
Corollary 1 to Principle #3: Be sure to say that this is what you are doing. Do not try to hokey up your decision with a lot of non-relevant data. You'll get caught.

Corollary 2: Although Principle #3 is possible, you won't get away with it very often. There is no substitute for a well-planned, adequately supported research program in your park.

Corollary 3: Be prepared to be challenged.

Principle #4: Issues which appear to be settled, based on environmental considerations, can quickly become highly charged political issues.

Corollary to Principle #4: The political friends of the park should be prepared to play a role in the ensuing process.

Principle #5: No politician is immune to overwhelming expression of public opinion, even if that expression is contrary to what the politician's instincts tell him/her.

Corollary to Principle #5: The opinion (rendered by the park and its friends) should be based on resource considerations--not an attempt to grind any partisan political axe.

Smith refers in the paper to Frederick Law Olmstead and Joseph Sax and their references to national parks as "sanctuaries" where visitors can become aware of their relationship to the environment and to our historic past. Smith concludes: "In these sanctuaries, the Ranger is the minister, not merely the usher."

Rick Smith, Assistant Superintendent, Everglades National Park, Florida.

A FEW CONVICTIONS

Presented to the Association of
National Park Rangers, October 10, 1983

T. Destry Jarvis

When a speaker gets up he must have a few convictions, otherwise pronouncements from him are not particularly valuable. I have a few convictions, which I suspect are shared by many of you here today, regarding the National Park Service and the National Park System. One of my convictions is that the National Park System contains the single most important collection of our national heritage. If you agree with this then you must concede that we all individually and collectively must do everything in our power to ensure that this heritage is not eroded or lost.

Another of my convictions is that the National Park System is inseparable from the National Park Service. That is, the morale, esprit, integrity and professionalism of the National Park Service family is completely inseparable from the administration, management, interpretation and protection of the resources of the National Park System.

Taking these two convictions together it follows naturally that when the resources of the System face the cumulative impact of countless thousands of threats from outside park boundaries, coupled with the politicization and demoralization of the professionals of the Park Service, a crisis is at hand. I believe such a crisis faces the National Park System in 1983. Anyone who says that the National Parks are in better shape today than five, ten, or twenty years ago is either monumentally ignorant, attempting an artful deception, or engaged in the most destructive sort of demagoguery. This crisis can be attributed to no one event or no one person but has, in my view, come about as the result of five principal factors.

First, the integrity of park ecosystems has been seriously jeopardized by the encroachment of society in all its forms around park boundaries in a manner totally beyond the control and often beyond the comprehension of either the Service or those engaged in the encroachment.

Second, the System has grown enormously in size and responsibility without a concomitant growth in the size of the Service which cares for it.

Third, the Service to date has not adequately responded and only recently acknowledged, the cumulative impact of many threats by either bringing into the Service or selecting from within, a large number of resource management specialists and resource scientists who can give the Service the skills and the data it needs to make informed decisions and defend them.

Fourth, the phenomenal popularity of the parks has been reflected in the astounding growth in visitation and the tremendous diversification in the types of use which the parks must absorb. Unfortunately, the Service has been altogether too timid in acknowledging and responding to the need for visitor impact management.

Fifth, and some would say, most importantly, the Service and the System have faced the most sudden and often conflicting pressure of politicization of any agency at any level of government.

Somehow, working together, the professionals of the Service and the millions of citizens throughout the country whose love of and support for the National Parks has never wavered, must restore the resources of the parks which have been damaged, protect those which are threatened, and maintain that which is intact. It is organizations such as the Association of National Park Rangers within the National Park Service and private conservation organizations outside the Park Service together with these citizens which give me hope, indeed confidence, that the System can be maintained and restored for future generations.

Former Director Newton Drury's calm appraisal issued in 1951 is still valid today. We must "cherish these crown jewels among the lands of the nation to keep them unsullied and intact, to conserve them, not for commercial use of their resources but

because of their value in administering to the human mind and spirit. Surely we are not so poor that we need to destroy them, or so rich that we can afford to lose them."

If our national security depends on our national defense, then I believe that our national sanity depends on the national parks. The spiritual value of the national parks is all too often forgotten by those of us who work on park matters in our daily lives or those of you who are living and working in the parks. Yet this facet of the park is perhaps the most important of all because it goes beyond preserving our heritage, it goes beyond preserving nature for its own sake, and makes each of us better humans for having experienced them.

In the last century, Ralph Waldo Emerson said that, "Within the plantations of God a decorum and sanctity reign, a perennial festival is dressed, and the guest sees not how he should tire of them in a thousand years. In the woods we return to reason and faith." Carl Sandburg said it even more poetically, "There is an eagle in me and a mockingbird...the eagle flies among the Rocky Mountains of my dreams and fights among the Sierra crags of what I want...the mockingbird warbles in the early forenoon before the dew is gone, warbles in the underbrush of my Chattanooga of hope, gushes over the Ozark foothills of my wishes--and I got the eagle and the mockingbird from the wilderness."

Before I get too philosophical here, let me come back to a point which I passed over lightly early on. The hazard which you as the present and future managers of the National Park Service face in your day-to-day decision-making is the danger of being too tolerant. You see your area every day and feel the many conflicting pressures coming at you from all sides, and you say to yourself, "something has got to give." More often than not, what gives is a new road, a new facility or a new development site. Something has got to give and does, and with the pressure of day-to-day decision-making perhaps you never have time to step back and look at the cumulative impacts of several acts of tolerance.

This scenario is perhaps an all too common fact of life in the career of National Park Service managers. My advice is simple, to matter what you are called by those who would sully the parks with conveniences, no matter what political pressures are brought to bear on you, every time a new development is proposed or a new use is considered, look at it carefully and don't be too tolerant. Give in if you have to, but only as a last resort and only after making sure that this will be remembered the next time and counted in the cumulative effect.

You, the professionals of the National Park Service, hold a sacred trust, a trust that future generations who will use the parks will hold you accountable for. One of the most common impacts on park managers from the pressures of day-to-day decision-making is shortened vision. We must strive for the long view, think of 100 years, of 200, 500 or 1,000 years and don't

be too short sighted. Looking at only the immediate impact, only the immediate effect will result in too much tolerance. Look ahead to the time when people will be clamoring for the parks as they have never clamored before. And look ahead to the time when due to the integrity, morale, and professionalism of the National Park Service these places will have remained intact.

For more than 100 years the parks have stood for something different, something special. As early as 1885 a Congressional report on a visit to Yellowstone stated that, "the park should so far as possible be spared the vandalism of improvement. Its great and only charms are in the display of wonderful forces of nature, the ever varying beauty of the rugged landscape, and the sublimity of the scenery. Art cannot embellish them."

The question with which I want to leave you today is this: will the natural and cultural resources of the National Park System in the 21st Century be largely intact; will the great nature parks be primeval and pristine; will the sites commemorating the great events of our cultural history maintain their dignity in a setting conducive to public appreciation? More than any other single group in this country, the Association of National Park Rangers has within its potential the ability to determine the answer to this question.

T. Destry Jarvis, National Parks & Conservation Association,
Washington, DC.