Forest Industry Foundation, Inc.

St. Paul, Minnesota

Oral History Interview I

With Royal S. Kellogg

Palmetto, Florida

April 16, 1955

By Elwood R. Maunder

E.R. Maunder (ERM): Mr. Kellogg you were born, according to this typewritten biography on October 19, 1874, in Cato, Cayuga County, New York.

Royal S. Kellogg (RSK): That's what I've always been told. I haven't any birth certificate. We didn't have such things in those days. I was reliably informed by Mother, as I recollect it, that it was four o'clock on a Monday morning.

ERM: And I note here too, that your first evidence of interest in the woods, or forestry, if you please, was the purchase of a book with your own money when you were just a boy of seven.

RSK: Yes, I'd saved up a dollar. I sent it off for a little natural history.

ERM: And would you say that was the beginning of you interest in forestry?

RSK: Well, it was the beginning of my interest in outdoor things, I should say. Book's right here in my bookcase if you want to see it.

ERM: Most of your early life was spent on a farm?

RSK: Yes.

ERM: In Kansas?

RSK: Yes. My father moved to western Kansas in the spring of 1882, just before I was eight years old. Before that we were on a farm out in the country northwest of the little village of Cato, New York.

ERM: Now I see that one of the things that you practiced in your childhood was the observation of Arbor Day. Would you care to tell us a little bit about how that day used to be practiced?

RSK: Well, Arbor Day, as I recollect it, was instituted in the first place by J. Sterling Morton who was Secretary of Agriculture- he came from Nebraska, and he was a very enthusiastic promoter of tree-planting. And our first Arbor Day in Kansas in 1883 came in April- it seems to me it was April 24- I can't be sure. My mother and I went down to the little stream, the Saline River, that ran through our ranch, and got some willow cuttings and brought them back and set them out along the drain that came from the sink in the house. So they got some moisture and they grew to be pretty good size trees and lasted for a long time. That was my first Arbor Day observance.

ERM: How would you say the practice, the observation of Arbor Day was recognized in your community at that time? Was that typical of what all the people did?

RSK: No, not very many people out there where we were those days, they didn't know.

ERM: Did you know the originator of Arbor Day?

RSK: I never met him. I knew about him, plenty, but as I say, I never had the pleasure of meeting him. But Arbor Day was mostly a means of getting publicity for tree planting. It has some effect, probably, on public sentiment. Gave quite a little information to the public about the desirability of tree-planting, particularly in the plains country where if you didn't plant trees you didn't have them.

ERM: What would you say about this early forerunner, if you please, of the forestry movement? Would you consider it that or not?

RSK: No, I think of it mostly in the way of preparation. Public sentiment getting ready to accept the idea of forestry later. See, forestry is dependent upon public education, education of the public to the necessity and desirability of maintaining the forests and increasing them in the places where they have been wiped out. Its one of those very desirable things same as a good many years later we had forest fire prevention week for a long time. We set up a national committee on that- I was chairman of the executive committee of it for a while, back in the 1920's. They were all means of education the public. Big variety of means.

ERM: Would you say then that perhaps the first evidence of interest in forestry in this country sprang from horticultural and botanical roots?

RSK: Yes, it came out of them. Of course, you've got to remember the American Forestry Association was set up in 1875, which has always been a very important influence, very important. We had a few early people that realized the importance of maintaining our forests. You can go way back and find out what Benjamin Franklin said on that subject. But there weren't so very many, so it's only comparatively recent times that there's been a really mass-conception, and the widespread state and governmental program.

ERM: We had many claims as to the father of American Forestry. Who would you consider the father?

RSK: There wasn't any <u>one</u>, there were a good many individuals who were pretty active, but there was no one. The ones entitled to the most credit were the few far-seeing people that started the American Forestry Association. I should think they were entitled to more credit than anybody else. Then there was a commissioner of forestry finally set up by the department of agriculture, and that finally grew into a division of forestry and then into the bureau of forestry and then into the Forest Service. It was a long process. The division of forestry, I think, under Fernow was set up in 1886, the first time. And Fernow lasted until about 1898, as I recollect it, and Pinchot came to stay until 1910, then Graves, etc. The thing grew pretty rapidly finally.

ERM: Well, now, your own active participation in this movement stemmed from what beginning, would you say? Where did you start becoming a forester?

RSK: Well, my first experience at all along that line was 'way back about 1885 when my father took up a tree claim, a timber claim out there in Western Kansas as part of our old ranch. Back in those days you could file a tree claim on a hundred and sixty acres of land and if you produced evidence you'd planted ten acres of trees, spaced four feet by four feet, you could get a deed to that hundred and sixty acres. Well, we had an honest tree claim. There were a great many of the other kind. There were a great many where the fellow who filed the claim got somebody to go and swear before the land office he's done those things, and he got the deed to it, but there weren't any trees. As I say, we had an honest tree claim. Ten acres set out, four by four feet, the law required, which was close spacing. And we cultivated and hoed that just as carefully as a garden.

ERM: What species did you plant?

RSK: Well, in the lowest part we put out cottonwoods. You've got to remember this was western Kansas – dry country. Then we put out some ash, some elm, some species of the kind which did almost nothing. We had a very successful plantation of black locust which is hardy in that area and climate, but the trouble was when the black locust got up to about fence post size the borers got into it and killed it. That's the big trouble with black locust. It is a very valuable tree, one of the most durable fence

post materials we can get, and it grows fast. But through all the western range it is generally killed before it gets much size. We got a good many fence posts and some firewood out of ours, but they were almost completely killed. It's a valuable species, but I'd say we had an honest tree claim.

ERM: Well, now back in the 1880's and 90's what were the uses that you made of your wood lot?

RSK: Well, as I say, we got mostly fence posts out of it.

ERM: Mostly fence posts and firewood?

RSK: We got some firewood, yes.

ERM: Were there any other used for that wood?

RSK: No. That's what there would be for that kind of stuff. Of course we did a good deal of planting by way of shelter around the garden, things like that. You need to have something to protect from those winds out there on the plains. But you didn't get anything out there unless you took care of it. If you planted your trees and neglected them, why they died in very short order.

ERM: And is that what happened with a great many of the claims that were made?

RSK: Oh yes. There was very little timber of any value produced from the old tree claim act. It was finally abolished, I think, in 1892. The original timber horticulture act, passed in the 70's provided you had to plant forty acres out of a hundred and sixty. And I've seen some plantations in Nebraska that went clear back to that time. But that forty-acre requirement didn't go on for a great while.

ERM: Where did the farmers get their seedlings?

RSK: Well, you sent off to nurseries for them or in the case of the lack locust and the honey locust was also used, you got seed and planted the seed.

ERM: Now going on from there, where and how did you pursue your interest in forestry?

RSK: Well, I didn't call it forestry in those days – it was an unknown term. I went to agricultural college. If I hadn't gone to an agricultural college, I might have been a farmer. The agricultural college that I went to back in the 1890s, the agricultural part of it was a joke. It was a general college course, and boys and girls and everybody took the same course right straight through, except there was one term in the spring of the second year and one term in the fall of the senior year in which some agriculture was taught. But as I say, agriculture was really a joke the way it was taught in those days in my particular college and most of the others. That was Manhattan, Kansas. I graduated from there in '96. But one of my particular chums who specialized in horticulture, Will Hall – I think you know who he is - he took the examination and went into the old division of forestry in 1900. Then he induced me to come along in 1901 and go into it – five years after I graduated from college. That was my beginning as a forester.

ERM: What were you doing in the interim?

RSK: Oh well, I graduated from college in 96', then I taught old country district school for thirty dollars a month and paid my college debts. I lived at home and rode my own pony five miles northwest all winter long to get to a little wooden schoolhouse and sweep it out and build a fire every morning.

ERM: Where was that?

RSK: Western Kansas. I did that for a year. Then I went back to college for two years, to take postgraduate work and had a teaching job in college. I saved a few dollars and also went to the University of Chicago, summer of '98. So I got my postgraduate degree at Manhattan in '99. Then my mother was so sick that I had to throw the college job and stay home for a year or two. So in February 1901 I signed up with the United States Division of Forestry – I was living in western Kansas – I borrowed fifty dollars to go to Washington and go to work for Uncle Sam at twenty-five dollars a month.

ERM: This was at the request of your friend, Will Hall?

RSK: Yes

ERM: Now Will was then in what position?

RSK: He had a title at that particular time of Superintendent of Tree Planting in the division of forestry.

ERM: Did you go to work for him?

RSK: Well, yes, I was under him. He was my immediate boss and Gifford Pinchot was on top. You see, the division of forestry didn't have very many people at that time.

ERM: What was the size of the department in which you were at that time?

RSK: I don't remember, but it was really very few and there's only very few indeed of us left of that era – it was very small.

ERM: Who were the members of that old fraternity?

RSK: Well, the only ones that are still active in forestry besides myself are Will Hall and Ralph Hosmer. They went in just before I did. There were some others that were in at that time – they dropped out, they didn't stay in forestry.

ERM: Now were you associated for a time with Dr. Carl Alwin Schenck?

RSK: Well, that was quite a while later. You see, the first thing that I did for Uncle Sam in 1901, I took a party into the field in western Nebraska, a field party. We all had horses and we had a good man to drive the team of mules, chuck wagon, and cook for us, and we made a survey of all that western Nebraska country, which led to the establishment of the Sand Hill Reserves, where there has been so much tree planning since them. That's what I did in forestry for my first season. I knew the western country. I rode my own cow pony two thousand miles in charge of that expedition that summer of 1901.

ERM: Who went with you on that one?

RSK: L.C. Miller had been in the division of forestry under Will Hall the summer before. The others were all new like myself. We had Hugh Baker who came in as student assistant right out of Michigan Agricultural College. Hugh went to Yale, then over and got his PhD degree in Germany. He went into teaching, and finally ended up as president of the University of Massachusetts. He was well known. There was Frank Miller, who had been an Iowa schoolteacher. He was older than most of the rest of us and he came in on the same twenty-five dollar a month basis and he finally

wound up as head of the forestry school at the University of Idaho. Then we had John Hatton who came from South Dakota and he had a long career in the United States Forest Service afterwards. We had a good, all around party. Very congenial, pleasant party and all bright young fellows that were very much intent upon what they were doing. A perfectly delightful party. Never had any fallings out, or anything of that kind. We had a good time all summer long and I think they did a good job. And Charlie Scott who had just graduated from Manhattan came in, as I say, to drive the mule team and be our cook. Charlie went into forestry and became the first superintendent of the Sand Hill Reserve. He started the tree-planting program there the next year or two after we made this survey. He later became state forester for Kansas, then he set up his own forest nursery, and he is retired now, living in Denver, Colorado. Charlie and I hope to get together out in the Sand Hill Reserves a year from this next June.

ERM: What would you say about the findings of your group and the results of the recommendations?

RSK: Well, our findings were that that sand hill country was suitable for growing timber. That was one of our findings. One other of our jobs was to find out how much of that country was still unreserved, Government land. It was still being grazed by the cattlemen, but a large part of the area was still unappropriated public land, so the President by proclamation could set it aside as a permanent reserve on which to plant timber. We did those two things. We studied the country and the vegetation and found out what would grow there, made our recommendations on that, and then went to the land offices and made a list of the unreserved public land – section by section. The following winter after that, President Roosevelt proclaimed the reserve. And then nurseries were set up and tree-planting began. That was the procedure.

ERM: All of that is part of the written record of the service, I imagine.

RSK: Oh, I think there is something on that. They held quite a good party out there a year or two ago to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary. Some affair there, I wasn't able to go to it, but I think there is a good record of it.

ERM: All right, now you on from that experience to other work in the service?

RSK: The next year, beginning in March of 1902, A.F. Potter, and old-time cattleman in Arizona and I were sent to Arizona to examine the various mountain ranges and groups of small mountains in that country and make recommendations as to whether forest reserves ought to be set up. That was my next job. Potter and I worked together. Being an Arizona man he knew the cattle and sheep business very well. He was a mighty valuable man on that. And Potter was Pinchot's big help in getting on better terms with the cattle men in the West later. We had a very interesting time. We went over all those southern Arizona mountains. Some of them we didn't recommend for forest reserves and some we did, but even the ones we didn't recommend were taken in afterwards. But this recommendation, you see, went to the Department of the Interior because the forest reserves, they called them at that time, were all under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior . The Department of Agriculture was given the task of examining and recommending further reserves, but had no power over them. It wasn't until the first of February, 1905, that the reserves were transferred to the Forest Reserves and were called National forests.

ERM: Your friend who went with you was a sheep and cattleman?

RSK: Yes, A.F. Potter, Albert Potter. He stayed in the Forest Service until he retired.

ERM: Well, of course, we always think, most of us, of sheep and cattlemen being the antagonists of people interested in forestry.

RSK: There was a long period in which sheep and cattle men had to get acquainted with what the Forest Service was trying to do and there was a good deal of antagonism for a long time, but that is pretty well worn out. You see, the sheep and cattlemen were used to grazing that country with complete freedom – it was public land. And anybody who went in there, if he could find a water hole, could set himself up a ranch and graze all over the public land without any charge whatever. And a lot of that land was included in the Forest Reserves. When the Government attempted to regulate that and set up some charge for grazing and prevent over-grazing, there was a great deal of opposition from the old time sheep and cattle men. Very great opposition. But that has been pretty well worn out because the old-time way completely ruined the range.

ERM: How did Mr. Potter happen to change his occupation from being a rancher to being a worker in the Forest Service?

RSK: Well, I guess Gifford Pinchot persuaded him. He had been a secretary to the Cattlemen's Association in Arizona, and was public-spirited man. Pinchot, you know, was a very engaging chap. He had pretty good powers of persuasion.

ERM: And this was?

RSK: 1902. This was 1902 this particular time.

ERM: Would you say that this was one of Pinchot's really significant accomplishments?

RSK: No question about it.

ERM: Bringing together of various groups?

RSK: Very much so. As I say, he had a very delightful, engaging personality.

ERM: And he brought people into the Forest Service from all different walks of life?

RSK: And got them enthusiastic. Kept them working. He got a great bunch of people together – mostly young fellows. You see, the fellows who went in as student assistants at twenty-five dollars a month were all picked college graduates. They knew about it and they applied and had to give a full statement of their qualifications and everything like that. This Nebraska party, for instance, Will Hall and I went over a stack of applications from these young college graduates who wanted to come in, and we picked out the ones we wanted. And they were given those appointments.

ERM: You had no schools of forestry at that time?

RSK: The only school of forestry at first was Cornell, then Yale. The Pinchots endowed Yale School of Forestry. Most of the student assistants later went to the school of forestry, mostly Yale, and took a Civil Service examination. And if they passed the Civil Service examination they were given an appointment, Civil Service appointment, as forest assistant. Started at a thousand dollars a year as a forest assistant back there in those days. Some of us didn't go to a school of forestry but we passed the *same* Civil Service examination.

ERM: It wasn't until about 1904 that you started to get and annual crop of forestry school graduates?

RSK: Yes, that's about what happened at that time. I took the Civil Service examination in the spring of 1905, after I had done four years of fieldwork for the service.

ERM: What about the Biltmore School – what contribution would you say it made?

RSK: Well, the Biltmore School made a big contribution. It was different from any of the others and some of the high-tone foresters were inclined to look down on it a good deal because it wasn't the classical type at all. Schenck organized it of course, down on the Biltmore Forest which he had charge of for George Vanderbilt near Asheville. And he organized that and it made a big contribution, no question at all. He took boys in without any education qualifications at all. A good many of them were sons of timberland owners, fellows like that. He took them in for two years. He gave them pretty stiff course of lectures. Schenck was highly gifted, a trained man himself, brilliant man. He gave them a course of lectures, invited other people to come in from the outside on various subjects – wood, preservation, etc., everything like that, then he took the boys on field trips. He operated right here in the Biltmore Forest. Had their own sawmill for instance. Gave them practice in sawing lumber and grading lumber which they didn't get at the other forestry schools. And then he took them on trips all over the United States and a trip to Europe. He gave them the experience that a lot of the other boys that went to the ordinary forestry school didn't get. And he turned out some mighty good men and he turned out the most devoted lot of graduates of any forest teacher in the United States. Schenck was a teacher. He was the most brilliant man I have known in the forestry field.

ERM: What would you say was the cause for the failure of the Biltmore School then?

RSK: Well, it didn't exactly fail. It just kind of tapered out. World War I came along you know – 1913 was about the last good year, as I recollect for the Biltmore Forest School. You see, Schenck was in this country for twenty years, very interested in this country and everything like that, but he never became an American citizen. He kept his reserve commission in German army and I've never quite forgiven him for that. So when World War I broke out he went back into German military service.

ERM: You think then that part of the antagonism that was felt toward him was partially because of his failure to accept American citizenship?

RSK: Well, I don't know whether that was it or not – some of us wished he had done it, taken American citizenship and cast his lot in with us and I think that after many years he came to that opinion himself and wished he had. But he was a pretty loyal German, you see, up to the time of World War I when he was called back in the service. And then, of course, after World War I was over, Schenck had quite a little investment in this country and lost it – well, he didn't quite lose it all. He lost everything he had in Germany – the period of German inflation after World War I, and he did have some investments over in this country he was able to save. Well, then when World War II came on after that, he lost over here because his insurance annuities were taken from him and he was never able to get them back. Schenck was cleaned out twice.

ERM: What would you have to say about Dr. Schenck's personality as a factor in...?

RSK: Well, his personality was the controlling thing because as I say he was a teacher and real teachers are mighty scarce. He was a real teacher. He'd work the hides off the boys every once in a while. He'd take them out through the woods, and he'd take his long legs and hike over hills and mountains 5-6 miles an hour – do it all day long – things like that, he'd make them sweat. And every boy down there at the Biltmore Forest had to have his own pony and take care of it. But he was an inspiration. You

never knew where he'd break out. He was very widely informed, as I said – he was brilliant.

ERM: Did he rub his contemporaries the wrong way often?

RSK: Well, I don't know that that was it. He was just so much different from them, for one thing. He was of the German military type. But all of us that had anything to with Schenck were very fond of him, indeed, because as I say, he was so different and enthusiastic.

ERM: He and Pinchot were friendly?

RSK: Pinchot got him that job in the first place and then they saw things differently finally. Schenck, in all his forestry teaching, was immensely practical. So he ran his own sawmill and taught his boys how to grade lumber, and they had the problem of selling it, everything of the kind. He gave the boys much more practical training in some aspects than they got in any other forestry school in the United States at that time. There's no question about that. It has also shown up since. But as I say, Schenck saw things from an entirely different viewpoint than Pinchot did. Schenck – one of Schenck's favorite sayings was that forestry is a question of transportation. If you don't have roads into your forests you can't protect your forests and you can't get your logs, pulpwood and other products and market them. That was one of his favorite aphorisms. Forestry was a question of transportation – he was darn right.

ERM: He also used to say that forestry is anything that happens in the woods.

RSK: He was likely to break out with any kind of statement.

ERM: That sort of thing...

RSK: That wasn't orthodox, but as I say, he'd likely break out in the midst of a lecture with any kind of a statement. Put people on their toes and make them think. That's what a good teacher does. For example, at a meeting in Cincinnati about 1905, I think it was, he was talking about the question of raising timber permanently – taxation, and things like that and he said the thing to do was to take a gun and shoot all the assessors.

ERM: In other words, he was considered rather intemperate in some of his remarks?

RSK: But as I say, he made people think. They remembered him.

ERM: Where would you say he and Pinchot came to the parting of way?

RSK: Well, I don't know the exact cause for that. I think it was primarily because they were such different temperaments and viewpoint. Schenck had the more practical one.

ERM: Fernow didn't see eye to eye either, although they both came out of the same background.

RSK: No, but I don't know of any particular difference. Fernow was very distinctly the Prussian military type. Fernow had quite a time because he was rubbing people the wrong way. Fernow made a tremendous contribution to this country, as far as that was concerned, in these very early days. The one book on forestry that I ever read that did me more good than any other single book was Fernow's Economics of Forestry, where he made it perfectly plain you didn't have forestry unless it paid its

way. And that is being abundantly proved nowadays. But it was a different thing fifty odd years ago.

ERM: Schenck, too, was a great exponent of that idea.

RSK: Oh, absolutely. They were both of them right in that respect. As I say, Fernow had the big faculty of not getting along well with people.

ERM: And Schenck, in a sense, also had the same difficulty only to a lesser degree?

RSK: Yes, but Schenck had personal devotion among his students that Fernow never had.

ERM: How did Schenck get along with contemporaries in the Society of American Foresters?

RSK: Well, I don't know whether I can say anything very special on that or not. A lot of us are friends and admirers of Schenck – but that thing never came up so much. As I say, Schenck didn't get along well with the orthodox teachers, of course.

ERM: I've heard some professional foresters say that Schenck was guilty of unethical practices in consultant work. Would you?

RSK: I don't think he was. I couldn't say specifically on that, but I never saw anything about Schenck that I thought was unethical.

ERM: Nothing was ever brought before the Society?

RSK: On, no, nothing of that kind.

ERM: In other words, perhaps some of these rumors that have existed spring out of the antagonisms of the war years that were felt toward everything German?

RSK: Probably some of that. Schenck came back here after World War I. I was instrumental, perhaps, as much as anybody in arranging a tour of lectures for Schenck to go around the various forestry schools and I published a report by him on Forest Utilization in Europe which gave him a few needed dollars.
Zon came along a little later and he made a great contribution. He wrote on more subjects than most anybody else.

ERM: Zon was another European, wasn't he?

RSK: Oh, yes. He was Russian.

ERM: When did he come to this country?

RSK: I've forgotten. I think he came into the service about 1904 – wouldn't be positive in that date – I thing that's about the time he came in. He was a well-educated Russian. He had a good many more or less radical notions which I guess he has smoothed out a little in his older days. Zon and I were always good friends and generally disagreed.

ERM: Do you still see each other occasionally?

RSK: I haven't seen him years now because he is retired – been a long time since I've seen him. No, as I say, it was more or less a joke between us – we like one another and disagreed on most things.

ERM: He was brought into the Forest Service?

RSK: Pinchot brought him in.

ERM: It would seem that a great many of the early people in forestry were European trained, then.

RSK: Well, because there were forestry schools in Europe and there weren't any in the United States.

ERM: What was Zon's special field?

RSK: Well, it's pretty hard to say. He worked in a lot of different fields. Quite an extent, more of less I should say, theoretical research and things like that. He wrote on a lot of subjects. He wrote on silviculture subjects, for instance. A wide variety of things. He made a pretty big contribution to the Forest Service. Not any question. He advocated the principle of government control which we disagreed with, which we fought to a standstill – things of that character.

ERM: When would you say that idea of government control first began to manifest itself? Thinking of the early forestry.

RSK: Well, I suppose probably Pinchot had it in the back of his head for a long time, but as I said last night, they didn't become so conspicuous 'til after Pinchot left the service. And we had a whole bunch of foresters then – with the exception of Greeley – that followed in Pinchot's steps and tried to put that one over.

ERM: McArdle?

RSK: They've soft-pedalled it now and McArdle isn't preaching that doctrine. His predecessors did. But McArdle has a faculty of getting along much better with people.

ERM: For a long time the Forest Service in early years seemed to be on very happy terms with the private owners...

RSK: Well, we did quite a lot to help the private owners, in the early days. We made tree-planting plans for them – things like that. People who wanted to plant out there in the prairie country – we gave a good deal of advice to such lumbermen as wanted to try to do something to their forests and maintain their supply. And then the big field in Forest Service in these days as propaganda. Built up sentiment for forestry. That was one of its big things. When I was in the Forest Service I think I went around and talked to more organizations that any other man in the service. And I wrote more bulletins that had a wider distribution than anybody else in the Forest Service for that particular period.

ERM: Well, when would you say that Pinchot became a real antagonist of the industry? Only after he lost command of the Forest Service?

RSK: Yes, I should say that that's approximately correct. And of course, Graves didn't help any, either. See, Graves was an old associate of Pinchot's; he followed Pinchot as a forester. And Graves was a perfect frost so as getting along with the lumbermen was concerned.

ERM: He didn't get along with them?

RSK: No, he didn't get along at all. The Forest Service didn't make any progress at all in cooperating with the timberland owners under Graves.

ERM: To get back to your work in the service, you last recounted going to Arizona.

RSK: Yes.

ERM: What followed after that?

RSK: Well, the summer of 1903 I had charge of a little field party in Western Kansas and as a result of that I wrote the first bulletin that Uncle Sam ever published for me, and that was Tree Planting in Western Kansas. We found out that the species that would grow best in that semi-arid country where they couldn't grow anything else. That bulletin was pretty widely distributed at that time. So far as I can tell the conclusions we reached then were sound.
In the summer of 1905 – no, 1904, I had a field party and made a similar study of tree planting in Illinois. And there are some very excellent examples of tree planting in Illinois. We went all over the state. We had transportation, of course, by horse and buggy in those days – same as we did in western Kansas. We had a very nice little party and we went from one end of the state to the other. There are a great many examples of early tree planting in Illinois and, of course, conditions for tree growing in Illinois were very much more favorable than they were in Western Kansas. And then we made some little study of natural timber in southern Illinois – where the southern species – yellow pine- came in southern Illinois, and one very notable grove of white pine in northern Illinois. Near Oregon, up toward the northwestern part of the state which has since been pit into a state park. We had the northern white pine in northern Illinois and the southern yellow pine in southern Illinois. And many species in between. As I say, it was all very favorable for planting a great many kinds of trees there in the Illinois prairie country. So my next bulletin was on tree planting in Illinois. Then – I'd been living out in western Kansas all that time – I moved to Washington the first of January, 1905. And I wrote my Illinois bulletin and studied on the side all I could and took the Civil Service examination in April, 1905, and I passed it and was appointed forest assistant, a thousand dollars a year, the first of July, 1905. And I was given the job of organizing the annual collection of the statistics of forest products, which we had never had, a brand new job. I was given that job. And so from the first of July, 1905, I traveled the United States north and south and east and west, Canada to some extent also, talking to lumber manufacturers, associations, visiting sawmills, and pulp and timber mills, and every other king of forest utilization plant and organizing the full system of collection of annual statistics of forest products. Did that in 1905 and right after the first of January, 1906, we sent out thousands and thousands of reporting cards to all these industries for a report of how much lumber and what species they had cut.

ERM: May I interrupt you? You say that 1905 was the year of the organization of the Forest Service?

RSK: Yes.

ERM: And it was also the year in which an American Forest Congress was held, was it not?

RSK: Yes.

ERM: Wasn't that the congress at which Teddy Roosevelt made his famous speech?

RSK: That was the congress that resulted immediately, that is by legislation, transferring the forest reserves to the Forest Service. And they were transferred on the first of February, 1905. And that is what the Forest Service recently celebrated though the

Bureau of Forestry wasn't transformed in name to the Forest Service until the first of July at the end of the fiscal year. The American Forest Congress was a landmark. It resulted in such overwhelming sentiment that the Congress had to pass the legislation transferring the national forests to the Department of Agriculture from the Department of the Interior. Roosevelt was a star speaker, also the Ambassador from France, J.J.Jusserand, and prominent lumbermen. The actual details of organizing the Congress were very largely carried out by Will Hall.

ERM: The Congress was called, I suppose, specifically for the purpose of mobilizing public opinion?

RSK: Absolutely. It was a real propaganda event. And it got results very quickly.

ERM: there have been tales told of Roosevelt throwing aside his prepared speech and giving an extemporaneous one.

RSK: Well, I guess he did. I heard it.

ERM: Well, do you recall the details of that?

RSK: Oh, no, I couldn't recall the details of it at all. As I say, the – it was completely one-sided. If there were any opponents to the transfer, they didn't get a chance to say anything.

ERM: The proceedings of that Congress are in printed form?

RSK: Yes, I believe so. I don't think I've got them, but I was there and I listened to them.

ERM: And the record of Roosevelt's speech, as recorded in those printed proceedings, seems to be at variance with the tales that are told of what he actually said in his speech.

RSK: Well, I don't remember at this late date what he actually said.

ERM: We are trying to establish whether or not the printed proceedings represent his true spoken remarks, or whether the tales that are told of his spoken remarks represent his true speech.

RSK: Well, I can't clear that up. I surmise what he said off-hand was what he basically thought, and probably what he had written out is what he wanted printed. That happens a good many times.

ERM: Would you mark that event as the beginning of the rupture between the industries and the Forest Service?

RSK: No. No, I don't think so at all.

ERM: There seems to have been a great deal of antagonism felt by some of the leaders in the industries who had been invited to sit on the platform that day.

RSK: I see.

ERM: I wondered if you people in the service had recognized it as being...?

RSK: No, I don't recollect that. There were prominent lumbermen on the program. No, I don't think that was the beginning of any trouble of that sort. Of course, it wasn't very long after that that Pinchot began to preach an impending forest famine. Said

the timber was going to be gone in forty years, or some such thing. That didn't set so well with the lumbermen. At that particular time he wasn't advocating too much the direct control of all private timberlands. He didn't advocate that so much until he was out of office.

ERM: Well now, you were making the rounds of the country in this year, 1905.

RSK: Yes, I talked to Lumbermen's Manufacturers' Association all over the United States.

ERM: And also to private individuals?

RSK: And they were all very strong for getting information on annual forest products. They helped me a lot. And the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association even paid a clerk to work in the office in Washington compiling data. We had the backing of all the lumber manufacturer's associations. We had their good will.

ERM: In other words, you encountered no feelings of antagonism toward the Service in that trip?

RSK: Oh no.

ERM: They were all for it?

RSK: They were all for what I was trying to do. Very much so.

ERM: Would you say that they were also favorably impressed with the service as a whole?

RSK: I should say so, at that time, thought the Service hadn't had a chance to make its mark yet, as early as 1905, with the industries in general. But there is no question but what the studies are doing, had a big effect, I think, in creating a favorable attitude among the timberland owners toward the Forest Service.

ERM: The statistics that you amassed as the result of this survey, did they become a regular part of your work?

RSK: That was the beginning and we have had annual statistics of forest products ever since.

ERM: Were the trade associations already at that task themselves?

RSK: They had some. Of course, the function of the trade association, the primary function of the trade association of every industry, is to get information about what is going on in its industry, so all the lumber manufacturer's associations had some information of their particular field. Northern Pine did. The Douglas fir manufacturers did. Yellow Pine people – they all had some information on their own field, but what we did was to get national information and for five years following that I was on the program of the National Lumbermen's Manufacturers' Association annual meeting to talk about the lumber cut in the United States. We got data on pulp and paper manufacture, upon the manufacture of cooperage, upon all the different forest products. We got help from all the organizations in those fields.

ERM: Was the lumber industry then looked upon as a sick industry?

RSK: No, not so much. Not so much right there at that time. It has had some harder times more lately than it was having in 1905. It had a great many ups and downs, but it didn't feel so bad in 1905. The yellow pine manufacturers' association in 1905 advanced their price five times – so they were feeling pretty good.

ERM: The over-production of lumber was not then a factor?

RSK: There wasn't so much. But the biggest cut of lumber in the United States was in 1910 – the maximum footage produced. But whatever is so-called overproduction or not, depended upon the general industrial situation in the country. What the demand was.

ERM: Well, I'm referring specifically to your talk now before the NMLA in 1915, in which you made a few remarks that I made some notes on last night…

RSK: The statistical work in 1905 was under my jurisdiction for five years. And we developed what we called the Office of Wood Utilization, in the Washington office, and I was chief of that office. And we had timber-testing stations at Yale, at the University of Washington, University of California and Purdue. And wood preservation sites and things like that. They all came under wood utilization.

ERM: Were these the forerunners of the experiment stations?

RSK: No, that was the forerunner of the forest products laboratory at Madison. In 1910 a cooperative deal was worked out with the University of Wisconsin and Forest Service established its first forest products laboratory at Madison, in a building built by the University. And then all the timber testing, wood preservation, wood utilization work, dry kilning, was concentrated in that laboratory, instead of where it had been scattered around before. And that laboratory was dedicated in 1910. It has grown on since to a tremendous institution – another building, and work greatly expanded. The University of Wisconsin was a very able and progressive institution – at that time under President Van Hise. Always has been a leading organization, the University of Wisconsin has, and we were very glad to work out that cooperative with them. The original laboratory was designed by my right hand man in my Office of Wood Utilization – an engineer named McGarvey Cline, who is retired and living in Jacksonville, Florida, now. He designed the original laboratory and was in charge of it. He did a fine job.

ERM: It has grown into one of the really great research organizations in the country.

RSK: Oh, yes. Sure it is.

ERM: And you consider that to be one of the significant accomplishments of the Forest Service?

RSK: No question about it. No question at all about that. As I say, I've known all those different lines of work. I wrote the annual report about lumber production for five years in the United States, and some of my assistants wrote some of the others. I've got some of these volumes right here now. Then the first of April, 1910, I resigned from the Forest Service and became the first secretary of the Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers' Association at Wausau, Wisconsin. I was there for five years. I resigned from that and became secretary of the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association in Chicago on January 1, 1915.

ERM: Can we go back just a little bit? To your departure from the Forest Service. You had been, of course, closely in contact with the industry during the years you were in the Forest Service, so that the transfer then from the Forest Service to the service of industry and trade association was a very easy step for you to take?

RSK: Oh, yes. I knew all the lumber manufacturer's association secretaries all over the United States. No, it was perfectly simple.

ERM: How did the offer come to you? To the Hemlock Association?

RSK: Well, a friend of mine heard – the Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers' of Wisconsin had just split off from the Northern Pine Association and decided to form their own organization. And a friend of mine told me about it and suggested that I look into it. Well, I had had enough if government service, so I dropped out. I was giving some lectures at Madison at that time and I ran up to Wausau and saw the President of the newly formed organization and talked with him and the result was that I resigned from Uncle Sam and went there.

ERM: You say you had enough of government service. You mean the opportunities were too limited or...?

RSK: Well, there's a good many things to be said about government. I always said I did two good things myself – I went into the service and I got out. It was a great educational experience being in government service at the time I was. But it wasn't anything permanent as far as I was concerned – there's a certain amount of deadening effect from public service – Civil Service is a great refuge for mediocrity – I think maybe you understand that.

ERM: And you felt that you had served your apprenticeship, if you please, and were ready to go into something...?

RSK: I wanted more freedom. I felt like a free man the day I got out of government service. But at that I had a good deal more freedom – we fellows in the Forest Service did in those days than they have ever had since. Everything was on the 'make' and we had pretty complete freedom. I had to travel all of the nation – I could go anywhere I thought best, anywhere in the United States, while I was in the Forest Service.

ERM: When you left, let's see, was Pinchot still...?

RSK: No, Pinchot was fired by Taft in January, 1910. Graves was appointed to succeed him and I went out the first of April, 1910.

ERM: Was your leaving the service in any way affected by these changes?

RSK: Well, possibly to some extent. I had had offers to leave the service before and didn't want to – offers from industries to leave the service – some years before. But I didn't want to, but by the time 1910 came around I had had enough. I was very glad to leave and do something else. You see, my last season's work in the service – 1909 – was in Alaska, and my final bulletin I wrote for the Forest Service was on the forests of Alaska.

ERM: Was there any considerable split within the Forest Service itself over the firing of Pinchot?

RSK: Well, I don't think it would be a split – all of them were very sorry to see him go, of course. But there wasn't any particular split.

ERM: Was there any group within the personnel of the service who saw the matter in a different light than Pinchot did at that time?

RSK: No, I don't think so. If they did, they were inconspicuous. They were entirely devoted to Pinchot.

ERM: How did you look upon it yourself at that time?

RSK: Well, I didn't see the other side so much as I did later. I saw some of the other side later, but at that time I thought Pinchot was right.

ERM: You had been in Alaska just previous to this?

RSK: Yes, I didn't have anything to do with the part of Alaska that Pinchot and Ballinger were involved in. They were talking about the coal down in the southern part of mainland Alaska. I was looking over the timber situation in southeastern Alaska and the whole length of the Yukon, back in the interior of Alaska. So what I was doing didn't come in contact with the sources of the row with Ballinger. But, of course, naturally at that time I think all of us lined up on Pinchot's side, as far as we had any information. But looking back to it, I see the thing in somewhat a different light.

ERM: Well, what would you say about the new light that you see it in now?

RSK: Well, looking back at it now, I think that it was rather unnecessary hullabaloo.

ERM: Because the coal lands have never been...?

RSK: Never been developed anyway.

ERM: What about the principles that were involved in the argument?

RSK: Well, of course, Pinchot was a great advocate for government ownership. You've got to bear that in mind. That was his particular prejudice, entirely in favor of government ownership of natural resources. And that is a debatable question yet.

ERM: Would you say there might be some validity in the idea that Pinchot's argument for government ownership was only intensified by his defeat in this particular instance?

RSK: There might be something to that, yes. I hadn't thought about it in that light, but that might be true. As I say, he was socialistically inclined in his theories, as to government ownership of all natural resources. As I say, that's – probably will always be a debatable question.

ERM: Do you think that springs in part from his training in European forestry where...?

RSK: Well, I don't know as it was, because they haven't had government ownership nearly as much in Europe as is generally, popularly supposed. There has always been a great deal of forestry in Europe that has been privately owned always. The ordinary man that you run across thinks it's all publicly controlled.

ERM: Well now, would you care to go on and tell us a little bit more about your work with the Northern Hemlock Association?

RSK: Well, it was a new organization and the first thing we had to do, of course, was develop adequate statistics all the way along the line, the kind that the Lumber Manufacturer's Association ought to get and that's what I did. Because I had been handling statistics on a national scale for the past five years I knew something about it. So we started that, and we started a good many other activities. I started an advertising campaign, for instance, for hemlock and northern hardwoods – things of that character. It was all new work – it was easy to get started in a new field, so I did a lot of things that have been carried on ever since.

ERM: An advertising campaign? Was that something comparatively new for the lumber industry at that time?

RSK: Yes, it was one of the newer things. Trade Associations were just getting started on it.

ERM: In other words, you might say you had a pioneering role in that field.

RSK: Well, somewhat, yes. I wasn't the first man to do it, but I wasn't the last one, either.

ERM: Who would you say among your members in the Northern Hemlock Association stands out in your memory as being a leader of outstanding...?

RSK: Well, I don't know, we didn't have any so very conspicuous along that line. We talked things all over and it was all done by practically unanimous consent. I think it's a good thing to do. I proposed it, I suppose, and got support for it.

ERM: Who were the leading members of your association in the years that you were there?

RSK: Well, the president when I went there was W.C. Landon of Wausau, president of a large lumber manufacturing firm which cut out and quit years ago. He was the president of it first, and then the next president was up in northern Michigan, named E.A. Hamer. They were the first two presidents when I was there, and then just before I left R.~~G~~.B. Goodman, of the old time Sawyer-Goodman Company in Marinette was president.

ERM: Mr. Goodman was sort of Henry Hardtner's opposite number in the north, wasn't he?

RSK: Something like that. He came to be more devoted to that idea after I left there. He was new in the lumber industry when I was there, but he made that his principal activity later and became very active in Wisconsin conservation efforts.

ERM: Would you sight any others as being pioneers of more progressive forestry methods among the industry?

RSK: No. No, there weren't – as I say, we went along more or less by getting unanimous consent. Things that I proposed were backed up and we went ahead in a minor sort of way. You don't do very much in association work unless you get nearly unanimous backing for it. A trade association executive doesn't go out and advocate anything if he isn't pretty sure his membership is going to back him up. He can't get away with it, as a matter of fact. But he can lead them – advocating things to make converts.

ERM: What particular accomplishments in that association would you point to as having led the way for the people?

RSK: Well, as I say, I put their statistical work on a sound basis, a wide variety of it. I got them started on some publicity, advertising, things along that line during those five years there. And it's been carried on in a bigger scale ever since.

ERM: Now you were with the association for how long?

RSK: Five years.

ERM: That brings us to 1915.

RSK: 1915, and I went to Chicago as secretary to National Lumber Manufacturer's Association for the next three years. Then I went to New York City as secretary of the Newsprint Service Bureau, manufacturers of newsprint all over North America.

ERM: All right, now would you tell us, Mr. Kellogg, of your experience with the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association?

RSK: Well, we organized the statistical work on a national basis much better than it was before. We set up a trade association department under Ernest Sterling, an old time forester friend of mine, in which we tried to promote extension of lumber use and through the publication of a good many bulletins helpful to lumber retailers in selling their product. The trade promotion effort was one of the biggest things we did. We participated in a good many hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission examiners because there was a big fight on at that time between the manufacturers of wooden boxes and the manufacturers of paper boxes. And the lumber manufacturers were trying to see that enough freight was charged for the paper containers so that the wooden box would have a chance. Of course, in the long run the paper box won out and a great many wooden box manufacturers went over to making paper boxes. But we spent a lot of time and effort on that particular thing, for instance.

ERM: How large a staff did you have?

RSK: I didn't have a very large staff. I don't know – half a dozen. Maybe. Something like that. We weren't very well financed. You see, the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association was a federation, with eight or ten regional associations, and they all paid dues at so much per thousand feet on their output. The rate was low and the budget wasn't very big, and the association really hadn't found itself in those days. The National Association was organized in 1902 and George K. Smith, who was secretary of the Yellow Pine Manufacturers' Association in St. Louis, was simultaneously made the secretary of the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association. He carried the whole thing on in his office in St. Louis. He was secretary of both, until about 1910. No, I guess it was 1908. And he retired and Leonard Bronson who was editor of the American Lumberman in Chicago was made secretary for two or three years and the office was separated and brought up to Chicago and set up by itself—the split-off from the Yellow Pine Association. The first time it ever had its own organization under its own roof, separate place. Bronson was secretary of it and then when I came back from Alaska in the fall of 1910, I stopped in Chicago and I saw Edward Hines, who was one of the big factors in the lumber association work, and he offered me the job of secretary of it, at that time. I was still in the Forestry Service. But he offered it to me for five thousand dollars a year, and I told him I wouldn't take it for less that seven thousand, five hundred, and we parted company. And then after Bronson had passed out, J.E. Rhodes came in. he had been former secretary of the Northern Pines Manufacturers Association in Minneapolis, Frederick Weyerhaeuser's private secretary. He was a top-notch man. He took over the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association and he kept it until the first of January, 1915, when he went to the newly formed Southern Pine Manufacturers Association. And I came from Northern Hemlock to take his place as secretary of National Lumber. We made that shift. It was all agreeable between ourselves. Both Rhodes and I were considered by the Southern Pine Association and it turned out that he went there and I came with the job on the National. It was all a family affair. And that's the way it worked out. But the National didn't accomplish a great deal during the three years I was there. They had a good deal of dissension in National, on way or other, inside. And there was a very strong movement on to move the headquarters to Washington and get the political atmosphere to which I wasn't particularly sympathetic. I never enjoyed political activities. But finally the result was

that I resigned from the National. I had a very nice offer to go to New York and I went and was very much happier.

ERM: You went to the Newsprint Bureau?

RSK: Newsprint Service Bureau which was a new organization of newsprint manufacturers covering North America. So I had the benefits of starting a new organization, breaking new ground there, the same as I had in Northern Hemlock and Hardwood. I stayed with them thirty-two years.

ERM: Your first year now with the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association was 1915?

RSK: 1915. The first of January, 1915.

ERM: That was the year in which you made this presentation to the NMLA at its annual meeting?

RSK: Yes, and made the same talks with various regional organizations, too. But I put that in the proceedings of that annual meeting at San Francisco, May, 1915.

ERM: I have one or two questions in regard to that talk. On page 172 you make some statements to this effect, that a new generation of lumbermen would have to succeed to positions of power before a great many of the troubles of the industry could be cured.

RSK: I think that was a very good prophecy. Looking back, we can see that happened.

ERM: And the leadership of the industry has had to come into new hands....

RSK: Into younger hands—better educated—wider visions—and more resources behind them. I think that was a good prophesy; I forgot that I said that.

ERM: You also said in that talk that lumbering had never been efficient. Would you care to comment on the history of industry's endeavors to improve its efficiency during your career?

RSK: Well, I should say this, that the efficiency in the utilization of timber has been directly proportional to the value of the product. You don't save anything unless it pays to do it. Isn't that the history of industry generally? Back in the early days of lumbering you could only market the best grades of lumber, and the best species of lumber. And a good many times you didn't make any money doing that. There wasn't any market for by-products of that character. Well, now as time has gone on and the demand has increased and original supply isn't so large, the prices have gone up. And just as fast as the prices go up you have a way to market. You can utilize your by-products. We're getting a lot of stuff today that goes into pulpwood for instance. It was totally lost before. Used to be the case in the big timber – the Douglas fir regions of the Pacific Coast, for instance, west of the Cascades where the stuff that was left on the ground after logging took place for lumber, was a good deal bigger in volume than they ever grew on the ground in the eastern forests. Any amount of cases of that kind. It isn't so today. They've got a market for stuff. They've got a market for the edgings and trimmings at the sawmill and the burner is going out of existence. They got a market for the smaller stuff that's in the woods, going into pulpwood. Everything is right there. All depends upon the price of the product. If you can't make any money saving it, you waste it. That's the key to the whole situation.

ERM: And part of that has been brought by research, part of it by enlightened new management.

RSK: Yes, and part of it by increasing the price of timber.

ERM: Which factor would you consider the more important, the increasing price of timber or...?

RSK: That's basic, yes. Timber is up to the point now where it pays to grow it. Therefore we aren't going to have a timber famine. We are going to always have timber while it pays to grow it. We've got plenty of acreage to grow it on in the United States.

ERM: Who would you consider the pioneers in the field of sustained yield ideas, the tree-farming idea?

RSK: Well, the pioneers in forestry were the pulp and paper industry. Because they used smaller size timber. Doesn't take so many years to grow what they need. So the pioneers in real forestry operations in the United States were pulp and paper companies in New York and New England.

ERM: Which of these would you single out as the people who led the way?

RSK: Well, there's the Great Northern Paper Company in Maine, and the Finch-Pruyn Company in the Adirondacks in New York.

ERM: What individuals in those companies would you single out?

RSK: Well, I wouldn't single out any particular individual – it was a general company policy. They employed foresters very early. Austin Carey, for instance, did some of his earliest work for Great Northern.

ERM: In other words, you go back to Carey as being the person who perhaps sold the idea within these companies?

RSK: Well, I don't know whether he sold the idea, or whether it was the general owners of the industry who saw the need for it, but he was one of the people who went to work on it.

ERM: In your 1915 talk you also said that forestry is practicable only as it pays its way. What credit do you think Dr. Schenck deserves for preaching this idea?

RSK: He deserves a great deal of credit. No question about it.

ERM: Was he the first exponent of the idea?

RSK: No, Fernow was one of them.

ERM: Before Schenck?

RSK: Before Schenck. But Schenck was spectacular. He got attention just because of the kind of man he was.

ERM: He had a Wagnerian touch to him that Fernow didn't.

RSK: Yes, he talked to lumber manufacturers' associations, all kinds of organizations, and he made himself heard. He was a popular speaker. Particularly when he said that the way to solve the taxation problem was to shoot all the assessors.

ERM: You've read all Schenck's memoirs, haven't you?

RSK: Sure.

ERM: Do you think that Schenck himself takes too much credit for being the originator of the idea?

RSK: Oh, I don't know as he does, I didn't get that impression. I haven't read the book; I've read the manuscript, while Butler was editing it. He sent it down to me and I corrected some minor statements. I don't know as Schenck takes too much credit for himself. I'm not inclined to think he did. He wasn't the originator but he was the propagandist in that respect. You can't pin it down to say who originated a lot of these things. A great many things were in the air and sometimes they crystallized. As I said, one of our pioneer advocates of protecting forests in the United States was Benjamin Franklin, but nobody paid any attention to him.

ERM: In setting up his planting?

RSK: Yes, it's about growing timber. He was one of the greatest minds this country's ever produced. He and Thomas Jefferson.

ERM: In 1915, I believe you felt very definitely that the industry was doing a poor job of selling its product. Would you comment on why that was the case and when did the change take place?

RSK: Well, it was beginning to take place at that time. You see, the lumber industry was beginning to find, through the competition of competing building materials that if they didn't get up and make some effort to sell their products—educate the possible consuming trade, they would lose a good deal more market than they had. They were forced to do it.

ERM: You strongly emphasize in your talk to the association in 1915 a totally new and more dynamic approach to sales.

RSK: Why, sure!

ERM: What evidences did you see following in the wake of that talk?

RSK: Well, I don't know as that talk of mine had anything to do with it or not. I'm not claiming any such thing as that, but I was summing up the way the situation looked at that time and the things the industry needed to do in its merchandizing problems, and a good deal of it's being done. I advocate in there, for instance, grade marking and trademarking the product. That has gone a long ways since. So if the good product can be identified, then the consumer knows what to ask for when he wants another one. The industry got behind its product, putting out a guaranteed product. I didn't originate those ideas. Maybe I put them the way some people paid attention to them.

ERM: Well, I seem to recall that Weyerhaeuser Sales Company came into existence the year following that, 1916.

RSK: I have forgotten the date. I know they came into existence under the direction of a good old friend of mine and they've done a 'cracker-jack job' ever since.

ERM: Now, I also seem to recall that some of the better merchandizing of lumber began then too, with the Red River Valley, Red River Lumber Company, Paul Bunyan...

RSK: Yes, and in the South the Southern Pine took the lead, the Southern Pine Association under J.E. Rhodes. That's one of the first jobs that they undertook down there. They've done a good job ever since. And then the West Coast Lumbermen's Association came on, and the Western Pine Association, and others.

ERM: Do you think the industry has continued to do a good job promoting its own product?

RSK: It's done a good deal better job than it used to. I don't know that it has done as much as it might, but it has done a good deal better job. We began some work in the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association cooperating with architects on specifications, building specifications and building codes. That's gone a long way since and, of course, the National Lumber has set up its own testing laboratory. Done a good job of that character, so it's become, I think, a recognized source of reliable information about the use if it's material. The Portland Cement Association did a good job before the lumber industry did. That's probably one thing that stirred the lumber industry.

ERM: Why do you suppose it is so many lumbermen live in brick houses?

RSK: No, no wise lumberman claims that lumber us the universal material for everything and everywhere. It's all got its uses. I have a cement block house, but there is a lot of lumber in here if you'll look around. There's cypress, there's good spruce, and there's good yellow pine. It's all used in the proper place.

ERM: The substitute materials though, have been making great inroads on the market.

RSK: Tremendous. But lumber couldn't hope to supply every kind of building material forever and the wise lumberman won't advocate the use of lumber where it isn't at least as good as any other material. It's very foolish merchandizing to advocate the use of your product where it won't be satisfactory. You won't establish a permanent market that way.

ERM: Well, there seems to be considerable debate right now as the whether or not other substitutes – substitutes for lumber aren't being stresses in the big school building program that is underway and that lumber is being bypassed where it could be used more economically than other products.

RSK: Well, I don't think that you could ever get lumber to be the universal material for building big school buildings. I think other materials are much better for such uses. You have lots of lumber used anyway for your interior trim, everything of the character. There are more important building materials than lumber, for a great many purposes.

ERM: Yet the oldest buildings we have in America are made of wood, aren't they?

RSK: Yes, but America isn't very old, you've got to remember. America is a young country. My old house in Connecticut, for instance, was built in 1724—entirely of lumber, of course. Good house today.

ERM: Now what point that you made in your talk in 1915 had to do with the establishment of honest grades…

RSK: That's very important.

ERM: What would you say about the establishment of that principle and the history of the idea as it is developed up to the present day?

RSK: Well, that was the first job that the various lumber manufacturers' associations undertook, was to develop suitable grades for their materials. That was a pioneer work. They decided upon grading rules. They published them. They appointed association inspectors to go around and inspect the lumber being produced at the various mills and to instruct the graders at the mills how to apply those grades. Now that was the first great big and most highly important undertaking of the lumber manufacturers in the United States, establishing grades. And some finally got down to the point as I suggested there in 1915, of grading and marking every stick of lumber they put out. And that meant that you were getting a reliable product. If you don't have a reliable product you can't go very far in permanent merchandizing. As I say, that was the biggest thin the lumber manufacturers ever did.

ERM: This wasn't very popular with everyone in the industry in the beginning?

RSK: No, it was an educational process.

ERM: From what quarters did the opposition chiefly come?

RSK: Well, I don't know. I don't want to say anything, but some of it might possibly have come from the jobbers and dealers. They wanted to get stuff as cheap as they could and work it off on unsuspecting customers, in some cases.

ERM: What about within the manufacturing group itself? Were there any sections in the country which seemed to oppose the idea more than others?

RSK: No, I don't think they opposed, but the pioneer in establishing grades was the White Pine Manufacturers' Association in northern Wisconsin and Minnesota. They were the pioneers in getting somewhere with grades.

ERM: In other words, your hemlock and white pine industry was…

RSK: Particularly white pine. And the others followed suit.

ERM: Today that problem no longer exists really.

RSK: Oh, they universally recognize now the necessity for the grades.

ERM: What about the lumber and paper industry's recognition of the value of advertising their products? Would you say they have come into a greater understanding of the use of this means of public education?

RSK: Oh yes, there is no question about that. There's been organized association advertising in various of the lumber fields. There hasn't been and there can't be in the paper industry – you've got such tremendous diversity – they have paper producers that no organization of paper manufacturers can be successful advertiser of. There's a lot of big advertisers of individual companies making specific grades. In the paper industry the problems are somewhat different than in the lumber industry. And, of course, we've got a lot of outstanding lumber firms that do individual advertising, in addition to organization advertising.

ERM: Advertising of lumber is quite a different proposition from advertising of paper, of course.

RSK: Oh, yes.

ERM: How would you compare the advertisement for lumber as compared with the advertisement for aluminum or steel?

RSK: Well, the advertising for those products – steel, aluminum, concrete products and things like that – there has been, I should say, more extensive and consistent than lumber advertising. I mentioned that in 1915 and I think that's still true.

ERM: In other words, the lumber industry still has a lot to learn about advertising its products.

RSK: Yes, no question about that.

ERM: Would you say that they are not keeping pace with some of these substitute materials?

RSK: Well, possibly not. But they are doing pretty fair, but these other products, of course, have expanded their markers tremendously by research and advertising. You can go further with research on some of those products, I think, than you can go with lumber. You can go an indefinite distance when you come to cellulose, which is made from wood, but lumber is different. Nobody can set any limits as to the uses of cellulose and paper. They are expanding, yes. Now we reached our greatest per capita lumber consumption in 1910 – we are using only about half as many board feet per capita now as we did in 1910. But the per capita use of paper is still going up. Paper has gone into so many different fields, as we've developed so many different kinds of paper. Gone into one field after another we never suspected could go. Once upon a time you'd never thought, for instance that all cement would be put up in paper bags – the paper bag field has gone completely out of sight. You've got water proof paper products – everything of the kind nowadays. That you would think wouldn't happen at all. As I say, the paper field is expanding right along.

ERM: What about the per capita use of paper?

RSK: Well, as I say, it is higher than it has ever been before. I cease predicting.

ERM: On page 183 of the Proceedings, under point nine, you suggest a need for regulatory legislation and public education to provide regulated output of forest products which will be absorbed at remunerative prices and so forth.

RSK: I take that back. That was a poor idea. I was rash enough to say once upon a time at a public meeting later than that, that I thought perhaps the lumber industry ought to cure its ills by being regulated as a public utility. But I'll take that back, that was a poor notion.

ERM: Your thinking has changed about completely in that area?

RSK: Some of those things. I have seen too much public regulation.

ERM: Has government regulation served to any of the ills of the forest product industry?

RSK: I can't see that it has at all.

ERM: None of the early legislation of a regulatory nature was…

RSK: No, the lumber industry wasn't regulated. There were efforts to get it regulated. The manufacturers even went so far as to have hearings before the Federal Trade Commission, asking for some kind of regulation back there in the 1915 to '18 period. They didn't get, and I'm glad they didn't.

ERM: What would you have to say about the New Deal, NRA period?

RSK: Well, the thing that saved Franklin Roosevelt's reputation more than anything else was the declaring of that unconstitutional by the Supreme Court – because it was heading for a glorious fizzle. It was a very big mistake, that notion was. I was secretary of the newsprint Code Authority, I know a good deal about that period. Of course, the lumber industry gained through it some because they did set up some codes of practice in regard to the handling of timber lands. And they've carried out some of those ideas since, so the lumber industry in that respect got some good out of it. Paper industry got no good out of it. But as I say, NRA was on the way to being a glorious fizzle. It couldn't be enforced. And they saved Roosevelt's reputation by throwing it out. All NRA ever did for the paper industry was to increase its manufacturing costs. I submitted a good many papers to the NRA in those days harping on that subject. The NRA was based on the theory the way to bring back prosperity to this country was to increase consuming power and you increase consuming power theoretically by increasing wages. Well, you can see what that did to production costs. That was the basic fallacy – the wrong end to.

ERM: It didn't work at all, in your estimation then?

RSK: No, and it was fading away. They couldn't enforce it. It was all mighty lucky for everybody that the Supreme Court threw it out. Because one of the basic theories of the NRA was to control production through the prevention of building more plants. We even went before the Reconstruction Finance Commission and protested against reconstruction finance loans to build new paper mills. Stopping of enterprise, holding down production. That's what that meant. That isn't the way of progress. One of the best labor leaders we had in the paper industry told me on the side that NRA instead of elevating things was going to bring everybody down to a common level. He was a pretty wise labor leader.

ERM: Who was that?

RSK: Oh, his name was Matt Burns, he was head of one of the organizations of workers in the paper industry, he's passed out (on) now, but he was one of the most level-headed fellows we ever had. And I will always remember that remark from all the years in Washington.

ERM: What would you have to say about the history of labor-management relations in the paper industry?

RSK: They've been excellent. Ever since there was a very foolish strike about 1920 or '21 in the paper industry relations have been splendid. It had good leadership. Leaders that the paper manufacturers respected and there has been no labor trouble since then, except one or two sporadic cases, but in general, none.

ERM: Not comparable to the history of labor-management relations in the lumber industry?

RSK: No, so very much better. As I say, they've had intelligent leadership in the paper industry – people that I have had very high regard for.

ERM: Who among those labor leaders in the paper industry would you single out?

RSK: Well, one of the outstanding ones that came in after the strike in about 1921 was Matt Burns. I just quoted. He was head of the paper makers. And he carried on – retired a few years ago. I had a very high personal regard for him. And another fellow – there were two organizations of the paper industry, one of the paper makers and the other was the pulp and sulphite group, which took in also the common laborers, under the head of John Burke at Fort Edward, New York. And John Burke is

on the job yet. I knew him back in 1918 when he was head of that union, and he's done a splendid job. Right straight through.

ERM: Would you suggest that a man like Burke, who might very well represent the labor group in a project such as the Foundation's…

RSK: I think he would be an excellent man for you to talk with, very excellent man. I'd recommend him to you without any hesitation.

ERM: His home now is where?

RSK: At Fort Edward, New York. And he's been head of that union since 1918 – I think he came in a little before. You can use my name if you want to introduce yourself.

ERM: Who else would you suggest?

RSK: Well, I've forgotten the name of the paper makers union now, but John can tell you. But he has had that consistent record for thirty-seven or eight years. Good leadership. As I say, he is respected by the manufacturers in the industry.

ERM: What group are they affiliated with?

RSK: AF of L

ERM: Do you know any responsible labor leaders in the lumber industry?

RSK: No, I haven't had anything to do with them – of course they have more radical leadership, too. They've had their western troubles. I don't know those fellows. But if you have good labor leadership you don't have so much trouble. The leaders in the labor organizations of the paper field have been well informed right along on what the conditions of the industry were and what the industry could stand, and what is good for it.

ERM: Mr. Kellogg, will you now tell us a little something about the problems of the trade association executives at the time that you became active in that field?

RSK: The first problem was to get more membership. The Trade Association secretary, according to my observation, very largely had to make his own job. He had to plan what he thought the Association ought to do – he had to sell the idea to the Board of directors, the Executive committee or whatever it was, the membership at large, and he had to persuade people who were outside the fold to join the Association. As I say, the Trade Association secretary, at least in the old days, very largely had to make his own job. And he was a pretty independent citizen too, as far as that was concerned. You couldn't do anything very successfully unless you had practically the unanimous approval of the membership. It wasn't any use to go out and fight for something that was unpopular because you wouldn't put it over. So he had to be pretty careful in choosing things that everybody would stand for. Being a Trade Association executive I've always thought was a very interesting profession. And it's developed pretty largely into a profession because we've set certain standards for it. We formed a national organization of Trade Association executive sin 1920 and I am one of the charter members of it. It's made its mark. It's been, as I say, an interesting profession without any question, particularly due to the fact the Trade Association executive meets the top men in industry, in every firm of the industry, on a pretty fairly even basis. He associates with the best there are in that respect among those businessmen. You learn a lot. Sometimes you may teach them some things.

ERM: What would you say the attitude of the industry was toward trade associations at the time you entered the field?

RSK: Well, the best and will-informed people were for it, of course, 'cause they formed the organizations. But you had to get a lot more. You to get a lot more people to join it so as the give the Association a bigger scope, bigger resources, more opportunities. You always had a few – you wouldn't have a Trade Association to start with if there hadn't been a few leaders in business that saw the necessity for it. And then they called in a professional man – or made a professional man to take it over. The Trade Association executive should ordinarily not have had any connection at all with any particular firm in the industry. Here's a statement of my idea of the legitimate functions of a trade association made in 1918 and one of the Federal Trade Commissioners told me once upon a time it is worth its weight in gold. Now if you want anything take that, and I won't have to repeat it.

ERM: Did you say that a Trade Association executive should not have had any previous…?

RSK: He shouldn't have been a sales manager for a particular firm in the Association, for example. I know of cases where they got in very bad having that type of man come in.

ERM: Why do you say that, because it's hard for a man to divorce himself from old loyalties?

RSK: Well, that's partly it, and especially because the problems are so much different. It needs a fellow who's had no personal interest at stake at all. He must have an impartial viewpoint.

ERM: He can only serve the industry best if he can render a critical judgment?

RSK: Oh yes. But as I say, that is the basic principle of the Trade Association management right there, which I said in 1918 and I've never taken back a word of it.

ERM: Well, how would you feel about the Trade Association recruiting men from within the industry, as has been the case in recent years?

RSK: Well, once in a while it's turned out all right, but basically I think it's a better idea to go outside. The man who has an entirely impartial viewpoint, he hasn't any friends of particular kinds or any enemies inside.

ERM: You were saying that the Trade Association goes back to the 1860's and one of the first was in the paper field.

RSK: Yes.

ERM: Well, how long did the Trade Association exist for the purpose of fixing price alone?

RSK: Well, I can't say that exactly, but I should say that was the main purpose behind them to the time of the Sherman Act. And of course you know the Sherman Act wasn't applied very much for quite a long time after it was passed. Far as I was personally concerned when in trade association work, I was very glad we had a Sherman Act. There were always a great many people, still are, in industry who think the Sherman Act ought to be pretty radically changed. I never endorsed that idea. I never thought it was anywhere near proper for a group of manufacturers to control the distribution of their product. To control the amount of production, to control the price. I never believed in it. I think it'd throttle down industry, throttle down progress, and I was very glad that there was legal backing, that those things

shouldn't be done in any organization that I had anything to do with. Because as I said a minute ago, the agreements to do those things never stood up in practice, they didn't work.

ERM: Do you see any danger of there becoming a tendency toward monopoly in that field?

RSK: Which industry, forest industry? No, I don't see and danger whatever, to wide spread, too diversified. There are bigger organizations, individual organizations, but there's no chance for monopoly in that field.

ERM: Now what about your problem of getting additional support for the NLMA back in 1915?

RSK: Well, you've got to remember that the NLMA was a federation of regional associations. Didn't have individual manufacturers, and once in a great while we were able to get another organization lined up. But when I went with the Newsprint Service Bureau in New York City in 1918, it was the problem of getting individual manufacturers all over North America. And I was pretty successful. I think it's more satisfactory from the Trade Association executive's standpoint perhaps, to work with individual membership than it is with groups. Particularly if the group is contributing to the over-all organization, because groups are pretty jealous of their own money. They like to have it for their own purposes rather than passing it on to another organization. But the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association in years has been successful as a federation. And the American Paper and Pulp Association is successful as a federation.

ERM: Would you say the national association has eclipsed the regional associations in importance?

RSK: Well, certain problems the national associations have handled that the regional can't so well, so far as representation in Washington is concerned and federal legislation. That's where the national associations have their strongest fields, perhaps.

ERM: Well, has the tendency toward the aggrandizement of the national government in Washington also had its similar effect in the trade association field?

RSK: Yes, it has to some extent. Most every organization has felt in recent years it has to have some direct contact with Washington. That's the reason they have made many of their headquarters there. That's the reason they moved the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association to Washington not very long after I resigned. I wasn't in favor of that move myself.

ERM: Has the industry support of the national organization increased at a greater rate than if has before the regional group?

RSK: No, I think they have gone along together. The regional groups have built themselves up very much stronger, and then they recognize more the need of the national organization to handle problems that the individual can't handle. They've come along pretty well, the two together. But it took quite a long time to get to that point. It took pretty near fifteen years after the national was first formed to get to that good basis.

ERM: That came along under Wilson Compton?

RSK: Yes, that came along under Wilson Compton. Wilson Compton went in there from the Federal Trade Commission.
There's one field now that Will Hall is working on out there in Arkansas. I don't know

whether he is going to get it finished or not, and that's more or less the history of the Weeks Act, which was passed in 1910, which provided for the purchase by the national government – it was exercised in the East mostly – of forested areas on the watersheds of navigable streams and putting then into national forests. Will Hall had a good deal to do with the passage of that act and he was pit in charge of the administration of it afterwards, and they built up the national forests in the White Mountains and other places in the East upon the basis of protecting watersheds of navigable streams. That's where Congress got into it, on the navigable stream side, you see. And Will this last two years has been writing that history up. But he hadn't made very rapid progress on it, and I don't know just where he'd gotten to by now. But that is a very interesting development that ought to be properly documented.

ERM: And has not had much written on it up to now?

RSK: No, a great many people don't realize the significance of it. But as I say, he had a great deal to do with it. He deserves a great deal of credit for it.

ERM: As for the history of leading individuals in the field – do you feel we need some good biographies?

RSK: There's been a very voluminous biography published about Dr. Fernow, but it isn't a very good job. The fellow that did that, I think, was overwhelmed by his material and kind of lost track of things as he went along. It's a big volume. Lots of extraneous stuff in it. There hasn't been a biography of Pinchot, as far as I know. There is Pinchot's own autobiography which is entirely one-sided and inadequate. There's been no biography, as far as I know, on Dr. Rothrock, our old Pennsylvania pioneer who deserves very great credit. Another man who did a good deal of work in New York State was Colonel Fox – he passed out (on) a long time ago. There hasn't been any adequate biographical mention, I think, of our pioneers in forestry work.

ERM: Is that a project that the Society of American Foresters would undertake, do you believe?

RSK: I doubt the Society of American Foresters would do it. They haven't the money to do it with, and I doubt if they would. They've done some things. They brought out a thing here four or five years ago…. That's pretty good, but of course that isn't a biography of any individual. I don't think they could do what you are talking about.

ERM: Hosmer, you say, might be interested in writing.

RSK: He might. As I say, he likes to do historical writing more that anybody else does and he does a very accurate job of it. As I gave you that history of the National Forestry Program Committee that he wrote in 1947.

ERM: There ought to be a whole series, don't you think, of sketches by the people who worked with and knew Pinchot. For example, I think it would be of value to have a personal impression of your recollections of work with him.

RSK: I'll never write it.

ERM: You won't?

RSK: No, too lazy. I don't write unless I'm compelled to. And I don't do that much anymore since I can't call a secretary in to dictate. I don't write speeches. I make a good many, but I don't write speeches.
I came into a new field when I went with the newsprint paper manufacturers, a new

organization. It had an organization for three years before that, and Uncle Sam buckled that up on the usual Sherman Act charges and dissolved it.

ERM: What was that?

RSK: It was called Newsprint Manufacturers' Association.

ERM: Who organized it?

RSK: Frank Steeler, a former Wisconsin man, went to New York and organized it. And after three years Uncle Sam busted them up on Sherman Act charges. And then that had to be dissolved. They formed a new organization. Organization articles written by a very competent attorney, and they asked me if I would take the job of running it. And I took it. So I started in with a perfectly clean slate – being under permanent injunction no to do things I didn't want to do. So I came in under fortunate circumstances, a complete outsider – no acquaintance in the industry. I knew the forest industry so I had a beautiful chance. I organized the statistical work – I put in technical service, put in general information service, etc.... Started cost keeping and engineering efficiency reports for operation of paper machines – lots of things. I had a beautiful opportunity there and it went fine. It was, as I said, strictly international. United States, Canada - we had a member in Mexico. I exchanged information with other organizations elsewhere in the world. I organized the annual collection of statistics of world newsprint output, beginning in 1924. It's been carried on to this day. Pretty near everything that I started has been carried on since. Monthly bulletin, monthly statistical reports, all sorts of things. As I say, particularly reports about operating efficiently *(sic)* of paper machines. Strictly engineering technical reports. We introduced a cost system- cost keeping system for the benefit of paper manufacturers. We did a lot of different things like that, all constructive work. It was a good field. We had a lot of fun at it.

ERM: How many members did you have?

RSK: Didn't have so many members because the newsprint paper manufacturers were big fellows and there weren't very many members. I had, oh, I guess maybe thirty. I've forgotten the exact number. Pretty small group but they produced the entire output in North America.

ERM: No such thing as a small newsprint manufacturer?

RSK: Not any more. I didn't have the one hundred percent membership in North America, but I had a hundred percent of the industry reporting their production figures to me. I established a hundred percent about 1922 or '23 – all of them reporting their production figures to me, production shipments and stocks, whether they were members or not. And that record has been maintained to this day. We had the best statistical record of any industry in North America, I think.

ERM: What can you tell us about the history of production in newsprint? As between Canada and the United States.

RSK: Well, you see, all the newsprint used in the United States was produced in the United States, practically speaking up to about 1912. Then the duty was taken off the newsprint and the industry began to grow in Canada. Newsprint is the only kind of paper ever made in the United States that doesn't have protective duty. And it had that up until 1912. Soon as that duty was taken off American capital began to go to Canada and the Canadian industry began to develop, too. United States produced more newsprint than Canada up to and including the year 1926. Since then Canada has produced more than the United States and it will forever after, on newsprint. But

the newsprint industry is coming back in the United States and about two years from now, the way things are going, we will be producing as much again in the United States as we did in 1926. And from then on we will probably produce more. It's all based upon the perfectly tremendous increase in newsprint consumption. It's gone far beyond what anybody dreamed it would go thirty years ago. Same as the consumption of a lot of other things has gone clear beyond expectations.

ERM: Do you think that the manufacture of newsprint from southern pine will make a very considerable…

RSK: It's a permanent factor. It will supply, eventually supply the southern newspapers very largely. There's a good deal of paper from the North and even Newfoundland coming into the South yet, but eventually the South may pretty nearly meet its needs, on newsprint.

ERM: But at the same time the demand will be so much in other areas that…

RSK: Yes, that will increase too. The South has been the big field for newsprint development because the South is just now pretty well recovered from the effects of the Civil War. The South was set back about three generations by the Civil War. We've had a very high percentage of illiteracy in the South, which is rapidly being overcome, and we're getting bigger urban populations. I made various studies beginning in 1920 on the relationship between newsprint consumption and urban population and literacy. I drew a lot of parallels like that for the various states – some of which are in that book that I gave you. It's very obvious that as your urban population increases, and your literacy increases, the consumption of newsprint will increase. Perfectly obvious, and I put a lot of figures in along that line.

ERM: And as the literacy increases, the productivity of the area increases, the standard of living raises, and the use of other kinds of paper increases.

RSK: Use of everything increases. No, it's been a very interesting period. I was secretary of the Newsprint Service Bureau for thirty-two years, before I resigned five years ago. And the boy that's carrying it on now I trained.

ERM: Could we go back to talking a little bit about the Forest Service? You watched the development of the Forest Service since you've left it, of course, and seen a succession of leaders in it. Could you tell us a little bit about some of them? You know Bill Greeley, of course.

RSK: Yes, he was an outstanding man. And we haven't had any since. Probably McArdle, who is in now, is the best man we've had since Greeley's time. We've had some that weren't much in between.

ERM: Greeley's leadership was of tremendous importance to this.

RSK: It was because he was the one to cooperate with the lumber industry and the timberland owners and the whole thing made great progress under Greeley. As I said, if it hadn't been for Greeley's leadership at the time that I had the National Forestry Program committee we wouldn't have got the Clarke-McNary law when we did and got the principle of cooperation instead of compulsion clearly established.

ERM: Has Greeley been considered a sort of renegade to the Pinchot-vian idea because of that, by some of the…

RSK: Some of the 'lily-whites' probably did. But by and large, not. Its influence isn't very much, anymore. 'Tisn't as vocal as it used to be. Mrs. Pinchot is trying to revive some of that, but I don't think she'll succeed.

ERM: What sort of a person is she? Do you know her?

RSK: Well, I don't know her. I just met her. You see, Pinchot didn't marry her until after he left the Forest Service, so I just met her, that's all. But she's for some very radical ideas. As radical as Pinchot's most radical ones. And she's been trying to bring out the old idea again, but she isn't going to get anywhere.

ERM: Perhaps she had something to do with influencing him in his later…

RSK: Well, I am not sure, possibly did. But as I say, he went along the natural inclination he had – just got more emphatic, I think.

ERM: Well, looking to the future, what are the things you anticipate in the development of the field of forestry?

RSK: Well, I anticipate a great deal of progress in that field. Primarily because from now on the price of the forest products is going to be high enough so it's going to pay to grow the raw material. And to grow the raw material you've got to have the help of the trained foresters. So it's a big field. It's going to increase more. You've got the Society of American Foresters now – when it was formed it consisted entirely of a few members of the Forest Service, and for a great many years almost all its membership were people in state or government service. Well, I should say it was safe to say now they're all technical foresters – I presume the majority of them are not in public employ anymore. Now that has been a tremendous gain. Forestry is going back in the woods where it belongs.

ERM: In a sense the whole field has survived a revolution.

RSK: Sure it has.

ERM: And it's now established on an entirely different basis. It once had to justify itself and find public support for itself through a tremendous propaganda campaign.

RSK: Yes.

ERM: Now it has emerged into a new era?

RSK: Got onto a business basis. So I'd say, it's got a good future. Forestry will never be a highly paid profession. Any youngster that comes around and talks to me about going into forestry, I very promptly tell him if he wants to make a lot of money keep away from forestry. When they come around, as some of them do nowadays, and they ask you what the hours of work are in forestry, I tell them a forester works all the hours there are. Isn't any eight hour day in forestry. He'd got to go into it for the love of it – because he likes the outdoor life, he likes to grow things, he likes the opportunity to do something worthwhile for his country, for the public. Nobody should go into forestry with the idea he is going to make money out of it. He may make a decent living but he will never get rich.

ERM: Quite a nomadic kind of existence.

RSK: Likely to be. But it is interesting.

ERM: When did you settle down and become married and come to roost more? Or didn't you ever do that?

RSK: Well, I went into forestry work in 1901 and I was married in 1902. I was engaged when I went into forestry work.

ERM: Well, your wife must have been left alone at home a good many months of the year.

RSK: Well, she was quite a little. You see, I moved to Washington on the first of January, 1905, and I lived there and I went to Wisconsin in 1910, of course I traveled a great deal, far as that was concerned, but we had a home there just outside of Washington.

ERM: Your summers were spent in the field – your falls, I suppose back in Washington?

RSK: Well, I was put in charge of the Office of Wood Utilization – all the timber testing, wood preservation, forest statistics, and everything else, I spent more time in Washington than I did anywhere else. I was gone on a great many short trips. I was called upon to go everywhere and talk to organizations on all sorts of subjects; go out on inspection trips to the various operations we had. But the last long thing I did for the Forestry Service was Alaska in the summer of 1909.

ERM: And Trade Association work was in some respects a continuation…

RSK: Sure. I traveled any amount in Trade Association work. I visited every newsprint mill in North America.

ERM: And I imagine you covered practically every state in the United States and province in Canada.

RSK: I've seen every one of them. Let along a good deal of the rest of the world. But as I say, I personally knew every newsprint mill in North America. There's only one or two of them operating now that I don't know and haven't visited – been built in the last year or two.

ERM: Forestry and its development in this country has been very closely related with Canada and its…

RSK: Well, I've always said that as far as United States and Canada are concerned, it is an international industry with an international source of raw material. We haven't drawn any line in that respect. I've got a great many fine friends in Canada. I've seen more of Canada than a great many Canadians have.

ERM: And your attitude on the tariff program…

RSK: I don't think there should be any between the two countries. I think for the ultimate salvation of the two countries we've got to abolish the tariff one of these days. Canada made her big mistake in 1776 when she didn't accept the persuasion of Benjamin Franklin when he went to Montreal that time and asked them to join the thirteen colonies. I like to tell them that that's where they made their mistake.

ERM: What would you say about the relationship of North American forestry in a narrowing international community? Is it eventually going to become as closely related to forestry in South America, for example?

RSK: No, I don't think so. Situation is entirely different in South America. You've got to remember that the Northern Hemisphere has the most useful forests in the world.

They've got the great softwood forests – which exist nowhere else. South America you've got twice as many native species perhaps, diverse, all mixed up together. You don't have pure forests of any one particular species. You've got very difficult utilization conditions. One of my friends who's worked there a great deal days that Brazil has as much timber as there was in the United States, but it's going to be very difficult utilization problem. You've got hundreds of species all mixed up together. Very difficult operating conditions. You can't float the timber – you've got tremendous jungles, everything like that. Probably that timber may be utilized some day, but it doesn't compare to the utilization of the northern forests, or here what we can do in the south.

ERM: American capital is already beginning to show an interest in it.

RSK: Oh, it's gone down there some. Gone into Central America some. Gone into Mexico a little. But that isn't a pinprick on the whole situation. We've got the resources right here. We can grow timber in the South cheaper than you can anywhere else in the world.

ERM: What about the position of the Lake States, for example? Do you think…?

RSK: Well, the Lake States are coming back in good shape. Coming back tremendously. I was up there last summer in northern Wisconsin, northern peninsula of Michigan and that country is being transformed from what it was fifty years ago when it was all cut and skinned and burned. Now you can drive through that country and you can't see out because of the timber everywhere. It's come back in good shape; it's a green country again. And they are utilizing those woods there in the pulp and paper mills. But they can't grow wood over half as fast per acre per year as we can here, so they are up against very pertinent competition.

ERM: Doesn't that same situation pertain in Canada too, then?

RSK: To quite an extent. But you've got to remember Canada's big resources are big water powers. They've got much bigger water powers than we've got, except in the extreme west in some cases. They've got much bigger water powers than New York and New England.

ERM: And that's why their position will always be prominent in the newsprint field.

RSK: It's likely to be. I'll not say 'always', but it's likely to be for a good while. As long as they use power to grind wood and the basis of newsprint is ground wood.

ERM: Perhaps the coming in of atomic power might have something to do with that situation.

RSK: It might eventually – no telling. But Canada is, I think, a pretty firm situation in the paper industry as far ahead as anyone can see. Position of Canada in the paper industry is a good deal like that of Sweden and Finland, and Norway. They've got big areas that you can't do anything with except grow timber on.

ERM: Mr. Kellogg, will you tell us something now of the history of you National Forestry Program Committee?

RSK: Well, the main facts of that were recited in an article by Ralph Hosmer in the Journal of Forestry in September 1947. I turned over to Ralph my ten-year records of the operation of that committee – carbons of correspondence, the entire records I turned over to Ralph to go into the files of the history committee of the Society of American Foresters. So far as the account and make-up of the committee, there isn't any use

of repetition. The most important point was that the formation of the committee led to a big showdown with those foresters and other semi-socialistic people who advocate complete governmental control of timber cutting on privately owned land throughout the United States, the compulsory idea. The committee made its basic program the idea of cooperation between the timberland owners and the states and federal government. And the committee won out in the enactment of the Clarke-McNary law in 1924. That was, as I say, the showdown between these two schools of thought. And I've always taken a good deal of pride in the fact that we won out on that, notwithstanding the very vigorous opposition of Pinchot and all his admirers.

ERM: That was a long, drawn-out battle.

RSK: A long, drawn-out affair, and I think the thing was settled permanently at that time, because when the compulsory idea has been revived every little while since, it hasn't gotten anywhere. And that principle is so clearly established now I think we can count on it indefinitely in the future. There's no question at all but that it is very successful. You don't get anywhere if you start out to try and do something with our timberland owners by antagonizing them. That's exactly what the compulsory idea did. It got them all up in arms and very rapidly so. You have to work with people to accomplish things.

ERM: You would say that your opponents have come to life every now and then?

RSK: Oh yes, every once in a while they popped up but got nowhere.

ERM: Have these efforts been getting progressively weaker?

RSK: I think so, because the other program's made good. And the fact that I mention, I think a while ago, that half the members of the Society of American Foresters today are not in public service, they're in the service of the lumber manufacturers, pulp and paper manufacturers and timberland owners. They're learning forestry right in the woods. And the public is recognizing that. No, as I say, I think that was a most historic situation.

ERM: Would you tell us a little something about the story behind the story of Pinchot's opposition to this program?

RSK: Well, I think the basis of Pinchot's opposition to it was his own natural inclination of a socialistic nature to believe in federal control of all natural resources. It was his philosophy. Some of the rest of us didn't think that way. He didn't love us any more – his former associates.

ERM: Did he use that argument as an avenue to public power?

RSK: Well, of course, it would have resulted in that if his idea had gone over. Yes. But he held it to the end. As I mentioned the other night about Pinchot's book, reciting his own accomplishments, he never mentioned Bill Greeley's name.

ERM: What could you say about Greeley's contribution in this?

RSK: Well, Greeley's contribution was tremendous. If we hadn't had at that time as Federal forester, we wouldn't have got the Clarke-McNary law because Greeley worked with us. Our committee represented the lumber manufacturers, the pulp and paper manufacturers and the timberland owners on one side, and Greeley represented the federal government and the Forest Service on the other side, and we worked together perfectly. It hasn't been a partisan matter.

ERM: It had support from both parties and opposition from both?

RSK: One of our biggest helps was Senator McNary of Oregon. Clarke McNary law – Representative Clarke from New York State; Senator McNary from Oregon in the Senate. And the law was given the Clarke-McNary name. No, it wasn't a partisan matter. We can be thankful for that.

ERM: Do you see any evidence that the use of forest lands may soon become a matter of partisan politics?

RSK: I don't anticipate it, no. I think this principle of cooperation has gotten so thoroughly entrenched these past thirty years now that I'm not worried about it. Because the timberland owners and the lumber manufacturers and pulp and paper manufacturers are making such rapid progress in practicing forestry on their own lands, that they can't be held up as scapegoats any more or destroyers of the forest.

ERM: The old lumber baron theme is worn out?

RSK: Yes, there is no question about that. No, I'm not worried about that score. As I said, we won that fight.

ERM: I wish you'd tell us a little something now about your joint textbook committee – how it became organized and the work that it's done.

RSK: Well, that's in the pulp and paper field. We had, in the Canadian pulp and paper association a technical group; they had a committee on education in the industry. In the technical association in the pulp and paper industry in the United States we had a committee on education. But they weren't doing anything particularly. They knew there was a need for vocational education to give some training to young fellows who wanted to go into the industry, be practical operating men. But they hadn't got much of anywhere, but finally in September, 1918, those two committees representing United States and Canada, got together at a joint meeting in Buffalo. And we decided to do something about it. So we set up a joint committee – later called it the Joint Textbook Committee – of three representatives of the United States industry; two representatives of the Canadian industry; and then that joint committee chose an editor for the proposed textbooks, and he was a Canadian, so we had balance between the two countries. Counting the editor in, who was the most important man we had, we drew up plans for a series of textbooks to be used by anybody who wanted to study the industry, for employees in the industry who wanted to improve their knowledge of the industry and get a promotion. And also to furnish textbooks for correspondence schools and schools of forestry and university extension courses to use. That was the plan of the whole darn thing. And we had to have money. We paid our editor a very modest salary. Nobody else got any pay at all – all members of the committee, all five of us, we worked for the love of it.

ERM: Did the editor, Mr. Stephenson, where was he associated in Canada?

RSK: He was the editor of the Pulp and Paper Magazine in Canada, and he is to this day. But that committee was set up in September, 1918. I'm the only surviving member of that committee. Stephenson is still active as the editor. We've been right straight on the job these thirty-seven years. It required money, of course. We had to pay authors now and then for separate parts, various papers written on it. We had to spend a lot of money for drawings, illustrations for the textbooks, etc.... and all together the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association appropriated $27,000 toward that joint fund, and we fellows in the United States, through personal solicitation, raised $30,000. These are just round numbers. So we set ourselves up with a total of

$57,000. Well, during that period – giving round numbers again – we have spent some $115,000 and have $5,000 left. Now that isn't New Deal financing.

ERM: You sold how many thousand books?

RSK: Well, all together, counting the total number of volumes of the four series, we have sold over seventy thousand volumes. And we get standard royalties from McGraw-Hill, whom we arranged to publish the book. And everybody's been very happy about the outcome – particularly McGraw-Hill.

ERM: Those textbooks sell at what price?

RSK: Well, it depends upon the size. They sell all the way from $7.50 to $10.00 a volume. Of course, printing costs tremendously more now than it did thirty-seven years ago. But they run rather roughly about a cent per printed page, and it hasn't gone very much beyond that even today. But the books have had very wide acceptance' there's nothing like it in the industry, anywhere in the world. Books have sold everywhere; they're translated into French – one of the editions was for the use of the French-Canadians. The McGraw-Hill London office has sold lots of copies. As I say, there is nothing like it in existence in the paper industry.

ERM: Is that French edition one of the five…?

RSK: Yes, that's counted in there. I think it was the first edition that was translated into French. We have just finished the fourth volume of the fourth edition – just came out on the sixteenth of March.

ERM: There are revisions made about how often?

RSK: Well, as I say, the first one came out in, I think, 1921 or '22 and we wound up now with the last one of the fourth edition. I could look up and give the dates of every one – I've forgotten just what they are. But it has been a very interesting piece of work – had world-wide acceptance. It's a good example of industry cooperation on an international basis – because we treated it just as one industry, regardless of boundaries.

ERM: Well, in your professional career, I suppose you would point to this textbook committee and the national forestry program committee and the setting up of the Newsprint Bureau on a sound bases as three of the major accomplishments of your work.

RSK: Well, they are three projects that I have had a lot of fun at. Only got paid for one of them. We get more satisfaction out of our unpaid activities sometimes.

ERM: Well, that's true, and I suppose you are finding that true today in the activities you have here in Florida?

RSK: Well, I am certainly not getting paid for them but they are taking all my time.

ERM: And it's costing you money?

RSK: Plenty. But I've been secretary-treasurer of the textbook fund from the beginning. All the finances have all been handled through my New York office – still are.

ERM: Do you still occasionally get into the New York office?

RSK: Oh, once in a great while. I was there last February, but my successor, a young fellow whom I trained up there in the Newsprint Service Bureau, keeps these records for me now, and sends checks down for me to sign whenever it's necessary. I tried to resign from this committee last February and the other fellows wouldn't let me.

ERM: Well, they probably figured the …

RSK: One of the back numbers.

ERM: One of the charter members.

RSK: Well, that's true, the textbook committee, as I've had occasion to remark in my annual reports to the meetings, the textbook committee has always been unanimous. We've had some pretty good arguments once in a great while, but when we get through, we stood on whatever we decided to do.

ERM: One subject we haven't talked about so far is the Society of American Foresters. You are a member of the Society and one of the early…

RSK: Yes, one of the early ones. I didn't join as early – I wasn't elected to membership as early as some of the others, but I began attending their meetings within three months after the Society was formed.

ERM: That was back in 1900?

RSK: The Society was formed in December, 1900, and I began attending their meetings in February, 1901, so I know a good deal about their meetings. I was elected to membership in 1905, before I passed the Civil Service examinations for professional forester. On the basis of the four years of fieldwork I had done in forestry.

ERM: And you take an active part in the Society's southeast section here?

RSK: Oh, yes. I'm very fond of the Society and, of course, it's done a great job. We didn't get the Society to going places until about 1929. That's when we got a full-time professional secretary of it. Before that we elected various people as secretary without any recompense, and carried on as best we could. But we had a meeting in New York City during the Christmas 1928 vacation of the Society, and we decided to have a full-time professional secretary. We made it possible in the first place by extra contributions on the part of some of the membership, until we could get the revenues up enough to get somewhere. And the Society has been going places these last twenty-six years. On the bases of that it's got a budget over a hundred thousand dollars a year now. Got ten thousand members. So it's been doing good work.

ERM: Don't you feel that the Society might, within the budget of that size, embark upon some historical publication?

RSK: Well, it's done a little. It put out a number of very valuable publications in the technical field in addition to what it did a few years ago on the first fifty years of forestry in the United States. And I suppose if it goes on, it will do more of the same thing. As I say, it's done a good job. It's done a great deal to advance the profession – the recognition of forestry as a profession. You see, the Society was formed originally by Pinchot and six other fellows in the old division of forestry. There's two of them left yet – that's Will Hall and Ralph Hosmer – two of the seven charter members. And the membership was very small for a long time, and all the meetings were held at Pinchot's house on Rhode Island Avenue – a fine, magnificent mansion in the aristocratic section in Washington. The meetings were all help up there and we had good programs, and of course he was chairman of it, the president, or whatever

you choose to call it. And after the meetings he always used to serve baked apples and ginger bread and any amount of cream. And the boys used to call it the 'Baked Apple Club'. But after a while - and I led it too, I'll take credit for that - I was instrumental in taking the meetings away from Pinchot's house. And getting them down to the Cosmos Club. I wanted the Society to begin to get on its own feet.

ERM: And that was in what year?

RSK: Oh, it was about 1908 or '09, I think. I've forgotten just when it was. And the next thing that I took the lead in was as the membership grew, was to have things settled in letter ballot, instead of just the fellows who were living in Washington in Forest Service settling everything for the Society, when we began to have membership all over the United States. So I take credit for two things. Which put the Society on its own independent feet. And then another thing, the Forest Service used to do all the mimeographing gratis. Well, I was the secretary of the Society in the first quarter of 1910, just before I resigned from the service. And another thing that I did at that time was to go to an independent firm and get our printing done and take it away from the Forest Service. I worked to put the Society on its own independent feet, with a nation-wide membership. So I had something to do with those three things. Been a member of the American Forestry Association for fifty-four years. There's no qualification for that, except pay your dues. Anybody can be a member, and they've done a good job. And of course, a great many professional foresters are also members of the Forestry Association, and here we've a Florida Association and I'm on the Board of Directors of our Forestry Association too. As I say, anybody who wants to pay his dues can be a member of those organizations. There's no particular credit to you for that.

ERM: Would you say that the influence of these forestry associations is waning now?

RSK: No, I don't think so. 'Tisn't with the American Forestry Association. I think that the American Forestry Association is as influential as it has ever been, and some of the state associations are pretty strong.

ERM: The contributions of such meetings as the Higgins Lake conference?

RSK: Yes. They more or less set the pattern of desirable things to do to promote forestry. No, I think the American Forestry Association is a strong hand. The present manager of it, Lowell Besley – I've never met him but he is the son of one of the first men I ever worked with in the United States Forest Service, Fred Besley, who was forester of the state of Maryland for a good many years after he left the Forest Service.

ERM: Lowell Besley came from the University of British Columbia?

RSK: Yes, he was out there for a while – not so awfully long. You see, the American Forestry Association made big progress under Ovid Butler, who came from the Forest Service and went into the Association.

ERM: He was the executive of it and editor of its publication for quite some time.

RSK: Oh yes. A long period. He did a good job.

ERM: What have you been doing in Florida?

RSK: Five years ago I started a movement that resulted in having forest fire control right here in my home counties of Manatee and Sarasota, under the Clarke-McNary Act, which I had something to do with starting. You see, the matter of forest fire control in Florida is entirely an arrangement between individual counties and the Florida

Board of Forestry. It isn't statewide – it's only as each county wants to come in and cooperate with the State Board under terms of the Clarke-McNary Act. Well, five years ago in January, I began to have a notion that we ought to do something down here. I told people I got tired of seeing this country burned up as long as I lived her, because Florida has always had the worst record of any state in the Union – still has for that matter – on forest fires. But in order to get it, I had to do this: I had to get the signatures of owners of the majority of the acreage of the land in these two counties on petitions, asking the county commissioners to put that referendum question on the ballot in November, 1950. Had to canvas these two counties and get the signatures of those landowners, majority of acres. Five hundred thousand acres in this county, for instance, I had to get over two hundred and fifty thousand acres on the dotted line. Sarasota County is smaller, but over half the acreage. Well, I did that. Had a lot of help from the Florida Forest Service and had a lot help with some of the good people around here. I went to the Rotary Club in Palmetto, which I am a member of, and told them that if they'd appoint me chairman of it, I'd make a motion that we have a forestry committee. I went to the Chamber of Commerce in Bradenton – a good friend of mine was president of it – and told him the same thing. And he did it. So I set up those two committees and worked them as one committee. And then, of course, they said tight away we ought to do something in Sarasota, adjacent county and so I went down there and talked to the people in the Chamber of Commerce in Sarasota and got them behind it. That's the way we got the signatures of the required acreage. Well, then after we got the commissioners to agree to put it on the November ballot, we had to go ahead and carry the election. And we did that. I worked up a regular schedule there, for instance, of twenty organizations before election in the fall of 1950 and talked to every one of them for five minutes or so. Other people did the same thing in Sarasota County. I also did a little down there. Them just before the election I got out a page ad in the paper. The election was Tuesday – I had the page ad in on Sunday. I had about thirty-odd firms sign it. Each one paid its share. A big paid ad – about the importance of fire control and voting for it. We got the principle stores and the banks to send out little cards calling attention to the matter and urging people to vote for it. We had all kinds of cooperation. And we pit it over. We got seventy-two percent of the votes in this county and eighty-four percent of those voting in Sarasota County. And them we had to wait two years before we got the money out of the legislature to start it. The first session of the legislature came right after that – didn't appropriate enough money. But beginning the first of July, 1953, we got forest fire control set up in these two counties. We have three towers operating. We've half a dozen or more fire-fighting trucks. We've got some other equipment, and we've got airplane patrol – that's the most valuable thing we've got. During the danger season the plane is in the air pretty near all the time over these two counties. And the airplane patrol – the towers and the fire-fighting trucks, all equipped with two-way radio. So if there is a fire spied anywhere they know it immediately.

ERM: What's happened to your fire record in recent years?

RSK: Well, it's been pretty good. There haven't been any bad fires. There's been a good many promptly extinguished. And it goes even further than that so-called forest fire control, because if there's fire anywhere in the county, our men go right after it, if it's a house. They even put out a fire in an automobile the other day. The highway patrol found an automobile on fire and they radioed immediately to the forest fire fellows and they ran right over there and put the fire out. They get cooperation right along, between the local fire department, the highway patrol and the forest fire patrol. But the best single thing is the airplane patrol. You see, a fellow can't see a fire out from a fire tower – he just knows what direction it is. He doesn't know at all where it is until he gets a cross sight from another tower. That tower may not be close enough. But the fellow in the plane flies right over it and he knows exactly where it is and he radios back immediately. There isn't any lost time by a truck trying

to find the fire. Another thing they do, they plow fire lines for ranchers at three dollars and a half a mile- that's a cinch! You see, down here, a man can burn and destroy his own property just as fast as he chooses. In the North, for instance, you can't even get permission to burn a brush pile in the danger season, on your own property. There's nothing like that down here. A man can burn all he chooses on his own property. The big job here is to educate these people that if they want to burn off their old ranges, and some of them do yet – is to let the Forest Service fellows know when they are going to burn. Then the service fellows can go out there and help them keep the fire under control and from going over onto the other fellow. That's one thing we had to talk about with some of these big ranchers, the big landowners, because they'd always been used to burning off their ranges, and we told them they still had that right to burn their own property, but they mustn't burn any other fellows and we'd help them from burning the other fellow. And that is the way we got the best of the ranchers lined up. And then, of course, wherever they'd gone ahead and improved their ranges and got in good grass and grading up good cattle, those fellows were very strong in our support. They didn't want fire under any circumstances. So we got the bulk of the cattlemen lined up with us. No, it's working fine.

ERM: That's one of your more recent accomplishments?

RSK: That's my latest in the forestry field. Probably the last.

ERM: Well, now don't say your last. You are making a real contribution in getting the story of forest history.

RSK: That's just sitting in an easy chair and talking.
I once wrote a series of reports for the American Paper and Pulp Association on what we ought to have in the way of forest policy. And then we came around to getting the legislation when the Forest Service drew the bill, covering those points, and other things we agreed between us that ought to go into the bill. Our committee didn't draw the bill that finally went into Congress, but our committee pooled all the principles we wanted covered. And those principles started with the reports I wrote for the American Paper and Pulp Association. That's when they first came into public widespread print.

ERM: Those reports were made then back when?

RSK: About 1919. You see, the American Paper and Pulp Association – I wasn't a member of the Paper and Pulp as far as that's concerned, except I had a lot of good friends there. They appointed a forestry committee and made me secretary of it and I wrote all the reports, and made the reports to the American Paper and Pulp Association, although my own organization was the Newsprint Service Bureau. But it happened that the president of the American Paper and Pulp Association was a darn good friend of mine and a very far-seeing all around citizen.

ERM: What relationship does the Newsprint Service Bureau have to...?

RSK: The Newsprint Service Bureau now is strictly a United States organization. It's been reorganized in the last few years. And have only United States membership – it's one of the affiliated organizations now of the American Paper and Pulp. It wasn't back in those days. It was an independent, international organization. But the Canadians finally got strong enough to set up a big organization of their own.

ERM: How did you feel about that?

RSK: Oh, it was all right.

ERM: A good liaison between…?

RSK: Oh, absolutely, they exchange statistics regularly. So they have an international report.

ERM: What do you think of the efforts that are being made in international forestry now through the U.N. organization?

RSK: Well, frankly I haven't taken much stock in it.

ERM: You get this publication UNASYLVA?

RSK: Yes. I haven't been sold on that at all. All they are doing is rehashing a lot of stuff that we've already got. I haven't been sold on it.

ERM: It seems it does sometimes contain data which might not be available, especially on what is going on behind the iron curtain.

RSK: Well, they don't get much on that either, as far as that's concerned. No, as I say, I haven't been sold on that organization. I haven't been able to see that it's worth the money. I haven't been sold on a lot of work that the U.N. has done. I think the U.N. has just gone ahead and spent millions and millions of dollars – mostly ours – put up those tremendous headquarters and things like that and hasn't accomplished the basic purposes for which it was set up very largely. I think it might better have gone ahead with a good deal smaller front and more effective work.

Royal S. Kellogg Interview

Topics Discussed