

INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF NATIONAL PARKS IN
CONSERVATION EDUCATION

Part 1. Contribution of National Parks to the Advancement of Conservation
Education by Harold J. Coolidge

The theme of the First World Conference on National Parks, which was held in Seattle, Washington, from 30 June to 7 July 1962, was "national parks are of international significance." The success of that Conference and the recommendations emanating from it have given us in a sense a blueprint for future action on a worldwide basis.

Such action has not been postponed for future consideration as is often the case. I propose to share my time in this workshop with two of my colleagues who are specifically doing something about the Seattle recommendations. The first is Jean-Paul Harroy, former Secretary General of the IUCN and now serving as Vice Chairman of our International Commission on National Parks, who is working on the U.N. World List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves. This list was established by vote of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in 1959, and now includes areas reported by 81 countries. The second person is William J. Hart, former Director of State Parks for the states of Nevada and Utah, who is exploring the need for establishing an international office for park systems planning on a worldwide basis.

Three excellent papers dealing with the subject of education as related to the national park field were presented at the Seattle Conference by Daniel B. Beard of the United States, John A. Pile of Southern Rhodesia, and Tetsumaro Senge of Japan. I would like to refer to some of the points made in those papers on conservation education in the three countries represented.

Mr. Beard pointed out how effectively the National Park Service, a U.S. Government Agency established in 1916, has carried forward its mission to assure "that the opportunity to enjoy national parks would be provided and continued in perpetuity." Educational work in U.S. parks started about 1916 with "nature guidings" which meant that visitors were escorted and showed trees, birds, flowers, and rock formations. By 1935 this pattern was well established in many parks and the program under Carl Russell was characterized by the word "interpretation" which was defined as "an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects by first hand experience and by illustration media rather than simply to communicate factual information". They appreciated that interpretation was an art, and that its aim was to provoke interest.

Orientation which introduces visitors to what to expect from their park experience adds greatly to the values that they can acquire and this is done in many ways in the U.S. parks by talks, films, and naturalist campfire programs. Then there are "site museums" located at historical and archaeological sites and trailside exhibits that help to explain the story of the park. Actually the park is the exhibit, and the museums should be thought of as explanatory labels. The latest developments are the visitor centers that are used not only for orientation, but to stimulate interest and answer questions about the park in a relaxed atmosphere. 63 such centers are already established in U.S. parks, and it is expected that there will be 82

more by 1966. Greater emphasis is being placed on self-guiding facilities along park roads and trails because of the crowding and the short time that some visitors have available. Signs, markers, exhibits, nature trails with booklets keyed to numbered stakes or stations are being used. Publications based on research findings for those who want to make a more serious study of the parks are available.

John Pile emphasized the value of creating a natural resource conservation consciousness to underly any conservation education program. He defines the education problem as "(a) the education of the more advanced section of the community to the need for and methods of conservation and wise use of resources; (b) the education of the more backward sections of the population in adapting themselves to the new way of life thrust upon them, and to give them an appreciation of the importance of basic natural resources and how to conserve them for their own betterment and that of their children in the light of their new environment; (c) as progress is achieved with (a) and (b), the stimulation of interest in national parks and museums, and the creation of an awareness of the important part they have played in research, education and recreation."

Conservation education had to be started in the schools and to accomplish this the Natural Resources Board started conservation education courses for teachers in the school vacations. Two or three such courses catered to some 150 teachers each year. A Conservation Day and later a Conservation Week was instituted, and a definite theme is now taken for a whole year with Wild Life Conservation being the theme for 1961. This education campaign has had a tremendous impact on Southern Rhodesia by creating an appreciation of the wild life resources, their conservation and wise utilization, and the importance of national parks and museums in the overall pattern.

Tetsumaro Senge told how the national parks in Japan are used for study tours as part of the regular curriculum for Japanese school children. In 1959 a total of 45,000 schools had school journeys involving more than 5,000,000 children, and five national parks were among the best ten destinations for such tours. Museums play an important part in this education aspect of national park activities.

Since most of Japan's limited land must be used for the various industries to support its large population, little remains in its natural state. Parks are, therefore, the most outstanding of those places which have managed to retain much of nature and are indispensably important spots to study geographical features, geology, ecology of animals and plants, etc. Japan's parks also include many of the countries historic relics, and are important places for the study of history, archaeology, and the arts and crafts.

Not only these three papers, but many others dealing with such subjects as principles and policies of national parks; scientific, economic and cultural values of such areas; optimum use; administration; and international coordination of national park and reserve programs, contributed substantive material that can be found in the proceedings of the Seattle Conference. The proceedings, which will be published in late 1963, together with papers from the Arusha Conference (Symposium on the Conservation of

49

Nature and Natural Resources in Modern African States) can give us a substantive baseline for all aspects of conservation education dealing with this subject.

If we visualize a world in which most nations have national parks which can be an asset to their economy, and which attract large numbers of tourists often from foreign countries, it seems to me that we have a particular justification for making this subject a primary part of any education program. Such a program will strengthen the support of the park system within a country, as well as encourage visitors to share the values and knowledge that can be gained from this cultural asset. I maintain that natural beauty is the highest common denominator in the spiritual life of mankind, and that the inspirational values to be found in natural areas for the poet, the artist, the dreamer, or the tired city worker are of great cultural significance. We need to stimulate, especially at the elementary school level, a back to nature movement such as occurred at the time of Rousseau in the early 19th Century. If this can be achieved, then the children in elementary schools will not only have a basic understanding of and reverence for the natural world of which man is a part, but they will hopefully take a greater interest in solving problems of stabilizing the natural environment and the biotic community that is dependent upon it for survival.

National parks are a natural area for schools and colleges to visit in their nature study courses. Granted that they should not be used as collecting grounds for specimens, nevertheless they are often well adapted for observation of an undisturbed ecosystem, and their value to science as a reference study area will be increasingly appreciated as the undisturbed areas of the world get fewer and fewer.

Conservation education is particularly necessary for people whose homes are in areas close to national parks. They are constantly being subjected to questions as to the justification of this form of land use as compared to using the same land for some agricultural or industrial purpose. Unless those who are most affected by these areas become convinced of their values, the long range outlook of maintaining them will be jeopardized.

Another target group for whom special knowledge of parks and reserves is most vital is the government planning group which thinks in long range terms, but which is often made up of bureaucrats, who have little appreciation of the significance of what is at stake.

A third group which should have priority are the teachers of conservation in the teachers schools and colleges. They must have a dedication to the cause to enable them to inspire interest in this new subject, which has the potential not only to fit into existing curriculum of geography, agriculture, soil science, social anthropology, economics, etc., but also can make a case for conservation as a special discipline to which some U.S. colleges have devoted entire departments.

The methods of giving such instruction will be handled in other sections of this workshop, but it seems to me that the preservation of the natural habitat as nearly undisturbed as possible for future ecological studies, as well as for the benefit of the species of animal and plant life that are found there; is the contribution that parks and reserves can make to

this important subject. These habitats will have to be classified and zoned, but once this is understood and accepted by those visiting or living in regions adjoining such areas, great progress will have been made in establishing a solid educational base for strengthening the park concept. Another value of such education will be to make it easier to extend the boundaries of the preserved habitat areas.

Perhaps we can dream of the day when the entire world will be covered by a network of parks and reserves where principal biotic environments will be permanently preserved for research, education, and enjoyment of future generations. When that day comes there might be a free flow of administrative and technical people concerned with improved management of such areas who would not only visit areas similar to their own in other countries, but also spend some time carrying out practical work on an exchange basis.

Part 2. The United Nations World List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves by Jean-Paul Harroy

Notre Président vous a analysé avec clarté et conviction les multiples liens qui unissent, dans les deux sens, ces précieuses et trop rares réalisations que sont les parcs nationaux et la nécessaire campagne d'éducation qui se développe rapidement presque partout dans le monde en faveur de la conservation de la nature et de ses ressources.

Je vais à sa suite, et à sa demande, vous exposer maintenant un aspect particulier de ce problème, auquel depuis un an j'ai consacré mes efforts, et qui correspond à l'établissement de cette "liste mondiale des parcs nationaux et réserves équivalentes" décidée en avril 1959, à Mexico, par le Conseil Economique et Social des Nations Unies.

Faisons, pour commencer, si vous le voulez bien, un peu d'histoire.

L'idée avait pris naissance en 1958 au cours de la 6ème Assemblée Générale de l'UICN, à Athènes et à Delphes, et avait fait alors l'objet d'une recommandation qui avait été communiquée au Secrétaire Général de l'Organisation des Nations Unies.

Vint alors la résolution 713, votée l'année suivante par le Conseil Economique et Social, qui priait le Secrétaire Général de l'ONU "d'établir, en coopération avec l'Unesco et la FAO, une liste des parcs nationaux et réserves équivalentes, accompagnée d'une brève description de chacun d'eux, ainsi que de formuler des recommandations concernant la tenue à jour de la liste et sa distribution".

La même résolution demandait encore aux Etats Membres de l'Organisation de fournir au Secrétariat de New York toutes informations nécessaires pour l'établissement de cette liste et à l'UICN d' "aider le Secrétaire Général, sur sa demande, à préparer la liste proposée".

Début 1961, ONU et UICN avaient reçu 52 réponses, dressé et publié une première liste, que le Conseil Economique et Social ratifia à sa session de New York en avril 1961, en émettant le souhait que le travail fût poursuivi.

Un an plus tard, une trentaine d'autres réponses avaient été reçues et une deuxième liste était imprimée, par les soins de la CIPN cette fois, et présentée à la Conférence de Seattle au début de juillet 1962, ainsi qu'en avait exprimé le vœu l'Ecosoc dans sa résolution d'avril 1961.

Des délibérations de Seattle et de consultations ultérieures -notamment du Conseil Exécutif de l'Union- résulta la conviction que la tâche n'était pas achevée, que des lacunes restaient à combler, que les informations publiées étaient à inventorier, à classer, voire à trier ou à modifier afin de permettre une comparaison entre les réalisations énumérées. C'est à ce travail que je me consacre depuis un an. C'est ce travail que je m'efforcerai de vous décrire et de vous commenter dans un instant.

Mais auparavant, il serait bon que, en suivant la ligne de l'exposé du Dr Coolidge, je vous définisse sommairement les buts fondamentaux que visaient les promoteurs de l'établissement de cette liste mondiale des parcs nationaux et réserves équivalentes.

Le premier de ces buts, qui, d'une manière ou de l'autre, recouvre tous les autres, c'est de contribuer à ce que l'humanité mette à profit les dernières années qui lui restent, avant que le "développement" économique et social ait fini d'envahir toute la Planète, pour se constituer un réseau suffisant de parcs nationaux et réserves naturelles où seraient sauvegardées des portions de Nature sauvage pour les diverses raisons que tous ici nous connaissons parfaitement.

Nombreux sont heureusement déjà les pays où de tels territoires protégés existent. Mais d'autres états, par contre, n'en possèdent pas encore, ou tout au moins ne sont pas parvenus jusqu'ici à assurer à de tels territoires, pourtant choisis déjà, la protection efficace nécessaire. Souvent, les sanctuaires établis sont menacés par des convoitises extérieures. Presque partout, des intérêts économiques privés se manifestent antagonistes des tendances visant à ménager ou à défendre des "parcs nationaux" voués, leur nom l'indique, à la satisfaction de besoins de beauté, de distractions ou de science communs à toute une nation.

Avec toute la prudence et le tact désirables, la publication d'une liste des réalisations "méritant" le titre de parc national -ou de "réserve équivalente"- peut, dès lors, par une sorte de "mise internationale en commun" de ces sanctuaires, patrimoine commun de l'humanité, utilement contribuer, d'une part, à inciter les gouvernements des pays où de tels parcs et réserves existent déjà à en assurer plus jalousement le maintien et à en accroître la valeur et le nombre et, d'autre part, à donner l'envie soit aux autorités publiques soit même à des groupements privés des pays encore démunis de semblables sanctuaires d'en créer au plus tôt et de leur assurer un statut de protection et de surveillance qui leur confère le droit de figurer désormais sur la liste des Nations Unies.

Accessoirement ou simultanément, le fait que la consécration de la liste par une très haute autorité internationale aurait été précédée d'une analyse objective sévère de chacune des réalisations énumérées, pourrait vraisemblablement amener diverses autorités responsables à consacrer davantage d'attention aux mesures pratiques de mise en application des statuts édictés pour les parcs nationaux de leurs pays.

Enfin, le très long et délicat travail que comportera cette analyse objective, noeud de la mission dont je suis chargé et que je vais maintenant essayer de brièvement vous décrire, ne manquera pas de contraindre tous ceux qui s'y consacreront à mettre sans cesse plus d'ordre dans leurs idées, ouvrant ainsi la voie, on peut l'espérer, à un premier commencement de solution à une irritante question toujours pendante, posée le jour même où s'est dégagée la notion moderne de protection de la Nature, inscrite à l'ordre du jour des préoccupations de l'UICN le jour même de sa création à Fontainebleau en 1948, restée malencontreusement sans réponse valable jusqu'ici : l'imbroglio de la nomenclature.

X
X X

L'idée-force devant présider à l'essai de classification entrepris, c'est qu'il ne convient pas que la liste des Nations Unies donne une importance égale dans ses rubriques à des réalisations qui diffèrent fondamentalement entre elles par le type de protection qu'elles assurent aux associations naturelles, par leur superficie ou par le degré d'efficacité de l'application de leur statut.

Dans ce triple esprit, trois critères furent alors proposés, discutés et retenus, qui devraient permettre la sélection des territoires justifiant leur inclusion dans la liste. Ceux qui ne satisferaient pas à ces trois groupes de conditions se verraient en principe écartés de ladite liste, sauf si un motif particulier -et chaque fois dûment exposé dans cette dernière- ne justifiait pas qu'il en fût autrement.

D'innombrables nuances et interprétations, notamment en fonction de l'état de développement ou du degré d'occupation humaine des pays en cause, sont évidemment apparues nécessaires dans la stricte et objective application de ces critères de base : une note les analyse, dont je possède ici quelques exemplaires, et que pourront consulter tous ceux que ces détails intéressent.

Mais en bref, voici le canevas de cette grille de sélection :

1er principe : "La qualité de 'parc national ou réserve équivalente' ne peut être reconnue qu'à des territoires bénéficiant d'un régime juridique de protection générale contre toutes les exploitations par l'homme des ressources naturelles **et contre toutes autres atteintes à l'intégrité du territoire résultant de l'activité de l'homme**, les tolérances éventuellement admises par endroits en contradiction avec ce principe ne devant être que des exceptions et devant être considérées comme telles."

2ème principe : Sauf exception motivée, ne sont pas retenus les territoires inférieurs à 2.000 ha dans les pays dont la densité de population est moindre que 50 habitants au kilomètre carré, inférieurs à 500 ha dans les pays où ce dernier chiffre de densité est dépassé.

3ème principe : sont exclus de la liste les territoires, quels que soient leur statut juridique, leur surface ou leur nom, pour lesquels ne sont pas prévus un minimum de personnel à temps plein et de budget de gestion par unité de surface.

Le cas de chaque pays est actuellement analysé à la lumière de ces trois groupes de critères. Le résultat de l'analyse est communiqué aux autorités responsables pour correction ou commentaire. Les cas douteux seront soumis, dossier à l'appui, à l'appréciation des membres de la C.I.P.N.

Les territoires ayant alors franchi victorieusement l'épreuve donneront finalement naissance à un premier projet de liste définitive envers laquelle les gouvernements conserveront un droit d'appel avant que les instances officielles des Nations Unies soient à nouveau priées de donner leur consécration à l'ensemble.

Tels sont, fort sommairement esquissés, les principaux objectifs visés et les principales voies choisies pour les atteindre. Il resterait, vous le sentez tous, beaucoup à dire encore pour faire sortir de l'imprécision les nombreux coins d'ombre restés obscurs à ce tableau.

Une première parenthèse pourrait, par exemple, s'efforcer de définir ces "réserves équivalentes" dont parle la résolution de l'Ecosoc et dont le contenu réel devrait justifier l'insertion au tableau d'honneur aux côtés des parcs nationaux reconnus dignes de cette noble dénomination.

Une deuxième remarque essentielle devrait ensuite mettre, une fois de plus, l'accent sur la prudence et le tact avec lesquels tous les travaux tant de sélections que de notification de ces sélections devront être menés. Le but, rappelons-le, est d'encourager, de stimuler. Ce but pourrait être totalement manqué par simple excès de rigidité dans l'application d'un critère objectif.

Troisième considération importante qui pourrait être formulée et analysée : c'est le sort à réserver aux réalisations, pourtant valables et concrètes, que leur statut insuffisamment strict (chasse autorisée, mais bonne protection de végétaux rares, par exemple) ou leur superficie insuffisante auraient fait exclure de la liste des Nations Unies. Déjà, pour les territoires protégés de l'Europe des dix-sept, le Comité d'Experts de Strasbourg pour la sauvegarde de la Nature et du Paysage a décidé d'entreprendre l'énumération aussi complète que possible de la totalité des réalisations européennes, jusque et y compris les "espaces naturels prévus pour l'agrément du public". Et le Conseil Exécutif de l'UICN a, pour sa part, émis un vœu similaire pour l'ensemble du monde, vœu qui ne serait à prendre en considération que lorsque la liste des parcs nationaux et réserves équivalentes sera terminée, mais dont la réalisation peut commencer à être préparée sans retard.

Et ceci conduit tout naturellement à la notion d'un harmonieux équilibre à maintenir dans chaque pays, entre ces diverses réalisations, depuis la réserve intégrale jusqu'au parc naturel en passant par les parcs nationaux et les nombreux types de réserves de chasse, réserves forestières, monuments naturels. Et nous voici tout logiquement parvenus à la notion de planification, de "park planning" dont notre ami William Hart vous parlera dès que je me tairai...

L'heure a donc sonné pour moi de conclure.

Je le ferai en renouant le fil entre mon propos particulier : la liste mondiale des parcs nationaux, et le vôtre : "un workshop on conservation education".

Certes, en clarifiant à bien des égards les concepts en matière de territoires protégés dans les divers continents et pays du monde, l'oeuvre entreprise de préparation d'une liste équilibrée de ces parcs nationaux et réserves équivalentes apportera sa contribution non négligeable à l'élaboration rationnelle des politiques et programmes modernes en matière de "conservation education".

Mais en l'occurrence, c'est dans l'autre sens que s'orienteront la plupart des flèches de notre organigramme, car c'est surtout l'action d'éducation qui se montre le ferment vital de réussite de l'entreprise que représente la préparation de cette liste.

Le but, rappelons-le une dernière fois, c'est de faire servir la liste, et le levier psychologique qu'elle peut constituer, à décider peuples et gouvernants à profiter des dernières années qui leur restent encore pour parachever leurs dispositifs nationaux de sanctuaires naturels de tous types.

Et pour que ce levier ait quelque chance de servir, il faut que son point d'appui ait été solidement établi, parmi ces peuples et ces gouvernants, par une action d'éducation qui soit parvenue à y ancrer les compréhensions puis les volontés sans lesquelles aucune défense de parcs nationaux existants et aucune création de parcs nationaux nouveaux ne pourraient valablement se concevoir.

Part 3. The Projected Park Systems Planning Program by William J. Hart

Recommendation No. 12 was unanimously adopted by the First World Conference on National Parks because many nations felt, for a variety of reasons, that they should be able to benefit from the experience of others in the park field. The recommendation specifically urged the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), as the international leader in the field of conservation, to establish a Committee on Park Planning.

The committee which framed the recommendation included consideration of the whole spectrum of open space reservation which can provide for the daily demands of urban populations, as well as the pure nature reserves which meet the urgent demand for knowledge about the world around us. My task has been to examine the needs of a variety of countries to determine, from the standpoint of need and desire, whether there can be fruitful park counseling at the international level. Based on the reconnaissance, it is hoped that my recommendations to the International Commission on National Parks (ICNP) will enable the Commission to assist IUCN in choosing the best approach to providing the needed services -- it is no longer possible to consider the alternative of not doing the job. All of us are being helped by cogent advice rendered by a special international advisory committee chaired by Dr. Joseph L. Fisher of the U.S.A.

Every effort has and is being made to have a variety of natural, political and economic conditions examined to provide maximum flexibility in the machinery finally instituted by IUCN. cursory visits have been made to France, Greece, Spain and Mexico. Greater depth was achieved in Costa Rica and a considerable effort was made in Turkey and Colombia. It is planned to do follow-up work to check validity in an African Special Project country and two Asiatic countries. Depending on the funds on hand and the judgment of the ICNP, one country may be selected to try a pilot effort to more critically test the validity of the broad recommendations endorsed by the ICNP.

The matter of terminology is being considered in conjunction with those working on the U.N. World List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves. The tie is worth mentioning because there is a range of management alternative available to governments governing the use of their natural resource base to achieve the most relevant conservation objectives. Any realistic advice which IUCN gives to a nation must be couched in terms that make sense to the objectives of any nation requesting that assistance. One type of land use solution may not be able to meet all the needs of a particular country. National park use is one such alternative, but it cannot be considered in isolation. What ought to emerge soon is some agreement of the definitions of the alternatives -- particularly from an ecological point of view.

This leads to the observation (understatement) that the needs of countries vary from region to region and from country to country within regions. One way to discuss this aspect is to draw on the countries and regions visited. One can, for instance, say that there is general homogeneity among the countries of the northern Mediterranean which can be compared with the general homogeneous characteristics of Latin America. All of the Mediterranean countries are old and people have been intensively exploiting the natural resource base for centuries. No one seriously disputes the need to embark on large scale tree planting projects to stabilize soil and water and to create a more pleasant life. Such programs are popular. One university president is responsible for planting over 3 million seedlings on his extensive new campus. Each government, as a recognizable force, supports research and nursery operations pointed at massive field planting efforts. Latin America, on the other hand, is a new region. The resources have not been trampled into the ground. Here the emphasis is on accelerating the rate of exploitive use so that economic expansion will keep pace with population increase. Although nurseries have been established, there is little enthusiasm for them. Government is strangely ambivalent in that it controls most investment capital yet is vague and impotent in many subject areas (national park administration is a case in point).

Yet no one can deny that there are great cultural, administrative, and natural differences between Turkey and Spain or that Greece behaves differently than the other two. Costa Rica will react to problems in a different manner than will Colombia or Argentina. The main point here is that one can talk to government officers in northern Mediterranean countries in sophisticated terms about national parks, national forests, game refuges and so on and be able to receive accurate impressions about whether the government will activate programs in any or all of these fields. In Latin America there is a tendency to assume that one form of land use, as national park, will pose the solutions to whole range of resource problems and there is little understanding of the differences in management philosophy involved in the alternative types of designated areas or how the public areas can be complimentary to private land uses.

This means that care must be taken in choosing the talent a particular country needs at a given point of time. It is time, for instance, to have a qualified park planner visit Turkey to make a prototype park plan for a major national park. The planner can be assured of a core of receptive men who can work with him. He can also be assured that the plans will be, for the most part, carried out. Costa Rica needs a general land

use planner and administrative specialist who can assist the government in delineating those areas which ought to be receiving conservation treatment of some kind to preserve the watershed resources on which the country is hinging a great deal of its hopes for future growth.

Without exception, the countries face the problem of providing for mushrooming urban populations. Old city parks, designed as passive areas for strolling and sitting, are outmoded and no longer have the capacity to meet the demand of greater numbers of city dwellers, more younger people -- requiring more space for active enterprises -- increasing leisure time, and the other hallmarks of industrializing modern society. Very little thought is given to areas peripheral to the city which can satisfy the demand tomorrow as the city grows outward, or about the implications of putting such requirements into the land use plans for the future development of the city, or about the amenities such planning infers for future residents of the city.

It is worth noting that such planning for the future could be translated into a present benefit by using some of the unemployed people in the city, many of them unskilled rural people displaced by the advance of mechanized agriculture and insufficient land to gainfully support the population. Such "city" people could be used to build park facilities in need today, learn new skills to better equip them for urban life, and teach many of them to appreciate the value of constructive play in industrial society.

Many types of park area, indeed many types of managed land area, offer many of the benefits of national park management; there is a specific niche in any country's natural and historic heritage that needs to be filled by national parks designed to protect and interpret scientific values of great significance. The basic objective is to organize a whole system of areas so that each segment of the public presenting demands on the land resource base will feel maximum satisfaction and national parks will enjoy the long term security of a nationally recognized land use.

47

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON NATIONAL PARKS

IUCN

NOTICE TO ALL CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS:

The International Commission on National Parks has just been informed that the ship transporting the copies of Parts I and II of the United Nations List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves will not arrive in Mombasa until after the conference is over. Therefore, it will not be possible to distribute copies in Nairobi.

Any participant desiring a copy of either Part I or Part II, or both, should place a note in the box labeled "Packard, F. M." in the lobby, stating what parts they would like to have. We shall be glad to mail them to you from Washington, D. C.

Fred M. Packard
Secretary