



## SOCIETY AFFAIRS



In this issue of our magazine the Society Affairs Section is devoted entirely to a consideration of the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY's editorial policy. It centers around the petition to the Council of June 13, 1934, whose signers are plainly dissatisfied with present policies and methods of management, and demand, it would seem, a radical change.

In the following pages you will find: first, an introductory statement by President Chapman, including a digest of the reactions to the petition on the part of the Council, and on the part of those 87 members of the Society who have had opportunity up to date to write the Council; second, the petition itself; third, a statement by the former Editor-in-Chief, Professor Emanuel Fritz; fourth, a statement by the Executive Secretary giving a historical account of the editorial policies from the beginning and an exposition of current policies and practices; fifth, the Society's "Principles of Forest Policy" which were adopted by referendum vote and have been in effect since the spring of 1931.

This symposium, together with President Chapman's editorial, will it is hoped give you an intelligible picture of the situation so that you can make up your minds concerning it and advise the Council accordingly.—FRANKLIN REED, *Editor-in-Chief*.

### STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT CHAPMAN

On assuming office in January, 1934, I found that the arrangement in force by which the Executive Secretary acted as editor-in-chief of the JOURNAL was to continue through the May issue, at which time the Council could make further disposition of the matter.

No meeting of the Council is possible during the year without prohibitive expense, consequently the consideration and decision on the future management of the JOURNAL would either have to be conducted by correspondence or await the annual meeting in January, 1935.

After my return from the West I took up this matter and wrote the following letter to the Council:

"The existing arrangement regarding the editorship of the JOURNAL by which the Executive Secretary, Franklin Reed, was made editor has expired. This was run through the May issue. Action should be taken at once on the editorship beginning next fall with the October issue.

"In talking with Prof. S. T. Dana, former editor, it was his opinion that ulti-

mately the editorship would best be divorced from that of Executive Secretary, but in considering possibilities for the job he conceded the fact that it would be next to impossible to find a man at this time who could devote the time to it without compensation. This was based upon his own experience. He suggested that the ideal arrangement would be someone who had retired from active service but retained his youthful vigor. He did not have any one to fill this category to propose for the job.

"I believe that the Society is safe in continuing or extending the present arrangement by which Mr. Reed acts as editor *until the matter can be thoroughly thought out*. I shall be able to exercise a fair degree of supervision over the editorial policy, at least for the current year. At the end of that time if it appears that a change should be made we will be in a better position to know what to do. I believe that Reed has done a very creditable job on the whole. I, therefore, recommend that Mr. Reed's appointment as editor be continued throughout the present fiscal year and until further action by

the Council, which would not be before the annual meeting in January, 1935.

"I ask you to record your tentative vote as follows: Shall the Executive Secretary be continued as editor until January 1, 1935, and thereafter, until this arrangement is confirmed or changed by the Council at its annual meeting?"

In reply to the above letter ten members of the Council voted to continue Mr. Reed as editor-in-chief until the annual meeting and to decide on the future policy for the editorship at that time. The eleventh Mr. Clapp, was one of the signers of the petition and indicated this action as his recommendation on the question as follows: "See recent statement on editorial policy, etc., which I signed along with several other members of the Society. E. H. C."

At this time nothing was known of the petition dated June 13th which first reached the Council from Mr. Zon under mailing date of June 28. On receipt of the petition, request was made by me that the Council comment thereon. Replies were received from nine of the ten members, Mr. Clapp not replying. The President is the eleventh.

The Council in their replies considered the three "steps" suggested by the petitioners. Of the second, or specifications for the editorship, the ground was covered by S. N. Spring who wrote: "The qualifications for editor as stated are simply ideal expressions, generally considered in picking an editor for any professional Journal."

As to the first "step," or advisability of the separation of the office of editor-in-chief from that of executive secretary, the Council's opinion was unanimous that there was *no objection* to such a change of organization, that it probably constituted the goal toward which to work, and that they were in agreement with the petitioners as to its ultimate desirability. The Council were likewise unanimous in call-

ing attention to the fact that the present arrangement had been dictated by the demonstrated inability of previous editors to continue to devote the required amount of time, without compensation, to the editorship, and the lack of funds wherewith to employ an editor in addition to the Executive Secretary, hence to the practical necessity of the present arrangement until larger Society revenue was forthcoming.

The third step suggested was "to insure the independence of the editor from any pressure on the part of the administration that may be in office; he should not be subject to dictation by the Executive Council with respect to editorial policy"

It is a very salutary incident that this point was raised, for the issue of editorial independence has never been crystallized and now bids fair to be. On this question five of the ten members took the position that the Council, elected as the policy making body, was responsible for the editor and for his editorial policies, just as they were responsible for his appointment, and that it was extremely unwise to constitute the editor as a czar, with no controlling body to stand between him and the Society. With this position the President agrees.

Of the five remaining members (Mr. Clapp not replying) two did not discuss this point and the remaining two favored a strong and independent editor, while not specifically repudiating the directive functions of the Council.

On July 24 after receiving these replies, the President sent the following letter to the signers of the petition:

"Some two weeks before receiving the recent petition signed by you, and without knowledge of its existence, I had asked the Council to renew the arrangement with Mr. Reed as Editor until the meeting of the Council in January, at which time we could decide on the future arrangement regarding editorship of the

JOURNAL. The Council have by ballot confirmed this temporary arrangement.

"As six months is none too long a time to consider thoroughly the question of suitable candidates for editorship, and as we accept your petition as a sincere effort to coöperate for the advancement of the Society, may I, for the Council, formally request that you give us the benefit of your advice as to candidates who fill the specifications set forth in your petition.

"I would request that you give us the names of twelve men, numbering them in order of your preference, and to do this promptly in order that we may make progress in this matter."

Replies have been received from signers Marshall, Zon, Bates, Sparhawk and Kneipp.

Mr. Marshall submitted a list of twelve candidates; Bates and Kneipp one each; Sparhawk stated he had no one in mind; Zon expressed the opinion that it was not necessary to employ a man on a salary for editorship as many scientific societies secured editors from scientists who were glad of an opportunity to give their services for such a task. Three of the petitioners also wrote letters amplifying their reasons for signing it.

In order to determine in a preliminary way what the sentiment of other members of the Society was towards the subjects discussed in the petition, copies of the document were sent to all section chairmen and secretaries, all state foresters, all heads of forest schools, the editorial staff, secretaries of forestry associations, regional and assistant foresters in the U. S. Forest Service, and about fifty other members of the Society. The letter follows:

"At the request of President Chapman, I am enclosing for your comment and recommendations copy of a petition, dated June 13, 1934, to the Council of the Society, and signed by twelve Society

members who plainly disapproved of the manner in which the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY is now being handled and who advocate, it would seem, a radical change in editorial policy and in management.

"The JOURNAL is the property of the Society as a whole, and of all its members. Its editorial policies and its methods of management therefore should be such as to meet with the approval of the largest possible majority. It is not the personal property of the Editor-in-Chief, to be run according to his own individual whims and fancies, nor should its policies be dictated by any one small minority group or faction. Whether the views expressed in this petition are the views of the majority of the membership, or whether they are simply the opinion of a small minority, or whether this group is wholly, or in part, right or wrong, the Council can determine best with the advice and assistance of as large as practicable a number of representative members like yourself.

"Will you be so good as to give the Council the benefit of your opinion in this matter at your earliest possible convenience? Your reply will be forwarded immediately to President Chapman for him to take up with the rest of the Council. Franklin Reed."

To this letter 87 replies were received by August 23, distributed as follows:

Officers of sections including chairmen and secretaries—21.

Members of editorial staff—4.

State foresters—13.

Heads of forest schools—12.

Secretaries of forestry associations—7.

Members of government services—14.

Private individuals—16.

Since the letter was not in the form of a ballot or questionnaire, the replies covered a wide range of opinions, and are of great assistance to the Council as a preliminary cross section of opinion in the Society.

The President has endeavored to tabulate all opinions expressed on definite points with the following results: The number of opinions under any one point falls short of the total, since many correspondents touched only one or two questions. The tabulation, of course, did not include the twelve signers of the petition but only those who replied to the circular.

1. Shall the office of editor be separated from that of Executive Secretary? Eight voted no unequivocally, and 33 approved of the separation, but with hardly a single exception conditioned this change on the *financial ability of the Society to compensate the editor*. One was farseeing enough to suggest the need of increasing the dues for this purpose. The others preferred apparently to carry out the separation only when it could be afforded on the present basis.

2. Shall the editor be absolutely independent of the Council? Thirteen favored this plan. Thirty were opposed to it, some emphatically, on the basis that the Council was chosen to represent the Society and could not be deprived of this responsibility of supervision over editorial policy without disrupting the Society.

3. Does the conduct of the JOURNAL under Executive Secretary Reed as editor meet with approval? Forty-five members expressed commendation and satisfaction with the improved character of the JOURNAL; and only four replies were received which expressed disapproval or condemnation.

4. Should the Society and JOURNAL adopt a more vigorous editorial policy with respect to economic questions? Twenty-seven answered yes. Six were against such a course.

5. Should the idea of a separate publication, conducted for the purpose of advancing progressive economic principles, be approved? Three of the corres-

pondents sensed a real benefit in such an independent publication. (One called attention to the American Forestry Association's field as covering this line.) Seven advised that the proponents of the new publication by all means be permitted to carry out their proposal rather than commit the Society to championship of untried economic theories. Thirteen regarded the suggestion as distinctly injurious to professional progress, disruptive of cooperative spirit and inadvisable, while four severely criticised the suggestion as a deliberate threat to force the Society to capitulate.

6. Was the petition clear as to its basis for criticism and objectives? Thirty of the correspondents raised serious objections to the statements in the petition which criticised the past editorial policy without giving any specific facts or examples. They did not accept as justified the expressed desire of the signers to avoid personalities and nine specifically asked for a frank and open discussion. Some even sensed personal hostility. This clause seemed to have aroused more suspicion than it allayed (See Table 1).

The President wishes to say that the presenting of this petition is an action sure to result in far-reaching benefit to the Society. In his own case, he sought for many years to accomplish the same general type of objectives as are contemplated by the signers, but preferred to work through an organization definitely intended for propaganda, namely, the American Forestry Association. He found, however, that in the absence of control by men educated and trained as foresters, this organization was constantly skidding onto a sand bank for lack of courage and incentive to fight the battles of the public. With the advent of a professional forester or secretary this handicap has been greatly modified, but still exists in the Board. Meanwhile the Society of American Foresters was developing healthily and naturally as a professional

organization with a professional JOURNAL.

The issue on which the last election was fought was distinctly professional in character and in true keeping with the normal evolution of the Society. It was not, as is being erroneously stated, an effort to align the Society in opposition to the Forest Service, but rather, to place it in a position of vastly greater strength as a supporter of such sound Forest Service and other public policies as receive the approval of professional foresters. It continued the independence of the JOURNAL as a medium for discussion of all phases of thought, without diminishing its possibilities as a constructive agency in all sound progress in forestry. It upheld the principle that public foresters who courageously imperilled their jobs for the sake of professional standards should be vigorously supported by the Society, and that those *who betrayed these standards should be as vigorously condemned*, and did not substitute, as has been claimed, an indiscriminate trade union platform of backing Society members, right or wrong.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the members of the Society can realize, through the JOURNAL, the full measure of strength and benefit which should flow from a strong, mature, professional or-

ganization, capable of both leadership and criticism, preserving zealously the crowning glory and most priceless possession of civilization, the right of free speech and fearless criticism. In this way only can foresters and forestry survive the remorseless test of practical application, the revealing force of time and experience. Let us build soundly, as a profession, avoiding hysteria, seeking the facts. To this objective the Society and the JOURNAL are dedicated.

H. H. CHAPMAN,  
*President.*

THE PETITION OF JUNE 13, 1934

The Executive Council,  
Society of American Foresters,  
839 Seventeenth Street N. W.,  
Washington, D. C.

Friends:

A group of members of the Society (whose names appear below) have come to the conclusion that the editorial policy of the JOURNAL during the last few years no longer represents the broad social ideals of the founders of the Society.

At a time when vast, surging forces

TABLE 1

THE OPINIONS TABULATED ARE DISTRIBUTED BY CLASSES ACCORDING TO THE TABULATION SHOWN BELOW. THE NUMBERS CORRESPOND WITH THOSE USED IN THE SUMMARY

	1		2		3		4		5			6		Number represented
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Let 'em	No	Yes <sup>1</sup>	No	
Officers of Sections.....	8	1	1	9	12	1	6	0	1	1	5	0	5	21
Editorial staff.....	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
State foresters.....	5	1	5	1	4	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	13
Heads of schools.....	7	1	4	3	4	0	7	1	0	0	6	0	2	12
Secretaries of associ'ns	1	3	0	3	5	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	7
Government services.....	8	2	2	8	8	2	5	1	0	0	1	1	2	14
Private employ.....	2	0	0	5	11	0	2	3	1	6	2	0	13	16
Totals .....	33	8	13	30	45	4	27	6	3	7	17	2	32	87

<sup>1</sup> Expresses unqualified approval. Partial approval is expressed under the other columns.

are overwhelming the accepted truisms of the past, the JOURNAL is lost in petty quibbling over inconsequential matters and artificially created issues.

The vital problems of forestry are overlooked or discussed not from a social standpoint or in the spirit of the New Deal.

The membership of the Society has recently been enriched by a large number of young men who are earnestly seeking positive leadership which keeps in step with the dynamic movements of the present. This they do not find in the JOURNAL.

In the field of technical forestry, the JOURNAL provides a satisfactory outlet for some of the scientific findings of the profession. In the field of forest policy, however, it lacks the spirit of social leadership which was once a distinguishing characteristic of the profession.

The future of the Society—and the JOURNAL as the mirror of the profession—is close to our hearts. We would be guilty of indifference if we failed to point out the weaknesses of our present position and seek remedies.

One of the proposals which has been crystallizing, is the publication of an independent organ to fill the gap left by the recent purposeless editorial policy of the JOURNAL. Funds have been made available to publish such an organ.

We are not unmindful, however, of the possible effect of such publication upon the official organ of the Society and upon harmony within the Society itself.

We still have implicit faith in the idealism of the rank and file of our Society and before adopting this extreme measure we should like to make an appeal to you, the members of the Executive Council, to view the situation with

us dispassionately and realistically, in an effort to make the JOURNAL the real spiritual spokesman of the profession.

Among the first steps in this direction we suggest:

1. The separation of the offices of the Executive Secretary and Editor-in-Chief;

2. Appointment as Editor of the JOURNAL, a man of high standing in the profession and of scholarly attainments and literary ability—a man with strong social convictions but tolerant of the opinions of others, scrupulously honest intellectually, and a strong believer in complete freedom of expression;

3. To insure the independence of the Editor from any pressure on the part of the Administration that may be in office, he should not be subject to dictation by the Executive Council with respect to editorial policy.

We should prefer, in this letter, not to go into specific instances where the editorial policy of the JOURNAL has been prejudicial to the best interests of the Society. This would only lead to long-drawn-out argument and possibly to personal recrimination, which we wish to avoid.

It is sufficient that dissatisfaction with the policy is prevalent among many members of the Society, and we must face it frankly.

If the Executive Council is not convinced of the need for the changes suggested by this group, we would like to propose that this letter be published prominently in the next issue of the JOURNAL and all members of the Society be invited to express their views on the matter.

The final decision can then be made after full and open discussion, for which adequate provision should be made at the next annual meeting.

Signed:

GEORGE AHERN  
1760 Euclid St., N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

CARLOS G. BATES  
2370 Chilcombe Avenue  
Saint Paul, Minnesota

EARLE H. CLAPP  
Branch of Research  
U. S. Forest Service  
Washington, D. C.

L. F. KNEIPP  
Branch of Lands  
U. S. Forest Service  
Washington, D. C.

W. C. LOWDERMILK  
Bureau of Soil Erosion Control  
U. S. Department of Interior  
Washington, D. C.

ROBERT MARSHALL, FORESTER  
U. S. Indian Service  
Washington, D. C.

E. N. MUNNS  
U. S. Forest Service  
Washington, D. C.

GIFFORD PINCHOT  
State Capitol  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

EDWARD C. M. RICHARDS  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
Knoxville, Tennessee

F. A. SILCOX  
U. S. Forest Service  
Washington, D. C.

WM. N. SPARHAWK  
U. S. Forest Service  
Washington, D. C.

RAPHAEL ZON  
2237 Doswell Avenue  
Saint Paul, Minnesota

STATEMENT BY FORMER EDITOR-IN-CHIEF  
EMANUEL FRITZ

Inasmuch as the Zon petition regarding the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY is to be published I beg leave to make a public reply, but more as a former Editor than as a Council member. I think that eight years as an associate editor and three as Editor-in-Chief qualify me to speak authoritatively on the problems of the JOURNAL.

That the JOURNAL falls short of what it should be and can be must be admitted. Nevertheless the present JOURNAL is infinitely superior to the JOURNAL of 1928 et ante in every respect, not excepting adherence to the ideals of the founders of the Society unless a more realistic approach can be called an impairment. I will take up the principal reasons for its shortcomings later.

Neither can we take exception to the qualifications set up by the petitioners for the editorship. They are obvious and well understood and it was as unnecessary to state them as it would be to say the director of an experiment station should be first of all "tolerant of the opinions of others, scrupulously honest intellectually." The Council has always sought an Editor who possessed the highest score in the necessary qualifications, though it has been seriously handicapped by its limited funds.

The JOURNAL's problems were brought to the attention of the Council and members in each of my three annual reports and in a 9-page unpublished supplementary report of 1932 entitled "The Future of the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY." These re-

ports<sup>1</sup> answer all the legitimate points brought up by the petitioners and now make interesting reading in the light of the petition. The policies there set forth, I believe, are being continued by the president Editor to the best of his ability.

What ails the JOURNAL is not the fault of the Editor so much as that of the profession. The members, with some laudable exceptions, have never given the JOURNAL or its Editor proper or adequate support. Some have embarrassed the magazine and thereby robbed it of a chance to grow in quality and prestige by giving to other publications articles which should have been offered to the JOURNAL. Some have spread the unfounded rumor that "Policy articles" are not desired, and others have ignored the Editor's invitations to contribute. And now a group of twelve wishes to further weaken the Society's official organ by publishing a rival magazine! It is hard to see how the new magazine can survive if it gets no more contributions from its sponsors than they gave their JOURNAL OF FORESTRY.

I must condemn the charge that space has been given to "petty quibbling" as a showy misstatement. I would like to be shown an example in the last six volumes.

If some vital problems are not covered it does not follow that the Editor overlooked them. It is more likely due to his inability to get competent men to discuss and write upon them. If the competent members considered their JOURNAL not good enough for their discussions I fail to recall that they voiced their New Deal sentiments in other magazines. What they don't write can't be published. For the period of my own editorship I can exhibit a sizable file of solicitations

and reminders addressed to members who should have been glad to contribute. The response was pitifully weak. A list would interest the petitioners. Doubtless the present Editor has had the same experience.

The main complaint seems to be an insufficient number of "policy" articles, and that in the past they have been discouraged. Policy articles have not been blacklisted and never should be. The inclusion of a reasonable number of well written, well thought out policy articles is highly desirable. They would stimulate our idealistic sides. But they should be real contributions and not sophomoric rehashes of material oft printed before or destructive criticisms that affront the reader's intelligence. Nevertheless, with nothing better available such policy articles have had to be printed. If one should boil down most of our past policy articles the result would be the simple statement that forestry is a necessary thing. I think we long ago proved that forestry is necessary. Then why restate it? Why not devote our space now to show how forestry can be accomplished in the woods? The implication that our past articles were not high in quality is well founded. But if they who can write better policy articles don't write them, the Editor can't be expected to pull them out of thin air. The scientific, technical and spiritual tone of the JOURNAL can not be raised if the members don't give it a higher grade of material to print.

The petitioners forget that the forestry profession has many divisions, and that there are silviculturists, mensurationists, protectionists, utilizationists, economists, recreationists, idealists, etc. All look to the JOURNAL for additions to their field of knowledge or interest. I maintain that

<sup>1</sup> JOURNAL OF FORESTRY, Vol. 29, p. 294; Vol.30, p. 367; Vol. 31, p. 233. See also "A Chat with the Editor," Vol. 28, p. 1014.



these fields have equal rights for space. The JOURNAL is not solely a professional magazine in which members can propound their views on the social aspects of forestry. It is equally a technical publication from which that forgotten forester, the practitioner, hopes to get the technical help he needs to effectuate what the founders of the Society preached.

Policy articles certainly should not outnumber those on silviculture, protection, etc., combined. A little tolerance here and respect for the other readers who want meat and not menus, will make for the balanced JOURNAL we should have and which I am sure has been the aim of the present Editor, and certainly was the aim of his immediate predecessors.

The JOURNAL is indeed the "mirror of the profession," but like a mirror, it can reflect only that which is placed before it. If the membership doesn't or isn't competent to submit better papers, the JOURNAL will show the effects. So far, the JOURNAL has reflected a truthful picture of the state of the forestry profession, not only by what it *has* published but also by what it *has not* published. The present controversy is a good example, and personally I regret to see space so used. But the petitioners have requested that their petition "be published prominently."

The petitioners make it appear that there have been numerous "instances where the editorial policy of the JOURNAL has been prejudicial to the best interests of the Society." I think, if the President, would insist that they furnish him with a list of such instances, we members of the Council and the present Editor could learn just what or who they are shooting at.

The petitioners evidently were not aware that the Council had already considered and acted upon the separation of the offices of Executive Secretary and Editor-in-Chief. For the present I can

see no chance of getting a man who is able to contribute gratis 100 hours per month, furnish his own clerical help, and be willing to accept carping criticism instead of gratitude. I am on record as favoring a separation of the offices. I neither defend nor condemn the present Editor. We must be charitable in our criticism of a man who is carrying a double load and is trying to serve two masters.

The man does not live who can edit the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY or any other magazine and satisfy all his readers. An editor is expected to be "tolerant of the opinions of others," to be a "strong believer in complete freedom of expression" and to be "independent." Yet, if he exercises these qualities and permits a contributor to present a view in opposition to that of a certain group he is condemned as having prostituted the "ideals of the founders of the Society." We want both sides of every question, not volumes on one. As to independence, any editor who attempts to exercise it when this powerful group is on the other side, simply invites trouble. I know, because I ran into it and I don't think I lack independence.

At a time when forestry has been handed its sweetest victory on a diamond-studded gold platter one group wants to indulge in debate while the rest are straining to practise forestry in the woods. Are we going to let the first group control the JOURNAL for its debates or are we going to insist that our official organ provide a proper assortment and an adequate number of technical tools?

EMANUEL FRITZ,

*Former Editor, Journal of Forestry.*

#### AN EDITORIAL POLICY FOR THE JOURNAL OF FORESTRY

The petition of June 13, to the Council concerning the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY should stimulate among the other mem-

bers of the Society an active interchange of ideas about their magazine, whether and wherein it is good or bad, and how it might be made better. The outcome should be a clear cut and commonly acceptable editorial policy for the future guidance of the Editorial Staff. Toward that end it is perhaps best to begin with an appraisal of the JOURNAL itself, as it has been under previous editors-in-chief, and as it now is under the present incumbent in that distinguished office.

The petition alleges that, "the editorial policy of the JOURNAL no longer represents the broad social ideals of the founders of the Society." The founders were Gifford Pinchot, Overton W. Price, William L. Hall, Ralph S. Hosmer, Thomas H. Sherrard, E. T. Allen and Henry S. Graves. Their first meeting was on November 30, 1900. Their first Constitution stated the objectives of the Society to be—

"The object of this Society shall be to further the cause of forestry in America by fostering a spirit of comradeship among foresters; by creating opportunities for a free interchange of views upon forestry and allied subjects; and by disseminating a knowledge of the purpose and achievements of forestry."

To further these ends, the Society, in May 1905, began the publication of the "Proceeding of the Society of American Foresters" which was continued until 1917. Beginning with the address of Theodore Roosevelt, at the meeting of March 26, 1903, the "Proceedings" contains all of the addresses and papers delivered at the Society's then frequent meetings, which the Publications Committee judged to be worthy of preservation. The "Proceedings" at first appeared at irregular intervals—later, four times a year.

In October, 1902, Dr. B. E. Fernow, then Director of the first school of forestry at Cornell, began the publication of the "Forestry Quarterly" which he

continued until 1917. The first issue contained the following announcement of editorial policy:

"Although there are a number of publications in the United States and Canada, wholly or in part devoted to the propagandism of forestry, there are at the present time none which are mainly or entirely devoted to the professional or technical interests of the subject.

"With the establishment, within the last four years, of two fully-equipped special schools of forestry, whose graduates have begun work in the field; with the rapid expansion of the field work of the Federal Forestry Bureau, and of other agencies in technical direction, professional foresters have multiplied, and the time for means of communication among those who are building up the science and art of forestry in the United States seems to have arrived.

"The *Forestry Quarterly* is intended to meet this need.

"Besides publishing original articles on subjects of interest to the profession, and translations of such articles from foreign sources, it is intended to bring reviews and references to the current literature, and also, in brief notes, the notes, the news of the forestry world, personal and otherwise, with a view of keeping the readers in touch with the development of their art in all its branches.

"While this journal, in its inception and management, is a child of the New York State College of Forestry, it is hoped that, as time passes on, its pages may be used by all or any workers in the field for the discussion of their problems and record of their experiences.

"The *Forestry Quarterly* opens its pages for the freest discussion of all forestry problems; it welcomes advice and invites criticism which may tend to promote our professional knowledge."

In 1917 the "Quarterly" and the "Pro-

ceedings" were merged into the "Journal of Forestry" which since then has been the Society's official publication. In the first issue (January, 1917) the editorial policy was defined as follows:

"With this issue the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY takes the place of the Proceedings of the Society of American Foresters and of the Forestry Quarterly. . . . The new Journal is not an absorption of the Forestry Quarterly by the Proceedings or of the Proceedings by the Forestry Quarterly, but is in the true sense an amalgamation of the best features of the two original publications."

"The Journal will be devoted to all branches of forestry and will contain original articles, notes and comments, reviews of books, periodical literature, and news and personal notes. . . . It will be the official organ of the Society, and will be distributed to the active members of the Society without charge. . . ."

"The Editors bespeak an active interest of all readers in making the JOURNAL a worthy organ of the Society and representative of the best thought of the profession by the contribution of articles and otherwise. The Editors will welcome any suggestions and criticism, intended to improve the publication, addressed to any member of the Board."

The JOURNAL has had five successive Editors-in-Chiefs, each supported by an editorial staff, varying in numbers from 6 to 8, viz., B. E. Fernow, January 1917 to February 1923; Raphael Zon, March 1923 to May 1928; S. T. Dana, October 1928 to May 1930; Emanuel Fritz, October 1930 to December 1932; and Franklin Reed, January 1933—.

To all practical intents, Zon was Editor-in-Chief for the Society for 23 years. He served on the Editorial Board of the

"Proceedings" from its inception and later was its chief editor. During the same period he was Fernow's right hand assistant on the "Quarterly." During the five years that Fernow was Editor-in-Chief of the JOURNAL, Zon was Managing Editor. His resignation was at his own initiative, for a combination of reasons,<sup>1</sup> one of them being that his official duties no longer left him the necessary spare time.

To fill the vacancy the Council commandeered the services of Samuel T. Dana, a former President of the Society, who was then, as he is now, Dean of the School of Forestry and Conservation at Ann Arbor, Michigan. After two years of devoted effort, he too was forced to give up for the same reason.

His successor, Emanuel Fritz, met with the same difficulty. As a member of the faculty of the Division of Forestry at the University of California, he could no longer spare the time and energy which the editorial job demanded.

In accepting Fritz's resignation, at the annual meeting in December, 1932, the Council, directed the Executive Secretary, myself, to carry on as acting Editor-in-Chief through the May, 1933 issue. The purpose was to give the Council time carefully to canvass the whole field and to select the very best man available. At the end of six months the Council was still unable to put its finger on a man possessed of the desired qualifications and at the same time both able and willing to undertake the responsibility.

The Council was confronted with a condition, instead of a theory. The JOURNAL OF FORESTRY must go on whether it had the idealistically perfect Editor-in-Chief or not. The Society was under contract with its 2,700 or more members and subscribers to furnish them with 8

<sup>1</sup>See Zon's letter of resignation in the March, 1928, JOURNAL OF FORESTRY, pp. 410-412.

copies of the magazine annually and the next issue must be off the press the first of October. It must be made up and in the hands of the printer in less than two months and there was a vast amount of work to be done in the way of reviewing, editing, and accepting or rejecting articles that had been offered for publication and of soliciting additional contributions. Furthermore, plans for the subsequent issues must be initiated. The Council met the situation by authorizing the executive secretary to serve as Editor-in-Chief until the completion of the May 1934 issue, by which time, it was hoped, there would again be a breathing spell that would permit a definite decision.

After the May 1934 issue had come off the press, it was still impossible to sign up a separate Editor-in-Chief and the Council therefore approved President Chapman's recommendation to keep the Executive Secretary in office as Editor-in-Chief until next January, when the whole problem would be thoroughly threshed out in executive session of the Council at the Society's annual meeting.

As to the JOURNAL's editorial policy: The policies followed by my predecessors is a matter of historical record written into those issues of the JOURNAL which they edited and published. The current editorial policy can also be appraised partially by an appraisal of those issues of the JOURNAL for which I have been responsible and also by my own conception of what the editorial policy of the JOURNAL is, or should be.

The editorial announcements quoted from the "Forestry Quarterly," the "Proceedings" and the first issue of the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY are the nearest thing to anything I can find approaching an official pronouncement on editorial policy.

About all we have in the way of a present day written definition of JOURNAL policy is to be found in the Society's

Articles of Incorporation, in the present Constitution which was adopted in 1928, and in certain by-laws based upon it from which the following quotations are made.

"Articles of Incorporation."

"The particular business and objects of the Society are to encourage a broad and constructive practice of forestry; to stimulate research and achievement in the science of forestry; and to advance the profession of forestry through co-operative thought and a spirit of solidarity among foresters."

"Constitution."

"*Article II—Object.*—The object of this Society shall be to advance the science, practice, and standards of forestry in America."

"*Article IX—Editorial Staff.*—The Editorial Staff shall consist of a Chairman, chosen by ballot of the Council, and eight (8) other members of the Society, who shall be recommended by the Chairman and appointed by the President. The Chairman shall be designated Editor-in-Chief. The Chairman and other members of the Editorial Staff shall serve for two years, or until their successors are appointed. The Staff shall have charge of the official publication of the Society and shall decide all matters related to its publication, subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the Council."

"*By-Law 64.*—The JOURNAL OF FORESTRY is designated as the official organ or publication of the Society, referred to in various sections of the Constitution, and publication in it shall constitute notice to the membership as required in Arts. IV, VIII, and X, and in the By-Laws. Programs of meetings and similar publications, although strictly official publications of the Society, are not intended to be subject to the Editorial Staff as provided in Art. IX."

Out of all this, combined with a con-

sideration of the precedents established by my predecessors and guided also by comments of other interested Society members, I have deduced and am attempting to follow, these fundamental principles of editorial policy:

1. The JOURNAL OF FORESTRY is the property of the whole Society and all of its members. Its editorial policy and its methods of management therefore should be such as meet with the approval of the largest possible majority of the membership. The JOURNAL is not the personal property of the Editor-in-Chief, to be run according to his own personal whims and idiosyncrasies, nor should its policies be dictated by any one small minority group or faction.

2. The Council is the Society's Board of Directors, elected by the membership to conduct its affairs. One of its important duties is to oversee the conduct of the Society's official publication, the JOURNAL OF FORESTRY. The Editor-in-Chief who is appointed by the Council, and the whole Editorial Staff should, therefore, be subordinate to the Council.

3. The JOURNAL is the profession's one best medium for free expression of opinion and interchange of ideas, for the promulgation of new knowledge in all the various forestry fields and concerning all of the numerous and varied questions of forest policy and practice. The pages of the JOURNAL should, therefore, be freely open to any member who desires to express his independent thought and opinion. The only restrictions should be that he treat his subject in a manner that renders what he writes of instructive and constructive value; that his literary style be up to JOURNAL standards and that he avoid petty personalities.

4. The Society includes among its members foresters of wide variations in interest. Many of them are specialists and are interested primarily (and sometimes

only), in articles on subjects coming within their respective fields. It is not humanly possible to publish a magazine every article in which would be of intimate interest to every member. About the best we can hope to do is to publish a combination of articles on varied subjects amongst which every reader, whatever his specialized interest, may find at least one that will be of value to him.

5. The Editor-in-Chief is not the sole arbiter of the JOURNAL. As the Constitution provides, he is the Chairman of an Editorial Staff composed of 8 Associate Editors. So far as it is humanly practicable, the responsibility for deciding what to publish should rest on the combined Editorial Staff.

In attempting to conduct the JOURNAL in compliance with the above principles, I have naturally in specific cases run up against difficulties such as anyone with editorial experience would understand. Certain branches of forestry have been inadequately covered in spite of earnest effort to solicit articles from foresters working within those fields. This applies particularly to several of the forestry activities under the New Deal. Beyond something good on the E.C.W., on forestry in the Indian Service, and on Article X of the Lumber Code (most of which I had to write myself) there has frankly been a paucity of New Deal material. The other New Deal forestry activities have not been touched, or at best, inadequately treated, for the simple reason that the foresters concerned have as yet been unable or unwilling to tell the JOURNAL'S readers what their respective projects are all about. I have had no opportunity to reject any New Deal copy but on the contrary have had to run some that plainly was below par, for the simple reason that I could get nothing better. At one time I was hopeful of getting a ringing editorial, fully "in the spirit of the New Deal." The January,

1934, issue carried a signed editorial which some would characterize as being in the spirit of the "old deal." One of our most ardent New Deal members took strong exception to it and expressed a desire to answer it. I signed him up for the editorial page in the next issue. He failed me at the last moment. I am still hopeful that during the coming fall and winter months, after the New Deal has shaken down into more systematic and more smoothly running order, several of our members connected with it in high places will find the time to make contributions to the JOURNAL, so that its readers will be permitted to know what they are doing and how they are going about it.

As to the JOURNAL's editorials: Time was when they were all unsigned and were presumably accepted by our readers as the voice of the Society. Under Emanuel Fritz's regime the question was raised by the President and Council concerning the advisability of a certain such editorial. This led to a discussion at the Council meeting in New Orleans in December, 1931, as to what the governing policy should be. It was agreed that all unsigned editorials should be accepted as the voice of the Society and should therefore be in line with the Society's officially adopted policy. It was also recognized, however, that there was room for signed editorials representing not necessarily the Society's policy and point of view, but primarily the point of view of the author himself for which he would be fully responsible. During my regime I have published several such signed editorials representing the author's personal point of view in the hope that they would stimulate constructive discussion of the points raised. My experience has been that our average reader refuses to make this distinction between a signed and unsigned editorial but persists in accepting every editorial whether signed or unsigned as

the voice of the Society. My personal conclusion, therefore, is that all editorials should be in line with the Society's officially adopted policy and that if an individual member wishes to present a divergent point of view, what he has to say should appear in the JOURNAL not as an editorial but as an article over his signature in the body of the magazine.

After all is said and done, the proof of the pudding is in the eating and proof of the JOURNAL lies in the opinions of those who have been reading it carefully during the past several months. I can only insist that I myself as Editor-in-Chief and all of the 8 members of the Editorial Staff have been conscientiously doing our best to put forth a magazine that would come as nearly as possible to pleasing the greatest possible majority of its readers. Constructive suggestions how to make the magazine better have always been most welcome and have been earnestly solicited. Many members have given the editorial staff the benefit of their counsel. The 12 signers of the petition of June 13, are not among them.

At this point I might perhaps be permitted to express my own views on the existing scheme of organization wherein the position of Editor-in-Chief and Executive Secretary are combined in one man. When I first heard of the proposition two years ago, I was definitely opposed to it on the ground that it was inefficient organization. I felt that the two jobs are quite radically different in their nature and should normally be filled by individuals of marked difference in background, talent and temperament; an excellent Editor would not necessarily be a good Executive Secretary and vice versa; a man with the required editorial temperament and talent would be inclined to belittle and neglect the secretarial functions and by the same token an excellent executive secretary might give the editorial work the short end of the stick. It

was proving difficult enough to find a competent editor; it would be ten times as difficult to find a man possessed of both the editorial and the secretarial qualifications. Furthermore, it impressed me that the Editor-in-Chief, whoever he may be, and whatever he may do or may not do, is bound to draw down on his devoted head the wrath and condemnation of some individual member or some group of members for having rejected some manuscript or even for having insisted on publishing it. The Editor-in-Chief, therefore, as I sense it, should be as free from such influences as possible and should if at all possible not be a salaried employee of the Society.

By the summer of 1933 after I had had experience as Acting Editor and also had heard much argument in support of the combination, I found myself frankly "on the fence" and curious to see the scheme given a thoroughly practical test. It is in that spirit, therefore, that I have carried out the assignment as Editor-in-Chief for the period ending with the May, 1934, issue. With that experience behind me I find myself still on the fence, with the arguments and evidence "pro" evenly balanced by the "cons." If space would permit I could present a long bill of particulars listing numerous instances wherein the combination is of proven advantage to both functions and giving an equally long list of disadvantages. Such a brief however would be so long that too few would read it.

In the meantime it occurs to me that a compromise might be effected between the two schools of thought which might prove mutually satisfactory.

The time required to perform the strict-

ly editorial functions, in my judgment and experience, is far less than most members unfamiliar with the internal workings of the Society's executive organization generally believe. In the days when Raphael Zon was Editor, he had to handle the whole works. He had to be editor, publisher, business manager, advertising manager, deal with the printer, read proof and do everything incidental to publication and distribution of the magazine. The Executive Staff of the Society has since the last two years reached that point of development and efficiency that it can relieve the Editor-in-Chief of all of the routine mechanical details of seeing the magazine through the press so that an Editor-in-Chief today could limit his time and efforts exclusively to the purely editorial function of deciding what material to publish and of providing the editorials.

It has been my opinion for some time that an Editor who is willing to follow that course and to unload on the Executive Office every last bit of routine work would find that the strictly editorial duties would not absorb more than 32 to 40 hours a month. Under this conception it might still be possible to find someone with the required qualifications to function as Editor-in-Chief as a side issue to his regular official duties. Maybe before another year is out, the Council will be able to put its mark upon such a man. He should, of course, be located within easy reach of the Executive Office so that he could maintain close and frequent contact with the Executive Secretary.

FRANKLIN REED,  
*Editor-in-chief.*

## PRINCIPLES OF FOREST POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

The Society's officially adopted forest policy, referred to in the foregoing exposition of the JOURNAL's editorial policy, is embodied in these "Principles of Forest Policy." They were adopted by referendum vote in May, 1931, after three years of careful preparation by a specially appointed committee. Each section was voted on individually. The way the vote went is given after each section. Since then they have served as a guide to the Council in its conduct of Society affairs, including the editorial policy of the JOURNAL.

It is now October, 1934. During the intervening three and a half years there has been marked, in some instances radical, evolution in professional forestry thought which undoubtedly, should be reflected in a revision of our official policy statement. In this every member can aid materially by giving the Council the benefit of his suggestions wherein and how our present policy principles can be modernized.—FRANKLIN REED, *Editor-in-Chief*.

### I. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN FORESTRY

The industrial and general welfare of the country requires a direct participation of the public in the protection, development, and continuance of the forests.

Yes—824 No—12 No vote—3

### II. STRENGTHENING PUBLIC FOREST POLICIES

To prevent further extensive deforestation, existing public forest policies must be strengthened or new policies created. Federal and state action are both required, and the federal government must not only discharge its own direct responsibilities, but must stimulate and coordinate state action.

Yes—816 No—15 No vote—8

### III. PRIVATE PARTICIPATION IN FORESTRY

There rests upon private owners an obligation to handle their forests in such a manner as to prevent the public injuries which follow destructive exploitation and failure in fire protection.

Yes—745 No—77 No vote 17

### IV. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TO PRIVATE FORESTRY

The public interest requires that private forests be protected from destruction. The public must therefore take the lead in offering every legitimate encouragement and assistance to private

owners in removing controllable obstacles to private forestry.

Yes—822 No—12 No vote—5

#### 1. Fire Control

The nature of the forest fire problem and the public interest in forest protection justify and demand that the federal and state governments provide adequate funds, far larger than at present, to enable the states, in coöperation with private owners, to complete and intensify the coöperative fire protection system.

Yes—818 No—17 No vote—4

#### 2. Control of Insect and Fungus Infestations

Public funds must be provided in adequate amounts to control infestations of destructive insects and fungi, and to prevent, so far as possible, the occurrence of such infestations.

Yes—806 No—28 No vote—5

#### 3. Reforestation

Congress and the state legislatures should provide liberal appropriations to aid in replanting private lands, and to replant denuded lands in the public forests.

Yes—709 No—113 No vote—17

#### 4. Stabilization of the Forest Industries

The Government should protect the interest of the public against the losses sustained both by the public and the forest industries through over-production and wasteful exploitation of forests.

Yes—637 No—87 No vote—15



### 5. Coöperation to Improve Exploitation Practices

Coöperation between the federal government, the states, and the private owners in bringing about improved exploitation methods so as to eliminate destructive cutting is necessary for the perpetuation of our forest resources.

Yes—801 No—29 No vote—9

### 6. Taxation

Present forest taxation is an obstacle to private forestry. The states should establish forest tax systems adapted to the peculiar needs of the forest enterprise as a business with irregular and sometimes long-deferred income, fitting these systems to such reforms in public finance as may seem necessary to economical administration of local government in forest regions.

Yes—818 No—14 No vote—7

### 7. Research

The urgent need for larger scientific and economic knowledge of forests, domestic and foreign, and of their products, demands a greatly increased support, especially by the federal government, of the agencies engaged in forest research and experimentation.

Yes—791 No—36 No vote—12

### 8. Extension

The importance of educational work in forestry justifies and requires liberal appropriations by Congress and the state legislatures for the public agencies engaged in that work.

Yes—791 No—41 No vote—7

## V. PUBLIC FORESTS

The manifold public and private interests in forestry require a greatly enlarged system of public forests, owned by the federal, state and local governments, occupying lands which require a special type of management difficult to secure under private ownership, and well distributed throughout the country.

Yes—788 No—37 No vote—14

### 1. Federal Forests

The federal government should acquire as large a proportion as possible of the forests needed to protect the watersheds of navigable or interstate streams and which are beyond the power of the states to acquire and properly handle, or which are not likely to be managed by private owners in a way to safeguard public interests.

Yes—806 No—25 No vote—8

The federal government should assist in the solution of the rehabilitation and submarginal land problems in several ways:

(a) by creating demonstration forests to show private owners good forest practices:

Yes—749 No—73 No vote—17

(b) by purchasing such lands for national forests in order to protect and manage the young growth, to reforest waste lands, and to withdraw submarginal farm land from cultivation:

Yes—728 No—96 No vote—15

(c) Unreserved forested lands of the public domain suitable for the purpose should be added to the national forests. Private forest lands intermingled with or adjacent to the national forests should be acquired by the government where best suited for that purpose.

Yes—807 No—20 No vote—12

### 2. State Forests

The states should establish public forests where essential to protect state interests in water conservation, in prevention of erosion, in the protection of areas of special scenic, historic and scientific value, and to promote public recreation, the conservation of wild life, the demonstration of applied forestry, coöperation with private owners in fire protection and coöperative marketing, and the utilization of land of low productive value.

Yes—820 No—10 No vote—9

### 3. County and Municipal Forests

County and municipal forests are an important feature of a general system of public forests, and should be encouraged where the local public interests will be served by their establishment.

Yes—767 No—58 No vote—14

### 4. Federal and State Collaboration

As a means of formulating an adequate program of public forests, the federal and state governments should collaborate in making a nation-wide study of needed public forests and of a fair division of federal, state, and local responsibility in their acquisition.

Yes—812 No—18 No vote—9

## VI. PROTECTION FOREST ZONES

The public, in protecting water resources, should include private forests which are needed for watershed protection in a special category of protection forests subject to such regulatory measures as the public interest requires, and on these forests the public should bear a larger share of protection costs and road building than on areas where less onerous regulatory measures are needed. Where the protection of navigable streams, or of other national interests within federal constitutional powers, are involved, the responsibility for the creation of protection forest zones rests upon the federal government.

Yes—788 No—40 No vote—11

## VII. DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC FORESTS

Federal and state financial support of public forests should be progressively increased to the point of fully developing their productive capacity.

Yes—788 No—37 No vote—14

## VIII. PUBLIC CONTROL OF PRIVATE FOREST EXPLOITATION

1. The public has the responsibility to exercise such control over the exploitation of private forests as may be neces-

sary to prevent injury to the community at large.

Yes—708 No—108 No vote—23

2. Any system of public control of private forests should provide:

(a) Control measures shall as far as possible be worked out by local and regional boards, in order to establish local representation.

Yes—737 No—57 No vote—45

(b) Forest owners shall be represented on these boards.

Yes—746 No—46 No vote—47

(c) Beyond a general restriction against clear cutting, without satisfactory provision for restocking, there shall be a minimum of prescriptive rules and a maximum of freedom on the part of the owner to work out his own methods to assure reproduction.

Yes—710 No—76 No vote—53

(d) Control measures shall give full weight to economic conditions and handicaps, and shall be applied reasonably and progressively, beginning with practices most easily susceptible of remedy and with remedies that are least onerous or most advantageous to the owner.

Yes—740 No—49 No vote—50

## IX. FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY IN PUBLIC CONTROL

1. The executive branch of the federal government should be authorized and instructed by Congress:

(a) to cooperate financially and in an advisory way with the several states in devising and carrying out regulatory measures, when and as needed, and in accordance with their respective constitutions and local needs:

Yes—749 No—66 No vote—24

(b) to encourage and assist groups of states with similar forest problems to adopt state compacts on regulations, subject to approval by Congress, as provided in the Constitution.

Yes—745 No—62 No vote—32

2. These various responsibilities of the federal government to bring about public control should be carried out.

Vote for one only	{	(a) through the Forest Service. Yes—446 No—30 No vote—35
		or (b) through a permanent central forestry board, supplemented by such regional and local boards as it should find necessary. Yes—345 No—31 No vote—35
		Total number of ballots cast—839.

By-LAW No. 57

The following by-law was recently adopted by the Council:

By-Law No. 57. The funds of the Society except those needed for current use shall be deposited in a mutual savings bank approved by the Finance Committee, and/or invested in federal securities. No other class of securities shall be authorized as investments for Society funds. This by-law shall not be retroactive as ordering the sale of existing securities and reinvestment, except in the discretion of the Finance Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following names of candidates for membership are referred to Junior Members, Senior Members and Fellows for comment or protest. The list includes all nominations received since the publication of the list in the August Supplement, without question as to eligibility. The names have not been passed upon by the Council. Important information regarding the qualifications of any candidate, which will enable the Council to take final action with a knowledge of essential facts, should be submitted to the undersigned before November 1, 1934. Statements on different men should be submitted on different sheets. Communications relating to candidates are considered by the Council as strictly confidential.

FOR ELECTION TO GRADE OF JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

<i>Name and Education</i>	<i>Title and Address</i>	<i>Proposed by Section</i>
Albert, Otis W. Colo. Agric., B.S.F., 1933.	Foreman, Tenn. State Forest Service, Kingsport, Tenn.	Appalachian
Bigley, Michael Univ. of Wash., B.S.F., 1933.	Jr. Technician, Ouachita Natl. Forest, Hot Springs, Ark.	Ozark
Blackerby, J. Harton Colo. Agric., B.S.F., 1933.	Foreman, C.C.C. Camp, Morristown, Tenn.	Appalachian
Cooper, Edward N. Univ. of Ga., B.S.F., 1934.	Cultural Foreman, Nantahala Natl. Forest, Franklin, N. C.	Appalachian
Fletcher, Peter Whitcomb Pa. State, B.S.F., 1933; Yale, M.F., 1934.	Junior Forester, U. S. F. S., Rolla, Missouri.	Ozark
Hamlin, Edgar G. Mich. State, B.S.F., 1916.	Forester, Whitney Realty Company, Sabattis, N. Y.	New York
Jacobson, Albin George Univ. of Mich., B.S.F., 1930; M.S.F., 1930.	District Supervisor, Dept. of Conservation, Newberry, Mich.	Ohio Valley
Kline, L. V. N. Y. State, B.S.F., 1928 (Reinstatement).	U. S. Forest Service, C.C.C., Edinburg, Va.	Allegheny
Kuppe, Adolph Joseph Willis Pa. State, B.S.F., 1925.	Supt. E.C.W., Camp S-52, Grantsville, Md.	Allegheny
Maturen, H. F. Univ. of Minn., B.S.F., 1924.	Technical Forester, Wis. Conservation Dept., Rhinelander, Wis.	Wisconsin
Randall, Arthur G. Yale, B.S., 1933; M.F., 1934.	Asst. to Technician, Allegheny Forest Experiment Station, Kane, Pa.	Allegheny

Riley, Madison Monroe  
N. C. State, B.S.F., 1933.

Simmons, Edward M.  
N. Y. State, B.S.F., 1924.

Syverson, Martin Louis  
Wash. State, B.S., 1933.

White, Jack C.  
Univ. of Mont., B.S.F., 1929 to  
1933.

Technician, Appalachian Forest Ex-  
periment Station, Asheville, N. C.

Jr. Forester, Allegheny Forest Exp.  
Station, Philadelphia, Pa.

Jr. Forester, Ouachita N. F., Hot  
Springs, Ark.

Technical Foreman, E.C.W., Mc-  
Comb Lake Camp, Munising, Mich.

Appalachian

Allegheny

Ozark

Wisconsin

C. F. KORSTIAN,

*Member of Council in charge of Admissions.*

## THE NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF FORESTRY

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

Undergraduate courses of four years are offered in forestry leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science. There is also opportunity for graduate work in several branches of forestry leading to advanced degrees.

The College has ample laboratories and classrooms in William L. Bray Hall and the Louis Marshall Memorial Building. It has forest properties approximating 20,000 acres that serve for demonstration, research and instruction in forestry.

Special laboratories for instruction in wood technology, in pulp and paper making, in kiln-drying and timber-treating and a portable sawmill are other features of this institution.

*Catalog mailed on request.*

SAMUEL N. SPRING, *Dean*

P L A N N O W

TO ATTEND

ANNUAL MEETING  
SOCIETY OF AMERICAN  
FORESTERS

JANUARY 28-30, 1935

SHOREHAM HOTEL

WASHINGTON, D. C.

