

VERMONT

*The
Proceedings of the
Vermont Historical Society*

HISTORY



SUMMER/FALL 1997

VOL. 65, Nos. 3&4



“A Desirable Class of People”: The Leadership of the Green Mountain Club and Social Exclusivity, 1920–1936

The trustees sought to attract people like themselves without encouraging participation by others whose growing wealth, increased leisure time, and access to automobiles opened up new opportunities to visit Vermont and explore the Long Trail.

By HAL GOLDMAN

Between 1910 and 1930, Vermont's Green Mountain Club expanded from twenty-one members to over one thousand. Its reason for being, the Long Trail, had grown from dream to reality. By 1930 the trail stretched 270 miles from Massachusetts to Canada, having been cleared and blazed almost entirely by volunteers.¹ As the project neared completion the club's leadership turned its attention to maintaining both the trail and the club in the future. To the GMC's leadership and others, this task involved more than simply finding a way to attract new members and revenue.² Demographic change and increased automobile travel meant that different kinds of people now had access to the trail and the club's facilities. In the minds of club leaders, future growth had to take into account the challenge these developments posed to the social ambience they believed was key to their members' enjoyment of the trail and its facilities. As a result, the trustees sought to attract people like themselves without encouraging participation by others whose growing wealth, increased leisure time, and access to automobiles opened up new opportunities to visit Vermont and explore the Long Trail. Though their discourse primarily referenced class and culture, there is evidence that ethnicity also played a role in some members' thinking. The conflict between necessary economic growth on the one hand, and maintenance

of social standards on the other, came to a head with a 1933 proposal to build a limited access parkway that would run parallel to the trail. The private tensions and biases that had heretofore characterized the debate within the club burst into the open as a result of the parkway controversy and brought into much sharper focus the desire for social exclusivity which informed the thinking of many among the club's early leadership. This social concern was not confined solely to the Green Mountain Club. As we shall see, progressive thinkers such as those making up the membership of the Vermont Commission on Country Life also debated similar issues at this time.

This phenomenon did not take place in a vacuum, but was informed by developments in American society and culture which were affecting the entire nation. The period during and after World War I was a time of reaction, repression, and organized intolerance in the United States. The deaths of Americans at the hands of German U-Boats and on the fields of France led to growing hostility toward the nation's enormous ethnic German population. In the aftermath of the war and the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the federal government rounded up and summarily deported immigrants suspected of having Communist sympathies. Ethnically exclusionary immigration laws were passed and the Ku Klux Klan exploded in popularity not just in the South, but throughout the rural North as well. All of these developments had manifestations in Vermont.³

At the same time, elite Protestant society was confronted by the growing diversity of America. The children of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe began to seek entry into middle-class institutions. Of all these groups, American Jews were most active in seeking admission to universities, neighborhoods, corporations, clubs, and recreation areas which had heretofore been the exclusive province of Protestant America. In response, many of these areas of American life were limited or closed to Jews. Quotas were imposed by ivy league universities like Harvard. Corporations and law firms would not hire candidates with Jewish-sounding names. Certain apartment buildings and neighborhoods were off limits. Social clubs restricted membership and tourist facilities prohibited stays by Jewish guests. Even where Jews managed to gain admission to elite institutions, they might well meet with open bigotry or ostracism from non-Jewish members.⁴ Again, Vermont society was not immune from these attitudes and practices.⁵

Members of America's Protestant establishment may well have felt besieged and threatened by what they perceived as the foreign politics, culture, values, and religion of immigrants who packed the cities of the east coast. These immigrants (along with many other Americans of older stock) had in the past been excluded from the mainstream of American life be-

cause of barriers caused by language, culture, religion, or resources. With growing assimilation, prosperity, and the advent of the automobile, they increasingly had the means to join in the middle-class pursuits of tourism and recreation. In assessing the attitudes and values expressed by members of the Green Mountain Club and others in Vermont during the 1920s and 1930s we should keep these national trends in mind.

THE GREEN MOUNTAIN CLUB

During the 1920s, the GMC membership came to represent an extraordinarily influential group of Vermonters. The club's membership included professors, politicians, writers, doctors and lawyers. It was a Who's Who of Vermont political, social, and intellectual leadership and included names like Proctor, Webb, Field, Perkins, Flanders, and Fisher.⁶

The GMC had then, as it does now, two forms of membership: "at-large," which is statewide, and "sectional," which pertains to geographic areas either within or without the state. One can be a member of a section without being a member-at-large of the GMC and vice versa. During the 1920s, at-large membership required sponsorship by two club members—a not unusual arrangement for the time.⁷ Each section, however, was allowed to regulate its own membership. During the 1920s and 1930s the sections represented between two-thirds and three-quarters of the club's 1,500 members.⁸ The three largest sections were the New York section with over 300 members, Killington (Rutland) with 300, and Burlington with approximately 100.⁹

Despite these numbers, the club's leadership constantly tried to increase membership during the 1920s and 30s. The problem was how to do so without attracting undesirables. In a 1927 report of the club's membership committee, George Story advocated personal contacts as a way of generating new members rather than through mass advertising, noting that: "if each member would take the trouble to solicit his friends, we could in a very short time double our list and still maintain the high standard which now exists."¹⁰ As a result of the membership committee's recommendation, the GMC officially adopted what it called the "every member get a member" strategy for building its numbers.¹¹ The intent of the club's policies was clear: increasing growth without sacrificing the "high standard" of its membership.

Nonetheless, the club continued to struggle with the membership issue throughout the 1920s and 1930s as the GMC sought to preserve its perceived social ambiance while still keeping its head above water financially. This struggle manifested itself in several different ways: restriction of Jewish membership in the New York Section and at-large; differentiation between the social ramifications of section and at-large

membership in general; and maintainance of the profitability of the club's Long Trail Lodge at Sherburne Pass without sacrificing its social ambiance.

In his annual report of 1922, Will Monroe, president of the New York Section, noted that membership had seen little increase during the past year. Despite this, Monroe commented that the section maintained an increasingly restrictive membership policy. "I am convinced . . . that there is a very much greater scrutiny of the social qualification of candidates than in the early days of our section. We seem to be going more and more into a social club and with this development, the exclusion of all save the socially desirable (or what our officers deem the socially desirable) seems to have become a settled policy in the election of new members."¹²

One year later, however, Monroe seemed more reconciled to the increasingly exclusionary policies of the New York section. In his 1923 report, he wrote that the section could no longer choose its membership based merely on those interested in walking and hiking, but had to take into account "personal and social qualities that harmonize with our established precedents." Noting the growth in the number of hiking clubs in the New York area, Monroe wrote that "clubs like ours must necessarily stress selective factors in additions to our membership. And this has become an established policy of our section."¹³

In April, 1924, Isidor Greenwald, a charter member of the New York Section, wrote to its secretary, Laura Woodward. He had been told by one of the trustees of the New York Section that Jews were no longer welcome. He tendered his resignation, asking to remain as a member-at-large of the club. Woodward wrote back, informing Greenwald that it was the unanimous wish of the section's trustees that he remain, and that membership in the section was "first and foremost, upon the basis of personal qualifications, such as you yourself have displayed to an unusual degree since your enrollment as a charter member." Greenwald replied that the letter failed to address his initial question: had the section decided to exclude other Jews from future membership? Because the trustee in question had since confirmed to Greenwald his earlier statement that Jews were not welcome, Greenwald again sought an assurance that the section had not changed its policy with regard to Jews, and if it had, he wished to resign. Four months later he had his answer. In a one-sentence letter, Woodward informed him that his resignation had been accepted by motion of the section's trustees.

Greenwald pursued the matter with the club's trustees in January, 1927. While stating that he had no intention of returning to the New York Section, he asked that the GMC take action similar to that of the Adirondack Mountain Club, which had come out strongly against religious restrictions on membership in its sections.

In a letter from Willis M. Ross to J. Ashton Allis (both GMC trustees), Ross suggested that Allis respond to Greenwald, because he feared that he would "put it too strong." Ross reminded Allis that they had talked about Greenwald when Ross had been in New York the year before. Greenwald had asked to be kept in the club as an at-large member and "that is just what we did do." Ross reiterated to Allis what Allis already knew: it was very hard for a Jew to get into the New York Section. "And every application of a Jew for member-at-large is looked up more carefully than if he were not a Jew. And if he comes from New York or near there, we would have him scrutinized more thoroughly than if he resided elsewhere."¹⁴ Given the section's stagnant membership figures, it was clear that the decision had been made that growth would not be sacrificed to "quality."¹⁵ Beyond that, the comments of the club's trustees indicate at least their understanding that application by Jews even for at-large membership would be more heavily scrutinized than application by others deemed more socially fit.

I want to be clear about what this episode does and does not tell us about the Green Mountain Club in the 1920s. It is impossible to know what the attitude of the club's membership was towards Jews. Presumably its members held a broad spectrum of opinions and attitudes on the issue. The evidence cited above is not sufficient to make a blanket condemnation of the club as "antisemitic," and, in any case, that particular issue is collateral to the thesis of this article. What the episode does show is that antisemitic attitudes informed the thinking of those at the highest levels of the club's leadership and that those attitudes were recognized and tolerated by at least some club trustees acting in official capacities (the comments of Ross appeared on club stationery and were maintained in the club's records). I use the episode as just one example of how official club decisions often reflected a particular social vision—a vision which resulted in the exclusion of some who wished to partake of the club's offerings. These exclusionary attitudes resulted in actions unrelated to (and sometimes at odds with) the club's constitutional mandates, which included making the mountains of Vermont play a larger part in the life of the people. This indicates the complexity of the club's motives and actions during this period. The club was never solely motivated by the promotion of hiking or the conservation of the Vermont woods.

Throughout the 1920s and early 1930s, the trustees attempted to deal with the tension between fiscal and constitutional responsibilities (which required a steady stream of hikers) and their desire to preserve the "values" of the membership. The result was a somewhat contradictory policy. On the one hand they were relentless in publicizing the trail. Noted figures

wrote syndicated articles on the trail that ran in hundreds of newspapers.¹⁶ The *Long Trail News* maintained a running commentary on which national publication or figure mentioned the trail. When an outdoor stunter named Irving Appleby made several nationally celebrated end-to-end trips, the club basked in the publicity. At the same time, however, it was troubled by the fear that the trail was in danger of becoming commercialized, particularly after Appleby began trying to cash in on his feats by seeking commercial endorsements in Boston.¹⁷ As a result, the trustees passed two resolutions in March, 1928. The first stated that the trail's main purpose was for "release and relief from the hurry and confusion prevalent in modern life" and that the club welcomed "especially all who come with the purpose of seeking out quietly and discerningly the beauties of Vermont's great wilderness." The second resolution stated that the club was not interested in speed records on the trail.¹⁸ In the next issue of the *News*, the editor discussed the resolutions, noting that he hoped they would arrest the tendency to use the trail for self-advertising and commercial purposes for freak stunts and speed records. While such activities were good publicity, the editor wrote that they brought the trail into "disrepute" with real mountain lovers, for whom it was designed. Should such trends continue, the editor envisioned a trail where "hot dog stands would spring up at short intervals to accommodate the crowds. Landing fields might be established for the benefit of those who preferred to come by air and avoid the trouble of walking. And the genuine nature lover, for whom the Trail was intended, would be crowded out of the cabins and off the Trail entirely."¹⁹

Nevertheless, the club needed new members in order to finance its activities. By the early 1930s it solved the problem by simply acknowledging the distinction that already existed between the at-large members and those of the sections. As a result, at-large membership became the cash cow that funded patrolling, clearing, and maintaining the large portions of the trail not under the care of the individual sections. While the editor of the *News* encouraged at-large members to take an interest "in building up your list of fellow-members with the sort of folks you prefer to meet in the lodges," this form of membership was recognized by the trustees as being second best.²⁰ The club "sorely needed" more at-large members. However, as club president Herbert W. Congdon pointed out, "this class of membership has nothing to offer to the possible candidate save the tepid glow of having aided a worthy cause. The member at large has no contacts with the club nor with the other members of his class."²¹ Social activities remained focused around the sections. The fact that Isidor Greenwald was now an at-large member of the GMC as opposed

to a member of its New York Section was not a mere technicality; it had real social ramifications.

Another example of the trustees' attempts to walk a line between fiscal responsibility and the preservation of the club's social characteristics revolved around the management of the Long Trail Lodge. Located on the trail where it passed through Sherburne Pass, this gift by future governor Mortimer Proctor and his mother was also the GMC's club house. The trail actually passed through the front door and out the back, a literal merging of the club's hiking and socializing functions. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the Lodge went through a series of short-term managers, and at a September, 1932, meeting the Board of Trustees concluded that the current hostess was not working out. The hostess, a Mrs. Bates, had been too ardent in protecting the lodge from undesirable visitors. The trustees noted her "chilly reception of persons who should be welcomed but do not seem to her of the social rank to which she feels the use of the lodge should be limited." What was needed according to the trustees was a woman capable of maintaining standards without at the same time leaving the lodge bereft of customers. They believed "that a more discriminating hostess might greatly increase the trade without deterioration to the grade of house atmosphere." They also suggested that a booth be built on the road with an attendant "of the right sort" as a "steersman" whose job it would be to screen people whom the lodge might wish to welcome.²² Shortly after the September meeting, the trustees finally gave up and turned operations over to a professional management firm. Thereafter, the lodge began to operate in the black.²³

The increasing diversity of people interested in the trail and its facilities during the 1920s and early 1930s was a symptom of a much larger force at work in Vermont and the nation—the impact of automobile tourism. Between 1917 and 1926, automobile registrations in the United States quadrupled, from 4.6 million to 19.2 million. While many owners were middle class, many others were more economically marginal. But even as the Depression wore on, automobile travel continued to grow while other recreational activities declined.²⁴ Vermont had been selling itself to tourists for years, but the availability of the automobile meant that tens of millions of people were now within a day's journey of Vermont's rural spaces. Vermont's progressive intelligentsia soon realized that, for better or worse, the automobile had the potential to alter dramatically the appearance of Vermont's rural places and the lives of its people. And, like the Green Mountain Club, these thinkers recognized the potential conflict between the economic benefits of the increased use of Vermont's countryside and the impact such activity would have on Vermont's community values and social cohesion.

The most obvious example of this concern appears in the 1931 report of the Vermont Commission on Country Life. An offshoot of University of Vermont Professor Henry F. Perkins's eugenics survey, the commission undertook its study "to see if anything could be done to better the living conditions in which so large a part of our population is born and grow up." The commission was headed by Henry C. Taylor, an agricultural economist from Northwestern University. Its membership was initially made up of three hundred self-described "progressive citizens of the state." Eventually, two hundred of them formed into committees and sub-committees, each charged with investigating a particular aspect of rural Vermont life.²⁵ Two groups dealt expressly with tourism and the automobile. The Committee on Summer Residents and Tourists detailed the growth of tourism in Vermont, examined the economic and social significance of the various kinds of tourists (the "transient" tourist, the "vacationist," and "the property owner") and provided suggestions for improving tourism which addressed the needs of all three types of tourists. For example, the committee noted that the "farmer, the wage earner, and the business man operating on a limited scale, are taking vacations where a few years ago only the more prosperous business and professional men enjoyed an annual outing." These tourists of lesser means were increasingly able to take advantage of inexpensive lodgings in the homes of farm and village families.²⁶ In order to accommodate them, the committee proposed state regulation of these accommodations to assure the comfort and safety of guests. It also proposed improving roads, acquiring mountain top property, and forming a state police force to protect the homes of summer residents from criminal activity when their owners were absent.²⁷ In its recommendations, the committee noted that the summer home movement was "the most promising feature of recreational development in Vermont" (so long as it did not displace agriculture) and it warned against "cheap and vulgar displays along the roadside."²⁸ But these were only two of sixteen diverse recommendations. In short, the Committee on Summer Residents and Tourism accepted the eclectic nature of Vermont tourism, pointed out the pros and cons of each type of tourist activity, and refused to take a condemnatory position on any of them.

The other committee to examine the issue of tourism, however, took a different approach. The Committee on the Conservation of Vermont Traditions and Ideals, by virtue of its mandate, was deeply concerned with the impact automobile tourism could have on the social fabric of the rural community.

The make-up of the committee's membership was extraordinary in several respects. Five members were poets, two were professional writers, two were professors of English, one was an editor, lecturer, and histo-

rian, and one was a minister. Six of the eleven were women. Of the ten whose birthplaces could be determined, six had been born outside Vermont. Three of them lived in and around the summer home enclave of Manchester.²⁹ Three of the eleven were Green Mountain Club members (Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Helen Hartness Flanders, and Frederick Tupper).³⁰

Because of its mandate to conserve Vermont traditions and ideals, it is instructive to examine what the committee deemed were threats to these values. It was heavily oriented towards the summer home owner and away from the transient automobile tourist. Unlike the Committee on Summer Residents and Tourists, it was clear that Traditions and Ideals wanted no part of the transient tourist trade. Instead it noted that the state "offers a pleasant environment for authors, artists, college teachers, and others in the same general classification. . . . It would be fortunate for the state and its people if more and more men and women of this desirable type sought Vermont for summer or permanent homes. They are far more valuable to Vermont as summer residents or as habitual dwellers in the state than other classes that might be mentioned."³¹ It was quite clear who those other "classes" were. They were "the farmer, wage earner and business man operating on a limited scale" whose comfort and safety the Committee on Summer Residents and Tourists had acknowledged and sought to protect through a system of tourist home regulations.

Traditions and Ideals explicitly linked the class of tourists visiting Vermont and the preservation of Vermont's traditions and ideals. But it also did so implicitly. Following its discussion of the desirability of the intellectual second home owner, the committee called for the conservation of the state's beauty as a vital component of any attempt to protect Vermont's traditions and ideals. While the Committee on Summer Residents and Tourists had noted the importance of "wise and consistent policies of protection of our scenic assets," the Committee on Traditions and Ideals adopted far more militant language. The state had to "maintain an unbroken front against the forces which more and more will be destructive of Vermont's peace and beauty unless held at bay."³²

What were these forces that so threatened Vermont? They were the tasteless nouveaux riches and the low class automobile tourist. Author Dorothy Canfield Fisher, a member of both the Committee on the Conservation of Vermont Traditions and Ideals and the Green Mountain Club, elaborated on both in pieces she published the next year.

In an expensively produced pamphlet issued by the state Publicity Bureau in 1932, Fisher described the middle-class professionals she was interested in attracting to Vermont as second home owners. These people were attractive, not because of their wealth, but because of their values.

.....

"I think it well to specify those who are concerned by this screed about summer homes in Vermont—those men and women teaching in schools, colleges and universities; those who are doctors, lawyers, musicians, artists—in a word those who earn a living preferably by the trained use of their brains. And in addition—note this—those others not technically of that class but who enjoy the kind of life usually created by professional people." These people, Fisher wrote, had much in common with Vermonters and were distinct from those Americans "of the same sort who manufacture, or buy and sell material objects or handle money." Fisher's people sought to "train your children not to be dependent on manufactured mechanical recreation-for-sale, but to make their own fun, most of it out of doors and in the day time, rather than race off to roadhouses and dance halls." Fisher closed the brochure, richly illustrated with pictures of restored farmhouses (identified by their out-of-state owners' names and hometowns), by warning prospective home buyers to be careful while searching for a second home in Vermont. Advice and information should only be sought from "people of your own kind."³³

Like the Greenwald correspondence, Fisher's comments must be assessed carefully. Fisher dedicated much of her professional life to combating intolerance, bigotry, and authoritarianism.³⁴ Despite this (or perhaps because of it) her text is revealing for the ease with which it categorizes people and makes clear that some are *not* welcome. That the comments appear in a publication paid for and produced by the state's Publicity Bureau indicates the extent to which theories of typing and exclusion dominated the thinking of Vermont's elite classes and were accepted by it.

In the same year that *Vermont Summer Homes* came out, Fisher published her well-known play *Tourists Accommodated*, a farce about a poor Vermont farm family who decide to jump on the bandwagon and cater to automobile tourists, those members of the "other classes" Fisher's committee could not even bring itself to mention by name in its report. In her introduction, Fisher explained that the play was based on the stories she had gleaned from her neighbors and friends who had themselves accommodated such tourists in Manchester.³⁵

Early in the play, young Lucy, her mother, Sophie, and their Aunt Nancy Jane discuss with some trepidation the benefits and dangers of welcoming strangers into one's home. Sophie worries that the guests will steal from them, while Aunt Nancy Jane argues that it is good to meet strangers "and try to figger out from just looking at them what they're like." Though she must admit that "sure, yes, they do steal things."³⁶ Still, Sophie is not convinced and vents her concern in lines symbolizing the economic, social, and ethnic challenges an influx of automobile tourists will bring to the state.

Why, seems as though it would give me heart failure to have a lot of strangers come and me try to make 'em pay for sleeping in our beds. How would I know how much to ask 'em for anything? Suppose they didn't pay me the morning after? Suppose they up and said some of us stole something from 'em? Suppose some French Canucks come along that don't speak English? Suppose a couple come—why how can you tell whether they're even married or not, nowadays with no morals to speak of?³⁷

In the end, the family earns enough to pay the taxes and send Lucy to teacher's college, but not before it has had to agonize over the potential problems, and not before experiencing various misadventures as strangers take over their home. Sophie's discourse about what could have been is telling. Just like the roadhouses and dance halls of Fisher's summer homes pamphlet, the dialogue in *Tourists Accommodated* is a none too subtle code Vermonters must have understood. With automobile tourism comes the risk of crime, ethnic discord, sexual deviance, and the introduction of a foreign economy into the rural landscape. Though in the end, if financial conditions made it necessary and if they were clever, Vermonters could profit from this kind of tourism without losing their souls. Given the themes of *Tourists Accommodated*, it is no surprise that the Committee on the Conservation of Vermont Traditions and Ideals adopted the popular play and disseminated it to theater groups throughout rural Vermont—the proceeds going to advance the work of the committee.³⁸

THE GREEN MOUNTAIN CLUB AND THE PARKWAY PROPOSAL

By the early 1930s, the potential impact of automobile tourism on Vermont had been discussed extensively among the state's close-knit intelligentsia and experienced first-hand by some rural Vermonters. But the issue did not really come to the fore for the public or the trustees of the Green Mountain Club until 1933 when William J. Wilgus proposed construction of a "Green Mountain Parkway" which would roughly parallel the Long Trail and cross it repeatedly. Wilgus, a nationally renowned civil engineer, proposed the road as the only Vermont project the federal government would be willing to spend New Deal money on as part of its National Industrial Recovery Act. He estimated that Vermont could qualify for seven to ten million dollars, and that the project would create thousands of jobs.³⁹ The proposal forced the club, like others in the state before it, to contemplate the impact of the automobile on its operations and brought the issue of who was welcome in Vermont out of the sequestered meetings of the GMC board and the Country Life Commission and into public discussion.

At a special meeting held on June 24, 1933, the GMC's Board of Trustees unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the project. The road

would be "a detriment to the best good of the State of Vermont;" it would "impose an impossible financial burden on the people of the State of Vermont for future upkeep;" and, most importantly from the GMC's perspective, "it would mean the abandonment of the Long Trail of the Green Mountain Club and would commercialize a section of the State that has so far been unspoiled but has been opened up by the Green Mountain Club's Trails to lovers of the outdoors in its natural state." The GMC resolved that it was "unalterably opposed" to the construction of such a highway and that a copy of the resolution be presented to the governor with the plea of the club that "he use every effort in his power to prevent the construction of such a highway."⁴⁰

Wilgus was aware of the GMC's opposition and understood the potential mischief the club could do to his efforts given the political, intellectual, and social influence of its membership. Future governor Mortimer Proctor was by now the club president. Members Henry Field Sr. and his son were the publishers of the *Rutland Herald*, the state's most influential newspaper, which reviled the project from the start, and worked very hard to defeat it.⁴¹

As a result of this opposition, Wilgus worked closely with James P. Taylor, secretary of the Vermont Chamber of Commerce and founder of the Green Mountain Club, in the production of a pamphlet entitled, "Vermont's Opportunity," which sought to allay many of the fears expressed by the GMC leadership. The pamphlet's focus and language confirm the extent to which the men understood the GMC's concerns to be as much social as environmental.

To those who objected that the parkway would bring a "flood of undesirable visitors" to the state, Wilgus implied that those who even suggested such an objection were deserving of censure. "As if we wished to remain a 'hermit kingdom' for all time," he wrote, "just because an occasional visitor via the parkway may not be all that is to be desired." Wilgus attacked the related concern that the parkway would bring another type of invasion in the form of "signs, hot-dog stands, filling stations and hovels" that would "spoil the State." He asserted that "all of such objectionable features will be barred" on land within the federal right-of-way.

Wilgus squarely addressed the objections of the Green Mountain Club concerning "the invasion of the fastnesses of their Long Trail by motor parkway, bringing with it the noise and smell of civilization, and an influx of people where few now go." He responded to these concerns by noting that the parkway "will be skillfully located by landscape engineers, or the trail relocated . . . all with a view to the preservation of the trail in its primitive beauty." Wilgus downplayed the concerns of those he de-

scribed as "trail devotees" who complained that the parkway "will take from them the psychological sense of complete solitude and remoteness from the haunts of man, even though far out of range of the noise of the motor."

In the end, Wilgus maintained that, even if all the concerns of the Green Mountain Club could not be assuaged:

a balance must be struck between the slight disadvantage that the hikers, few in number, will suffer on the trail, and the enormous advantages that will be reaped by the country at large in the spiritual satisfaction that will be brought to the many using the parkway, the material reward that will come to the business interests, farmers, property owners, and taxpayers in general in the State, and the restoration of morale that will be brought to workers through self-respecting employment, and finally, the benefits that will go to the members of the Green Mountain Club itself, in the protection of forest and wild life on the Long Trail. Judged by the criterion of the greatest good to the greatest number, the park project should have the unanimous support of the citizens of the State.⁴²

In other words, in "troubled times" as he described them, the needs of the many had to outweigh those of the few—a plea for a democratic approach. But privately, Wilgus was more blunt. Those who opposed the parkway on socially exclusionary grounds were "snobs who sneer at the vulgar populace to whom the parkway will be a boon above price."⁴³

While many people both inside and outside the club opposed the parkway on grounds that it would harm the wilderness and associated values, for the leadership of the GMC the focus remained squarely on the parkway's threat to the existence of the club itself as currently constituted. That threat centered not only on the quantity of people who it was feared would now have access to the trail, but also on their quality. E. S. Marsh, the editor of the *Long Trail News*, explained the fear of the trustees following a special meeting with Wilgus. "The trustees think that the result would be that the Trail would lose its interest for those who have tramped it in the past and others like them, that it would gradually be abandoned, and that the Club, having lost its *raison d'être*, would disintegrate. It is their duty to seek to preserve the Trail and the Club, and to oppose anything which tends to destroy them."⁴⁴ Marsh's comments require careful reading. It was not that the trail would be abandoned by people, but that it would be abandoned by "those who have tramped it in the past and others like them." Thus, if many members were afraid of the parkway's effect on the woods, they were concerned as well by the numbers and kinds of people it would bring to Vermont and the Long Trail.

Wilgus repeatedly supported his proposal by pointing out the millions

of nearby urban dwellers who could benefit from the Vermont countryside. These people, argued Wilgus, heretofore unable to reach the Long Trail, would now be able to drive to it. Even those who were not sufficiently fit to experience the trail as it was currently constituted could walk on it.⁴⁵ In general, given Vermonters' ambivalent attitude towards the city, such an argument was problematic. Many rural Vermonters increasingly relied on the city for their livelihoods, whether as dairy farmers or as tourist hosts. But "the city" had a long history of luring away Vermont's children and dictating the prices paid for Green Mountain agricultural products. Thus, appeals to Vermont that the parkway would bring a flood of city people to the state did not always win supporters.

From the point of view of the GMC's trustees, the notion of a flood of city people on the trail was particularly troubling. Given the attitudes held by its leadership, Wilgus's arguments that the parkway would inundate the Long Trail with hordes of New York and Boston visitors hardly seemed calculated to reassure. Many were horrified at the thought of the trail, *their* trail, being invaded by socially unacceptable automobile tourist "hikers." According to acting club President Congdon, if these people were too feeble to hike and wanted a mountain view, then let them ride up Mansfield or Mount Philo, which had already been defiled by carriage roads.⁴⁶

Nevertheless, the leadership of the GMC did face a rift in its ranks over the parkway similar to the one that had been more generally articulated in the report of the Vermont Commission on Country Life. Should Vermont accept automobile tourism, which would attract a larger and inherently more diverse population? Or should it focus on attracting a "higher-class" tourist?

The membership, both in-state and out-of-state, was divided. In a survey on the parkway taken in 1934, in-state members who responded opposed the project 129 to 117. The out-of-state members who responded to the survey opposed it by a much wider margin—143 to 79.⁴⁷ In addition, several important GMC figures favored the parkway. Judge Clarence P. Cowles, an early club leader and the major force behind early trail building, favored the parkway for many of the reasons James Taylor did. In a letter to Governor Stanley Wilson, Cowles pointed out that the GMC's object was to build trails and roads and to make the mountains play a larger part in the life of the people. Certainly the parkway would do that.⁴⁸ Future U.S. Senator Ralph E. Flanders published an open letter to the club in the *Rutland Herald* threatening to quit if it continued to spend money and effort opposing the parkway—resources he felt would be better spent on maintaining trails and shelters. He thought the parkway would be good for the state. Surprisingly, by 1936, Dorothy

Canfield Fisher was also supporting the project. This drew an angry rebuke from the *Rutland Herald* which accused her of hypocrisy, given earlier statements by her on the Long Trail as an antidote to civilization.⁴⁹ Throughout the debate, however, the GMC trustees were a consistent voice against it, opposing it unanimously throughout 1933 and 1934.⁵⁰ It was their voice that represented the club's position and it was their voice that the GMC publicized via the *Long Trail News*.

The comments of *News* editor E. S. Marsh and the comments of those he quoted reflected a consistent fear of the kind of people the parkway would bring to Vermont. These people would simultaneously ruin the experience of the Long Trail and drive away the kind of people Vermont should be attracting, people very much like those members who wrote letters to the *News*.

Zephine Humphrey Fahnestock (a member of the Committee for the Conservation of Vermont Traditions and Ideals) was quoted in the *Long Trail News* as asking "what do our summer friends want of us? They say that they want healing and quietness, simplicity, release." Bertha Oppenheim (also a member of Traditions and Ideals) panned the parkway in the *News*. "The very name 'Skyline Parkway' is a desecration of all we stand for, of all that our tradition, our ideals, our hopes mean to us."⁵¹ Mortimer Proctor, club president (on leave of absence), wrote that in addition to destroying the charm of the trail's solitude and natural wildness, the parkway "would attract unknown thousands, thereby creating a situation which would, to a great degree at least, destroy the finest charms of this great natural sanctuary." He went on to discuss other problems, including the "influx of undesirable elements." Herbert W. Congdon, the club's acting president, stated the difficult problem of bridging the "deep gulf that lies between some of us in the matter of taste. To those of us who love the forests through which our Trail passes, the idea of having hordes of people, convenient hot dog stands and the like, is abhorrent. Yet there is a very large number of people who think these factors are the only things lacking to make our mountains perfect."⁵²

In its June 1934 issue the *News* published Llew Evans's poem, "Over the Parkway."

You're crazy, guy. You told me how you'd climb.
 Deep in the forest, sidling 'round a rock,
 To see the broadening vista, and unlock
 The very heart of Nature. "Grand—Sublime!"
 You said. I'll say you're crazy. It's a crime
 How me and Bill, my side-kick, and two janes
 Burned up that parkway that the state maintains
 along the mountain. Boy, did we make time?
 We loaded up with frankfurts, beer and gas;

.....

Took Killington and Camel's Hump in high;
 Just shifted once on Mansfield—couldn't pass
 a line of cars. But what an alibi
 this Nature pulled. We never saw the lass
 From Dome to Journey's End. You're crazy, guy.

Marsh wrote in the same issue that many lovers of the mountains and the wilderness will not cease to regret "this great gash . . . bringing hordes of people, some of whom may be genuine nature lovers who will appreciate the scenery, but a majority of whom, they fear, will be like those described in Llew Evan's sonnet."⁵³ These people—beer swilling, hot dog chomping, autoborne tourists, accompanied by their vulgar "Janes"—were not the sort many club members wanted to meet on the trail.

If the *News* received any letters favoring the parkway, it did not print them. The paper, controlled by the trustees, printed only letters critical of the parkway. A large portion of this correspondence focused not on harm to the natural environment, but to the human environment of the trail in particular and Vermont in general. For these club members, the parkway emphasized "quantity rather than quality." Girls' camps would no longer be able to send their campers on the trail unchaperoned by men for fear of kidnapping. The road would provide "just another picture postcard for empty headed sightseers." Another reader argued that the plan was being promoted by a "certain element in the state, moved by its prospects of commercial or other economic advantages." In any case, the motor traveler would bring some "subtle, disturbing thing hard to reduce to figures or concrete facts, but which tends to change and practically to ruin that which it touches." Vermont had so far been spared exploitation and commercialization by "public attractions and noisy cheap amusements that always attract a like class of people." The future of Vermont lay not with these types, a reader wrote, but with people "of more background, cultivation and vision" who were opposed to the parkway.⁵⁴

Often, the rhetoric was tied directly to the effect the parkway would have on the state's attempts to attract summer residents—the kind of people Dorothy Canfield Fisher had sought to attract and who, presumably, would be very similar to the kinds of people in the GMC. As early as 1929, the *News* had featured a group of Long Island hikers who had returned to Vermont, eventually purchasing over 1,000 acres of land. Soon their friends had purchased summer homes as well, forming a small summer colony.⁵⁵ Club members often made reference to these summer people in their opposition. "I know of a goodly number of desirable people now looking for summer homes in Vermont just because the isolated charm appeals to them, and if this charm is destroyed they are no longer interested." "Vermont has a great future as a residence region . . . I mean a

place of residence for high-grade well-to-do people. . . . There is no other place for them in this part of the world. The White Mountains and the Adirondacks have both been vulgarized and spoiled." A summer resident threatened that, if the parkway were built, "our interest in this part of the country will be lost . . . and our thoughts will have to turn toward finding a substitute somewhere else." The same writer who had complained of "noisy cheap amusements" pointed out that Vermont had become the summer home of hundreds of "refined" families who had been attracted to it because Vermont was "beautiful, natural, clean, quiet and unspoiled." Another reader wrote that the parkway would attract "just the class of people who do the state no good, and drive away the kind that Vermont wants and needs — quiet, cultivated people who want to get away from just those things that the parkway would bring in its wake."⁵⁶

In September 1934, the GMC board discussed reconsidering its position on the parkway on the motion of member and popular writer Walter O'Kane. However, the motion to reconsider was unanimously defeated. In addition, the trustees appointed a committee to keep alive their opposition and to formulate further "counter proposals for spending any national appropriation or state assistance especially on influencing and circularizing the coming legislature."⁵⁷

Herbert Congdon feared that the club was out-gunned by the Wilgus parkway juggernaut and called the contest "a fight in the dark against illusive giants."⁵⁸ Despite these fears about the GMC's disadvantages, there is much circumstantial evidence that the club effectively lobbied against the parkway. First of all, the mere fact that the club publicly opposed the project served as propaganda for other opponents because of the club's influential membership. As we have seen, the club's opinions were important enough that Wilgus felt obliged to devote a good portion of his "Opportunity" to addressing its concerns. And James Taylor felt the strong minority support for the parkway demonstrated by the GMC's survey of its members was so significant that he called it to the attention of the governor.⁵⁹ In addition, the club actively lobbied against the proposal in the General Assembly.⁶⁰

In September 1934, Mortimer Proctor proposed an alternative parkway plan to the GMC trustees. Although the *News* refused to reveal the plan at the time, Marsh described it as one that would not "desecrate the mountains, . . . bring in a horde of sightseers in speeding automobiles, . . . spoil the scenery" nor "interfere with the Long Trail," but he predicted, "it is expected that it will open up attractive locations now inaccessible, and attract a desirable class of people to become summer or permanent residents."⁶¹

At the club's annual meeting in January 1935 the trustees officially revealed the plan. Labeled "Vermont for Vermonters," and the "All-Vermont Plan," Proctor's proposal would improve trunk and secondary roads with an eye toward opening up beautiful but less accessible hill country to second-home development. The *News* reported that nine arguments had been made in favor of the plan. The *News* chose to focus on only the two "which will appeal particularly to members of the Green Mountain Club," the others being economic and practical arguments appealing to Vermonters generally. The first of the two arguments focussed on conservation. No "super highways" would invade and desecrate the "hidden fastness" of the Green Mountains. The second argument was listed under the title, "An unspoiled Vermont." This plan "would preserve, not destroy, Vermont's justly famous friendly charm and simplicity. It would encourage the leisurely tourist who really appreciates what Vermont has to offer. It would not attract the speedster, the stunters, the unprofitable through tourists, who contribute little or nothing to the communities through which they rush." The *News* then quoted from the report's conclusion that the GMC stood ready to save Vermont from the "mistaken attempts of exploitative experimentalists" and preserve Vermont so that "weary city dwellers" could be brought to the peace of the woods, the mountains, and the lakes, "far from the jazz-mad atmosphere of the cities."⁶² Wallace Fay submitted the plan to the House of Representatives which printed it in its entirety in the *House Journal*.⁶³

Soon after the "Vermont for Vermonters" plan was proposed, Proctor suggested yet another possibility. This plan would place a parkway along the Taconic Mountains west of the main Green Mountain range. It would proceed north through Hazen's Notch to Lake Willoughby, then turn south heading for Brattleboro, then west over the Green Mountains to Bennington. The trustees approved the plan and voted to appropriate \$100 for a survey to be used in its promotion.⁶⁴

What is significant about both plans is what they reveal about the priorities of the GMC leadership. Either alternative would have disrupted an enormous amount of forest land. Apparently, the GMC trustees were less concerned with the parkway's effect on wilderness in general than they were with its effect on *their* wilderness in particular. Nonetheless, neither alternative was implemented because the entire parkway proposal was overwhelmingly defeated in a March 1936 referendum.

CONCLUSION

Historians have studied the parkway episode in depth because the controversy illuminates many of the hidden faultlines in Vermont society in the 1930s. Among those faultlines were the challenges posed to a

state increasingly committed to selling itself to people who lived in the surging cities of the east coast. The idea of the autoborne tourist frightened many people since it meant that almost anyone of any social or ethnic background could now enjoy the state's offerings. Many people feared the impact of these tourists on the state and promoted second home ownership as a solution that promised economic development while limiting the threat of social disruption. To the people who worried about them, motor tourists represented a "subtle, disturbing thing" representative of the massive social, economic, and cultural changes taking place in America. Vermont was supposed to be a refuge from these changes—a refuge many people thought worth saving even if it meant keeping others out.

The actions of the Green Mountain Club leadership during the parkway conflict reflect attitudes and practices already in place by the early 1930s, within the club, the state, and the nation. The club's leaders understood their mission as preserving not only the Long Trail, but also a kind of social experience for club members. It was a young organization struggling to define and maintain itself in a nation experiencing both demographic and transportation revolutions. Many people in America felt deeply threatened by the implications of these changes, and reaction to them came from all levels of society—from private clubs to Congress. These reactions were sometimes ugly—both by the standards of the day and by the standards of our own time.

Today the Green Mountain Club is a pluralistic organization with a diverse membership. Its work makes the Vermont woods available to all people who would enjoy them on nature's terms. It has preserved a large chunk of wilderness in the heart of Vermont and has fought throughout the years to protect it from incursion. The groundwork responsible for these achievements was laid by many of the people featured in this article. But this article has also shown the extent to which their attitudes and practices were motivated by the conviction that certain people were welcome in Vermont and certain people were not. A commitment to hiking or a love of the outdoors was not always enough. Membership in a particular class or adherence to certain social or religious values was an important consideration. These judgments influenced the leadership's attitudes and actions in the 1920s and 30s. Historical accuracy demands that any assessment of the club and its actions during this period take this into account. My purpose here is not to judge the Green Mountain Club and its leaders—only to point out their attitudes and actions and try to explain them in the context of their times. I leave it to the reader to grapple with the ambiguous legacy that history has left for us.

NOTES

The author thanks Michael Sherman and Tom Bassett for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

¹ Laura Waterman and Guy Waterman, *Forest and Crag* (Boston: Appalachian Mountain Club, 1989), 353-357; Jane Curtis, Will Curtis and Frank Lieberman, *Green Mountain Adventure: Vermont's Long Trail* (Montpelier: Green Mountain Club, 1985), 12, 59, 64, 89.

² I use the term "leadership" broadly in this article. It includes not only the club's officers and trustees, but also the officers and trustees of the club's individual sections, as well as others active in the club's affairs.

³ Robert Vincent Daniels, *The University of Vermont: The First Two Hundred Years* (Hanover, N.H.: University of Vermont, 1991), 201, 210 (hostility toward a German faculty member); Gene Sessions, "Espionage in Windsor: Clarence H. Waldron and Patriotism in World War I," *Vermont History* 61 (1993): 133-155 (federal criminal trial of minister accused of opposing the war); David Williams, "'Sowing the Wind': The Deportation Raids of 1920," *Historical New Hampshire* 34 (1979): 1-31 (deportations of suspected Communists in neighboring New Hampshire); John M. Lund, "Vermont Nativism: William Paul Dillingham and U.S. Immigration Legislation," *Vermont History* 63 (1995): 15-29; Maudean Neill, *Fiery Crosses in the Green Mountains: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan in Vermont* (Randolph Center, Vt.: Greenhills Books, 1989).

⁴ Leonard Dinnerstein, *Antisemitism in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 78-105.

⁵ David M. Stameshkin, *The Strength of the Hills: Middlebury College, 1915-1990* (Hanover, N.H.: Middlebury College, 1996), 208 (on the discomfort of being Jewish at Middlebury in the 1920s and 30s); Daniels, 329-330 (antisemitism, and resistance to it, at the University of Vermont's College of Medicine); Elin Anderson, *We Americans: A Study of Cleavage in an American City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), 41-42, 108-109, 262 (Burlington's Jews excluded from neighborhoods, shunned in high school clubs and activities, and denied admission to the local nursery school). Many Vermont resorts were off limits to Jews in the 1920s and 1930s. See footnote 34. Restrictive covenants on Vermont summer home properties around Caspian Lake were common. This practice came back to haunt now Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist when it was revealed as part of his Senate confirmation hearings that the deed to his summer home in Greensboro, Vermont, prohibited conveying the property to members of the "Hebrew race." The restrictive language was added in 1933. "Justice Knew of Deed in '74," *New York Times*, 8 June 1986, A 13; "Unenforceable Covenants Are in Many Deeds," *New York Times*, 1 August 1986, A 9.

⁶ *Revised By-laws of the Green Mountain Club, Inc. and List of Members* (Rutland, Vt.: A. J. Novak, 1930). Copy in the Green Mountain Club Papers, Vermont Historical Society, Montpelier, Vermont, Doc. 182, folder 25 and Special Collections, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.

⁷ For example, the Vermont Historical Society required sponsorship by one member and election by a majority of those present at the Society's annual meeting. However in its new constitution and by-laws passed in 1930 the sponsorship requirement was removed and membership required only election by a majority of members. *Proceedings of the Vermont Historical Society* (Bellows Falls: Vermont Historical Society, 1926); *Proceedings of the Vermont Historical Society* (Montpelier: Vermont Historical Society, 1930), 21-26. Interestingly, the Green Mountain Club also changed its membership procedure at this time. Its 1922 by-laws permitted admission to anyone making application and receiving approval by any club officer or section officer. By 1930, the club's by-laws required that "each applicant be vouched for by two members of the club or furnish two references" before being admitted. It is unclear whether this new procedure made it easier or harder to gain admission to the club. *Revised By-laws of the Green Mountain Club* (1930); *Revised By-laws of the Green Mountain Club* (1922). Copies in Special Collections, University of Vermont.

⁸ Report of the Membership Committee, 1926, typescript (hereafter, ts). Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 17; Report of the Membership Committee, 1927, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 18.

⁹ *Long Trail News* (April 1926), 1; *Long Trail News* (April 1927), 1. Copies available at Special Collections, University of Vermont and at the Vermont Historical Society.

¹⁰ Report of the Membership Committee, 1927, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 18.

¹¹ Lula Tye, letter to all GMC members, 20 April 1927, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 18.

¹² Report of the New York Section, 1922, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 185, folder 10. The parenthetical portions of Monroe's words were added by him in pencil to the typed text.

¹³ Report of the New York Section, 1923, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 185, folder 10.

¹⁴ Correspondence, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 19.

¹⁵ The New York Section had earlier also refused to give up its rule on "sex balance" despite the fact that there was a waiting list of females desiring membership. This is another indication of

the section's deep concern with maintaining a desired social structure at the expense of membership revenues. Report of the New York Section, 1922, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 185, folder 10.

¹⁶ *Long Trail News* (July 1927), 1.

¹⁷ *Long Trail News* (December 1927), 3; *Long Trail News* (April 1928), 3.

¹⁸ *Long Trail News* (April 1928), 1.

¹⁹ *Long Trail News* (June 1928), 3.

²⁰ *Long Trail News* (April 1930), 3.

²¹ Report of the President, 1933, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 32.

²² Report of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 29.

²³ *Long Trail News* (November 1933), 3; (February 1934), 2.

²⁴ Warren James Belasco, *Americans on the Road: From Autocamp to Motel, 1910-1945* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979), 106, 142-143.

²⁵ Henry F. Perkins, "The Vermont Commission on Country Life," *Vermont History* 23 (1955): 335-340; Kevin Dann, "From Degeneration to Regeneration: The Eugenics Survey of Vermont, 1925-1936," *Vermont History* 59 (1991): 5-29. For the most recent work on Perkins, the eugenics survey, and the Vermont Commission on Country Life, see Nancy L. Gallagher's thorough treatment in "Henry Farnham Perkins and the Eugenics Survey of Vermont" (M.A. thesis, University of Vermont, 1996), particularly Chapter Four.

²⁶ *Rural Vermont: A Program for the Future* (Burlington, Vt.: Vermont Commission on Country Life, 1931), 124.

²⁷ *Rural Vermont*, 129-133.

²⁸ *Rural Vermont*, 130, 133.

²⁹ The membership of the committee was as follows: Arthur Peach, chairman (professor of English, Norwich University), Sarah Cleghorn (poet, Manchester), Walter J. Coates (poet, editor of the literary journal *Driftwind*, East Montpelier), Walter H. Crockett (editor, UVM lecturer and historian, Colchester), Zephine Humphrey Fahnestock (poet, Dorset), Dorothy Canfield Fisher (author, Arlington), Helen Hartness Flanders (poet, Springfield), Bertha Oppenheim (poet, Ferrisburgh), J. D. Shannon (minister, Bennington), Mary Spargo (writer, *Bridgeport [Ct.] Post*, Bennington), Frederick Tupper (professor of English, UVM, Burlington).

³⁰ *Revised By-laws of the Green Mountain Club, Inc. and List of Members* (Rutland, Vt.: A. J. Novak, 1930). Copy in the Green Mountain Club Papers, Vermont Historical Society, Montpelier, Vermont, Doc. 182, folder 25 and in Special Collections, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.

³¹ *Rural Vermont*, 380.

³² *Rural Vermont*, 382.

³³ Dorothy Canfield, *Vermont Summer Homes* (Montpelier, Vt.: Vermont Bureau of Publicity, 1932), copy in Special Collections, University of Vermont.

³⁴ For example, her 1939 novel, *Seasoned Timber*, recounts the story of a Vermont town forced to grapple with policies of exclusion when a wealthy citizen dies and leaves a large bequest to the local academy subject to its excluding Jews and girls. His bequest also demands that the school seek to attract wealthy boarding students at the expense of local students of modest means. Four years later, Fisher wrote to Governor William Wills carefully broaching the subject of opening Vermont's restricted tourist facilities to Jews. She suggested a very discreet committee be formed to look into the matter. The committee would be composed of "some of the very best Vermonters to be found, head of the Vermont Chamber of Commerce maybe, President of one or another of the colleges and two or more intelligent Jews of high standing and good will, who are already summer Vermonters." Dorothy Canfield Fisher, letter to Governor William Wills, 25 October 1943. Dorothy Canfield Fisher Papers, Box 22, folder 19, Special Collections, University of Vermont. My thanks to Barney Bloom at the Vermont Historical Society for the *Seasoned Timber* reference.

³⁵ Dorothy Canfield Fisher, *Tourists Accommodated: Scenes from Present-Day Summer Life in Vermont* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1932, 1934), 1-2.

³⁶ Fisher, *Tourists Accommodated*, 19-20.

³⁷ Fisher, *Tourists Accommodated*, 21.

³⁸ Fisher, *Tourists Accommodated*, 9-10.

³⁹ For a thorough treatment of the parkway controversy, see Hannah Silverstein, "No Parking: Vermont Rejects the Green Mountain Parkway," *Vermont History* 63 (1995): 133-157; Hal Goldman, "James Taylor's Progressive Vision: The Green Mountain Parkway," *Vermont History* 63 (1995): 158-179; Hal Goldman, "'Vermont's Opportunity': Responses to the Green Mountain Parkway" (M.A. thesis, University of Vermont, 1995).

⁴⁰ Resolution of the Trustees of the Green Mountain Club, Inc., June 24, 1933, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 31.

⁴¹ Goldman, "James Taylor's Progressive Vision," 171-174; Goldman, "Vermont's Opportunity," 75-92; Frank M. Bryan, *Yankee Politics in Rural Vermont* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1974), 224, 228-229.

⁴² William J. Wilgus, "Vermont's Opportunity," 4, Green Mountain Parkway File, Special Collections, University of Vermont.

⁴³ Wilgus to James P. Taylor, 30 September 1934, James P. Taylor Papers, Vermont Historical Society, Montpelier, Vermont.

⁴⁴ *Long Trail News* (September 1933), 3-4.

⁴⁵ "Presentation by William J. Wilgus to the Board of Trustees of the Green Mountain Club," August 13, 1933, as reported in the *Long Trail News* (September 1933), 1-2.

⁴⁶ Curtis, Curtis, and Lieberman, *Green Mountain Adventure*, 64.

⁴⁷ *Long Trail News* (September 1934), 2.

⁴⁸ Cowles to Governor Wilson, 26 August 1933, Taylor Papers.

⁴⁹ *Rutland Daily Herald*, 28 February 1936, 12; 29 February 1936, 8. Fisher responded to the criticism by arguing that as long as the road was protected from commercial development, she had no objections to it. *Rutland Daily Herald*, 3 March 1936, 8.

⁵⁰ *Long Trail News* (September 1934), 1.

⁵¹ *Long Trail News* (November 1933), 2.

⁵² *Long Trail News* (September 1933), 2; (November 1933), 2.

⁵³ *Long Trail News* (June 1934), 4.

⁵⁴ *Long Trail News* (September 1934), 3-4.

⁵⁵ *Long Trail News* (August 1929), 2.

⁵⁶ *Long Trail News* (September 1934), 3-4.

⁵⁷ Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees, 8 September 1934, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 34. The committee was comprised of Proctor, Wallace M. Fay and L. B. Puffer.

⁵⁸ Report of the President, 1933, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder 32.

⁵⁹ Taylor to Governor Wilson, 28 August 1934, Taylor Papers.

⁶⁰ See for example the printing of the "All Vermont Plan" in the House journal. *Journal of the House of Representatives*, biennial sess., 1935, 232-234; see also *Long Trail News* (April 1935), 2.

⁶¹ *Long Trail News* (September 1934), 1.

⁶² *Long Trail News* (January 1935), 2-3.

⁶³ *Journal of the House of Representatives*, biennial sess., 1935, 232-234.

⁶⁴ Meeting of the Board of Trustees, June 15, 1935, ts, Green Mountain Club Papers, Doc. 182, folder, 35.