



Report from the McCapital



JULY 1967

News Analysis

by W. Barry Garrett

A most interesting conversion has taken place in Washington. This time it is the evangelist who has been converted.

Billy Graham, world-renowned Southern Baptist evangelist, by his own confession has announced his conversion to a social action program carried on by government and to some extent in cooperation with the churches.

At a luncheon sponsored by the leadership of the House June 13 on Capitol Hill in the Rayburn House Office Building, Graham spoke to more than 100 Congressmen of both parties and to 45 of the nation's leading business men. The occasion was the showing of a film by the Office of Economic Opportunity which was made during a tour of poverty areas in North Carolina three weeks earlier by Sargent Shriver, director of OEO, and Graham.

"This is the first time in 17 years," Graham said, "that I have come to Washington to speak for or against a government program." But now, he continued, "I have come to speak to various Congressmen in favor of the poverty program."

It was explained as only a coincidence that Graham's visit came at a time when both the Senate and the House of Representatives were holding hearings and considering renewal of the Economic Opportunity Act (War on Poverty). Both the OEO and its director have been under attack by opponents of the anti-poverty program.

Although Graham was lavish in his praise of both Shriver and the program of the OEO, it was vigorously denied that his appearance had political significance.

An analysis of the evangelist's speech reveals that he said the following things:

1. Relief for the poor and needy is a major Biblical concept. Graham read Deuteronomy 15:7-11 to the Congressmen and businessmen. This passage commands care for the poor and needy. He said there are

175 more passages in the Bible that teach the same thing.

2. Anti-poverty programs should not be bogged down in partisan politics. When the evangelist said this, the audience responded by vigorous applause.

3. The elimination of poverty conditions requires government action. Graham said that there was a time when individuals and small groups could deliver themselves from poverty. "But this is impossible now," he said, "and only by government action can we win the poverty war."

4. There are areas where the churches and government can and should cooperate for the elimination of poverty. Graham insisted that separation of church and state should be maintained, but that areas of cooperation could be found.

In explaining his conversion Graham said that when the War on Poverty was first announced he was against it because he thought it was just a handout. But a study of the program of the OEO convinced him, he said, that it was designed to give people motivation and to enable them to help themselves.

There is no way to predict the effect of Graham's "conversion." He is well-known for his conservative theology, economics and politics. He has a large following in the nation among those with similar views.

Does this new move by the evangelist mean that many conservative Christians will now be led to think that government social action programs are in harmony with their basic theological concepts?

Will Graham's appearance in Washington and his newly announced views take the edge off the attack on Shriver and the War on Poverty? Will his new position open doors that have up to now been closed in the so-called Bible belt?

Could possible proper roles for the churches be to (1) provide motivation, (2) supply information, (3) enlist cooperation, and (4) encourage participation?

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL—a bulletin published 10 months during the year by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, 200 Maryland Ave., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. A purpose of the bulletin is to set forth information and interpretation about public affairs that are relevant to Baptist principles.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs is a denominational agency maintained by the American Baptist Convention, Baptist Federation of Canada, Baptist General Conference, National Baptist Convention, National Baptist Convention, Inc., North American Baptist General Conference, Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, and the Southern Baptist Convention.

Page Two

STAFF REPORT

"PRELIMINARY CHECKLIST OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS REQUIRING ANALYSIS IN A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS" (Re-issue)

A tabulation of federal programs as an initial attempt to estimate the scope of a comprehensive analysis of state efforts which may in some measure be implemented through church-related institutions. (Covers 300 federal programs.) Single copy—50¢. Ten or more copies—35¢ each.

PAMPHLETS

"IS A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT NECESSARY?"

Prayer and Public Schools

A pamphlet which deals with the adequacy of the First Amendment to guarantee "no establishment" and "free exercise" of religion. The pamphlet sets forth the position of major Baptist denominations that the First Amendment has been and still is wholly adequate to maintain religious liberty in our land. Single copies—free. In quantities—.02c each.

"RELIGION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION"

A pamphlet containing some staff proposals as guidelines for teaching about religion in public schools. The proposals are made available for discussion and dialogue and will be considered by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs in semi-annual session in October. Single copies—free. Dozen copies—\$.75. 100 copies—\$5.00. 1,000 copies—\$35.00.

BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE
ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS

200 MARYLAND AVE., N.E.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002

Executive Staff of the Committee: C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director; W. Barry Garrett, director of information services; Walfred H. Peterson, director of research services; and James M. Sapp, director of correlation services and editor of Report From The Capital.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Individual subscription, \$1.50 per year; Club rate for 10 or more, \$1.00 each per year; Bulk distribution of 10 or more to a single address, \$.75 each per year. Write for further information about Club and Bulk distribution plans.

JULY 1967—Volume 22, Number 5

Report From The Capital



Washington Observations

News — Views — Trends

June 30, 1967



OPPOSITION TO ALTERING the First Amendment continues to grow. Most recent voice added to the chorus speaking out against so-called "prayer amendments" is the conservative fortnightly Christianity Today, published in Washington.

THE MAGAZINE JOINS WITH THOSE who have for some time maintained the adequacy of the First Amendment. An editorial asserts that, "For over 175 years the First Amendment has demonstrated its value as a safeguard of religious freedom and a clear statement of the line of separation between church and state."

"SENATOR DIRKSEN'S AMENDMENT, which voices a plea for the right of persons to participate in non-denominational prayer in publicly supported buildings, not only is unnecessary but might lead to prescribed sectarianism if the prayer were truly biblical, or to innocuous religiosity if it were not," the editorial continues as it points out the danger of tampering with the First Amendment.

THE SPANISH CORTES (PARLIAMENT) has adopted a new religious liberty law. A product of the Vatican Council's statement on religious freedom, the law opens with a general statement as follows: "The Spanish state recognizes the right of religious liberty as founded on the dignity of the human person, and ensures the necessary protection in providing immunity against any coercion in the legitimate exercise of this right."

THIS HOPEFUL BEGINNING is, however, not a good indicator of the tone of the long law. In forty articles that follow, non-Catholic groups are subject to a wide variety of restrictions and liabilities.

THE DISTINGUISHED EUROPEAN Protestant religious liberty scholar, A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, concludes that the new law places the non-Catholic communities under governmental control potentially more severe than that known to the churches in the Communist states of Eastern Europe.

HE ASKS IF "we dare wonder whether the Catholic Church, which has now a special body for the implementation of the norms of the Second Vatican Council, can possibly accept without protest a law contrary to the conciliar doctrine"

SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN (D., N.C.) deplored House inaction on the Senate passed bill that would give a taxpayer standing to sue in a federal court if he believed certain government expenditures constituted an establishment of religion.

THE SENATOR NOTED that recently a three-judge federal court dismissed a suit making such a contention concerning the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act because of lack of standing. While Rep. Emanuel Celler has promised committee hearings on the bill, supporters of it fear that it will have little chance in the hectic rush of final sessions.

PLURALISM in our society means that we are a diverse, heterogeneous people culturally, socially, and religiously. Culturally, we are less diverse than socially or religiously, largely because cultural differences in our free and open society have gradually become worn down. Culturally diverse groups have in time become Americanized, not by coercion but by the blending of patterns and ideas characteristic of a people who are dynamic and who influence each other when not unduly pressured to conform. The prevailing common culture in our country is largely Anglo-Saxon in origin, although its current expression is less typical of its early coloration than a century ago.

Social and economic pluralism is of a different character—less homogeneous, more stratified by discriminatory influences in our society. In spite of our democratic idealism, we still experience the pressure of privileged groups in our country to monopolize their privileges and to exclude other groups from access to them. As a consequence, we have underprivileged groupings, racially discriminated minorities, and the very wealthy in a society which is on the surface middle class, comfortably affluent, and relatively sophisticated.



ence of millions of non-Protestants to this country and of the trend toward the secularization of life and thought in an increasingly technological and affluent society. At the same time, the Roman Catholic Church has emerged as a strong expression of American Christianity, having centers of great influence in the urbanized areas of our society. The Jewish community has also emerged in strength in many areas of the increasingly urbanized life of the nation. Accordingly, it has become increasingly clear—especially since the election of President John F. Kennedy in 1960—that the United States is no longer a "Protestant" nation, but that there are at least three predominant religious influences—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish—with an increasingly significant fourth non-religious and secular influence to intensify the pluralism.

To be sure, there are factors which seem to be encouraging the emergence of a more united Christian influence in American society. Among these are the Protestant ecumenical movement from 1910 to the present, the remarkable effects of the Vatican Council II on the attitudes of the Roman Catholic Church towards its inner life and its openness to other Christians, and the increasing awareness of all Christians that their witness in the present age demands a



• Religious pluralism has characterized Christianity in the United States since the early seventeenth century, and it has become progressively and increasingly more complex to the present day. When the Constitution was framed, there was no denomination strong enough to gain national support. As a consequence of this reality and of a disposition of certain religious minorities (Baptists, Presbyterians, Friends, and Deists) to plead for religious liberty, the First Amendment was adopted, guaranteeing that Congress shall enact no legislation in support of a national church and protecting the conscience of the individual in his right to freedom from coercion in matters of religion. In the nineteenth century, evangelical denominations made a determined drive to make the United States a Protestant nation. This was achieved to a remarkable degree through the efforts of voluntary societies, often interdenominationally organized, for missionary expansion, evangelistic reclaiming of immigrants cut loose from religious ties at home, education through public schools (predominantly Protestant) and church-supported colleges, and for reform efforts in support of a Christian ethic and morality that was predominantly Puritan.

This drive has failed in the present century as a consequence of the cumulative influ-



Pluralism and RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

By Robert G. Torbet



greater unity if their message is to be convincing. The recent renaissance of biblical and theological study have also raised hopes for the fuller unity of Christians and for the achievement of an understanding of evangelism which will enable us to move beyond the pluralism and a triumphalism which has characterized the denominational system.

Religious Liberty: Its Meaning

There are many reasons why men believe in religious liberty. Some cherish it as an inherent right of mankind derived from natural law. Minority groups have honored it out of a desire to protect their existence and their right to free speech and belief. Others believe in religious liberty because they have been conditioned to it by the culture in which they live. Then there are those authoritarian churchmen who may at times rely upon it when their position is in jeopardy.

Baptists have been among those Christians whose conviction regarding religious liberty has been grounded in the gospel of Jesus Christ—"that the gospel of God's free salvation in His Son, Jesus Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, is for all men without distinction, and that today as in previous generations it speaks to man's every need, convicting, redeeming, transforming, guarding the human spirit and requiring the ending of exploitation and tyranny, and the provision of full opportunities for its free acceptance and for worship, witness and service" (from *Manifesto on Religious Liberty and Human Rights* adopted by 11th Baptist World Congress, Miami Beach, Fla., June 27, 1965).

This view of religious liberty is concerned for the responsible freedom of all people under God and for their mutual welfare. In this context religious liberty involves relationships of men and women with God and with each other, and with the established government under which they live. It has to do with personal freedom,

social justice, and a responsible relationship of government to its citizens and to God. The state and government exist for an orderly and just society and the preservation of the welfare of its people. From the Christian point of view, the ideal framework for the operation of liberty is love which is motivated by allegiance to Jesus Christ who mediates the love of God to us and releases its transforming power in our lives.

In view of this frame of reference for religious liberty, the separation of church and state is not to be regarded in abstract, theoretical terms, nor as an absolute separation. For the welfare of all human beings is the major concern of the Christian, and his plea for religious liberty and the safeguard of the human conscience must be dictated by humanitarian not selfish concerns.

We would be desirous therefore to protect the freedom of human choice so that a person may relate meaningfully and voluntarily to his Creator and Redeemer, but not so as to imply that religion is separate from the major pursuits of one's daily life. We would be concerned to avoid the support of sectarian indoctrination by tax funds but not to omit a descriptive teaching of religion and religious values in public schools. We would be concerned to avoid a school board's requirement that prescribed prayer be used in the public school but not to be against personal prayer. We would be concerned to avoid a partnership of church and state which involves patronage and control of the church by the state but not to reject a sound cooperative relationship in the social welfare functions of society where both church and government agencies are needed together to solve critical problems of social needs which involve moral and religious factors. Government subsidy of social welfare projects in which the church may be involved under these circumstances may be legitimately re-

ceived when the free exercise of religion is carefully protected from government controls.

Increasingly Christian leadership is coming to see that the critical problems of human welfare in our complex, pluralistic society cannot be solved solely by the church or by the state. The moral and spiritual dimensions of these problems leave the state in a quandary without help from the church. If therefore the church sees clearly its role in society as a ministry of compassion and spiritual and moral insight, it may therefore be willing to accept public aid in support of church related agencies offering social, psychiatric, health, housing, rehabilitation, or educational services. But in doing this, the church must clearly guard itself, as we have said, against any restrictions by government upon the free exercise of religion.

Former Congressman Brooks Hays (and well known Baptist leader) has made his plea for a less than absolute separation of church and state on the grounds that the church is not an area apart from society but rather "a circle in the center of society, radiating its influence out into every aspect of life, including the political world" (*Reports From The Capital*, Vol. 22, No. 2, p. 7).

In the pluralism which exists within almost every denomination today, the church will need to be as concerned to protect a free conscience within the church as it is to protect a free conscience within the state. In an age of dialogue and wide diversity of viewpoints and religious inquiry, responsible attention will need to be given academic freedom in which the right to express freely religious convictions within and without the church is recognized. This, too, is an important dimension of religious liberty.

The writer is Executive Director of the Division of Cooperative Christianity of the American Baptist Convention.

Photographs on page four courtesy of the Washington offices of Father John Ryan, Rabbi Richard Hirsch, and Reverend Winston Taylor.

QUEST FOR ANSWERS

REACHING DECISIONS THROUGH STUDY AND PARTICIPATION

By Frank H. Woyke



Baptists have always found it difficult to reach agreement and to make decisions, especially when complex and controversial issues are involved. This is true of local churches, where we frequently multiply by division and the result is a proliferation of small, struggling churches. On the denominational level, there are more varieties of Baptists than of any other Christian group.

This would make it appear that we are a very inefficient and impotent people. Let us admit that most experts would not rate our organizations high for efficiency. It must also be granted that our democratic form of organization makes it easy for individuals and small groups to obstruct action and to cause division.

But is it necessarily bad? In this way each member, and each local church, has at least a small part in the decision making progress. To be sure, such procedure is slow and laborious; but it also assures a broad base of support when the decision is finally made.

The thing for Baptists to do is not to aim for less democracy but for more. Our goal should be not so much to authorize a few leaders to make the important decision but to improve the participation of our constituents in the decision making process. I am confident that this is what we are all trying to do, in spite of the increasing complexity of our society.

Perhaps I can best illustrate the kind of process to which I am referring by describing an advance program being considered by our own Conference. I do this not because I feel that it is in any way outstanding but only because I am intimately acquainted with the steps that have been taken and because the program shows how decisions can be reached through wide participation by the constituency.

For many years it has been the custom of our Finance Committee and General Council to determine the budget for the fiscal year after going over the requests of the various

departments. Obviously it was seldom possible to give every department all that had been requested. Such year to year budget planning became more and more unsatisfactory, for it did not provide an opportunity for the various departments to make advance plans.

As this problem was discussed in various workshops and board meetings, the conviction grew that an advance program for the next decade would be highly desirable. The result was the appointment of a Denominational Advance Planning Committee of fourteen members. Only one member of the Committee was a salaried denominational official.

Dividing it self into four study committees, the Advance Planning Committee spent the past two years reviewing the programs and needs of the several departments. Questionnaires were sent to pastors, laymen and local churches. In addition, personal conferences were arranged with the leaders in charge of the departmental programs.

Out of this study there developed a series of recommendations for denominational advance during the next decade for consideration by the General Council. In May the Council, consisting of about 55 denominational representatives, considered each recommendation carefully and voted either to approve, reject or revise it. Those suggestions approved by the General Council will now be presented to the delegates, about 700 in number, at the General Conference in Detroit for final decision. Meanwhile copies of the resolutions to be considered, in sufficient number for all prospective delegates, have been sent to the churches for study, and they are also being published in our denominational periodicals. By the time the decisions will finally be made, thousands of our people will have been involved in studying and weighing the issues under consideration. It is our hope that through this involvement the program as finally adopted will have broad support among our people and that success will thus be assured.

HOUSE VOTES BAN ON FLAG MUTILATION

WASHINGTON (BPA) — The U.S. House of Representatives has passed with an overwhelming majority and sent to the Senate a measure that would make it a federal crime to desecrate the United States flag.

Angered by recent flag-burning incidents, the House voted 385 to 16 to make it a federal offense punishable by a \$1000 fine or a year in prison to "cast contempt" upon the flag "by publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, or trampling upon it."

The action took place following an emotion-charged debate on the necessity for such legislation. Some members of the House questioned the wisdom and constitutionality of the bill. A few said it was an unwise attempt to put down dissent on the war in Vietnam.

Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler (D., N.Y.), who had voted the bill out of committee for action on the floor, voted against the bill in the final showdown. Earlier, Celler had called it "a bad bill" and said he doubted its constitutionality.

Rep. Roy A. Taylor (D., N.C.) told the House that it was "a disappointing state of national affairs" that legislation of this type was needed but that it seemed necessary "to curb a minority group of misguided Americans who do not yet know the meaning of citizenship or patriotism."

"It is time for patriotic people to speak out," he urged, saying "the Voice of America must not be that of the pacifist, unpatriotic minority."

Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal (D., N.Y.) raised one of the lone voices against the bill, questioning its constitutionality and the ability of Congress to legislate respect for the flag.

"Tolerance of dissent—even of irrational dissent—is at the very heart of our form of government. To compromise that tolerance—as this measure would—is to weaken that which we should strengthen," he said.

"What disturbs me more than anything else," Rosenthal continued, "is that because a couple of kids in Central Park (New York City) engaged in what seems to me a rather stupid act, the whole foundation of this nation is shaking to the point that we are spending an entire afternoon enacting a bill of this type."

Rep. John Buchanan (R., Ala.) said there is no more forceful way for the American people to speak than through an act of Congress. "This body has the right and the duty to protect our flag. In passing this resolution

(Continued on page 8)

**A Witness to
Religious Liberty in Public Affairs**

A Churchman Talks With His Elected Officials

By Walfred H. Peterson

Any person may have several good and proper reasons to talk with his elected officials: business to transact, information to be learned, suggestions to be made, etc. As government grows in size and importance, such reasons multiply.

The churchman has special reasons to talk with these officials, for he is especially concerned about both the moral aspects of community life and the protection of his and the church's Christian witness in the community. In brief, justice and freedom of religion are his Christian concern. In this pamphlet it will be assumed that the churchman talks with elected officials to promote these values in society.

Often, the churchman has scarcely recognized these public concerns. Often, he has thought that morality meant only something about his own dealing with other men. In the United States the churchman has been glad to assume that freedom of religion was a settled issue. He did not think that public life and its politics was his concern as a churchman.

Such thought were always wrong. First, because morality has a social or public quality. Second, because freedom of religion is always an important issue.

The above paragraphs are the introduction to an educational booklet released recently by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

This 16-page piece discusses in depth the basic elements to be considered in serious communication between churchmen and elected officials.

The booklet is excellent material for discussion groups, lay organization program material and individual reading. It might be well received also by public officials who are interested in learning how churchmen and church groups are beginning to take their political leaders more seriously.

Sections of the booklet deal with various aspects of the subject with more than the usual examination. An outline of the treatment of the subject follows:

- The Public Quality of Morality
- The Obligation To Talk
- Freedom of Religion—A Live Issue
- Democratic Government and Christian Responsibility
- Some Prerequisites for Talking With Public Officials Effectively
- When Talk With Elected Officials Aims At Influence:
 - General Suggestions
- The Churchman as Representative of His Church
- Churches Should Exercise Care
- Other Things To Be Done

July 1967



*A Witness to
Religious Liberty in Public Affairs*

A Churchman Talks With His Elected Officials

How to Secure This Booklet

Write to the

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs
200 Maryland Avenue, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

Single copy 15¢
100 copies \$10.00

Dozen copies \$1.50
1,000 copies \$70.00

Page Seven

HR 1198, S 9—JUDICIAL REVIEW. To provide effective procedures for the enforcement of the establishment, and free exercise clauses of the first amendment to the Constitution. (S 3 passed April 14, Senate Report 85.)

HR 7819, S 1125—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS. Extends act for one year beyond June 30, 1968, expiration date. (HR 7819 passed May 24, House Report 188.) Senate Hearings in progress.

HR 232, S 1126—HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS. Provides broad training authority for education personnel; extends Higher Education and National Defense Education Acts five years; increases interest rates for academic facilities loans; permits academic institutions to borrow 100 per cent federal money for NDEA loans. Hearings completed in House.

HR 8068, S 1445—HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS. Senate bill increases interest rate for college housing loans. Each bill extends urban fellowship program three years, requires that patents and copyrights developed under HUD grants be made freely available to public. Hearings completed in House.

HR 10196—APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH, EDUCATION WELFARE AND LABOR. Appropriates about \$2.9 billion for higher education programs. Passed by House May 25, House Report 271. Senate hearings in progress.

HOW TO ORDER CONGRESSIONAL BILLS

List only the number of bill desired and write to:

House Document Room
The Capitol
Washington, D. C. 20515

Senate Document Room
The Capitol
Washington, D. C. 20510

HOW TO ORDER HOUSE AND SENATE REPORTS

List the number of the report desired and write to document room as listed above.

FLAG MUTILATION

(Continued from page 6)

tion we are saying, we love our country, we honor our flag," he declared.

On the calmer side, Rep. James H. Scheuer (D., N.Y.) said that Congress did not need "to rise to meet the bait of every irresponsible who finds a new way of making a bloody fool out of himself."

A member of the Judiciary Committee, Rep. Don Edwards (D., Calif.), said he was against the bill because it is unconstitutional and "bad for the country."

"In addition," he told the House, "our national image as a nation where free speech is protected would not be improved when it is pointed out internationally that seven months ago the Soviet Union amended its criminal code to include a statute much like the proposed legislation."

Baptist General Conference Planning Study of Merger

DULUTH, Minn. (RNS)—The Baptist General Conference voted at its annual meeting here to make a detailed study of the feasibility of merging with the North American Baptist General Conference.

The Baptist General Conference is a denomination of Swedish background with some 90,000 members which operates Bethel College and Bethel Seminary in the St. Paul area.

The North American Conference is a denomination of German background with some 50,000 members which operates North American Baptist Seminary in Sioux Falls, S. D.

The Rev. Lloyd Dahlquist of Chicago, general secretary of the Baptist General Conference, told delegates here that the North American Conference will act on the merger study proposal at its forthcoming annual meeting.

IN THIS ISSUE . . .

PLURALISM AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY
Page 4

QUEST FOR ANSWERS
Page 6

News Analysis
by W. Barry Garrett
Page 2

COVER PICTURE

The Mall today as seen from atop the Washington Monument is one of the sights many visitors to the Nation's Capital readily remember.

Washington owes much of its dignity and impressiveness today to the vision and planning of Pierre Charles L'Enfant, the Frenchman who drew the original plans for the format of the Capital city.

Many revisions and uses of the land, however, preceded the beautiful and spacious landscape which is today's Mall. At one time, this area degenerated into a common for pasturing cows. Again, it was the right of way for depots and railroad tracks before the advent of the great Union Station.

Today, the vast, well-kept lawn, bordered by rows of beautiful trees, in the heart of the bustling city, lies like a gigantic magnet attracting visitors in the city from all parts of the nation. Many like to walk its length or ride down its wide streets or simply pause to rest under the trees.

Flanking the Mall are various important government buildings which visitors busily seek out and identify.

Photo by Abbie Rowe
Courtesy National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Report From The Capital