

The Park Idea as Catalyst and Conscience

George B. Hartzog III

IN THE EARLY YEARS OF THE 21ST CENTURY, the issues that face (and jeopardize) the world's parks and protected areas are enormous and urgent. Often they exceed the boundaries of the parks and are beyond the conventional scope of park management—whether it be environmental degradation and climate change, economic disparity and poverty, globalization and ethnic strife, or terrorism and war. All of these—and more—affect parks, park administration, park programs, and the park experience.

While the park as idea has helped to inspire visitation, promote patriotism, encourage recreation, educate about nature and history, and instill a pride in democracy,¹ now is the time to place parks and protected areas as idea within the larger context of the great issues which confront us.

Indeed, this is a “kairos” moment in history *and* the park movement—“kairos” being the ancient Greek term for a special moment which is ripe for action. As David Harmon has written, “Events during the next few decades will determine whether we will cross over into a fundamentally changed or diminished world.”² The US National Park Service’s Second Century Commission was prescient as it admonished that “an expanded national park idea is first priority.” To do so, the park idea must be linked with the great ideas which form our common life: the ideas we live by—liberty, justice and equality; the ideas by which we judge—truth, goodness and beauty.³

As we come to a deeper understanding of these dimensions, it is then that the park idea can be persuasive, compelling, and generative for a new century and its enormous challenges. A new and more comprehensive understanding of the park idea can open new opportunities for the establishment and management of parks, their stewardship, and ways by which to serve persons and communities more effectively.

Toward a new definition and framework

The Organic Act of 1916 ordered the newly formed US National Park Service (USNPS) “to

The George Wright Forum, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 6–17 (2012).

© 2012 The George Wright Society. All rights reserved.

(No copyright is claimed for previously published material reprinted herein.)

ISSN 0732-4715. Please direct all permission requests to info@georgewright.org.

conserve the scenery and the natural and historical objects” and “to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future generations.” Since March 1, 1872, when the first national park was established, the park idea has continued to change—from initially preserving natural wonders and historic sites to establishing cultural parks and international biosphere reserves.

It is recognized by many that the park idea is one of the finest contributions to world culture. In moving toward a new definition and framework, may I suggest for your consideration that parks are all of those natural, historical, cultural, and recreational places, sites and areas owned and managed by governments (federal, tribal, state, regional, or municipal), indigenous peoples, charitable organizations, private enterprise, or partnerships as well as those managed by communities through traditional and customary means.⁴

Throughout the centuries, places set aside for special purposes, such as parks, have evolved and expanded: from Nebuchadnezzar’s Hanging Gardens of Babylon to New York City’s Central Park, from regional forest preserves to the Washington, D.C.’s National Mall of monuments and museums, from Yellowstone National Park to amusement parks, from backyards to international biosphere reserves. As national and international nomenclatures now attest, parks are many different types and sizes (e.g., those of the US national park system and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature’s protected area categories).

As disconcerting as it may seem to link Yellowstone with amusement parks⁵—or as incongruous as it may seem to link natural, historical, recreational, sacred, and cultural sites—this international and interrelated network of parks and protected areas serves as:

- Expressions of local, regional, tribal, and national self-understanding and the values of a people;
- The “miner’s canary,” giving forewarning of the changes in the natural and human condition; and,
- “Bridges” for mutual understanding among the world’s diverse communities.

Significantly, the world’s parks and protected areas share a common “language” that gives expression to the diversity of identity and interest among the peoples of the world and, also, expresses their shared heritage in the world community. As a whole, these parks and protected areas are more than physical resources. They are a living, changing legacy—a cosmorama—for exploring the dimensions essential for developing an ethic for personal and corporate behavior.⁶

The centennial of the US National Park Service offers an opportunity to reassess the meaning of parks and their significance for society. Indeed, the challenge of a threatened biosphere, growing economic disparity, the degradation of cultural landscapes and historic sites, the disappearance of flora and fauna and the world’s languages, the pandemics of human illness and hunger, political upheaval, widespread corruption, and unprecedented immigration make vivid the urgency posed to conscience. Amid these “sea-changes,” are parks and protected areas relevant to the human experience and the quality of life? Does the park experience provide only a transitory escape and respite, or is the park experience *re-creative*, personally and collectively, for humankind?

I suggest that the park, parks as a whole, and the park experience can only be understood fully in the context of feeding the hungry, housing the homeless, restoring the land, releasing the oppressed, and caring for the ill and the aged and the young. As Freeman Tilden, the preeminent park interpreter wrote, parks are about the question, “Who am I?” *In a very real way, parks and the park experience are mandated to be a strategic fulcrum for re-creating a quality of life for all humankind and the Creation.*

To do so, a meaningful and sustained discourse of the park idea with the great ideas of our common life—liberty, justice and equality; truth, goodness and beauty—and the interface with the pressing and urgent issues of society must take place. It is then that an expanded park idea can be developed, which, in turn, can provide our several vocations—park professionals, educators and researchers, public activists, policy leaders—with new vistas for effective management, stewardship, and relevance.

The park idea in practice and the common good

During the last several years, scholarly treatises have been developed about the relationship of research and management, rethinking nature, the role of conservation, reassessing history, civic engagement, and understanding the values (both tangible and intangible) of parks.⁷ These efforts have made significant contributions to the park movement. An expanded park idea can be a part of this renaissance. To illustrate, I offer the following suggestions using one of the six foundational ideas: justice.

In the United States, our common creed is “liberty and justice for all” and it is fitting to begin with the idea of justice in order to expand the park idea. One of the most visited parks, the Statue of Liberty in New York City’s harbor, gives eloquent testimony to three interrelated philosophical–ethical concepts: liberty, justice, and equality.

Naturally, when we remember the Statue of Liberty, our thoughts turn to liberty and all that that has meant and still means for our nation and the peoples of the world as well as for each one of us. The Statue of Liberty, as a literal landmark of welcome to millions of immigrants, also speaks of the idea of equality and the promise of equal opportunity. Yet, this internationally recognized symbol of freedom and democracy is, also, about justice.

In recognition of the friendship established during the American Revolution, “Liberty Enlightening the World” was a centennial gift to the United States from France. However, the United States, in order to receive and display the gift, was to build the pedestal upon which “Liberty” was to stand. For months, the United States had difficulty in deciding upon the design of the pedestal and even more difficulty in raising sufficient funds to build it—and “Liberty,” in pieces, sat in the shipping crates on the dock. With fundraising efforts stalled, Joseph Pulitzer, publisher of *The World*, decided to use his newspaper to push Americans to donate. A sonnet was written in 1883 as a donation to an auction of art and literary works that, then, raised the money to build the pedestal. “Liberty” was assembled and finally erected. The poem, entitled “The New Colossus,” was written by a young Jewish immigrant, Emma Lazarus. In 1903, the final lines of the poem were inscribed on a bronze plaque and placed inside the pedestal.

“Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp,” cries she
With silent lips. “Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.”

Justice in its most ancient understanding, that of the Sophists of ancient Greece, was obedience to the law. Plato and Aristotle qualified that understanding because a more powerful people could impose their law and customs upon another people. Thus, they said justice is served when there is also non-interference. While obedience to law and non-interference have been predominant, the Judeo-Christian tradition has understood justice to be the care of the least and most vulnerable, e.g., the widow, the orphan, those in want, the newcomer, the refugee. This Judeo-Christian tradition of justice has deep similarities in the Gandhian and Hindu tradition, *Antyodaya* (the well-being of the poorest individual) is the pathway to *Sarvodaya* (the welfare of the entire human society). Today, we starkly realize, whether in our cities or among nations, injustice anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere. *Indeed, liberty, justice, and equality are inextricably linked and, if separated, their individual meanings and their moral imperative are severely misunderstood and diminished.*

Profoundly, the very foundation of liberty is always justice. Like the original pedestal of the Statue of Liberty, justice is, at times, difficult to design and often there is deep resistance to invest in its construction. But justice is the hallmark of a people and a civilization. Justice is linked with participation—the aspiration and access of all peoples as well as all the creatures and elements of the Creation. Justice, as one of six foundational ideas, can expand the park idea.

At times, assuredly, it will be difficult to design, to build, and to implement such an expanded park idea as a part of a 21st-century park movement. Yet, in our intensely interconnective world, liberty, justice, and equality as well as the other great ideas—truth, goodness, and beauty—have taken on a new urgency. With an expanded park idea, park management and programs as well as the park experience can become more deeply fulfilling, generative, compelling, and persuasive as we move into a new century.

To continue the illustration, I will pair three critical functions—management, stewardship, and relevance—with justice. (One can continue to expand the park idea by pairing, again, these functions with all the great ideas—the ones we live by and the ones by which we judge.)

Management and justice

Most recently, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) in partnership with USNPS has convened a consortium of universities to provide leadership development programs called “Leadership for Public Lands and Cultural Heritage.” This effort takes its place in a long-standing tradition of management consulting, leadership development, and organizational effectiveness programs with public, private, and non-profit institutions.

In 1914, upon graduating from Northwestern University (Chicago), Edwin G. Booz began to develop an idea that organizations could be more successful if they could call upon someone outside their own organization for expert, impartial advice. His theory, new at the time, evolved into a new firm and a new profession: management consulting. During the 20th century, the firm Booz, Allen and Hamilton became the leading provider of management consulting services to the US government with services in human capital, operational improvement, communication and information technology, organizational change efforts, and program innovation.⁸

Building upon this success, on May 9, 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson opened the Federal Executive Institute (FEI) to improve the quality of government and better serve the American people. The first director of the FEI was Frank P. Sherwood, professor of public administration at the University of Southern California. Among the FEI's initial participating agencies was the US National Park Service. Since that time, other efforts also have been created such as the Washington, D.C.-based Center for Government Leadership. Its Leadership for Public Service programs connect experts from America's top corporations with federal leaders to confront government's key management challenges on an operational level.⁹

Within this tradition, the new NPCA-NPS leadership program offers courses and certificates in a variety of areas for park and conservation leaders. It is guided by the NPCA Center for Park Management Advisory Council¹⁰ and the program's faculty comprises faculty members of six universities with expertise in park and public administration. The program's overall purpose is "to produce park, public land management, cultural resources management, and conservation leaders who are forward-thinking, proactive, and strategic with a keen ability to think holistically about the challenges facing their organizations in an increasingly interconnected world of the 21st century."¹¹

With this purpose in mind, what would happen if one thought more expansively using the concept of justice? For instance, what would happen if the faculty of this new initiative were multidisciplinary and multicultural? Sometimes, as in the case of parks and public lands, it is easy to focus, as qualifications for teaching and program design, on faculty whose experience and expertise are only in administration and/or parks. What would happen if the faculty of this consortium effort included other disciplines, such as urban studies, anthropology, critical theory, etc.? What would happen if the advisory council and the faculty included a school teacher from Harlem or a migrant worker from California or a Native American from Wisconsin or a young person from Cincinnati? Perhaps, then, the questions of relevance and effectiveness and leadership for parks would take on new meaning, significance, and a much-needed depth.¹²

Stewardship and justice

In the 1960s, USNPS, along with the National Education Association and the Association of Classroom Teachers, developed the first environmental education program. This is when the word "environment" was not yet in the everyday lexicon. Today, the word is most readily associated with the natural world. However, the original and more complete understanding of "environment" included both natural and cultural dimensions. The original NEED (National Environmental Education Development program)¹³ included all the academic dis-

ciplines and USNPS designated certain natural and historical areas as special NEED sites. These parks were like “prisms” used to refract the newly developed “five-strand” interdisciplinary pedagogy. But the real focus of NEED was to help students understand the environment through understanding their neighborhood in all of its natural/”built,” social, historical, economic, and ethnic complexities—for this constitutes “environment” in its comprehensive definition. The motto of the program was:

There is one web of life.
You are a part of it.
The web is in trouble.
And you can do something about it.

Today, elementary and secondary environmental education principally consists of science-based programs¹⁴ and often national parks are used as outdoor classrooms and laboratories. At times, the programs include stewardship activities such as restoring natural habitats in national parks or local communities—and these are important contributions to education and parks. However, expanding the role of parks and its education mission through the concept of justice, again, could make parks more relevant and compelling (as well as build important community and political support).

For instance, what if young people from St. Louis traveled to Diamond Grove, Missouri, the birthplace of George Washington Carver, and Tuskegee University (Alabama), the place where he taught.¹⁵ George Washington Carver, born in obscurity as a slave, became one of the world’s most renowned scientists. With the small peanut, Carver developed new products and nutritious foods, bringing new hope to people and lifting the South from overwhelming poverty to a new quality of life.¹⁶ With head and heart and hand—and the small peanut—Carver changed the course of history!

What would happen if USNPS and the National Park Foundation, in the spirit of the original NEED program, enlarged their focus to partner with a school in St. Louis, with the teachers and the young people and neighborhood residents? In their conversations and assessment of the neighborhood,¹⁷ they, perhaps, would discern, among the many needs, the pressing priority was for healthy, affordable food—and jobs. Subsequently, UNSPS personnel, retirees,¹⁸ and volunteers, working alongside the teachers and students and residents, could create a “George Washington Carver Community Garden” to grow nutritious food for the neighborhood residents as well as supply local grocery stores, restaurants, and schools with affordable, fresh foods. They could even teach new culinary arts and/or build a farmer’s market. Working with the neighborhood in such a manner could create, over the long term, healthier family lifestyles and school lunches and, perhaps, new jobs for the unemployed. Linking parks and the park experience with this form of community development is using justice to enlarge the park idea and make the park experience have new relevance for persons who might never have an opportunity nor an interest to visit a national park.

Naturally, efforts like the suggested St. Louis initiative would necessitate that park and foundation personnel to have knowledge about community organizing and economic development. What if USNPS or a foundation partnered with universities to restructure present

park administration programs? Presently, many university programs are structured, from the early years of the park movement, within departments organized around recreation and tourism. Today, the issues facing parks require knowledge of many fields, e.g., anthropology, economics, education, history and cultural studies, psychology, sociology, jurisprudence, communication and information technology, the natural sciences and the humanities, etc. An expanded park idea could be a catalyst to re-tool universities to broaden their curriculum in order to diversify leadership specialties and equip future park leaders for the challenges of the 21st century.

Relevance and justice

Lastly, along these lines of justice and relevance, an expanded park idea has the potential to address conceptually some of the most pressing needs of society and parks which, then, would have implications for public policy, park priorities, and programs—thus, setting a new agenda and direction for society and for parks. One such issue is poverty and the growing economic disparity within and among communities and nations. Poverty (and its twin, global warming), are overwhelming issues facing the human family—and the press of both is jeopardizing the integrity of parks, particularly poverty in the Third World and economic development/global warming worldwide.

In the 1950s, Freeman Tilden wrote about the linkage between ecology and economics (both rooted in the Latin word, *oikos*, meaning “household management”)—a truth, he said, we reluctantly acknowledge or dismiss at our peril.¹⁹ Should not poverty and its effects²⁰ on parks, park programs, and park policy warrant attention as a comprehensive research project within the park movement and its cooperating agencies and universities? Like the Leopold Report, such a research project should be comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and inter-agency in its scope.

The Leopold Report, officially known as “Wildlife Management in the National Parks,” was a series of recommendations presented to United States Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall in 1963. It was named for the advisory board chair and principal author, zoologist and conservationist A. Starker Leopold. The Leopold Report became the basis for “science-based” management by the US National Park Service; it was the first plan to manage park visitors and ecosystems under unified principles. The report was reprinted in several publications and had far-reaching effects beyond national parks. (A. Starker Leopold was the son of Aldo Leopold, noted scientist and professor at the University of Wisconsin who was influential in the modern development of environmental ethics; cf. “the land ethic” in *A Sand County Almanac*, 1949.)

Presently, the secretary of the interior’s Advisory Board on National Parks, with the lead of the US National Park Service, is reexamining the original Leopold Report in terms of climate change and its affect on national parks and their management. An expanded park idea would direct this effort to include the whole cluster of issues related to climate change, such as poverty and economics. An expanded park idea could be a catalyst to implement a broad research effort regarding climate change/poverty, economics, and parks—and engaging several universities, cooperative ecosystem study units, other park agencies, and related organizations to address the philosophical-ethical, cultural, scientific, political, and governance

aspects. Utilizing some preliminary works by Elinor Ostrom, Jane Jacobs, William R. Lowry, Paul Shackel, Peter Harnik, and David N. Cole and Laurie Yung,²¹ for example, such an effort could build upon the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) and its subsequent studies and work, e.g., Convention on Biological Diversity, Framework Convention on Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol, Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, etc. As widely acknowledged, climate change can only be understood and effectively addressed when poverty, economics, ethnic traditions, and ethics become integral to the discussion and decision-making. This is all the more true regarding parks and protected areas.²²

Conclusion

As many know, the great devotion of my father (George B. Hartzog, Jr., USNPS Director 1964–1973) was to the parks and park people. But many do not know his first calling was to the Methodist ministry. His favorite sermon subject was the prophet Amos, a busy layman, a farmer, who took time for God. This calling informed my father's character and inspired the priorities of his park administration that became so generative and creative.²³

Perhaps the reason the prophet Amos was an inspiration to my father was that his own youthful years, spent in South Carolina, were during the Great Depression when his family lost their farm—an experience that indelibly etched his character and shaped his vision for a greater society and the ultimate purpose of parks. As he took the pulpit at age 16, he read the Scripture to the people:

Be prepared to meet your God ... for I take no delight
in your assemblies and offerings of well-being,
but let justice roll down like waters
and righteousness like an everflowing stream.
For it is then I will restore the fortunes of my people
and they shall rebuild their ruined cities and flourish
in the land I gave them, says the Lord.

— Amos, ch. 6–9

I am sure, today, he would remind us: The great moral, ethical, and philosophical issues of our day and their relation to parks form the *raison d'être* of the park movement. Woe unto us, as Amos proclaimed, if we forget the grave injustice in social dealings, the abhorrent immorality in the public and private spheres, and rely on shallow, meaningless piety, military might, or economic superiority. If parks are to be relevant, if parks are to maintain their integrity, the park movement must come to terms with the most critical issues facing our common life. It is with such an expanded park idea as *catalyst and conscience* that the park movement will have a lasting impact and eternal significance.

Endnotes

1. Robert Sterling Yard, *The National Parks Portfolio* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1916); Freeman Tilden, *The National Parks: What They Mean to You and Me* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951); Tilden, *The State Parks: Their Meaning in*

- American Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962); National Park Service, *Who Am I? Reflections on the Meaning of Parks on the Occasion of the Nation's Bicentennial* (Washington, DC: Office of Publications, National Park Service, 1975); Dayton Duncan and Ken Burns, *The National Parks: America's Best Idea* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009).
2. David Harmon, *In Light of Our Differences: How Diversity in Nature and Culture Makes Us Human* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002).
 3. Mortimer J. Adler, *Six Great Ideas* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981).
 4. During the Conservation Foundation Symposium held at Yosemite National Park (1970), USNPS Director George B. Hartzog, Jr., first offered the definition of national parks as areas owned or managed by various public, charitable, quasi-public, indigenous, and private entities to suggest new opportunities for collaboration and cooperation among agencies and organizations. The General Authorities Act of 1970 was an amendment to the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 to consider all areas—natural, recreational, historical—administered by USNPS as a single entity, stating that “though distinct in character, [they] are united through their interrelated purposes and resources into one national park system as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage; that, individually and collectively, these areas derive increased national dignity and recognition of their superb environmental quality through their inclusion jointly with each other in one national park system preserved and managed for the benefit and inspiration of all people. . . .”
 5. Unconventionality and imagination often go hand-in-hand. During the 1960s and 1970s, the USNPS director sent maintenance personnel to Coney Island, New York, “because they were the best in America for keeping the park clean.” He also assigned new park rangers to urban areas as a part of their training before they could serve in places like Yellowstone or Yosemite in order to expose them to the issues of serving an urban society.
 6. See note 5. Also see George B. Hartzog, Jr., “Closing Speech,” in *Proceedings of the Second World Conference on National Parks, Yellowstone National Park, 1972*, Hugh Elliott, ed. (Morges, Switzerland: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, 1974).
 7. Marc Hockings, et. al. *Evaluating Effectiveness: A Framework for Assessing the Management of Protected Areas* (Cambridge, UK, and Gland, Switzerland: IUCN, 2000); William Cronon, ed., *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998); Ben A. Minteer and Robert E. Manning, eds., *Reconstructing Conservation: Finding Common Ground* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2003); Gustavo Esteva and Madju Suri Prakash, *Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures* (London: ZED Books, 1998); Robert E. Stipe, ed., *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the 21st Century*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley, eds., *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation and Nature Conservation* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2006); David Harmon and Allen D. Putney, eds., *The Full Value of Parks: From Economics to the Intangible* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003).

8. In 1998, Booz, Allen and Hamilton led the efforts to modernize the Internal Revenue Service and, over the years, its clients have been as diverse as AT&T and the National Football League, as it serves organizations in the public, private, and non-profit sectors.
9. The Center for Government Leadership is a part of the Partnership for Public Service (<http://ourpublicservice.org>). In 2005, the Partnership for Public Service merged with the Private Sector Council and created the Leadership for Public Service program. The projects have ranged from revitalizing the federal workforce to digitizing the Food Stamp program. It has built a broad base of financial support including the Annenberg Foundation, Atlantic Philanthropies, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.
10. One of the members of NPCA Advisory Council is Tom Fox, vice president for leadership and innovation, Partnership for Public Service, where he oversees the Center for Government Leadership.
11. The mission statement of the Leadership for Public Lands and Cultural Heritage (PLCH) program (<http://publiclandsleadership.org>).
12. The recent program of the NPCA and USNPS partnership is one of many for emerging leaders, such as the internship programs of federal departments (e.g., US Department of Health and Human Services) and non-profit organizations (e.g., George Wright Society).
13. The nation's first environmental education program (National Environmental Education Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-516, October 30, 1970, 84 Stat. 1312) was initiated and administered by USNPS and the US Department of Education; it was based upon the more comprehensive definition of "environment," including natural, historical, and cultural dimensions. Unfortunately, "environment" became more narrowly defined when the public law was amended in 1975. Environmental education became administered by the Environmental Protection Agency. The National Environmental Education Act of 1990 specifically delineates only the natural dimensions in its definition of "environment." The North American Association for Environmental Education and the National Environmental Education Foundation, not to be confused with the original NEED program, also use the more narrow definition of environment as the basis for their programs. Today, there is a growing recognition among scholars and public leaders, students and activists, individuals and governments that environmental challenges are inextricably interwoven with issues of economics, ethnic/cultural traditions and ethics. The 21st century will be the time to reclaim the original vision of environmental education as developed by Wayne F. Miller, special assistant to the director for environmental education, USNPS, who helped author the original act of 1970 and design its programs.
14. One of the most recent examples of this emphasis is the new partnership of USNPS with NatureBridge, funded with a \$4 million grant from Google, Inc. "NatureBridge's continued efforts to engage children in science at some of the nation's most beautiful sites comes alongside a national push to improve the quality of STEM—or science, technology, engineering and mathematics—instruction." Quote from Nora Fleming, "National Park Service Expanding Education Mission," *Education Week* (December 14, 2011).

Also, USNPS recently has made strides in its service-learning and civic engagement initiatives. See www.nps.gov/civic/ and *Beyond Outreach Handbook*, Conservation and Stewardship Publication no. 21 (Woodstock, VT: USNPS Conservation Study Institute, 2011). While service-learning and civic engagement are important methodologies, community development—beginning with and addressing the critical issues of both society and a neighborhood—redirects these outreach efforts in order to fulfill the recreative purpose of parks.

15. Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site (established in 1974) includes the George Washington Carver Laboratory and the Booker T. Washington Home, all part of what is now Tuskegee University. Tuskegee is the only park/protected area in the world which is also a university.
16. George Washington Carver's contributions to agriculture were substantial. He was not single-mindedly focused on peanut research and, as history demonstrates, the peanut alone did not lift the South from poverty. Although in popular memory Carver and the peanut have become inseparably linked, Carver's research on several nitrogen-fixing plants (e.g., sweet potatoes, cowpeas, etc.) was driven by the dual purpose of restoring soils that had been exhausted through decades of dependence on cotton monoculture. Carver's wide-ranging innovations and discoveries helped to develop a commercially viable, diversified agricultural base that, importantly, also required relatively low input labor which, then altogether, helped to lift subsistence farmers of the South out of poverty.
17. Some of the promising forms of new community development are holistic participatory learning and action (PLA) and capacity building using the appreciative inquiry approach (AIA). Over the last several decades, community development has undergone substantial changes; cf. Bryan L. Myers, ed., *Working with the Poor: New Insights and Learnings from Development Practitioners* (Colorado Springs, CO: Authentic, 2008); Paul G. Hiebert, *The Gospel in Human Contexts: Anthropological Explorations for Contemporary Missions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009); and M.J. Brown, *Building Powerful Community Organizations* (Arlington, MA: Long Haul Press, 2006).
18. The Volunteers-in-Parks, the Employee & Alumni Association (USNPS), and the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees represent a tremendous wellspring of voluntarism. While these groups have traditionally focused their efforts on parks, it is suggested here that their efforts could abet such cooperative park/community development projects as these.
19. Tilden, *The National Parks*.
20. J.M. Griesgraber and B.G. Gunter, eds., *Rethinking Bretton Woods*, 5 vols. (Washington, DC: Center of Concern, 1996); , John B. Cobb, Jr., *The Earthist Challenge to Economics: A Theological Critique of the World Bank* (London; MacMillan, 1999); Robin Attfield and Barry Wilkins, eds., *International Justice and the Third World* (London: Routledge, 1992).
21. Among the many works that provide some of the "building blocks": David N. Cole and Laurie Yung, eds., *Beyond Naturalness: Rethinking Park and Wilderness Stewardship in an Era of Rapid Change* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2010); Peter Harnik, *Urban Green: Innovative Parks for Resurgent Cities*, (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2010);

Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York: Modern Library, 1961; rev. ed. 2011; its chapter on parks is a classic in the field); Elinor Ostrom (who was a Nobel Laureate in 2009), *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Setha Low, Dana Taplin, and Suzanne Scheld, *Rethinking Urban Parks: Public Space and Cultural Diversity* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005); Setha Low and Neil Smith, eds., *The Politics of Public Space* (New York: Routledge, 2006); William R. Lowry, *Preserving Public Lands for the Future: The Politics of Intergenerational Goods* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1998); Paul A. Shackel, *The Archeology of American Labor and Working-Class Life* (Tallahassee: University of Florida Press, 2009); Paul A. Shackel, *Archeology and Created Memory: Public History in a National Park* (New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum, 2000); R. Gerald Wright, ed., *National Parks and Protected Areas: Their Role in Environmental Protection* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Science, 1996).

22. It is important to note that the US National Park Service, particularly since the 1960s, has sought to diversify its leadership and involve community participation, including indigenous peoples, in the management of parks and protected areas, e.g., the “Programmatic Agreement Among the National Park Service (USDO), The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.”
23. George B. Hartzog, Jr., became the seventh director of the US National Park Service (1964–1973). During his administration, the national park system experienced its largest expansion in visitation and the number of new units added: more than 70 new areas, including the “Alaska Amendment” setting aside the vast preserves of the 49th state. He was instrumental in the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wilderness Act, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and urban recreation. He helped to institute science-based management and appointed ethnic minorities and women to important leadership positions. In 1968, he appointed Grant Wright to head the US Park Police, the first African American to lead a major police force in the United States. He established the nation’s first environmental education program and fostered “Living History” as a new interpretive tool. Summer-in-the-Parks for urban young people, the Volunteers-in-Parks and the National Park Foundation were other signature accomplishments during his years of service. (For a more complete profile: www.aapra.org/Pugsley/HartzogGeorge.html.)

George B. Hartzog III is president of The National Parks Project, a nonprofit educational enrichment and community service program. He is a United Methodist minister and served as a pastor in southern California and as president of the Navajo Methodist Mission School. He taught environmental ethics at Indiana University and has served as legislative aide to Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen. He is a former national park ranger and a Life Member of the Association of National Park Rangers, the Employee and Alumni Association, and GWS. He and his family currently reside in Chicago. He can be reached at hart5749@att.net.