

431/D-70
File Golden
Spike

THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MOVES TOWARD RESPONSIBILITY
FOR THE GOLDEN SPIKE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE,
1957-1965

A paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for History 201

Utah State University

by

Richard L. Jensen

March, 1969

PLEASE RETURN TO:

TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
DENVER SERVICE CENTER
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

SCANNED

11/5/01

IMPORTANT, BUT WHO SHALL ACT? 1957-1959

In the spring of 1959 a very modest white concrete obelisk stood alone in the vast silence of Promontory Summit to mark the spot where ninety years earlier America's first transcontinental railway had been completed. True, a celebration was held there every May 10 to commemorate the event; and the monument bore a National Park Service plaque indicating that here was a National Historic Site.¹ Otherwise, there was little here to indicate that anything significant had occurred. The completion of a cutoff across Great Salt Lake in 1904 had meant that the Promontory line was no longer the main line of the railroad.² Trains ran less and less frequently; small towns along the line began to die; and finally in 1942 the tracks themselves were removed, presumably to be used in the war effort. Gone now, too, were the lines of the transcontinental telegraph. The remains of the old town of Promontory had deteriorated or had been removed, and the few remaining ruins gave no indication of what had happened in 1869. Signs of the railroad were obliterated here, but down the old roadbed in either direction was impressive evidence of what had been done to bring those bands of iron together. In fact, much of the railroad bed provided a remarkably level dirt road for those who cared to use it. It was said that artifact-seekers, and well-intentioned people who hauled piles of rocks away, and vandals were removing the traces of the railroad workers;⁴ but what could be done about that? The State Road Commission had helped maintain the site,⁵ but they could not patrol the area. Tourists visited the place and complained that it was sadly neglected.

There was an agitator at work. We would have focused more clearly on her if we had come a few years earlier. She had a bit less to say now that others were beginning to take up the cause she had been promoting for about thirty-two years. Mrs. Bernice Gibbs Anderson had first seen the site where the golden spike was driven in about 1906 when she helped trail cattle through the area on the way to summer range. She was a resident of Corinne, Utah, twenty-five miles from the site. She had never graduated from high school, but she read widely and had gained some renown for her writing on local history. Mrs. Anderson had taken up the cause of the Golden Spike as her own special crusade. She believed that the completion of the first transcontinental railroad had a tremendous effect upon the unity of the nation and upon its subsequent course of development. This was something which called for a more adequate remembrance than that given by the concrete monument which the Southern Pacific Company had built in about 1915. Mrs. Anderson was especially concerned with the gradual disappearance of the evidence of railroad construction. Almost from the first, she said, she felt that the federal government could best preserve these historic remains and provide for a fitting monument. She wrote hundreds of letters, first to officials and groups in Utah, then to congressmen, then also to federal agencies and to the President. Many of her former letters were printed in Utah newspapers. She gained the support of the Box Elder Chamber of Commerce in 1952 for a celebration at Promontory on May 10, the anniversary of the joining of the rails. The Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County which was formed at that time put most of its efforts into the annual event.⁶

In November 1953 the Golden Spike Committee of the Box Elder

Chamber of Commerce sent to the National Park Service a report on the history and significance of the Golden Spike Site, written by Mrs. Anderson. The report recommended that a national monument be established which would include several miles of historic roadbed. It gave specific suggestions about preservation of the area and erection of a suitable monument and suggested that plans be made for the celebration of the railroad's centennial May 10, 1969.⁷

The historian of Region Three* of the National Park Service, John O. Littleton, visited Promontory in February 1954. In the report of his inspection he suggested that the significance of the railroad building feat merited greater recognition. However, the site was relatively inaccessible, and Park Service funds were limited. Littleton suggested that a minimum of ten acres be designated a National Historic Site in non-federal ownership and that the state government or local organizations maintain the site with federal cooperation.⁸ On October 22, 1956 an agreement was signed for joint sponsorship of the historic site by the state of Utah, the Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County, The Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and the United States. Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, then designated seven acres of railroad right-of-way as a National Historic Site under non-federal ownership on April 2, 1957.⁹

It could soon be seen that the cooperative agreement resulted in little visible change; state funds for the Golden Spike were not to be had, and Promontory's most ardent supporters, the Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County, continued to agitate for federal ownership.

*Region Three, later Southwest Region, is the administrative unit of NPS directly concerned with the area including the Golden Spike site. Often referred to hereafter as simply "the Region."

They continued to work on annual May 10 celebrations, now with the help of the county commissioners.¹⁰

Robert Utley, who had become National Parks historian for the Region, visited Promontory in 1958 and reported on conditions there.¹¹ He would return. The Park Service, in answering letters which urged federal management of the area, was putting the problem into the context of long-range plans; the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, in its systematic way, would one day begin dealing with the topic of transportation, which was rather low on the list of its priorities. Promontory's day would come, and thorough study would be made of its merits. The acting director of the National Park Service anticipated in June 1959 that pressure would be exerted for reconsideration of Promontory's status and indicated that the survey would be forthcoming.

THE PERIOD OF EARNEST EXPLORATION

The movement toward federal involvement accelerated perceptibly in 1959. Harold Fabian, chairman of the Utah State Parks and Recreation Commission, was also vice-chairman of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments. Thus he had contact with local enthusiasts on the one hand and with officials of the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior on the other. Fabian suggested the development of Promontory to Director Conrad L. Wirth of the Park Service; Wirth replied that it would be studied. In the meetings of the Advisory Board in October 1959 a resolution was passed encouraging further development of the Golden Spike Site by the Park Service if the necessary lands could be donated. Mr. Fabian then talked to Joel L. Priest, Jr., Director of Public Relations for the

Union Pacific Railroad in Salt Lake City, who then contacted Carl O. Olson of Southern Pacific. Mr. Olson, whose company held title to the old right-of-way, expressed willingness to investigate the possibility of a donation of land.¹⁴ Mr. Fabian continued to communicate with the National Park Service with regard to the Golden Spike Site. Senator Wallace F. Bennett of Utah was also expressing interest in the possibility of National Park Service studies of the area.

On November 24, 1959, Associate Director E. T. Scoyen of the National Park Service directed that a special historical study be made of the Golden Spike Site by the Region Three office. The study was carried out by historian Utley as part of the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings. His report, dated February 17, 1960, was the product of field investigation and of research at Stanford University Library, Bancroft Library, and the Southern Pacific collections in San Francisco. The first section of his report was a finished work of history, dealing with the coming of the transcontinental railroad and depicting in vivid detail the final stages of construction by the two rival railroad companies. The second part of the report contained his recommendations with regard to the possible development of the historic site.

As a historian, Utley recommended that a minimum of fifteen miles of the old right-of-way be included within the National Park System if such were feasible. He suggested that the area had already been declared significant when it was made a National Historic Site under non-federal ownership and that the historical section of his report further pointed to its importance. Utley continued by applying the criteria of the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings to the

area. No other unit in the National Park System depicted the same facet of American history. The proposed area included cuts and fills, footings for trestles, and parallel grades, all illustrating the heavy work of the early railroad construction. There were ruins of dugouts used by railroad graders. The area was largely unchanged by modern intrusions. Unfortunately, there was really nothing left in the immediate vicinity of the spot where the rails had joined. Southern Pacific, long reluctant to part with its land, seemed to be more favorably inclined now; and the prospects seemed good for acquisition of state and private lands, although Utley was basing the latter point on conjecture. Accessibility was a problem, since visitors would have to take a fifty-mile round trip from Corinne to the spike site; but there were important railroad features to be seen from the road. Thousands visited the site each year even then, despite the length of the journey.¹⁵

The Utley report was forwarded in March to Washington, from whence a request came in May for a study of feasibility and boundaries. The study took place June 21-23. Participating were William L. Bowen, Leslie P. Arrnberger and Paul V. Wykert of the Recreation Resource Planning Division of Region Three; historians Roy Appleman from the Washington office and Utley from the Region; and Harold A. Marsh, a landscape architect from the Region. Park Service memoranda indicate that a number of those responsible for the report came away from Promontory opposed to federal development of the site. Historians Appleman and Utley, realizing that their recommendations differed from those of their colleagues, asked for their favorable comments to be made a part of the record. These conflicting views were sent to the Washington office of the National Park Service. In the meantime, Mr. Fabian and

unnamed others were pressing for a favorable recommendation. Director Wirth visited Fremontory with Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah. Messrs. Diederich and Thompson of the Washington staff of the Park Service saw the site and reported their favorable impressions to Wirth. By August 13 the Director was converted to incorporation of Golden Spike into the National Park System. He directed that the final suitability-feasibility report be submitted in time to be considered as scheduled by the Advisory Board at its meetings September 17-22. His memorandum ended with the following: "Please give the preparation of such report the highest possible priority, casting it in a positive manner as suggested herein."¹⁸ Thus the same study which might otherwise have resulted in a negative report became the basis for a positive one. This "Area Investigation Report" was rushed to the Advisory Board early in September.

Like the Utley report, the Area Investigation Report treated the significance of the site as a foregone conclusion on the basis of its designation as a National Historic Site in 1957. The value of the area was such that it merited further planning and development. The authors considered further development under non-federal ownership to be impractical and indeed not feasible. They therefore recommended that the Park Service acquire land and take measures to upgrade the area.

Several facts supported the idea that the site should be included in the National Park System. The proposed area comprised a comprehensive unit. Public support was indicated by the interest of the Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County and of the Utah congressional delegation. The coming of the railroad's centennial made this a timely project. There were valuable remains of railroad construction.

On the other hand, railroad grades near the existing monument had been obliterated. The unique shape of the proposed area would present problems of administration. There would someday be an interstate highway in the region, but it would be twenty-five miles away.

The report included an analysis of the status of the land required, classified according to value. The authors estimated the costs of acquisition on the basis of donation of railroad lands and recommended that such donation be a prerequisite for federal development of the area. The study envisioned incorporation of 1060 acres into the unit. A visitor center would be located not at the place where the railroads had joined but near historic cuts in the hillside, overlooking the salty flatlands which surround Great Salt Lake. In this way the stories of both the prehistoric Lake Bonneville and the first transcontinental railroad could be presented. One-way roads should be established for touring on the old railroad grades. Various practical suggestions were made.¹⁹

With Mr. Utley's recent report and the Area Investigation Report in hand, the Advisory Board recommended in September that the Golden Spike Historic Site be incorporated into the National Park System.

POSITIVE STEPS TOWARD FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Regional Chiefs' Meetings in October 1960 marked the beginning of a transition in Park Service activity from exploratory work to planning and proposing. Information released to governors and congressmen indicated that the officers present at the meeting recommended to the Department of the Interior that Golden Spike be made a part of the National Park System. They issued directives for refining of boundary proposals, drafting of legislation, and preparation for public hearings.²¹

In late February of 1961 Senator Moss wrote to the new Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, telling of support in Utah for federal management of the Golden Spike Site and asking whether it would be possible for the Secretary to recommend action of this nature. Mr. Udall's reply in mid-March sounded favorable.²² Meanwhile, Senator Bennett introduced a bill for the establishment of the area as a national monument.²³ In May the Washington office of the National Park Service recommended passage of the Bennett bill with certain amendments. Park Service personnel were directed to get information on the possibility of donations of land by the state of Utah and to prepare maps for congressional hearings.²⁴ Maps had been sent to Southern Pacific in February, and the company was reviewing their proposed donation. Negotiations with Southern Pacific proceeded favorably, and in July Mr. Wolfe, S. P. real estate officer in San Francisco, said they would donate the needed land if they could retain certain rights for its use in emergency. This was approved by a member of the Washington staff of the National Park Service. The donation of state lands was investigated by Dr. A. R. Mortensen, Director of the Utah State Historical Society. He found that outright donation was impossible but that an exchange might be arranged.²⁵

In May of 1961, Thomas J. Allen, Regional Director, instructed the Western Office of the Division of Design and Construction to begin its work on the Golden Spike. The stage of concrete planning was here. Mr. Utley accompanied a planning team composed of Mr. Arnerberger, Regional Chief of the Division of Recreation Resource Planning, and two landscape architects to the site in early August. By the end of August, memoranda about a master plan were plentiful. The year 1961

had seen a positive abundance of positive action, but complications appeared by the year's end.

INTO THE MAZE: NOVEMBER 1961 - MAY 1965

On November 3, 1961, the acting regional director of Region Three raised doubts as to what rights Southern Pacific could convey to the property it planned to donate.²⁷ This problem was to remain throughout the period being studied here, and if any one factor should be singled out as the primary cause of delays in official action on the Golden Spike project, uncertainty over the Southern Pacific's right-of-way would be that factor. At about the same time, tensions were created by conflicting proposals in two areas: (1) A choice had to be made between executive and legislative action for the enactment of the Golden Spike proposal; (2) A variety of approaches arose for use in the master plan of the historic area. These tensions were interrelated at times. The year 1962 seemed to produce little progress. Mrs. Anderson was exasperated. She indicates that she had restricted her agitation of late, entrusting the crusade to the National Park Service. In June of 1962, however, she wrote a letter to Secretary Udall, the second within a month, showing the depth of her frustrations and strongly reemphasizing the significance of Promontory Summit: "THE DESTINY OF THIS GREAT NATION," she exclaimed, "RODE TRIUMPHANT UPON THE RAILS WHICH MET AT PROMONTORY SUMMIT ON MAY 10, 1869!"²⁸

There were problems with a title survey which consumed time. There was a preliminary title opinion by Attorney General Kennedy, issued November 28, listing seventeen objections which had to be met or shown not to be applicable.²⁹ Negotiations with Southern Pacific would continue, complicated by changes in the acreage requested. A

deed was finally sent to the Department of the Interior on March 16, 1964, but doubts remained as to the nature of the title it conveyed.³⁰ The main question involved the rights which Southern Pacific retained to certain parts of its property after having abandoned the railroad. The original grant of land had been contingent upon the building and maintenance of a railroad. Final resolution of land problems came about after the period covered by this paper, through negotiations with those who held rights of any kind in the property finally included in the National Historic Site and through a ruling that any rights relinquished by the Southern Pacific Company reverted to the original owner, which happened to be the United States of America.³¹

Senator Bennett continued to favor legislative action for the establishment of a national monument. Accordingly, he again introduced a bill on July 2, 1963.³² Senator Moss advocated an executive proclamation at this time. The National Park Service was caught in the middle of a tug-of-war. By August 14, 1963 it was decided not to send Senator Bennett information for use in connection with his bill, because a Presidential proclamation of a national monument was in the making. President Kennedy was to visit Utah in late September as part of an eleven-state conservation trip, and the proclamation was planned to be issued at that time.³³ The Region had suggested in March that a measure to incorporate the Golden Spike area into the National Park System should be worded broadly so as to allow for more immediate action and for later settlement of property problems.³⁴ The President was to issue a proclamation on the basis of the dubious property rights which would be conveyed by a deed from Southern Pacific, with a view toward subsequent federal acquisition of the lands which remained questionable.

However, a meeting September 19 in the office of George B. Hartzog, Jr., now Director of the National Park Service, apparently resulted in the decision to defer action until the conflict about land ownership could be resolved with the Solicitor General's office.³⁵

Questions of nomenclature often entered into discussions about the Golden Spike area. As Director Hartzog explained the opinion of the Solicitor General's office to Secretary Udall, the Golden Spike area could better be made a National Historic Site than a National Monument. Legislation enabled an area to be designated as a National Historic Site without its first being owned by the federal government, whereas federal ownership was a prerequisite for the creation of a National Monument.³⁶ Utahns continued to push for the creation of a National Monument. They felt that monument status would indicate greater significance and perhaps entail more extensive development of the area by the Park Service. Service officials denied that this was the case and contended that the title "National Historic Site" was a more appropriate designation. Besides, it was more in keeping with the system of nomenclature now being followed by the Park Service. But people continued to clamor for a sign of change; the area was already a National Historic Site. The change in actual status would come, but the old name would remain despite the fact that Utah's congressional delegates continued to use the title "National Monument" in bills presented before Congress.

Director Hartzog traveled to Ogden, Utah, where a public hearing about the Golden Spike area was held February 1, 1964. At that time it was announced by Senator Moss that legal problems had been cleared for a Presidential proclamation. None was made.³⁷ On April 8 Senator

Bennett asked Director Hartzog whether executive or legislative action would be taken and asked when he would be given a report on his bill.³⁸ His letter was not answered until June 9. In the meantime, a secretarial order by Mr. Udall was planned, probably for May 10, designating The Golden Spike National Historic Site within the National Park System. The Department of the Interior now had the deed for Southern Pacific property, and whatever title it conveyed to the land would be used; additional land, again, would have to be acquired later. Udall sent copies of the proposed designation order to the Budget Director for approval. A development including 2176 acres was proposed, at an anticipated cost of \$692,000 for development and acquisition, in addition to yearly administration expenses. Senator Moss announced on May 9 that the Secretary would issue the designation order, but this was never done. Apparently there was opposition to the order from the House of Representatives. The Department of the Interior wrote Senator Bennett that because of title problems the department could not decide whether administrative or legislative action should be taken, so he was not receiving a report on his bill.⁴⁰ With the procedural stalemate, the situation seemed to call for revised Park Service proposals, but it was felt that these should "wait for the air to clear."⁴¹

During the interlude, historian William E. Brown of the Region visited Promontory for the first time. There were varied responses to Promontory by its Parks Service visitors. Brown's probably expressed thoughts that ran through many of their minds. He wrote of "the very desolation of the area . . . a kind of haunting counterpoint to the climactic scene that was once enacted here." He concludes: "All in all, it seems to me that this site, despite its present lonesome

aspect and silence, fairly shouts its lively past." Brown noted that Utah was beginning to make big plans for the 1969 centennial.⁴²

Development of the Master Plan for the proposed area involved varied possibilities. The two reports made in 1960 mentioned in a general way the possibility of eventual restoration of a length of sample railroad and of the use of vintage railroad stock, probably for display purposes. In January 1963 it was reported that Director Wirth wanted rolling stock on rails.⁴³ Many planners discouraged this idea of actual operation of rolling stock as being too costly and impractical. The Region, under a new director, Daniel F. Beard, sent a memorandum to Director Hartzog, Wirth's successor, on December 4; this memorandum seemed to have put the idea of rolling stock to rest. After the legislative - executive stalemate, the Director mentioned the possibility of a smaller federally owned National Historic Site surrounded by state lands and perhaps administered by the state of Utah. Perhaps his idea was based on the possibility that the recent Water and Land Conservation Fund Act would make sufficient funds available to the state to enable it to do more than it had been willing to do in the past for Golden Spike. The Region Director was asked in December 1964 to take a new look at all possible alternatives and send the Director recommendations.⁴⁴

In late January, 1965, Roger W. Allin, Assistant Regional Director of Cooperative Activities, and J. F. Carithers, park planner, were sent to Utah. They visited the site, talked with local groups, and scouted out reactions to the most ambitious proposal yet, which embodied the ideas originally proposed by Director Wirth. They advocated the restoration of five and one-half miles of railroad, using workers from the

Job Corps. A train ride on the restored track would be the basis for interpretation of the area to visitors. Granted, this "bold approach" would cost money, but it would give the benefit of actual participation to visitors and construction workers alike. Washington had thought of a modified version of the modest kind of joint administration long advocated by Park Service people who wanted to save money and effort by planning limited participation on the Service's part. In response, the Region now sent back to Washington a discussion of four alternatives:

1) The proposal being supported up to that time was one with no major restoration of track but with the use of rolling stock for display if possible. Interpretation would be aimed at people who would drive their own cars through the area.

2) Joint administration by the National Park Service and a local society was considered. However, Regional personnel felt that the Box Elder Golden Spike Association was incapable of supporting a project requiring expanded use of money or manpower.

3) Study had been made of joint administration by the State of Utah and the National Park Service. State park officials did not have funds available at that time to cover such an effort and were not enthusiastic about the prospects of anything but federal development.

4) The plan submitted by Allin and Carithers was quite thoroughly discussed.⁴⁵

While the national office was pondering over alternative proposals, Senator Moss reported that he had conferred with Utah officials and that they were unwilling to take financial responsibility for the Golden Spike, since they had already committed themselves to greater expenditures than their available funds would cover.⁴⁶

Thus the hope of effective state participation in administration of the site disappeared. If there were to be changes made, the National Park Service would foot the bill and furnish the personnel.

National Park Service historians Appleman and Utley reacted negatively to the plan of Allin and Carithers. They favored going back to the proposals of 1960: acquire the significant features and protect them; gear interpretation to automobile travel; build a suitable visitor center. Carithers bemoaned the planning of facilities by historians, but it seems that they had their way.⁴⁷

THE WAY BECOMES CLEAR: MAY - JULY 1965

Congress was to see a rash of Golden Spike legislation from Utah's delegation in 1965. Senators Moss and Bennett introduced bills on January 6 and January 8, respectively. Both mentioned that problems still surrounded the question of the title to Southern Pacific lands. Indeed, in early February the railroad company was told that their deed still could not be accepted, since some objections still had not been resolved. Senator Moss said he hoped the problem would be resolved; Bennett openly stated that he had introduced legislation in the hopes of thereby applying pressure for the speedy solution of existing problems.⁴⁸ It is difficult from the present vantage point to determine to what extent congressional pressure affected the rate of progress the National Park Service made in processing the Golden Spike proposal, but progress came. Requests for reports on bills, like requests for reports by the National Advisory Board, could well have provided incentive for the more rapid formulation of recommendations. This is not to say, however, that slipshod work was done under pressure. Conversely, lack of any immediate prospect of enactment may have encouraged the

multiplication of alternative plans by removing the immediate necessity of an overall decision.

Congressmen Lawrence J. Burton and David S. King each introduced a Golden Spike bill before the House of Representatives on March 15. Burton's bill was reported to be identical with Senator Bennett's measure, and King's with Moss's. Burton commented in July that he had been in agreement with Congressman King for months as to which bill should be considered in the end. The Utah delegation demonstrated a rare unanimity in support of legislation for Promontory Summit.⁴⁹

The Assistant Director of the Park Service wrote Regional Director Beard May 10, 1965: a decision had been made on the plan to be followed in developing the Golden Spike Site. The first alternative of the four was chosen; the historians had won out. The proposed area would include about 2176 acres, not 1060 as outlined in some previous proposals. A report had been requested for Senator Moss's bill, and information must be gathered.⁵⁰ At some point in the planning a change sneaked in: the visitor center would be built in the area where the last spike had been driven, not on the face of the hillside.

On May 18 the Department of the Interior recommended the enactment of Senate bill S. 26, Mr. Moss's bill, with certain amendments. It was suggested that the Secretary of the Interior be permitted to obtain less than the fee title to property where necessary. This would allow the troublesome questions about the Southern Pacific deed to be bypassed. And the new unit should be called a national historic site, not a national monument.⁵¹

Golden Spike bills went smoothly through hearings of Senate and House committees and subcommittees. Director Hartzog was called upon

to answer questions about Park Service policy. Park Service observers reported that several Utahns aided in the presentation of material in support of the bills.⁵²

Senator Moss's bill was considered, amended and passed June 16. Representative King's bill was amended and passed in the House July 12, whereafter the House laid the King bill on the table and passed a bill consisting of Moss's enabling clause and King's measure as amended. The Senate concurred in the House amendment on July 21. The bill as passed included a provision that authorized the subsequent appropriation of not more than \$1,168,000 for the acquisition of land and interest in land and for the development of the historic site. The bill became Public Law 89-102 on July 30, 1965, with the approval of President Lyndon B. Johnson.⁵³

On August 5, 1965, Regional Director Beard wrote to Mrs. Anderson. Quoting a statement by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Stanley A. Cain, he said,

"The public, as such, never created a national park or any of these other areas I have been discussing. The idea originates with one or a very few persons. The drive to make a park proposal into an actuality is carried on by one or a very few persons. Millions will benefit, but millions do not get the job done."

Beard then congratulated Mrs. Anderson and her co-workers for the success of their persistent efforts.⁵⁴

In Mrs. Anderson's reply she indicated that no progress could have been made without the help of the National Park Service. She told of the discouragements she had faced and of the incentive disgruntled tourists had given her to go on with her fight. Thanking the Regional Director for his salute on behalf of her group, she closed by confiding they were "most happy to know that now we can pass the bur-

den on to you! And if we can assist you in any way please feel free to call upon us."55

The National Park Service was now committed to the protection, management and development of one more area. State and local groups had been given the first chance to carry out these functions, but they did not measure up to the task. There was considerable local enthusiasm for someone to take action, but the enthusiasts wanted the federal government to do the work. State funds were spread thin on other commitments. Perhaps if different priorities had been established, state or local groups might have been able to adequately administer the area. As it was, their resources could not compare with those of the National Park Service, which had an organization oriented toward involvement with historic sites. Here, too, was a site which many people felt should be honored and preserved by the nation, since its significance was national.

At least fifteen Park Service men inspected the site at Promontory between the time it was declared a National Historic Site in non-federal ownership and its incorporation into the National Park system. Some of these people returned a number of times. Not mentioned here are representatives who participated in the annual ceremonies each May 10. How much effort went into investigation of the various proposals which were made? It is difficult to measure the effort expended away from the site in investigations, planning, negotiating, and providing information for congressmen. Perhaps, though, this paper will give some indications of the kind of work involved in Park Service efforts, which generally is carried on behind the scenes. It should also provide a glimpse of ways in which Park Service action can be affected by indiv-

idual citizens and by legislative and executive personnel.

* In the spring of 1969 Promontory Summit would be a little different from the Promontory of 1959. Perhaps the difference would help many people to listen in this wild and quiet country, to penetrate beyond the kind of silence some would take as a cue for boredom, as the place "fairly shouts its lively past."

FOOTNOTES

Note: Copies of all letters and memoranda for which no other locations are noted can be found in file L-58 in the office of the Golden Spike National Historic Site, 623 South Main, Brigham City, Utah.

¹See Robert M. Utley, "Special Report on Promontory Summit, Utah (Golden Spike National Historic Site)," (National Park Service, Region 3, Santa Fe, New Mexico, February, 1960), appendix.

²Letter to the writer from Mr. E. A. Bancroft, General Agent, Southern Pacific Company, September 3, 1968 (in the possession of the writer).

³Utley report, pp. 73-74.

⁴Interview by the writer with Mrs. Bernice Anderson, Corinne, Utah, December 23, 1968.

⁵Bernice Gibbs Anderson, "A Report on the Site of the Driving of the Golden Spike May 10, 1869, at Promontory Summit, Box Elder County, Utah," November 24, 1953, p. 6 (in the library of the Golden Spike National Historic Site).

⁶Interview with Mrs. Anderson.

⁷Anderson report.

⁸John O. Littleton, Report on the Investigation of the Golden Spike Site, Promontory, Utah (Region Three Office, Santa Fe, New Mexico, March 1954).

⁹Golden Spike National Historic Site; Proposal to Enlarge and Include within the National Park System; an Area Investigation Report (Region Three, Santa Fe, New Mexico, September, 1960), p. 1.

¹⁰Interview with Mrs. Anderson.

¹¹Robert M. Utley, Annual Report on Golden Spike Historic Site (April 29, 1960) (in file L-58 of the Golden Spike NHS).

¹²See letter Acting Sec. of Interior Elmer F. Bennett to State Sen. Kleon Kerr, May 5, 1959; and letter Acting Director National Park Service E. T. Scoyen to Congressman H.A. Dixon, 1956.

¹³Memorandum Acting Director NPS Hillary A. Tolson to Region 3 Director, June 3, 1959.

¹⁴See Golden Spike National Historic Site; Proposal to Enlarge. . . p. 5; memo. Asst. Director Scoyen NPS to Director Allen, Region, November 27, 1959; letter Joel L. Priest, Jr., to Carl O. Olsen, October 27, 1959; letter Fabian to Director Wirth NPS, Feb. 16, 1960.

¹⁵Utley, "Special Report on Promontory Summit."

¹⁶Golden Spike National Historic Site; Proposal to Enlarge . . . p. 5.

¹⁷See memorandum, Leslie P. Arnberger to Regional Chief, Div. of Recreation Resource Planning, July 20, 1960; memo. Robert Utley to Regional Chief, Division of Interpretation, July 1, 1960.

¹⁸Memo. Wirth to Region 3 Director, Aug. 18, 1960; Ben H. Thompson to Region 3 Director, July 19, 1960; letter Scoyen to Sen. Frank E. Moss.

¹⁹Golden Spike National Historic Site; Proposal to Enlarge . . .

²⁰See letter Elmer F. Bennett to Gov. George D. Clyde, Oct. 3, 1960; card in L-58 file quoting statement of Advisory Board.

²¹See agenda of Regional Chiefs' Mts., Oct., 1960, L-58 file.

²²Letter Moss to Sec. of Interior Stewart L. Udall, Feb. 23, 1961; Udall to Moss, March 14, 1961.

²³United States Congressional Record, Vol. CVIII (1961), part 3, p. 3142.

²⁴Memo. Tolson to Director, Region 3, May 19, 1961.

²⁵Letter John A. Carver, Jr., to Mr. E. J. Russell, Pres., Southern Pacific, Feb. 10, 1961; E. F. Widdas, Manager of Southern Pacific Company, Real Estate Dept., to Region 3 Director; Memo. Tolson to Regional Director; George W. Miller to Director, June 26, 1961.

²⁶Memo. Allen to Chief, Western Office, Division of Design and Construction, May 26, 1961; letter Arnberger to Travelodge Motel, July 25, 1961.

²⁷Memo. George W. Miller to Director, Nov. 3, 1961.

²⁸Letter Anderson to Udall, June 13, 1962.

²⁹Letter Robert F. Kennedy to Udall, Nov. 28, 1962.

³⁰Letter Widdas to Jackson E. Price, Asst. Sec. of Interior, March 16, 1964.

31 Interview by writer with F. Andrew Ketterson, Jr., Historian, Golden Spike National Historic Site, Brigham City, Utah, December 19, 1968.

32 Congressional Record, Vol. CIX (1965), part 10, p. 13011.

33 Memo. Thompson Assist. Director of Resource Planning to Regional Director Beard, August 14, 1963; Annberger to Beard, Sept. 9, 1963.

34 Memo. George W. Miller to Director, March 4, 1963.

35 Telegram Lee to Beard, Sept. 10, 1963.

36 Memo. Hartzog to Udall, Sept. 30, 1963.

37 Salt Lake Tribune, February 2, 1964.

38 Letter Bennett to Hartzog, April 8, 1964.

39 Salt Lake Tribune, May 9, 1964; memo. Udall to Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget, May 7, 1964; draft of secretarial order in file L-58; memo. Annberger to Beard, May 19, 1964.

40 Letter John A. Carver to Bennett, June 9, 1964.

41 Memo. Norman B. Herkenham to Regional Director, June 12, 1964.

42 Memo. Brown to Region Chief, October 7, 1964.

43 Memo. Edward S. Pertz, Acting Chief of Master Plan Coordination, to Regional Director, Jan. 16, 1963.

44 Memo. Ira B. Lukes, Acting Assistant Director of Cooperative Activities, to Regional Director, Dec. 16, 1964.

45 Box Elder News Journal, January 28, 1965; Regional Director to Director, March 16, 1965.

46 Letter Moss to Hartzog, March 12, 1965.

47 Memo. Appleman to Bill Orr, Chief, National Park System Planning studies, April 14, 1965; Carithers to Asst. Reg. Director of Cooperative Activities, April 22, 1965.

48 Congressional Record, Vol. CXI (1965), part 1, pp. 167, 430; memo. Lee to R. P. Bray, Mgr., Real Estate Dept., Southern Pacific, Feb. 5, 1965.

49 Congressional Record, Vol. CXI (1965), part 4, pp. 5064-65; memo. Fritz Kessinger to Chief, Division of Legislation and Regulation, June 14, 1965; Salt Lake Tribune, June 11, 1965.

50 Memo. Theodore R. Sveng, Asst. Director NPS, to Beard, May 10, 1965.

51 Letter Udall to Senator Jackson, May 18, 1965.

52 See memorandum Regional Chief, National Park System Studies to Beard, June 10, 1965.

53 Congressional Record, Vol. CXI (1965), part 10, pp. 13885-87; part 12, pp. 16379-382; part 13, pp. 17791-92; part 14, p. 19060; part 22, p. 1200.

54 Letter Beard to Anderson, August 5, 1965.

55 Letter Anderson to Beard, August 15, 1965.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Bernice Gibbs. Interview by the writer with Mrs. Anderson.
Corinne, Utah, December 23, 1968.

_____. "A Report on the Site of the Driving of the Golden Spike
May 10, 1869, at Promontory Summit, Box Elder County, Utah.
November 24, 1953 (in Golden Spike National Historic Site
Library, 623 South Main, Brigham City, Utah).

Bancroft, E. A. Letter to the writer. September 3, 1968 (in the
possession of the writer).

Box Elder News-Journal. 1965.

Golden Spike National Historic Site; Proposal to Enlarge and Include
within the National Park System; An Area Investigation Report,
Region 3, Santa Fe, New Mexico, September, 1960 (in Golden Spike
NHS Library).

L-58 file. (in office of Golden Spike NHS).

Littleton, John O. Report on the Investigation of the Golden Spike
Site, Promontory, Utah. Region 3 Offices, Santa Fe, New Mexico,
March, 1954.

Salt Lake Tribune. 1964-65.

United States Congressional Record. Vols. CVII (1961), CIX (1963),
CXI (1965).

Utley, Robert M. "Special Report on Promontory Summit, Utah. (Golden
Spike National Historic Site)." National Park Service, Region
3, Santa Fe, New Mexico, February, 1960. (in Golden Spike NHS
Library).