



Cornell University
Library
Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections

This document is from the Cornell University Library's Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections located in the Carl A. Kroch Library.

If you have questions regarding this document or the information it contains, contact us at the phone number or e-mail listed below.

Our website also contains research information and answers to frequently asked questions. <http://rnc.library.cornell.edu>

Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections
2B Carl A. Kroch Library
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853
Phone: (607) 255-3530 Fax: (607) 255-9524
E-mail: rareref@cornell.edu

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TAPED INTERVIEW

WITH CARL FEISS

June 27, 1986

Q: Glass

A: Feiss

SIDE FOUR (STARTING AT 471 ON THE TAPE COUNTER)

Q: You were saying, in your paper, I think, that you and Larry Henderson were talking about this. . .

A: Henderson is a very interesting and enigmatic figure in this whole thing. He was a relatively young man, very well dressed, very much to the manner born, very much of what you would call a gentleman in the best sense. His mother was a very wealthy person who lived in a beautiful home up on Cape Cod, at Chatham. He had been, I can't remember whether he was Choate or one of the good New England finishing schools. I believe he is a Yale man. He was a very private person. He lived in a fine house in Georgetown. He did not entertain very much. He'd been. . .

Q: A man of means?

A: Very definitely a man of means. He was an aviator. There are all kinds of legends about him. I never have been able to pin them down. Larry and I were very good friends; I mean to think that he was out to the house for supper or I visited him and his mother on the Cape and so on, when we were putting this thing together. And yet, I can never say that I knew him. One of the legends was that he made his great wealth, and he was very

wealthy, by acquiring. . . [END OF SIDE FOUR]

SIDE FIVE:

Q: Carl, you were just saying that Larry Henderson made his wealth somehow involved in planes.

A: Well, this is legendary. I have nothing but legend to go on. Acquiring disposable military planes, from wherever, I don't know--Europe or the U. S. Flying them himself to Latin American dictators and selling them at many times over the purchase price and that he had caches of wealth in all kinds of places. Always he was on the right side, however. He was a genuine "angel," in the sense that he financed things that were good things. He was interested in, and did a great deal in the development of public interest in public housing and urban renewal and so on. He was a very genuinely interested man. And he was also close enough to Albert Rains, a powerful Congressman from Alabama, to really want to help him find something to do when he retired.

Q: How did Larry happen to come to Washington and get involved in the congressional subcommittee?

A: I haven't the slightest idea. And no one else that I ever ran into knew. But he did appear on the Hill many times testifying on behalf of good, public interest programs, largely in the housing and community development field.

Q: So he knew Albert Rains.

A: He knew Albert Rains and knew him intimately. How much Albert ever knew about Larry, I don't know.

Q: I sent Albert Rains a questionnaire. I hope he answers

it.

A: I'll be interested in finding out. Of course, I saw a great deal of Albert and John, and John and I appeared together on T. V. programs, discussing urban renewal.

Q: John?

A: Senator John Sparkman of Alabama. And Larry was one a first name basis with all those people. And everybody liked him and admired him and respected him and trusted him. And he never betrayed his trust. And he was really an extraordinary guy. As I say in one of my papers, he was a sort of P. T. Barnum, he liked to engineer things and to carry them out.

Q: Was he an idea man?

A: Oh, hell yes, I should say he was. Delightful person, absolutely delightful. My associate for many years was a man by the name of Nathaniel Keith, who was the first head of the HHFA Urban Redevelopment program established by the Housing Act of 1949. Nat and I were across-the-alley neighbors and very, very good friends, and we became associated, and after we both of us got out of government, on any number of consulting projects all over the country and down in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. And Nat was probably the closest friend I ever had. We traveled together . . . our families were close--our kids grew up together, it was just a nice Keith-Feiss relationship. Nat was the president of the National Housing Conference, which John Gunther, Executive Director of the U. S. Conference of Mayors, was a member and a number of other people who later became

involved in the With Heritage So Rich program. And Larry Henderson was very active in that Conference. The National Housing Conference met in Washington weekly and was a very powerful lobby, pro-public housing lobby and urban renewal, and so on. And immediately after Nat got off the . . . got out of the federal government, he became president of the National Housing Conference and was for a good many years. And I met Larry Henderson at meetings of the Conference. I was a member of it, but never really active in it, I had too many other things--AIA, National Trust, and so on, the AIP. And just couldn't take on all of the things. I tried, but I didn't. Anyway, that's where Larry and I met. And Larry knew about my involvement with the Trust. So he called me up one day and asked to sit down with me and said that he wanted to know whether I felt like getting Albert Rains interested in preservation. . . [interruption]

Q: You were speaking about Larry Henderson calling you up.

A: Yes, at first I didn't see any connection, and it was difficult to figure it out. I had a sister-in-law and brother-in-law and their family who had a house in Chatham right near where Henderson and his mother also had a house. We were going up there for a holiday, and we decided to get together and kick this thing around some more, where we wouldn't be interrupted. So, this whole thing was cooked up at a beach southwest of town, where we were having sundowners--Mrs. Henderson and Kelly (my wife) were along--and we sat and talked for a long time. It was Larry's idea that we could take a whole bunch of legislators over

to Europe to look, to talk to people who were responsible for the national preservation programs, who were really running them at the equivalent of our federal level. And he knew that he could get Senator Muskie of Maine interested and Congressmen Rains and Widnall (of New Jersey) and Governor Hoff of Vermont. These were all good friends. Well, Larry also had a house up at Burlington, Vermont. So he had no trouble getting hold of Hoff. He and his family did a lot of skiing up there. They got to know the Hoff's that way.

Q: I wondered how Governor Hoff happened to get involved.

A: Yes. And all of this was very much on a personal basis. And so we made up a list of names of people. I had some hesitancy as to whether or not Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army and current Chairman of the National Trust, could be persuaded to come in on this. But I felt it was extremely important that Bob Weaver, Secretary of HUD, be brought in as early as possible. And George Hartzog, Director of the National Park Service, just had to be brought into it.

Q: Excuse me, what idea did Larry have, to do with this committee? What was the long-term, the ultimate objective, that he had in mind at the beginning?

A: In the first instance, it was a new job for Albert and good politically.

Q: Okay.

A: Rains would hope to get federal interest and legislation equivalent to the national legislation of any one or all of these

places they might be going to in Europe.

Q: But his objective was to get federal legislation in the area of preservation. Was that what he started out with?

A: Well, it was jointly that. That's what we were kicking around, how we could get federal funds for preservation, because the Trust was in real bad trouble.

Q: Financially?

A: Financially. A lot of localities needed money, like Savannah. There was just no money available at. . . Frances Edmund, Director of Historic Charleston Foundation, was on a shoe-string. . . so were all the rest of them, and I began to get, well, it was very. . . I felt it was awfully important to get the states involved.

Q: The states involved.

A: And that was one of the first objectives I had. And I have to go back a minute in my own history on this. In the late 'fifties and early 'sixties, I became a consultant to the State of Connecticut as their prime planning consultant, to the Connecticut Development Commission, which was a state agency. I did this through a series of circumstances that are very peculiar. Shortly after I left the federal government, I was employed by Ed Logue (L-O-G-U-E), later head of the Boston Redevelopment Authority and then the New York State Redevelopment Authority, who was at that time assistant. . . he was deputy mayor, or assistant to the mayor of New Haven. And he had inherited a messed-up local slum clearance and redevelopment

program. And it was really fouled up by the guy who was then in charge of it, who is a recent emigre and knew nothing about American practices. Awfully nice guy. And who had. . .knew nothing about filing things, and so he had put all kinds of federal applications and everything else together in piles between newspapers stacked in the corners of the room.

Unfortunate. Nice guy, and then he had to be evicted, and I was then taken over to take charge. And it was during that period, that I was doing it on a consulting basis, that I met a couple of guys from the Connecticut Redevelopment Commission, and they asked me whether I would come up as a consultant. For the next eight years, I was. And I managed to get, for the State of Connecticut, funds from HUD to undertake a historic inventory, state-wide. . .

Q: State-wide.

A: State-wide; it was the first in the country, and they got a local architect. An awfully nice guy (I can't even remember his name now; it was something like Turner), to do a state-wide inventory, but on a very superficial basis. But it was to go all across the state, looking at large cities and small towns and see what needed to be done and pick samples of the kinds of things that we found in them. I had left HHFA in the fall of 1955, and it was the first use of 701 money, as far as I know, through the planning function of a state development commission, which was the state planning agency. Again, this is a bit of shenanigans, but there's no point in not making use of whatever shenanigans

you could use. And then we also set up, and I became consultant to them on this, the Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency, which was a branch of the state development commission, a historic preservation inventory for the Norwich and the area around there. In the Thames valley. And we set up the first, anywhere, local regional planning preservation program. As part of the local planning program. And that was very successful. It was built into the actual, regional preservation program. . . planning program--it was an integral part of it. Those early Connecticut programs are not known about nationally, but they're there for the record, if anybody wants to check it. And they were in the background for my recommendations of setting up some kind of a procedure whereby states could get involved in a national program. That's where your SHPO's came from, long before the SHPO's existed in anybody's brain.

Q: Now, Carl, one of the things that Ernest Connally and some others were saying is that the model that the Interior Department or the National Park Service used for the federal-state relationship and the SHPO's later took was the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which had had a similar set-up as early as the early 'sixties. They had a federal-state. . .

A: Well, let's put it this way. It's got to be understood that the. . . there are a number of federal agencies that had direct lines to localities, like the public housing program. Did not go through the state, anywhere. There were a number of them

that went through matching state agencies. When the National Park Service became involved in the federal-state-local preservation relationships, they had no difficulty in understanding this kind of thing as a result of their own, existing agency relationships in Interior.

Q: Such as BOR.

A: Yes. Exactly. However, when I wrote this into the last chapter of With Heritage So Rich, I was not thinking of their relationship. I was thinking, frankly, of my own experience in Connecticut, you see. Because I had not been involved in the . . . Interior's system, and the . . .

Q: So, Carl, when you first were discussing this with Larry Henderson, this was one idea that you'd had from your previous experience.

A: Yes.

Q: That happened to operate through the states. Is it fair to say that the specific preservation concepts that were being kicked about were coming from you or did Larry also have some preservation . . .

A: Larry had some too. But Larry had not been closely involved in . . . Let me put it this way. I would drop some things out to Larry, and Larry would immediately invent a way of using them, you see.

Q: But when he came to you, Carl, with this idea, did he have some preservation interest, at that point?

A: No. He knew nothing about it at all. He knew I did.

Q: But he wanted to find something to do.

A: Right.

Q: Just something, anything, that had to do with housing.

A: Yes.

Q: And so, in inter-acting with you, the preservation emphasis came into this.

A: That's right.

Q: Okay, I understand.

A: That's the way it grew. It wouldn't have happened without Larry, and it wouldn't have happened without me.

Q: He understood Congress, he understood the pers-

A: He knew it a hell of a lot better than I did.

Q: He understood the politics.

A: That's right. . . the whole thing. The interesting thing is that these leaders in Congress understood him and liked him and trusted him. So you have that invaluable combination there that could put preservation knowledge into the hopper of an extraordinarily fertile mind (if I can mix a metaphor here!) [laughter] And the mix worked unbelievably well.

Q: Now, had Albert Rains had a previous interest in preservation?

A: No, not that I know of. His wife had some. She was involved in some local preservation group.

Q: So, Larry's idea was to have a committee of legislators and other people who might have some influence go over to Europe.

A: Yes. I was to select the places to. . . for them to go

to.

Q: And he was to pick the people to go, is that. . .

A: He would pick the people to go, and I was to arrange for meetings with them. I went over to Europe in advance of the group, having. . . I think I indicated in one of my papers that I paid my own way. And I was somewhat limited in what I could do, I had to borrow money to do it.

Q: And there was a problem in financing this, wasn't there?

A: Yeah. Larry and I, immediately after our meetings in Chatham and a few meetings in Washington, contacted a man who had been in charge of grant programs for planning and other purposes at the Ford Foundation.

Q: Was this Ralph Schwarz?

A: No, this is before Ralph got there. Ralph was still in Bethlehem, I think, or maybe had come to AIA. No, he was still in Bethlehem, I think, at that point. I can't remember the name of the man at the Ford Foundation. Anyway, he met us with We got nowhere.

Q: What did he say to you? Why wouldn't he entertain it?

A: I think largely because he didn't trust the auspices. And quite rightly. We were . . .

Q: Did it strike him as too shaky an enterprise?

A: Yes, I mean, we didn't have an organization at that time. We were nothing. . . It would've been an awful gamble for the Ford Foundation to put any money into, give their money to Larry and me, and that's where it would have to go. We weren't

incorporated. We had nothing.

Q: So what did you do then?

A: We retreated back to Washington and regrouped ourselves and tried to figure out what to do. And this is when we went to Gordon and to . . .

Q: Bob Garvey? [then Executive Director of the National Trust]

A: Garvey, and to Weaver and Hartzog and the rest of them and gradually tried to get an organization pulled together. At the same time, our timing was so bad. We had to move fast.

Q: Now, there was another funding grant, wasn't there? Bob Garvey was saying at this conference in Fredericksburg that some of the Mellon family got involved at some point, with a small family foundation and gave some money that got you started.

A: Yes, they did it through the . . . and I was not involved in that. . . they did it through John Gunther and the League of Cities and Conference of Mayors. They were the only ongoing, independent mechanism that we could use. There again, that was something that Larry was largely responsible for. I knew John well, and we are still good friends.

Q: How did he get involved in all this?

A: Well, again, it was partly political. John was always interested in programs for urban improvement . . . He was very useful, very interested in the things that Nat Keith was doing and Henderson. And he was interested in broadening the housing program. He had never been directly involved in preservation.

Again, his wife had been doing preservation things I think in Georgetown. And you mustn't forget that a very substantial part of the preservation movement was run by women in those days. Very strong female contingent around the country.

Q: Yes.

A: I was so busy trying to get. . . make contacts in Europe, with old friends in Europe, in England, France, and the Netherlands, and Scandinavia, and so on, that I left to Larry that whole question of how to pull this thing together.

Q: Of how to solve the finance problem.

A: Yes, that's right. I wasn't really interested in that. I had enough confidence in Larry to know that he'd find a way, even if he had to reach into his own pocket, which I'm sure he did. I don't think there's any question about it. I'm sure he paid my hotel bills in Europe, because I simply couldn't stay at the Carlton in London on my funds. And he paid for those big banquets and all kinds of things. The group, when they arrived, arrived by boat, because many of these people had never flown the Atlantic.

Q: I found that interesting--that as late as '65 people were making a transatlantic voyage.

A: Yes. Which took a hell of a long time.

Q: And for busy people.

A: And for busy people. It took a hell of a long time. Again, I think Larry's own money went into that. And he put on great dinners and banquets. When I arrived at London, the first

thing was a great luncheon, at which I had to speak, in late September or early October, something like that. In '65. And this banquet at the Carlton, where we entertained the head and members of the National Trust in England. Similarly in Paris, we had a big banquet for people from the Ministry of Culture, took over the whole restaurant of the Eiffel Tower for it. And it was that kind of thing, you see. It was certainly sumptuous!

Q: Red carpet treatment.

A: Red carpet treatment. I went to as many things as I had time for. It was important for me to collect information as to how these things were functioning at the equivalent of our federal level. And I went out to the Hague, for instance, and did a lot of work with the Ministry of Culture there, while Larry entertained people and showed them some of the preservation work in Holland, guided by various public officials. And this just worked out fine. This is just the way it had to be done. And then I flew back, and they went on to Moscow, for no other reason except they wanted to see Moscow.

Q: Oh, I didn't realize they went all the way to Moscow.

A: And then flew down to Italy.

Q: Didn't they go to Warsaw?

A: No, not that I know of.

Q: Yes, the reports I looked at, the annual reports of the Trust, they've got some shots of Old Town in Warsaw.

A: Well, you see, I went to Warsaw later, for the initiation, the getting underway with ICOMOS. They may have gone

there.

Q: Bob Garvey took some photos of them in Warsaw, and said they made quite a point of going. . . you know, the restored Old Town section there.

A: Well, we did that with ICOMOS, and Bob was along too. I'm just wondering if it's. . .

Q: He was saying that he went to the ICOMOS thing, and later used some contacts he had made in Warsaw there, to set it up for them. . .

A: Oh, I see. My memory's a little slipping on this thing, and it could very well have been the case.

Q: So, anyway, they went to. . .

A: Yes, that's right, and I've used some of those Warsaw pictures in here [referring to With Heritage So Rich]. That's quite correct; my mind just slipped on it. However, they did not come back with any information that I could use really in . . .

Q: So the purpose was really just sort of introduce people to the scene, meet people, get some idea of. . .

A: And figure that other people were doing it, and it would be perfectly proper for us to do it here. [turning pages] And it was a general educational thing, and again, the P. T. Barnum of Larry was. . . because this was a real road show.

Q: A road show.

A: It was super, it was just great!

Q: But in the meantime, you had been collecting the technical information.

A: Yeah, and photographs.

Q: Because you knew this book was going to come about.

A: Well, we had decided that we were going to put it together before the New Year and on time for the 1966 Congress.

Q: Larry and you.

A: Larry and I had decided that we were going to put this thing together. And we'd gotten Garvey to agree to assign Helen Bullock (of the National Trust staff) to us, when we got back. In fact, before so, and get an office for her, where she'd start working. And Larry had worked with John Gunther to help get an office for us to put this thing all together, as close to the Trust as we could get at that time. And the Trust at that time was headquartered in Decatur House. So we were just within a block of it. So I came back, and here were secretaries and typists, that had just been brought in, and an office in the third floor of an office building at the corner of 17th and I Street. And we had a suite of, fairly small suite of offices, about five or six rooms, where we were able to get our writers and so on to begin. Helen had an office across the street, across 17th. It's now been. . . no, it's still there. And she was editor and assigned the editorial job. We didn't have any text at the time. We had a photographer who is still in Washington--a very good guy--by the name of Hubert Leckie, who is the main photographer at Washington Cathedral. Is a professional photographer. To help me on getting photographs and figuring out how they could best fit into the publication. We wrote to

friends and everybody we could find to get contributions of photographs to take a look at, in various cities around the country that could be helpful. And then I used a lot of my own pictures. This (With Heritage So Rich) is full of those. This is a photograph of mine, for instance: Charleston. In the With Heritage So Rich, I was trying to break away from the single building attitude, get as much as possible, inter-lard the whole thing, with pictures of building groups. Here's one of my pictures in Georgetown, as an example. This is mine down in the 'Vieux Carre', Jackson Square. This is one I took in Maryland, and so on. So that you got interjected here, in the photographic collection, material about communities.

Q: And also, it seems from the photos you're showing, a "sense of place."

A: A sense of place, definitely, and then my. . . the chapters I wrote in here was on historic communities, historic town plans. So that you get that. . . what I call, "our lost inheritance," which was specifically the lost towns, the lost portions of towns. And Walter Whitehill did talk about historic districts in his article; he didn't originally, only structures, but I persuaded him. . . [END OF SIDE FIVE]

SIDE SIX:

Q: You were just saying you had some difficulty with Walter Whitehill.

A: Walter, bless him, was very much of a prima dona, a great one. [chuckle] He never got material into us on time. He had

two articles he was scheduled to write. One of these in here was not written by him, but was written by Helen. And she got him . . . simply because he was so far behind that we could never get published if he hadn't gotten the damned thing written.

Q: And you had a very short time frame.

A: A very short time frame, so that Helen wrote one, and Walter signed it [chuckle] And this one, "Window to the Past," by George Zabriskie? George never wrote a word of it. In order to make it appear as though it wasn't all being done by Helen and me, we used the names of others. As long as we. . . George was responsible for the, in large part, for this collection of photographs and putting them together and putting them on the page and getting the format and all that. He was technically a professional, real good professional man.

Q: Who was this? That was responsible for the photos?

A: Oh, I beg your pardon. Leckie was responsible for the photographs, Zabriskie in part. George was a nice guy; we brought him in there, and his name was pretty good. I don't know what ever happened to him. But the [chuckle]. . . this one other guy, who was a very well known writer on historic stories and so on, for the Saturday Evening Post, and I won't give you his name, best to be forgotten. It was a big name in periodical literature, and he loved his beer and he loved his cigars. He was a great big, heavy guy in his mid-sixties. Delightful! Absolutely delightful character. He sat down at the typewriter and he started to. . . He would be given an assignment as to why

historic buildings and places were important to American history, to the knowledge and feeling of American history. He got a first sentence into the typewriter, sat and drank a glass of beer or mug of beer or a can of beer, whatever it was, tore the thing up, throw the beer can in the wastebasket with the paper and start over again. And he must have done a hundred first lines. He never got beyond the first paragraph. It took him a whole week, and we were paying him a big salary. Finally, Larry and I agreed, we just had to fire the poor bastard, he was frozen. He couldn't get a story started. So we paid him for two weeks in advance, got rid of him, and put Zabriskie's name on his article, which I wrote. We were up day and night, getting text out.

Q: Because you only had, what, about a month after the trip?

A: We only had a month! We had to have a full text and get. . . [break]

Q: Go ahead, Carl.

A: Let's look at the content of the recommendations in the last chapter of With Heritage So Rich and some of the content in the Preservation Act. And I think it's important to think about that content and where it came from, because while a great deal of time has been spent in discussing who was responsible for putting the thing through and the character of its administration, what is it that is being administered? The National Register, the President's Council, all the requirements for the Register, where do all these come from? And how did they evolve? The question of local preservation assistance, through

the Trust, the role of HUD we've discussed a bit and the National Park Service, but when you look at it, the tools that are used by the federal agencies and their immediate affiliates have been designed and sharpened through a number of historic precedents. Quite clear that one of those precedents is the whole subject of research and inventorying of the historic resources, using the word "historic" in this case as historic architectural resources. And we have to go right back to what have already mentioned, the Society Hill study. . . no, I beg your pardon, the College Hill study in Providence, and a few other of the models on which really, the entire program had to be based. We could not use, with any degree of specificity, the systems that were used overseas, with the possible exception of the Dutch one that I was very much impressed with on this tour which preceded the With Heritage So Rich publication. And this was the visit I made to the office building of the Bureau of . . . let's call it the Bureau of Cultural Affairs of the Netherlands. This office building is a six or eight-story, modern building, just at the edge of the Hague, just the edge of town, devoted entirely to the research and recording and archival handling of historic heritage, which includes paintings, sculpture, crafts, old and present day furniture, old towns and villages, everything that had to do with the canal, history of the canals and boating and fishing and so on, and historic architecture. Every single community in Holland has major file of its own. That file contains detailed street plans and property maps of every single

portion of that town, with house plans and photographs of every building in them. And not just facade photographs, but photographs taken from the rear, where there is a rear, and side, whatever angle they could get. There are also, of course, aerial photographs of all the towns. You could destroy any place in Holland and rebuild it accurately from those records, if those records survived, depending on what their destruction was. They'd done the same thing in Warsaw, with the Old Town. Now, there, it was a very interesting history, you may have been told it. Have you?

Q: Of how the Old Town got rebuilt?

A: [non-verbal affirmative]

Q: Yes, the '63 Williamsburg conference proceedings, the papers that were presented there, go into that somewhat.

A: Well, there they were in Holland, just as accurate. . .

Q: They had many measured drawings to aid them, as I recall.

A: Right, the measured drawings, the equivalent to HABS in the Netherlands is all there. Every house has been "HABS'd," every church, every. . . everything!. . . every windmill, you name it.

Q: All have measured drawings?

A: Everything!

Q: Amazing.

A: File, steel file after steel file after steel file.

Well, I figured that was the model on which we should try to build our own inventorying, state by state. . . the country. And

was one of the reasons why I felt that a state preservation plan should be part of any recommendations we made, which would include, in my screwball thinking at that time, an HABS, a state-wide, HABS program, backed with the federal HABS program for all buildings that were considered of importance, of national importance, of state importance, and of local importance. Three levels of importance. And that had not been discussed before. And it was this three levels of importance that I felt were extraordinarily important to be included in the national program. Because there were obviously, like I showed you here in Gainesville, buildings that are important to Gainesville in its short history that may have some significance at the state level, like the Hippodrome Theatre, but certainly is not nationally a great building. There's nothing nationally important here whatsoever. But important to Gainesville, yes, very important, and important to the state, in part. So what you get, and this was the thing I've always been teaching my students in preservation or anybody else, what you get is a kind of truncated pyramid of organization, with the greatest number of items to be surveyed and to be listed in a local inventory at the bottom. And then a certain number of them to come up to the state level, which would be lesser. And from the state level, a certain number at the top to be recommended for the National Register. But you could have a state register, as we do here in Florida, which puts a certain premium on preserving those things which are of importance to the state, whereas at the local level, it's up

to the local preservationists, the local preservation ordinances to preserve all of them. There's greater strength locally to do that. It has to be done locally, because the ownership of most of the property is local. The state and the federal government get the residuum of a higher quality, presumably, and what is of greater importance than what's at the local level, exclusively.

Q: Then would each level of government then have some responsibility for enhancing or encouraging the preservation of its level of significance?

A: Yes. They should have. Should have all the way along the line, as you go up to that, or come down, whichever way you want to do it. That's the easiest way I have to demonstrate what I was driving at in putting these things together. I'd done enough local inventories, by this time, so that I knew what the importance was of a local inventory kind of thing really was. And the identification at the local level of what was important to the locality. Now, the locality might recommend to the state that items which the state was interested in or may not be interested in would reject. And it was up to the locality to make nominations for a federal registration. If it wished, the state might not accept these for transfer. Or the state might say, "These are good for the state, but they're not of national significance." You can always go around the state and go to the Register and say, "Look, we think we've got something that is better than the state thinks," and there's some kicking back and forth. And the federal boys would go to the state people and

say, "Look, we've just seen this, and we think maybe you've misjudged it and how about nominating it?" And they always do, they'll nominate it then to the Register, and it goes through. But my model for all of this was that, what I found in the Hague. Now, in Copenhagen, they've done pretty much the same thing, but not quite with the same intensity. In Stockholm, they've done a good deal of it. Not for all of Sweden, but for Stockholm and environs and for several cities in Valingbee [phonetic spelling] and for half a dozen other places where there's really historical material. But they've never been able to cover the whole country, nor has Norway. There is a good preservation program. . . are good preservation programs in several Norwegian cities, but nothing, no where did I see the perfection with which it had been handled in the Hague. Incidentally, everything that had color was in color. They had developed a color chart, and where they didn't have good color photographs or where they weren't certain that the color photographs represented the exact color, they have this color chart that you used, and they had labeled in transparent overlays the colors of the buildings by number or letters. . . by some sign or the other. So that you got the coats of paint. On the interiors, marvelous interior shots of churches, public buildings, and the public palaces and things like that, castles. In Denmark they have excellent ones also, particularly of scattered chateaux or castles or things like that all around, throughout Denmark itself. More for that than you do for many of the smaller towns and villages, they

haven't got those. You see, these are the kind of thing we just don't have for the New England villages or the villages in Michigan, or wherever. We just have no record of these things. You ought to go back to Barbor [phonetic spelling] and see what a New England village really looked like, or looks like.

Q: Carl, let me see if I understand your concept of the National Register. Did you intend, when you wrote the recommendations, with respect to the Register, that the National Register would include only items of national significance?

A: Yes.

Q: Okay. And that there would be perhaps state registers and local designations, etc.

A: Now, I don't object at all to the change, the shift, that's taken place. I hadn't envisaged it.

Q: Now, the change we're talking about is. . .?

A: I'm talking about where a locality will recommend a registration for the National Register, something like the Thomas Center or one of these districts here in Gainesville.

Q: Something of local significance.

A: Yes, it. . .the reason that I don't object to it. . . In principle, it's wrong, but in practice, it's right.

Q: In what way?

A: Because it gives a prestige at the local level to something which local people have selected, that it wouldn't have otherwise, and therefore, from the protection standpoint, you've got to look beyond a local ordinance or code, which is always

fallible. Every time there is a hearing for a public, city council, or whatever, it may be something under attack, and the local preservation people are unable to do anything about that. It may be a change in zoning, it may be a change in the building code, or something, whatever. On the other hand, if it is on the National Register, it gives it a prestige immediately, to the locality. And it means a great deal more to the people here in Gainesville to have something on the National Register, than it ever would have occurred to me that it would when I was living in Washington.

Q: And means more than a purely local designation.

A: That's right. . . purely local interest, you see. So, it's. . . I completely missed that, I didn't anticipate it.

Q: So you don't particularly regret the fact that the National Register includes state and locally significant sites, as well as national?

A: No, I think this was, it turns out that this was an inevitable thing to have happen.

Q: This also, I suppose, brings in the recommendation regarding the Advisory Council and mediating sort of role with federal agencies, doesn't it? The National Register, in a way, is necessary for that process to work.

A: Yes. We originally envisaged the Advisory Council to serve only as a ultimate hearing place where local historic structures or places were in jeopardy because of a federal program. It was limited very much to that in our minds. And

still is, in large part. And this is correct, I think this is the way it has to be. It's a mediating agency, it's a . . . it has to work politically at a very high level. This, again, is one of the reasons why I urged that it be kept as an independent agency. It had to be kept independent of any federal agency. So, if Interior wanted to knock something down, it wouldn't be [unintelli.] against or [unintell.] of Interior, you see.

Q: And in fact, there were some problems soon after the OAHP was started, in conflict of interest situations, where the National Park Service was undertaking an action, and the staff had to both prepare comment for both sides.

A: Yeah, this was inevitable that this was going to happen in that kind of a situation. It couldn't be wronger. So that part, I was right at. Now, in the case of the James Island Bridge in Charleston, [chuckle] Well now, no, let me take another case. Let's take the Mississippi River highway that was to go in front of the Vieux Carre'.

Q: That was a celebrated case. Precedent-making, wasn't it.

A: That one was really celebrated. That location line had been drawn on an Esso map by Robert Moses as consultant to the then Bureau of Public Roads as to where a highway should go in New Orleans. And he did it with a soft pencil. I've seen the map!

Q: You have?!

A: I would swear on any Bible that this is a fact. There had been no engineering studies, no nothing. And the result was

that the Federal Highway boys designed a highway to go along the waterfront there, right between the French Market and the water and the brewery--Jack's Brewery and the river--and on an elevated structure that was about 35 or 40 feet above the top of the levee. It was a gigantic wall. And it went from the Old Customs House building over and cut across to Canal Street and came down beyond it upstream. Well, Russ Wright and I were working then on the New Orleans study, for which Marcou and O'Leary were "responsible" for. They were responsible only for its printing, really, in large part. Russ and I wrote, along with Sam Wilson (New Orleans' best known preservation architect), the whole first volume, and we chose the illustrations for it.

Well, this subject of the highway was hot. And the mayor was all for it, and so were a number of the politicians up at the state capital. But of course, the Vieux Carre' people were very much against it. I appeared before the Trust board and explained what it was all about, and urged the board to make a motion against it, which they did. Then, Gordon and I got together, this was mid-winter, I can't remember the exact date. It was the New Year's, Christmas-New Year's Week. . .Let's see, this report was just. . .[referring to the report] It's the "Historic Demonstration Study," and this was just off the press. Incidentally, this was a HUD study, you know. Urban Renewal demonstration project. "The publication of this report was made possible by an Urban Renewal Demonstration grant."

Q: Could I make a note of the title, and so on?

A: Sure, of course. It was December, '68, that this came out, and it was that weekend of the Christmas weekend, '68-'69. [showing page out of the report] "Robert C. Weaver," letter of transmittal.

Q: Oh, yes.

A: It's really worth your while to dig into Weaver's operations in this thing. He financed it, he approved of my serving as consultant.

Q: Personally did.

A: Personally. Well, I don't know whether he was. . . in a sense, he did in writing, but he knew that I was. You don't know this volume?

Q: No, I don't.

A: Well, it's one of the best things we ever turned out.

Q: Well, I want to make sure to make a note of it, then. I'm sure we've got it back at Cornell somewhere.

A: Oh, yes. I'm sure of it. I'm there as "Consultant to the Bureau of Governmental Research, which raised the local matching fund, and that Bureau of Governmental Research was indicated here [pointing] and Louis Brown, who was then executive director, was right-hand man of mine. I put it that way because he really was, he did everything he could to make the darn thing work. And Russ and I interchangeably wrote most of the text for this and provided most of the photographs. It was that time that I took the picture that's in With Heritage So Rich. No, this is after that. Several of my pictures are in here. Anyway, there it is

[the report]. It's a damn good job.

Q: Thank you very much.

A: Without being overly bragging.

Q: So, you did this plan, and . . .

A: Well, let me show you something here. Oh, yes, we're back on the river-front expressway. See, it was supposed to go right in through here. . . and all of this. Here's Jackson Place and then the Cabildo and the Cathedral and all the rest right there. And Gordon and I got together and we decided that the only thing to do on this thing was to take this report--happened in Gordon's office--and call the Secretary of Transportation.

Q: John Volpe.

A: And ask him to meet us in Gordon's office, just the three of us.

Q: Have him come to Gordon's office, not you go to his office.

A: That's right. Gordon had enough moxie, as a former Secretary of the Army. Volpe left his office in . . . it wasn't a blizzard, but it was a heavy snow storm. We met in the late afternoon. I remember, it was in the middle of the holiday week. Christmas week, just before New Year's. And we knew that by this time, all the guns were out to get the highway built.

Q: The local and state "guns."

A: And federal.

Q: And federal?

A: Oh, yeah.

Q: And the Department of Transportation.

A: Yes. And there was no opposition that I remember from the National Parks people or anything of that kind. They weren't involved, you see. No reason why they should be. There was no park property or Interior responsibility here at all.

Q: Well, it was a Section 106 case.

A: Well, they didn't take that very seriously.

Q: Well, Ernest was saying that they had hearings and everything down there, the Advisory Council. And they were saying that they viewed that as a major victory for the Advisory Council and the 106 process, because Volpe ended up taking the advice of the Advisory Council not to proceed with the expressway. That's what I was told, any way.

A: What I'm telling you is behind the scenes.

Q: No, that's fine. I like to get the whole . . .

A: He was persuaded by Gordon at that time.

Q: I see. Interesting. Well, go ahead, I didn't mean to interrupt you.

A: Any way, we killed it.

Q: Volpe came over to Gordon's office and listened to what you all had to say

A: With this report.

Q: And it was at that meeting he decided not to go ahead with it?

A: [chuckle]

Q: So the Advisory Council wasn't as persuasive as it. . .

A: They think it was. And Volpe handled himself very well. I'm telling secrets out of court, but. . . and Gordon is dead now, but he handled it so beautifully. There was very little I had to say.

Q: Gordon handled it beautifully?

A: [non-verbal affirmative]

Q: What was persuasive to Volpe, do you suppose? I mean, he didn't have to stop the expressway.

A: I think that the argument was that this would be a monstrosity that would be seen by millions of visitors. That'd be something that would forever redound against the Transportation officials and that they wouldn't want it on their record. Without arguing the pros and cons of whether it was the more convenient way of getting cars around, and so on. And it was. . . [END OF SIDE SIX]

SIDE SEVEN:

A: I was very much impressed, there, with, as I always was, with Gordon Gray's extraordinary persuasive abilities. He was always quiet, logical, friendly, never raised his voice, never appeared antagonistic. Never made. . . and yet, he was firm. And he made his points very, very clearly and directly. There was never any question about it.

Q: Did he have an air of authority?

A: Oh, yes, it was just built-in. That's the reason why he was so successful as a chairman of the board at the Trust. Only a few people ever dared interrupt him or break-in or contradict

him. [chuckle]

Q: Carl, where did the idea for the Advisory Council come from, in the recommendations of With Heritage So Rich?

A: [unintelli.] [break]

Q: You were just saying that the copy you have was the one that was released at the party, a party at Gordon Gray's house.

A: That's contained in, it's mentioned in my speech, where they went around getting their copies signed, and this is it. It's evidence of the truth of my talk [chuckle]. Any way, let me see what I was looking for here [break] [Reading from With Heritage So Rich] "Representing the major federal departments and agencies in all preservation matters" . . . Yeah, that's exactly as I wrote it, as I remember. That grew out of some discussions with Henderson and Rains as to how to give some. . . support the Register, back up the Register. We had a lot of talks, over drinks or lunch or something, whatever it might be, at different times, and there were two prior meetings of the group. . . I don't have exact dates. Hard to find the one from which these recommendations were made. And at those meetings, there were some discussion of all these matters. These recommendations, with the exception of one or two, most of them had been kicked around a little bit. There'd never been any meeting at which there was a resolution to accept any one of these ideas or to turn it down.

Q: Carl, perhaps this would be the point to ask you about this panel hearing, of sorts, that was held in New York by the

Rains Committee.

A: Yes.

Q: What was done then?

A: Well, that was the finalization of this [indicating the recommendations]

Q: Oh, it was?

A: Yes.

Q: And did you actually hear from some other people? The reason I mention it is, Abe Wolfe mentioned that he. . .Gordon asked him to come to that to be an expert witness regarding the National Trust in England and what it could do with historic properties. And he said that he came into this hotel in New York and there congressmen and Senators and Gordon was there, and at one point, they asked a question about whether the National Trust had the authority to do something or other. He called on Wolfe at the back of the room to give an expert testimony. So I presume that was an important part of finalizing. . .

A: Yeah, that was part of finalizing. You know, I don't even remember that Abe was there.

Q: He said he was brought in a plane at the last minute, came in at the back of the room, and Gordon called on him and. . .

A: [chuckling] I didn't know that. I was up front; I may not have seen him, actually. The room was very small and very crowded.

Q: The Committee was just discussing the recommendations

there, was that it, or. . . ?

A: Well, what happened was, we'd had a meeting the day before.

Q: They got back from Europe, right?

A: That's right.

Q: And you'd been working on the book all that time.

A: That's right, all that time. The text of the book was never cleared by the Committee. Only the last chapter.

Q: The recommendations.

A: Yeah, and I told how the last chapter fell into my lap, that last night. Did you read that?

Q: Yes, I think I did.

A: The guy who had been appointed, actually he was from the staff of Albert's. He was some young guy that Albert had wanted to try out. But he didn't work out. Nice enough guy, but he just [didn't] knew what it was all about. And so that's why they dumped him . . . his recommendations were really gruesome, and so they just dumped it all in my lap.

Q: So, you had to re-work all these recommendations for this meeting in New York at this hotel. Is that right?

A: Well, I had to re-work 'em the night before the final meeting on a Sunday morning, at the hotel.

Q: The same meeting Wolfe was talking about.

A: The same meeting Wolfe was talking about. And he didn't come in until I was making my presentation at that time, you see.

Q: That's how that worked.

A: Yes, you see, we met, it was our first meeting after everybody got back from Europe. Hartzog and Weaver had begun to lock horns the previous day.

Q: Okay, now Weaver hadn't gone to Europe, had he?

A: No.

Q: He sent his deputy, the head of Urb-Slayton.

A: Slayton, Bill Slayton. Now, Bill and I were old, long, close personal friends. Bill and I came into the Housing and Home Finance Agency at the same time, in June, 1950 . . . well, I came in full-time in 1950 and met Bill in 1949. He was just a youngster out of the University of Chicago (?), I guess. And Bill later became executive vice president of the American Institute of Architects. Then he was in charge of foreign embassy planning and design for the State Department. And has retired now and is consultant to National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

Q: It seems in retrospect, to have the administrators of many of these key federal agencies, which had an impact on preservation, to go on this trip and be involved, doesn't it?

A: But Weaver simply couldn't go. He simply couldn't get away.

Q: To have Lawson Knott and Bill Slayton and . . . Let's see, I'm missing some. . .

A: Right, and Lawson at that time was representing the General Services Administration, GSA. I can't remember whether he'd gone on the board of the Trust or not at that time.

Q: No, I don't think so.

A: I don't think he had. He was a very useful member of the board, and then he went on. . . what was it? He was sort of assistant executive director for a while, too. Very able man, very much interested in preservation.

Q: So Bill Slayton had gone on the trip and you knew him and had rapport with him.

A: That's right.

Q: But then, for this meeting in New York, Bob Weaver himself came up.

A: That's right.

Q: And how did it come about that he and George Hartzog had these disagreements?

A: Well, it was really one of those turf things. Weaver was interested in having. . . He'd been interested in preservation, he'd helped out on. . . through some of the programs, and he felt he could be more effective, having come out of the . . . everything housed with him, rather than with Interior. I disagreed.

Q: You disagreed with both of them.

A: Both of them. Yeah, sure. I felt it had to be an independent agency, under the Bureau of the Budget. Then it wouldn't get tangled up politically with HUD or with Interior or with GSA or Transportation or any of them, you see.

Q: How did it happen that George Hartzog was able to resolve this in his favor?

A: George is a very, very, tough hombre. And when he sets his mind on something, he doesn't give in. And he simply said, "You either go my way or I won't play."

Q: To Bob Weaver?

A: To everybody! Made it quite clear. It was a very unpleasant confrontation.

Q: There was actually a confrontation, then?

A: Oh, yes, indeed. Right at the. . . It was on Sunday morning, and everybody was "hung-over" and . . .

Q: The whole Committee was there?

A: The whole committee was there, and Gordon was chairing it, and Hartzog, if I remember correctly, was on the right-hand side of the table, of the speaker's table, and Weaver at the left. I can't remember who else was up there. I think Rains was there, and maybe. . .whether Sparkman was there or not. Any way, maybe Hoff and Widnall, I don't remember. But, any way, these were the three key people. No, it was. . . it was when I came around to that recommendation. . .

Q: Your recommendation was that it be put in the Bureau of the Budget.

A: That's correct.

Q: What were people's reaction to that recommendation?

A: That is where they got negative, and said no.

Q: All of them said no?

A: No, it was only Hartzog and Weaver

Q: Who said, "No, it's not going to be in the Bureau of the

Budget."

A: That's right.

Q: And then, if it's not going to be in the Bureau of the Budget, where is it going to be? Is that how the discussion went?

A: Yes, that kind of thing. And nobody else entered into the discussion, as I remember.

Q: Nobody else wanted to get caught in the cross-fire?

A: That's correct. And nobody did. Everybody kept their trap shut while this was going on. Clouds of tobacco smoke all around [laughter] Weaver was a cigar smoker, too. Everybody was really feeling hung-over. Of course, I was no better than anybody else.

Q: Because you had just spent the previous night getting this all together?

A: All night long, and I'd been to the theatre before that, family party, so I was no condition.

Q: Hartzog won the argument because he said I'm not going to be involved in this unless we put it in the Park Service.

A: Exactly.

Q: Now, why was Park Service involvement considered crucial?

A: Well, because they wanted to get this, they wanted to get the funding for it, to come through the Park Service's budget, in the appropriations to the Park Service. This was to their advantage, they thought, and to the advantage of the program, they felt. It was perfectly genuine, I don't think there's any

question about it, just as Weaver thought. . .

Q: The committee members felt that Interior perhaps had the best case for getting money.

A: Well, you got to remember that Hartzog had been on the board of the Trust, that the staff of the Trust were all ex-Interior people. Garvey was all for it. Ronnie Lee, everybody. Ronnie was on the board. It was. . . really, the cards were all stacked on that side. It just couldn't be otherwise.

Q: So Hartzog had plenty of support.

A: Oh, sure, sure. He knew it.

Q: And Weaver didn't, really, in the structure.

A: [non-verbal negative]

Q: You were really the only one who understood the HUD side.

A: That's right, but I still wasn't recommending any. . .

Q: And you weren't even recommending. . . [laughter]

A: You see, you have to understand my. . . My role was certainly was for something altogether different than what was finally decided and what was being battled. I didn't want it to go to HUD, anymore than I wanted it to go to Interior.

Q: What was Gordon's role in this clash?

A: That of a very astute, gentlemanly chairman. And when they put it finally to a vote, Hartzog had won. And Gordon took no sides. I can't remember whether he voted or not.

Q: Do you see that as sort of a crucial point in this new program? The direction it took?

A: Yeah, sure. I think it was inevitable that it would go

to Interior, but I didn't see any reason for not putting up a fight. The interesting thing about it was that once I had been defeated on that, that I was asked by Gordon to continue. And I did, and they accepted everything else in my recommendations. So, what I had to do was to sit down and rewrite this section.

Q: Which section are we talking about?

A: This is the section having the establishment, the Advisory Council and the relation to . . .sources of funding, and so on, the National Park Service, wherever it came in, the National Register. . .

Q: Delete the "Bureau of the Budget" and put in the "National Park Service."

A: That's right. And to do this, and I checked it out with Gordon, before we went to press.

Q: Was there any precedent for an "advisory council," sort of set up, that you knew of. You were speaking of Holland, or the Netherlands, being the precedent for the National Register.

A: That's a good question, and I don't remember any. In a sense, the board of the British Trust serves as an advisory council, will appear before parliamentary committees. It has a sort of extra role beyond that of just administering their own properties. No, I don't recollect, somebody else might, but I don't recollect any precedent for this, this having come into our discussion, and I don't recollect clearly who, if any one person, was really responsible for inventing it.

Q: Do you think Bob Garvey might know?

A: He might, he was there on many discussions.

Q: I was just trying to think of somebody else, who's still around, who was involved in that.

A: Yeah.

Q: I'm going to interview Lawson Knott, but I don't know he was. . .

A: Lawson wasn't in on discussions the way Bob was. Bob was sitting in largely for Gordon, many, many times. And Bill was there, too.

Q: Bill Murtagh?

A: Yeah. Did you ask Bill?

Q: No, because he'd said that he wasn't that involved with With Heritage So Rich.

A: That's correct.

Q: Any way, that's an interesting question.

A: I just don't recognize that any one individual was responsible. It sort of surfaced during our discussions with a need for some kind of

Q: . . .Coordinating, advisory body?

A: It's coming back to me a bit. It grew out of the free-wheeling Department of Transportation's. . . several instances in which Public Roads had run major highways through or immediately adjacent to a preservation district. There was the famous Morristown, New Jersey case at that time. They fought them, I guess; the highway people won. And, now I'm not sure of my dating on that. It was that kind of thing that was very much in

people's minds. The riverfront thing in the Vieux Carre was very much in people's minds. So that. . .and nobody knew how to keep Transportation under control, and it was felt that some agent or agency that had the ear of the President, appointed by the President. . . Here we get back to something like the BOB situation that I was trying to invent. That this was absolutely essential, so that there could be some review of federal programs that might impact a preservation project, whatever it might be. [Note: The taped interview continues at some length beyond this point].

ORIGINAL DRAFT TRANSCRIBED BY JAMES GLASS, OCTOBER, 1986.

"LIGHTLY EDITED" BY CARL FEISS, NOVEMBER 13, 1987.

FINAL DRAFT CORRECTED BY GLASS, NOVEMBER THROUGH DECEMBER, 1987.