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EMERGENCE OF THE OREGON STATE PARKS: A TRAILER ON THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

The Oregon State Parks system\textsuperscript{1} is the state's showcase. Oregonians look to their parks with justifiable pride and boast of public ownership and access to their ocean beaches. The parks are mainly scenic, but some of them represent other values, including scenic waterways, historic locations and hot springs, botanical, geological, volcanic, archeological, or wildlife preservation. Many of the state's 225 parks and waysides are clustered along the highways. The location of these parks attests to the value of early 20th century initiatives to preserve Oregon's natural beauty. Appreciation of the parks' beauty attracts over 32 million visitors yearly, placing Oregon sixth among the states in park attendance and eighth nationally in overnight visitors. Conservative estimates place the Oregon State Parks system economic value to statewide tourism at more than $150 million annually.

\textsuperscript{1}The Oregon State Parks system has been officially identified by a number of titles since its initial organization. For the purposes of this study, the term "Parks" refers to the system rather than to one or several of its component parks.
This is nine times greater than the present Parks budget. Victor Atiyeh, while governor of Oregon, described the Parks system as a giant hospitality business in a giant industry (Oregon State Parks and Recreation Division, 1985, p. 2).

Until 1980, the operational expenses of the Parks were supplied by revenues from the Highway Fund. But when Oregon legislators directed 100 percent of those funds to maintaining the state’s highway system, Parks became dependent upon monies from recreational vehicle registration fees, park user fees, federal funds, and the state General Fund. The state’s declining economy reduced the General Fund and the inevitable agency budget cuts occurred; the parks system suffered. Park users encountered reduced services and park closures. Maintenance, capital improvements, and land acquisition met with delays.

Today, the Parks system is at a crossroads. The system needs legislative support, methods for alternative funding, and an ongoing Parks’ constituency. In order to assess park developments and the contributions of the parks, the state needs to examine the historical record of the Parks system. Currently, no comprehensive study of the system is available. When the advocates of the Parks system seek state-wide support for funding initiatives, Oregonians need to be reminded that their parks preserve the state’s natural
heritage, provide access to recreation, interpret the past, and are vital to the state's economic future.

The objective of this study is to examine the sources of public concern which led to the establishment of the Oregon State Parks system. The study begins with a review of the roots of the conservation movement in the Progressive Era, in order to establish attitudes in the western United States toward the early preservation of public lands, and with consideration of the important roles played in this process by federal agencies, as well as state leaders and local crusaders. Initial expectations were that a groundswell of public opinion, even a grass roots movement, would be discovered, demanding that sections of the western frontier be preserved for future generations. In other words, is the contemporary environmental caretaker-image which Oregonians convey to the rest of the nation rooted in the early history of the establishment of public parks policy? It is not. Rather, this study suggests that a few farsighted preservationists challenged public inertia and commercial interests to set aside and protect parcels of land, created an infrastructure for future parks development, shaped a preservation philosophy, and made the state's beaches and highways central to park planning.

The following chapter considers the significance of national conservation movements and their attempts
to institutionalize a national plan of rational park management. Succeeding chapters review the development of the Oregon Highway Commission and the Commission's subsequent efforts to gain public support for a system of state parks. A chapter profiling the first Oregon Superintendent of Parks is followed by a review highlighting Parks development from the 1950s through the 1980s, and a summary and conclusion.
This year, 1987, marks the 58th anniversary of the Oregon State Parks system, which was an outgrowth of the Progressive Era’s blending of the conservation of natural resources and the preservation of natural scenery. People of vision crusaded aggressively to save Oregon’s natural beauty from the despoliation that was a consequence of the rights of private land ownership. Embracing the spirit of progressive reform, young middle-class professionals and reform politicians joined in utilizing the methods of the Conservation Movement\(^2\) to establish a policy for public lands preservation based upon the spirit of efficient and judicious economic growth.

The Conservation Movement emerged from the frustrations and chaos which accompanied the rampant and often destructive exploitation of natural resources that has been so much a part of the settlement of North America. By the late 19th century some people had become convinced that the United States required a

\(^2\)There was no formally organized "Conservation Movement" per se. The term is a convenient generic description of the efforts and policies of any number of local and national coalitions to establish public lands policies and institutions, while at the same time furthering the interests of economic growth.
program of rational and efficient conservation management (Wiebe, 1967, p. 185). Proponents of this program found a ready alliance with the political reformers of the Progressive Era. Together, they sought the administrative means to bring about the democratic reforms which would place conservation restrictions upon the more rapacious activities of the captains of industry, who were the real movers and shakers of American society. The established 19th century coalition of business interests and politicians had resulted in an unregulated economy and more than a little social injustice. The new generation of "progressive" leaders envisioned scientifically-oriented government as the answer to "greater democracy, good government, the regulation of businesses, social justice, and public service" (Tindall, 1984, p. 903).

As Americans moved west, they rarely concerned themselves with preservation of the natural scenic beauty that seemed so bountiful; instead, they sought dominion over the countryside. Compared to settlers east of the Appalachians, the fur trappers, hunters, miners, cattle ranchers, and sheep herders had a transient relationship with the western frontier. In like terms, the slash-and-burn techniques small farmers practiced on marginal lands left a string of "burned-out" farms in their wake. In the small communities of the growing West, expansionists built fortunes on land
sales during the booms and busts of the western migration, while new corporations harvested the riches of the land and the sea. Their new-found means eventually resulted in the redistribution of the patterns of power and wealth in the United States.

Until the 1870s, America's wealth, status, and power had been diffused and to a broad degree subject to the influence of pillars of eastern communities. All told, there were fewer than 20 millionaires in the entire country. However, industrialization and the expansion of the frontier rapidly transformed the older society, and by 1892 the list of reputed millionaires had risen to 4,047 individuals. The following year the Bureau of the Census estimated that 9 percent of the nation's families owned 71 percent of the nation's wealth. The newly rich, masters of the corporations, emerged as the eminences of wealth and power. The old society--the established manufacturers, professional men, and civil leaders of the eastern seaboard--declined in influence (Hofstadter, 1955, p. 136).

The record reveals that the amount of destructive resource exploitation in the 19th century varied directly with ownership of lands and resources. Large corporations with abundant capital to appropriate large holdings of valuable land wasted resources lavishly, while small individual farmers did not (Hays,
America's industrial age brought enormous economic advances, but it also carried with it the burden of the exhaustion of resources. Civic leaders seemed unable to check the economic power that the corporations and their political allies exerted upon the formation of public land policies. Following the Civil War, however, popular reactions to the private corporations' land-use policies (or lack of them) culminated in the Conservation Movement. Roy Robbins, a historian of the public lands, has stated that the demands for restoration and equal access to the public domain did not come about until after the developers of western resources had established empires fully as great in extent as any of those previously set in place by eastern industrialists (Robbins, 1976, p. 301). Before the federal government approved the first of a series of laws, which were ultimately identified with the Conservation Movement, those who had grown wealthy in their scramble over the land "had ripped through forests, abused precious water supplies, squandered minerals, and stripped lands in a rape of Gargantuan proportions" (Wiebe, 1967, p. 185).

The means to provide corrective action escaped the grasp of many concerned citizens, particularly those in the West whose state governments were new and inefficient. Bitter conflicts, shattered dreams, and indications of a diminished bounty combined to gener-
ate a sense on the part of many civic leaders that Washington must intervene where the centers of power in the individual states made what passed for public and natural resource policies. However, neither a tradition nor the means for effective action existed. The few federal laws that had been passed failed to generate essential change (Wiebe, 1967, p. 186). The authority of the Department of the Interior had little impact upon public resource policies until Theodore Roosevelt became president and his administration adopted an aggressive stance in the interest of preserving public resources and restricting public land utilization. The Congress was convinced that state governments "necessarily bowed to monied interests and that waste and destruction of public lands was inevitable unless strong federal action was taken" (Petulla, 1977, p. 267). At the same time, eastern progressives committed to political and economic justice and the proponents of grass roots democracy did not hesitate to attempt to force the preservation of forests on state and local governments. Their justifications rested on two objectives, "wise-use" and "public good."

By the 1890s, aware that many of the decisions regarding the development of western lands originated in the east, American Westerners felt threatened by the erosion of their political power. A campaign to
establish forest reserves originated with the efforts of wilderness preservationist groups to perpetuate untouched areas of natural beauty, eastern arboriculturists' and botanists' desire to save the trees for the future, and western water users who wanted to protect their water supplies by silt control. Nationally, progressive anti-monopolists and wilderness groups joined in coalitions against corporate business interests, but they often opposed each other's particular local interests. Factions seemed unable to compromise upon a common conservation program. While cattlemen supported the lease of rangelands, settlers opposed it; homesteaders bitterly opposed the Forest Reserve Act of 1891 because it reserved public lands from private entry. Many people saw little difference between forest, range, or mineral reserves and railroad land grants and fought both methods of land withdrawal. Conversely, some conservationists and railroad lines cooperated closely in developing western resources. The Conservation Movement's emphasis on efficiency and consolidation, and its goal of economic growth, often complemented the spirit of railroad construction (Hays, 1959, pp. 264-265).

Americans did not view resource exploitation as a reflection of a national attitude. Citizens in all walks of life, from small farmers to corporate leaders, contributed to wasteful patterns of land-use.
However, there were individuals and small groups of people, often prompted by scientific or aesthetic motives, who labored to set aside sufficient portions of land resources to protect the enduring nature of the environment. John Muir, John Burroughs, Louis Agassiz, and Aldo Leopold played important roles in heightening public awareness of destructive patterns of resource exploitation and in teaching citizens to defend their long-term environmental interests.

Even earlier, Ralph Waldo Emerson's transcendentalist philosophy of nature had convinced critics of American economic progress that truth and wholesomeness could be found in nature and the wilderness, and that spiritual deceits were the product of urban civilizations. As this philosophy gained a certain popularity, land-use practices were pushing the frontiers of the forests further west. Consequently, city vacationers, who found it increasingly difficult to locate unspoiled camping areas, contributed to a movement for forest preservation. Books, magazine articles, and newspaper accounts about nature, travel, and camping in the American West grew in popularity. As early as the 1860s, artists and photographers, notably George Catlin, who was the first to propose the establishment of a system of national parks, portrayed America's natural beauties and popularized their preservation.
The precedent for subsequent national park legislation was set in 1864, when Congress set aside the Yosemite Valley of California for "public use, resort and recreation" and appointed the State of California as trustee for the federal interest. Frederick Law Olmsted, the landscape architect who had designed New York's Central Park, prepared Yosemite's management plan, a role he would later repeat in parks throughout the country.

The natural scenery at Yellowstone generated another request for a national park in 1872. Two factors brought about rapid accession of Yellowstone as a national park. First, it did not lie within the boundaries of any one state and, second, the Congress believed that its ruggedness limited its commercial value. No management policy was suggested and its protection fell to the cavalry regiments of the U.S. Army resident in the area. Prior to this action, physical conditions and limited territorial jurisdictions had led to undisciplined vandalism and poaching in both Yosemite and Yellowstone. The army initiated vigorous steps against those who would further exploit the parks (Petulla, 1977, p. 230).

Public opinion alone did not move Congress to create national parks. Railroad companies, hoping to obtain routes through potential parks, actively encouraged government action. Increases in passenger
travel resulted from the establishment of Yosemite National Park and from 1899 the railroads lobbied for the creation of Mount Rainier and Glacier as national parks. Louis W. Hill, successor to his father, James J. Hill, as head of the Great Northern Railroad, helped promote the Glacier wilderness as a rival to Yosemite Valley and Yellowstone. His railroad closely paralleled the southern boundary of the proposed park and would gain a virtual monopoly over passenger traffic (Runte, 1979, p. 75). These developments fostered a recognition of the value of nature in the complexity of American life. In 1898, John Muir (cited in Tilden, 1951, p. 19), president of the Sierra Club, wrote:

Thousands of nerve-shaken, overcivilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home; that wilderness is a necessity; and that mountain parks and reservations are useful not only as fountains of timber and irrigating rivers, but fountains of life.

By the beginning of the 20th century a variety of influences—the popular image of the transcendent beauty of western resources, economic interests concerned with income from travellers or rational economic development, recognition of the need to preserve water resources, and western mistrust of the perceived eastern political monopoly of power, among others—had coalesced to form the basis for the Conservation Movement. Supported by progressive enthusiasm, eastern
scientists and technologists infused their ideals and practices into federal resource planning. Professionals, rather than grass-roots public groups, set the tone for the Conservation Movement (Hays, 1959, p. 266). The Roosevelt administration utilized the latest scientific knowledge and sought efficiency through planning, foresight, and conscious purpose: Resource development goals required public management of the nation's streams and western lands to balance the use of one resource against those of others.

The organizational continuity and idealistic leadership of the Conservation Movement promoted a multiple-use view of the national parks and prepared the way for the National Parks Service (NPS). When the Service was established in 1916, 16 national parks and 18 national monuments had already been set aside for public recreation and enjoyment (Petulla, 1977, pp. 220-231).

For years the parks had been considered as the heritage of the future, rather than as recreational centers for immediate enjoyment. The new aggressive management of the NPS recognized the potential for increased tourist travel and soon enough the federal government, the railroads, and businesses came to view the national parks as a nucleus for a system of American tourism (Buck, 1921, p. 53). The projected future for the parks was confirmed when the automobile
effected a revolution in popular means of travel. It was the automobile that swiftly democratized the national parks by opening them to people who otherwise could never have afforded to visit them (Cox, 1985, p. 208). As the public obtained more leisure, America's romance with the automobile began.

The demand for park literature and the interest of newspaper and magazine writers indicated a growing acceptance of the concept of parks as centers of recreation. In turn, the NPS launched a nationwide publicity campaign and soon enough various organizations, e.g., local chambers of commerce, tourist bureaus, and automobile clubs, wanted the right to dispense park and tourist information. At the same time the administration of the NPS strengthened its relationships with the states in which the parks were situated.

Automobile touring created the need for a host of auxiliary services--gasoline stations, repair shops, cafes, and motor courts--which brought rapid economic changes to smaller western communities. Free automobile camps were established and hosted by cities and civic organizations in order to accommodate increased tourism. By 1916, motorists had gained entry to all of the national parks, and organizations interested in good roads sought approach improvements and posted road signs directing tourists to park resources.
Private individuals joined in forming a National Park-to-Park Highway Association, designed to promote an interpark road system for easier access and increased travel opportunities. Gradually, highway improvements at the local, state, and federal levels established automobile travel to and within the park system on a permanent basis, profoundly influencing the development of the national parks as recreational centers (Buck, 1921, p. 57).

The "See America First" movement, an early 20th century effort to encourage Americans to tour the United States rather than Europe, increased tourist travel to the parks. Even greater increases occurred when World War I closed Europe to American travelers. For the first time many Americans crossed the continent and began actively to experience the grandeur of western scenery.

Clearly, western states profited from park tourism. The national park concept captured the public imagination and states began to set aside their own areas as new parks. Stephen T. Mather, the first Director of the NPS, encouraged the states to emulate on the local level what the nation was doing on a grander scale. He offered his agency as a model, insisting that "we should develop this industry [tourist travel] as other countries are doing, into one of our biggest economic assets" (Buck, 1921, p. 57).
Mather also promoted his dream of a park-to-park highway system, a federally supported scenic loop connecting the national parks of the West. Mather wanted visitors' itineraries to include several parks so that they might experience an entire region. At the same time he campaigned at state and local levels against the rapid disappearance of scenery along local highways, sacrificed to clear-cut logging practices. Expanding networks of paved roads brought tourists to the parks, but at the same time the roads opened previously inaccessible timber tracts to logging interests. Highway scenery was at the core of Mather's belief that America

should have comfortable camps all over the country, so that the motorist could camp each night in a scenic spot, preferably a state park, . . . and that some day the motorist will be able to round up his family each night on some kind of public land. (Tilden, 1962, p. 8)

It was a goal eventually reached in the American West, as the states, Oregon among them, individually built their own networks of parks and recreational resources and the highways to reach them.
THE OREGON HIGHWAY SYSTEM: A NETWORK FOR PARK PLANNING

Oregon highways have been the framework for state parks planning. The entire transportation system of state highways, secondary roads, bike, hike, and horse trails, waterways, and even the beaches constitute the essential infrastructure of Oregon's park facilities. The history of Oregon's state parks is linked to public rights of beach access, as well as to highway rights-of-way and beautification programs.

The use of the beaches as highways predates Oregon's written history. The coastal Indians traveled well-worn trails that followed the beaches centuries before Spanish, Russian, British, and American explorers sailed along the Oregon coastline. The estuaries of the larger coastal streams, principally at the present sites of Seaside, Nehalem, Tillamook, Newport, Waldport, Yachats, Reedsport, and Coos Bay (see Figure 1), were the favored locations for Indian villages (Dicken, 1976, p. 8). The Indian trails followed the beaches as closely as possible because dense forests limited inland trails to short, narrow, and sometimes steep paths. When an area's rough terrain required
Figure 1. Oregon Coastal Map (Raisz, 1965).
canoe travel, the Indians remained within sight of land. The dry sandy beaches served as places where meals could be prepared and rest obtained.

The first written account of the use of Oregon's beaches as highways by other than Indians, appeared in Captain William Clark's journal on January 6, 1806. Twelve men, including Clark and the Indian guide Sacajawea, traveled south from Camp Clatsop to Cannon Beach in the hope of obtaining blubber from a beached whale near a Tillamook village (Straton, 1977, p. 3).

White settlers from the midwest, who began to stake out claims on the Clatsop Plains in the 1840s, found themselves virtually isolated in a primitive wilderness. The area was accessible by ship or by utilizing the beaches, and the shoreline was an obvious ready-made road. Horseback riders used the beaches to carry communications between settlements. As late as the 1880s, there were but few wagon roads to the south of Seaside (Straton, 1977, p. 5) and the reliance of the settlers upon the beaches as a means of communication increased. At the same time the industries developed along the Oregon coast, commercial fishing and canning, lumber mills, and mines, as well as agricultural developments, were equally dependent upon the beaches for access to their markets.

By the late 1800s, the Oregon Pacific, the Corvallis and Eastern, and the Willamette and Coast rail-
road companies had been formed to both serve local coastai communities and to bring tourists from inland cities to the beaches and the coastal resorts which developed with rail travel. Railway depots, sometimes within a block of the beach, discharged passengers to nearby hotels and tent cities. The beach trains became so popular with Willamette Valley residents that sometimes eight daily trains were needed to deliver tourists from Corvallis to Yaquina City. By 1898, the route between Portland, Astoria, Seaside, and Clatsop Beach was established. Regular service brought Portland passengers to Tillamook in 1911 and in 1916 rail service was extended west from Eugene to Florence and from there south to Reedsport and Coos Bay (Straton, 1977, p. 6).

The State Land Board, however, saw the beaches as something other than a public highway. As early as 1872, to raise revenues, the Oregon Legislature made provision for the sale of portions of state-owned lands, including tidal and overflowed lands. This act permitted local owners to purchase the tidelands facing seacoast property they might happen to own (Armstrong, 1965, p. 50). The question of the state's right to the title for the tidelands, and its authority to sell them, was upheld by the Oregon Supreme Court in Bowlby vs. Shively. Justice William P. Lord stated that the tidelands became the property of the
State of Oregon upon admission to the Union and the state had the right to dispose of them. The state ruling was later upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, which declared that the law of the land was relative to ownership of the tidelands (Armstrong, 1965, p. 50).

The State Land Board had in 1874 begun to dispose of state-owned lands and the policy continued until 37 transactions were completed. These sales conveyed 23 miles of tidal shorelines into private ownership, alienations of lands in every coastal county, with the exception of Lane County. The questionable wisdom of the sales of beach properties caused public controversy, and the importance of the beaches to north-south transportation became a political issue. Consequently, in 1899 the Oregon Legislature decreed that the ocean beach from the Columbia River to the southern boundary of Clatsop County, between ordinary high and extreme low tides, was a "public highway, and shall forever remain open as such to the public" (Armstrong, 1965, p. 49).

Governor Oswald West subsequently demonstrated even more determination to preserve the state's shorelines. In opposition to the sale of the tidelands he told the 1913 Legislature that the entire length of Oregon's beaches should be declared a public highway because no other transportation route existed along
the coast. The Legislature, with the important exception of those state tidelands previously sold, accepted West's proposal and amended the 1899 law to include all of the tidelands from the Columbia River to the California border (General Law of Oregon, 1913, Chapter 47).

As a strong advocate of land preservation, Governor West earned a state and national reputation as a champion of natural resources. His actions included creation of the office of State Forester, the Bureau of Forestry, and the establishment of the Fish and Game Commission. He was best known, however, as the "Father of the Oregon Beaches."

Governor West also prepared the stage for the Oregon State Parks system when he focused attention on the need for construction and maintenance of public highways. To that time, Oregon had lagged behind its neighbors, California and Washington, in public highway construction. California had in 1895 established a state highway bureau and in 1910 the California State Highway Act provided $18 million in bond issues for the construction of 3,050 miles of roads (Tuhy, 1983, p. 142). By 1910, Washington's commitment to highway construction included three key roads: the Blaine to Vancouver segment of the Pacific Highway (present-day Interstate 5); a road east from Vancouver along the Columbia and northeast to Spokane; and a
mountainous route from Spokane through Snoqualmie Pass to Tacoma and Seattle. A year earlier the Washington Legislature had allotted one-third of state revenues for road construction. This budget provided $28,000 per mile to build roads around Seattle (Tuhy, 1983, pp. 134-137).

At the same time Oregon had only a few thousand miles of ungraded trails, and the 1913 road construction fund totaled only $250,000 (Oregon has led the way, 1952, p. 124). Earlier Oregon legislatures had recognized neither the inadequacy of public feeder roads to rail and shipping terminals, nor the immediate need for a year-round highway network. But Sam Hill’s good roads campaign, the Oregon Automobile Club, and A. E. Todd’s Pacific Highway Association all touted the concept of a paved highway connecting Washington, Oregon, and California as a logical and inevitable development. The model was the Oregon and California Railroad.

After touring the state, Todd had observed that Oregon possessed only a few miles of good macadam or gravel roads and that 65 percent of the entire road system lacked proper grading. Mud and boulders made Oregon roads often impassable in winter and difficult in summer. Todd also cited Oregon for having the only tollgate on the Pacific Highway, and at that, placing it on a very poor section of the road. He suggested
that the "notably independent, if not always progressive, Oregon voters had to be persuaded of the need for change (Tuhy, 1983, p. 142).

That change occurred in 1913 when Governor West and Sam Hill, philanthropist, highway enthusiast, and an executive of the Great Northern Railroad (founded by James J. Hill, Sam Hill's father-in-law), joined forces to get the public "pretty much good roads-minded by the time the 1913 session of the legislature rolled around". In West's opinion, "the people of this state are fine, but damned peculiar. One often is obliged to resort to strategy in order to induce them to do things that are really in their interest" (Tuhy, 1983, pp. 140-141). Part of the governor's strategy was to appoint a "Harmony Committee," whose members each pledged $500 to support bills for state road bonds, the appointment of a highway commission, and to gain the use of convict labor for road construction projects.

Hill's best public relations strategy involved taking the entire legislature to see his experimental road at Maryhill. As an additional endorsement of the bond bill he showed hand-colored slides of northwest mountains, waterfalls, and rivers, a part of his "famous" illustrated good roads lecture. John Tuhy calls the Maryhill excursion "Sam's grand gesture," and he credits it as a turning point in gaining
legislative support. Later, the Oregon Legislature passed concurrent resolutions thanking Hill for his dedication to the cause of good roads. Prominent Portland citizens honored him with a banquet and gave him the title, "Oregon's friend" (Tuhy, 1983, pp. 140-141).

The 1913 Legislature, convinced of the need to build primary and secondary highways, replaced an advisory board with the State Highway Commission. By virtue of their positions, the Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, and the State Highway Engineer were to serve on the commission, along with three appointees from different congressional districts. A one-quarter mill state property tax provided the commission's operating funds, while counties negotiated some $1 million in bond issues for construction purposes. The counties' interest promoted improvement of the main routes of travel (Oregon has led the way, 1952, p. 124).

By 1917, Oregon's highway situation was in general more desperate than that in the nation. With its sparse population, large area, rugged terrain, and long rainy season, no state needed "to get out of the mud" more, according to the slogan of Hill's good roads campaign. Two factors helped the legislature recognize the enormity of the Highway Commission's financial problems. Automobile registrations in Oregon
had reached 48,632 and a federal grant program for road construction was set in motion, offering matching funds for those projects which met its requirements (one of which was that highway financing include revenue producing programs). A $6 million bond issue was passed and auto license fees netted an additional $150,000. Operator’s license fees and a one-cent per gallon state gasoline tax, the nation’s first, followed two years later, as vehicle registrations approached 100,000 (Oregon led the way, 1952, pp. 124-125).

The Oregon highway commissioners set their sights on a paved road from border to border by the end of the decade and high on their list of expectations was a more profitable tourist industry. Multnomah County, which contributed 40 percent of the highway funds, expected the profits from tourist travel to add to its development and prosperity. Predictions that thousands of tourists would journey north from California led some observers to view Portland as the future “hub for the scenic Northwest” (Ausman, 1917, p. 36).

One of the first cars to travel over the Pacific Highway in 1917 did so towing a camping trailer. The Oregon Motor Association, however, questioned the ability of the state to accommodate tourists who wanted to camp while touring. Some smaller cities hosted sites and benefited from the money spent by
visitors, but the only campgrounds near Portland were across the river in Vancouver, Washington (Automobile news, 1917, p. 36). Organizations pushed for free campgrounds offering water, shade, and fuel. Cars piled high with camping paraphernalia stopped wherever they could find water, either on or off the right-of-ways. Few public facilities existed, however, making long trips in Oregon more difficult. Requests for camping sites and roadside beautification resulted in a Highway Commission advisory instructing highway engineers "to investigate the matter of park possibilities along the highways" (Armstrong, 1965, p. 3).
THE INFLUENCE OF THE MAJOR FIGURES
OF THE PARKS MOVEMENT

Although the momentum of Oregon’s parks movement attracted concerned citizens and organizations, it did not emanate from the public at large, but from the enthusiasm of a few dedicated civic and political leaders. Individual interest had spurred the projects which resulted in the early preservation of Crater Lake, the Oregon Caves, the Columbia Gorge, and the coastal beaches. The Portland city parks included scenic as well as recreational areas. These successes indicated that Oregonians could be persuaded to protect endangered scenic sites, but as historian Lawrence Rakestraw has pointed out, "their infrequency underscores how little was actually being done" (cited in Cox, 1968, p. 184).

Conservation leaders Stephen Mather and Madison Grant, president of the Bronx Parkway Commission and chairman of the executive committee of the New York Zoological Society, inspected Crater Lake National Park in 1919 and then worked to rally greater state and local support for scenic preservation. They joined to pursue Mather’s dream of a scenic highway connecting all of the western states and national
parks, placing their cause before an Assembly of Oregon Editors and Governor Ben W. Olcott. The results were disappointing. Support from civic groups faded when Mather and Grant left the state, but the pair's unscheduled visit to Bend's newspaper office marked a turning point in Oregon's conservation history.

Mather and Grant recruited Robert W. Sawyer, the young editor of the Bend Bulletin who brought more than just his local experience to the cause of conservation. Educated at Phillips Exeter and Harvard, Sawyer practiced law in Massachusetts before emigrating to Oregon (Cox, 1968, p. 183). In Bend, Sawyer's poetry attracted the attention of Bulletin editor George Palmer Putnam, who became the younger man's mentor. Even at this point the Bulletin was not unconcerned with some of the aims of the conservation movement, supporting highway development and expressing concern at the divestment of state lands (Cox, 1968, pp. 180-181).

Sawyer listened to his visitors express their dismay at the spectacle of stump-and-slash wastelands on the highway south of Bend. Grant claimed that tourists saw nothing but barren, unattractive slashings. Pine forests, the highway's assets, were cut away on both sides of the roadway and shipped to the city's sawmills (Cox, 1968, pp. 180-181). Sawyer was already an advocate of scenic preservation and tourism
and he agreed with Mather's assessment that a highway loses its value if its scenic beauty is destroyed. Fired with renewed enthusiasm, he agreed to crusade for the preservation of the remaining timber on the Dalles-California highway.

Ambitious and politically astute, Sawyer appealed directly to Shevlin-Hixon, a large Bend timber firm. He persuaded the company to reserve timber strips on both sides of the highway, to preserve the Dillon Falls area on the Deschutes River, to donate land for a city park, and to dedicate Tumolo Canyon as a living memorial to the company's late president, Thomas Shevlin (Cox, 1968, p. 183).

Bend's other logging firm, Brooks-Scanlon, proved less willing to take similar steps. To combat the firm's resistance, Sawyer enlisted the support of a powerful ally, Governor Ben Olcott, who would emphasize "the patriotic and civic duty" attached to preserving "our wonderful natural surroundings." In spite of this pressure, Brooks-Scanlon held out until November, 1921, when the Oregon Legislature assured an exchange of Forest Service timber for strips of land adjacent to the highway in question (Cox, 1968, p. 186).

Governor Olcott was a recent convert to the conservation struggle, as may be witnessed by the failure of Mather and Grant to gain his support at an earlier
meeting. The governor's transformation occurred on a highway inspection tour of the road from Cannon Beach to Seaside. Crossing the Coastal Range, Olcott saw logging crews cutting virgin forests and laying waste to the land on both sides of the highway. He subsequently forced a delay in Crown-Willamette's coastal roadside logging until "equitable arrangements could secure its preservation." When news of this agreement received broad circulation and support, Olcott quickly promoted himself to the position of Conservation Movement spokesman. Convinced of the need for legislation, he began to query other states for guideline information. A response from California explained how a law in 1915 protected its roadside scenery and enlarged state highway right-of-ways. Olcott needed publicity for his campaign, and the press responded. An Oregonian editorial affirmed that something should be done to preserve Oregon roadways, citing California's example as the precedent. The paper went on to praise Olcott and his actions as the "voice of the times," further pointing out that it was not necessary that "every vestige of verdure be shaved from the landscape" (Cox, 1968, p. 188).

The reaction from civic and urban leaders was favorable, with some of them even recommending immediate and drastic action to halt the roadside logging.
Reports from a fact-finding committee appointed by Olcott reinforced his sense of urgency. Highway investigator Herbert Nunn had reported that the devastation was even greater than previously had been believed. There were no trees, he reported, left standing along the highway for 10 miles south of Bend, and loggers had even felled the trees in the right-of-way. Roadside logging had also marred the Columbia River highway, a source which fed logs to the Portland mills which alone consumed a daily harvest of over 80 acres of timber. Moreover, the new technology represented by development of the Caterpillar Tractor promised to accelerate the pace of logging to ever greater quantities (Petulla, 1977, p. 51). Logging operators were not the only guilty parties in this history. Between Eugene and Goshen, telephone crews had cut away a particularly beautiful section of timber that Nunn had hoped to save (Cox, 1968, p. 189).

Increased public awareness and organizational support encouraged Olcott to push for action. He reminded Oregonians of the thousands of dollars spent to promote tourism, linking protection of the scenic beauty of the highways to the welfare of the state. He also raised the issue of instituting an organized method of welcoming and accommodating out-of-state visitors (Armstrong, 1965, p. 4).
It is appropriate that Olcott, who had been Oswald West's protege and Secretary of State, was the public official responsible for urging vigorous state action to preserve the scenic beauty of Oregon's highways. His address to the Oregon Legislature on January 10, 1921, painted a dismal picture if vital forested highway sections went unprotected:

Without them our mountains would be rocky, forbidding eminences; our streams would dwindle into rivulets; our lakes be shorn of the sylvan fringes which make them entrancing to the nature lover, and our valleys [be marked] by monotonous stretches. (Armstrong, 1965, p. 4)

Noting the common interests of the public, the tourist industry, logging companies, and the state government "to keep our state the most livable in the Union" (Armstrong, 1965, p. 4), Governor Olcott urged the legislature to adopt three objectives, based upon existing California laws: empowering the State Highway Commission to enlarge right-of-ways for maintenance and preservation purposes; prohibiting the wanton destruction of trees along public roadways; and authorizing the Highway Commission to acquire lands for parks and for parking to accommodate the traveling public and beautify and protect roadside areas (Cox, 1968, p. 193).

Opponents of the governor's plan surfaced quickly. Rural residents, in particular, had a more utilitarian perspective of natural resources. They
were willing to accept the principle of the preservation of roadside scenery, but not at the impractical price of setting aside extensive strips of timber. The government could not afford to purchase the land, nor could private landowners sacrifice their rights to the timber lining Oregon's highways. The economic primacy of the state's lumber industry, critics argued, overshadowed the desirability of leaving a forested corridor.

Olcott countered by offering assurances that he would not deprive individual owners of valuable lands. He did not seek vast areas, he pointed out, but rather "isolated tracts tucked away in pretty nooks, and virgin stretches of forest along highways." He hoped to accomplished this "without too great [an] expense and without arbitrary confiscation of property" (Armstrong, 1965, p. 5).

The governor's concept--to preserve timber within 300 feet of existing highways--gained support from the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Concerns about logging practices on reservation lands arose when the Pelican Bay Lumber Company of Klamath Falls prepared to cut timber on a tract of the Klamath Falls Indian Reservation. The tract lay directly east of Crater Lake National Park and was crossed by The Dalles-California highway. Olcott and Stephen Mather had influenced BIA officials to reserve timber strips
on Oregon's Indian reservations. Mather saw this example for private owners as "the least the government can do" (Cox, 1968, pp. 188-189). At the same time loggers felt pressured by the rise in public criticism, believing that they had been singled out for special censure. Cooperation in effecting the change rested with the stumpage owners who accepted timber bids, and not with the contract loggers. The larger logging operations that owned their own timber lands were those that could best afford to support conservation measures. Compliance enhanced a company's reputation, making an impression upon state and local officials. Lands donated for parks not only offered proof of industry's concern for the state's economy and welfare, it also created enduring monuments.

Only half of Olcott's proposals gained legislative approval. A bill (HB 311) outlawing wanton destruction was unanimously passed by the Oregon House, while an amended version allowing "trimming" cleared the Senate by a 21 to 4 margin. The right-of-way bill (SB 365) passed in the Senate by a 20 to 4 vote, but met strong opposition in the House. The vote, 39 to 15 in favor of the measure, reflected substantial opposition from rural constituencies (Cox, 1968, p. 194).

The triumphant governor signed these two measures into law on February 24, 1921. The Highway Commission
now had the authority to acquire land and timber rights up to 300 feet from the center-line of public and state highways. Unfortunately, the part of Olcott's program which would have created a state parks system died in the Senate Highway Committee (Cox, 1968, p. 194). These measures had proved to be premature. The public expressed little interest in the concept of a state parks system. Even though the automobile had put people in contact with the state's scenic beauties and the opportunities that tourism presented, no basic changes in public attitudes seemed to be forthcoming. Public awareness of the need for change had not developed. There had been no organized movement to direct public concern toward retaining areas set aside as natural environments or pressure to actively institute highway beautification programs and rest area facilities for travelers.

Olcott countered by working to establish the Scenic Preservation Association, a state-wide organization. He urged each county to participate by providing representation on the state panel. The movement registered only slow organizational progress because influential groups failed to cooperate with local associations, leaving the movement's promise unfulfilled. The setback to conservationist concepts even led to criticism of Olcott by the more militant preservationists. With the governor's defeat in his
reelection bid on November 7, 1922, Oregon lost its most influential conservation champion. Conservation groups splintered, unable to agree upon a common program and certainly unable to set in motion a public crusade to revive their programs.

The public voice of the conservationists might have been temporarily muted, but the movement was not moribund. Some preservationists adopted a new direction, working within the Highway Department to gain the appointment of an advisory committee on roadside beautification. The coalition working in this direction found Olcott's 1921 law insufficient to cover the costs of land acquisition for parks. Recognizing that public roads with narrow right-of-ways were not enough, they sought broader public authority to condemn private property for park purposes and to exercise the right of eminent domain. Over the next few years the actions of a few private individuals and groups, a lobby if you will, proved more successful than the loosely organized movement inspired by Olcott. The 1925 Legislature was led to modify the 1921 law to include acquisition of lands necessary for "parks, parking places, auto camps, campsites, public squares, [and] recreation grounds on resorts . . . conveniently reached by and from state highways" (Armstrong, 1965, p. 14).
Even prior to the passage of legislation enabling public acquisition of land for parks and recreation areas, an active policy had been initiated within the State Highway Commission to encourage public support for preservation by soliciting land donations for park sites by public-spirited citizens. The Commission hoped that the impact of land donations would serve to increase state land holdings, while at the same time conserving funds for improvement purposes. The first of many noteworthy donations was a five and one-half acre tract bordering the West Pacific Highway on the Luckiamute River in Polk Country, deeded to the state on February 15, 1922. The park site was named in honor of Sarah Helmick, a pioneer who in 1845 had crossed the plains to Oregon by covered wagon, and was donated by the Helmick family (Armstrong, 1965, p. 185).

During the period from 1922 to 1929, private individuals were led to contribute a total of 24 similar land parcels to the state. The gifts, though small in number, represented the diversity of Oregon geographic regions. Located in 14 counties, they totaled 2,257.2 acres. The largest, in the Saddle Mountain area,
contained 1,280 acres, while the smallest consisted of 25 square feet of land provided for the Barlow monument at Government Camp (Sawyer, 1930, p. 110). Some of these sites, secured without cost to the state, are presently among the state's most valuable parks (see Figure 2).

Certain features made some of the park sites especially significant to the parks system. Bradley Park, at Clatsop Crest, afforded a sweeping view of the Columbia River, while Mayer Park, near The Dalles, presented a panorama of the Columbia River Valley. Talbot Park, near Portland, permitted entry to the Latourell Falls area. Peter Skene Ogden Park protected the remarkable geological formations in the Crooked River Canyon, and Lava River Caves Park preserved the unusual cave believed to be a result of volcanic action. A coastal park provided the area necessary to view the Devil's Punch Bowl, where wave action crashing into Cape Creek channel boiled up and reverberated like thunder. Chandler Park, located on both sides of Crooked River Canyon, barely escaped destruction from logging activities. Chandler Park and Shelton Park, on the John Day Highway, served as valuable oases for travelers (Sawyer, 1930, p. 110).

In addition to the donated park sites, the state also purchased rights to 32 park areas. The land sale represented many transactions because some park units
Figure 2. State Park Locations, By County, 1929.
were composed of purchases from many individual sales. Blue Mountain Forest Wayside, bordering the Old Oregon Trail between Deadman's Pass and La Grande, typified many such acquisitions. The park preserved the first pine forest travelers saw when they entered Oregon from the east, and in 1965 it was still the only evergreen forest on U.S. Highway 30 between Salt Lake City in Utah and The Dalles in Oregon (Armstrong, 1965, p. 94). Some of the most important and interesting purchases along the coast, such as Yachats, Rocky Creek, Boiler Bay, Otter Crest, Cape Sebastian, and Humbug Mountain state parks were acquired during these years. By February 24, 1930, expenditures for park sites totaled $80,504.39 (Sawyer, 1930, p. 111).

In addition to gifts and purchases from private landowners, public lands were also made available for park purposes. The federal Recreation Act of 1926 allowed the sale of unreserved public domain lands, designated by the states as chiefly valuable for scenic and recreational purposes, to public agencies at prices fixed by the Secretary of the Interior (Armstrong, 1965, p. 2). The Act provided several park sites in the late 1920s, including a 1,600 acre tract in Grant and Wheeler Counties, recommended by Dr. John C. Merriam, president of the Carnegie Institution and a founder of the Save-the-Redwoods League,
which attracted considerable scientific and geological interest (Sawyer, 1930, p. 111).

Guided by the greater scope of the 1925 parks amendment legislation, the Highway Commission set itself a dual course, both to preserve natural beauty and to attract tourists to enjoy Oregon's scenery. The Commission, in agreement with Olcott's wish to keep the state "the most livable in the Union," also recognized that without preservation of scenic beauty there would likely be no tourist industry to encourage.

In 1927 the experienced conservation campaigner and staunch supporter of Governor Olcott's efforts to preserve Oregon's scenery, Robert Sawyer, became a state Highway Commissioner. His active advocacy within the Commission converted its chairman, Henry B. Van Duzer, vice president and general manager of Inman-Poulsen, Portland's largest lumber company, to the cause of preservation. Within six months of Sawyer's appointment, the Commission acquired twice as many sites for parks and strips of highway timberland as it had in all the previous years of its existence combined. The number increased even more by the end of Sawyer's first year on the Commission (Cox, 1973, pp. 22-23).

Robert Sawyer proved to be an informed and articulate commissioner, playing a significant role in
state conservation for the next generation. His perceptive judgment of Oregon’s political realities benefited the Commission and influenced the course of state park development. He disagreed with the proposals of Charles G. Sauers, a representative of the National Conference of State Parks (and an Indiana parks developer), who came to the west coast in 1927 to advocate creation of a state department of conservation, which would then develop a parks system in conjunction with the management and protection of natural resources. In Oregon he insisted that his type of organization dedicated to park development would prove more effective than the existing Highway Commission. According to Sauers, the states with the most impressive parks systems had created them through institution of just such state departments.

Sawyer’s opposition to a separate department of parks sprang from his own conservation efforts in Bend and the experience of Olcott’s crusade for scenery preservation, which, in spite of widespread public support, had met with only limited legislative success (and no direct funding) from cost-conscious legislators. To Sawyer, these experiences were a strong forewarning of the uncertainties of legislative funding (Cox, 1973, p. 23).

Although a proposal for a centralized and specialized approach to building a system of statewide
parks seemed logical, Sawyer anticipated serious funding problems if and when parks became a separate department. Appropriations for what appeared to be non-essentials were difficult to obtain when the uncertainties of the economy and high taxes produced budget reform movements. Sawyer believed, and later Parks management would discover, that a conservation agency, dependent for legislative funding each biennium, might be seriously restricted in developing the parks system. Moreover, Sawyer was fearful that the publicity surrounding periodic budget proceedings would unnecessarily alert property owners at potential park sites and encourage speculation, or at the least inflated land costs. Sawyer preferred that the parks remain under the auspices of the Highway Commission, where "funds for the purchase and management of parks were assured and secrecy more likely" (Cox, 1973, p. 23).

Commissioners Sawyer and Van Duzer quietly set out to suppress the drive for a separate agency without a public confrontation. Undue publicity might have aroused questions regarding the Highway Commission's use of the gasoline tax receipts and other funds for park purposes. When the Commission explained to Sauers what had been accomplished with a "behind-the-scenes" approach, he changed his view and withdrew his support for a separate department of conservation in Oregon (Cox, 1973, p. 26).
Sauers not only withdrew his proposal, he lent his active support to the continuing efforts of the Highway Commission. This was an important victory for the commissioners, but it did not ensure support for the Commission's parks program. Sawyer sought the open support of Governor Isaac L. Patterson, which was given in May, 1929, when the Governor proposed the establishment of a state parks commission (Armstrong, 1965, p. 10). The governor's proposal quickly won public support, the commission was initiated and Sawyer, Van Duzer, and Charles E. Gates of the Highway Commission, and two former Highway Commission chairmen, R. A. Booth and William C. Duby, were appointed to the Oregon States Parks Commission. The group met only once, on July 24, 1929, to create guidelines for site selections and maintenance. The rules guided state land acquisition policies for many years. Based on these policies, the Highway Commission gave first consideration to scenic or inspirational value and the natural beauty of a site. With few exceptions, recreational areas of picnicking, hiking, swimming, and surf-bathing received secondary attention (Greider, 1938, p. 532). The Parks Commission did nothing that the Highway Commission could not do alone, but it provided an official sanction for land acquisitions for specific park purposes and formed the basis for future action (Armstrong, 1965, p. 34). The appointment of
the State Parks Commission ended the activities of the advisory committee.

In the summer of 1929, Sawyer convinced Van Duzer and Gates that a parks superintendent should be appointed, arguing that neither the Commission nor the engineers of the Highway Department could provide the continuity or systematic direction essential to establish firmly the state's parks system. Sawyer pointed out that engineers facing construction and maintenance problems had little time to devote to parks design and management. Nor could the Commission be regarded as free of political pressures. Progress, according to Sawyer, required a dedicated champion who could set in motion a consistent statewide parks policy over the long-run.

The timing of the Commissioners' decision proved critical to the continuity and security of Oregon's parks. Governor Patterson died in December, 1929, and shortly thereafter Robert Sawyer was removed from the Highway Commission following a disagreement with the new Governor, Albin W. Norblad, over road-building priorities. Sawyer would no longer influence parks acquisitions and development, but what had been established during his brief tenure (see Figure 3 for the extent of the state parks system as of 1929) was considerable. His removal from office marked a turning point in the history of the Oregon Parks system.
LEGEND OF PARK SITES

1. Bradley Park
2. Unnamed Park
3. Guy W. Talbot Park
4. Unnamed Park
5. Viento Park
6. Unnamed Timber Area
7. Memaloose Park
8. Mayer Park
9. Unnamed Park
10. Unnamed Park
11. Blue Mountain Timber Reserve
12. Emigrant Park
13. Gangloff Park
14. Wanlows Timber Reserve
15. Unnamed Park
16. Rattlesnake Springs
17. Unnamed Park
18. Unnamed Park
19. Unnamed Timbered Area
20. Painted Rocks
21. Johnny Kirk Springs
22. Shelton Park
23. Peter Skene Ogden Park
24. Unnamed Park
25. Terrence H. Foley Park
26. Lava River Caves Park
27. Chandler Park
28. Unnamed Park
29. Booth Park
30. Camas Mountain Park
31. Unnamed Park
32. Helmick Park
33. Holman Park
34. Unnamed Parking Strip
35. Barlow Monument Site
36. Park Site at Boiler Bay
37. Park Site at Rocky Creek
38. Park Site at Otter Crest
39. Park Site at DePoe Bay
40. Devils Punch Bowl
41. Unnamed Park
42. Park Site at Yachats
43. Unnamed Park
44. Humbug Mountain Park
45. Unnamed Park
46. Cape Sebastian Park
47. Park Site at Harris Beach
48 and 49. Offered by Lane County
50. Offered by Jess Darling of Eugene

Figure 3. Oregon State Park Sites, 1930 (Sawyer, 1930, p. 108).
Initiatives would no longer come from the Highway Commission, but would originate with the Parks Superintendent (Sawyer, 1930, pp. 24-28).
When Samuel H. Boardman was appointed Parks Engineer (subsequently titled "superintendent") on July 24, 1929, members of the State Parks Commission considered the appointment as temporary in nature. The commissioners wanted to promote someone from within the Highway Department, and Boardman's enthusiasm for tree planting and highway beautification made him a logical choice. As it turned out, his methods of influencing people to donate property for park purposes made him a wise choice as well. Boardman's 21-year tenure as the first State Parks Superintendent has been referred to as the "Acquisition Period." His principal duties sent him around the state to identify and protect roadside timber, but Boardman also turned his attention toward acquiring scenic park sites (Cox, 1973, pp. 26-27). Constantly on the move, Boardman later estimated that he traveled two to three thousand miles each month (Merriam, 1987, p. 2).

Boardman derived great pleasure and gratification from the Parks' acquisition program. His affinity for nature and his practical experience gained him a great deal of public recognition. Born in Massachusetts in
1874, Sam Boardman had received his education in Wisconsin before migrating west. He homesteaded along the Columbia River, where the present-day town of Boardman bears his name. An affection for trees led him to plant them in treeless country, especially along the Columbia River and the Old Oregon Trail. He experienced great satisfaction when the tree planting along shadeless highways became a project of the Oregon Highway Department (Boardman, 1939, p. 2).

The superintendent joined previous advocates in understanding the need to preserve Oregon's resources. He predicted that if Oregon had sufficient state parks it would experience considerable growth in the tourist business and he lived to witness tourism become the state's third largest industry (Armstrong, 1965, p. 75). Directing his efforts primarily at land acquisition, Boardman believed that transactions had to be made while the land was unspoiled and inexpensive and that when necessary, development could wait until adequate funding existed.

Boardman also realized that he had no hope of saving the bulk of first-growth timber on highway strips, since the monetary value of the timber was too great. He rather concentrated on saving groves of trees at particularly scenic points, preserving for the newer highways the scenic beauty already lost to older roads (Allen, 1930). At times he devised means
to block timber contract bids. When the Highway Commission authorized an $18,000 harvest at Short Sand Beach (presently "Oswald West") to finance the area's purchase, Boardman attached stipulations to the contract sufficient to discourage bidders, and the area was never logged (Merriam, 1987, p. 2).

The cut-over lands adjoining highway right-of-ways became an important source of acquisition for Boardman and the Parks Commission. They purchased reasonably priced lands in areas conducive to the rapid growth of alder, pine, and other indigenous species. As Boardman predicted, the regrowth areas became valuable and timbered scenic assets (Boardman, 1939, pp. 137-140).

The Parks administration believed in preserving the natural settings of parks and waysides, prescribing as little man-made development as possible. This policy prohibited overnight public camping in Oregon parks until the 1950s. Oregon's rule against camping appeared in a National Park report which provided a statistical picture of state park use throughout the 1930s. The report noted that the most frequent visitors to Oregon state parks were employed in the trades, professions, and clerical occupations, which together represented only 28 percent of the state's population. The vast majority of park visitors, 82 percent, came from urban populations, though Oregon's
urban population constituted only 52 percent of the total population. Oregonians also showed their preference for the seashore (National Park Service, 1941, pp. 9, 34). The coastal area, dotted with parks for over 362 miles, was one of four geographic regions which Boardman designated as the coastal, west of the Cascades, east of the Cascades, and Columbia River highway areas.

Much of the development Boardman had projected occurred between 1933 and 1941, when the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) performed park-conservation work which benefited the parks and promoted the values of conservation and preservation. It was during this decade that the struggle intensified between those who wanted to maintain the natural state of the parks and those who sought to provide the means for greater recreational use. Boardman frequently argued with the CCC and the National Park Service officials "to keep the state's parks in a natural condition." He complained that they "like to hang the garland on the crag, festoon the stars and the moon" (Cox, 1981, p. 16). His opposition to overnight camping in the state parks set aside the National Parks Service's proposal to establish overnight camping at Woahink Lake at Honeyman State Park, and it was only with great reluctance that he was persuaded to allow the creation of overnight facilities at Silver Falls State Park, camps
at Wallowa Lake, and, at the close of his tenure, a campground at Sunset Bay on the Oregon coast (Merriam, 1987, p. 2). However, in his appraisal of the CCC projects, Boardman noted that without the aid of the CCC, Oregon's parks development would have been years behind the schedule it achieved (Tilden, 1962, p. 375).

During his years as superintendent (1929-1950), Boardman built up Oregon's recreational and scenic areas: in all, some 121 parcels of land representing gifts, private sales, and acquisitions from federal, state, and county government agencies. When Superintendent Boardman lacked adequate state funding, he turned to private sources and proved that resourcefulness, enthusiasm, and vision were as essential to the system's growth as were money and construction. Donations ranged from a fraction of an acre to the 5,730 acre park at Silver Falls, a gift presented by the Secretary of the Interior (Boardman, 1939, p. 3). Parks holdings grew from 6,444 acres in 1930 to 57,195 acres at Boardman's retirement (Armstrong, 1965, p. 75). Boardman acknowledged each gift by presenting a certificate to the donor (see Figure 4).

Boardman's successful acquisitions program and his campaign to encompass the divergent natural features of Oregon into a single parks system won him national acclaim. In 1947 he received the American
Figure 4. Land Donation Acknowledgement for State Park Purposes (Armstrong, 1965, p. 21).
Scenic and Historical Preservation Society medal for outstanding service in the cause of conservation. He also came to be regarded as the "Father of the Oregon State Parks System" (Cox, 1968, p. 199), a system which Boardman described as "a necklace of scenic gems . . . [to which] many brilliants must still be added" (Boardman, 1956, p. 4).
REVIEW OF PARK PROGRESS, FROM 1950 TO THE PRESENT

After 1950 the scope and management of the State Parks system changed. No longer a scattering of holdings devoted to preservation, the sizable network required bureaucratic management, closer alignment with other state agencies, a forest management policy, and recreational development. Increased public demands called for a balance between preservation and utilization. Parks programs changed from acquisition to development and construction. Some 55 campgrounds with 5,500 campsites were built in primarily nonurban areas, reflecting the needs of the nuclear family, while a gasoline tax supported the expanding system (Oregon State Parks and Recreation Division, 1985, p. 4).

The Highway Commission's management of the parks came under greater public scrutiny; pressure increased to establish a separate parks division. The Advisory Committee on Travel Information (a state body) conducted an evaluation of Oregon's parks system and compared it to the California and Washington organizations. The Committee recommended that management remain under the Highway Commission's jurisdiction so long as the parks were solely financed by highway
revenues. Another suggestion led to the appointment of an advisory committee, a citizen's group, to function as an agency for the Highway Commission. Reflecting the new direction of the State Parks Division, the word "recreation" was inserted into its title, making it the State Parks and Recreation Division. The advisory committee became known as the State Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (Armstrong, 1965, pp. 36-39).

Other changes brought greater administrative, supervisory, and professional roles into the administration of Chester A. Armstrong (1950-1960), Mark H. Astrup (1961-1962), Harold Schick (1962-1964), and David G. Talbot (1964--). Legislators and voters asked state parks management to take on additional responsibilities, including land and water conservation, historic preservation, protection of Oregon's beaches as recreation areas, a Willamette River Greenway, scenic waterways, and an authorized trail system. The parks' new program attracted growing numbers of tourists.

The state, as well as local communities, wanted economic impact studies and cost analyses for every proposed expansion of the park system or functional change to existing parks. Studies were begun on who benefited and who should pay for the use of the parks system. Finance became an increasingly crucial issue as the competition for funds between agencies became
sharper. The deteriorated condition of Oregon's highways, the economic decline, and the energy crisis prompted the 1973 Legislature to separate the State Parks and Recreation Division from state highway funding in 1980.

The legacy of earmarked funds, highway proximity, and low visibility has not proven altogether desirable. Parks management must learn to compete with other agencies for monies from the State General Fund, at the same time that state and federal legislation has expanded the responsibility of the parks system to meet new public recreational needs. The system's focus on wayside and scenic preservation has neglected the development of a system of suburban parks close to major metropolitan areas. Highway expansion frequently threatens to engulf park acreage, while community development impinges on the integrity of the landscape. In a period of increasingly severe budgetary restrictions, the Parks Division must try to gain public support, while providing expanded services with a diminished budget. By any definition, this situation may be termed a crisis.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

As the American frontier moved further west, pioneers repeated easterners' patterns of subduing the land and taming the wilderness. To gain more than a subsistence living, settlers exploited the land and its water resources. Eastern money played a vital role in the economy of the west, and transportation lines opened the door to establishing an eastern "colonization" of the west. Much of the valuable land was purchased by the captains of industry, and the west provided raw materials to the east. Westerners' profits were used to purchase eastern manufactured goods. As the bounty from private and public lands diminished, conflicting interest groups requested federal government intervention.

The frustration and chaos arising from the rampant exploitation of the country's resources gave rise to the Conservation Movement. Crusaders for rational and efficient conservation management forged an alliance with progressive reformers. Consequently, the Conservation and Progressive Movements played significant roles in transforming loosely organized groups
into an effective force to combat exploitation of natural resources. They directed efforts toward establishing a bureaucracy whose ideals of efficiency and wise-use could initiate new regulations and provide national leadership to guide the processes of change.

Other reformers' views of nature and the wilderness, and society's relationship to both, were influenced by philosophers, writers, artists, and photographers who were critical of the impact America's rapid industrial progress had upon the environment. They advised the nation to preserve forests and scenic beauty for mankind's spiritual well-being and to provide havens of physical regeneration.

The precedent of setting aside Yosemite and Yellowstone National Parks for preservation and recreation represented more than just ecological and aesthetic awareness; the action was living testimony to the vested interests of several groups: preservationists, the railroads, business interests, and the federal government. The establishment of the National Park Service assured an aggressive national parks management policy, but for parks to gain the public's support, they had to have visitors. First, the railroads brought in the wealthy of North America and Europe, following which the automobile revolution democratized the nature of park visitations. Both modes of
travel fell heir to the profits of the "See America First" movement.

Establishment of the national parks proved profitable for the western states and it became obvious that a proposed network of state parks would encourage an even more intense pace of western tourism. Supporters of parks expansion and the opponents of roadside logging in Oregon joined forces to justify, in the eyes of the public, the preservation of roadside timber tracts. Stephen Mather lent the support of the National Park Service and a trip to Oregon confirmed his worst fears. Logging threatened areas adjacent to Crater Lake, the scenic beauty of forested highways, the Columbia Gorge, and even the Oregon shoreline, which Governor Oswald West had fought to protect. All showed logging scars. Oregon required a concerted effort in order to prevent its scenic assets from becoming a stump-and-slash spectacle. Mather was disappointed with the results of his visits with state leaders and civic groups, but an unscheduled encounter with Robert Sawyer of the Bend Bulletin proved more providential.

Sawyer found himself in agreement with Mather's assessment and set out to give the preservation cause some public momentum. His circle of influence grew in Central Oregon, reaching into the capital in Salem when Sawyer assisted Governor Olcott in becoming the
statewide spokesman for the conservation interests. Olcott was able to gain passage of legislative bills preserving timber on highway right-of-ways and giving the Oregon Highway Commission the power to acquire land.

In 1927 Sawyer became a highway commissioner and played a significant role in state conservation for the next generation. He was instrumental in acquiring numerous park sites, influenced other commissioners to maintain the parks system under the auspices of the Highway Commission, and led the move to appoint a state parks superintendent.

Samuel Boardman became the first State Parks Superintendent; his 21-year tenure was later called the "Acquisition Period." He collected many of Oregon's scenic "gems" and acquired other parcels of land to protect the integrity of the system. He believed in preserving parks in natural settings and successfully opposed the establishment of overnight camping and recreational facilities in the parks. His enthusiasm and way with words won many donations and his service earned him national acclaim. Boardman, with some justice, is regarded as the "Father of the Oregon State Parks System."
Conclusions

Oregon's settlers were aggressive entrepreneurs whose spirit of restlessness, individualism, and competitiveness helped them transplant cultures from east of the Mississippi. They had faith in science, confidence in obtaining wealth, and they possessed the technology to increase control over the environment. Exploitation and eastern capital established a "colonial" west. Too few westerners realized how rampant the destruction could be, and little was done to confine environmental exploitation within limits that might be regarded as reasonable. Consequently, it was nearly inevitable that the Conservation and Progressive Movements would make the American west their laboratory. However, their preservationist program attracted no groundswell of public concern.

It was instead the sheer chance of timing and the actions of key individuals that influenced change to the existing patterns of land use and misuse. Still, Robert Sawyer's efforts to establish Oregon's scenic and economically valuable parks system would not have been nearly so successful without the patronage and protection given those efforts by the Oregon Highway Commission. The Highway Department's funding base, professional services, and knowledge of the land
provided a base that no fledgling park service could have commanded. The relationship also provided Oregon Parks with a useful shield between the parks and close legislative and public scrutiny. The Parks system needed time to grow and mature and was given it by the Highway Commission.

Limited accountability continued to favor the parks system during Boardman's tenure as the first parks superintendent. Gaining approval from the Commission was much easier than reporting to the Legislature. However, there were practical limits to this broad degree of operational autonomy. Because Boardman's authority within the park system was virtually unchecked, no one was able to enlarge the scope of the parks, contrary to Boardman's policy of natural park settings, at a time when the public began to demand increased recreational use of park lands. The result was an organization with only limited management capabilities.

Today, the parks organization lacks an ongoing relationship with the legislature, has too little experience in competing for monies from the General Fund, and suffers from the absence of a state-wide public constituency. In light of Oregon's economic situation and prospects, it is incumbent upon the parks organization to balance a judicious appreciation of natural beauty with many public values and demands.
The Oregon State Parks and Recreation Division must understand what it is by coming to terms with its own history, if it would hope to experience a renaissance.
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Appendix

The Contribution of the Civilian Conservation Corps

Beginning in 1930, the Depression years caused a decline in recreational demands. At the same time, federal assistance gave the development of parks an impetus no one could have envisioned. Emergency measures aimed at reducing the country's widespread unemployment pumped hundreds of millions of dollars into conservation projects. Congress, at the urging of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, enacted legislation in March, 1933, that created the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). The President identified the Corps' objective when he said,

I propose to create a civilian conservation corps to be used in simple work, not interfering with normal employment, and confining itself to forestry, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control, and similar projects. (Armstrong, 1965, p. 24)

The emergency projects required the joint effort of various federal agencies. The National Parks Service's unique position in park conservation and recreation made it well-suited to direct the Corps' effort toward public recreational needs. At the peak of its activities, the CCC operated 2,635 camps; of these, 561 units worked to improve national, state, and local
parks. Hundreds of millions of dollars poured into conservation projects, but the greatest proportion went to nonfederal park development for state, county, and city improvements (Tilden, 1962, p. 15).

The CCC established its first Oregon camps in October, 1933, at Gold Beach in Curry County, and Benson Park in Multnomah County. Eventually, 17 camps operated in the parks, while other CCC units used U. S. Forest Service areas and grazing lands.

Oregon state parks received over $3,500,000 in benefits from work accomplished by the CCC during the 1933-1942 era. The projects included constructing and surfacing roads; building parking lots, trails, and bridges; eliminating fire hazards; surveying property lines; establishing property corner monuments; constructing comfort stations and shelters; and erecting administration buildings and storage facilities. Improvements occurred in the following 45 state parks (Armstrong, 1965, p. 24):

Guy W. Talbot  
George W. Joseph  
Ainsworth  
John B. Yeon  
Lang  
Sheridan  
Viento  
Starvation Creek  
Wygant  
Silver Falls  
Giesel Monument  
Ophir  
Humbug Mountain  
Battle Rock

Casey  
Emigrant Springs  
Battle Mountain  
Alderwood Wayside  
Blachly Mountain  
Triangle Lake  
Shelton Wayside  
Harris Beach  
Cape Sebastian  
Hunters Creek  
(Buena Vista)  
Devil's Elbow  
Muriel O. Ponsler  
Memorial Wayside
Port Orford Cedar Forest Wayside
Cape Arago
Simpson Wayside (North Bend)
Umpqua
Bolon Island
Tidelands Wayside
Jessie M. Honeyman Memorial
Joaquin Miller Forest Wayside
The Cove Palisades
South Beach Wayside
Yaquina Bay
Devil's Punch Bowl
Otter Crest Wayside
Rocky Creek Wayside
Depoe Bay
Boiler Bay Wayside
Short Sand Beach (now Oswald West)
Nehalem Bay
Ecola
Saddle Mountain

The tasks performed by the CCC established the beginning of a planned and well-developed program for future park construction. The improvements also showed that park use increased noticeably with the addition of facilities.