive multiplication of hot dog stands, tourist traps of all kinds, fake museums, and other money making enterprises near or in areas of serious importance becomes in some cases a public disgrace. It remains true that within the boundaries of the National Park System commercialism is at a minimum and this is now, and has always been, one of the System's basic objectives. The Vatican Congress warned developing countries where tourism is rapidly expanding of the necessity of protecting themselves "against the psychological and moral degradation which may arise from a mercenary tourism," and of "defending in all the sense of a personal and national dignity." This warning would be equally appropriate for developed countries, including the United States.

Serious as these problems are, we should not allow our perception of the basic values of travel to be unduly distorted by them. It is easy to throw up one's hands and denounce the whole tourism kettle of fish. We should have the perception to see that travel is a tremendously significant national and world-wide social phenomenon to be guided, not fought. The need is for intelligently regulated sightseeing. This is what we seek and hope to provide in the National Park System.

d. Values of Well-Regulated Sightseeing in the National Park System.

(1) General values. One can properly claim that well-regulated sightseeing in the System contributes an important share to the general values of travel in the United States outlined above. It is also well to remember that the American people appreciate and strongly support the concept that their government is preserving the superlative natural, historical and recreational places of America for their enjoyment, and has provided carefully designed public facilities in each area so they may derive benefit from their visits. The National Park System is distinguished for its non-commercial character, and for the fact that visits to the parks are comparatively inexpensive. These public benefits are an important element in the steady growth of public use of the System.

The National Park System is indelibly identified with the great national parks of the West. Newton B. Drury testified eloquently to their general role "in lifting people out of their everyday routine, in opening to them new vistas, in revealing to them something of the majesty of this country when first viewed by the explorers and the pioneers, in teaching them through interpretive methods the story of earth-building processes through the milleniums, the evolution of plant and animal life and the relation of these to each other and to their environment ..."[47]

Let us touch briefly on some other values, not always noted.

(2) Civic value. In his "Life of Mather," Robert Shankland reports this conversation between Gilbert Stanley Underwood and Steve Mather about the national parks: "They belong to everybody," Mather said. "We've got to do what we can to see that nobody stays away because he can't afford it." Underwood replied: "I hear lots of complaints about the tin-canners. They dirty up the parks. Strew cans and papers all over." Mather replied: "What if they do? They own as much of the parks as anybody else ... It's a cheap way to make better citizens."[48]

(3) Value to nation. Victor Hugo had a saying about the French national theater of his day: "In the theater, the mob becomes a people." A mass of unrelated individuals go through a common experience, reflecting their nation's history and thus lose their mob character and become a people. Similarly, American tourists who have seen Yosemite Valley, Independence Hall, the Statue of Liberty, Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, or other national possessions, have something in common that transcends regional, class, ethnic, racial, religious or economic lines. This is a valuable contribution to the unity of the nation, and in war-time is reflected in the fact that pictures of the national parks are preferred ornaments on the walls of Red Cross clubs overseas as emblems of home for everybody, even those who have never visited them. Today the need for national unity is felt perhaps more keenly than ever.

(4) Appreciation of natural beauty. The aesthetic appeal of the national parks was well described by Miss Harlean James in a discussion of the philosophy of parks and people in her excellent book, Romance of the National Parks. "One of the proverbial joys of youth comes from pleasure in physical movement and muscular well-being ... But far beyond the pleasure of walking or riding horseback in the ordinary open country, indulging the eyes in pleasant prospects, feeling the welcome warmth of the sun and the revivifying breezes of the air, is the spiritual uplift which comes from the contemplation of superlative scenery. Man is indeed 'in tune with the infinite' when he scales high mountains and looks upon stupendous scenes."[49] As Senator Gaylord Nelson pointed out in May 1965 during a White House Conference (on the subject of natural beauty), natural beauty makes a common appeal to everyone and crosses all geographic, political, educational and class lines. George Trevelyan called it "the highest common denominator in the spiritual life of today." Miss James recognizes the limitations of automobile travel as a means of experiencing natural beauty and considers frequent "lookouts" and walks on nearby trails that radiate from every camp, lodge, and visitor center as an indispensable minimum. "But the automobile is not to be despised. It carries the most ardent of walkers and horseback riders to the portals of the wilderness. It makes it possible for everyone to reach the high places on the face of the earth. Sometimes only a few hundred yards from a highway, one may find lonesome-looking places and may sense in some degree the excitement of standing alone to gaze on far distant views. But, as one who stands high on a 'peak in Darien,' it is the lover of Nature who strays from the beaten path and the man-made trails who may reach the most sublime heights of emotional and spiritual climax. These are super-experiences to be remembered and treasured as long as one lives."[50]

(5) Appreciation of American history. The contribution of the National Park System to the appreciation of American history is described in the Service brochure, That the Past Shall Live. "Americans," it says, "need to view the great memorials of their historic past, and through them to understand and more thoroughly appreciate their national heritage. Today, for the people of the United States, this need is perhaps greater than at any other time. Subjected unrelentingly to the threats and tensions of an uncertain world, they are drawn in increasing numbers to reestablish contact with the nation's past ... Year by year increasing millions are finding the answers to these questions in the historic sites and shrines of the National Park System which keep fresh and alive the story of the forces and processes that combined to shape our nation and our land."[51]

We know that popular history may be abused, but we also know that historical interests have deep roots. Dr. William J. Goode, Professor of Sociology at Columbia University, comments in the ORRRC report on "the increasing interest of American families in all of their past, as well as in the grand natural environment in which some of that past was enacted. Just as the grandchildren of the immigrant no longer feel ashamed of their Italian or Yugoslavian ancestors, now that they are securely and definitely American, so do the grandchildren of the farmer gain a new perspective on the beautiful but sometimes harsh and forbidding regions in which their ancestors tried to make a hard-scrabble living. Folk songs become big business, square dancing becomes socially acceptable, regional food products are sold to the urban gourmet, and tourists as they pass through national and state parks, buy dolls, furniture, or hearth brooms for their decorative value. The European intellectual's charge that the American has no sense of history has perhaps been correct in the past, but becomes increasingly false, as Americans impress upon their children the reality of their family and regional heritage, and in their utilization of outdoor recreation facilities remind them of it by direct participation."[52]

(6) Educational values. Sightseeing in the National Park System provides the stimulation of great places of scenery and history and awakens curiosity and the desire for knowledge. For many persons, recreation, important as it is, is not enough. They want to gain at least some new knowledge and understanding of nature or science, history or art from their leisure and their travel--for themselves and for their children. The National Park System, presenting natural wonders and places of great human drama to

families on tour, is an immense outdoor museum where knowledge can be gained on the very spot where questions come to mind. The interpretive program offered by the Service is an invaluable aid to sightseers in widening and deepening their knowledge of nature and history.[53]

(7) National symbol to foreign visitors. Foreign travel to the United States is steadily increasing. Travellers are interested, not only in our skyscrapers and our technology, but also in our historic, cultural and natural heritage. These are often the values to which a foreign traveller responds most readily.

Some foreign visitors have only time enough to visit eastern metropolitan areas. When this happens, they almost certainly will include in their visit the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, and some other public park areas in Washington, D. C.; Independence Hall in Philadelphia; and at least a distant view of the Statue of Liberty in New York City. They may explore some nearby countryside, possibly the George Washington Memorial Parkway, or Shenandoah National Park. If their trip is transcontinental, many arrange to visit Grand Canyon, Yosemite, or Yellowstone, and possibly other western national parks. Travellers from South America may view El Morro in San Juan, Puerto Rico; and visitors from the Orient may see the Alaskan and Hawaiian national parks. The U. S. Travel Service is currently engaged in a major program to attract more foreign visitors to the United States. There are no totals for foreign visitors to the National Park System, but by now it must be substantial and still growing, having been often encouraged by the State Department, the Department of Commerce, and other Federal agencies which usually deliberately route foreign VIP's to one or more units of the System. The story of the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia is now available in seven languages, and a number of other parks find growing demand for bi-lingual interpretation. While foreign visitors have always sought out the national parks, the growing role of the United States in world affairs makes the value of the National Park System as a national symbol to foreign visitors more important than ever before in our history.

8. Estimating Public Use of the National Park System to the Year 2000.

a. Population Growth.
b. Increases in Outdoor Recreation.
c. Public Use in the National Park System.

DIGEST

It is often estimated that the 1960 population of the United States will almost double by the year 2000. Outdoor recreation activities generally are increasing at twice the rate of population growth. According to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's most recent survey, outdoor recreation activities will double their 1960 figure by 1980 and quadruple it by 2000. This is because leisure time, income and mobility are all increasing much more rapidly than population. But travel to the National Park System is one of the fastest growing segments of outdoor recreation. The 1960 National Park System travel total will have doubled by 1967 instead of 1980 and will have more than quadrupled by 1976 instead of 2000. The growth rate for National Park System travel is such that a travel year of one billion by 2000 no longer appears fantastic.

8. Estimating Public Use of the National Park System to the Year 2000.

a. Population Growth. In 1960 the population of the United States was 179,000,000. A widely accepted estimate for our population in the year 2000 is 350,000,000. This means the 1960 population will have approximately doubled by the end of the century unless widely discussed possibilities of population control materially alter current trends. It is always possible that the gravity of unrestrained population growth will eventually bring control that will ease the problem of growing public use of the National Park System. So much of growth in park use comes from other factors than population that we believe the basic analysis in this study will probably remain generally sound under foreseeable conditions. If National Park System travel increases in direct proportion to population, it will rise from 72,000,000 in 1960 to 144,000,000 in 2000. That figure was exceeded even in 1967. We must, therefore, look further.

b. Increases in Outdoor Recreation. ORRRC's National Recreation Survey made projections for all outdoor recreation activities in the United States to the year 2000. Those projections have now (1967) been up-dated by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to reflect the results of a comprehensive follow-up survey of summertime outdoor recreation activities for 1965.[54] These projections show that outdoor recreation activities in the United States will increase far more rapidly than population during the rest of the century. While population will almost double by 2000, outdoor recreation will double by 1980 and quadruple by 2000. In other words, outdoor recreation activity is increasing at least twice as rapidly as population. This is because leisure, mobility, and income are increasing much more rapidly than population.

Passive outdoor pursuits will more than double their 1960 figure by 1980 and triple by 2000, which is somewhat slower growth rate than outdoor recreation as a whole. However, sightseeing, one of the principal activities in the National Park System, will more than double by 1980 and quadruple by 2000. Walking for pleasure, another important activity in the System, will grow even more rapidly, almost tripling by 1980 and increasing four and one-half times by 2000.

Backwoods recreation will also increase rapidly. Camping will almost triple by 1980 and quintuple by 2000. Hiking will more than double by 1980 and almost quintuple by the end of the century.

Water sports show some variations. Fishing will increase one and a half times by 1980 and only about double by the year 2000. Boating, however, will more than double by 1980 and quadruple by the year 2000. Swimming will multiply almost two and one-half times by 1980 and more than quadruple by the year 2000.

Physically active recreation of youth will grow rapidly, tripling by 1980 and quintupling by 2000. Bicycling will almost triple by 1980 and quadruple by 2000. Horseback riding will grow rapidly but not as fast as outdoor games and sports, which will multiply almost six times by 2000.

Considering these various special growth rates collectively, if public use of the National Park System increases in direct proportion to outdoor recreation in general, it will double from 72,000,000 in 1960 to 144,000,000 in 1980, and quadruple to 288,000,000 by 2000. This would represent something less than doubling 1967 travel by the end of the century. We know, however, that travel to the National Park System is already increasing much more rapidly than that. It is growing not only at a much faster rate than population, but also at a much faster rate than outdoor recreation generally.

c. Public Use of National Park System.

(1) Estimates by Marion Clawson in 1959. In an extremely perceptive paper called "The Crisis in Outdoor Recreation," published in 1959, Marion Clawson differentiated between user-oriented recreation areas located quite close to people who use them, such as city and county parks; intermediate recreation areas which are relatively accessible but contain more natural environment, such as state parks and reservoir areas; and resource-based recreation areas, including outstanding examples of natural beauty, whether of mountain, lake, forest or desert, and unique historic and scientific sites. The principal areas in this last category, he pointed out, are the National Park System and the national forests.

Marion Clawson then attempted to estimate the probable growth in demand for each of these three types of recreation areas by 2000. His results are very interesting. His starting point was an estimated ten-fold increase in the total demand for outdoor recreation between 1950 and 2000. He then estimated that public demand for user-oriented recreation areas would quadruple between 1950 and 2000; for intermediate areas it would increase sixteen times; but for resource-based areas, such as the National Park System, public demand might well multiply forty times between 1950 and 2000.

The reasons Mr. Clawson gave for believing the growth rates would vary are very interesting, although sketchy. He considered that two factors--large urban population and more leisure time--would increase the demand for user-oriented areas, but that two other factors--higher incomes and greater mobility--would have little importance for this type of area. In fact, he conjectured that these forces might tend to divert more prosperous and mobile seekers of outdoor recreation to places farther from home. He foresaw a much greater increase in demand for intermediate areas because of large rises in average income and annual travel. But he concluded that "lack of time and money still keeps many families from trips to distant national parks and forests. With higher family incomes and longer vacations, the potential demand in the year 2000 may well be forty times what it has been in the recent past."[55]

(2) Estimates by the National Park Service. How does the actual experience of the National Park Service compare with these estimates? What public use of the System does the Service now project for the future?

For eight years since Marion Clawson's 1959 predictions, visitors have been pouring into the National Park System. If one uses 1950 as a base, as he did, total travel to the National Park System was 33,000,000. By 1960, this number had increased to 72,000,000, and by 1966, to 133,000,000. In other words, travel has multiplied over four times in sixteen years.

In April 1967, the Service issued to its key officials, for in-Service use, projections of visits to the National Park System through 1976.[56] In this valuable document, it is estimated that travel to the System will total almost 347,000,000 by 1976, representing a ten-fold increase over 1950. The National Park Service has not carried its own projections for the System beyond 1976, but its statisticians are well aware of the serious nature and tremendous dimensions of the long-time travel trend as seen today.

Of course, one must remember that part of the increase in travel to the National Park System represents new areas. Nevertheless, the projections for increases in travel to some of the long-established areas are sufficient to reveal how general the increases are. The following table presents data for some well-known areas in each category of the System:

	Actual 1950	Actual 1960	Estimated 1967	Projection 1976
Natural Areas				
Yosemite	821,000	1,150,400	2,091,000	3,010,000
Yellowstone	1,110,500	1,443,300	2,283,000	3,281,000
Great Smokies	1,843,600	4,528,600	7,263,000	9,934,000
Historical Areas				
Independence (1951)	769,200	1,595,000	2,960,000	4,888,000
Lincoln Memorial	2,065,600	2,488,200	4,884,000	8,103,000
Gettysburg	656,000	1,336,000	4,562,000	10,392,000
Recreation Areas				
Blue Ridge	1,996,400	5,503,200	8,638,000	12,527,000
Lake Mead	1,798,300	2,254,200	3,843,000	4,953,000
Cape Hatteras (1955)	264,500	467,300	1,179,000	1,594,000

Any projected figures for the year 2000 would, of course, be highly conjectural. A mathematical projection of the 1950-1976 trend to the year 2000 is not presently available to this writer. It appears to be the case, however, that 1950 travel to the National Park System will have multiplied something like ten times by 1976, to a total of 347,000,000. If there were to be another ten-fold increase during the next 26 years, travel would rise by the year 2002 (only 34 years away), to the astronomical (and ridiculous) figure of 3,470,000,000, or 100 times 1950 travel. These fantastic figures suggest, however, that it would not be prudent to laugh Marion Clawson's rough conjecture of 40 times 1950 travel by the year 2000 entirely out of the ball park. A National Park System travel year of one billion visits, or three times 1976 travel by 2000, no longer seems fantastic.

9. Regulating Public Use (Part One).

a. Dispersing Visitors Outside the System.

(1) Promoting alternate recreation areas.
(2) Diverting "recreationists" to less unique areas.
(3) Providing overnight facilities outside the national parks.
(4) Providing alternate routes for nonpark traffic.

b. Limiting Developments, Land Uses and Vehicles in Each Park.

(1) Limiting developments.
(2) Limiting land uses.
(3) Vehicular controls.

DIGEST

The first part of this section reviews basic ideas for dispersing visitors outside the System. While merit is seen in some of these ideas, the conclusion is reached that at best they can make only a limited contribution to regulating mounting park travel because there is no substitute for a visit to a national park. The second part of this section then reviews concepts and methods for regulating public use inside the parks through park developments, land classification, including wilderness area designations, and vehicular controls, including new transportation systems.

9. Regulating Public Use (Part One).

The 1916 Act says the National Park Service shall "promote and regulate" the use of the National Park System. We have reviewed the eras, particularly 1916-1929, when much attention was necessarily given by Steve Mather and Horace Albright to promoting public use of the System. Without that promotion, the System might not have survived its infancy. We will now turn to the growth of concepts and methods for regulating public use. We will consider this subject in two parts. In Part One we will review ideas for dispersing visitors outside the System, which are frequently advocated nowadays as a means of reducing impact. In this part we will also review concepts for regulating public use through controls over physical facilities, including developments, land uses, and vehicles. Later on, in Part Two, we will review concepts and methods for regulating public use through direct controls over visitors.

a. Dispersing Visitors Outside the System. In this section we will review four different ideas about dispersing visitors outside the System as a method of relieving the mounting pressure of travel on the National Park System.

(1) Promoting alternate recreation areas. A favorite idea for relieving pressure of public use on the National Park System, particularly the national parks, is to develop more recreation facilities in state parks, national and state forests, reservoir and other recreation areas to take up the visitor load. Steve Mather promoted an early version of this idea in 1921--the National Conference on State Parks. The Service deserves credit as an originator of this idea and its sponsor for half a century. In Mather's time the real pressure on the System was not so much over-use of national parks by the public as the demand to add unqualified areas to the System. The state park concept was valuable, in itself, but it also provided suitable status for many unqualified national park proposals. In later years, however, state parks also came to be looked upon as safety valves for mounting travel. Although state parks multiplied during the 1930's, travel to the national parks continued to mount. Many planners then looked to the growing number of large reservoir areas, such as Lake Mead, as outlets for recreation seekers, as well as to the expansion of recreation facilities on national and state forest lands. All these measures were launched and still national park travel mounted. The development of Millerton Lake has not materially reduced travel to Sequoia any more than Colonial Williamsburg has lessened travel to Jamestown, or Pennsylvania's

attention to Valley Forge reduced travel to Independence Hall. The ORRRC study was made, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation established, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund inaugurated. National park travel is greater than ever. These many measures, undoubtedly, have helped meet rapidly mounting public demand for outdoor recreation and must be continued and expanded. But what is often overlooked is that there is no substitute for a visit to a national park. Grand Canyon is unique. So is Yosemite Valley, Gettysburg Battlefield, Cape Cod, and each unit of the System. If a citizen of the United States really wants to see and experience his national heritage, he has to visit the National Park System.

(2) Diverting "recreationists" to other areas. This is a variation of the first concept, based on the assumption that a great many national park visitors come, not for a unique experience, but only in search of a place to pursue ordinary forms of outdoor recreation, which it is considered they could just as well pursue elsewhere if facilities were available. There may be some condescension toward the average traveller implicit in this assumption, but more important, there is no hard evidence that any large proportion of visitors to the national parks do, in fact, come just for ordinary recreation. For example, this assumption appears to be contradicted by statistics for Yosemite. In 1966 almost 55 percent of Yosemite visitors were day-users, and an additional 26 percent stayed three days or less. Most of these visitors--all of whom paid a fee to enter the park--must have been sightseers. What evidence is there that they were "recreationists?" And what citizen is qualified to say why another citizen came to a national park and what he got out of his visit? In recent years extensive facilities for active physical recreation have been added to state parks, national forests, reservoir areas, and beaches in California, but travel to Yosemite continues to mount. Taking a swim in a California reservoir or camping in a national forest, valuable as these activities may be, does not serve most people as a substitute for a visit to Yosemite National Park.

(3) Providing overnight facilities outside the national parks. The National Park Service is parent of the concept of eliminating overnight accommodations (except campgrounds) inside the parks to minimize intrusions and lessen impact. Implementation of this idea led into regional planning. Lately, this idea has been taken up by others who now claim it as a new concept. The principle of eliminating overnight accommodations was first applied over thirty-seven years ago in plans for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Except for Le Conte Lodge, no overnight accommodations, except

campgrounds, have been permitted in the park since it was established in 1930. This same idea was subsequently adopted for Acadia National Park, Cape Hatteras, and Cape Cod, among other places. Has this policy solved the problem? Undoubtedly it has reduced construction of buildings in the parks and lessened some kinds of physical intrusion. It must also be noted, however, that by this policy noncamping visitors are denied the cycle of the day and night in a supreme environment because there are no overnight accommodations for them. The National Park Service and the visitors have accepted this sacrifice as necessary. While it has lessened intrusions, it has not solved the main problem. Travel to the Great Smokies has mounted at an even greater rate than travel to most other national parks, and it is now the most heavily visited park in the System. In Acadia National Park, where the Service also prohibits overnight accommodations, except campgrounds, visits in 1966, though briefer in duration, exceeded in number the visits to Yellowstone. Furthermore, Acadia and Yellowstone travel are projected to grow at almost the same rate through 1976 though Yellowstone has overnight accommodations and Acadia does not. In weighing the advantages of sparing a national park the intrusion of overnight accommodations, one must remember that visitors who stay outside the park use the park roads twice each day, coming and going, and road use increases correspondingly.

Some commentators now advocate prohibiting campgrounds as well as other overnight accommodations inside the national parks. Or to put it perhaps more accurately, they would at the very least stabilize the number of campsites inside the national parks at present levels and locate new campgrounds and campsites outside. This proposal apparently has two purposes. One purpose is to spare the national parks the physical intrusion of additional campgrounds. The second purpose, which may be more accurately characterized as a hope, is to divert potential national park users to surrounding areas of pleasing natural environment and thus reduce the visitor load on the national parks.

Limiting national park travel to day-users represents a major sacrifice of quality in national park experience. And even if one reluctantly agrees to prohibit such types of overnight accommodation as lodges and cabins, the idea of also prohibiting additional campgrounds in these millions of acres set aside as "park and pleasuring grounds" strikes one as requiring very substantial justification. No American outdoor experience is more deeply rooted than camping or more valued as a link to the American past. To camp in a national park is doubly meaningful to many people. It is difficult to believe

that preservation problems have become so serious that additional camping in carefully selected locations must now be ruled out as not a legitimate use of a large national park.

This does not mean that more campgrounds are not needed outside as well as inside the national parks. They are badly needed and should be provided for as part of current regional planning. Nevertheless, there is little evidence to show that after they are built, park travel will be substantially reduced. There are campgrounds outside but near national parks in many places today, and their number is increasing. National park travel continues to mount, because these campers become day-users of the adjoining national parks.

(4) Providing alternate routes for non-park traffic. The effort to eliminate non-park traffic from park roads by providing alternate and more attractive routes for such travel around the park is highly important. It can be demonstrated that perhaps a good many travellers in some national parks are "through" travellers simply seeking a destination on the other side of the park. In some areas non-park travel, including business travel, may be fairly large. Director Hartzog is energetically pursuing an effort at the present time to route non-park travel around Yellowstone. This effort, and other similar efforts, should materially help in limiting park travel to park users.

b. Limiting Developments, Land Uses, and Vehicles in Each Park to Control Public Use. A separate discussion of each of these three subjects follows.

(1) Limiting developments. A favorite idea of some commentators is that travel to the national parks is attracted to a considerable extent by the developments inside the park, such as lodges, campgrounds and visitor centers, rather than by the magnificent scenery, the unique natural features, the abundant wildlife, or the other essential qualities of a national park. The corollary of this idea is that if only the National Park Service would stop developments, travel would cease growing and the parks would be safe.

This concept is like saying that the cock crowing makes the sun rise. To realize the basic absurdity of this idea, it is only necessary to recall a few facts. The United States has built at great expense an amazing network of interstate highways, designed for high-speed, non-stop travel to every section of the nation. The people of the United States now own over 78,000,000 modern

automobiles, and they have rising incomes and increasing leisure time for travel. The national parks are famous around the world and are lifetime travel objectives for a great many American citizens and their families. The idea that the pressure of this travel can be stopped just short of its destination in the national parks by refusing to provide facilities there for visitors, strikes one--to be polite about it--as somewhat superficial. Most visitors come to the national parks to see the parks, not to see the developments. It does not help in seeking a wise course of action to sponsor the derogatory idea that mounting travel is the result of developments built by the National Park Service rather than face up to the fact that park developments are a necessary response to legitimate travel and will continue to be so unless travel is limited by a new national policy. We must, of course recognize that the problem of mounting travel will also never be solved simply by adding new and well-designed developments to correspond with demand. That course has no end, and is opposed not only by lovers of wilderness but also by many sightseers. A majority of the American people today are aroused about ugliness and overcrowding. They, too, are looking for a better solution to their problems than the automatic addition of more developments as travel grows, with no end in sight to the whittling away of natural beauty. Therefore, an end--at least of unrestricted automobile travel--must be projected on some kind of understandable formula. This is a requirement of National Park System administration, unless in the meantime the tide of travel is arrested by population control, war, or depression. It means eventually establishing a publicly acceptable "carrying capacity" for each park so that one ten-year development program is not followed by another and another right up to the year 2000.

Limiting construction of new roads. This subject is carefully reviewed in the new "Compilation of Administrative Policies for the National Parks and National Monuments of Scientific Significance (Natural Areas)." It is pointed out there that Secretary Lane's famous 1918 letter to Steve Mather set forth a policy of encouraging access to national parks by any means practicable. Subsequently, Director Mather stated "it is not the plan to have the parks grid-ironed by roads, but in each it is desired to make a good sensible road system so that visitors may have a good chance to enjoy them. At the same time, large sections of each park will be kept in a natural wilderness state ..."[57] During the 1930's, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes laid down a dictum practically prohibiting the construction of new roads in established national parks. In the above-mentioned codification of Service policies,

we are returning from Secretary Ickes' policy to Mather's policy. In that document, limits to future additions to the road systems are set by the phrases "a good sensible road system" and "large sections of each park ... kept in a natural wilderness state." Within these limits road locations must be cleared by the Chief Scientist and the Assistant Director for Interpretation. At peak seasons, private vehicular travel will be supplemented by shuttle bus service, to diminish congestion and increase safety. As a further aid in dealing with this vital subject, Director Hartzog has recently appointed a Committee on Roads, composed of key staff members and distinguished conservationists to make further recommendations on policies and standards.

The restatement of Steve Mather's policy is, in part, the consequence of mounting pressure from travel, far exceeding the projections of MISSION 66. The principal ways to avoid building some new roads by 1970, or at least 1980, would appear to be through (1) making more efficient use of roads we now have and developing alternative means of transportation; (2) altering the balance of park use to give greater emphasis to back-country recreation and less to sightseeing; (3) altering the policy that anyone can visit a national park by establishing a ceiling on capacity at any one time. More efficient use of present roads and new methods of transportation are in progress in the National Park System and will substantially help the situation. However, the rate and extent of this progress does not appear likely under present conditions to keep pace with mounting travel. It is the viewpoint of this report that the Wilderness Act does not constitute a mandate to alter the balance of park use. Ceilings on park capacity therefore appear to be inevitable, but they will take at least ten or twenty years to work out. In the meantime, some carefully designed new road construction to meet public use needs may be justified in some cases.

It may also be noted here that converting two-way roads to one-way roads may in some instances increase their carrying capacity, thus enlarging the number of visitors served without the necessity of building new facilities. As Superintendent of Yellowstone, Regional Director Lon Garrison developed an interesting proposal to make the Yellowstone Loop (except for the cross-bar) a one-way road for this reason. As he points out, until 1916 this loop was a one-way road and the Service might well consider returning to that earlier pattern. He also proposed large parking areas near each entrance and public bus transportation within the park. These proposals merit careful study.

(2) Limiting land uses. There is a marked trend in park planning today to regulate public use in part by classifying lands into categories andin various ways limiting the public uses permitted in each category. This approach has much merit and offers an important tool both for analysis and management of public use.

(a) Wilderness area designations. The most conspicuous example of classifying land for limited public use is the designation of wilderness areas within the National Park System. The process of classification is now underway and must be completed within ten years of the effective date of the Wilderness Act of 1964. It is estimated that some 60 to 90 percent of the area within many of the national parks and monuments may be classified as wilderness. The percentage will vary from area to area within this general range. The wilderness area designations, based upon a coherent philosophy, extended hearings in Congress, and helpful definitions of wilderness use in the legislation itself, provide an important tool in managing and further insuring meaningful wilderness preservation in the National Park System.

We are obliged to note, however, that the precise extent of designations in particular parks poses difficult problems, some of which may stem in part from different interpretations of the meaning of the Wilderness Act. It has been sometimes contended that the Wilderness Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to set aside as wilderness every square foot of national park land that qualifies under the law. For example, Stewart M. Brandborg, Executive Director of the Wilderness Society, in his otherwise thoughtful statement for the Great Smoky Mountains wilderness hearing said, in part: "The Wilderness Plan the Wilderness Society and many other conservation groups are supporting is based on the Wilderness Act's requirement that all of the land within the park which qualifies under the Act's definition for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System will be given Wilderness System protection."[58] The law, in fact, makes no such requirement. The favorable report of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House on the Wilderness bill, presented by Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall on July 30, 1964, specifically stated as one of the underlying principles for a National Wilderness System that "areas within units of the national park system and the national wildlife system should not be considered for inclusion in the wilderness system until completion of a thorough review during which all interested parties have an opportunity to be heard."[59] Furthermore, the Wilderness Act itself states that "nothing in this Act shall modify the statutory authority under which units of the national park system were created ..."

Even though designation of every eligible square foot as wilderness may not be legally required, many conservationists believe that it was the spirit and intent of the act that practically all eligible wilderness should be so classified. Here we come to a crucial point. Wilderness designation is not only a preservation measure. It earmarks park land for a particular form of public use. The effect of each designation is to assign those solely for wilderness enjoyment and inspiration or, in the less happy official language of the ORRRC report, for "backwoods recreation." Land so reserved is not available for any form of park use that requires an automobile for access. Wilderness designation gives preference to one form of traditional park use (such as back-country hiking) over another (such as sightseeing and camping from an automobile). These, then, are the competing forms of park use, which represent part (though by no means all) of what is involved in current controversies. The issue is not simply wilderness preservation versus mounting public use, but also one form of public use versus another.

What was the intent of Congress in regard to public use of the national parks when the Wilderness Act was passed? Undoubtedly some individual members of Congress were concerned about the effect of mounting travel on the national parks and opposed at least some proposed developments, such as new roads which would increase automobile travel. In this sense some individuals may have considered sightseeing had gone far enough. There is no good evidence, however, that this was the specific position of any member of Congress who voted for the bill. Even if there were a few such individuals, this is not the same thing as concluding that Congress intended that the Wilderness Act should alter the structure of purposes built into the National Park System in a long series of measures enacted during the ninety-two years between 1872 and 1964. As this report demonstrates in other sections, one of the fundamental objectives of Congress over the years has been to make the national parks accessible to the people of the United States. It has been widely believed over the years not only that it is beneficial to individuals and families to visit the national parks, but that their visits are also good for the country.

It should be made clear that some of the most responsible advocates of the largest possible wilderness designations within the National Park System present their viewpoints persuasively as a "pro-people" policy. In one of his last public statements, Dr. Howard Zahniser, an always thoughtful, eloquent and profound advocate of wilderness preservation, said:

"We have learned from our studies that wilderness preservation, an important aspect of our culture--not an exception from it--was nevertheless something that could be expected to endure in our culture only if it is deliberately valued as wilderness; that we and our forebears had already been through the history in which wilderness could exist just because there wasn't anything else to do with it; that we were already forced to recognize that all the wilderness that there ever will be will be the wilderness that we deliberately determine to use as wilderness. All our land is going to be put to some use. To have any wilderness is to require our recognizing wilderness preservation as one of the important uses. * * *

"And that leads me to a further point on which we base our conviction of the necessity; we are not advocating a program for The Wilderness Society or the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs; we are advocating a program for the people of the United States of America. In Congress assembled--by the Senate, by the House--we are asking the whole people to espouse something that we, in our conviction of the public interest, have come to regard so highly that we will put great effort into it. The fact is that we are asking the whole people to espouse, and to dedicate some of their brains to, a purpose that we, in their behalf as well as in our own, have been the ones with the privilege of perceiving its value. We are asking for a national consensus, and the significance may not be how far we can move with this important first step but in the fact that so many people take that step."[60]

This is a superb statement. With all of its appeal, we must still recognize that the Wilderness Act added to the original public use functions of the National Park System, but did not supersede them except in designated wilderness areas. Substantial wilderness designations are essential and so is the continuation of substantial public use.

(b) Other land classifications. Going beyond wilderness area designations, the ORRRC report recommended that all outdoor recreation lands, including those in the National Park System, be assigned to one of six classes--high density areas; general outdoor recreation areas; natural environment areas; unique natural areas; and historic and cultural sites.[61] This classification has been adopted by the National Park Service and is now being applied to each unit of the

System through the master plan process. It provides another important tool in dealing with the impact of mounting public use. Nevertheless, this land classification system also presents serious problems.

Estimating future demand for Class I (high density areas) and Class II (general outdoor recreation areas). There is an understandable tendency for Service planners concerned with land classification for master plan purposes, to reserve enough land in each park for Class I (high density uses) and Class II (general outdoor recreation areas) to accommodate the public use needs of the park for "foreseeable future expansion." What is the "foreseeable future?" Considering the fact that a national commission, ORRRC, projected outdoor recreation needs to the year 2000; and that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, exercising authorities granted by Congress for several purposes, including the preparation of a National Recreation Plan, is also projecting needs to the year 2000 and periodically revising and up-dating its data, which is available to all Federal agencies, it would appear that "the foreseeable future" for broad planning purposes should be the year 2000. The Outdoor Recreation Act declares that it is national policy for "all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action." This would seem to require that overall plans for the National Park System and projections of its future use should tie in with the National Recreation Plan, which will be revised every five years for transmittal to Congress. Individual park master plans may require shorter planning increments within the overall period.

If we accept the year 2000 as "the foreseeable future," what land will need to be reserved for expansion of "high density areas" and "general recreation areas" in the national parks? Official National Park Service projections of travel go to 1976 only. By that time, for example, Yosemite travel will increase from a 1966 level of 1,817,000 to 3,010,000. Great Smokies travel will increase from 6,466,000 to 9,934,000. These figures would seem to require reserving enough land for a possible fifty or sixty percent expansion of high density and general recreation use.

Let us, however, try to project these 1976 figures to the year 2000 in a very crude way. If we agree that sightseeing is the principal visitor use of Yosemite, then we can take the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's projection of the increased demand for sightseeing to the year 2000 as one guide to a rough estimate. BOR calculates that sightseeing will quadruple the 1960 figure by 2000. Yosemite had 1,817,000 visitors in 1960 and the estimate for 2000 would then become 7,268,400. Since visits to national

parks increase several times more rapidly than outdoor recreation activities generally, this figure is probably conservative. If it were taken as a basis for designating lands for future high density and general recreation uses in Yosemite, it would mean quadrupling present areas devoted to these purposes. It is this trend that naturally and properly alarms many conservation people with visions of seemingly endless increases in public use.

Until recently, adding to developed areas one by one provided a workable though temporary solution to travel pressure. That day is now past. Designating additional lands for expanded public use is no longer a sufficient solution because travel is mounting too rapidly. While the Service may be able substantially to improve the efficiency of its present facilities, positive steps must also be taken to limit and stabilize the permissible amount of public use. What would seem reasonable is continuing the present kinds of public use, including both sightseeing and back-country use in balance, with sufficient lands for each purpose, but gradually moving toward limiting the total quantity of public use.

ORRRC's land classification system should be tailored differently for each segment of the National Park System--natural areas, historic areas, and recreational areas. There is some tendency within the Service to make few distinctions in applying land classifications to the different segments of the System. Take Class I, High Density Recreation Areas, as an example. Typical instances of this class sometimes cited by the Service include Camp Curry in Yosemite, Grand Canyon Village, Coulter Bay in Grand Teton, Canyon Village in Yellowstone, and future developments at Fire Island National Seashore and Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. There is, however, a fundamental distinction between "high density recreation areas" in national parks and in national recreation areas. In national parks high density recreation areas are primarily necessary to provide accommodations and administrative services for the sightseeing public. In national recreation areas high density locations will more often be developed to provide bathing beaches and marinas, with picnic grounds and playgrounds, for active recreational use. It would help clarify thinking about national park use if this distinction could be emphasized. In fact, might not a more accurate term for this category in the National Park System be High Density Public Service and Recreation Areas?

Last of all comes the "wilderness threshold" concept as a name for natural environment areas in national parks and monuments. The expression is an apt description of a part of the functions of a

natural environment area. It is, however, one of the themes of this document that sightseeing is in fact the predominant public use of the national parks--at least in volume; that well-regulated sightseeing is one of the legitimate uses of a national park; that it is, moreover, a use beneficial to the nation; that well-regulated sightseeing was one of the original objectives and is a continuing purpose and function of the National Park System as established by Congress; and that sightseers must be provided for. If park use must be limited in quantity, it need not and should not be limited in kind. Is not the principal function of the lands classified as "natural environment" to serve the sightseer? Is not this the place he gets out of his car, camps, hikes, and achieves some first-hand touch with nature? He does not have to be a potential wilderness hiker to enjoy more modest and less intense contact with nature. The natural environment areas should be thought of as justified because they meet a legitimate need of park users. They should stand on their own feet as a justified land use. Such areas do not have to be justified as wilderness "buffers" or wilderness "threshold," though they also serve those purposes. Natural environment areas should, however, be only large enough to meet the legitimate needs of regulated sightseeing use. It is because some roadside lands are essential for this legitimate purpose that bringing the wilderness area boundary to the very roadside itself would be a serious planning mistake. Because natural environment areas serve the sightseer does not mean there are no restraints. Developments are permitted in this land category that are prohibited in wilderness areas; but by law as well as by policy they are limited in extent, location, and design to those that will not impair the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein.

(3) Vehicular controls.

(a) New transportation systems. Proliferation of automobiles is one of the greatest problems of modern living in the United States. The idea of transferring from one's private automobile to public transportation at some point in travel prior to reaching one's crowded destination has great appeal. This is true whether one's destination is Yosemite Valley or the canyons of Wall Street. Manhattan commuters and others have been doing this for a long time. One's personal automobile is driven from a suburban home to a suburban railway station and parked there. The rest of the trip is by public transportation. This avoids unmanageable traffic congestion at one's destination, eliminates the parking problem, and--a benefit overlooked until Greyhound featured it--a more

relaxed journey, if one "leaves the driving to us." Public transportation in a national park, in addition to relieving congestion, may well give the sightseer a more meaningful trip. Furthermore, major improvements in equipment and facilities for public transportation are far advanced. This is a need felt by all modern industrial societies and is being pursued imaginatively in Tokyo and Paris, as well as New York and Montreal. The possibilities are fascinating and the potential great, and range from conventional forms of public transportation, such as buses, through drastically improved mono-rail and other trains, to various forms of lifts and cable cars.

We recognize two early problems: (1) the technological and design aspect, and (2) the economics of it. Public transportation in national parks can undoubtedly be designed in due course, but it may eventually have to be subsidized if the cost of family travel by public means seriously exceeds the cost of travelling the same distance in the family automobile. The Service is studying new transportation systems intensively both here and abroad. Mini-buses have been introduced in National Capital Parks and are under serious consideration elsewhere. Major progress is in sight.

10. Regulating Public Use (Part Two).

Direct controls over visitors within each park.

a. Entrance Requirements.
b. Limitations on Number of Visitors to Areas within a Park.
   (1) To a park feature.
   (2) To a park facility.
c. Limitations on Duration of Visits.
d. Limitations on Character of Visits.
   (1) Requirements for guides.
   (2) Requirements for permits for specific recreation activities.
e. Physical Limitations.
f. Codes of Visitor Conduct.
g. Information and Interpretive Programs.
h. Conclusion.

DIGEST

This part deals with five direct forms of control over park visitors now in effect in varying degrees in the management of the National Park System. It is the thesis of this report that direct controls over park visitors will have to be greatly extended during the next decades and that the Service will have to win public acceptance for them if the National Park System is to continue to provide quality park experience for visitors.

10. Regulating Public Use (Part Two).

We now turn from indirect methods of regulating public use to consideration of direct controls over visitors. Over the years the Service, quietly and unheralded, has developed numerous direct controls and in this section we will review some of the principal ones that affect the volume and impact of public use in the System. It is the thesis of this report that regardless of other measures, direct controls over visitors will have to be greatly extended between now and the year 2000. It may even be that the largest single task facing the Service in the next decades will be to extend these controls substantially and to achieve public acceptance for them.

a. Entrance Requirements. In most parks, though not in all, control begins at the park entrance. Here we are at once faced with a significant policy, stated as follows in one of the guidelines for MISSION 66: "All persons desiring to enter a park area may do so." It is a long-standing principle in the United States that National Park System areas are the heritage of every citizen and each has an equal right to enter. Certainly, any system for controlling the number of visitors at the entrance would and should be defeated before it began if it were based on anything other than equal treatment for every citizen. It is entirely conceivable, however--though we are far from that point today--that future visitors may be informed that a condition of entrance is an advance reservation or entrance before a certain hour, or is permitted under other conditions. We know that entrance controls are already in effect at certain state parks where the park entrance is closed when the campgrounds are full. Similarly, Jones Beach is closed at the entrance when parking areas are full, with the result that traffic may back up for several miles as potential visitors wait in line for someone to leave so they may enter. Closing state and metropolitan parks when campgrounds and parking areas are full may be difficult but not impossible to justify to the public. The National Park Service, however, faces an even more difficult and less tangible problem. When is a scenic sightseeing road full? When is an historic tour route full? To justify requiring reservations, or closing such facilities when a certain capacity is reached, will be difficult but must be considered as a possible future step if the quality of park experience is to be maintained in the fact of mounting travel.

In many units of the National Park System, a fee is an entrance requirement. The fee policy of the National Park Service, as laid

down by the Bureau of the Budget and Congress, is not intended to serve as a means of reducing public use. If fees were increased for this purpose, the result would be discriminatory, favoring affluent visitors in contrast to those less economically fortunate. Such a public policy would be intolerable in the United States. It is interesting to note that nevertheless, Marion Clawson, in his notable 1959 article, "The Crisis in Outdoor Recreation," suggested that entrance fees to national parks might have to be raised to twenty-five dollars. Today, the situation is further influenced by official adoption of the Golden Eagle Passport to all Federal recreational areas which makes no provision for limited use.

Although control over the amount of public use by raising or lowering fees seems impossible, entrance stations do provide the physical machinery for administering some other kind of use limitation, if a fair one could be devised, such as rationing among the entire population on an equal basis a given number of opportunities to visit a given national park. Such arrangements would have to be based on a pre-determined "carrying capacity" of the park, and their acceptance lies in the future. It is time now, however, to begin thinking of them, which makes the Service's current study of the "carrying capacity" of Rocky Mountain National Park particularly interesting and significant.

b. Limitations on Numbers of Visitors to Areas within a Park. Once a visitor has entered a unit of the National Park System, he may encounter quite specific limitations on visits to certain features or facilities within a given park.

(1) To a park feature. In a number of historical and archeological areas, ceilings have been in effect for years on the number of visitors permitted within a particular park feature at one time. One of the earliest examples is "Montezuma's Castle," the remarkable cliff dwelling that is the principal feature of Montezuma Castle National Monument--a small structure built into a recess in a precipitous cliff overlooking a valley. Many years ago, the Service, concerned over the safety of visitors who gathered in numbers in this cliff dwelling, caused a study to be made by the Bureau of Standards. After careful structural examination, the study recommended that no more than nine persons be allowed in this cliff dwelling at one time. For a while, only this number was permitted to enter, but many more visitors had to be denied than admitted. Finally the Service excluded all visitors, but built a careful model of the cliff dwelling and placed it along

the main trail so that visitors could examine the model and view the cliff dwelling at the same time. This appears to work well during 235,700 visits a year to Montezuma Castle National Monument.

Other examples of limitations on the number of visitors entering a particular park feature are:

Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt, where a ceiling of 75 persons is in effect, on visitors permitted at one time in the Home (not on the grounds, which are freely open), based on the fire code of New York State. Visitors enter on a first-come, first-served basis, and in the peak season 2,000 a day are able to go through the Home.

Glenmont, the home of Thomas Edison adjoining the Edison Laboratory in West Orange, New Jersey, where the special circumstances of acquisition resulted in a Service agreement to limit travel to 100 visitors a day, on a first-come, first-served basis. Tickets are bought at the Edison Laboratory and after 100 are sold, sales cease for that day's tickets.

Bishop White House, Independence National Historical Park, was recently opened to the public on a limited basis. Visitors who desire to see the house may apply for tickets at the visitor center. Ten tickets are issued for each hourly tour, blue tickets for the ten o'clock tour, green for the eleven o'clock, and so on. When the tickets are exhausted, no more visitors may enter on that day.

(2) To a park facility. It is a long-established practice to close certain park facilities when they are full. Most commonly, these are campgrounds and signs saying "campground full" are frequent sights. Furthermore, when all the campgrounds in a park are full, which may happen by noon, additional visitors arriving at park entrance stations with the intention of camping are advised there are no camping facilities available and if they enter they may have to leave at nightfall. For example, it is understood this practice is in effect at Grand Canyon National Park.

Parking areas also fill up and can be marked "full." This can happen in any park, and would seem to be a certain destiny for national recreation areas.

Park concessioners who operate lodges and cabins, of course, follow the same practice when their accommodations are sold out, sometimes advising potential visitors seeking reservations that

none are available and sometimes having to refuse them at the registration desk. Some concessioners allot half their accommodations for advance reservations and half for booking on a first-come, first-served basis.

Methods of communicating with actual and potential visitors on the availability of facilities would appear to be of growing importance, particularly when long distances must be travelled to reach park areas.

This may require, among other means, adopting methods used in metropolitan areas to advise motorists by radio of traffic congestion situations.

c. Limitations on the Duration of Visits. Another type of limitation now in effect restricts the length of time a specific visitor may use a specific park facility. For example, the Superintendent may establish a limit on the time allowed for camping in a campground. Over the years, in some parks, the limit has been reduced from thirty days to fifteen days, and even shorter. Such a step increases the number of persons who can enjoy the park without building additional intrusive facilities. In many parks present limits should be further reduced for this reason, probably to a three-day stay. This simple step would materially increase the number of visitors who can use present campgrounds.

Similarly, the Superintendent may establish reasonable limitations on the time any person may use any picnicking facility when such limitations are necessary to accommodate the visiting public. We are not informed of instances in the National Park System where a time limit is established for parking, but there may be such cases. Certainly the motoring public is accustomed to and accepts such limits every day, and pays a fee for the limited parking privilege in addition.

d. Limitations on Character of Visits.

(1) Requirements for guides. Another type of limitation now in effect prohibits visitors from entering an individual park feature unless they are accompanied by a National Park Service guide or other employee. This control is often used to protect archeological ruins from damage and insure visitors safety. Such regulations are in effect, for example, for visits to the cliff dwellings of Mesa Verde National Park and to the canyons in Canyon de Chelly National Monument.

This control is also used to protect some historic buildings and regulate their use by visitors. For example, no person is permitted to enter the Vanderbilt Mansion in New York, or the Adams House in Massachusetts, unless accompanied by a National Park Service employee.

The same control is exercised in certain caves. For example, no person may enter Oregon Caves unless accompanied by a guide. Although not specifically provided in the Code of Federal Regulations, this is also believed to be the practice in other caves, including Mammoth Cave and Carlsbad Caverns.

(2) Requirements for permits for specific recreation activities. Another type of control is the requirement that a permit be secured before a particular outdoor recreation activity can be pursued. Permits (or in some cases, licenses) are required for many different visitor activities in units of the National Park System where volume of use warrants, including:

Camping
Fishing
Mountain Climbing
House Trailers
Hunting (where legal)
Athletic Games (in NCP)
Parades
Public Meetings
Boating

It is interesting to note that in some instances the issuance of permits may occur days or weeks in advance of the actual use of the facility. This is true, for example, in National Capital Parks where a group desiring to picnic may be granted a permit for a certain time and place several weeks in advance. This then introduces the idea of a reservation. Reservations are presumably made on a first-come, first-served basis. The instances where a citizen can today make advance reservations for use of a public facility in the National Park System are very limited, however. Of course, the reservation of accommodations in concessioner facilities is standard practice.

e. Physical Limitations. Last of all, visits to a park feature are frequently limited by the physical capacity of the facilities to handle crowds. Visits to the top of the Washington Monument are limited by elevator size. Visits to the top of the Statue of Liberty

are limited by the width of the stairway. Visits to the top of the Arch at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial are limited by carrying capacity. The doors of Independence Hall are open to everyone and there is no fee. The doors, however, may be manned under extremely congested conditions, such as the spring season of school visits, when classes are required to wait in line and only three classes are usually permitted in the Hall at one time. Instances could be multiplied to note the limited capacities of hallways in historic houses, ladders to cliff dwellings, narrow passages in caves, and so on. The same physical limitation is reached at parking areas, campgrounds, amphitheaters, and other similar facilities.

f. Codes of Visitor Conduct. Note should be taken of the growing importance of codes of conduct for users of the out-of-doors. These codes may have begun with Smokey Bear. At any rate, they are now an important regulatory tool. The anti-littering campaign is an example, with the "Keep America Beautiful" slogan. The Service has developed codes for back-country use, and campaigns on special issues, particularly "Don't Feed the Bears." The Vatican Congress asked the International Union of Official Travel Organizations to draft a code for international travellers which, among other points, would emphasize the importance of respecting the people, customs, and cultures of countries less "developed" than one's own. The process of living together in a more crowded, mobile world will require public acceptance of codes of conduct, the regulation of travel, and limitations on use of public facilities.

g. Information and Interpretive Programs. The information and interpretive programs offer the best vehicles to guide park use through voluntary means. Aldo Leopold said the objective of park management is to improve the quality of park use. Here is where the information and interpretive programs can make a central contribution to management.

h. Conclusions.

(1) For only a little while longer, in many older areas, can the Service meet the pressures of increased travel by additional development without unacceptable impairment of park values.

(2) Over the years, the Service has developed many effective direct controls over visitor use, including limiting the number of visits to special features, and limiting the duration of use of certain popular facilities.

(3) These direct methods of visitor control must be steadily extended to cope with mounting use.

(4) The methods for regulating public use outlined in the previous section offer the possibility of postponing the time when controls may be required for an entire park. They should be given high priority. If the automobile could be eliminated in key areas, and other means of transportation substituted, it is conceivable that many features in the parks could be viewed with reasonable satisfaction by many more visitors.

Nevertheless, it is not too soon thoughtfully to review the long-standing policy that "all persons desiring to enter a park area may do so." The accepted practice of limiting travel to a particular park feature may have to be extended to an entire section of a park when its capacity is reached, and then ultimately be applied to an entire park. The Service should study and experiment in a consistent and progressive way with such methods, including various concepts for reservations and rationing use, and their policy implications.

(5) A study should be made of direct visitor controls developed by other agencies, including metropolitan, county and state parks; historic houses and villages; crowd control at sports events; and methods in use in other countries. Codes of conduct for travellers should be part of this study.

II. Final Summary and Conclusions.

1. During almost a century of growth, the National Park System has achieved great diversity and wide geographic distribution. The System is no longer overwhelmingly natural and western, but environments and traditions of every part of the nation are woven together into its fabric.

2. Public or visitor use functions of the National Park System have evolved as the System grew and now embrace a cumulative succession of concepts from resort and recreation in parks and pleasuring grounds; to enjoyment by such means as will leave the scenery, natural and historic objects and wildlife unimpaired; to inspiration and benefit in historical areas; to public outdoor recreation in recreational areas; and to opportunities for solitude or primitive recreation in wilderness areas. The unifying theme in this progress has been that the natural, historical and recreational areas of the System combine to present a superb expression of our national heritage.

3. Public or visitor use of the System has increased tremendously during the 92 years of its evolution and at the same time has steadily widened to include at least some visitors from every geographic region, from both urban and rural areas, from every ethnic, religious and racial group, and from every social and economic class except the most deprived. The composition of this growing user audience is changing with the changes in our society.

4. The frame of reference developed by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission for analyzing national patterns and activities in outdoor recreation is helpful in studying public use of the National Park System.

5. Public use of the National Park System may be thought of as pluralistic with different outdoor recreation activities pursued by different groups of people in different areas of the same park simultaneously. Day-use predominates. Some park activities, such as camping, fishing, and mountain climbing have been studied intensively. It is at least equally important to study and understand sightseeing, the principal process through which most Americans today experience at firsthand their national heritage conserved for them in their National Park System.

6. Travel for sightseeing in the National Park System is part of a world-wide social movement which in recent decades has brought the possibility of leisure travel within reach of many average men

around the world. Sightseeing was one of the original objectives and is a continuing purpose and function of the National Park System as established by Congress. Sightseeing is the major visitor use of the System today. Sightseeing in the System has important values for the nation. Among other benefits, it is an important unifying force for the people of the United States.

7. Wilderness area designations, based upon a coherent and eloquent philosophy, extended hearings in and out of Congress, and helpful definitions of wilderness use in the legislation itself, provide an important means of further insuring meaningful wilderness preservation in the National Park System. Wilderness areas, by definition, provide a specialized opportunity for solitude that can best be pursued in designated wilderness areas by a limited number of people at one time. Wilderness designations reaffirm that wilderness has a definite, resolute, and permanent home in the National Park System. That home should be generous and rooted in ecological concepts, but it cannot be so large that it tends to deprive important numbers of travelling American families of the opportunity to identify themselves, by a personal visit, even by automobile, with the great examples of their own national heritage conserved in their National Park System.

8. The population of the United States is expected to double its 1960 total by 2000; but outdoor recreation activities are growing twice as fast as population, and travel to the National Park System is mounting several times more rapidly than outdoor recreation activities generally. A System travel year of one billion visits by 2000 no longer appears fantastic. To prevent indigestion followed by strangulation in the National Park System, mounting public use must be increasingly regulated.

9. Public use may be, and currently is, regulated in part by measures aimed at dispersing visitors outside the System. While some of these measures are necessary and helpful, including developing alternate routes for non-park travel, they cannot solve the basic problem of mounting travel because, for most people, there is no substitute for a visit to a national park.

10. Public use is also regulated by measures aimed at limiting developments and land uses within parks, and controlling the use of vehicles. The National Park Service seeks to provide for visitors and to achieve reasonable limits on development, road construction, and land uses. The American people, including the sightseers, are increasingly opposed to ugliness and overcrowding. New methods of

public transportation, based on improved technology that will limit private automobiles in key locations while still providing access for people, are also highly important and promising. In the last analysis, however, if present travel trends continue, all these measures may also be exhausted long before increases in travel cease.

11. Last of all, public use is also regulated by direct controls over the volume, duration, and character of visits to important features and heavily used facilities. Such controls are supported by codes of visitor conduct, and information and interpretive programs. If park travel mounts are expected, many more direct controls over the number and duration of visits to key features and perhaps to entire parks will have to be developed, especially in older areas; and the Service may have to reconsider its policy of admitting all visitors if the quality of park experience is to be maintained. This may be the largest single task in regulating public use in the years ahead. It is none too soon to intensify further development of such methods now so they will be available when and if needed.

12. A new, comprehensive study of public use of the National Park System, past, present and future, is urgently needed, including detailed studies of heavily used areas. Management of the National Park System must be based not only on thorough knowledge of its natural, historical and recreational resources, but also on surer knowledge of the evolving character of its citizen users. These studies should be conducted by behavioral scientists, aided by ecologists, historical preservationists, and representatives of the management, statistical, interpretive, planning and design elements of Service organization. Such studies should be given high priority in order that the Service may meet the real needs of growing numbers of diverse users, and at the same time manage the System so as to continue to protect its quality as an invaluable part of our national heritage.

FOOTNOTES

1. David C. Swain, "The Passage of the National Park Service Act of 1916," Wisconsin Magazine of History, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Autumn 1966).

2. Robert Shankland, Steve Mather of the National Parks (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1951), p. 52.

3. Stephen T. Mather, Report of the Director of the National Park Service, 1920, as quoted in Paul Herman Buck, Evolution of the National Park System in the United States (United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1946), p. 59.

4. Bernard DeVoto, "Let's Close the National Parks," Harper's Magazine (October 1953), pp. 49-52.

5. Our Heritage, A Plan for Its Protection and Use, MISSION 66 (National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., n.d.).

6. Stewart L. Udall, The Quiet Crisis (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1963).

7. Quoted in William H. Draper, Jr., "Parks--Or More People?", National Parks Magazine, Vol. 40, No. 223 (April 1966). Also see Udall, The Quiet Crisis, for many insights into the story of conservation in the United States.

8. Marion Clawson, "The Crisis in Outdoor Recreation," American Forests, (March, April, 1959).

9. Outdoor Recreation for America (Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Washington, D.C., 1962).

10. Compilation of the Administrative Policies for the National Parks and National Monuments of Scientific Significance (Natural Area Category) (National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., September 1, 1967).

11. Our Heritage, op. cit.

12. Buck, op.cit., p. 60.

13. National Recreation Survey, ORRRC Study Report 19 (Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Washington, D.C., 1962).

14. Outdoor Recreation Trends (Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., 1967).

15. ORRRC Study Report 19, p. 6.

16. Warren A. Johnson, "Over-Use of the National Parks," National Parks Magazine, Vol. 41, No. 241 (October 1967).

17. Participation in Outdoor Recreation: Factors Affecting Demand Among American Adults, ORRRC Study Report 20 (Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Washington, D.C., 1962).

18. Trends in American Living and Outdoor Recreation, ORRRC Study Report 22 (Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Washington, D.C., 1962), p. 6.

19. Ibid., p. 109.

20. ORRRC Study Report 20, p. 59.

21. See footnote 10.

22. A Survey of the Public Concerning the National Parks, Princeton, New Jersey, 1955. A mimeographed report from Audience Research, Inc. to the National Park Service.

23. Hans Huth, Nature and the American, Three Centuries of Changing Attitudes (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1957), p. 150.

24. Harlean James, Romance of the National Parks (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1939), p. 75.

25. Michael McCloskey, "The Wilderness Act of 1964: Its Background and Meaning," Oregon Law Review, Vol. 45 (June 1966).

26. Shankland, op.cit., Chapter XII.

27. The National Park Wilderness (National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., September 1957).

28. Buck, op.cit., p. 64.

29. Ibid, p. 59.

30. Report with Recommendations from the Committee on Study of Educational Problems in National Parks, January 9, 1929 and November 27, 1929, a printed thirty-page report transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior by Dr. John C. Merriam, Chairman, and members of the Committee.

31. A Proposed Program for Scenic Roads and Parkways, (U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., 1966).

32. Michael McCloskey, op.cit.

33. Buck, op.cit., p. 67.

34. Buck, op.cit., p. 68.

35. Howard R. Stagner, "National Parks--Their Role in Outdoor Recreation," an address before the annual meeting, Society of American Foresters, Atlanta, Georgia, October 24, 1962. Mr. Stagner was Chief Naturalist, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

36. "Draft Conclusions, Congress on the Spiritual Values of Tourism, Rome, April 18-21, 1967" transmitted with comments by Regional Director Lemuel A. Garrison to Director George B. Hartzog, Jr., June 19, 1967.

37. F.W. Ogilvie, "Tourist Traffic," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934), Vol. 14, p. 661.

38. J.C. Charlesworth, ed., Leisure in America: Blessing or Curse? (American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1964).

39. Robert Lee, Religion and Leisure in America (Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1964).

40. "Tomorrow's Traveler," Saturday Review, January 6, 1968.

41. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, A Standard of Achievement (United Nations Office of Public Information, United Nations, New York, 1963).

42. ORRRC Study Report 22, p. 229.

43. Ibid, p. 230.

44. Ibid, p. 112.

45. United Nations International Tourist Year (United Nations Office of Public Information, July, 1967).

46. Bernard Lemann, The Vieux Carre'--A General Statement (School of Architecture, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1966).

47. Newton B. Drury, Introduction to Freeman Tilden, The National Parks, What They Mean to You and Me, (Alfred A. Knopf, New York 1951).

48. Shankland, op.cit., p. 161.

49. James, op.cit., p. 95. This forms part of an excellent chapter entitled "Prospect: Philosophy of Parks and People."

50. Ibid, pp. 100-101.

51. That the Past Shall Live, the history program of the National Park Service (National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., n.d.), p. 11.

52. ORRRC Study Report 22, p. 104.

53. Freeman Tilden, Interpreting Our Heritage, Principles and Practices for Visitor Services in Parks, Museums, and Historic Places (The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1957).

54. Outdoor Recreation Trends (Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., 1967).

55. Clawson, op.cit., 11.

56. "Projections of Visits to Areas Administered by the National Park Service, 1967-1976," a mimeographed document issued for in-Service use by the Branch of Statistics Analysis, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, April 1967.

57. Compilation of the Administrative Policies for the National Parks and National Monuments of Scientific Significance (Natural Area Category) (National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., September 1, 1967). P. 47

58. Stewart M. Brandborg, "Statement for Smokies Wilderness Hearing," The Living Wilderness, No. 92 (Spring 1966) p. 24.

59. Wayne N. Aspinall, "Underlying Principles of Wilderness Legislation as I See Them," The Living Wilderness, No. 86 (Spring-Summer 1964) p. 6.

60. Howard Zahniser, "The People and Wilderness," The Living Wilderness, No. 86 (Spring-Summer 1964), pp. 39-41.

61. Outdoor Recreation for America, op.cit., pp. 95-120

GPO 940-291