

Brig.

Will you please forward
this to Mrs. Kurt Ruckstuhl
of the New Beacon or
Joyce Rock — at her home
Duncan Lane.
Fitz

P.S. Did you see our letter printed
in the Beacon?

Send to Brig.

COPY

Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall,
House Committee on Interior & Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

8/5/1960

Dear Congressman Aspinall:

I am taking the liberty of addressing you directly on the issue of the Cape Cod National Seashore because the larger part of the evidence presented at hearings held to-date has been directed by the opponents of the Park.

Unfortunately, in some instances private interest pleaded the opposition's cause under the guise of concern for public good.

This was the case in Wellfleet and Truro. I live on the town line between the two and have first hand experience of what has been going on ever since the Park proposal was made known.

The well organized opposition concentrated its arguments on details and deliberately ignored the provisions and safeguards of the Bills in respect to these, but above all it ignored cynically the basic aim of the National Seashore, namely conservation.

Selectmen's proposals, which include the withholding of large areas of historic interest in the heart of the proposed park, such as Thoreau's Cape around Gull Pond in Wellfleet, do not have the support of the majority of established house owners in this areas. Most of us feel amply protected by provisions of the Bill. These proposals have been put forward by owners of unimproved land looking for spectacular profits or by builders of summer rent shacks erected since Sept. 30, 1959 date-line provided in the Bill.

"Compromise" boundaries discussed between selectmen and Congressman Keith in fact have little justification either from the point of view of residents in the area or from the point of view of the public interest at large.

The area originally proposed is on the whole a most reasonable one, even if some modest adjustments in a few particulars require to be made on the periphery.

As a professional planner I respectfully submit the following points for the most serious attention of Congress:

- 1) The eventual conservation of the largest possible area without pockets of a heavily populated kind within the conservation area, already very small

(See back)

and ecologically speaking vulnerable. It should be noted that conservation wise the most promising portion is the full Cape width between Truro and Wellfleet.

- 2) The concentration of recreation facilities involving traffic and crowds to a strictly limited number of beach-heads, which provide in any case the overwhelmingly largest proportion of the Cape's attractions.
- 3) The placing of the Cape Cod highway within the Park area, with the consequent preservation of Cape scenery for the visitors to enjoy: the vast majority of whom come by car.
- 4) The containment of the Lower Cape Townships in strictly defined boundaries which might convince them to plan the proper use of their ample resources; ample for an expansion of their economy and population, and the preservation of their character.

The Town boundaries proposed under the Bill, with minor adjustments, more than suffice to meet the needs of the foreseeable future, if the present fashion for small house scattering with eroding effect is replaced by a more appropriate concentrated planning related directly to the National Seashore Bill.

- 5) To urge that the establishment of the Cape Cod National seashore be linked to Master Planning of the Lower Cape as a whole. The Lower Cape presents an opportunity for the development of conservation and economic growth simultaneously which may prove to be typical of other situations which will inevitably arise in many parts of the United States in the immediate future.

The Cape presents a wonderful opportunity for a demonstration. It would be tragic if it were to be missed, for the losers will be not only the people of the United States but the Cape Codders themselves.

Respectful ly yours,

Serge Chermayeff
Professor, Graduate School of Design,
Harvard University.

11/25/60

Dear Fitty -

Chermyoff asked me to circulate copies of this letter. I think his points are excellent. He feels, and so do I, that proponents of the park should turn out in much larger numbers. Now Ray is at the Senate hearings and the House hearing in Washington. I agree and am planning to attend. I hope Ned can drive

me down and if so we could pick you up in New York. Perhaps others there could be persuaded to attend. I wish Dickerson would, for instance, and Brig.

I plan to talk mainly about the Province lands part of the park. The selection will be there to plug for boundary revisions and must be counteracted. ~~I am very pleased with our progress~~

I am very pleased with our progress to date - Thought the meeting with Lawrence was terrific - but feel sure that Snow and Lawrence stand to gain by this grab - will fight to the last ditch for it.

I enclose a letter from Heaton Vore, which I'd like back. Would be much interested in seeing copies of letters sent out especially the one to Kennedy. by your group, is it an organized group as yet?

The hearings are scheduled for December 15, 16 and 17 in Eastham. Our best regards to you and family.

Charles Lane to the Secretary -